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Executive Summary

The Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee (the “Committee”) has developed a Land Use Plan and Background Report for the Dehcho territory. This document is the Background Report.

The Background Report supports the Plan by providing context, rationale and methodology, but is not part of the Plan or subject to approval by the Parties.

The Background Report contains six chapters.

Chapter 1 introduces the Plan and Background Report and sets the context for planning decisions.

Chapter 2 describes the Plan Area, culture, people, land and resources, and highlights the key conclusions of all the research included in Plan development.

Chapter 3 describes the current regulatory and policy context of the region and how the Plan is integrated into that system. There is also a discussion of how the Plan integrates with other land use initiatives, including the Protected Areas Strategy, the Nahanni Park Expansion Process, the Cumulative Effects Assessment and Management (CEAM) Framework and Strategy, transboundary activities, and community planning initiatives.

Chapter 4 describes the overall planning process as laid out in the guidelines presented in Appendix II of the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement, under which the Committee was established. It defines the methods used to develop the zones and the nature and purpose of the five zone types. This chapter explains the Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations included in the Plan and how they address planning related issues. The methodology used in the cumulative effects and Economic Development Model Assessments is also defined in this chapter.

Chapter 5 provides a detailed description of each Land Use Zone, identifying the permitted uses, zone objectives, conservation values and resource potential, and any specific Conformity Requirements applicable to the zone.

Chapter 6 assesses the impact of the Plan from various perspectives, including:

- A comparison of the Land Use Zones with existing dispositions;
- Land use comparisons which show how the zoning relates to the development potential and existing situation for each of the five key land uses;
- A comparison of the Land Use Zones against conservation goals;
- The Economic Development Assessment; and
- Cumulative Effects Assessments.

Appendix 10 contains all the questions and comments raised during the information sessions or through written submissions on the November 2005 Revised Draft Plan and the Committee’s responses to them. Many of the responses are also reflected in changes to the Plan. The other appendices contain additional background information not required in the Plan.

For reference, discussion of Cumulative Effects Assessment and Economic Development Assessment occurs throughout the Plan and Background Report according to subject:
• Chapter 2 of the Plan describes the Conformity Requirement for Cumulative Effects
• Appendix 3 of the Plan describes the detailed methodology for Cumulative Effects Assessments.
• Chapter 4 of the Background Report describes general methodology, assumptions and rationale for both topics.
• Chapter 6 of the Background Report describes the Assessment results for both topics.

NOTE: The maps provided in Background Report are for illustrative purposes only. While the Background Report uses the best information available at the time of writing, we make no guarantees of completeness or accuracy. The maps may become outdated after print. Interested persons or organizations requiring up to date information should contact the data source for the most current files.
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Definitions

In this Background Report,

“Actions” means measures that the Parties agree to make best efforts to complete through approval of this Plan, and that do not regulate land or water use (e.g. research, meetings).

“agriculture” means a land use involving the cultivation of soil, production of crops and the raising of livestock.

“applicant” means any person engaged in or intending to engage in an activity requiring an authorization for a land use.

“authorization” means any permit, licence, or other form of authorization required under legislation.

“best available technology” means the most effective and economically-achievable technology.

“biodiversity” means the variability among living organisms. It includes diversity within species (genetic diversity), between species (species diversity), and of ecosystems (ecosystem diversity).

“communities” include Fort Simpson (Líídįį Kųįé), Fort Providence (Zhahti Kųįé), Fort Liard (Echaot’ie Kųįé), Hay River Reserve (K’átľ’odeeeche), Hay River (K’átľ’odehhé), Wrigley (Pehdzeh Kį), Jean Marie River (Tthets’éhk’edéľį), Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e), Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó), Kakisa Lake (Ka’a’gee Tu) and Enterprise and all residents thereof.

“community boundaries” means the extent of community lands including Development Control Zones, Municipal Boundaries, and the Hay River Reserve (K’átľ’odeeeche).

“Conformity Requirements” mean the requirements that, upon implementation of this Plan, a) a land use must meet in order to receive authorization, or b) that must be included and/or complied with under an authorization.

“corridor” means all linear features wider than 1.5 m, including roads, trails, utility corridors, pipeline right-of-ways and seismic lines and all other linear features where natural ground cover has been removed due to human disturbance, and “corridor density” is expressed as km/km² and is calculated for each quarter of an oil and gas grid as defined in the Canada Oil and Gas Land Regulations (under the Territorial Lands Act).

“critical threshold” means a science-based target reflecting the continuous maximum amount of stress that an environmental or social system can support without long-term harm.

“Dehcho First Nation(s)” consists of the regional body known as Dehcho First Nations, or the following First Nations, or both, as the context implies: Líídįį Kųįé First Nation (Fort Simpson), Deh Gáh Got’ie First Nation (Fort Providence), Acho Dene Koe Band (Fort Liard), K’átľ’odeeeche First Nation (Hay River Reserve), Pehdzeh Kį First Nation (Wrigley), Ts’ueh Nda
Tthets’éhk’edélî First Nation (Jean Marie River First Nation, Jean Marie River), Naæahdee First Nation (Nahanni Butte), Ka’a’gee Tu First Nation (Kakisa), Fort Simpson Métis Local 52, Fort Providence Métis Local 57 and Fort Liard Métis Local 67.

“ecoregion” means subdivisions of the ecozone characterized by distinctive large order landforms or assemblages of regional landforms, small order macro- or mesoclimates, vegetation, soils, water, and regional human activity patterns/uses.

“ecosystem” means a biological community of interacting organisms and their physical environment.

“environment” means the components of the Earth and includes (a) land, water and air, including all layers of the atmosphere; (b) all organic and inorganic matter and living organisms; and (c) the interacting natural systems that include components referred to in paragraphs (a) to (b).

“employment” means the total number of hours of work provided as a result of development. Employment includes “Dehcho” employment, which reflects employment of Dehcho residents and “southern” employment, which relates to southerners who work temporarily in the region.

“existing use” means any rights, titles, interests, entitlements, licences, permits, authorizations, reservations, reservations by notation, benefits and privileges existing in the Dehcho territory on the day prior to Plan approval.

“forestry” means a land use involving i) the harvest of timber or ii) the management of an area for the purpose of producing timber, but does not include the cutting of timber necessary for any other land use, and does not include timber harvesting activities authorized under a free timber cutting permit.

“geophysical operation” means the measurement or investigation, by indirect methods, of the subsurface of the earth for the purpose of locating oil and gas or of determining the nature of the seabed and subsurface conditions at a proposed drilling site or of a proposed pipeline route, and includes a seismic survey, resistivity survey, gravimetric survey, magnetic survey, electrical survey and geochemical survey and any work preparatory to that measurement or investigation, such as field tests of energy sources, calibration of instruments and cable ballasting, but does not include a velocity survey or a vertical seismic survey that is not a walkaway vertical seismic survey.

“governments” includes local governments, Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT), Government of Canada (GOC) and all departments and agencies of each.

“gross domestic product” is the sum of value added by all resident producers with respect to development plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output.

“gross expenditure” is the total value of gross production derived from the Dehcho economy.

“gross production” means the total volume of the product (oil or gas, minerals or timber) directly related to the agriculture, forestry, mining, oil and gas and tourism sectors in the Dehcho territory as determined by the Economic Development Model.
“human disturbance” means any relatively discrete event arising from human sources that disrupts an ecosystem, community, or population structure and changes resources, substrate availability, or the physical environment. Sources may include agricultural operations, resource extraction, industrial processes, combustion of wood or fossil fuels, earthmoving activities, and entrainment of road dust into the air.11 12.

“labour force” is the group of people who have a potential for being employed. All persons 15 and over who are either employed, temporarily idle, or unemployed and seeking employment.

“labour income” means the gross wages and salaries and supplementary labour income earned by the people employed by a project. It includes income taxes, employment insurance, pension fund contributions, etc. It can apply to direct or spin off employment. Household income is part of gross domestic product.

“land use” means any use of land, water or other resources and associated activities, works and undertakings that requires a) a land use permit as per the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act and Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations or other subordinate legislation; b) a lease or other interest in land granted on behalf of the Crown, where a land use permit would be required if not for the grant; c) a water licence under the Northwest Territories Waters Act and Northwest Territories Waters Regulations or other subordinate legislation; d) a commercial fishing licence under the Fisheries Act or subordinate legislation; e) a big game outfitter licence under the Wildlife Act or subordinate legislation; or f) an outfitter licence under the Travel and Tourism Act or subordinate legislation.

“land” means, unless the context indicates otherwise, land, water, and resources including air and all layers of the atmosphere above and the subsurface below.13

“local government” means any local government established under the Cities, Towns, and Villages Act, Hamlets Act, Charter Communities Act, or Settlements Act, of the Northwest Territories, including a city, town, village, hamlet, charter community, or settlement, whether incorporated or not, and the GNWT acting in place of a local government.14

“low impact seismic” means operational procedures that minimize the effects of seismic operations on the environment by creating a narrow, continuously meandering line that reduces the line of sight to less than 200 m, avoids larger trees (avoidance cutting), and leaves the soil and ground cover generally undisturbed. Line width may vary from 1.5 to 4.5 m and be hand cut or mechanically cut. The average line width cannot exceed 4.5 m and maximum line width cannot exceed 5.0 m.15

“Mackenzie Valley Pipeline” means the land use as defined in Section 1.1.1.2 of the "Application for Approval of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline, Volume 1: Pipeline Project Overview" submitted by Imperial Oil Resource Ventures Limited to the National Energy Board on October 7, 2004. This includes the possible expansion to 1.9 Bcf/d described in this section insofar as all additional components remain within the defined pipeline corridor. The pipeline includes ancillary infrastructure and activities including but not limited to compressor stations, heater stations, meter stations, block valves, pig receivers, gathering systems, processing facilities, well sites, pump stations, production facilities, remote maintenance base sites, access roads, camps, barge landings, airstrips, staging areas, borrow sites, water crossings, road/pipeline crossings, land leases, quarrying, water use, timber storage and any other construction only workspace required, and any other infrastructure or activity essential to the construction or operation of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline within the Dehcho territory.16
“**minimal impact seismic**” means the creation of seismic lines where cutting of forest growth is restricted to the width necessary to create a walking trail for foot access. There is no cutting of standing trees and little if any cutting of shrubs. Minimal impact lines can include the use of existing lines and thus avoid cutting new lines.17

“**mining**” means a land use involving the exploration for or development of a mineral resource, the extracting of minerals from a mineral resource, the processing of ore, other than iron ore, from a mineral resource to the prime metal stage or its equivalent, the processing of iron ore from a mineral resource to the pellet stage or its equivalent and the restoration of strip-mined land to a usable condition, but does not include anything done in the course of prospecting, staking or locating a mineral claim unless it requires the use of equipment or material referred to in section 4 or 5 of the *Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations*. “**Mineral Resources**” include (a) a base- or a precious-metal deposit; (b) a coal deposit; (c) a mineral deposit from which the principal extracted substance is diamond or ammonite gemstone, potash, sodium chloride, gypsum or silica (if extracted from sandstone or quartzite); (d) a certified non-bedded deposit from which an industrial mineral is the principal mineral extracted; (e) a bituminous sands or oil shale deposit19; or (f) bedded industrial minerals (e.g. barite) or rock, i.e., building stone or dimension stone; but exclude gravel.

“**no net loss**” means balancing unavoidable habitat losses with habitat replacement on a project-by-project basis so that further reductions to resources due to habitat loss or damage may be prevented.20

“**non-exclusive geophysical survey**” means a geophysical operation that is conducted to acquire data for the purpose of sale, in whole or in part, to the public.21

“**oil and gas operations**” means a land use involving exploration (excluding non-exclusive geophysical surveys), drilling, production, conservation, processing and transportation of oil and gas and any related activities. “**Gas**” means natural gas that is or can be produced from a well, both before and after it has been subjected to any processing, and includes marketable gas and all fluid components not defined as oil. “**Oil**” means crude oil and all other hydrocarbons, regardless of gravity, that are or can be produced from a well in liquid form including crude bitumen but excluding condensate 22.

“**outputs**” means outputs from the Economic Development Assessment model, which includes gross domestic product, gross expenditure, employment, labour income and revenue. These may be classified as “**direct**” which arise directly from land uses (agriculture, forestry, mining, oil and gas and tourism) in the Dehcho territory as determined by the economic development model; “**indirect**” which arise as a result of the effects of all land use activity throughout the economy. These might be secondary industries e.g. building / wood manufacturing; and “**induced**” which arise from economic activity induced in other local industries.

“**parties**” means Dehcho First Nation(s), Canada and the GNWT.23

“**pipeline**” means a pipeline that is used or is intended to be used for the transmission of oil, gas or any other commodity.24

“**pipeline right of way**” means a strip of land over and around pipelines where a pipeline company has acquired rights to use the land for the construction, operation and maintenance of its pipelines, however, ownership of the land remains with the landowner. All activities within the right of way are governed by the *NEB Act*, the *NEB Pipeline Crossing Regulations*, Parts I...
and II, and easement agreements negotiated between the landowner and the pipeline company.

“Plan approval” includes, except where otherwise stated or indicated by the context, favourable consideration of the Plan.

“precautionary principle” means the absence of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing decisions where there is a risk of serious or irreversible harm.

“Recommendations” means statements which provide advisory guidance to various governments, Responsible Authorities and organizations on additional measures that will help achieve the goals of the Plan; for clarity, they are not legally binding requirements, but where appropriate, should be given consideration in future land use decisions and policy initiatives.

“Responsible Authority” means the government department, agency or institution responsible for managing land, water or resources, or issuing a licence, permit or authorization that regulates the activity in question within the Dehcho territory, and where there is more than one such body, includes all such bodies.

“significant environmental features” means sites of important ecological significance, some of which also provide unique wildlife habitat for different species, including but not restricted to karst topography, hot and cold springs, waterfalls, ravines, cliffs and other unique geological features.

“sustainable development” means development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

“tax revenue” means government income due to taxation.

“tourism” means a land use involving any outdoor recreational activity as defined in the Travel and Tourism Act, not including big game outfitting. Depending on this context, “tourism businesses” may or may not include a tourist establishment as defined in the Travel and Tourism Act; and “tourism services” include fishing, hiking, cultural skills and interpretation, dog-sledding, and canoeing, but do not include big game outfitting.

“traditional knowledge” means the accumulated body of knowledge, observations and understandings about the environment, and about the relationship of living beings with one another and the environment, that is rooted in the traditional way of life of first nations.

“traditional land use and occupancy” consists of a) activities by aboriginal persons involving the harvest of traditional resources like hunting, trapping, fishing, gathering of medicinal plants and berry picking, and travelling to engage in these kinds of activities, whether or not authorizations are required (traditional land use) and b) the area which a particular aboriginal group regards as its own by virtue of continuing use, habitation, naming, knowledge, and control (traditional occupancy). The mapping of traditional land use records the locations where these activities occur. The mapping of occupancy records stories and legends about places, ecological knowledge of places, indigenous place names, and habitation sites like cabins and burial grounds.

“water” means any inland water, whether in a liquid or frozen state, on or below the surface.
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View of the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and mountains from the community of Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki). Photo Credit: DLUPC

NOTE: The maps provided in this Background Report are for illustrative purposes only. While the DLUPC uses the best information available at the time of writing, we make no guarantees of completeness or accuracy. The maps may become outdated after print. Interested persons or organizations requiring up to date information should contact the data source for the most current files.
1.1 Introduction
The Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee (the DLUPC or Committee) was established in May 2001 through the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement (IMA). The Committee is mandated to develop a Land Use Plan for the Dehcho territory for lands outside the existing community boundaries and Nahanni National Park Reserve.

“The purpose of the Plan is to promote the social, cultural and economic well being of residents and communities in the Dehcho territory, having regard to the interests of all Canadians.” (IMA, S.3)

“Taking into consideration the principles of respect for the land, as understood and explained by the Dehcho Elders, and sustainable development, the Plan shall provide for the conservation, development and utilization of the land, waters and other resources in the Dehcho territory.” (IMA, S.4) As such, Elders play an important role in guiding Plan development.

The Plan outlines “what types of activities should occur, generally where they should take place, and terms and conditions necessary to guide land use proposals and development projects over time.” (IMA, Appendix II)

“The Parties share the objective that upon approval of a Dehcho Final Agreement, the approved Plan will be a land management tool that provides legally-binding direction and guidance to regulatory agencies and decision-makers in the evaluation of development projects, protected area proposals, and other potential land uses.” (IMA, Appendix II)

In advance of a Dehcho Final Agreement, the implemented Plan will provide binding direction to Responsible Authorities in their decision-making and regulation of land use activities through the implementation mechanisms outlined in Chapter 3 of the Plan.

The audience for the Plan is primarily Responsible Authorities and potential applicants who will want to ensure their applications conform before filing them. Readers may wish to consult the detailed information in the Background Report. It assists in interpreting the Plan and may provide useful insight into community values, interests and expectations.

1.2 The Dehcho Territory
The Dehcho territory is located in the southwest corner of the Northwest Territories. It is surrounded by the Sahtu Settlement Area and the Tlicho (Dogrib) Settlement Area to the north, the Treaty 8 territory to the east, Alberta (AB) and British Columbia (BC) to the south, and the Yukon Territory to the west. It covers approximately 215,615 km² and is home to approximately 7000 people. The Mackenzie River or Dehcho (meaning big river) dominates the landscape, carrying water from Great Slave Lake (Tucho) to the Mackenzie Delta. Map 1 shows the Dehcho territory.

The Dehcho territory contains 11 communities: Fort Providence (Zhahti Kújë), Kakisa (Ka’a’gee Tu), Enterprise, Hay River (K’átł’odehé), Hay River Reserve (K’átł’odeeche), Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e), Jean Marie River (Tthets’èhk’èdélî) Fort Simpson (Łiidliı̨ł Kújë), Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki), Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) and Fort Liard (Echaot’ı̨l Kújë). Within these
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communities, there are 14 aboriginal organizations belonging to the Dehcho First Nations, plus the regional Dehcho First Nations headquarters in Fort Simpson (Łíídlįį Kųįę). Hay River (K’átå’odehé) and Enterprise are predominantly non-aboriginal. Five of the communities have municipal governments, whereas the First Nation offices are the only governments present in the smaller communities. They are illustrated in Map 1.

Most of the communities are accessible by the NWT highway system. Ground access to Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) and Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) is via winter road from November to April. With the exception of freeze-up and break-up Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) is also accessible by boat for the remainder of the year. There are ferry/winter road crossings over the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) near Fort Providence (Zhahti Kųįę) and Ndulée, and another over the Liard River (Acho Tine Deh) by Fort Simpson (Łíídlįį Kųįę). There are plans to construct a bridge at the Fort Providence (Zhahti Kųįę) crossing in 2006. All communities are accessible by air year round. Chapter 2 provides a more detailed description of the people, their culture, the economy, land and resources.

1.3 What is Land Use Planning?

Land use planning outlines what types of activities should occur, where they should take place, and the terms and conditions necessary to guide land use decisions over time. It requires a clear vision of how we want the land and the people to be in 20 to 30 years. The Plan becomes the roadmap that guides decisions at every turn to take us where we want to go.

Appendix 1 provides a detailed history of the Dehcho land use planning process. The Committee collected information about the values and resources in the Dehcho territory and presented this information to communities and planning partners. We then asked people what they wanted to do with those resources. How should they be used? Where should land use be permitted and where should it be protected? Communities answered these questions through mapping. They identified where they are comfortable having development and what types of land use they would like to encourage. We discussed employment, goals and priorities with the community and then explained how mapping land uses could help them achieve that.

Those maps, together with the information collected on resource potential and conservation values provided the Committee with the necessary information to develop Land Use Zones. These zones tell applicants and Governments where certain land uses are allowed and where they are not. These zones may also lay the foundation for future protected areas under the Protected Areas Strategy (PAS) for communities wanting land permanently protected.

1.4 Land Use Planning and the Dehcho Process

In other regions in the north, land use planning has followed settlement of land claims. The Dehcho First Nations requested that land use planning be completed before the Dehcho Final Agreement to protect land, manage land use and inform negotiations. If the Parties have concrete information on the land and resources and can agree on how they will be used, that will provide the basis for a new relationship of “shared stewardship” – an alternative to the land selection and extinguishment model. The approved Plan is expected to guide further discussions on lands and resource management systems towards a Final Agreement. Once the Final Agreement is in place, the Plan will be revised to reflect the terms of the Final Agreement.
Until there is a Final Agreement, the Plan will be implemented by the Parties under policy direction from the appropriate Ministers. Governments are expected to carry out their duties in conformity with the approved Land Use Plan. The land use restrictions will be implemented through a new set of land withdrawals under S.23 of the *Territorial Lands Act*. That is, all Conservation Zones and those Special Management Zones that prohibit certain land uses will be included in a new set of land withdrawals that will replace the existing ones.

The Plan is intended to advance the negotiation of agreements on land, resources and governance between Canada, the GNWT and the Dehcho First Nation(s). Accordingly, approval and implementation of the Plan is without prejudice to any positions that may be taken, or agreements made in those negotiations.

Approval of this Plan will not have the effect of recognizing, denying or altering Aboriginal rights, Aboriginal title, or Treaty rights.
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Traditional hand games and drumming – DLUPC Dene Nahodhe Workshop April 2004. Photo Credit: DLUPC

NOTE: The maps provided in this Background Report are for illustrative purposes only. While the DLUPC uses the best information available at the time of writing, we make no guarantees of completeness or accuracy. The maps may become outdated after print. Interested persons or organizations requiring up to date information should contact the data source for the most current files.
2.1 Dene Culture
The Dene Culture is one of working together and respecting people and the land. This has been passed down through generations, through language, stories and cultural practices. These have formed the foundation of the Land Use Plan.

2.1.1 Logo
The Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee’s logo brings together the important elements which have sustained Dene people since time immemorial. Each piece of the logo has special significance to the Dehcho Dene.

- The 14 poles of the teepee represent the 14 aboriginal organizations;
- The fire represents the relationship between the land and the people;
- The fire logs represent the four directions,
- Green represents land,
- Blue represents water,
- Red represents fire,
- Yellow represents the sun, and
- White represents the wind

2.1.2 Dene Language
The language reflects the identity of the Dene culture. Language is taught at home by parents and Elders. Dene language is connected to the land and words have specific meaning. There are slightly different dialects of South Slavey in the eleven communities. Table 1 shows the percentage of aboriginal people who speak their aboriginal language, according to the NWT Bureau of Statistics. The small isolated communities with fewer non aboriginal people tend to retain the use of their native language. In the past there were no paper maps and people learned how to live through their oral history. Many Dene words describe the specific environment and people’s relationship with the land and resources. Every part of an animal has a specific name and use. The seasons have special significance for cultural uses. For example, the fall season (xat’áâ) is when the Dene go out on the land to harvest fish and berries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>% of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trout Lake (Sambaa K’ée)</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakisa Lake (Ka’a’gee Tu)</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó)</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki)</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Liard (Echaot’je Kúé)</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Marie River (Tthets’éhk’édéj)</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Providence (Zhahtí Kúé)</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River Reserve (K’át’t’odeeche)</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.3 Oral History & Legends

Dene culture is maintained through oral history and legends. Some of the stories that have been passed down from generation to generation are about Yamoria. According to these stories Yamoria was like God.

“Yamoria made the people understand that medicine power was given to the people by the Creator to help them, not to harm others with. They should always share the gains that came out of owning medicine power with each other. 

Yamoria also gave the Dene medicine laws to live by. He called meetings whenever he went and told them, I want Elders and parents to teach their children as soon as they start to talk. I want the Elders to tell stories of the past, every day, and talk about good people and bad people. Talk about the mistakes they have made and how people suffered from it. Try to prevent these mistakes from happening again. I want you to work together and share everything you have. Or, you can elect a person to be your leader. Pick a strong person. A respected leader has to be a strong medicine man, so they will know what is going on if there is a problem.”

He was the one who brought order to the Dene’s way of life. He set rules for how people should live in harmony with the land and animals. Yamoria is said to have put structure to the animals as well. There are a lot of legends that are not properly documented but are only told orally through story telling.

In Dene culture there is a time and a place for everything. Each story is meant to pass on messages to the youth. Through story telling messages were delivered and passed down to the next generation. An Elder’s respect and trust is earned, not given. It takes time and patience. There is a time for becoming a woman, man, hunter and leader. Elders and parents will determine when a person is ready to receive knowledge. It is not given but earned. When you become a man there are certain tools that are given to you by Elders; or when you become a woman, only then are you taught how to sew.

2.1.4 Cultural Beliefs about the Land and Resources

Traditionally, people have depended and still depend on the land and animals so both have a very spiritual meaning. Spiritual practices such as feeding the fire and paying the water show respect to the Creator. The land provides people with everything they need in order to survive. Without knowledge of the land they would be lost. In this respect, Dene have always been land use planners.

The Committee’s guiding principle states, “This Plan will be guided by the principles of sustainable development and respect for the land as understood and explained by the Dehcho Elders.”
It is important to remember that the Dene culture lives on. Like many generations before, people still depend on the land to provide for their survival. The environment is something they want to keep pristine to protect the wildlife and resources for future generations.

Wild animals represent an essential part of the Dene culture. Wildlife has sustained the Dene traditional way of life through hunting, fishing, trapping, crafts, tool making and sewing for generations. Many cultural activities involve animals. When an animal is harvested nothing is wasted. Everything is used that has been taken from the land whether it is an animal or a tree. Out of respect, certain parts of the animal are given back to the land.

Water is essential to the survival of the Dehcho Dene. It is the basis for life itself. Water plays an important part in the Dene culture as it is used for various tasks such as travel routes, spiritual practices and hunting. It is the place where most wildlife is to be expected as animals need water to live. Water bodies are landmarks used for long walks; people used to walk for days in order to reach their food source (fishing spots or hunting grounds).

The Dehcho Dene have sustained their culture and livelihood by using herbal remedies from the boreal forest for generations. Medicinal plants are used as medicine and for healing wounds.

In Dehcho culture, some types of resource development activities are seen as disrespectful to Mother Earth. They open the earth, take out the resources and leave scars behind. They operate on economic principles that are sometimes in direct contravention of Dene laws and principles. While many people recognize the need and value of these industries to the economic well-being of the Dehcho territory, the conflict of values often leads to opposition to resource developments.

The Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee held a workshop on Dene Nahodhe (“Being Dene”) to try and determine how to overcome cultural barriers to development. Dene laws, principles and values were reviewed to understand the key values held by Dehcho Dene descendants. Land uses were discussed to understand peoples concerns and explore ways to make new land uses culturally acceptable. The Dehcho Dene descendants consider themselves stewards of the land and as such, they are responsible for protecting it. People told us that if land uses follow the Dene laws, principles and values then it would be okay. The participants felt very strongly about this. They put together a statement to send this message.

**Dehcho Dene Nahodhe**

“*Yamora came to the homeland of the Dehcho Dene with laws from the Creator. These laws were given to the Dene to live by. The most important law was respect for creation – Mother Earth. We were put here by the Creator to take care of Mother Earth. The foundation of our Dehcho government and Mother Earth is Nahe Nahodhe. Nahe Nahodhe is who we are and where we came from. We stand firm behind this belief.*”

*Accepted by the Elders and Youth at the Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee’s Dene Nahodhe Workshop in Fort Providence (Zhahti Kįįę) on April 1, 2004.*

Dene Laws, Values and Principles have been used and practiced for centuries. They are a result of many meetings and oral history passed on for generations.
## Dene Laws
1. Share what you have.
2. Help each other.
3. Love each other as much as possible.
4. Be respectful of Elders and everything around you.
5. Pass on the teachings.
6. Be happy at all times.
7. Sleep at nights and work during the day.
8. Be polite and don’t argue with anyone.
9. Young girls and boys should behave respectfully.

## Dene Values
1. **SHARING**: The Dene shared in the use of the land and the resources of the land. In particular food. The work of maintaining the camp was shared, as was the responsibility for caring for children, and protecting the safety and health of the family.
2. **RESPECT**: One showed respect for oneself and for others, for leaders and elders and those with special skills, and for the land and all living things.
3. **CARING**: Caring was shown for all members of the extended family. The widows, orphans, and elders unable to provide for themselves were cared for by their community. Concern was shown for the safety and protection of oneself and others in the home.
4. **EQUALITY**: Equality among all people, and the equality of humans and all other living creatures were recognized.
5. **SELF-RESPECT AND PRIDE**: Everyone, as equals, had reason to respect themselves and take pride in doing well, whatever it was their particular responsibility to do. There was pride in being self-reliant, in being someone who could contribute something to the family and community.

## Dene Principles
1. This land was created by “the one who provides for all”, and we came from this land. We recognize our equality with this land and all living creatures.
2. We recognize and respect the natural laws, which regulate the cycle of seasons, the rhythms of the earth, the ways of the animals.
3. No one individual has the right to own the land. As the ones who came from this land, we have a collective right to use the land and its resources to ensure our survival as a people. We also have a collective responsibility to protect the land and resources for our children and grandchildren.
4. We take only what we need from the land. We honour and give thanks to the spirit of the land and that which we take from the land. We do not waste anything that we have taken from the land. But share it with all who are in need.
5. The survival of the whole group (family, community) is more important than the accumulation of individual wealth or status.
6. Individual rights and freedoms are respected and encouraged within the larger, more important context of a collective identity and collective responsibilities for the survival and well-being of the entire group.
7. The laws of the Dene, which have been passed down to us by our elders, teach us how to respect the land, ourselves, and each other. They teach us how to live in balance and good health, and how to protect ourselves and our children. We must continue to live by these laws and pass them on to our children.
8. We respect and care for each other, in particular, we honour and provide for our elders, who cared for us and passed on the gifts of generations past. We also honour and provide for our children who will pass on the ways of the Dene to generations yet to come.
9. We come from male and female, and we respect and honour the contributions which both men and woman make in working together for the survival of the people.
10. We respect and honour our leaders and medicine men and woman who share their special skills, experience, wisdom and powers for the benefit of their people. We don’t expect them to work for us or serve us, but we look to them for guidance and instruction to help us govern ourselves in a good way.
11. Everyone has the right to be heard and to take part in the decision making process on discussion of matters which will affect us.
12. We respect the right of the Dene, in family groups, in communities, or in regions, to make decisions, without interference from outside, with respect to matters which affect them alone in their territory.
2.1.5 Traditional Land Use and Occupancy

Traditional land use and occupancy (e.g. hunting, fishing, trapping, harvesting, and plant gathering) continues to be culturally and economically significant for Dehcho Dene. Every journey and every person’s experience out on the land is different. It all depends on the purpose of the journey. Traditional land use and occupancy (TLUO) is an essential element of Dene culture and traditional knowledge. It provides a wealth of information about people and their relationship with the land, water and wildlife, which can be used in land use planning.

The Dehcho Dene have always sustained their culture through the land and animals. They were a nomadic people. Nomadic people have always followed their food source; if the caribou were migrating so would they. When the fish started to run, (fall time) they would go to their gathering place. Since being relocated to communities, the Dehcho Dene have continued their culture. The cultural practices that their forefathers have taught them are still practiced today. A lot of the Dene people have adapted to the non aboriginal lifestyle but still hold onto their culture. People still go out on the land to harvest their traditional foods. Traditional foods are not bought in a grocery store but are simply harvested from the land.

Back in the late 1950s, dog teams were the only type of transportation that the people had. Trapping played a major role in Dene life. Due to the price of fur back then, people were able to afford a snow machine. The snow machines soon replaced dog teams.

The work to collect traditional land use and occupancy information began many years before the Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee was established. Between 1974 and 1987, the Dene Nation carried out a mapping initiative called the Dene Mapping Project. Unfortunately, the research methods were not thoroughly documented.

In 1996, the Dehcho First Nations initiated a new project to document TLUO by harvesters and Elders using maps and geographic information systems (GIS) technology. The TLUO study was initiated to document traditional use for input into:

- Lands and Resource Negotiations;
- Land Use Planning/Protected Areas Design;
- Environmental Impact Assessment; and
- Natural Resource Management.

The data collection was based on methods developed by Terry Tobias. Petr Cizek and Herb Norwegian interviewed 386 land users out of a target list of 531 individuals between 1996 and 2002. They documented places where harvesters and Elders killed animals, set traps, gathered plants, used cabins or camp-sites and knew of spiritual sites. The information was recorded on 1:250,000 mapsheets as points, lines or polygons. The resulting maps were digitized into ArcView 3.x. The database contains 54,769 data elements and is coded according to community, name of harvester, and the type of land use. These 54,769 data elements were analyzed using ArcView 3.x Spatial Analyst 2.0 to determine the relative density of TLUO for a given area. Map 2 shows the generalized density of traditional land use and occupancy with permission from Dehcho First Nations. This map shows areas of low, moderate, high and very high use.
Map 2. Generalized Density of Traditional Land Use and Occupancy
2.1.6 Archaeology, Cabins, Cottages and Historic Sites

Many areas in the Dehcho territory have archaeological or historic significance. Archaeology is the study of past human life as revealed by relics left by ancient peoples. The history of the Dehcho Dene extends back since time immemorial. Dene culture is closely related to the land and many of the traditional trails, cabins and gathering places continue to be used today. Early European settlers also left their mark, from the Northwest Company and Hudson Bay Company to churches, missions and industrial developments. Historic sites include places of historic significance such as historic village sites, trading posts and historic cabins. These resources have significance for Dene cultural heritage, education and tourism in the region.

Map 3 shows the Density of Archaeology, Cabins, Cottages and Historic Sites, which reflect the activities of Dene people over many generations. Four data sources were used to create the map:

- Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre (PWNHC) maintains a database of known archaeology sites;
- Forest Management Division, ENR maintains a database of “Values at Risk”, which contains locations of buildings, cabins, infrastructure, developments, fuel caches, property, etc. that they use to determine what might be at risk from forest fires;
- DIAND’s Land Use Dispositions database; and
- The Northern Land Use Information Series (NLUIS) – an extensive project conducted in the 1970’s to classify values on the land.

These information sources were combined to locate archaeology sites, cabins, cottages and historic sites within the Dehcho territory. Due to the confidentiality of some of these data, individual sites are not shown. Instead all the locations were combined into a density analysis. The resulting map shows areas of low, moderate, high and very high significance for these values within a 1 km² grid. In this way, one can see the relative importance of an area without defining the exact location.

Dehcho First Nations database of traditional land use and occupancy information contains detailed files of important traditional use sites, cabins and historic sites that could be included in this analysis for a more comprehensive picture. However, the raw data is confidential.
Map 3. Density of Archaeology, Cabins, Cottages and Historic Sites
Map 4. Currently Collected Dene Place Names
2.1.7 Dene Place Names

Map 4 shows currently collected Dene place names. Through various consultations and workshops that we held throughout the years since the existence of the DL UPC, we have heard that the Dene names should be documented on our maps. This request has now been supported by a Dehcho First Nations Leadership resolution (see Appendix 3). We requested assistance from Leadership to provide us with Dene names for their areas. These include names for communities and the most significant rivers, lakes and features of the Dehcho territory. The map of Dene place names reflects areas of cultural importance to the Dehcho Dene. These are areas they have traveled to in order to continue their cultural practices and beliefs. As more names are collected they will be added to the map and used more extensively in the Plan.

2.1.8 Traditional Knowledge

Dene culture cannot be separated from the land. Traditional knowledge is vast and comprehensive, based on generations of experience and stories passed on from Elder to youth. The Dehcho Dene want to ensure that traditional knowledge is valued and used to make good decisions. They also need to make sure that their culture and language are maintained and strengthened, to allow this traditional knowledge to continue and be passed on to future generations.

Dene Elders see the future through the land. The Committee and planning partners all recognize aboriginal traditional knowledge as a valid and essential source of information about the traditional environment and its resources, the use of natural resources, and the relationship of the people to the land and to each other. A discussion on the Integration of Traditional and Scientific Knowledge is provided in Chapter 4.

2.1.9 Conclusions

The Dene culture has thrived from its creation to the present day. The Land Use Plan will be a living document that will sustain the natural resources and people in a balanced way in order to keep the culture alive and well. The Land Use Plan will have a regular revision cycle every five years to reflect the relationship of the people with each other, the land and their culture. Culture is very important to the Dehcho Dene; it is a part of who they are. One can not exist without the other.
2.2 Communities and the Economy

In 2004, the total population of the eleven communities in the territory was estimated at 7,439 persons, of whom 4,733 (63.6%) identified themselves as aboriginal. In comparison, the 2001 Census suggested a population of around 6,866, but this reflects an undercount.

Figure 1 shows the population size of the Dehcho communities. Hay River (K’átł’odehé) is the largest community within the territory and serves as a major business centre. The latest figures estimate Hay River’s (K’átł’odehé) population to be 3,876 people or 52% of the Dehcho population. Besides Fort Simpson (Liídli’ Kúé) (1,269 people), Fort Providence (Zhahtí Kúé) (835 people) and Fort Liard (Echaot’í Kúé) (596 people), the remaining communities range in size from around 45 people at Kakisa Lake (Ka’a’gee Tu) to 176 in Wrigley (Pehdzech Kí). It is not uncommon for people from different communities to spend time in the larger centers to take advantage of the broader range of services.

The majority of aboriginal people in the region are descendants of the Dehcho Dene as shown in Table 2. The population in smaller, more isolated communities such as Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó), Jean Marie River (Tthets’ehk’edélc), Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) and Kakisa (Ka’a’gee Tu) is almost exclusively Dene. The majority of non-aboriginal people reside in Hay River (K’átł’odehé) where only 46% of the population is aboriginal. The membership of Dehcho First Nations is shown in Table 3.

The descendent of the Dehcho Dene share similar culture, language and customs. Many families in different communities are connected through marriage. In the past, some communities were linked politically. The Kakisa Band (Ka’a’gee Tu First Nation) was a subdivision of the Fort Providence Band (Deh Gáh Got’ie First Nation) the Nahanni Butte Dene
Band (Naæahdee First Nation) was part of the Fort Liard Band (Acho Dene Koe Band). Each now have their own identity and run their own affairs. However, all the communities in the territory recognize their common interests, because many decisions affect everyone.

Table 2. Percent of Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal People per Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>% Aboriginal</th>
<th>% Non-Aboriginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trout Lake (Sambaa K'e)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Marie River (Thets'ěhk'edélj)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakisa (Ka’a’gee Tu)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River Reserve (K’átł’odeeche)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Providence (Zhahti Küįį)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Liard (Echaot’įį Küįį)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Simpson (Liídłį Küįį)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River (K’átł’odehė)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Dehcho First Nations Membership and Community Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Nation Name</th>
<th>Community Name</th>
<th>First Nation Members Living in the Community</th>
<th>Total First Nation Members</th>
<th>Total Community Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acho Dene Koe Band</td>
<td>Fort Liard (Echaot’įį Küįį)</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Liard Métis</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deh Gáh Got’ie Dene Council</td>
<td>Fort Providence (Zhahti Küįį)</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Providence Métis Local 57</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelts’ěhk’edélj First Nation</td>
<td>Jean Marie River (Thets’ěhk’edélj)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K’átłodeeche First Nation</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve (K’átł’odeeche)</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka’a’gee Tu First Nation</td>
<td>Kakisa (Ka’a’gee Tu)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liídłį Küįį First Nation</td>
<td>Fort Simpson (Liídłį Küįį)</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Simpson Métis Local 52</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naæahdee First Nation</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehdzeh Ki First Nation</td>
<td>Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aboriginal rights and title are currently being negotiated in the Dehcho territory through the lands and self-government talks known as the Dehcho Process. There is a regional office plus 13 aboriginal organizations that form the Dehcho First Nations (DFN). They are:

- Dehcho First Nations (Regional office in Fort Simpson - Łíídlìí Kùŋé),
- Acho Dene Koe Band (Fort Liard),
- Fort Liard Métis Local 67,
- Tthets’ēhk’edēlį First Nation (Jean Marie River),
- Nàrahdée First Nation (Nahanni Butte),
- Sambaa K’e Dene Band (Trout Lake),
- Deh Gáh Got’ie Dene Council (Fort Providence),
- Fort Providence Métis Local 57,
- Ka’a’gee Tu First Nation (Kakisa),
- Pehdzeh Ki First Nation (Wrigley),
- K’át’odeeche First Nation (Hay River Reserve),
- Ts’ueh Nda (West Point First Nation - West Channel, Hay River),
- Łíídlìí Kùŋé First Nation (Fort Simpson), and
- Fort Simpson Métis Local 52.

According to Statistics Canada’s 2001 Census the size of households in the Dehcho territory ranges from 2.33 persons per household in Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e), to 4.0 persons per household in Kakisa (Ka’a’gee Tu). The projected birth and death rates for the Dehcho territory over the next 20 years indicate a declining birth rate from around 15.9 per 1,000 people in 2005 to 12.6 per 1,000 people in 2022\(^2\). Although this is higher than the average for Canada, it is relatively low compared to other regions such as Nunavut where births exceed 25 births per 1,000 people. The Dehcho territory also has an increasing death rate as the population ages. Combined, the changing birth and death rates will lead to population declines as shown in Figure 2.

With the exception of Hay River Reserve (K’át’odeeche), there are more males than females in all the Dehcho communities. This is most noticeable in Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) and Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki) where 42% and 44% of the respective populations are female\(^3\). This reflects differences in male and female birth rates.
Across the territory, there is a shortage of skilled labour. According to the 1999 Labour Force Survey, the Dehcho territory has an approximate labour force of 3838 people, equivalent to over half (55%) of the total population. However, employment opportunities, particularly in smaller more isolated communities are limited. Figure 3 indicates that despite the high labour force participation rate in the majority of Dehcho communities the unemployment rate is high at 15%, compared to 13.7% in the Northwest Territories as a whole and 8.5% for Canada.

In smaller communities the Band is often the main employer. Other occupations include highway road crew, retail, janitorial work, construction, and teaching. Larger communities have more services, institutions and employment opportunities. These include nursing stations, social services, RCMP detachments, renewable resources offices, federal, territorial and municipal government services, crafts stores and coffee shops, fuel depots, airport terminals, and a fish plant. Many non-Dene residents hold positions within these institutions. The additional employment opportunities are reflected in the average incomes for Hay River (K’átt’odehê) ($38,246) and Fort Simpson (Líidî’î Kúé) ($31,444), which compare favourably with the NWT average ($38,497) and are higher than other communities. Figure 4 indicates that these communities also have higher levels of high school or post secondary education.

In general the smaller more isolated communities have lower levels of education and employment, largely due to the lack of training and employment opportunities within the locality. Many people have always lived in the same community and have strong family ties. This presents a major barrier to increasing participation in education and employment outside of the communities, irrespective of the level of development across the region.
Figure 3. Labour Force Participation Rates and Unemployment Rates

Figure 4. Percentage of Population with High School or Post-Secondary Education in Dehcho Communities
The economy of the Dehcho territory is based primarily on services and natural resources. The majority of the Dehcho territory has seen relatively little land use activity as outlined in the Land and Resources section. The Cameron Hills (Nágáh Zhíhé) and Fort Liard (Echaot'jë Kújë) areas have seen oil and gas developments. There are also logging operations underway in the Cameron Hills (Nágáh Zhíhé) and Jean Marie River (Tthets'éhk'edélî). Mining activity currently consists of advanced exploration at Prairie Creek, the Cantung mine which closed in December 2003 but reopened in October 2005, and prospecting. There are a few tourism operations, particularly around Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) and Hay River (K’átť’odehé). K’átť’odeechë First Nation also has an interest in agriculture and previously operated an egg barn in Hay River (K’átť’odehé).

The traditional or subsistence economy, including hunting, trapping, fishing and crafts remains particularly important in the territory. It operates on a seasonal cycle. Fall is spent hunting moose and other large game. The dominant activity in winter is trapping fur bearing mammals. In the spring, trapping activity focuses on beaver and muskrat. Summer is slack time for bush use and people spend time at their camps. Fishing occurs throughout the year but is concentrated in late fall. Craft work, tool making, small game harvesting, and other activities occur year round. Fall is the most active time in the bush, followed by winter and then spring.

The NWT Bureau of Statistics provides an indication of participation in traditional activities across the region for 2003. A summary is provided in Table 4. It would appear more people in more isolated communities participate in traditional activities. For example Kakisa (Ka’a’gee Tu) and Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki) have significantly higher levels of participation than the larger centers. The lowest levels of participation are found in Hay River (K’átť’odehé) and Enterprise where the aboriginal population is a minority. With the exception of Hay River (K’átť’odehé), 53.5% of other Dehcho households consume country foods for half of their dietary intake. Almost half of Dehcho residents (excluding Hay River) hunt and fish and around 14% of people continue to trap.

### Table 4. Traditional Activities in the Dehcho territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dehcho Community</th>
<th>Hunted and Fished (%)</th>
<th>Trapped (%)</th>
<th>Households Consuming 50% or more Country Food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e)</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakisa (Ka’a’gee Tu)</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Marie River (Tthets’éhk’edélî)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Liard (Echaot’jë Kújë)</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó)</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki)</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehcho territory Wide (Excluding Hay River)</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Providence (Zhahti Kújë)</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Simpson (Liidjë Kújë)</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River Reserve (K’átť’odeechë)</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehcho territory Wide</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River (K’átť’odehé)</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subsistence harvesting is clearly very significant for the Dehcho territory, particularly the aboriginal population. Perhaps the most fundamental and important use of wildlife in the NWT is as food. In 1994, the Centre for Indigenous Nutrition and Environment conducted a dietary survey in sixteen Dene and Métis communities in the NWT, sponsored by the Northern Contaminants Program. Table 5 summarizes the percent of total nutrition obtained from traditional foods, including moose, rabbit, caribou, spruce hen, beaver, prairie chicken, loche, trout, whitefish, and bison. In the Dehcho territory, Dene and Métis continued to derive between 22 and 36 percent of total dietary protein from traditional foods in 1994.

### Table 5. The Percent of Total Nutrition from Traditional Foods in the Dehcho territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Community Season</th>
<th>Percent of Total Nutrition from Traditional Foods, 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>14 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>7 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Winter</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>8 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>13 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
<td>12 ± 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this study, the most commonly consumed species in the Dehcho territory were moose, woodland caribou, and whitefish. Quantifying the economic value of country food is dependent on wildlife harvest statistics that are not routinely available. According to the GNWT the replacement value of country food in 1990/91 was estimated to be $30 million for NWT residents. However this study appears to underestimate the moose harvest which is a key food source in the Dehcho territory. The contribution of different species to the total replacement value for the NWT is shown in Figure 5.

Local harvesting data is relatively poorly documented. A draft report in 2004 on “The Impact of Climate Change on Traditional Food Security,” estimated harvest levels in Fort Providence (Zhahti Kúé) Further work is ongoing to verify these results and value the harvest. An earlier report into “Subsistence and Non-Industrial Forest Use in the Lower Liard Valley” details the harvest activities of Fort Liard (Echaot’jë Kúé) and Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) in the early 1990s. Table 6 shows the annual harvest of major species indicated by these two studies. The annual harvest varies in different communities both in quantities and species. Fort Providence (Zhahti Kúé) appears to harvest the most fish, whereas Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) which is only a faction of the size harvests considerably more beaver. A comprehensive study would be required to provide accurate and up to date figures for all Dehcho communities to understand their use of different species.
Traditionally the NWT fur industry also provided income opportunities for Dehcho communities. According to the GNWT, the industry had grown to more than $5 million by the late 1980s. However, since then both sales and annual harvests have declined significantly. As of the late 1990s, the number of pelts sold at auction remained below $50,000 with an annual value below $1 million\textsuperscript{64}. A number of small community based businesses strive to promote traditional crafts and generate income for local people. For example, Dene Fur Clouds Ltd.\textsuperscript{65} in Fort Providence (Zhahti Kųé) produces knitted products that are made from sheared beaver fur. Acho Dene Native Crafts Ltd. is known for birch bark baskets and other products. Traditional crafts reflect the ancestral techniques that were used to live off the land, to keep warm in the cold winters and to build birch bark canoes for travelling the rivers and lakes in the Dehcho territory.

Table 6. Annual Harvest of Major Species in Three Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Ft Providence (Zhahti Kųé) (2003)\textsuperscript{66}</th>
<th>Fort Liard (Echaot’į’e Kųé) (1993-94)\textsuperscript{67}</th>
<th>Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágo) (1993-94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large animals</td>
<td>Caribou (Woodland)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caribou (Barrenland)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moose</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small animals</td>
<td>Lynx</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porcupine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muskrat</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>10,689</td>
<td>4,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geese</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grouse</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. NWT Country Food Replacement Value 1990-91
2.3 The Land and Resources
This section describes the biophysical characteristics of Dehcho territory, including the resource potential and conservation values present. It includes the results, and maps, of all the research completed in developing the Land Use Plan.

2.3.1 Ecozones and Ecoregions
Ecoregions and ecozones are used to classify land based on differences of terrain, climate, vegetation, soils, water, and regional human activity patterns and uses. Ecoregions are smaller than an ecozone.

The ecoregions of the Dehcho territory are shown in Map 5. The Dehcho territory lies within the southern portion of the Taiga Plains ecozone and to the eastern portion of the Boreal Cordillera ecozone. Taiga, a Russian word, refers to the northern edge of the boreal coniferous forest, which spans from Labrador to Alaska and beyond. The Mackenzie River, known locally as the Dehcho or big river dominates the region. It stretches from the Great Slave Lake (Tucho) in the east, across plains to the mountains in the west, and northwards towards the Arctic Ocean.

Throughout the Taiga, cool air temperatures, a short growing season, and recent glaciation have resulted in lower biological productivity and diversity than southern Canada. Most of the Dehcho territory is in a discontinuous permafrost zone. In some areas the ground or subsoil remains permanently frozen, protected by vegetation from the hot summer sun. The few plant species that thrive have adapted to the harsh climate and poor soils. Because of the cold conditions, dead vegetation does not decompose readily into soil but is preserved in the form of peat, which covers most low-lying areas. This wetland includes bogs and fens, and is known as muskeg. When needles that have fallen from conifers decompose, they secrete an acid that prevents plants other than conifers from growing there.

Common tree species include black spruce, white spruce, jack pine, tamarack, paper birch, trembling aspen, and balsam poplar. Willows and alders are the most common shrubs. Species common in Taiga ground cover include lichens (such as species of the genera Cladina and Cladonia, which provide the main food of the caribou), mosses, heaths (e.g., labrador tea and leatherleaf), and berry-producing species, such as cranberries, bear berries, currants, and blueberries. Wetlands are dominated by sphagnum moss, shrubs, and, where conditions permit, black spruce and tamarack. Regeneration of mature forests takes a long time due to the challenging climate and soil conditions. White spruce and balsam poplar grow to greater heights along large rivers.
Map 5. Ecoregions
2.3.2 Landcover Classification

A landcover classification shows what type of vegetation, if any, covers the surface of the land. Map 6 illustrates the Land Cover Classification of the region from the Northern Biosphere Observation and Modeling Experiment (NBIOME) Project based on Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR)\textsuperscript{70}. Table 7 shows the proportion of cover by the different classifications. Needleleaf forest (spruce, pine, tamarack) dominate the landscape with 45% coverage, whereas broadleaf species (birch, aspen, balsam poplar) only cover 7%. This landcover classification is based on 1 km resolution, so agriculture and urban development do not appear. Vegetation is a significant resource in the territory. It is essential to forestry and traditional uses including medicinal plants and provides habitat for wildlife.

Table 7. Proportion of Dehcho territory According to Land Cover Classification (NBIOME Project based on AVHRR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Cover Classification</th>
<th>Area (Ha)</th>
<th>Percentage of Dehcho territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needleleaf Forest</td>
<td>9,702,900</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall and Low Shrub</td>
<td>3,953,100</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barren</td>
<td>2,432,400</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadleaf Forest</td>
<td>1,443,700</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry or Moist Herbaceous</td>
<td>1,399,100</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Classification</td>
<td>1,380,400</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichens</td>
<td>983,720</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clouds / Snow / Ice</td>
<td>284,270</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 6. Land Cover Classification (NBIOME Project based on AVHRR)
2.3.3 Climate

The climate of the Taiga Plains is characterized by short, cool summers and long, cold winters. The annual average temperature varies from -10°C in the north to -1°C in the south. In the summer, the temperature ranges from 6.5°C in the north to 14°C in the south; in winter, it varies from -26°C in the north to -15°C in the south. Each year, snow and ice are present for six to eight months. Average annual precipitation is light, varying between 200 and 500 mm. The ecozone has considerable variations in length of day during the year, although this is not as extreme as more northerly parts of the Northwest Territories. Mean annual temperature, precipitation and snowfall are provided in Map 7 (a, b and c).

There is considerable concern in the Arctic and sub-arctic region with respect to climate change, particularly with regards to water and hydrology. Map 8 illustrates the projected changes in monthly mean daily maximum screen temperature for the Canadian land mass during winters and summers between 2001-2030 and 2041-2070. This data predicts a 1°C increase in summer temperatures over the first 30 years, and 2°C over the second 30 year period studied. Winter temperatures will increase by 1.0-1.5°C over the first 30 years and 2.5-3.0°C over the next 30 years. Climate change may lead to changes in ecological processes (e.g. higher fire frequency, loss of permafrost) and long-term changes in the resource potential of the region (e.g. less forestry potential and more agricultural potential as soil moisture decreases).
Map 7. (a, b, and c). Mean Annual Temperature, Precipitation and Snowfall
Map 8. Projected Changes in Monthly Mean Daily Maximum Screen Temperatures Due to Climate Change Over Periods 2001-2030 and 2041-2070
2.3.4 Ecological Processes

In addition to climate change there are many natural ecological processes which impact and shape the environment. Human impacts must be considered in the context of these natural variations in the environment and this is an important consideration in establishing appropriate cumulative effects thresholds. The five-year Plan review cycle will address the impact of ecological processes on the landscape and the overall Plan. Data will be updated as new information becomes available. If significant revisions are required before this, the Committee may consider an amendment to the Plan.

Flooding

Flooding is an important process in the Dehcho territory. It is particularly noticeable during the spring breakup and overflow in the winter months. Flooding by the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) is critical for replenishing the freshwater lakes in the Delta, as it replenishes them with water, sediment, and nutrients. Natural variations in flooding reflect annual temperatures and precipitation in the Dehcho territory and wider region. Humans can disrupt this natural cycle with activities such as damming or dredging rivers.

Erosion

Erosion refers to the gradual wearing down of land or rock by streams, rivers, wind, waves and glaciers. In the Dehcho territory sensitive mountainous areas and the extensive river system is vulnerable to erosion, particularly in spring. The Mackenzie Mountains include fragile rock formations called the karstlands and slopes with poor stability. Torrents of water from melting snow can undermine these areas. Lowland rivers are also vulnerable. Every spring during break up, enormous pieces of lake and river ice flow down the Mackenzie and its tributaries carrying rocks and soil towards the ocean. This leads to stream bank slumping and instability. Human activities such as the wave action from river barges and extraction of resources can also cause erosion.

Fire

Fire is an important ecological process in the Dehcho territory. Many plants have had a long association with fire, so they need it to reproduce and grow (e.g. jack pine can only reproduce with fire). Fires destroy habitat for some species but create habitat for others. Fire frequency and intensity (from low to high) will initiate different responses from different plants resulting in a diverse, mixed landscape. In the boreal forest fire dominates the region and the mosaic of plant communities burn naturally at different intervals. Climate change may lead to an increase in fire frequency. Fire suppression can lead to fuel build-up resulting in unnaturally large fires. In the absence of fire, more diseases may also become established (i.e. spruce budworm). Fire rejuvenates the landscape and returns the nutrients to the soil. Fire management must consider the risks to life and property versus the needs of the forest in deciding whether to fight a fire or let it burn. Map 9 illustrates the fire history in the Dehcho territory.
Map 9. Fire History
Disease and Pests
The dynamics of animal and plant diseases has implications for the ecology of the region. Animal diseases such as tuberculosis and brucellosis have major implications for the wood bison and the maintenance of ecological processes and biological diversity\textsuperscript{76}. Spruce budworm is a destructive defoliator insect, native to spruce and spruce-fir forests of North America\textsuperscript{77} and widespread in the Dehcho territory as shown in Map 10. High populations develop periodically and may last for several consecutive years, feeding extensively and damaging and killing trees through loss of foliage. Plant and animal diseases and pests have important implications for traditional land use and occupancy and commercial operations.

Permafrost
Permafrost is the term used to describe permanently frozen ground. It is said to underlie from one fifth to one quarter of the world's land. In the Dehcho territory the majority of permafrost is discontinuous. As the climate warms, melting could release some of the large amounts of methane now locked into the frozen soil. This might add substantially to the concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. The surface layer above the permanently frozen ground can become very mobile during the melt season, making an unstable base for construction. This layer is also vulnerable to melting when built on, driven over, or even walked on. Such traces of human activity remain visible for many years in this delicate environment. A warmer climate might increase the depth of the surface layer\textsuperscript{78}. 
2.3.5 Water

Water is a resource which defines the Dehcho territory. In the south slavey language Deh means "river" or "moving water" and Cho is "much" or "big". This refers to the mighty Mackenzie River (Dehcho), which flows from the west arm of Great Slave Lake (Tucho) north to the Arctic Ocean. It is the longest and largest river in Canada. The Liard River (Acho Tine Deh) joins the Mackenzie from the south west. Numerous other lakes, rivers, tributaries and wetlands stretch out across the territory. The region is divided into 33 watersheds that show the natural water catchments and drainage within the territory. These are displayed in Map 11.

The water has always sustained the land, people and animals of the territory. Much of the key wildlife habitat lies in and around lakes and rivers. This is reflected in areas used for traditional land use and occupancy, place names and the close proximity of communities to water. It is important to protect all sources of water because they are all connected. Human uses of water within the territory include: drinking and domestic use, fisheries, recreation, transportation, forest fire control, waste disposal, industrial activities, and hydro-electric power generation. In 2001, the GNWT originally expressed interest in the development of hydro-electric projects along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and in subsequent years they have re-confirmed this position79. The Dehcho First Nations passed a resolution opposing large scale hydro projects on the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and its tributaries (see Appendix 3).

The Mackenzie River (Dehcho) basin is the principal source of fresh water discharge into the Arctic Ocean from North America. It has become the focus of a Global Energy and Water Cycle Experiment (GEWEX), an international study looking at the effect of climate change on water resources80. The basin remains a relatively undeveloped and unpopulated wilderness, where seasonal fluctuations in ice and water present unique challenges and opportunities. Global warming could have longer term implications, particularly for potential hydro-electric projects and transportation routes across many jurisdictions, including the Dehcho territory. Communities along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) are in the process of nominating the river as a Canadian Heritage River81.

Water is the ultimate shared resource, flowing from one region to another relatively unhindered. Activities occurring in one region have the potential to impact the water of all downstream users. As a result of its transboundary nature, water management must be coordinated between all potentially affected users. For the Mackenzie River (Dehcho), this is the Mackenzie River Basin Board. Great Slave Lake (Tucho) is managed by the Great Slave Lake Advisory Committee (GSLAC). This is discussed further in Chapter 3 under Transboundary Issues.
Map 11. Watersheds
2.3.6 Fish, Wildlife and Significant Environmental Features

The Dehcho territory has a rich resource of fish and wildlife, which have sustained the Dene for generations. There are a number of important wildlife areas in the Dehcho territory.

- The Mackenzie Valley forms one of North America’s most traveled migratory corridors for waterfowl (ducks, geese, and swans) breeding along the Arctic coast.\(^{82}\)
- Nahanni National Park Reserve and the surrounding area are critical for mountain woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*), mountain goats (*Oreamnos americanus*), dall’s sheep (*Ovis dalli*), and grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*).
- An area between Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kûège) and Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki) provides habitat and nesting areas for 15% of Canada’s trumpeter swan population (*Cygnus buccinator*).
- The Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary has been identified as a critical bison (*Bos bison athabascae*) habitat and for boreal woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*).
- There are other boreal woodland caribou calving areas distributed throughout the Dehcho territory, but especially east of Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) and in the Kakisa Lake (Ka’a’gee Tu) -Tathlina Lake (Tatl’ài lié) area.
- Most rivers, creeks and lakes are important for fish spawning and an important habitat component for both aquatic mammals and many terrestrial species.
- The Dehcho territory also has a number of significant environmental features which provide unique habitats. A detailed description is provided later in this section.

The availability of wildlife is important to many of the Dehcho communities. It is a source of food, income and traditional clothing. Equally important, wildlife is critical for maintaining traditional systems of knowledge and identity. If there are significant changes in wildlife numbers or habitats, then members of aboriginal communities will have to modify traditional patterns of trapping, fishing, and hunting. These areas are covered in more detail under the culture and traditional land use and occupancy sections.

Great Slave Lake (Tucho), Tathlina Lake (Tatl’ài lié) and Kakisa Lake (Ka’a’gee Tu) have also supported commercial fisheries for around 60 years. The important species include:

- Whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformus*, *C. nasus*, and *Prosopium cylindraceum*),
- Northern Pike (*Esox lucius*),
- Lake Trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*), and
- Walleye / Pickerel (*Stizostedion vitreum*)\(^{83}\).

Fish are sold through the FFMC (Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation) based in Hay River (K’att’odehé). The combination of trophy size fish, an interesting variety of game species and their presence in surface waters make Great Slave Lake (Tucho) angling without equal in the world. There are a number of lodges and camps available for sports fishing\(^{84}\). These include:

- Nahanni Naturalist Lodge (Cli Lake, Tuíhtth’î)
- Little Doctor Lake (Little Doctor Lake, Tuehgáh)
- Trout Lake Lodge (Trout Lake, Sambaa K’e)
- Brabant Lodge (Big Island, Nduro)
- Deeghani Lake Lodge (Dogface Lake, Ndugolîê)

There are three big game outfitters (Nahanni Butte Outfitters, South Nahanni Outfitters and Redstone Trophy Hunts), most operating in the Mackenzie Mountains for dall’s sheep (*Ovis dalli*), moose (*Alces alces*), woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*), mountain goats...
(Oreamnos americanus), black bears (Ursus americanus), wolves (Canis lupus) and wolverines (Gulo gulo), but also bison trophy hunts in the east of the Dehcho territory (Dehcho Wilderness Tours Ltd). DFN Leadership passed a resolution in 2004 seeking the "ultimate removal" of big game outfitters because they feel this is not an appropriate respectful use of wildlife.

EBA Engineering Consulting Ltd of Yellowknife conducted a literature review and analysis of wildlife and wildlife habitat in the Dehcho territory. The purpose of the research was to identify areas of low, moderate, high and very high habitat value for key wildlife species in the Dehcho territory. A total of 308 vertebrate species (animals with spines – e.g. not insects) are thought to occur in the Dehcho territory – three amphibians, 36 fish, 213 birds and 56 mammals. Complete species lists for the Dehcho territory are available in the EBA report. Species of special interest were evaluated individually, including woodland caribou (Rangifer tarandus caribou), moose (Alces alces), bison (Bos bison athabascae), whooping crane (Grus americana), peregrine falcons (Falco peregrinus anatum) and grizzly bear (Ursus arctos). Other species such as birds, furbearers, and fish were evaluated in groups. The EBA report selected a number of wildlife species and wildlife habitats for their inherently high conservation values. Valued Ecosystem Components (VECs) are included in Table 8.

### Table 8. Select Valued Ecosystem Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEC Grouping</th>
<th>VECs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ungulates</td>
<td>Dall’s Sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood Bison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodland Caribou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivores</td>
<td>Bear (Grizzly &amp; Black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Waterfowl (species treated collectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trumpeter Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whooping Crane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peregrine Falcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>(species treated collectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Biological Programme Ecological Sites</td>
<td>14 Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Migratory Bird Sites</td>
<td>1 Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karst Topography</td>
<td>51 Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Springs</td>
<td>10 Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the report summarized all available research, the final map was not an accurate picture of wildlife habitat value because a number of species had not been adequately studied yet. A regional wildlife workshop was held during November 2003 where harvesters, trappers and biologists met to fill in the map on wildlife habitat value based on traditional knowledge and known observations of habitat use. Species mapped include fish, birds, waterfowl, black bears (Ursus americanus), grizzly bears (Ursus arctos), wolves (Canis lupus), foxes (Vulpes vulpes), coyotes (Canis latrans), woodland caribou (Rangifer tarandus caribou), beaver (Castor canadensis), muskrat (Ondatra zibethicus), otter (Lutra canadensis), marten (Martes americana), other furbearers, cougars (Felis concolor), lynx (Lynx canadensis), dall’s sheep (Ovis dalli), mountain goats (Oreamnos americanus), moose (Alces alces), bison (Bos bison athabascae), deer (Odocoileus virginianus and O. hemionus) and elk (Cervus elaphus).

The final wildlife habitat value map consists of many maps from the original EBA analysis, the traditional and expert knowledge gathered at the Wildlife Workshop, and other sources compiled over the last year, including critical wildlife habitat maps from 1970s pipeline research.
number of inaccurate or generalized files were removed from analysis to provide more accurate results. The remaining files were all overlaid in the GIS and the maximum rank in any given spot was used as the overall wildlife value. Map 12 shows wildlife habitat values according to the following ranks:

- **Low**: Areas identified as general range for a species;
- **Moderate**: Areas that provide for year round habitat functions; or seasonally important areas;
- **High**: Areas serving a more critical role for the species (e.g. migration corridor); and
- **Very High**: Areas providing habitat for critical life requirements (e.g. calving, nesting, staging, and denning areas).

Of special note is recent research on boreal woodland caribou. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources (ENR, formerly RWED) began research to model potential habitat use (or occurrence) for boreal caribou in 2001. Observed habitat use was compared to habitat types to identify key habitats where caribou can be expected to occur based on a 100 km² grid system. This resulted in a map of predicted high value boreal caribou habitat for the Dehcho territory. The predicted high value boreal habitat is ranked as very high value within the Dehcho wildlife habitat values map (Map 12).

Some significant environmental features have also been included in the wildlife map (Map 12). These are referred to as rare features in EBA’s Wildlife Report and consist of hot springs and karst formations found in the Dehcho territory. The EBA report identifies karst topography as a Valued Ecosystem Component (VEC) which is reflected in Table 8. Karst formations are shaped by the dissolving action of water on bedrock and include sinkholes, vertical shafts, disappearing streams and springs, complex underground drainage systems and caves. Karst and hot spring ecosystems often have unique flora and fauna associated with them and provide critical habitat for multiple species. Karst streams increase productivity of downstream habitat and increase fish productivity. There are 51 known karst sites and 10 known hot spring sites within the Dehcho territory. These features are very unique and represent a significant ecological and cultural resource which has been recognized in Nahanni Park Expansion plans and by the tourism industry.

In recent years, biologists have been tracking woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*) movements in the Dehcho territory through the use of conventional and satellite-radio collars to develop an understanding of caribou habitat use and range. Preliminary results showing annual home ranges for individuals (boreal woodland caribou) and herds (mountain woodland caribou) are shown in Map 13.

Since 1995, biologists for Parks Canada, the Sahtu Renewable Resources Board, and the GNWT have been collaring mountain type woodland caribou in the Nahanni region. As part of the Nahanni Park Expansion studies, biologists have compiled collar data to identify home ranges for three different herds present in the Dehcho territory as shown on the map. The analysis is based on 4 animals tracked from 2002-05 for the Redstone Herd, 45 animals tracked from 1995-2001 for the Upper South Nahanni River (SNR) Herd, and 24 animals tracked from 2000-2005 for the Lower South Nahanni River (SNR) Herd.

The GNWT began collaring boreal woodland caribou southwest of Great Slave Lake three years ago and have deployed additional collars in other areas of interest in the southern and north-central parts of the Dehcho territory since then. Where multiple years of data are available, they show the cumulative home range for the whole period. In other cases, the range is based on one year or a partial year of data and this is indicated as such.
Map 12. Wildlife Habitat Values and Significant Environmental Features
Map 13. Woodland Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*) Home Range Analysis
2.3.7 Forestry

The forests of the Dehcho territory lie within the northern portion of the boreal forest region. The main economic species include: white spruce (*Picea glauca* (Moench) Voss), jackpine (*Pinus banksiana* Lamb), and aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx). The forest also provides critical habitat for wildlife and is essential to non-industrial, subsistence and traditional activities across the region.

The best timber is found in scattered stands on upland sites that encourage good drainage or in narrow strips along the river valleys. These include areas south of Wrigley (Pehdzeh Kí), Jean Marie River (Tthets’êhk’edéélí) and the Liard River valley. There is also good timber potential in the Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé) along the side slopes of the escarpment, some of which has been harvested. Fire has removed timber in many areas over recent years. The economics of forestry are marginal in the NWT due to high access and transportation costs and annual harvest levels vary (from 46,000 to over 200,000 m$^3$) according to the market price.

The Committee commissioned PACTeam of Edmonton to conduct a review of timber potential in the Dehcho territory. Timber was limited to sawlogs for this study – white spruce (*Picea glauca* (Moench) Voss), lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta* Dougl. var. *Latifolia* Engelm), jackpine (*Pinus banksiana* Lamb.), and aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx) with specific age and height criteria. Timber stands were evaluated on the basis of species, site characteristics, and access (distance to roads). In the absence of detailed inventories for the region, potential stands were identified using a variety of vegetation data of varying age, accuracy and scale. Burned areas were removed from the timber potential areas. JC Bartlett & Associates Ltd also completed a Delivered Log Cost Guide.

During consultations summarization problems with the original data were raised. DLUPC worked closely with Environment and Natural Resources (ENR) to revise the forestry sector data. This involved a new analysis to reflect actual saw log potential and appropriate development scenarios. ENR provided a long run sustainable yield average for aspen, white spruce and jack pine derived from mapped stands in the original PACTeam report, ENR inventories and spatial data on the distribution of spruce budworm.

Spatial revisions changed the volume and distribution of saw log stands. Consequently the Delivered Log Cost Guide also required complete revisions. Myers Norris Penny LLP (MNP) produced a new report entitled “Economic Parameters for Estimating the Delivered Wood Cost in the Dehcho Planning Area”. The report provided parameters for harvesting white spruce and aspen sawlogs from three operating regions, Fort Liard (Echaot’i Kúé), Fort Simpson (Líídłë Kúé) and Hay River (K’alú’odehé).

The estimated resources in the region include 339,298 ha (48,383,895 m$^3$) of white spruce and 174,424 ha (3,575,692 m$^3$) of aspen. MNP indicated the annual allowable cut is less than 500,000 m$^3$ for a long run sustainable harvest. Map 14 shows the location of possible aspen, white spruce and jackpine sawlogs within inventory areas of the Dehcho territory. The ranking is limited to sawlogs present and no sawlogs. Current operations are well below that providing significant room for growth. ENR ran a community based forestry workshop to develop community based initiatives.
Map 14. Forestry Potential
2.3.8 Agriculture

The Dehcho territory is at the northern edge of the agricultural zone and faces considerable limitations to widespread agri-food production including climate, water-logged soils and stoniness. The Plan has no jurisdiction within community boundaries so research was limited to large-scale agricultural potential and does not include things like market gardening, greenhouses or confined livestock. Outside of community boundaries, agriculture is a minor land use in the Dehcho territory. Historically, during the religious mission days agriculture provided much needed fresh produce to local communities.

Agriculture potential was assessed by the Committee with assistance from Gene Hachey, Agriculture, Agri-Food & Community Wildlife Development Consultant for the GNWT. Maps were compiled from soil surveys and agriculture capability analysis of the upper Mackenzie and Liard Valleys by J.H. Day in the 1960s. Similar work was undertaken in the 1970s for the Hay River (K’át’odehé) valley area and this has been included in Map 15. There is no data beyond the Map boundaries so agricultural potential for much of the Dehcho territory is unknown but thought to be severely limited.

Day identified eight classes ranging from no limitations (very good potential) to no potential. These were simplified these into five categories:

- **No Potential**: Class 7 - Organic soils and unmapped areas;
- **Low**: Classes 5 and 6 - Unsuitable for annual field crops; only grasses, legumes, or perennial forage plants; limited improvements possible; some natural grazing capacity; limitations too severe for other crops; scattered throughout the upper Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and Liard River valleys;
- **Moderate**: Classes 3 and 4 - Moderate to severe limitations; reduced choice of crops; special conservation practices required; high risk of crop failure; found throughout the upper Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and Liard River valleys;
- **High**: Class 2 - Moderate limitations; restricted range of crops; some conservation practices required; moderate to high productivity; found in the Liard Valley; and
- **Very High**: Class 1 - No significant limitations; wide range of crops possible; not found in the Dehcho territory.

The agricultural potential is presented in Map 15. Initial research identified a number of barriers to widespread agricultural development in the region, including the unavailability of land or financing and the high costs of accessing more remote areas. The Territorial Farmers Association is developing a strategy to address key issues and promote more agricultural development in the North. The TFA have a regional vision for agricultural development to guide further planning. The focus includes:

1. Assisting people to begin small scale farming;
2. Research into production and marketing methods;
3. Identifying and preserving arable lands especially near small remote communities; and
4. Developing protocols for land access, land use, and wildlife protection with regional governments.
Map 15. Agricultural Potential
2.3.9 Tourism

When one thinks of the Northwest Territories, romantic images of vast pristine landscapes, wild flowing rivers, lakes teeming with fish, flourishing Aboriginal cultures, and a place where caribou outnumber people, immediately come to mind. Fortunately, this is one of those few places in the world where this is all true. From a tourism perspective each of these images can be offered as a marketable product or service that can be sold to tourists from all over the world. However, the region continues to have relatively insignificant levels of visitation (less than 4% of overall NWT Tourism in 1998)\textsuperscript{104} and has a very limited share of the global tourism market.

“Every corner I turn on the highway or river or everything I see from the air reveals assets that have tourism potential” \textsuperscript{105}

Dehcho Environmental Ltd evaluated the tourism potential of the Dehcho territory\textsuperscript{106}. They suggested the reasons Dehcho territory tourism resources are not fully utilized include competition from other northern tourism destinations (i.e. Yukon and Alaska); difficulty distinguishing the Dehcho product from other similar, more accessible destinations, and the lack of market ready products for the global market place.

The study identified over 140 existing or potential tourism sites through discussions with managers, operators and review of documents. Of these, 112 sites fall within the Dehcho territory. Each site was given an overall ranking of low, moderate, high or very high based on a combination of the following criteria and importance.

(1) Prominence in the market (how well-known it is) (10%),
(2) Marketability (how well it suits current tourist demands) (50%),
(3) Accessibility (how easy it is to get to) (20%), and
(4) Local economic benefits (20%)

According to the study the highest potential for tourism follows the Mackenzie and Liard River Valleys and radiates out from communities. The river valleys are exceptionally scenic, offer various types of tourism experiences, and have good access. The proximity of communities to the river valleys increases the marketability for both the towns and the rivers as tourism destinations. Some sites show potential for more than one type of tourism opportunity.

There are a few “icon” tourism products or destinations in the Dehcho territory such as the South Nahanni River (Nahåå Dehé), Nahanni National Park Reserve (UNESCO World Heritage Site), and the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) that have some brand and market recognition. Other key destinations include the Ram Plateau and North Nahanni River (Mehzê Deh), Little Doctor Lake (Tuehgdåh), Cli Lake (Túihtth’î) and Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e). Areas of low potential or where information was unavailable are east of Wrigley (Pehdzech Ki), northeast of Fort Simpson (Líidl’ì Kújé), and west of Fort Liard (Echaot’îe Kújé). While there is physical potential for tourism in these areas, overall potential is currently limited by access, infrastructure development and marketing.

The Dehcho territory contains world class icon attractions and pristine wilderness, but it is currently not well developed for tourism. With careful planning and marketing, the potential exists to develop a thriving tourism industry in this region. Map 16 illustrates the tourism potential in the Dehcho territory.
Map 16 Tourism Potential
2.3.10 Oil and Gas

The Dehcho territory has considerable oil and gas reserves. The greatest potential for hydrocarbons is in the Liard Plateau, around Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kûê) and the Great Slave Plain (south-central and southeastern part of the Dehcho territory)\(^{107}\). The southern Great Slave Plain is the northern extension of the well known Western Canadian Sedimentary Basin – a high producing region in Saskatchewan, Alberta and northeastern British Columbia.

As of 2003, there had been 443 hydrocarbon wells drilled in the region since the late 1950’s. Most of these are wildcat wells (exploratory), but 127 of them have found hydrocarbons, ranging from minor oil streaks and gas bubbles to producing wells\(^{108}\). The current producing regions are Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kûê) for natural gas and Cameron Hills (Nagâh Zhîhé) for gas with oil. Several other significant discoveries have been made that are not yet developed. A pipeline and infrastructure has been proposed in the Netlå-Arrowhead region to allow for the commercialization of existing discoveries. The existing Enbridge pipeline carries oil south from Norman wells. A Mackenzie Valley Pipeline has also been proposed to transport natural gas from the Arctic Ocean to Alberta. The project is currently undergoing an environmental review.

The C.S. Lord Northern Geoscience Centre was contracted by the Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee to carry out an oil and gas potential evaluation of the Dehcho territory\(^{109}\). Potential was determined by looking at a combination of overall geological potential and confirmed occurrences. This focused on 20 stratigraphic intervals of similar geology called hydrocarbon plays and ranked these according to whether they were confirmed or hypothetical plays. The number of plays in a given area was then tallied and combined to create a polygon map of petroleum potential. The study indicated that the greatest potential for hydrocarbons is in Liard Plateau and Great Slave Plain (a natural extension of the Western Canadian Sedimentary Basin) in the southern Dehcho. The mountain areas (Mackenzie Mountains, Franklin Mountains, and Selwyn Fold Belt) have the lowest potential for containing hydrocarbons.

Additional Natural Resource Assessments were undertaken in Edéhzhíe, through the Protected Area Process by the C.S. Lord Northern Geoscience Centre\(^{110}\). The hydrocarbon potential for Edéhzhíe can be estimated at this stage of the non-renewable resource assessment to be high in the west, and moderate in the balance of the Candidate Protected Area.

During consultations participants asked for more detailed oil and gas assessments, which provide volume estimates per area. This was required to operate the EDA model. The Committee contracted Ken Drummond of Drummond Consulting to produce a report of “Oil and Gas Field Size Distribution of the Dehcho territory” to estimate the volume and distribution of oil and gas using industry accepted modeling techniques\(^{111}\). The report provides estimates for discovered and undiscovered resources, how much is recoverable and what is remaining. The ultimate recoverable gas resource for the Dehcho region is estimated to be 160 billion m\(^3\). Approximately 8.2% (13.2 billion m\(^3\)) of the initial recoverable gas resource has been produced, with remaining discovered resources accounting for 11% (17.7 billion m\(^3\)) of total recoverable gas. Approximately 81% (129.4 billion m\(^3\)) of the estimated recoverable gas has yet to be discovered. Around 136.8 billion m\(^3\) of this remaining recoverable gas lies within the Dehcho Plan Area excluding Edéhzhíe PAS Zone and is illustrated in Map 17. The remaining recoverable oil is estimated at 8.75 Million m\(^3\) and is illustrated in the small inset map. It should be noted these are estimates and not certainties. High potential areas only get recognised as such through exploration. Drummond characterizes volume estimates in million m\(^3\) / quarter grid for natural gas and thousand m\(^3\) / quarter grid for oil (Map 17).
Map 17. Estimated Remaining Recoverable Oil and Gas
2.3.11 Mining

Mineral resources have brought development to many northern regions. The Northwest Territories and Nunavut have been dominated by the diamond industry in the recent past (15 years), although the territories have a long and rich heritage of mining for many commodities. The Dehcho territory has seen relatively little mineral development. The only operating mine in the Dehcho territory is Cantung, a tungsten mine, closed in December 2003 but reopened in October 2005. Prairie Creek, a proposed lead-zinc-silver mine, is in advanced exploration. Another lead-zinc deposit located at Pine Point, next to Great Slave Lake (Tucho) supported a mine between 1965 and 1988, but Pine Point lies just east of the Dehcho territory boundary, in the Treaty 8 territory. There is interest in developing un-mined deposits that lie west of Pine Point, discovered by Westmin back in the 1980s.

It is important to emphasise that there has been little exploration in the Dehcho territory on which to base concrete conclusions. The Committee contracted the C.S. Lord Northern Geoscience Centre\textsuperscript{112} to evaluate mineral potential for the Dehcho territory based primarily on publically available information on geology and mineral showings.\textsuperscript{113} An initial comparison of geological conditions against known mineral deposit types allowed them to focus the research on 9 types thought to have the most potential in the region. The evaluation combined geological favorability (likelihood of being present) and known mineral occurrences to determine overall mineral potential. All areas within the Dehcho territory have some geological potential for one or more of the nine mineral types. Overall, mineral potential is highest in the western tip and moderate to low or uncertain in the remaining areas. The western portion has high to very high potential for skarn (lead-zinc, gold and tungsten), SEDEX\textsuperscript{114} and Mississippi Valley Type lead-zinc. It is in these areas that the potential for discovery of new mineral deposits is most likely. Lead-zinc and tungsten are also significant mineral types given their proven occurrences at operating mines and exploration sites.

The potential for diamonds was also evaluated due to the current interest in the Northwest Territories. However, given both the newness of the exploration techniques and the limited exploration completed, the diamond potential of the Dehcho area is essentially unknown and rated as uncertain\textsuperscript{115}. There is available information indicating that Edéhzhie is prospective for diamond bearing kimberlite occurrences. This conclusion is a result of diamond exploration carried out in the 1980s and 1990s, prior to, and contemporaneous with, the discovery of diamonds at Lac de Gras\textsuperscript{116}. Further work is required to properly assess diamond potential.

A second evaluation was completed to identify priority areas for mineral development. The researcher, Brian Eddy of GSI-Geosystems Integration, asked geologists from the C.S. Lord Northern Geoscience Centre\textsuperscript{117} and the Geological Survey of Canada to rank development zones based on their likelihood of development\textsuperscript{118}. The geologists considered a variety of geological, economic, and political factors. The final map of mineral development potential used in the planning process borrows elements of both research projects to provide the greatest level of detail for decision-making. The mineral development potential of the Dehcho territory is provided in Map 18. The ranges were low or uncertain, moderate, high and very high.

Projects which will enhance our understanding of geological potential in the Dehcho territory include Non-renewable Resource Assessments (NRA) and Mineral and Energy Resources Assessment (MERA). The Northwest Territories Geoscience Office has undertaken NRAs, and more general resource assessments in Edéhzhie as part of the NWT Protected Areas Strategy.
(PAS), in support of land claims and Land Use Plans\textsuperscript{119}. NRA are informed evaluations of mineral and petroleum potential based on the best geoscientific information available. The Government of Canada also requires a MERA or inventory of the non-renewable natural resource potential of areas in the Northwest Territories prior to their formal establishment as new national parks\textsuperscript{120}. A MERA is currently underway for the proposed expansion of the Nahanni National Park Reserve.
Map 18. Mineral Development Potential
Chapter 3: The Regulatory and Policy Framework

Assessing land use priorities is an important part of community consultations.  
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3.1. Introduction
The purpose of this section is to outline the current regulatory framework under which the Plan will be implemented prior to ratification of a Dehcho Final Agreement. The legal basis for the Plan is reviewed to provide context for the Committee’s recommendations. This will be followed by a brief overview of the current framework of acts, regulations and policies used to manage the land uses addressed in the Plan. Finally, it will describe how the Plan relates to other planning initiatives within and around the Dehcho territory – the Protected Areas Strategy (PAS), Nahanni Park Expansion, transboundary issues and planning, community planning and Cumulative Effects Assessment and Management (CEAM). A discussion of the regulatory changes expected as a result of Plan approval and implementation is included in Chapter 3.

3.2. Legal Basis of the Committee
Land use planning in the Dehcho territory receives its direction from the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement (IMA)\textsuperscript{121}. While the role of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act (MVRMA) in the Dehcho territory is under negotiations, the Committee does look to Part 2 of the MVRMA for direction on Plan development, the role of the Committee and specific steps for approval and implementation.

The Committee’s role is established under sections 2-6 of the IMA and in Appendix II of the IMA (later adopted as the Committee’s Terms of Reference).

IMA Excerpt:

S. 2. The Parties will develop a land use plan (the Plan) for the Dehcho territory for lands outside the existing boundaries of a local government and Nahanni National Park Reserve.

S. 3. The purpose of the Plan is to promote the social, cultural and economic well being of residents and communities in the Dehcho territory, having regard to the interests of all Canadians.

S. 4. Taking into consideration the principles of respect for the land, as understood and explained by the Dehcho Elders, and sustainable development, the Plan shall provide for the conservation, development and utilization of the land, waters and other resources in the Dehcho territory.

S. 5. A Land Use Planning Committee will be established pursuant to the Guidelines attached as Appendix 2.

S. 6. The Land Use Planning Committee will consult with the Dehcho Land and Water Panel, established under 25, during the development of the Plan.

The Committee’s Terms of Reference\textsuperscript{122} (provided in Appendix 4) outlines the nature of research to be completed and considered in the development of the Plan:

S. 8. Dehcho First Nations will produce a series of maps identifying sensitive lands for traditional use and occupancy, including harvesting areas and cultural sites. Communities are expected to be at different stages of readiness to produce these maps. Resulting analysed “sensitivity” maps will be provided to the Planning Committee, but the original raw data will be made available to the Planning Committee as requested on a case-by-case basis for viewing only.

S. 9. The Planning Committee will co-ordinate the production of a series of maps identifying sensitive cultural sites, critical habitat, and related harvesting patterns throughout the Dehcho territory. These maps will be distributed to Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders.
S. 10. The Planning Committee will co-ordinate the production of a series of maps identifying resource development potential in the mineral, hydrocarbon, forestry, tourism, and agricultural sectors throughout the Dehcho territory. These maps will be distributed to Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders.

S. 11. The Planning Committee will co-ordinate the production of a socio-demographic forecast to identify job creation and training needs within the Dehcho territory over the next twenty years. This forecast will be distributed to Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders.

S. 12. The Planning Committee will co-ordinate an economic development assessment to determine what entrepreneurial opportunities may exist currently and in the future. This exercise will build upon the analyses of 8 through 11 and assist with the identification of land use and economic opportunities, where practical. This assessment will be distributed to Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders.

S. 13. The Planning Committee will integrate the maps produced in Phase II in order to identify development opportunities, social and ecological constraints. This phase of the process may include the identification, analysis, and consideration of: potential land use projects, potential core representative areas within each ecoregion, and any other issues appropriate for consideration in the land use plan.

S. 14. The Planning Committee will also identify potential surface/sub-surface land withdrawals, and sub-surface land withdrawals only.

S. 15. A set of land use options will be developed from the information in this Phase for consideration by the Parties and other stakeholders.

S. 23. The land use plan will also include proposed land withdrawals which will be presented for negotiations pursuant to 13 of the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement.

For further context on Plan development, S. 41 of the MVRMA states:

S. 41 (2) A land use plan shall provide for the conservation, development and use of land, waters and other resources in a settlement area.

S. 41 (3). A land use plan may include
(a) maps, diagrams and other graphic materials;
(b) written statements, policies, guidelines and forecasts;
(c) descriptions of permitted and prohibited uses of land, waters and resources;
(d) authority for the planning board to make exceptions to the plan and the manner of exercising that authority; and
(e) any other information that the planning board considers appropriate.

These sections of the Terms of Reference (TOR) give broad direction to the Committee to plan for the “conservation, development and use of land, waters, and other resources”. They also guide the Committee with respect to which land uses will be considered during Plan development. Section 13 of the TOR provides the Committee with the responsibility to consider and address land use issues through the Plan. The Committee has used this authority to set Conformity Requirements and Actions pertaining to such things as consultations, air and water quality, timber recovery, revegetation, protection of cultural resources and traditional materials, and cumulative effects.

While some of these things are already regulated, the purpose of the Land Use Plan is to add value to the way resources are currently being managed. The Plan’s Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations address issues raised during consultations to give direction to Responsible Authorities with respect to how future land use should occur so as to “promote the social, cultural and economic well-being of residents and communities in the Dehcho territory”
(IMA S. 3). This community-based, issue-driven approach to Land Use Plans has formed the basis for planning since 1983 in the northern and arctic regions of Canada.

3.3. Regulatory Framework

Lands and resources in the Dehcho territory are currently managed under a large number of acts, regulations, agreements and policies, by a variety of different territorial and federal government departments and agencies. This section describes the key legislation and policies guiding land use decisions for the resource sectors considered under the Plan, the authorities responsible for their implementation and enforcement, and the types of approvals and authorizations required for land uses to proceed.

3.3.1 Land and Water – The Environmental Assessment (EA) Process

The Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act and associated regulations is a key statute in the overall framework which provides “for an integrated system of land and water management in the Mackenzie Valley” (MVRMA 1998). This act establishes the MVLWB\(^{124}\), the MVEIRB\(^{125}\) and regional boards, provides for land use planning, land and water regulation, and environmental monitoring and auditing. The regulations set “triggers” for different land and water uses (water use, fuel storage, land clearing, etc.), above which the applicant must submit an application to the MVLWB to get a land use permit or water licence to operate. Type B permits and licences allow small-scale land use activities to proceed and involve less intense approval processes. Type A permits and licences are required for large-scale land use activities, and are subject to rigorous scrutiny. Type A water licences require Ministerial approval.

Water is regulated by the MVLWB under the NWT Waters Act\(^{126}\) and NWT Waters Regulations\(^{127}\). The use of water or deposit of waste in water exceeding certain quantities requires a Type A or B water licence. The “triggers” for water licences are laid out in schedules for different land uses. Any water use affecting fish habitat also requires an authorization from DFO under the Fisheries Act\(^{128}\). DFO is currently developing operational statements under the Fisheries Act\(^{129}\). By following the conditions and measures provided, applicants will be in compliance with subsection 35(1) of the Fisheries Act and could be exempt from requiring a permit. The operational statements for the NWT cover bridge maintenance, overhead line construction, clear span bridges, routine maintenance dredging, culvert maintenance, underwater cables, high pressure directional drilling, and ice bridges.

The MVLWB, in consultation with regulatory authorities and landowners, may set any conditions on the permits or licences required for the protection of the environment (S. 69). If a project might have a significant adverse impact on the environment, or be a cause for public concern, the MVLWB, a local government, Regulatory Authority or the MVEIRB itself, may refer the application to the MVEIRB. The MVEIRB will then carry out an environmental assessment and may also carry out an environmental impact review, having regard for “the protection of the environment from the significant adverse impacts of the proposed developments, and the protection of the social, cultural and economic well-being of residents and communities in the Mackenzie Valley” (S. 115). Any recommendations resulting from the assessment or review imposed by the MVEIRB and approved by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs must be attached as conditions to the permits or licences issued by the MVLWB.
The other key statute is the *Territorial Lands Act* and its subsidiary regulations, which provides for the sale, lease and disposition of lands under Crown administration. This Act and regulations (including the *Canada Mining Regulations*) are administered by DIAND. While it does not regulate land use directly, it provides for the disposition of rights and interests required for certain land uses (e.g. mining) to occur, and provides the regulatory means to restrict certain land uses through a land withdrawal.

### 3.3.2 Fish and Wildlife

Wildlife is primarily managed through ENR using the *Wildlife Act*, *Big Game Hunting Regulations*, *Small Game Hunting Regulations*, *NWT Trapping Regulations*, and *Outfitters Regulations*. The *Wildlife Act* regulates research, land uses, and activities including hunting. The 2004-05 NWT summary of *Hunting Regulations* say that “all hunters require a licence to hunt caribou, bison, polar bear, muskox, or any other animal not being hunted for food, unless they are beneficiaries of a land claim specifically exempting them from requiring a licence.” ENR administers and issues hunting licences, tags, general hunting licences, outfitters licences, trapping licences and wildlife research permits. Enforcement of wildlife laws and regulations are carried out by renewable resource officers.

There is some federal management of wildlife through Environment Canada (Canadian Wildlife Service). The Canadian Wildlife Service is primarily responsible for managing migratory birds under the *Migratory Birds Convention Act*.

Also of importance is the *Species at Risk Act* (*SARA*), which provides for the designation of species at risk and protection of habitat for species under federal control (fish and migratory birds), or any listed species on federal lands under the authority of the Minister of the Environment or Parks Canada (National Parks, National Wildlife Areas, Migratory Bird sites). *SARA* makes it illegal to kill, harm, harass, capture, take, possess, collect, buy, sell or trade an individual of an extirpated, endangered or threatened wildlife species or damage or destroy its residence (s. 32 – general prohibitions). While the Act is restricted to certain federal lands, it may be applied to other lands though a Federal Order in Council (s. 35). In addition, any lands considered critical habitat for a threatened or endangered species under an approved Recovery Strategy, are also subject to the general prohibitions of *SARA*.

Parks Canada is involved in management of species at risk within National Parks such as Nahanni National Park Reserve. While the *Species at Risk Act* is now in force, regulations are not yet developed where many implementation details will be defined. Therefore it may be a few years before this Act is fully implemented.

COSEWIC (Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada) undertakes status reviews and recommends species to be listed and the appropriate designation under the *Species at Risk Act*. The Act requires the government to develop a recovery plan for threatened and endangered species to address the causes of the species decline and take measures to protect and recover the species. The following species are currently listed under Schedule 1 of the *Species at Risk Act*. COSEWIC is also reviewing the status of the grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) and wolverine (*Gulo gulo*) which currently have a status of special concern.

- Wood Bison (*Bos bison athabasca* - Threatened);
- Mountain Woodland Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou* - Northern Mountain Populations – Special Concern);
The most critical of these is the boreal woodland caribou. This species has been rapidly declining south of the 60th Parallel and has shown to be very sensitive to industrial development. The Species at Risk Act may offer opportunities to address wildlife concerns with respect to cumulative effects assessment. Much research has been carried out to determine how land use activities affect caribou and what measures can be put in place to reduce the impacts on this species. The Federal and Territorial governments are currently working on a discussion paper as part of the Recovery Strategy to outline the challenges facing caribou in the GNWT. A recent environmental assessment recommended the establishment of a Dehcho Boreal Caribou Committee to address woodland caribou issues associated with development. This Committee is in the process of being developed. Given the sensitivity of woodland caribou, they are the focal species used to develop cumulative effects thresholds in the Plan.

DFO is responsible for all fish management, including those fish species at risk. The Fisheries Act protects fish habitat through S. 35 which makes it illegal to “carry on any work or undertaking that results in the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat” without authorization. Applicants affecting fish or fish habitat must apply for and receive an authorization before any work is undertaken. DFO also issues fish licences and leases required for fisheries and fishing.

The protection of important wildlife habitat is usually a major consideration in land use applications. The MVLWB, in consultation with ENR’s Wildlife Division, Canadian Wildlife Service and DFO may attach any conditions necessary to land use permits and water licences to ensure impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat are minimized. Where this relates to species listed under the Species at Risk Act, the requirements are much higher.

3.3.3 Heritage Resources and Archaeological Sites

All land uses have the potential to impact culture, heritage and archaeological resources. The Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations prohibit land use operations within 30 m of known heritage resources (archaeological or historic sites, burial sites, artefacts and other objects of historical, cultural or religious significance, and historical or cultural records) without a permit and sets out required procedures if a new resource is discovered. The Northwest Territories Archaeological Sites Regulations are intended to protect heritage resources in the NWT, and to regulate research and operations that include or affect heritage resources. Pursuant to the Northwest Territories Archaeological Sites Regulations, the investigation of archaeological sites and removal of heritage resources from land in the Dehcho territory must be conducted under a NWT archaeologist’s permit. The Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre acts as the official repository for archaeological artefacts collected in the Northwest Territories, issues NWT archaeologist’s permits authorizing archaeological investigations in the NWT, and reviews land use applications to determine the effects of proposed land use activities on heritage resources. The Dehcho First Nation(s) also have traditional knowledge research protocols which applicants should follow in collecting information related to heritage resources and archaeological sites. Existing policies are found in Appendix 2.


3.3.4 Oil and Gas

Oil and gas in the Northwest Territories is managed under two key federal acts, the *Canada Petroleum Resources Act (CPRA)*\(^{146}\) and the *Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act (COGOA)*\(^{147}\). These acts flow from federal policy stated in ‘Canada’s Energy Frontiers – a framework for investment and jobs’ [1985]. The two petroleum acts form the existing legislative base under which oil and gas exploration and development is conducted in the Northwest Territories.

The National Energy Board (NEB) regulates operations under the *National Energy Board Act*\(^{148}\), COGOA and CPRA. There are detailed regulations under COGOA intended to protect human health and the environment and guide reclamation activities, which are overseen by the chief conservation officer. Under the *Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act* [COGOA], the Minister of DIAND may require the proponent of any ‘work, activity or development plan’, to submit for approval, a benefits plan containing provisions for training and employment opportunities for northerners and other Canadians and for northern businesses and other Canadian businesses to have a full and fair opportunity to supply goods and services on a competitive basis. The IMA (S. 42) also states “The Minister of DIAND shall require a benefits plan for any work, activity or development that requires the authorization or approval of the National Energy Board under the *Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act* in the Dehcho territory”\(^{149}\). The *Canada Petroleum Resources Act* regulates oil and gas rights, interests and royalties.

The NEB issues the overarching framework of permits, licences, certificates and authorizations for oil and gas exploration, development, production and pipelines. This includes geophysical authorizations for seismic exploration, operating licences, exploration licences, significant discovery licences and production licences, and certificates of public convenience and necessity for pipelines. The NEB is also responsible for approving applications, plans and activities relating to the abandonment of a well, production facility or a pipeline. The NEB may set conditions for any authorization under its jurisdiction.

DIAND is responsible for administering territorial lands and resources in the NWT through various acts and regulations including the *Territorial Lands Act and Regulations* and CPRA. The *Territorial Lands Act* provides for the issuance of surface leases and restricts the disposition of oil and gas rights through land withdrawals. DIAND administers rights and interests, while the actual licences, permits and authorizations needed to operate are issued by the NEB and the MVLWB.

The Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB) was established under the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act (MVRMA)* and regulates all uses of land or waters or deposits of waste in the Mackenzie Valley. The MVLWB issues land use permits and water licences as they pertain to specific activities within oil and gas exploration and development (i.e. any use of land or water or deposit of waste exceeding the triggers require permits and licences from the MVLWB). They may attach any conditions necessary to protect land and water, and they must implement recommended measures from the MVEIRB and Minister, following an environmental assessment. In addition, application guidelines require a host of plans to be submitted to address various environmental concerns (e.g. spill contingency, environmental monitoring and restoration, etc.).

Rights to explore for oil and gas in the north (referred to as frontier lands by DIAND Oil and Gas Directorate) are managed by DIAND through a rights issuance process under the CPRA. This process involves 5 steps as described in “A Citizen’s Guide to Oil and Gas in the Northwest Territories”\(^{150}\), though only the last 2 steps are set out in the CPRA:
• Expression of interest: Industry expresses interest in exploring an area;
• DIAND undertakes consultation with first nations;
• DIAND issues a “Call for Nominations”. Industry identifies specific blocks of land to be opened for bidding;
• DIAND issues a “Call for Bids” where companies bid on exploration rights to specific parcels of land;
• Issuing the exploration licence. The successful bidder is awarded an exploration licence for a term of up to nine years.

For greater certainty, under Section 41 of the IMA “Canada will not initiate any new issuance cycle for oil and gas exploration licences under the CPRA without the support of the affected Dehcho First Nations.”

An exploration licence gives the holder the right to explore for, and the exclusive right to drill and test for petroleum, an exclusive right to develop lands for petroleum production, and the exclusive right to obtain a production licence. If exploration is successful and where the intention is to hold rights to resources and not proceed immediately with development, the developer may apply to the NEB for a declaration of significant discovery. Once issued an interest holder may apply to DIAND for a significant discovery licence which replaces the exploration licence over the significant discovery area and provides indefinite tenure to the petroleum discovery. Where the intention is to develop resources, an application may be made to the NEB for a declaration of commercial discovery. Once the NEB issues a declaration of commercial discovery, the exploration licence holder or, as the case may be, the significant discovery licence holder may apply to the DIAND Minister for a production licence. A production licence gives the holder the exclusive right to produce petroleum from those lands and title to the petroleum produced.

3.3.5 Mining

The issuance of mineral rights is regulated by DIAND through the Canada Mining Regulations under the Territorial Lands Act. There are 3 main types of interests – prospecting permits, mineral claims and lease of a mineral claim. Once a person has a prospecting licence, they may stake claims. They may also apply for a prospecting permit, which gives the individual the exclusive right to explore for, and stake mineral claims in a specific area for a period of 3-5 years (three years in the Dehcho territory). The holder of a recorded claim has the exclusive right to prospect for minerals and to develop any mine on the land within the boundaries of a claim. Providing the claim holder does the minimum representation work and completes a legal survey of the claim, they may apply for a mineral lease. Once a mineral lease is obtained, a mine may go into production, subject to regulatory processes and approval. The issuance of coal rights is regulated by DIAND through the Territorial Coal Regulations under the Territorial Lands Act. Under S. 34, First Nations may be granted permission to mine small quantities of coal by an agent of territorial lands or a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, free of charge, without being required to make application under the provisions of these regulations.

The environmental regulation of mines and minerals occurs under:
• The Metal Mining Effluent Regulations (MMER) administered by Environment Canada,
• The Fisheries Act administered by DFO, and
• The Northwest Territories Waters Act and Regulations administered by DIAND through the MVLWB.
Environment Canada may issue “transitional authorizations” under the *MMER*, which would allow developers to deposit deleterious substances in waters providing they do not exceed limits laid out in the regulations. The MVLWB may impose any conditions on land use permits and water licences they deem necessary to protect the environment, and must include recommended measures imposed by the MVEIRB and/or Minister, made through an environmental assessment or environmental impact review.

### 3.3.6 Forestry

Forestry is primarily managed by the Forest Management Division, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, GNWT, using the *Forest Management Act* and a suite of subsidiary regulations. They coordinate and implement programs and services in forest management, including forest fire management, in cooperation with First Nations, communities, government and non-government organizations.

The Forest Management Division issues forest authorizations, permits and licences and supervises forest operations within this region. Forest authorizations are issued for timber harvesting and for land use activities which involve the removal of trees and timber. Permits and licences are issued to cut, use, transport, research, manage or scale timber and to operate a mill. Applications for permits and licences must be accompanied by annual operational plans and long range plans, respectively. The supervisor has the authority to set terms and conditions on permits and licences to ensure the proper management of forests. He/she may also fix the annual allowable cut for each tree species or group of species in each forest management unit and fix the volume of cut timber. The *Forest Management Act* includes a right of appeal and right to written reasons for refused applications. The Forest Management Division is also responsible for enforcement of its acts and regulations.

The federal government has very little direct involvement in forest management in the NWT as management of forest resources were handed over to the NWT through a Federal Order in Council. However, under the *Forest Management Act* there are provisions for transfers and agreements:

#### Transfer of forests

8. The Commissioner, on the recommendation of the Minister, may by order, transfer the control, management and administration of any forest to a Minister of the Government of Canada.

#### Forest management agreements

9. (1) The Minister may, on behalf of the Government of the Northwest Territories, enter into agreements with the government of a province or the Yukon Territory or with any person, institution or firm relating to (a) the harvesting of timber; (b) research respecting forests; or (c) the management of forests.

9. (2) The Minister and the Commissioner may, on behalf of the Government of the Northwest Territories, enter into agreements with the Government of Canada relating to

- (a) the harvesting of timber;
- (b) research respecting forests; or
- (c) the management of forests.

#### Authority under agreement

9. (3) An agreement referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may authorize the government, person, institution or firm named in the agreement to conduct the activities described in the agreement without obtaining a permit or licence.
The IMA also includes provisions for forest management in the Dehcho territory. The following sections relate to forest management agreements:

55. The GNWT will not enter into negotiations for any Forest Management Agreement where the affected Deh Cho First Nation(s) does not support the entering into negotiations.

56. The Executive Council of the GNWT will, within a reasonable period of time, consider any letter of intent from a Deh Cho First Nation respecting entering into negotiations for a Forest Management Agreement. The GNWT is committed to concluding Forest Management Agreements with Deh Cho First Nations wherever possible.

3.3.7 Tourism

The Government of the Northwest Territories administers travel and tourism in the NWT, through the Department of Industry, Tourism and Investment (ITI). The NWT Tourism Strategy outlines the GNWT’s agenda and vision with respect to travel and tourism, while the Travel and Tourism Act and regulations, and the Territorial Parks Act regulate travel and tourism activities. Enforcement and inspection is conducted by tourism officers.

The GNWT issues licences and permits for the operation of tourism establishments and regulates specific tourist activities under Outfitters Regulations, Tourism Establishment Regulations, and Travel Development Area Regulations. A tourism licence allows the holder to operate a tourist establishment. A permit is required to construct, move, or enlarge a tourist establishment or allow it to be occupied. In general, applications for tourism licences and permits must demonstrate that the operation:

- Will not have an adverse effect on the environment,
- Will benefit the local economy,
- Will not be incompatible with existing operations, and
- Will not conflict with the traditional use of the area of operation.

The tourism officer may attach any terms and conditions to the licence or permit deemed necessary to meet these criteria.

The Minister may designate an area as a travel development area if it is in the public interest to regulate the orderly recreational use and development of the area (S. 4, Travel and Tourism Act). The Minister can also designate a travel restricted area or designate areas in which non-residents are restricted from outdoor recreational activities without a permit and a guide (S. 5). This may be required to implement tourism restrictions in some of the zones and some of the tourism related Conformity Requirements and Recommendations.

Outfitters are regulated under the Outfitters Regulations. An outfitters licence is required before anyone can provide equipment, transportation, guiding services or related services for profit in connection with angling, hunting, boating, canoeing, camping or other outdoor recreational activity. The licencee must ensure the activity will not have a negative impact on the environment or conflict with the traditional use of the area of operation. However, a guide (any person who for gain or reward accompanies or assists another person in an outdoor recreational activity) does not need a permit or licence.

The Territorial Parks Act allows for the establishment of territorial parks under 6 different designations:

(a) Cultural Conservation Areas to protect culturally significant sites or landscapes;

(b) Heritage Parks to preserve and protect significant cultural or historical

   (i)   natural areas,
(ii) physical features, or
(iii) built environments;

(c) **Natural Environment Parks** to preserve and protect unique, representative or aesthetically significant natural areas;
(d) **Recreation Parks** to encourage an appreciation for the natural environment or to provide for recreational activities;
(e) **Wayside Parks** to provide for the enjoyment or convenience of the traveling public;
(f) **Wilderness Conservation Areas** to protect core representative areas that contribute to regional biodiversity, such as land forms, watersheds or wildlife habitats.

Currently, there are eight territorial parks and two day use areas established within the Dehcho territory:
- Blackstone Territorial Park
- Fort Simpson Territorial Park
- Liard River Crossing Territorial Park
- Sambaa Deh Falls Territorial Park
- Hay River Territorial Park
- Lady Evelyn Fall Territorial Park
- Sixtieth Parallel Territorial Park
- Twin Falls Territorial Park
- Kakisa River Day Use Area and
- McNally Creek Picnic Area

Territorial park designations are considered under the PAS process when lands are advanced for protection. At this time, no new territorial parks are being planned. Should future park establishment be considered, the Committee will address these during Plan review or through a Plan amendment if required sooner.

### 3.3.8 Agriculture

Agricultural activity outside community boundaries is managed by ENR and MACA under a variety of federal and territorial acts and regulations. Agricultural land can either be leased or provided under an occupancy agreement, but not purchased. The majority of agricultural leases fall within community boundaries in the Dehcho territory and are not subject to the Plan.

Exceptions include a lease near the Hay River (K’átå’odehé) at the AB/NWT border and another in the Fort Simpson (Liídilî Kúé) area. The title to an agricultural unit in Edéhzhíe near the Horn River (K’ázhíah) has recently been acquired by a conservation group. Any agriculture involving animals must be done in conformity with the *GNWT Wildlife Act* and the *Federal Health of Animals Act* and *Reportable Diseases Regulations*. Specific agricultural products are managed through agricultural marketing boards under their own regulations (e.g. eggs, dairy, wheat). New operations would require land use permits and water licences from the MVLWB. Operations would be subject to the *GNWT Environmental Protection Act*, the Guideline for Agricultural Waste Management and the Guideline for Ambient Air Quality Standards in the NWT.
3.4 The Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement

The Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement is the most important document guiding the current use and development of land and resources in the Dehcho territory. While it is not legally binding, all Parties are actively implementing it and carrying out their activities in conformity with it. It commits the federal and territorial governments to actively involve the Dehcho First Nation(s) in the management of land use activities within the territory. It also provides the basis for interim land withdrawals through which DFN and Canada agreed to withdraw from disposal approximately 33% of the Dehcho territory, pursuant to S. 23 of the Territorial Lands Act. These five-year land withdrawals prohibit the issuance of new dispositions until October 31, 2008 to allow for the development of a Land Use Plan and to facilitate the settlement of the Dehcho First Nations Final Agreement.

The following activities cannot occur in the Dehcho territory without consultations with the affected Dehcho First Nation(s):
- S. 27. The MVLWB cannot issue new land use permits or water licences;
- S. 28-29. Canada cannot sell, lease or license Crown Land;
- S. 61. GNWT cannot approve licence applications for new outfitters, outpost camps or lodges;

The following activities cannot occur in the Dehcho territory without the support of the affected Dehcho First Nation(s):
- S. 32. The GNWT will not sell or issue new leases on undeveloped Commissioner’s Land except within the Town of Hay River (K’átł’odehé);
- S. 39. Canada will not issue any new prospecting permits under the Canada Mining Regulations;
- S. 41. Canada will not initiate any new issuance cycle for oil and gas exploration licences under the Canada Petroleum Resources Act;
- S. 50. The GNWT will not issue any new forest management authorizations other than those listed in S. 51;
- S. 54. The GNWT will not increase the annual allowable cut on lands affecting DFN except in cases of emergency, or to recover timber after a fire, flood, insect or disease infestation, (to be done in consultation with DFN); and
- S. 55. The GNWT will not enter into negotiations for any Forest Management Agreement.

Other requirements of the IMA affecting land, water and resource management include:
- S. 12-24. Canada and DFN will negotiate land withdrawals to restrict disposal and mineral staking under the Territorial Lands Act. Governments will not issue new permits, licences or authorizations on withdrawn lands for the following land uses:
  - S. 42: new forest management authorizations,
  - S. 43: non-exclusive seismic operations (within certain withdrawn lands), and
  - S. 62: new tourism outfitters, outpost camps or lodges;
- S. 42. The Minister of DIAND will require a benefits plan for any work, activity or development requiring authorization or approval from the NEB under COGOA;
- S. 44. Canada and DFN will negotiate an Interim Resource Development Agreement to foster resource development and accrue benefits from Canada to the DFN;
- S. 45. Parties agree to include a provision in the Final Agreement requiring mining proponents to negotiate impact and benefit agreements with the DFN as a condition to approval from Canada;
• S. 58. A DFN may propose protected areas for land withdrawal or permanent protection under the Protected Areas Strategy; and
• S. 59. Canada and DFN will negotiate an interim management arrangement for Nahanni National Park Reserve.

In addition, several sections invite DFN participation on Boards regulating land and water use:
• S. 26. Nominate a member for appointment to the MVLWB and the Dehcho Land and Water Panel;
• S. 30: Participate in the Lands Advisory Committee for the sale, lease or licensing of land outside the boundaries of local governments or block land transfer areas.
• S. 57. Nominate a member for appointment to the MVEIRB; and
• S. 64: Nominate one member to the Great Slave Lake Advisory Committee.

3.5 The Policy Framework
Policies outline general principles and directions used to carry out government responsibilities. Policies are not legally binding. Both the federal and territorial governments have a large number of policies applicable to land use. This section reviews the key policies, strategies and other documents relevant to land use in the Dehcho territory. The Plan complements existing government policies while providing greater clarity and direction on specific issues relevant to the Dehcho territory.

3.5.1 The Northern Strategy
The federal government is currently developing a comprehensive strategy for the north known as the Northern Strategy, in cooperation with northern residents and aboriginal governments. The purpose of the strategy is to develop a long-term vision for the north and develop a list of actions required to achieve it. Three goals relate directly to the Land Use Plan:

1. Economic Development: To build strong, sustainable, diversified economies where northerners share in the benefits of northern development. This is also one of the goals of the Plan. The Plan helps to achieve this goal by considering social, cultural and economic factors when deciding where development should proceed and identifying appropriate Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations to guide development to achieve these goals. The DLUPC has developed an Economic Development Assessment (EDA) Model to assess the social and economic impacts of various zoning options.

2. Environmental Protection: To engage all partners in the North in the protection and stewardship of the environment. Through open consultations, the Plan has identified where culturally and ecologically important lands should be protected and designated those areas as Conservation Zones.

3. Preserving, Revitalizing and Promoting Culture and Identity: To ensure that the importance of language, traditional knowledge and way-of-life is recognized and encouraged. The Plan is based on the principle of respect for the land, as understood and explained by the Dehcho Elders. The Dene laws, values and principles are integrated throughout the Plan and have guided the decision-making process. The zoning, Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations were developed to preserve and promote Dene culture in the Dehcho territory.
3.5.2 Sustainable Development Policies and Reports

Both Canada and the GNWT have sustainable development policies and other relevant strategies and documents which lay out principles and directions the governments use to guide their decisions. All federal departments are required to have sustainable development strategies. However, we have focused on DIAND’s policy as it is the department responsible for approving the Plan on behalf of the Government of Canada.

DIAND

DIAND has established a Sustainable Development Strategy, updated every three years. The 2004-2006 strategy entitled “On the Right Path Together: A Sustainable Future for First Nations, Inuit and Northern Communities” has adopted the Brundtland Commission’s definition of sustainable development: “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. The policy lays out 8 principles to guide its decisions and activities, the most relevant of which are:

- Full consideration of economic viability, social implications, and cultural and environmental values in decision making and policy and program development;
- Honouring treaty and fiduciary obligations, as well as land claim, self-government and international agreements;
- Respect for diverse cultures and traditional values, as well as the land and its diversity as the foundation for healthy communities;
- Fair and equitable opportunities for First Nations, Inuit and northern peoples to share in the benefits, risks and drawbacks of development; and
- Decisions based on the best available scientific, traditional and local knowledge.

This policy supports the notion of community-based planning through the federal government’s requirement “to consult with First Nation peoples and accommodate their interests in the decisions that affect their lives”. This is at the heart of northern land use plans, which aim to address the needs of northern residents and communities as a first priority. This is also supported in the strategy’s vision: “Community planning and development will be long term, locally driven and comprehensive.”

The strategy includes long-term planning as one of the five key themes. DIAND’s objective for long-term planning can be distilled into the phrase “one plan and one process”. For this to be achieved, “government must ensure that community priorities, as reflected in community-based plans, become the foundation for federal strategic planning of program and service delivery to First Nations, Inuit and northern communities.” The strategy confirms the importance of “being able to monitor the impacts of planning processes and assess overall progress of communities working toward achieving their visions.” This theme also addresses the issue of local capacity to develop and implement plans.

GNWT

The GNWT’s Sustainable Development Policy defines sustainable development as “a way of managing natural resources and the environment so that economic, social and cultural needs are met while maintaining ecological processes and natural diversity.” Key principles include:

- The GNWT will promote economic development which maintains harvestable resources at sustainable levels, essential ecological processes and natural diversity;
• Sustainable development of resources is essential to the long term economic, cultural and social well-being of northern residents;
• Northern residents shall be assured meaningful input and participation in decisions related to conservation and resource development;
• Conservation and development practices shall take into account local knowledge, values and experience to be found among the regular users of the environment as well as the information developed in academic institutions, industry and government;
• Natural resources should be managed so that opportunities for future resource uses are maximized and maintenance of ecosystems is ensured;
• The GNWT recognizes the need for conservation areas to maintain special values related to wildlife and wildlife habitat, unique or representative ecosystems, prime forests, productive agricultural soils, and heritage, recreational, tourism, scientific, and aesthetic resources.

There are five key sustainable development objectives outlined in the policy:
• Promote integrated resource management;
• Maintain and enhance environmental quality – the GNWT “shall ensure that environmental quality is maintained to support the long term stability of northern society”;
• Establish conservation areas;
• Develop non-renewable resources in ways that contribute to a sustainable economy; and
• Promote cooperation in the management of transboundary resources.

The Plan is well aligned with all of these principles and objectives.

3.5.3 Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation
The Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation states that the objective of the Federal Government with respect to wetland conservation is to: "promote the conservation of Canada's wetlands to sustain their ecological and socio-economic functions, now and in the future." In support of the above objective, the Federal Government, in cooperation with the provinces and territories and the Canadian public, will strive to achieve the following goals:

• Maintenance of the functions and values derived from wetlands throughout Canada;
• No net loss of wetland functions on all federal lands and waters;
• Enhancement and rehabilitation of wetlands in areas where the continuing loss or degradation of wetlands or their functions have reached critical levels;
• Recognition of wetland functions in resource planning, management and economic decision-making with regard to all federal programs, policies and activities;
• Securement of wetlands of significance to Canadians;
• Recognition of sound, sustainable management practices in sectors such as forestry and agriculture that make a positive contribution to wetlands conservation while also achieving wise use of wetland resources;
• Utilization of wetlands in a manner that enhances prospects for their sustained and productive use by future generations.

The policy outlines seven strategies to provide for the use and management of wetlands so that they can continue to provide a broad range of functions on a sustainable basis.
• Developing Public Awareness,
• Managing Wetlands on Federal Lands and Waters and in other Federal Programs,
• Promoting Wetland Conservation in Federal Protected Areas,
• Enhancing Cooperation,
• Conserving Wetlands of Significance to Canadians,
• Ensuring a Sound Scientific Basis for Policy,
• Promoting International Actions,

These strategies are aimed at working in concert with other ongoing initiatives for wetland conservation. They are aimed at providing practical direction, support, and tools to program managers. They set out direction to put the federal house in order, to manage federal wetlands, and to ensure effective wetlands science and public awareness actions both nationally and internationally. All seven strategies are deemed to be critical to the success of the Policy. The Plan is consistent with this policy (CR #15).

3.5.4 Water

A key focus for the GNWT is water quality as reflected by their efforts in developing the Drinking Water Quality Framework and Strategy. As discussed earlier, water is the most important resource for northern residents. The protection of this resource is a top priority for all communities. The framework identifies three lines of defence to protect drinking water and identifies a number of related actions under each:
1. Keeping NWT Water Clean – preventing pollution at the source, watershed protection measures;
2. Making Drinking Water Safe – safe water treatment systems and water quality standards; and
3. Proving that Drinking Water is Safe – water testing, monitoring and reporting.

All three of these mechanisms are supported by the Dehcho Land Use Plan’s Water Monitoring and Management Conformity Requirements (section 2.3.3, CR #14 and 15).

3.5.5 Transportation

The GNWT report “Investing in Roads for People and the Economy: A Highway Strategy for the Northwest Territories”, presents a vision for roads in the Northwest Territories including:

• An upgraded highway system that provides improved safety and more reliability for people and resource development,
• A road down the Mackenzie Valley from Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki) to Tuktoyaktuk to provide all-weather road access for communities and to facilitate development of the resources of the Mackenzie Valley and Delta,
• Greater northern involvement in land-based access into the Slave Geologic Province and new road infrastructure that is responsive to the needs of industry to create economic development opportunities, and
• New or upgraded community access roads to provide improved land-based access for communities.

The GNWT vision for roads in the Northwest Territories is based upon two objectives:
• Creating opportunities for economic development, and
• Connecting communities.
The guiding principles in implementing the vision are:

- Activities will be undertaken in cooperation with all stakeholders, including aboriginal and land claimant groups, industry, other governments, communities, and individuals;
- Activities will maintain and, where possible, enhance road safety;
- Activities must consider their environmental impacts, and we must work to minimize the negative and maximize the positive impacts;
- Land claimant groups and land ownership issues must be considered in all activities; and
- In all activities we will maximize local and northern involvement.

Transportation has major implications for conservation, development and utilization of the land, waters and other resources in the Dehcho territory. The Plan complements this policy by addressing transportation in the Conformity Requirements. The Plan provides flexibility to address future access needs of all planning partners. Many of the Plan’s Conformity Requirements are consistent with the guiding principles outlined above.

### 3.5.6 Oil and Gas

In 2003, DFN and Canada signed an Dehcho First Nations Interim Resource Development Agreement\(^{173}\) to foster resource development in the Dehcho territory and to accrue benefits to the Dehcho First Nations from Canada in the interim of a Dehcho Final Agreement. While this Agreement is in force the Parties share the objective that new issuance cycles for oil and gas exploration licences under the *Canada Petroleum Resources Act* will be initiated in the Dehcho territory in a predictable manner. Before an issuance cycle is initiated, the Parties agree to pursue consultations under section 41 of the IMA, on such matters as the terms and conditions of the issuance. In return, DFN would receive a payment from Canada equivalent to a percentage share of the federal royalties collected from the Mackenzie Valley in the previous year. DFN can access up to 50% of their share of royalties annually, to a maximum of $1 million, to foster economic development. Their remaining share is payable upon ratification of the Final Agreement. Despite prolonged negotiations, Canada and DFN have been unable to reach agreement on terms and conditions for rights issuance.

The GNWT also has a *Non-Renewable Resource Strategy* to guide development of oil and gas and mining resources.\(^{174}\) This strategy outlines four principles:

- Partnership with other governments, industry and Canada;
- Sustainable Development;
- Economic Diversification; and
- Fiscal Sustainability.

Goals of the strategy include:

- Promote economic self-sufficiency for the NWT to reduce fiscal dependence on Canada;
- Position NWT residents and businesses to benefit from development;
- Promote equity participation by aboriginal organizations and governments in resource development projects;
- Maximize jobs and careers for northern residents and all Canadians;
- Provide Canada with the opportunity to benefit from increased resource royalties and tax revenues;
- Provide business and industry throughout Canada with enhanced opportunities;
• Establish a sound GNWT financial position which will enhance and support implementation of self-government initiatives;
• Provide a financial legacy for future generations;
• Encourage transportation infrastructure to maximize access to resources and to ensure long-term sustainability of northern communities; and
• Protect the NWT environment, renewable resources and wildlife.

The strategy identifies 19 actions falling into three key components:
1. Creating the right environment for development;
2. Managing Development; and

The Plan addresses all three of these components. The zoning identifies where land uses are permitted or not permitted, providing greater certainty in the regulatory process, which should reduce delays in approvals. The Plan also identifies a number of Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations to manage impacts from land uses (e.g. cumulative effects, health and social issues) and maximize benefits (e.g. maximizing employment benefits, promotion of secondary industries). The Plan’s Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations echo and complement the strategic directions of the GNWT as described in this document.

3.5.7 Mining

Under the Dehcho First Nations Interim Resource Development Agreement, Canada and DFN agreed to the following:
• S. 17: The Parties will work with the mining industry to identify areas where DFN would support new prospecting permits.
• S. 18: Canada will consult with DFN on any new proposed changes to the Canada Mining Regulations;
• S. 19: Canada will not issue a new surface lease for lands within the Dehcho territory in connection with a major mining project unless DFN and the project proponent negotiate an impact and benefit agreement on the mining project.

The mining sector is also guided by several policies. The Whitehorse Mining Initiative Leadership Council Accord175 (WMI) resulted from discussions between the mining industry, senior governments, labour unions, environmental organizations, and First Nations. The Accord adopts a strategic vision for a healthy mining industry: “Our vision is of a socially, economically and environmentally sustainable, and prosperous mining industry, underpinned by political and community consensus.” The Accord addresses six themes:
• Addressing business needs;
• Maintaining a healthy environment:
  o Principle: “Environmentally responsible mining exploration, development, operations and public policies are predicated on maintaining a healthy environment and, on closure, returning mine sites and affected areas to viable, and, wherever, practicable, self-sustaining, ecosystems that are compatible with a healthy environment and with human activities”;
• Resolving land use issues:
  o Goal: “To ensure that project-specific environmental assessments are effective, efficient, and well defined, and are conducted in the broader context of an integrated land use planning process, and government policies and programs”;
• Principle: “Protected area networks are essential contributors to environmental health, biological diversity, and ecological processes, as well as being a fundamental part of the sustainable balance of society, economy, and environment”;

• Ensuring the welfare of workers and communities:
  o Goal: “To produce the maximum practicable socio-economic benefits of mining for communities”;

• Meeting aboriginal concerns:
  o Principle: Aboriginal peoples have rights protected under the Constitution Act, 1982, which include, among others, rights to lands and resources”;
  o Principle: “Aboriginal peoples are entitled to opportunities to participate fully in mineral development at all stages of mining and associated industries and at all employment levels”; and

• Improving decisions.

Many of the directions taken in the WMI are reflected in Canada’s other policies. In the Minerals and Metals Policy, Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) outlines six key directions:

• Implementing a sustainable development approach;
• Ensuring the competitiveness of Canada’s minerals and metals industry;
• Promoting products, markets and stewardship;
• Promoting aboriginal community involvement in minerals and metals activities;
• Developing science and technology; and
• Providing international leadership in the implementation of sustainable development.

Of special interest to the Plan is the adoption of several key principles and commitments in the Mineral and Metals Policy:

• Pollution Prevention - “The use of processes, practices, materials, products or energy that avoid or minimize the creation of pollutants and wastes, and reduce the overall risk to human health and the environment.”
• Precautionary Principle - “Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation”;
• Polluter Pays Principle - “The polluter, should, in principle, bear the cost of pollution, with due regard to the public interest, and without distorting international trade and investment”.
• Life-Cycle Management and the Safe Use Principle – “Minerals, metals and their products can be produced, used, re-used, recycled and returned to the environment in a manner that is consistent with sustainable development”.
• Mine Reclamation - “Government will ensure that, as a condition for mine development on federal lands, comprehensive plans for the reclamation of disturbed areas are developed, including the provision of satisfactory financial assurances to cover the costs of reclamation and, where necessary, long-term maintenance.”
• Land Access and Protected Areas – Ensuring the completion of a National Park Network by year 2000; protecting critical wildlife habitat including legislation to protect endangered species; fully taking into account the mineral potential of an area before creating protected areas; and ensuring the widest possible access to lands for exploration outside protected areas.
• Aboriginal Communities - The Government affirms its support for the timely resolution of land claims to remove uncertainty over the ownership and use of land and resources, and to encourage self-reliance by aboriginal communities and promote their participation in economic opportunities.
• Science and Technology - Commitment to further geoscience mapping in northern frontier areas; Identifying sustainable mining operations, and safe and efficient processing and use of minerals and metals as priorities for research.

The NWT Mine Site Reclamation Policy\textsuperscript{177} is a federal policy for “the protection of the environment and disposition of liability relating to mine closures in the NWT.” The policy applies to all developed mines, whether operating or not, but does not apply to orphaned or abandoned mines or mineral prospecting and exploration. The policy is meant to clarify DIAND’s intent for resource management boards, industry and the public with respect to identifying terms and conditions for land use under its jurisdiction. It focuses on the following principles:
• Sustainable development;
• Polluter pays;
• WMI’s definition of reclamation;
• Mines must be able to support reclamation costs;
• Mines must post adequate security to cover all reclamation costs, including shutdown, closure and post closure;
• Best Management Practices, including progressive reclamation, should be used;
• Comprehensive, complete and timely communication and consultation between parties; and
• Reclamation planning: Every mine should, at all times, have a Mine Closure and Reclamation Plan, which includes measures to be taken in the event of a temporary closure. The Plan must address all components of the mine, including tailings handling, disposal of chemicals and hydrocarbons, and pit shutdown.

The GNWT also has a Non-Renewable Resource Strategy to guide development of oil and gas and mining resources, which is described under Oil and Gas.\textsuperscript{178}

A recent regulatory review completed by CARC (Canadian Arctic Resources Committee) and CIRL (Canadian Institute for Resource Law)\textsuperscript{179} identified several flaws in the current system consistent with community concerns, and proposed ways to improve security and reclamation of mines within the NWT. DIAND has also begun an annual review process of the Mine Site Reclamation Guidelines for the NWT. The most recent version, released in January 2006 emphasizes the importance of building consensus with affected communities and parties in designing mine reclamation plans.\textsuperscript{180} Many of the conditions in the Plan are consistent with recommendations made in these two documents.

3.5.8 Forestry
There are currently no GNWT policies guiding forest management or development in the region. While the Federal Government is not involved in managing forests in the GNWT or Dehcho territory, it is involved in research and policy development through the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers (CCFM) and the Canadian Forest Service, and has produced a number of relevant reports on forest management in Canada.

Forest management is guided across Canada by a number of policies jointly developed by Provincial, Territorial and Federal Ministers – most important of which are the Canada Forest Accord\textsuperscript{181} and the National Forest Strategy\textsuperscript{182}. The Accord and Strategy have moved away from a narrow focus on the economic benefits of cutting trees, to a more holistic appreciation of the social, cultural, environmental and economic benefits of forests, leading to a change in how forests are managed.
The most recent Canada Forest Accord 2003-2008 states under the section, Our Principles, “Canadians care about the sustainability of their forest and believe in the primary importance of nurturing its health through an ecosystem-based approach. Forest management must therefore sustain ecosystem health while meeting expectations of social well-being as well as continued environmental services and economic activity.” Furthermore, the principles of the Canada Forest Accord 2003-2008 also recognize that “Canadians have an important role in shaping the decisions affecting forest conservation and use. The sustainability of Aboriginal and other forest-based communities rests on their ability to participate effectively in forest management. This requires goodwill and long-term foresight by all parties.” The principles of the Canada Forest Accord 2003-2008 are consistent with the purpose of the Land Use Plan which is “to promote the social, cultural and economic well being of residents and communities in the Deh Cho territory, having regard to the interests of all Canadians.”

The Canada Forest Accord 2003-2008 includes 10 commitments to guide forest management across Canada of which three may be particularly relevant to the Dehcho territory.

- Managing Canada’s natural forest through an ecosystem-based approach;
- Adopting policies and practices that support forest-based community sustainability; and
- Accommodating Aboriginal and treaty rights in the sustainable use of the forest in a manner consistent with constitutional requirements.

The most recent National Forest Strategy 2003-2008 focuses on the following broad themes:

- Ecosystem-based Management;
- Sustainable Forest Communities;
- Rights and Participation of Aboriginal Peoples;
- Forest Products Benefits;
- Knowledge and Innovation for Competitiveness and Sustainability;
- The Urban Forest and Public Engagement in Sustainability;
- Private Woodlots’ Contribution to Sustainability; and
- Reporting and Accountability.

The application of the National Forest Strategy will vary across Canada and will be based on local social, environmental and economic circumstances.

The Canadian Forest Service conducts research and maintains Canada wide inventories of the forest resources in cooperation with their provincial and territorial departments. It releases an annual report on “The State of Canada’s Forests.”

Another key federal report of note was produced in 1999 by the Senate Subcommittee on the Boreal Forest, called “Competing Realities: The Boreal Forest at Risk.” This report detailed the numerous threats to the health of the boreal forest in Canada and recommended key actions required to ensure the long-term health of the boreal forest. Key recommendations of the Sub-Committee are:

1. The boreal forest should be managed under three zones:
   a. 20% for intensive management for timber production;
   b. 20% set aside as protected areas for old growth forests, traditional use areas, representative ecological areas and significant wildlife habitat; and
   c. The majority of forests to be managed to accommodate the full range of natural assemblages, uses and values of the forest.

2. A network of protected areas should be completed by 2002.
3. The federal government should not issue timber or other development permits in candidate park sites.
4. No industrial development should be allowed in established national and provincial parks.
5. All levels of government should manage lands adjacent to parks, on an ecosystem basis.
6. Establish and enforce maximum road and trail density standards.
7. Establish adequate logging buffers around parks.
8. Preserve wildlife habitat, using size and connectivity requirements of wildlife.
9. Limit cutting in old growth forest.
10. Phase out herbicide and pesticide use in forests.
11. Governments must live up to responsibilities regarding Aboriginal peoples.
12. Governments should not grant timber harvesting rights to companies on Aboriginal traditional lands, or in areas under dispute or claim, without adhering to most recent court decisions.
13. Forest companies must include traditional aboriginal land uses in land use planning.

These recommendations provide guidance for the appropriate management and land use in boreal forest regions across Canada, which includes the Dehcho territory. The Plan is consistent with many of these recommendations by identifying Land Use Zones, supporting the Protected Areas Strategy, and defining Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations for the sustainable development of forest resources with full input and participation of affected First Nations, communities and other planning partners.

3.5.9 Tourism

NWT Tourism Strategy (2003) recognizes that tourism brings more revenue to the NWT than all other renewable resources combined. As the GNWT is competing with similar destinations, notably the Yukon and Alaska, it is vital that the GNWT work towards protecting the key components that drive tourism, namely environment, culture, and wildlife. The mission statement of the strategy is “to support the development of a strong tourism industry in the Northwest Territories for the benefit of our members, visitors, our communities and our people, while protecting our environment and the northern way of life”.

3.5.10 Climate Change

The impact of climate change on people with traditional lifestyles in the North is a vital concern of the GNWT. The NWT Greenhouse Gas Strategy is designed to address some of these concerns. More than 40 federal and territorial agencies, Aboriginal organizations, industry and environmental groups participated in the development of the strategy. The purpose of the strategy is to:

- Identify and coordinate northern actions to begin to control greenhouse gas emissions, and
- Assist in developing and contributing a northern perspective as part of Canada's National Climate Change Implementation Strategy.

The Strategy states that “The Government of the NWT must demonstrate leadership by diligently and responsibly taking action to control emissions of greenhouse gases in the NWT”. However, “affected groups must be provided with a meaningful opportunity to participate in the development of legislation, policy, strategies and other initiatives that will directly affect them”. The strategy advocates a comprehensive, phased approach where “controlling emissions must be done in ways that carefully considers sectoral and regional economies”. To be effective “action should advance the environmental, economic and social goals of residents of the NWT”. Furthermore, “given the significant risk that potential climate change poses for human and
environmental health, a “weight of evidence” or precautionary approach must be used to justify preventative actions rather than wait for full scientific certainty”. The Land Use Plan provides clear direction on air quality monitoring and management, and sustainable development, which are important considerations for addressing climate change.

3.5.11 International Commitments

In addition to being integrated with Federal and Territorial policies and legislation, the Plan also supports Canada’s efforts and commitments on the international stage. Canada has made the following international commitments that are supported by the Plan:

- **Convention on Biological Diversity**\(^{190}\) - by supporting the three main goals of:
  - Conservation of biological diversity (Conservation Zones),
  - Sustainable use of resources (Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations), and
  - The fair and equitable sharing of resources (Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations);

- **The Convention on Migratory Species**\(^{191}\) - by protecting designated Migratory Bird Sites within Conservation Zones;

- **Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO Sites)**\(^{192}\) – by providing further buffers to the existing Nahanni National Park Reserve which is a UNESCO World Heritage Site;

- **The Kyoto Protocol and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change**\(^{193}\):
  - By providing a staged approach to land use activity through zoning, appropriate to existing levels of infrastructure and capacity,
  - By reducing clearing of land through cumulative effects thresholds, and
  - By promoting best practices through other Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations;

- **The North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation**\(^{194}\) – by assessing current levels of environmental impacts through the cumulative effects Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations and providing for a high level of environmental protection;

- **The Arctic Environment Protection Strategy**\(^{195}\) – by providing for:
  - The “Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna” (CAFF) within Conservation Zones,
  - Inclusion of the goals of CAFF in the Plan’s Vision and Goals, and
  - The use of traditional knowledge and cumulative effects assessment and Management in project screening processes; and

- **The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands**\(^{196}\) – through the protection of significant wetlands and migratory bird habitat in Conservation Zones, especially the Falaise Lake Wetland Complex (Zone 16) and in Zone 31 – the Birch Falaise Corridor Special Management Zone; through Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations. Monitoring the impacts of land use activities and requiring no-net loss of wetlands and shorelines is particularly relevant. Also promoting conservation and wise use of wetlands.

3.6 The Land Use Plan and Other Land Use Initiatives

While the Dehcho Land Use Plan is the main initiative to guide conservation and land use activities within the Dehcho territory, it is not the only one. The PAS and Nahanni Park Expansion processes are also planning future protected areas within the Dehcho territory. Communities are planning for their future needs, and governments are developing strategies to manage development. Given that all these initiatives are planning for the same lands, they
need to be coordinated and integrated to ensure consistency. This section reviews how the Plan integrates with and complements other land use initiatives.

3.6.1 NWT Protected Areas Strategy

The NWT Protected Areas Strategy\(^{197}\) is a joint federal/territorial process designed to make balanced decisions in identifying, establishing and protecting significant natural and cultural areas using best available knowledge. The establishment of protected areas is a component of regional land use planning processes, and is vital to integrated resource management planning. As per the PAS, "locally based land use planning and resource management processes will take the lead on identifying community and regional interests in areas being considered for protection". The strategy has two primary goals:

1. To protect special natural and cultural areas, and
2. To protect core representative areas within each ecoregion.

The process has eight steps:
1. Identify priority areas of interest.
2. Prepare and review protected area proposal at regional level.
3. Review and submit proposal for candidate protected area status.
4. Consider and where necessary apply interim protection for candidate area.
5. Evaluate candidate area.
6. Seek formal establishment of protected area.
7. Approve and designate protected area.
8. Implement, monitor and review protected area.

The NWT PAS process results in the permanent protection of lands. The PAS is a community-driven process. Communities interested in protecting lands under the strategy contact the PAS Secretariat to initiate discussions. Initial research is compiled into a formal proposal outlining the values of the land which support protection, identifying a sponsoring agency for the site, and the type of protected area designation being requested. A working group is formed to oversee the site’s progress through the process. If the proposal is accepted, the lands may be provided interim protection through a five year land withdrawal under the \textit{Territorial Lands Act}.

The NWT PAS process refers to prospective protected areas in the Dehcho territory under 3 categories\(^{198}\): An Area of Interest is a special area or site of natural or cultural value. It has formal support of communities and/or regional organizations (Step 1 or 2) and has a preliminary boundary that can be changed. A Candidate Protected Area is selected from an Area of Interest and an agency may be identified to sponsor the area. A proposal to evaluate the area for permanent legislated protection is to be developed and submitted to a sponsoring agency for review and acceptance (Step 3). The agency that accepts the proposal may then apply for interim protection for the area (Step 4). There are no legal restrictions on activities within an Area of Interest or a Candidate Protected Area until interim protection is approved. In a Candidate Protected Area with Interim Protection lands have been withdrawn from new surface and/or sub-surface interests for a limited time (usually five years). This helps ensure that the natural and cultural values of the area are not compromised during the planning process (Steps 5-8). Existing third party interests are respected.

During the land withdrawal, a number of assessments and studies are carried out, including the ecological and non-renewable resource values, renewable resource assessments, socio-
economic analyses; and cultural values studies. This is an important step. The non-renewable resource assessments are designed to take all the existing geological and exploration data for the area and make a determination on the oil and gas and mineral potential of the area. Only additional seismic exploration and drilling would identify hydrocarbon resources. Important cultural and ecological resources may also be identified and documented. The results of these assessments are considered by a working group. The PAS process can result in a range of protection which reflects the studies, the decisions of the Candidate Area Working Group, community members and the legislated powers of the sponsoring agency. The Working Group will submit a formal proposal for the protected area to appropriate government institutions for approval, specifying management objectives, proposed boundaries and preferred designation199. Once approved, the protected area will be designated through the appropriate legislation and managed in accordance with its management plan. The Plan will no longer apply within the boundaries of the protected area.

Currently there are four prospective protected areas in the Dehcho territory. Edéhzhíe is a Candidate Protected Area with Interim Protection being assessed under Step 5 of the PAS process and was withdrawn for interim protection in 2002. The interim land withdrawal expires on June 30, 2007. Sambaa K’e is at Step 3 of the PAS process and is a Candidate Protected Area. Pehdzeh Kì Ndeh and Ka’a’gee Tu are both Area’s of Interest under Step 1-2 of the PAS process. Sambaa K’e, Pehdzeh Kì Ndeh and Ka’a’gee Tu have not yet been withdrawn under the PAS (though most of the Sambaa K’e and Ka’a’gee Tu was withdrawn as part of DFN’s land withdrawals through the IMA and negotiations for withdrawals around Pehdzeh Kì Ndeh are ongoing).

“Regional land use planning and the PAS are sometimes confused. Although they are separate programs, they are complementary initiatives which reinforce one another, and therefore one does not replace the other”200. Land use planning complements the PAS process in several ways. First, land use planning initiates discussions with communities about where they want land protected and where they want land uses permitted. Areas requiring permanent protection should be advanced through the PAS process. However, achieving interim protection under Stage 4 of the PAS is a lengthy process. In the Dehcho territory, the Plan provides immediate protection to PAS Areas of Interest through the designation of Conservation Zones as per community request and government initiatives, while the initial stages of the PAS are underway. The Plan will be amended to designate these areas as protected under the PAS once that status is achieved.

If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy or the Nahanni Park Expansion Process prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

Areas where communities would like more flexible protection should be identified as Conservation Zones as these can be reclassified if other land uses are considered appropriate in the future.
3.6.2 Nahanni Park Expansion Process

The current Nahanni National Park Reserve has been recognized as inadequate to maintain the ecological integrity of the area and achieve ecological representation goals. Since 1987, management plans for Nahanni National Park Reserve have identified the need to expand the park boundary. The Dehcho First Nations have long supported the expansion of the current Nahanni National Park Reserve to encompass the entire watershed. This is supported through four separate Leadership resolutions (see Appendix 3):

- Resolution #03: Prairie Creek Road (Unanimous non-support for the road). Dehcho First Nations Leadership Meeting, Hay River Reserve (K’átå’odeeche). May 4-6, 2004.

Through a memorandum of understanding signed in 2003, Dehcho First Nations and Parks Canada have agreed to work together to expand Nahanni National Park Reserve within the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem. They are currently undertaking numerous feasibility studies, including a Mineral and Energy Resource Assessment. Consultation with the public is part of the process. When these studies conclude, an agreement to expand the boundaries of the current Nahanni National Park Reserve will be negotiated to establish new Park boundaries and to establish Nahanni National Park Reserve with full National Park status.

The Plan does not affect where the final boundaries of Nahanni National Park will be established as that is being determined by the Park Expansion Process. The Plan will be amended during future reviews to recognize the final park boundary. The Plan will not apply within Nahanni National Park. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy or the Nahanni Park Expansion Process prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

3.6.3 NWT Cumulative Effects Assessment and Management (CEAM) Framework, Strategy and Blueprint

The NWT CEAM Strategy and Framework and the CEAM Blueprint are a series of documents that outline a collaborative effort to improve environmental management and stewardship in Canada's Northwest Territories. “Cumulative effects are changes to the biophysical, social, economic, and cultural environments caused by the combination of past, present and "reasonably foreseeable" future actions.”

The vision of the NWT CEAM Strategy and Framework is to make recommendations to decision-makers to facilitate:

- The protection of ecological integrity;
- The building of sustainable communities, including social and cultural dimensions; and
- Responsible economic development within a sound environmental management framework.
The NWT CEAM Framework consists of nine components that capture the key functions necessary for CEAM and the principal linkages among them. These components are:

- Vision and Objectives;
- Land Use Planning;
- Baseline Studies and Monitoring;
- Research;
- Audit and Reporting;
- Project-Specific Screening, Environmental Assessment and Review;
- Regulation and Enforcement;
- Information Management; and
- Coordination.

The CEAM Framework and Strategy view land use planning as a key component required to implement cumulative effects assessment and management. An early CEAM Framework document published by DIAND and Environment Canada emphasize the role of land use plans in setting thresholds and guiding resource development decision-making processes:

“Land use planning involves the development of strategies and actions for the orderly development of land uses; these may implicitly or explicitly define thresholds or carrying capacities. Land use plans represent a broad ‘vision’ of the landscape, integrating social, cultural and economic values, and set the context for decision-making with respect to rights issuance, project review and regulation.”

Land Use Plans are an ideal vehicle for implementing cumulative effects thresholds because they require a vision to guide future land use activities, and they consider and integrate social, cultural, economic and environmental considerations within an open, inclusive forum through extensive consultations. This is reflected in the emphasis of the DLUPC as the lead agency in the development of the Dehcho Regional Plan of Action for CEAM as laid out in the CEAM Blueprint. The DLUPC was also funded through the CEAM Steering Committee to initiate research on both the Dehcho plan of action and cumulative effects indicators and thresholds. This work was developed and continues to be guided by a Steering Committee, of which the DLUPC is an active participant. Canada and the DFN agreed at the outset of the land use planning process that the Land Use Plan would be the appropriate vehicle with which to advance the CEAM Regional Plan of Action for the Dehcho territory. The DLUPC sees inclusion of cumulative effects indicators and thresholds in the Land Use Plan as a major step towards implementation of cumulative effects assessment and management within the Dehcho territory.

### 3.6.4 Transboundary Issues

The Dehcho territory is not an island. Its borders are political, not ecological, so they do not present a barrier to the movement of resources between this region and others. The vegetation does not suddenly change when crossing from the Dehcho territory to the Sahtú, Tłı̨chǫ or Treaty 8 regions, or into Alberta, BC or the Yukon. Wildlife regularly moves back and forth across the border and so do people. Resource deposits underground follow geological formations and may cover both sides of a border.
Water is perhaps the best example of a transboundary resource linking multiple regions together. The Mackenzie River Basin covers Alberta, BC, Yukon, and the Northwest Territories. Activities occurring in one region have the potential to affect the water of other regions downstream. The Great Slave Lake (Tucho) sits in the middle of the Dehcho territory, the T'ıchǫ and the Treaty 8 regions and is used by all regions.

Management of transboundary resources must be coordinated between affected regions. The Mackenzie River Basin Board (MRBB) is a transboundary body comprised of representatives from the affected provinces and territories. The MRBB develops agreements between the parties for transboundary management and coordinates research on the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) Basin. Similarly, the Great Slave Lake Advisory Committee (GSLAC) was established with representation from the surrounding settlement areas, fishermen, organizations and relevant government departments to oversee management of the lake and fish. The Plan respects the authority of these bodies to manage and address transboundary water issues.

Land use that crosses borders, or creates cross border impacts also needs a coordinated approach. While the Plan does not apply to land use outside the Dehcho territory, it can inform land use activities occurring across the border as to acceptable cross border impacts. Responsible Authorities are encouraged to consider transboundary issues in all land use activities and ensure all affected parties have the opportunity to participate in the EA process. The MVLWB has a Transboundary Applications Policy which requires the establishment of a transboundary panel to review such applications.

Good decisions cannot be made unless goals and research are coordinated across borders. The Plan encourages transboundary research and cooperation to ensure consistent datasets and understanding with which to make appropriate, informed decisions.

As land use planning advances in surrounding regions, the Plan will consider the proposed uses on the other side, and where appropriate, harmonize transboundary uses. The Plan currently aligns with proposed protected areas in the Sahtú Settlement Area for the northern tips of Pehdzeh Kí Ndeh and the Nahanni Park Expansion.

### 3.6.5 Community Planning

The Plan has to be integrated with other initiatives occurring within its borders. Community planning covers two distinct topics – planning within community boundaries and Dehcho First Nation(s) initiatives to develop more detailed plans for their own traditional territory outside community boundaries.

The Land Use Plan does not apply within community boundaries and community plans do not apply outside community boundaries so there is no direct conflict between the two. However, some community infrastructure currently exists outside community boundaries. There may also be the need to increase the size of community boundaries to allow for future expansion of community services.

All existing community infrastructure outside of current community boundaries will continue as an existing use for as long as it is required. The Plan may need an amendment to expand community boundaries and includes a Conformity Requiremt to guide development of new infrastructure.
Several Dehcho First Nation(s) have initiated planning processes within their traditional territory and others have expressed interest in doing so. The Committee supports and encourages community efforts to move beyond the regional scope of the Dehcho Land Use Plan. Regional and First Nation-based plans must be integrated and consistent with each other. The Dehcho Land Use Plan provides the regional framework for more detailed community-based planning. The Committee will coordinate with any community interested in community-based planning to ensure the final plans are consistent and complementary.

3.7 Non-governmental Organization Initiatives
During Plan development the Committee participated in various forums to present the Plan and solicit feedback from interested organizations affected by land use planning in the Dehcho territory. Some initiatives relevant to the Plan are described here.

3.7.1 NWT Native Women’s Association Recommendations
NWT Native Women’s Association has a strong voice when it comes to sustainable development in the NWT. On November 5-6th, 2004, the Native Women’s Association of the NWT (NWA-NWT) held their annual planning workshop in Fort Providence (Zhahti Kúé). The theme for this workshop was “First Nations Women’s Perspectives on Resource Development – Oil, Gas and Mining”. As part of the workshop, participants broke into groups according to settlement region to answer the question “what actions should leaders or the NWT Native Women’s Association take to ensure resource development is done right?” The recommendations from Dehcho participants are included for consideration in Appendix 5.

3.7.2 Canadian Boreal Initiative
The Canadian Boreal Initiative (CBI) is an organization working with conservationists, First Nations, industry and other interested parties to link science, policy and conservation activities in Canada's boreal forest. On December 1, 2003 the CBI released the Boreal Forest Conservation Framework - the most extensive national conservation vision ever. The Framework's goal is to conserve the cultural, sustainable economic and natural values of the entire Canadian boreal region by employing the principles of conservation biology to:

- Protect at least 50% of the region in a network of large interconnected protected areas; and
- Support sustainable communities, world-leading ecosystem-based resource management practices and state-of-the-art stewardship practices in the remaining landscape.

The Dehcho Land Use Plan reflects this national vision with approximately 50% of the region protected through a network of large interconnected protected areas. The Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations of the Plan are designed to add value to existing legislation and promote sustainable communities and resource management.
Chapter 4: Planning Process

Consultation is an important part of land use planning in the Dehcho territory. Photo Credit: DLUPC

NOTE: The maps provided in this Background Report are for illustrative purposes only. While the DLUPC uses the best information available at the time of writing, we make no guarantees of completeness or accuracy. The maps may become outdated after print. Interested persons or organizations requiring up to date information should contact the data source for the most current files.
4.1 Introduction

The planning process was established through a set of guidelines in the Interim Measures Agreement which were adopted as the Terms of Reference (see Appendix 4). The process is guided by the principles of sustainable development, and respect for the land, as understood and explained by the Dehcho Elders. Each party (DFN, GNWT and Canada) is represented on the Committee to oversee the process.

The purpose of the Plan is to promote the social, cultural and economic well being of residents and communities in the Dehcho territory, having regard for the interests of all Canadians. A successful process must reflect the people of the region and their relationship with the land. This is captured in the words “Nahe Nahodhe” “who we are and where we came from”, which is explored in the cultural section. Appendix 1 provides a detailed history of the planning process.

The process has four phases, consistent with the standard planning cycle (Figure 6):

- Committee Establishment and Office Setup
- Information Gathering and Analysis
- Plan Preparation
- Plan Implementation

Figure 6. The Land Use Planning Cycle

- **Identify Issues and Goals**
  - Information Gathering and Analysis: Initial information sessions.

- **Monitor the Plan**
  - (Plan Implementation): DLUPC and governments monitor all Land Use activities to ensure they conform to the Plan. The Plan is reviewed every 5 years.

- **Complete Research**
  - (Information Gathering and Analysis): Gather information on development potential, conservation values and community priorities.

- **Implement the Plan**
  - (Plan Implementation): DFN and GNWT approve the plan. Canada considers the Plan and provides binding policy direction to the MVLWB. DLUPC, DFN, GNWT, and Canada jointly implement the Plan.

- **Develop Options**

- **Make Decisions**
  - (Plan Preparation): Develop Draft Plan and revise as required based on feedback.
4.2 Research
The Committee conducted extensive research into the ecological and cultural values of the Dehcho territory and the potential for various land uses – agriculture, tourism, oil and gas, mining and forestry (see Appendix 6). Dehcho First Nations also provided a summary of traditional land use and occupancy information from an extensive mapping project conducted between 1996 and 2002. Further details are provided in Chapter 2. An Economic Development Assessment Model was developed and research was undertaken to develop cumulative effects indicators and thresholds. The Committee presented this research to communities and planning partners so everyone could see the information used in making decisions. A list of the consultations completed is provided in Appendix 7.

4.3 Land Use Options
Five preliminary Land Use Options, showing different levels of land use, were produced from the information gathered and presented to planning partners. Their purpose was to start discussions about overall priorities for future land use. Planning Partners were not expected to choose one option, nor were the options used directly in Plan preparation. The Economic Development Assessment Model was modified to compare the options and predict the impacts of the land use activity in these scenarios. The Draft Land Use Options Atlas details the information and analysis used to develop the Land Use Options. The Plan provides for a level of land use activity similar to Option 4.

4.4 Community Mapping
The community consultations included an additional day to map community interests in forestry, tourism, oil and gas, mining, agriculture, discuss issues and clarify critical areas for conservation. Communities were provided with a blank map and coloured pens representing the different land uses. Members identified if, where and how these activities should occur in their region. Maps of resource potential and conservation values were available to help participants make informed decisions. Community mapping provided an opportunity for people to become familiar with zoning which is a difficult concept to explain in the slavey language. The information was digitized into a computerized mapping system (GIS – geographic information system) to facilitate future use in the planning process. The feedback and input received provided direction for data revisions and Plan Preparation. The list of consultations in Appendix 7 includes details of community mapping sessions completed. The 2004 Summer Consultation Summary details the results of this work.

4.5 Plan Preparation
The DLUPC Terms of Reference states,

Regional land use planning in the Deh Cho territory is intended to form part of an integrated land and resource management regime and outline what types of activities should occur, generally where they should take place, and terms and conditions necessary to guide land use proposals and development projects over time. The Plan will involve finding a balance between development opportunities, social and ecological constraints, which reflect community values and priorities while taking into consideration the values of all Canadians. The Parties share the objective that upon approval of a Deh Cho Final Agreement, the approved Plan will be a land management tool that provides legally-binding direction and guidance to regulatory agencies and decision-makers in the evaluation of development projects, protected area proposals, and other potential land uses.
The best available information was considered in Plan preparation, including the research and feedback from consultations and community mapping sessions. The Plan has been prepared to provide the “fundamental shift in values and public policy” which the Government of Canada states as a requirement for sustainable development\textsuperscript{214}. Planning Partners have provided guidance on revisions to ensure the Plan uses the most accurate information in an appropriate manner\textsuperscript{215}.

The Plan consists of Conformity Requirements (including Land Use Zones), Actions and Recommendations. A flowchart outlining the development of Conservation, Special Management and General Use Zones is provided in Figure 7.

Land Use Zones define smaller areas with similar features, objectives and values. Zone boundaries are defined by biophysical and cultural factors. The zones focus on five key land uses (oil and gas, mining, forestry, tourism and agriculture), which are defined in the Plan. Each zone identifies which of these five land uses are permitted and which are restricted. This is the principle component of the land use plan that guides what types of land use are appropriate and where they should take place. Once the Plan is approved, new land uses for these five sectors can only be approved if they are shown as permitted uses for that area in the Land Use Zone Map.

There are five types of Land Use Zones:

- Conservation Zones;
- Special Management Zones;
- General Use Zones;
- A Protected Areas Strategy Zone; and
- A Special Infrastructure Corridors.

Conservation Zones have both an ecological and a cultural component as their foundation. They were developed as follows:

- Identify critical wildlife areas (generally high and very high value) for key species.
- Identify moderate to very high traditional land use and occupancy values as defined in analysis completed by Dehcho First Nations (as shown in Map 2, Chapter 2).
- Combine these layers to create the “conservation intersect”. This was the base layer for conservation areas. The traditional land use and occupancy and critical wildlife habitat data used to create the “intersect” are shown in Map 19.
- Identify other features such as International Biological Program (IBP) sites, migratory bird sites, karst topography and areas of community conservation interest identified through consultations.
- Subtract areas of high resource potential or where communities expressed support for specific land uses through community mapping. These became Special Management Zones.

Critical wildlife habitat was generally defined as high and very high value areas, including breeding areas, birthing areas, concentrations, migration corridors and mineral licks for key species: woodland caribou, moose, wood bison, sheep, goats, grizzly bears, wolverine, fish, waterfowl, peregrine falcons, trumpeter swans and whooping cranes. Woodland caribou home range data from satellite collars and habitat suitability data from ENR were also included in this layer due to the sensitivity of the species. The current feasibility studies associated with Nahanni Park Expansion and the four PAS Areas may add important new information with regards to additional critical wildlife habitat.
Figure 7. Methods Used to Develop Land Use Zones

- Select moderate to very high TLUO
- Critical Wildlife Habitat (high and very high habitat value)
- IBPs, PAS sites, Karst and Hot springs
- Community Conservation Interests
- Community Development Interest and/or High Very High development Potential
- Important Wildlife Habitat outside Conservation Zones

Compare to Existing Uses and Potential - Provide important development opportunities.
Compare to Existing Land Withdrawals - Protects significant conservation values.
Map 19. Critical Wildlife, Traditional Land Use and Occupancy and the Conservation Intersect
The density of traditional land use and occupancy analysis summarizes overall use by Dehcho communities. Areas used by a large number of people have a higher value than areas used by a smaller number of people. The analysis does not distinguish between the relative importance of any type of site (e.g. burial site) versus another.

The conservation intersect was created using computerized mapping (a geographic information system or GIS) by identifying all areas in which both critical wildlife areas (as defined above) and moderate to very high traditional land use and occupancy areas overlap. The conservation intersect was used as the basis for the Conservation Zones. The critical wildlife layer and the traditional land use and occupancy layer were also used independently in the development of Special Management Zones.

Conservation Zones are areas having significant ecological and cultural values. They are meant to provide flexible protection to lands of important cultural or ecological value. Conservation Zones will safeguard biodiversity, water, traditional land use and occupancy areas and ecological values. In the future, communities may choose to reclassify some Conservation Zones to Special Management or General Use Zones to permit different land uses, particularly where increased community capacity, jurisdiction and regulatory certainty ensures benefits to local people. Of the five types of land use controlled by zoning, only tourism is permitted in Conservation Zones, subject to the Plan’s Conformity Requirements. Two of the zones prohibit tourism as well. The Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor provides a passage through four Conservation Zones.

The Protected Areas Strategy Zone is a separate designation for Candidate Protected Areas with Interim Protection. These areas have been been withdrawn from disposition through the Protected Areas Strategy (PAS) process. This zone type represents a transition between an area subject to the Land Use Plan and the approved protected area, which is managed under the legislation and authority of the sponsoring agency and the Management Plan. At the moment, only Edéhzhíe (Zone 1) has this designation.

Special Management Zones were developed wherever there was significant potential for both conservation and resource development simultaneously. The Committee carefully assessed the overlap between wildlife areas, resource potential areas, existing dispositions, community interests and traditional land use and occupancy layer by layer to gradually refine Special Management Zone boundaries to best reflect the values considered. This was a highly iterative process.

Special Management Zones may be established to promote certain types of land use or protect values while allowing some forms of land use to proceed. To achieve these goals, each Special Management Zone prohibits at least one of the five land use types addressed, while permitting others, subject to the Plan’s other Conformity Requirements.

Areas left open became General Use Zones. General Use Zones permit all land uses, subject to the Plan’s Conformity Requirements.
Special Infrastructure Corridors delineate two study corridors for proposed pipeline projects. The construction and operation of a pipeline is permitted within these corridors, subject to the Plan’s Conformity Requirements, even where the corridors cross Zones where oil and gas operations are not permitted otherwise. All zone requirements and restrictions continue to apply in the corridors except where and to the extent that the Plan states an exception.

(1) The Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 34) delineates a study corridor for the proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline and associated infrastructure based on the routing of the proponent and negotiated corridors through existing land withdrawals. The corridor crosses Zones 1, 3, 4, 5, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29 and 33, with additional infrastructure lying in Zone 2. This zone overlays 0.6% of the Plan Area.

(2) The Netlá-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 35) delineates a study corridor for a proposed pipeline and associated infrastructure in the Netlá-Arrowhead and surrounding area, which would allow for the commercialization of existing discoveries. The corridor crosses Zones 25 and 26 and covers 0.2% of the Plan Area.

Conformity Requirements related to Special Infrastructure Corridors are provided in the Plan.

As a final step the Committee refined adjacent areas through smoothing and connectivity. Smoothing consisted of removing jagged edges and harmonizing very small holes or patches with the surrounding designation. Connectivity involved linking neighbouring areas together into a fewer number of zones where appropriate.

Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations are meant to provide guidance for the future development of the Dehcho territory. They were developed to address planning issues raised during consultations and cover a broad range of topics including:

- Identification and location of the five land uses permitted and prohibited in zoning;
- Identification of additional permitted and non-permitted uses not covered in zoning;
- Identification of specific exceptions to zoning;
- Identification of further conditions for land use; and
- Description of Actions and Recommendations required to achieve the goals of the Plan.

Conformity Requirements (CR) are requirements that, upon implementation of this Plan, a land use must meet in order to receive authorization, or that must be included and/or complied with under an authorization. Conformity Requirements were developed to ensure that new land uses approved under the Plan will help to achieve the vision and goals of the region and address issues raised through consultations with communities and planning partners. Zoning is the first Conformity Requirement and a principle component of the Plan. The other Conformity Requirements direct how the listed and unlisted permitted uses in a zone must be carried out.

CRs will be checked, implemented, monitored and enforced by government departments, agencies and other Responsible Authorities, who may consult with the Committee where appropriate or required. Responsible Authorities will ensure all relevant Conformity Requirements are followed or attached as conditions to any new permits, licences or authorizations granted and will monitor conformity.

Actions (A) are measures directed at the Dehcho First Nations, GNWT or Canada that do not regulate land or water use (e.g. research, meetings). Actions were developed to resolve larger issues or data gaps needed to move the Plan forward during future revision cycles. By
approving this Plan, the Parties agree to make best efforts to complete all Actions pertaining to them. Timeframes have been identified for the completion of these Actions where appropriate.

**Recommendations (R)** are statements which provide advisory guidance to various governments, Responsible Authorities and organizations on additional measures that will help achieve the goals of the Plan; for clarity, they are not legally binding requirements, but where appropriate, should be given consideration in future land use decisions and policy initiatives. Many Recommendations touch on issues important to the communities. Considering and implementing Recommendations may assist in building a positive, more productive relationship between communities, applicants and governments.

Chapter 2 of the Plan describes all the Conformity Requirements, Actions, and Recommendations. They are listed in numerical order in Appendix 1 of the Plan.

### 4.6 Relationship with Existing Land Withdrawals

The Land Use Plan is meant to revise the existing land withdrawals and replace them upon approval of the Plan. At every step, the Committee compared our work to the existing land withdrawals to see what changes would be required. The area conserved in the Plan is similar to the existing land withdrawals and Option 4 of the preliminary Land Use Options. The planning process recognizes that both information and the needs of communities may change and grow. Once approved, the Plan will have a regular review cycle to address these changes. Government have not conducted a full review of projected land use estimated by the EDA model.

### 4.7 Integrating Traditional and Scientific Knowledge

Both traditional knowledge and scientific information were integrated into the Plan. Traditional knowledge tells us about the land and resources, traditional land use and occupancy and the principles by which Dehcho people live and make decisions. Elders see themselves as stewards of the land and believe traditional knowledge is essential to protecting resources for future generations. They are also very conscious of the changing needs of youth and new land uses, such as oil and gas exploration and development. Scientific knowledge can provide additional information on new land uses. By integrating traditional knowledge with science, new land uses may be considered in a respectful way.

An important aspect of traditional knowledge is Dene Nahodhe, which means “who we are and where we came from”. Dene Nahodhe provides the foundation for planning decisions which reflect the needs of present and future generations.

Traditional land use and occupancy (TLUO) and wildlife are particularly important in Dene culture. Between 1996 and 2002 Dehcho First Nations collected detailed information from its membership on TLUO. At the 2004 Annual Assembly, DFN approved the use of the generalized density of TLUO map through a resolution (see Appendix 3). In November 2003 the Committee held a Wildlife Workshop where hunters and trappers from each community worked with biologists to revise the wildlife maps and integrate their traditional knowledge. The TLUO and wildlife layers were combined in the conservation intersect which formed the basis for Conservation Zones.
The TLUO and wildlife layers also provided a valuable resource for community mapping sessions, where community members integrated their traditional knowledge of the land with scientific information provided on new land uses and the environment. The Dene Nahodhe Workshop and consultations provided further opportunities to gather traditional knowledge and guidance from local people for inclusion in the Plan\textsuperscript{217}. This is reflected in the Conformity Requirements (including Zoning), Actions and Recommendations, which allow land uses to proceed in a manner which respects traditional knowledge and protects the land for future generations. Communities have included traditional Dene place names in the Plan to reflect their relationship with the land. A summary of the Plan is available in the Dene language.

The land use planning process has advanced the integration of traditional knowledge and science into land and resource management decisions in the Dehcho territory. Many community people are not familiar with large scale development, but they do recognise the value of the pristine environment upon which they depend, and understand that it is sensitive to disturbance. This is reflected in the importance placed on conserving critical areas in the Plan. The continued integration of traditional and scientific knowledge will provide further opportunities for sustainable development. The collection of traditional knowledge in the Dehcho territory should be done in accordance with existing traditional knowledge research protocols. For existing policies see Appendix 2.

4.8 Cumulative Effects Analysis

Cumulative effects are defined as "changes to the biophysical, social, economic, and cultural environments caused by the combination of past, present and "reasonably foreseeable" future actions"\textsuperscript{218}. Cumulative effects management means taking a holistic view of land use and looking at the overall impacts of all land use on the region.

The Plan is an ideal framework in which to integrate cumulative effects because it is guided by goals, involves broad consultation, and provides a flexible vehicle with which to implement CEAM activities under the principle of adaptive management. The point of adaptive management is that you have to start somewhere. Only by proposing thresholds, implementing them and monitoring the effects on both the landscape, regulatory system and development, can we improve the process and move forward.

Cumulative effects assessment and management is an important element of the Plan. In 2004, the Committee contracted Salmo Consulting Inc to complete research on cumulative effects indicators and thresholds and make recommendations for their application in the Dehcho territory\textsuperscript{219}. The research was presented to communities and planning partners and the Committee requested feedback on this issue to guide Plan preparation.

An indicator is something we monitor to determine the overall health of the environment – e.g. air quality, water quality, wildlife habitat. We have to be able to measure them so we know whether the environment is healthy or not. A threshold or limit for each indicator states the level of impact that can safely occur. Thresholds are set by a combination of science and regional values. Science tells us how much an indicator is impacted by land use. Society’s values determine how much impact we are willing to allow in return for the economic benefits of developing our natural resources. This method of setting thresholds is called “limits of acceptable change” – i.e. we set how much change we will accept for each indicator.
The Plan is currently focused on biophysical indicators relating to wildlife. Woodland caribou is sensitive to human disturbance so requires more stringent thresholds than other species which are more tolerant of human activities. It is therefore the focal species at this time. Grizzly bears also have relatively well documented thresholds that can be applied in the western portion of the Dehcho territory where they occur.

The four indicators and thresholds selected to achieve the goals of the Plan include:

1. Corridor/Road Density,
2. Habitat Availability,
3. Minimum Patch Size and Core Area,

Indicators and thresholds for cumulative effects management are described in section 2.3.3 (CR # 24) of the Plan. The selected indicators and thresholds are a Conformity Requirement against which all applications for new land and water uses are checked. Rationale and supporting studies for the thresholds are described below. Anyone interested in more detailed explanations should refer to the Salmo report referenced at the back of this document.

Implementation of the cumulative effects Conformity Requirement relies on a database of human disturbance assembled by the Committee, and new data to be supplied by each applicant with their applications as required by the Plan. As such, cumulative effects monitoring will occur continuously and the database will be updated with each new application received.

The Plan’s first priority is to monitor cumulative effects from existing and proposed land use activities. Once this priority is fully addressed and implemented, the Plan may shift its attention to a more long term approach to monitoring cumulative effects. Software such as A Landscape Cumulative Effects Simulator (ALCES) provides the opportunity to assess the long-term cumulative effects of proposed land use activities. However, this requires accurate vegetation classification data which is not currently available for the Dehcho territory. Ongoing research and funding will also be required to facilitate overall data updates such as new satellite imagery to identify areas where disturbed areas have regrown. The Committee will continue to raise such issues within the CEAM Steering Committee to identify potential partnerships and funding opportunities. The Plan includes a number of Actions describing the research gaps that need to be filled for effective assessment and management of cumulative effects in the Dehcho territory.

4.8.1 Corridor/Road Density
One of the biggest impacts of land use on wildlife is roads and other linear corridors. Where there are roads or trails, there are people. Greater access means greater hunting pressure and higher wildlife mortality both from hunting and vehicle collisions. Animals will encounter more people on a regular basis. The typical wildlife response to humans is to either flee the area or remain but experience increased stress levels. Both of these outcomes use the animal’s energy reserves required to survive the winter or reproduce. Even minor disturbances at critical periods can be sufficient to reduce survival and reproductive rates the following year, either of which may lead to population declines. Linear corridors also provide easier travel routes for predators, further contributing to declines in some species. For this reason, corridor/road density has been chosen as the key indicator of cumulative impacts used to manage impacts from linear development.
Corridor density includes roads, trails, utility corridors, pipeline right-of-ways and seismic lines and is employed across the Dehcho territory other than Zone 26, to manage land use impacts on woodland caribou. Road density includes winter and all-weather roads only and is used in areas where grizzly bears are present. For clarity, this indicator does not apply within community boundaries.

This indicator does not apply to activities that do not trigger an application under the *Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations*. Therefore, any linear disturbance of 1.5 m or less in width will not be included in the density analysis. A 1.5 m wide corridor is the minimum width required for safety reasons and is sufficiently wide to conduct seismic operations.

The MVEIRB defines minimal impact seismic as “the creation of lines where cutting of forest growth is restricted to the width necessary to create a walking trail for foot access. There is no cutting of standing trees and little if any cutting of shrubs. Minimal impact lines can include the use of existing lines and thus avoid cutting of new lines.” Low impact seismic refers to operational procedures that minimize the effects of seismic operations on the environment. The objective of low impact seismic is to create a narrow, continuously meandering line. This method reduces the line of sight to less than 200 m, avoids larger trees (avoidance cutting), and leaves the soil and ground cover generally undisturbed. Line width may vary from 1.5 to 4.5 m and be hand cut or mechanically cut. The average line width cannot exceed 4.5 m and maximum line width cannot exceed 5.0 m. By excluding land use activities of 1.5 m width or less, those employing minimal, or to some extent, low impact seismic techniques, would be allowed to continue operations, even in areas where the linear density threshold has already been reached.

Density will be calculated for each quarter of an oil and gas grid as defined in the *Canada Oil and Gas Land Regulations* (under the *Territorial Lands Act*). This unit was chosen because it provides a balance between the overly restrictive oil and gas sections and the larger oil and gas grids and was used as the basis of assessment for oil and gas volume estimates within the Dehcho territory. For each ¼ grid, the total length (distance) of corridors or roads (depending on the indicator and species of interest) will be added and divided by the area of each ¼ grid. A quarter grid is approximately 60 km². This density will be compared to the critical threshold for the zone to determine if it has been exceeded.

Once the thresholds have been reached, applicants may be required to:

- Employ technologies or mitigation methods that do not lead to an increase in cumulative effects. This may include re-using existing disturbed areas or employing minimal impact seismic, or to a lesser extent, low impact seismic (as defined by the MVEIRB and in the front of this document) wherever possible to ensure new disturbance does not trigger a land use permit application used to assess cumulative effects);
- With the approval of Responsible Authorities, reclaim other lands of similar ecological value, equivalent to the amount of land to be disturbed by their proposal such that the threshold will not be exceeded by the proposed land use activity (this will create a time lag before the site is revegetated to standards necessary for wildlife habitat, during which new land use activities adding to cumulative effects should not be authorized); or
- Submit new, more detailed or updated data/studies (e.g. a cutline regeneration survey) demonstrating that the overall level of disturbance, including the proposed land use activity is below the thresholds.

Woodland caribou, which occur over most of the Dehcho territory, are very sensitive to seismic lines, so corridor density is the primary indicator used to manage cumulative impacts on this...
species across the Dehcho territory. Studies referenced in the Salmo report stated the following results:

- Boreal-ecotype woodland caribou populations declined when total corridors exceeded 1.8 km/km² (Francis et al. 2002)
- Average seismic line density in mountain-ecotype home range was 0.67 km/km² (Oberg 2001)
- Seismic line density in boreal-ecotype woodland caribou seasonal home ranges was 1.0 to 1.3 km/km² (Dyer et al. 2002)
- Boreal-ecotype woodland caribou populations do not persist when total corridors exceed 3.0 km/km² (B. Stelfox pers. Comm.)

Salmo Consulting Inc. recommended use of the 1.8 km/km² as the critical threshold in areas where development is a stated objective. This threshold allows development to occur while ensuring caribou populations are not significantly impacted. This same threshold was recently included as a recommended measure in an Environmental Assessment in the Dehcho territory and accepted by the Minister of DIAND\textsuperscript{224}. The Dehcho Boreal Caribou Working Group is in the process of being established. This group may recommend revisions to CR#24 regarding corridor density for boreal woodland caribou to the Committee, governments and other planning partners for consideration in future reviews.

Grizzly bears show sensitivity to roads but reduced sensitivity to other linear features so the less restrictive road density indicator is used where grizzly bear habitat exists. The Salmo report provides the following references in support of the recommended road density of 0.6 km/km².

- Road density <0.6 km/km² to protect high quality grizzly bear habitat (BCF and MELP 1999b) – Recommended British Columbia threshold.
- Areas selected by grizzly bears had average road densities of 0.6 to 0.68 km/km² (Mace et al. 1996; McLellan and Hovey 2001) – Based on studies in northern Montana and southeast British Columbia.
- Areas with road densities greater than 0.6 km/km² do not support grizzly bears (Mace et al. 1996) – Based on study in northern Montana.
- Forest Operating Area with road density >1.25 km/km² on <10% of area and additional 10% up to 0.6 km/km² (Horejsi 1996) – Management recommendation for grizzly bear in Yukon Territory.
- <30% of Forest Operating Area with road density <0.3 km/km² (Horejsi 1996) – Management recommendation for grizzly bear in Yukon Territory.

### 4.8.2 Habitat Availability

Loss of habitat is a key factor in the decline of many species. This indicator is meant to monitor the overall loss of wildlife habitat in the Dehcho territory so that Responsible Authorities, decision makers and applicants can determine the impacts of their decisions on wildlife and take steps to either reduce or mitigate the effects of their projects. Habitat availability is based on a percent of habitat lost for species found within the planning unit. There is an overall threshold of <10% loss of habitat calculated for the entire Dehcho territory. This is based on research conducted in the boreal forest. The literature review conducted by Salmo Consulting Inc. found that habitat fragmentation effects do not appear to occur when less than 10% of available regional habitat is lost, but that the risk increases at intermediate levels of habitat loss (10-40%) and increases dramatically when 70-90% of the functional habitat in a region is lost\textsuperscript{225}. Habitat Availability is assessed and managed independently for each Land Use Zone.
4.8.3 Minimum Patch Size and Core Area

It’s not just the amount of habitat that is important to wildlife survival but also how it is distributed. A single large area of habitat is better for wildlife than many small patches. A patch that is round or square is better for most species than a patch that is long and narrow because the rounder patch is better buffered from surrounding disturbances. As land use increases, there is a loss of habitat and habitat fragmentation – large areas of intact habitat are broken into many smaller areas that are not as good for some species of wildlife.

As described above, every human-wildlife encounter may cause stress or energy use by the animal, or death. To address this, biologists try to maximize the amount of secure habitat (habitat greater than 500 m from roads and 100 m from seismic lines and other human disturbance features) where wildlife can be left undisturbed. Realizing that humans are everywhere, they do this by defining a minimum area of secure habitat that animals need to range for a 24-48 hour period. They then try to ensure that there are sufficient numbers of these patches close enough together that the species can occupy its regular range, minimize disturbances, and have enough energy to survive and reproduce.

Minimum patch size and minimum core area work together to achieve this. Habitat patches are areas of habitat secure from disturbance and mortality associated with human activities. Core areas are relatively undisturbed source areas for plant and animal populations that are at least 500 m from roads and 100 m from seismic lines and other human disturbance features and should be larger than the home range or territory of the target species. Habitat patches that meet the minimum patch size requirement are considered core area. Biologists have identified how much core area species need to be able to survive and reproduce (as a percent of overall habitat) and the thresholds were set accordingly to ensure viable populations of important species.

Again, woodland caribou and grizzly bears are used as the focal species for setting thresholds. The Salmo report recommended a minimum patch size of 515 ha for woodland caribou based on an average daily winter movement rate in Alberta of 0.64 km/day, which translates to a 24-28 hour range area of 130 to 515 ha. Core area studies from Alberta documented that boreal-ecotype woodland caribou populations declined when core area was less than 50% when a 250 m buffer was used. The Salmo report recommends that greater than 65% of woodland caribou habitat be maintained in core areas.

Minimum patch size and core area thresholds have been well documented for grizzly bears in southern regions as a result of extensive long-term research projects in AB, BC and the US. The Salmo Report recommends 1000 ha as the minimum patch size and maintaining at least 65% of grizzly bear habitat in core areas based on the following studies:

- Minimum viable core area of 450 to 1,000 ha (Gibeau et al. 1996) - Grizzly bear core area used in western Canadian analyses based on 24 to 48 hr. feeding bout of an adult female grizzly.
- Core area >10 ha in size, ideally >1,000 ha (NCGBRT 2001) - Recommendation for recovery of grizzly bear in the North Cascades of British Columbia.
- >60% of available habitat as core area (Gibeau 2000) - Grizzly bear management threshold for Banff National Park, Alberta.
- >58 to 68% of land area as core area (NCGBRT 2001) - Management goal for grizzly bear in Montana and Idaho National Forests.
- >60% of Forest Planning Area as roadless core wildlife habitat (Horejsi 1996) - Grizzly bear management recommendation for Yukon Territory.
Minimum patch size and core area are assessed and managed independently for each Land Use Zone. Further details about calculations are provided in the Plan in section 2.3.3 under CR #24.

4.8.4 Stream Crossing Density
Stream crossing density is similar to the road/corridor density but for water and fish. This is an indicator of sediment and mortality sources and stream habitat fragmentation in a watershed. It is expressed as the number of road crossings (winter and all-weather) per km² of stream or watershed and is calculated for each quarter of an oil and gas grid as defined in the Canada Oil and Gas Land Regulations (under the Territorial Lands Act). This unit was chosen because it provides a balance between the overly restrictive oil and gas sections and the larger oil and gas grids and was used as the basis of assessment for oil and gas volume estimates within the Dehcho territory. The Salmo report recommended a critical threshold of 0.5 crossings / km². This is considered to represent low risk of peak flow and surface erosion effects over the long term.

4.8.5 Analysis Parameters
The human disturbance data was digitized from 5 m resolution IRS satellite imagery. Anything visible when viewed at a scale of 1:10,000 and compared to 1:50,000 NTS map sheets was captured in the dataset. This includes roads, trails, seismic lines, cutblocks, utility corridors, communities, airstrips, wellsites and anything else visible in the imagery using the described parameters.

This visibility factor is used as a surrogate for the level of disturbance as a factor of both the size (e.g. width) and age of disturbance. Advanced technologies such as minimum impact seismic are not visible at this scale so are not picked up by satellite imagery. Similarly, cutlines and disturbances that are growing back to the original natural vegetation will not be visible on updated imagery so will not factor into the thresholds. If they are not growing back into similar habitat, they will continue to show up, just as they may continue to be a disturbance of wildlife habitat.

The minimum patch size and minimum core area indicator uses a 500 m buffer around roads and a 100 m buffer around seismic lines and other human disturbance, in recognition of the greater effects of roads in comparison to other disturbance features in the Dehcho territory. This is considered a conservative estimate of the “zone of influence” or area impacted by disturbance, since avoidance is generally related to activity levels rather than the features themselves. Lakes are excluded from the core area calculations as they are not affected by land-based disturbance. The habitat availability indicator does not use buffers, but looks only at the actual footprint of disturbance. The minimum patch size and core area and habitat availability indicators are calculated for each Land Use Zone. The corridor/road density and stream crossing density indicators are calculated for each quarter of an oil and gas grid as defined in the Canada Oil and Gas Land Regulations (under the Territorial Lands Act).

A cumulative effects assessment was undertaken for the Dehcho territory to demonstrate how these indicators and thresholds would be implemented and the current level of cumulative effects in the region. This is provided in Chapter 6.
4.9 Economic Development Assessment Model

The EDA Model was constructed for the DLUPC by Ellis Consulting Services to evaluate the impact of major alternative Land Use Options in the Dehcho territory\(^{228}\). The model projects changes in the Dehcho population and economic trends over a 20 year planning period. The purpose of the model is to assist in making informed land use planning decisions which reflect the interests of our planning partners within the Dehcho Plan Area.

The report “The Economic Development Assessment Model 1.0 (July 2004)”, outlines the model structure, operating procedures and preliminary results\(^{229}\). An outline of the model structure is provided in Figure 8. The information or “User Inputs” were then fed into the EDA Model. The model consists of a set of input-output tables linked to a tax, labour force and demographic model run together as a system to generate “outputs” reflecting changes in revenue, skill levels, employment and population across the region.

The model focuses on five land use sectors:
1. Oil and Gas,
2. Mining,
3. Forestry,
4. Tourism,
5. Agriculture.

An allowance is included for replacement costs of the value of traditional harvesting. Individual sector reports outlined in the Land and Resources section estimated the potential for each land use activity e.g. mineral development potential. These are displayed in resource potential maps in Chapter 2. Input structures translate these data layers into gross production and economic values then determine the change in demand for goods and services in the region. The model allows the user to initiate land use in different sectors and vary the level and timing of activities (e.g. start a mine, increase timber harvest) to determine the impact of these changes.

Figure 8. Structure of Economic Development Assessment Model
Model outputs include direct outputs, indirect outputs and induced estimates by industry for:

1. Gross Expenditure,
2. Gross Domestic Product,
3. Labour Income,
4. Total and Direct Employment,
5. Revenue (Federal and GNWT),
6. Population Trends,
7. Unemployment and Employment Rates.

Industry and Government assisted the Committee in establishing realistic scenarios for the level of land use activity in each sector over the next 20 years for inclusion in the model. These are based on current knowledge of the region, known resources, risks, costs and production parameters.

The production figures generated by the model from these scenarios reflect the anticipated level of land use activities for the next 20 years, rather than the total resources available. These are best guesses\textsuperscript{230}. It cannot be assumed that these exact scenarios will actually occur in the future as many factors will affect land use in the Dehcho territory. Details of research and revisions are outlined below for each land use sector. Model results showing the economic impacts of the Plan’s Land Use Zones and existing land withdrawals on the region are provided in Chapter 6.

### 4.9.1 Oil and Gas

Natural gas was considered in modeling hydrocarbon resources. Oil reserves are relatively small and would add extra complexity to the model. The final scenarios were based on the remaining recoverable gas data from Ken Drummond’s report\textsuperscript{231}. More than 69% (95 billion m\textsuperscript{3}) of the 136.8 billion m\textsuperscript{3} remaining recoverable gas resources (within the Dehcho Plan Area excluding Edéhzhíe PAS Zone) lie in quarter grids containing > 50 million m\textsuperscript{3}. In the model this area is considered for exploration over 20 years, given its relatively higher potential and proximity to infrastructure. Starting in 2005, resources become economic in steps of five grid squares northwards from the Alberta / BC border, every five years. This is staggered with grid squares containing >100 million m\textsuperscript{3} / year being considered viable in the initial step with additional volume from grids squares containing 50-100 million m\textsuperscript{3} becoming viable in subsequent 5 year steps as infrastructure is developed. For the purposes of modeling it is assumed production north of 61°30’ is unlikely over the next 20 years given the existing infrastructure and known reserves. Exploration activity leading to exploratory drilling is plausible in areas adjoining the Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor in the northern Dehcho although this is not addressed in the model.

The area south of 61°30’ was divided into three general regions, Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kû́ë), Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) and Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé), and appropriate costs and operational parameters established to reflect geological potential, relative costs and proximity to infrastructure. Sources included operator annual reports, industry enquiries and research findings. Production well tie-ins assume 12.5 miles of six-inch pipeline at $350,000 per mile. The model factors in production declines of 40%, 20% and 30% for the three regions in the first year of production, dropping to 5% by the fifth year of production. Further assumptions are provided in the Table 9.
Table 9. Natural Gas EDA Model Assumptions for the Full Development Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kûjé)</th>
<th>Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e)</th>
<th>Cameron Hills (Nagâh Zhîhé)</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seismic</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>$/ well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration Wells Cost</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>No. of wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Wells Cost</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>million $/well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Production Rate (average)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mmcf/d/well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$/boe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full development scenario assumes 62 new production wells would be developed south of 61°30’ over the next 20 years from 2005. This assumes 371 exploration wells across the region and reflects the level of land use activity observed south of 60°00’. In the existing land withdrawals and the Plan’s zoning, the full development production volume is scaled according to the volume available for exploration in the 3 regions, Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kûjé), Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) and Cameron Hills (Nagâh Zhîhé) compared to the full development scenario.

4.9.2 Mining

The geological potential doesn’t necessarily translate into working mines because many other factors such as access and regulation are involved. The model provides the option of running scenarios with different mines turned on or off.

Feedback from the mining sector indicated the model scenarios should capture the broader geological potential of the region and consider the exploration risks. DLUPC staff met with DIAND and GNWT to address these concerns and establish appropriate scenarios. The GNWT also provided a potential diamond mine model and information on the Coates Lake property. Canadian Zinc provided a scoping study of the Prairie Creek property. Considerations included timeline for regulatory approval, existing dispositions and prevailing market conditions. Under the full development scenario all the mines outlined in Table 10 were turned on to capture the broader potential of the region. For the purposes of modeling the existing land withdrawals and Plan’s zoning, existing dispositions (*) were assumed to go ahead, regardless of which zone they are in. The Plan also assumed the Pine Point deposits would resume activity towards the end of the period.

Table 10. Mining Scenarios used in EDA Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mine</th>
<th>Deposit Type</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Full Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantung*</td>
<td>Tungsten</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Creek*</td>
<td>Lead, Zinc, Silver</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>20 +</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Nahanni</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates Lake*</td>
<td>Copper, Silver</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Point (Westmin Style)</td>
<td>Lead, Zinc</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelled after Tahera / Snap Lake</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>Gem – emerald</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9.3 Forestry
The forestry scenarios (Table 11) start in 2005 and were established to reflect a realistic level of land use activity given local capacity and appropriate silvicultural practices. The maximum or full development scenario assumed a peak annual production across the region of 105,000 m$^3$ (10,000 m$^3$ of aspen and 95,000 m$^3$ of spruce) in 20 years. Both Fort Liard (Echaot'įį Kʉįį) and Fort Simpson (Łiidlıį Kʉįį) each start with volumes of 5000 m$^3$ of aspen which continue through to year 20, reflecting existing operations and plans in Jean Marie River (Tthets'éhk'ed'éłįį). This potential was not captured in the inventories so the model was adjusted accordingly. Spruce was chosen for "additional" increments in both regions, based on profitability. Enterprise harvests spruce for years 1-20 reflecting existing permits.

For the existing land withdrawals and Plan scenarios, the full development production volume is scaled according to the volume available to harvest in the three operating regions, Fort Liard (Echaot'įį Kʉįį), Fort Simpson (Łiidlıį Kʉįį) and Hay River (K’átł’odehé).

Table 11. Forestry Assumptions used in EDA Model for the Full Development Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Aspen</th>
<th>Spruce</th>
<th>Annual Harvest in Yr 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Liard (Echaot'įį Kʉįį)</td>
<td>5000 m$^3$/yr (years 3-20)</td>
<td>Increments of 5000 m$^3$/ yr every 2 yrs (years 5-20)</td>
<td>45,000 m$^3$/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Simpson (Łiidlıį Kʉįį)</td>
<td>5000 m$^3$/yr (years 1-20)</td>
<td>Increments of 5000 m$^3$/ yr every 2 yrs (years 3-20)</td>
<td>55,000 m$^3$/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River (K’átł’odehé)</td>
<td>5000 m$^3$/yr (years 1-20)</td>
<td>5,000 m$^3$/year</td>
<td>5,000 m$^3$/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9.4 Tourism
The tourism potential is based on the number of existing or potential tourism sites in the region$^{234}$. Each scenario reflects how many of these sites or points fall within the area open to tourism operations. The full development option has 149 sites, the Plan zoning 145 sites and the existing land withdrawals 73 sites. It is assumed different tourism sites develop at different rates. Ecotourism and consumptive (sports fishing and existing big game outfitters) tourism are expected to develop in 2006, while soft and hard adventure can be expected to develop in 2005 and 2010 respectively.

4.9.5 Agriculture
The agricultural scenarios reflect the lack of agriculture presently occurring in the region. Moderate and high class areas were considered most likely to be developed. It is assumed 10% of this area would realistically be developed over the next 20 years starting in 2005. The full development scenario assumed the full 10% would be developed. The existing land withdrawals and Plan scenarios reflect 10% of the moderate and high potential which falls within zones where agriculture is permitted.
Chapter 5: Land Use Zone Descriptions

Community mapping is an important part of land use planning in the Dehcho territory. Photo Credit: DLUPC

NOTE: The maps provided in this Background Report are for illustrative purposes only. While the DLUPC uses the best information available at the time of writing, we make no guarantees of completeness or accuracy. The maps may become outdated after print. Interested persons or organizations requiring up to date information should contact the data source for the most current files.
5.1 Overview

This section provides a detailed description about each of the 35 Land Use Zones identified in the Dehcho territory. This includes a map of the zone, permitted uses, zone description and objectives, ecological and cultural conservation values, resource potential, and any specific Conformity Requirements applicable to that zone (general Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations which apply to all zones are not discussed). Interested readers could find additional information about each zone by looking at Chapter 2, which describes additional biophysical features for the entire Dehcho territory.

Zone 1 (Edéhzhíe) has been given the designation of a Protected Areas Strategy (PAS) Zone in recognition of its existing land withdrawal and management under that process. While still part of the Plan, it will not be subject to the new land withdrawals required to implement the zoning restrictions for Conservation and Special Management Zones.

Table 12 outlines the total area falling into each zone type. The Plan Area and all zones exclude community boundaries and Nahanni National Park Reserve (areas not included in the Plan), but include Edéhzhíe. Conservation Zones cover 38.1% of the Plan Area, Special Management Zones cover 24.4%, and General Use Zones cover 25.5%. The Special Infrastructure Corridors overlay 0.8% of the Plan Area.

Table 12. Percent of Plan Area in Each Zone Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area-Ha</th>
<th>Area-Km²</th>
<th>% of Dehcho Plan Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dehcho Plan Area*</td>
<td>20,948,737</td>
<td>209,487</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Zones</td>
<td>7,974,288</td>
<td>79,743</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edéhzhíe Protected Areas Strategy Zone</td>
<td>2,518,272</td>
<td>25,183</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Management Zones</td>
<td>5,111,962</td>
<td>51,120</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Use Zones</td>
<td>5,344,213</td>
<td>53,442</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Infrastructure Corridors</td>
<td>160,565</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan Area and Land Use Zones exclude Nahanni National Park Reserve and Community Boundaries.

Table 13 provides an overview of the resource potential and conservation values in each Land Use Zone for information purposes. It is compiled from a computerized mapping (geographic information system or GIS) analysis that determines what layers are present in each zone. It does not provide an indication of how much of the zone is covered by the resource or value, just that it exists somewhere in the zone. Whether a zone has 5% or 95% coverage of moose habitat, it still gets a check. In some cases, planning partners identified values existing in zones for which we currently do not have supporting data. These are highlighted in red in Table 13. This table is provided as a means to flag issues that should be considered in proposing new land use activities. Applicants and Responsible Authorities can use this table as a checklist to identify subjects requiring consideration in applications for new land and water uses.

Table 13 makes reference to an “intersect”. The conservation intersect was created using computerized mapping (GIS) software by identifying all areas in which both critical wildlife areas
(as defined in Section 4.5) and moderate to very high traditional land use and occupancy areas overlap. The conservation intersect was used as the basis for the initial draft Conservation Zones (subsequent comments on the Plan have resulted in revisions since then).

Table 14 identifies the amount of oil and gas available per zone based on an assessment of oil and gas field size distributions\textsuperscript{235}. This information is provided as an overview of the resources estimated for each zone and was a factor in delineating zone boundaries and identifying permitted uses. The figures provided are estimates only, based on assumptions about the size of the current discoveries in relation to the overall level of undiscovered resources (i.e. have we discovered the biggest of the available gas fields or are the big ones still out there waiting to be discovered?). More detailed information is available in the original report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE NAME</th>
<th>ZONE NUMBER</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE</th>
<th>FORESTRY</th>
<th>MINING</th>
<th>OIL &amp; GAS (&gt;50 million m³/1/4 grid)</th>
<th>TOURISM</th>
<th>WOODLAND</th>
<th>CARIBOU</th>
<th>MOOSE</th>
<th>GRIZZLY BEARS</th>
<th>SHEEP / GOATS</th>
<th>BISON</th>
<th>WOLVERINES</th>
<th>WATERFALL / KARST / HOT SPRINGS</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL LAND USE &amp; OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>INTERSECT</th>
<th>LAND USE &amp; OCCUPANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edéhzhíe - Protected Areas Strategy Zone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMR Five Lakes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibbeston Plains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pehdžeh Ki Ndeh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambaa K’e / Redknife River</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Nahanni Ecosystem</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Lake</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman Lake</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovie and Betalamea Lakes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Mackenzie</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Slave Lake Shoreline</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River Corridor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Lake, McNally Creek, Muskeg River</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakisa and Tathliina Watershed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Lake, River, and Trails</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falaise Lake Wetland Complex</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraine Point and Islands</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Rivers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netlá River</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE NAME</td>
<td>ZONE NUMBER</td>
<td>TRADITIONAL LAND USE &amp; OCCUPANCY</td>
<td>INTERSECT</td>
<td>KARST / HOT SPRINGS</td>
<td>WATERFOWL / BIRDS</td>
<td>WOLVERINES</td>
<td>BISON</td>
<td>SHEEP / GOATS</td>
<td>GRIZZLY BEARS</td>
<td>MOOSE</td>
<td>WOODLAND CARIBOU</td>
<td>TOURISM</td>
<td>OIL &amp; GAS (&gt;50 million m³/1/4 grid)</td>
<td>MINING</td>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>GENERAL USE ZONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel River Plateau</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Mackenzie Mountains</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Mountains</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit Lake / Nulie</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Lake / Land Rivers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone / Lower Peace River</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buot Lake / Big Trash Lake</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Range</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout River</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Marie River - Shum</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Marie River - Patkoo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluefish Creek / Conder</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch / Falaise / Corridor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Big Buffalo</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Hills</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Valley Special Infra</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netla-Arrowhead Special Infra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Boxes are checked if the value or land use potential is present in any portion of the zone.

* Indicates zones where the potential exists.

* Indicates where planning partners identified values existing in zones for which we currently do not have supporting data.

* Indicates where the land use is permitted.
Table 14. Estimated Gas Volumes by Land Use Zone (million m$^3$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE #</th>
<th>ZONE NAME</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA of ZONE (Km$^2$)</th>
<th>Adjusted Volume Remaining Recoverable Gas &lt; 50 million m$^3$ / 1/4 grid</th>
<th>Adjusted Volume Remaining Recoverable Gas &gt; 50 million m$^3$ / 1/4 grid</th>
<th>Adjusted Volume Total Remaining Recoverable Gas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Édéhzhíe - Protected Areas Strategy Zone</td>
<td>25,183</td>
<td>5,266</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>6,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JMR Five Lakes</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sibbeston Plains</td>
<td>7,316</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pehdzeh Ki Ndeh</td>
<td>6,876</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>3,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sambaa K'e / Redknife River</td>
<td>12,405</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>9,305</td>
<td>12,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Greater Nahanni Ecosystem</td>
<td>28,147</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>7,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Birch Lake</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fisherman Lake</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bovie and Betalamea Lakes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Upper Mackenzie</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Great Slave Lake Shoreline</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>2,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hay River Corridor</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Heart Lake, McNally Creek, Muskeg River</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kakisa and Tathlina Watershed</td>
<td>8,384</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>5,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Buffalo Lake, River, and Trails</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>2,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Falaise Lake Wetland Complex</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Moraine Point and Islands</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Northwest Rivers</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Net lá River</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peel River Plateau</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Southeastern Mackenzie Mountains</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Franklin Mountains</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rabbitskin / Ndulee</td>
<td>5,909</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Grainger / Liard Rivers</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Blackstone / Lower Petitot Rivers</td>
<td>6,052</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>10,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Liard Range</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>40,348</td>
<td>41,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE #</td>
<td>ZONE NAME</td>
<td>TOTAL AREA of ZONE (Km²)</td>
<td>Adjusted Volume Remaining Recoverable Gas &lt; 50 million m³ / 1/4 grid</td>
<td>Adjusted Volume Remaining Recoverable Gas &gt; 50 million m³ / 1/4 grid</td>
<td>Adjusted Volume Total Remaining Recoverable Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Trout River</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jean Marie River - South</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jean Marie River - North</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bluefish Creek</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Birch - Falaise Corridor</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lower Big Buffalo</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cameron Hills</td>
<td>8,334</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>5,097</td>
<td>8,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General Use Zones</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,442</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,487</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,201</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>209,487</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,181</strong></td>
<td><strong>88,188</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,369</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special infrastructure corridors were not included because they overlay other zones.
5.2 Protected Areas Strategy Zone

Zone 1 - Edéhzhíe has been designated as a Protected Areas Strategy (PAS) Zone to reflect that it has already been withdrawn under the PAS process and will be managed according to the outcome of that process. While it is still considered under the Land Use Plan, it will not be subject to a new land withdrawal with the other Conservation and Special Management Zones where land use restrictions exist. The existing land withdrawal under the PAS process will remain until it expires on June 30, 2007.

Zone 1: Edéhzhíe

Permitted Uses
  • Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone shown in (Map 20) was delineated on the basis of the PAS proposal in 2001\textsuperscript{236}, which has very strong support from all Dehcho communities and neighbouring Tl'ichcho communities involved in Edéhzhie Working Group. Edéhzhie is a central cultural and spiritual gathering place for the Dehcho Dene and Dogrib People due to the richness and diversity of the land. Large lakes, wetlands and the bounty of wildlife can be found throughout the area including numerous fish species, beaver, lynx, moose, migratory birds and woodland caribou. It is important to protect this land to ensure the traditional way of life continues. The area is comprised of Mills Lake (Tuah), the Horn River (K'ázhíh), the Horn Plateau (Edéhzhíe) and Willow Lake River (Xahndaa Deh).

The PAS Candidate Protected Area with Interim Protection is centred on the Horn Plateau (Edéhzhíe), which towers 600 m over the surrounding landscape. The plateau stores huge quantities of freshwater in its lakes and muskeg, feeding all the surrounding areas. Wildlife are always abundant on the plateau, including woodland caribou, which are considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the \textit{Species at Risk Act}. Edéhzhie features prominently in Dene legends about Yamoria. The primary objectives of this zone are protection of:
  • Water resources,
  • Critical wildlife habitat for a variety of species, and
  • Significant areas for traditional land use and occupancy for Fort Providence (Zhahtì Kùjë), Jean Marie River (Tthets'éhk'edélì), Fort Simpson (LIílìíj Kùjë) and Wrigley (Pehdzehe Kì).

Zone 1 will be managed according to the terms of the PAS interim land withdrawal until the Protected Areas Strategy proposal and management plan are approved. The PAS Candidate Protected Area with Interim Protection is currently at Step 5 of the Process. The boundaries may change as a result of the resource assessments and studies required under the process. However, the Committee recommends that Edéhzhie Working Group preserve the connections to other Conservation Zones in the Plan to maintain regional connectivity. Once approved, the protected area will be designated through the appropriate legislation and managed in accordance with its management plan. The Canadian Wildlife Service is the sponsoring agency meaning that once Edéhzhie is approved, designation would occur through the \textit{Canada Wildlife}
Act (National Wildlife Area). The Plan will not apply within the boundaries of the approved protected area. The Plan will be amended or revised during the next Plan review to reflect the outcome of the PAS proposal. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

Conservation Values
Mills Lake (Tuah) and the Horn Plateau (Edéhzhíe) are well documented as key waterfowl staging areas in the spring and fall. Mills Lake (Tuah) has been designated as a key migratory bird site by CWS. Mills Lake (Tuah), Horn Plateau (Edéhzhíe) and Horn River (K’ázhíah) are all International Biological Programme (IBP) sites, recognized for their waterfowl. Moose, woodland caribou, furbearers including wolverine, fish and waterfowl are all abundant on the plateau. Woodland caribou calve on the southern slopes of the plateau and use the area year round. Wood bison are extending their range westward onto the plateau. Many residents maintain cabins on the Horn Plateau (Edéhzhíe), Mills Lake (Tuah) and the Horn River (K’ázhíah).

Resource Potential
The available minerals related geological information on Edéhzhíe is sparse because there has been little exploration in the area. The Northwest Territories Geoscience Office (formerly CS Lord Geoscience Centre) prepared a regional study\(^237\), which indicated low or uncertain potential for all deposit types, with the exception of vein copper which showed moderate potential and diamonds which could not be assessed from regional level data. Although the potential for diamonds remains uncertain it could be potentially significant\(^238\) and they can occur in any geological environment. The Northwest Territories Geoscience Office is currently working on more detailed resource assessments and studies of Edéhzhíe. It is anticipated that the final report will be complete by the end of summer 2006. The Phase 1 NRA results have identified areas of higher mineral potential than the regional assessments\(^239\):
- Moderate to high potential for primary diamond deposits
- Low to moderate potential for Mississippi Valley-type Lead-Zinc
- Low potential for SEDEX (Sedimentary Exhalative Sulphides Deposit copper-lead-zinc) and sedimentary-hosted copper

The report “Oil and Gas Potential Evaluation of the Dehcho territory” prepared by The Northwest Territories Geoscience Office\(^240\) indicated moderate and moderate to high hydrocarbon potential in Edéhzhíe. This is supported by Edéhzhíe Working Group, Phase 1 NRA results:
- High potential for petroleum in western Edéhzhíe, around the lower Willow Lake River (Xahndaa Deh).
- Moderate potential for petroleum in the rest of Edéhzhíe.

The Drummond report estimates by probabilistic methods that there is <50 million m\(^3\) of recoverable gas in a quarter grid area across most of Edéhzhíe with some higher estimates (50-100 million m\(^3\)/quarter grid) for the northern portion\(^241\). Remaining recoverable oil potential is estimated to be <2000 m\(^3\)/quarter grid.
The proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline falls within the Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor and will cross Edéhzhíe at the Willow Lake River (Xahndaa Deh) just east of the junction with the Mackenzie River (Dehcho). The current PAS land withdrawal delineates a four km wide corridor centered on the existing pipeline right of way to allow for the pipeline and associated infrastructure.

There are some good sawlog stands available on the southern edge of the zone near Jean Marie River (Tthe’s’ehk’edél) and Fort Providence (Zhahti Kúéj), but no inventories have been done on the Horn Plateau (Edéhzhíe). Research studies indicate moderate agricultural potential in the southeastern corner of the zone near Fort Providence (Zhahti Kúéj), however this rating needs to be tempered with the actual past experience of agriculture in that area. Agricultural was encouraged by government in the 1970s through homesteads being granted, but over the next 10 years climate, insects and distance from markets proved to be insurmountable barriers. The remainder of the plateau is thought to have severe limitations for agriculture. Tourism potential is considered high for Mills Lake (Tuah) and moderate on the major waterways within the zone.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
Map 20. Zone 1 - Edéhzhíe
5.3 Conservation Zones

Conservation Zones have exceptional cultural and ecological significance. They were delineated on the basis of critical wildlife habitat, generalized density of traditional land use and occupancy, and community interest in protection. Some Conservation Zones are moving towards permanent protection under the PAS process based on community direction.

Conservation Zones prohibit all specified land uses other than tourism as noted in Chapter 2 of the Plan. Traditional land use and occupancy is permitted everywhere within the Dehcho territory, including Conservation Zones. Two zones have restrictions on tourism to address specific community needs. In keeping with the significant values of these areas, communities wish to see these areas remain clean and pristine. The Plan describes several tourism related Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations to ensure tourism-related impacts on communities and traditional land use and occupancy are minimized.

Currently, Conservation Zones cover 38.1% of the Dehcho territory. This reflects both the high value the Dehcho communities place on protecting the land and maintaining traditional land use and occupancy, and also their commitment to long-term stewardship. It is also consistent with the guiding principles of “respect for the land as understood and explained by the Dehcho Elders, and sustainable development”, as described in S. 4 of the IMA. It is consistent with DIAND’s Sustainable Development Strategy 2004-2006 which quotes the Great Law of the Iroquois Confederacy: “In our every deliberation we must consider the impact of our decisions on the next seven generations”.

The Dehcho people approach land use cautiously, recognizing that once decisions are made to open lands to land use activities and rights are disposed of, the decision becomes irreversible - those rights and dispositions may always exist. If the area were to be protected later, it would have to recognize those existing uses and allow them to continue, even if it compromised the values to be protected. On the other hand, lands conserved today may still be opened to land use activities tomorrow. The conservation-first approach is reversible when the time is right, while the development-first approach is not.

Given the uncertainty in the Dehcho Process – that issues such as revenue-sharing, decision-making authority and self-governance are still being negotiated, it is wise to conserve important lands until such decisions have been made. Once the Dehcho Final Agreement is signed and there is more certainty around these important issues, the Plan will be revised to reflect the Final Agreement, and the Dehcho residents and other planning partners will have the opportunity to revisit zoning to determine if changes are warranted. In the intervening time, sustainable development can occur in the remaining 49.9% of the region, in cooperation with communities, to provide them with new, positive experiences which may foster more interest in future land use activity.

Each zone description includes a list of the permitted uses and specific Conformity Requirements applicable to each zone. All other Conformity Requirements apply to the entire Dehcho territory, so are not listed for every zone.
Zone 2: JMR Five Lakes

Permitted Uses
• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone, identified on Map 21 was delineated by a 2 km buffer around the five lakes including Ek'ali Lake (Tł'ok'á K'é), Sanguez Lake (T’oníe Tué), Gargan Lake (Tł Těhētîî), Deep Lake (Dechî Náráh) and McGill Lake (Tthets’éhk’é) which are culturally significant to the community. This area is important culturally and the community also recognise it may provide tourism opportunities in the future.

Conservation Values
The five lakes have a high density of traditional land use and occupancy. They also provide critical habitat for moose, woodland caribou and waterfowl. This area is considered good habitat for the boreal woodland caribou, which are considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act.

Resource Potential
Infrastructure associated with the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline will be required in this zone. There is moderate potential for tourism along the Jean Marie River (Tthets’éhk’edélî). There is considerable presence of aspen and spruce sawlogs. A small portion of the zone has moderate potential for agriculture. The Drummond report estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m³ to 50-100 million m³ / quarter grid for the zone. Research indicates low or uncertain mineral development potential although proposaling permits have recently been issued in the Poplar River (T’ihléah) area less than 50 km to the west.

Specific Conformity Requirements
• CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
Zone 3: Sibbeston Plains

Permitted Uses

• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives

This zone contains significant traditional land use and occupancy areas for the Łııdlı̨ ł Kų̦ę̦ First Nation and surrounding communities. Numerous cabins and burial sites with important cultural value are found along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and around the larger Lakes and rivers. The zone (Map 22) includes four major lakes. These are Antoine (Medehtú), Sibbeston (K'áéh Túé), Little Doctor (Tuehgãh), and Cli Lake (Tuį̨htth’į̨) and the Mackenzie River (Dehcho). It also includes the Poplar River (T'įl̨h̨l̨éah) and surrounding harvesting area. This area is considered good habitat for the boreal woodland caribou, which are considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. The zone is supported by community mapping, existing land withdrawals, the conservation intersect and woodland caribou data. The zone includes a 2 km buffer along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and around the major lakes. The zone also includes Camsell Bend (Mbehzężă).

Conservation Values

This zone was identified to support community traditional land use and occupancy and important waterfowl staging areas. The area provides critical habitat for fish, grizzly bears, sheep and goats, moose, waterfowl, and also wolverine and boreal woodland caribou, which are both listed under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act\textsuperscript{243}. This site was identified to support the waterfowl staging area. Karst and hotsprings are also present in the area. The community drinking water for Fort Simpson (Łııdlı̨ ł Kų̦ę̦) is also drawn from the waterways in this zone.

Resource Potential

There is moderate agricultural potential around Antoine Lake (Medehtú) and Liard River (Acho Tine Deh). Sawlog potential follows the Liard River (Acho Tine Deh) and Mackenzie River (Dehcho) through the zone. There is also very high potential for tourism along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and North Nahanni River (Mehzęż Deh). High and very high tourism potential is also found around the lakes, particularly in the west. There are lodges at both Cli Lake (Tuį̨htth’į̨) and Little Doctor Lake (Tuehgãh). There is also high mineral development potential on the west side of these lakes with the remaining area being low or uncertain. Prospecting permits have been issued in the Poplar River (T'įl̨h̨l̨éah) area. The Drummond report estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m\textsuperscript{3} / quarter grid with the exception of 50-100 million m\textsuperscript{3} / quarter grid in the Poplar River (T'įl̨h̨l̨éah) area. The remaining recoverable oil is estimated to be <30,000 m\textsuperscript{3}. The proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline within the Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor crosses this zone twice - east of Fort Simpson (Łııdlı̨ ł Kų̦ę̦) and north of the mouth of the Willow Lake River (Xahndaa Deh).

Specific Conformity Requirements

• CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
Map 22. Zone 3 - Sibbeston Plains
Zone 4: Pehdzeh Ki Ndeh

Permitted Uses
• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone was identified to support community interest in the PAS and traditional land use and occupancy. The delineation largely reflects the negotiated land withdrawals for the area. It also includes the Bulmer Lake (K’ádzáh K’é) trail which links up with Edéhzhíe, a 2 km buffer along the Mackenzie River burial sites and the Old Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki) town site in the west of the zone. Pehdzeh Ki Ndeh has been moving through the PAS process since 2000 but has been progressing slowly as a result of overlap discussions with the Sahtú. The Conservation Zone includes only those lands falling within the Dehcho Plan Area and excludes the parcels of Sahtú Settlement Lands indicated on Map 23. These are fee simple surface lands.

Zone 4 is part of the larger Pehdzeh Kí First Nation PAS Area of interest in Pehdzeh Ki Ndeh. The boundaries of the PAS Area of Interest may change as a result of the resource assessments and studies required under Step 5 of the PAS. Once approved, the protected area will be designated through its sponsoring agency's legislation and managed in accordance with its management plan. The Plan will no longer apply within the boundaries of the protected area. The Plan will be amended or revised during the next Plan review to reflect the outcome of the PAS proposal. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

Conservation Values
As identified through the PAS proposal and through the Committee’s own research, there are significant ecological and cultural values within Pehdzeh Ki Ndeh, specifically around the extensive network of rivers and lakes. This area provides important habitat for woodland caribou, moose, black bears, grizzly bears, lynx, wolves, coyotes, wolverines, waterfowl, beavers, muskrat and marten. Barren-ground caribou winter in the eastern portion of this zone. The waterways also serve as spawning and migration areas for a variety of fish, including inconnu, arctic cisco, whitefish, arctic grayling, lake trout, lake chub, yellow walleye, longnose sucker, and slimy sculpin. Many of the lakes are used for domestic fishing. These same waterways also provide drinking water for the community of Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki) and residents out on the land.

There are a number of known archaeological sites on the north and west ends of Blackwater Lake (Tì K’ee Tì), the mouth of the Blackwater River (Tì K’ee Tì Deh), the south shore of Fish Lake (Tìe Tì) and the mouths the Ochre River (Tsìa Dehà) and River Between Two Mountains (Pe Ghanîl). There are 18 cabins and one winter camp in Pehdzeh Ki Ndeh, located around Fish Lake (Tìe Tì), Blackwater Lake (Tì K’ee Tì), Blackwater River (Tì K’ee Tì Deh), Highland Lake (Dahtaeæáa Tì), Greasy Lake (Tetå’eh Tì), Paenfee Lake, and Spruce / Tseepantee Lake (Ts’ip’ëë Tì). A network of trails connects these lakes with Wrigley (Pehdzeh Ki). The Pehdzeh
Ki First Nation have documented traditional knowledge associated with sacred sites found in gaps in the mountain chains around the Blackwater River (Ti K’ee Ti Deh), Ochre River (Tsia Deha) and River Between Two Mountains (Pe Ghanîlî).

Resource Potential
There is moderate to high potential for minerals along the Franklin Mountains, just east of the Mackenzie River (Dehcho). Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of between <50 million m³ and 50-100 million m³ / quarter grid. There is a good distribution of spruce sawlogs along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) on the western boundary. The area is exceptionally scenic with the backdrop of the mountains. There is community interest in developing tourism, although there is currently a lack of access and infrastructure. There is low potential for agriculture.

The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline as currently proposed will run the length of this zone from north to south just inside the western boundary. DFN, the Pehdzech Ki First Nation, and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada recently negotiated an pipeline corridor through this area. As a result, the Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 34) has been extended to recognize these revisions.

Specific Conformity Requirements
• CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
Map 23. Zone 4 - Pehdzeх Ki Ndeh
Zone 5: Sambaa K’e / Redknife River

Permitted Uses
• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone holds particular cultural value for the people of Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) and surrounding communities. Zone 5 (Map 24) includes the Sambaa K’e PAS Candidate Protected Area and the Redknife River (Ts’udat’o) and Redknife Lakes. The zone includes two small sites of spiritual significance lying within Zone 27. Delineation is supported by a wealth of traditional and ecological information documented in Sambaa K’e Candidate Protected Area: NWT Protected Areas Strategy Step 2 Report (August 2005) and other community initiatives. The community approaches land use cautiously. There are ongoing studies of boreal woodland caribou and interest in other key species. The abundant conservation values reflected in the conservation intersect support the amendments to the existing land withdrawals. Sambaa K’e is at Step 3 of the PAS Process. They are developing a proposal and have approached the Canadian Wildlife Service as a sponsoring agency.

The existing land withdrawals cover most of the zone. Zone 5 will be managed as a Conservation Zone under the Plan until the Protected Areas Strategy proposal and management plan are approved. The boundaries may change as a result of resource assessments and studies required under Step 5 of the PAS. Once approved, the protected area will be designated through the appropriate legislation and managed in accordance with its management plan. The Plan will not apply within the boundaries of the approved protected area. The Plan will be amended or revised during the next Plan review to reflect the outcome of the PAS proposal. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

Conservation Values
The Sambaa K’e PAS Cadidate Protected Area captures the Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) watershed and has significant historic and cultural values. Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) and the two small sacred sites lying within Zone 27 are the subjects of a well-known Yamona legend. Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) and the surrounding areas are rich in wildlife and fish and important for subsistence harvesting. The numerous lakes and rivers provide essential drinking water for people in the community and for traditional land use and occupancy in the surrounding area. Critical boreal woodland caribou habitat extends throughout the area across to the Redknife Lakes. There is also critical habitat for moose, waterfowl and wolverine. Both caribou and wolverine are listed under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. There are important spawning grounds for many species of fish around the lake and along the Redknife River (Ts’udat’o). Grizzly bears have also been recorded in the area. Traditional burial sites and culturally significant areas are well documented for this area.

Resource Potential
The zone shows little potential for agriculture or forestry. The community is interested in sustainable tourism on Trout Lake (Sambaa K'e) which respects the local culture. It runs a
fishing lodge on the lake. Mineral development potential is low or uncertain. Drummond’s Report estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of the zone to be between 50-100 million m³ and 100-500 m³ / quarter grid. Remaining recoverable oil potential is estimated to be between 10-30,000 m³ / quarter grid. The Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor crosses this zone twice along the northern and eastern edges.

**Specific Conformity Requirements**
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
- CR #21: Fishing Lodges
Map 24. Zone 5 - Sambaa K’e / Redknife River
Zone 6: Greater Nahanni Ecosystem

Permitted Uses
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The zone is delineated by the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem (GNE) which captures the watershed of the South Nahanni River (Nahæâ Dehé) and the north Karst. The zone is shown in (Map 25) and excludes the current Nahanni National Park Reserve and encompasses only the land around it. The Nahanni National Park Reserve falls under the Canada National Parks Act as administered by the Parks Canada Agency. The MVRMA applies differently to National Parks and National Park Reserves covered by the Canada National Parks Act. The proposed expansion area for which this zone is delineated, is not yet part of the National Park and is therefore not yet subject to the Canada National Parks Act. Activities occurring in this zone will be managed under the MVRMA until such time as the additional lands may be gazetted.

Through a memorandum of understanding, Dehcho First Nations and Parks Canada have agreed to work together to expand Nahanni National Park Reserve within the GNE, as evidenced by four separate Leadership resolutions (Chapter 3 and Appendix 3). The Dehcho Land Use Plan will allow for that process to determine the expanded boundaries for the national park reserve within the GNE. The zone will be managed as a Conservation Zone until the boundaries and management plan are approved. The Plan will not apply within the boundaries of the expanded national park. The Plan will be amended or revised during the next Plan review to reflect the outcome of the park expansion process. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the Nahanni Park Expansion Process prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

Conservation Values
There are 51 known karst sites and 10 known hot springs in the area. The eastern section also includes a key migratory bird terrestrial habitat site (Area 43) identified by CWS as an important trumpeter swan nesting area within the Northwest Territories. Peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), a species listed as threatened under COSEWIC also nests in this area. There is critical habitat for many large mammals including mountain type woodland caribou, grizzly bear and wolverine. These three species are listed as special concern under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. The area also has critical habitat for sheep, goats and moose.

Biologists have been actively studying wildlife habitat values for grizzly bears, Dall’s sheep and woodland caribou within this zone as part of the Nahanni Park Expansion Process. Preliminary results identified several important areas for these species, which were not included in the existing land withdrawals – upper Prairie Creek (for grizzly bears and Dall’s sheep), upper Caribou River (for woodland caribou), northwest of Tungsten (woodland caribou), and upper Clearwater-Flood Creek (for grizzly bears, woodland caribou and Dall’s sheep).

Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) is an isolated community and relies heavily on the area for natural foods. Ecologically significant areas included Glacier Lake, Rabbit Kettle and Virginia Falls (Nájlį́cho). The zone is well supported by the critical wildlife map. The zone provides an
essential source of traditional foods and clean drinking water for the community of Nahanni
Butte (Tthenáágó) and traditional land use and occupancy in the surrounding area.

Resource Potential
Agricultural potential (moderate and high) is restricted to a small area around the community of
Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó). Forestry potential (sawlogs) is also restricted to the east of the
zone. There is high tourism potential around the karst lands and very high potential along the
South Nahanni River (Nahæâ Dehé). Nahanni National Park Reserve is a key attraction to the
area with three guiding operations leading trips down the Nahanni River (Nahæâ Dehé), and
international recognition as a UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural
Organization) World Heritage Site. There are a number of existing outfitting areas covering the
majority of this zone ²⁴⁸. Drummond’s Report estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of
100-500 m³ / quarter grid around the south east, extending north from Nahanni Butte
(Tthenáágó) to the Grainger River (Endaa-lîãh) and west to the Yukon Border. The majority of
the area shows high to very high mineral development potential. The Cantung mine was closed
in December 2003 but reopened in October 2005. Prairie Creek mine is at the advanced
exploration stage. These mines are existing uses, so are exempt from the Plan.

Specific Conformity Requirements
  • None
Map 25. Zone 6 - Greater Nahanni Ecosystem
Zone 7: Birch Lake

Permitted Uses
• None

Zone Description and Objectives
The zone shown in (Map 26) was delineated by community mapping and is supported by critical wildlife areas. The area has cultural significance for Fort Providence (Zhahti Kúé). It has rich wildlife habitat and is a prime location for trapping. The purpose of the zone is to protect the Birch Lake (K’i Tué) watershed and traditional harvesting areas. It also provides connectivity between Birch Lake (K’i Tué) and Edéhzhíe.

Conservation Values
Birch Lake (K’i Tué) and its associated trails have cultural significance for local people. The zone includes critical habitat for boreal woodland caribou, which are considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. It is also important for moose, bison, waterfowl and furbearers including wolverine which is listed under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act.

Resource Potential
Research indicates no potential for agriculture, forestry or tourism in this area. Drummond’s Report characterizes the remaining recoverable gas potential of the zone to be <50 million m³ / quarter grid. There is moderate mineral development potential in this zone.

Specific Conformity Requirements
• None
Map 26. Zone 7 - Birch Lake
Zone 8: Fisherman Lake

Permitted Uses
• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone (Map 27) was identified by Acho Dene Koe Band based on significant traditional land use and occupancy of these areas. The purpose is to protect burial sites and traditional land use and occupancy around Fisherman Lake (The Dehee). They also recognize the potential for tourism in this zone. The zone follows the existing land withdrawals and is supported by the critical wildlife map.

Conservation Values
The zone contains important cultural areas and trails the community wish to protect. Fisherman Lake (The Dehee) has the oldest archaeological sites in the NWT, dating back to 9000 B.C.249 The area also has rich wildlife habitat, including critical habitat for moose and is important for other species including furbearers, bison and waterfowl. The well developed wetlands at Fisherman Lake (The Dehee) are particularly important to trumpeter swans - a species of special management concern.

Resource Potential
Research indicates the zone holds moderate potential for agriculture. There is also good forestry potential including sawlogs. Moderate to high tourism potential is found around the lake and the community is interested in developing tourism in the area. The zone contains low or uncertain mineral development potential. Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of 100-500 million m³ / quarter grid around Fisherman Lake (The Dehee).

Specific Conformity Requirements
• None
Map 27. Zone 8 - Fisherman Lake
Zone 9: Bovie and Betalamea Lakes

Permitted Uses
• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The zone (Map 28) includes Bovie Lake (Ttheh Laké) which was delineated by the existing land withdrawals and Betalamea Lake (K’eh/meh), which has a ½ km buffer. Both areas are supported by the wildlife constraint layer and supported by community mapping and the conservation intersect. These sites were identified by Acho Dene Koe Band who identified these areas as important for traditional land use and occupancy.

Conservation Values
Bovie (Ttheh Laké) and Betalamea Lake (K’eh/meh) provide critical habitat for moose and form part of a migration route for waterfowl. The Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kúţ) area is also recognized as having an abundant song bird population. The well developed wetlands are also particularly important to trumpeter swans - a species of special management concern. Woodland caribou and bison are also found in this zone. These areas have significant value for traditional land use and occupancy for the Acho Dene Koe Band. There are some important historic trails and gathering areas for rare plants in the area.

Resource Potential
There is good agricultural potential around Betalamea Lake (K’eh/meh) and forestry potential (sawlogs) is found across the zone. There is moderate potential for tourism and community interest in promoting this land use in the area. The estimated remaining recoverable gas potential is between 100-500 million m³ / quarter grid around Betalamea Lake (K’eh/meh) and >500 million m³ / quarter grid around Bovie Lake (Ttheh Laké). The majority of the zone has low or uncertain mineral development potential although there is some high potential bordering the west side of Bovie Lake (Ttheh Laké).

Specific Conformity Requirements
• None
Map 28. Zone 9 - Bovie and Betalamea Lakes
**Zone 10: Upper Mackenzie**

**Permitted Uses**
- Tourism

**Zone Description and Objectives**
This zone extends along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) from Redknife River (Ts’udatọjà) to Beaver Lake (Tsá Tú) and also includes four tributaries. Moving from west to east the tributaries are “river flowing down on the other side again” (Nadahnodlj), which is adjacent to Bouvier River (K’á Ndu Deh) and then Axe Creek (Tthîæôâ Deh). The remaining tributary included in the zone translates “flowing in between” (Gogeeh Déï) (Map 29). The tributaries are all buffered by 2 km. The primary objective is to protect water around the community of Fort Providence (Zhahti Kùjé), which are used for traditional and cultural use. This is supported by community mapping, the existing land withdrawals and the conservation intersect.

The small area in the east is included in the Kakisa PAS Area of Interest. The Plan will not apply within the boundaries of the approved protected area. The Plan will be amended or revised during the next Plan review to reflect the outcome of the PAS proposal. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

**Conservation Values**
The zone includes critical wildlife habitat for a number of species which are important for traditional harvesting. The Mackenzie River (Dehcho) is a major travel corridor for waterfowl and migratory birds. Mills Lake (Tuah) and Beaver Lake (Tsá Tú) are particularly important for staging and nesting. These areas are considered key migratory bird terrestrial habitat sites by the Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS). There are numerous fish spawning grounds in the rivers and creeks that flow into the Mackenzie River (Dehcho). The community of Fort Providence (Zhahti Kùjé) and those using the surrounding area for traditional land use and occupancy rely on clean drinking water from the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) as it passes through the zone. Large species include moose and also wood bison and boreal woodland caribou, which are listed as threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the *Species at Risk Act*. Wolverine is also present and listed as a species of special concern under COSEWIC and protected by the *Species at Risk Act*. Numerous camps and cabins are found in this zone.

**Resource Potential**
The zone has very high potential for tourism. The excellent scenery and good road access makes the river corridor a prime location. There is low to moderate potential for agriculture and forestry potential is limited to scattered stands of spruce sawlogs. There is low or uncertain potential for mineral development and Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential to be <50 million m³ / quarter grid except in the south where two tributaries include potential of 50-100 million m³ / quarter grid.

**Specific Conformity Requirements**
- None
Map 29. Zone 10 - Upper Mackenzie
**Zone 11: Great Slave Lake Shoreline**

**Permitted Uses**
- Tourism

**Zone Description and Objectives**
This zone was delineated by a 2 km buffer along the shoreline of Great Slave Lake (Tucho) from Beaver Lake (Tsá Tú) to the IMA boundary on the south shore and to Deep Bay on the north shore (Map 30). The zone includes the lake adjacent to Deep Bay and Big Island (Nduro) based on the conservation intersect and the wildlife constraint layer. The zone objectives are to protect established commercial and subsistence fishing grounds, important areas for traditional land use and occupancy and critical wildlife habitat along the shoreline. The zone overlaps with Hay River Reserve’s (K’átł’odeeche) Domestic Fishing Area (an area set aside for subsistence harvesting), shown in blue dots.

A small part of the southern shoreline is captured by the Kakisa PAS Area of Interest. The Plan will not apply within the boundaries of the approved protected area. The Plan will be amended or revised during the next Plan review to reflect the outcome of the PAS proposal. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

**Conservation Values**
Besides being of cultural value to Deh Gáh Got’ie, Ts’ueh Nda and K’átł’odeeche First Nations, the area is rich in wildlife. The zone includes sensitive spawning grounds, notably around Deep Bay. There is also critical habitat for migratory birds and moose. Wood Bison are found along the northern shore and many areas are good for trapping. There is also critical habitat for caribou which are listed under COSEWIC and protected by the *Species at Risk Act*. There is an extensive network of trails, particularly around Point LaRoche on the southern shoreline. Big Island (Nduro) is important for berry harvesting. The north shore of this zone is part of the Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary. The area is also important source of drinking water for communities downstream and those using the area for traditional land use and occupancy.

**Resource Potential**
The shoreline of Great Slave Lake (Tucho) and Big Island (Nduro) shows very high potential for tourism and Brabant Lodge is an existing fishing lodge on Big Island (Nduro). The zone has low or moderate potential for agriculture and there is limited potential for forestry. Mineral development potential ranges from low or uncertain to moderate. Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of between 50-100 and 100-500 million m³ / quarter grid around Big Island and into Deep Bay. The remainder is <50 million m³ / quarter grid. There may also be some oil potential along the shoreline.

**Specific Conformity Requirements**
- None
Map 30. Zone 11 - Great Slave Lake Shoreline
Zone 12: Hay River Corridor

Permitted Uses
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The zone is delineated by a 2 km buffer around the Hay River (K’átł’odehé) and borders Highway 2. The zone is supported by community mapping, the existing land withdrawals and in parts by the conservation intersect. The primary objective of this land use zone is to respect community interest in protecting areas for traditional land use and occupancy, and burial sites along the river corridor. The scenery will also be protected for the enjoyment of tourists and local residents. The Plan does not apply within the community boundaries of the Town of Hay River (K’átł’odehé) and Enterprise which extend along the Hay River (K’átł’odehé) Corridor as shown in Map 31.

Conservation Values
The area has particular cultural significance for surrounding communities and includes numerous burial sites and archaeological sites. Habitat for moose and woodland caribou also runs adjacent to the river. The Twin Falls Territorial Park lies within this zone and is a popular tourist attraction. The GNWT, with the assistance of the Hay River Reserve (K’átł’odeeche) and the Dene Cultural Institute, established an interpretive trail between the two waterfalls explaining Dene culture and the site. The Hay River (K’átł’odehé) provides an important source of drinking water for traditional land use and occupancy and local communities.

Resource Potential
Highway 2 is a major travel route and has moderate tourism potential. Between Enterprise and Hay River (K’átł’odehé) there is moderate agricultural potential and limited potential for forestry (sawlogs). Remaining recoverable gas potential is estimated by Drummond to be between <50 million m³ in the north to 100-500 m³ / quarter grid in the south. The remaining recoverable oil potential is estimated to be between 2-10,000 m³ / quarter grid in the north and >30,000 m³ / quarter grid in the south. Mining potential is low or uncertain over most of the zone but moderate at the northern edge near Great Slave Lake (Tucho).

Specific Conformity Requirements
- None
Map 31. Zone 12 - Hay River Corridor
Zone 13: Heart Lake, McNally Creek, Muskeg River

Permitted Uses
• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone is supported by community mapping and delineated with a 2 km buffer along McNally Creek and part of the Muskeg River (Mbehgaah Dehé), around Heart Lake (Edze Tú) and up to the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) buffer (Map 32). Around half of the zone to the west is captured by the Kakisa PAS Area of Interest. The area is culturally significant for the surrounding communities. There is interest in developing a community education project around Heart Lake (Edze Tú) and the network of trails which follow the rivers. There is also interest in encouraging tourism in the area.

The Plan will not apply within the boundaries of the approved protected area. The Plan will be amended or revised during the next Plan review to reflect the outcome of the PAS proposal. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

Conservation Values
The zone captures unique habitat including the area around the IBP site at Heart Lake (Edze Tú), which was an important ecological research station. Heart Lake (Edze Tú), McNally Creek and Muskeg River (Mbehgaah Dehé) are important for subsistence harvesting and include critical habitat for boreal woodland caribou, which is considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. The habitat is also important for waterfowl, moose and furbearers. The lakes and rivers provide an essential source of drinking water for traditional land use and occupancy.

Resource Potential
Agriculture shows moderate potential across the zone and forestry potential appears to be limited to a few isolated stands of sawlogs. There is community interest in advancing tourism in this zone although no activities currently exist. The mineral development potential is considered low or uncertain. Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of between <50 million m³ to 50-100 m³ / quarter grid in this zone with a few areas of 100-500 m³ / quarter grid. Oil potential is estimated to be 2-10,000 m³ / quarter grid.

Specific Conformity Requirements
• None
Map 32. Zone 13 - Heart Lake, McNally Creek, Muskeg River
Zone 14: Kakisa and Tathlina Watershed

Permitted Uses

- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives

Zone 14 captures significant traditional land use and occupancy areas for many communities, including Kakisa Lake (K’ágée Tu), Tathlina Lake (Tatl’álıłę), Dogface Lake (Ndugolı̨ę) and the rivers connecting them (Map 33). The rivers include part of the Muskeg River (Mbehaňa Déhé), which is important for spawning. There are many burial sites within this zone. There is strong community opposition to development in this zone. There is particular concern about the area north-west of Tathlina (Tatl’álıłę) not previously captured in the existing land withdrawals. Ka’a’gee Tu First Nation have selected most of the zone to be included in the Protected Areas Strategy Area of Interest, which is in Step 1 of the Process. This area is both a critical area for caribou and continues to be used extensively by traditional land users. There are many legends, trails and camps across this zone, which connect up with the Sambaa K’e PAS Candidate Protected Area. Communities are particularly concerned about protecting the water, wildlife and cultural values. The zone includes Lady Evelyn Falls Territorial Park.

The Plan will not apply within the boundaries of the approved protected area. The Plan will be amended or revised during the next Plan review to reflect the outcome of the PAS proposal. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

Conservation Values

The Kakisa (K’ágée Tu) and Tathlina (Tatl’álıłę) watersheds are prone to fluctuating water levels and community and commercial fisheries are particularly sensitive. The Muskeg River (Mbehaňa Déhé) and other rivers around the lakes are important spawning areas. They also provide an essential source of clean drinking water to support traditional land use and occupancy in the area. The steep slopes in the Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé) are also vulnerable to erosion. The area contains critical habitat for moose, woodland caribou and wolverine. Boreal woodland caribou and wolverine are listed as threatened and special concern, respectively, by COSEWIC and are protected under the Species at Risk Act. Kakisa (K’ágée Tu) and Tathlina Lake (Tatl’álıłę) are documented as important sites for waterfowl and flocks of white pelicans are regular summer visitors. The area has cultural significance for all the surrounding communities who continue to use the area for traditional and cultural activities. Lady Evelyn Falls are a popular tourism site in this zone.

Resource Potential

Agriculture potential is restricted to the northern part of the zone which shows moderate to low potential. There is some potential for forestry around both Kakisa (K’ágée Tu) and Tathlina Lake (Tatl’álıłę). There is moderate tourism potential around Kakisa Lake (K’ágée Tu), Kakisa River (Kedjı̨lę̨gh) and Dog Face Lake (Ndugolı̨ę). The community has a small hotel and there are a number of campgrounds, where hikers can enjoy waterfalls and scenic trails. There is
also an existing lodge on Dog Face Lake (Ndugolje) but it is not operating. Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential of between 50-100 million m$^3$ / quarter grid in the south and northeast section of the zone with 100-500 million m$^3$ / quarter grid found in areas around Kakisa Lake (K’ágee Tú) and Heart Lake (Edze Tú). The remaining area is estimated to have potential of <50 million m$^3$ / quarter grid. The remaining recoverable oil potential is estimated to be between 10-30,000 m$^3$ / quarter grid in the south to 2-10,000 m$^3$ / quarter grid in the north of the zone. Mineral development potential is low or uncertain across the whole zone.

**Specific Conformity Requirements**
- None
Map 33. Zone 14 - Kakisa and Tathlina Watershed
Zone 15: Buffalo Lake, River, and Trails

Permitted Uses
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The zone (Map 34) provides a buffer around Buffalo Lake (Ejie Tú) delineated by moose data up to the IMA boundary and extends northward along the Buffalo River (Ejie Tú Deh) and a trail as delineated by the existing land withdrawals. The area is supported by community mapping and the conservation intersect. The primary objectives are to protect water, wildlife and traditional land use and occupancy in the Buffalo Lake (Ejie Tú) watershed and surrounding trails. The lake and rivers provide an important source of drinking water for traditional land use and occupancy. The community has expressed interest in advancing the Buffalo Lake (Ejie Tú) area through the Protected Areas Strategy. This may be addressed through future Plan revisions or amendments.

Conservation Values
The area includes critical habitat for moose, waterfowl and fish spawning. There is also significant traditional land use and occupancy in the area and many historic trails.

Resource Potential
Research indicates there is no potential for agriculture or forestry (sawlogs) in this zone. There is some tourism potential and interest from surrounding communities. Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas to be 50-100 million m$^3$ / quarter grid in most of the zone with a small area of higher potential (100-500 million m$^3$ / quarter grid) adjacent to Buffalo Lake (Ejie Tú). The zone included remaining recoverable oil is >30,000 m$^3$ in the southern portion of the zone. There are a number of mineral claims related to the Pine Point mineral deposits that are active. These mines are existing uses.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- None
Map 34. Zone 15 - Buffalo Lake, River, and Trails
Zone 16: Falaise Lake Wetland Complex

Permitted Uses
• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The zone was identified to protect the wetland complex and important wildlife habitat from Falaise Lake (Edahchîê Túé) to Highway 3 (Map 35). The area is delineated by bison data and 2 km buffers around the major lakes. The purpose is to support community and planning partner interest in protecting the area’s important conservation values, especially the many wetlands in this area. The area is supported by the critical wildlife areas and community mapping.

Conservation Values
The zone includes critical habitat for wood bison, boreal woodland caribou, waterfowl, trumpeter swans and whooping crane (non-breeding pairs). The wetlands around Falaise Lake (Edahchîê Túé) and west to the highway provide exceptional waterfowl habitat. Wood bison and boreal woodland caribou are listed as threatened under COSEWIC and whooping cranes are endangered. All are protected by the Species at Risk Act. The area is also important for Furbearers and the zone is a good area for trapping. This zone is part of the Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary.

Resource Potential
There is moderate potential for agriculture in the western half of the zone and no forestry (saw log) potential. The research indicates tourism potential is moderate across the whole zone. Mineral development potential ranges from low or uncertain to moderate potential in the top half of the zone. The edge of the zone around Falaise Lake (Edahchîê Túé) borders high potential which is the northern extent of a belt of Pine Point style lead-zinc deposits. These deposits were purposely excluded from this zone and added to Special Management Zone 31 to allow development of these significant deposits. Drummond characterizes this zone as having remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m³ / quarter grid.

Specific Conformity Requirements
• None
Map 35. Zone 16 - Falaise Lake Wetland Complex
Zone 17: Moraine Point and Islands

Permitted Uses
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The zone (Map 36) protects important island and shoreline habitat including Northwest Point which is a CWS Migratory Bird Site and nearby Found Island that is an internationally recognized breeding site for gulls. The area is defined by whooping crane data on the west side, with a 2 km buffer out from the shoreline and around Northwest Point. The zone also includes Moraine Point as the focal site of the area as well as Caribou Point and Jones Point. The mineral deposits adjacent to Falaise Lake (Edahchîî Túé) with high mineral development potential were purposely excluded from this zone and added to Special Management Zone 31 to provide the opportunity for development. The area is supported by community mapping and is widely recognized as an important area for wildlife.

Conservation Values
The area includes critical habitat for non-breeding pairs of whooping cranes as well as a summer feeding area for bachelor (non-breeding) flocks of white pelicans. Bald eagles have nests on nearly every point of land or large island on the Great Slave Lake (Tucho) side of the zone. With the early thaw in Moraine Bay, the zone also provides spring wetlands and open water for important migratory waterfowl including trumpeter swans, Canada & snow geese, surf scoters, mergansers, caspian terns and gulls. The area has large mammals including boreal caribou, moose and wood bison as well as wolves, wolverine, lynx and marten. Wood bison and whooping cranes are listed as threatened and endangered species, respectively by COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. This zone is part of the Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary.

Resource Potential
Agriculture and forestry show no potential in the area. Although research indicates moderate potential for tourism, the area has supported a viable ecotourism business for over 20 years. The adjacent waters of Great Slave Lake (Tucho) have supported commercial fishing summer & winter since the 1940’s. Drummond characterizes this zone as having remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m³ / quarter grid. Mineral development potential is moderate along the shoreline, and borders the high potential adjacent to Falaise Lake (Edahchîî Túé).

Specific Conformity Requirements
- None
Map 36. Zone 17 - Moraine Point and Islands
Zone 18: Northwest Rivers

Permitted Uses
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The Northwest Rivers Zone (Map 37) includes the major rivers in the northwest portion of the Dehcho territory including the Johnson (Ehk’eedaaréh), Wrigley (Pehdzech Ki), Root (Xáa Deh), North Nahanni (Mehzê Deh), English Chief and Tetcela (Tehts'éliá) Rivers. The zone was delineated by 3 km buffers along the North Nahanni (Mehzê Deh) and Root (Xáa Deh) Rivers due to their continuing importance for traditional land use and occupancy and by 2 km buffers along the other rivers. The primary purpose was to protect the water, critical habitat and important traditional land use and occupancy areas. The zone is supported by community mapping, wildlife data and existing land withdrawals.

Conservation Values
In addition to being a significant area for traditional land use and occupancy, the zone contains critical habitat for mountain woodland caribou (Redstone herd), grizzly bear, sheep/goats and wolverine, which are all listed as species of special concern under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. The zone also provides important areas for moose around Wrigley (Pehdzech Ki) and waterfowl at the mouth of the Root River (Xáa Deh). Communities use these areas extensively for traditional land use and occupancy. DFN may pursue designation of these rivers as special harvesting areas through the Dehcho Process.

Resource Potential
Research indicates there is no agricultural or forestry (saw log) potential in this zone. The North Nahanni River (Mehzê Deh) has very high potential for tourism and the Root (Xáa Deh) and Wrigley River (lower part Gozhíhílî and upper part Pe Vâp’í Deha), have moderate potential. Mineral development potential ranges from low or uncertain potential around the zone in the north east to high potential in the central to south western part of the zone. Drummond characterizes this zone as having remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m³ / quarter grid.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- None
Map 37. Zone 18 - Northwest Rivers
Zone 19: Netlá River

Permitted Uses
• Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The Netlá River Conservation Zone (Map 38) was identified as an important area for traditional land use and occupancy. It was delineated by a 2 km buffer along the Netlá River (Netlá) and two tributaries, including a section of water called Big Bend (Tłáho).

Conservation Values
In addition to traditional land use and occupancy the area includes critical habitat for wolverine and grizzly bears, listed as species of special concern under COSEWIC, and boreal woodland caribou which are considered threatened under COSEWIC. These species are protected by the Species at Risk Act. The area is also important for waterfowl and the Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) has identified parts of this area as critical nesting habitat for trumpeter swans. The area is also recognized as having an abundant song bird population. Other important species with critical habitat in the area include moose and bison. Traditional activities continue to be an important part of community life. The rivers are important travel routes and provide an important source of fish and fresh drinking water.

Resource Potential
Along the Netlá River (Netlá) there is some moderate agriculture potential and forestry potential (sawlogs), reflective of the excellent growing conditions existing in the Liard River Valley. The area is relatively close to the Liard River (Acho Tíne Deh) which shows very high potential for tourism and there is interest in the community to develop local enterprises. There is also interest in developing a youth camp at Big Bend (Tłáho). Remaining recoverable gas is estimated by Drummond to be mainly 100-500 million m³ / quarter grid with some areas to the east showing <50 million m³ and a small area indicating >500 million m³ / quarter grid. The remaining recoverable oil is estimated to be around 2-10,000 m³ in the area. Mineral development potential is generally low or uncertain.

Specific Conformity Requirements
• None
Map 38. Zone 19 - Netlá River
5.4 Special Management Zones

Special Management Zones were identified wherever there was significant potential for both conservation value and resource potential overlapping, or where issues needed to be addressed through either specific Conformity Requirements or land use restrictions (e.g. oil and gas only in Zone 27). At least one land use is restricted in every Special Management Zone.

Each zone description includes a list of the permitted uses and specific Conformity Requirements applicable to each zone. All other Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations apply to the entire Dehcho territory, so are not listed for every zone.

Zone 20: Peel River Plateau

Permitted Uses
- Oil & Gas
- Mining
- Forestry
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
Zone 20 is shown in (Map 39). It has four main areas delineated by critical habitat for sheep, goats and grizzly bears. The zone includes critical habitat for woodland caribou (northern mountain population). It is also supported by the existing land withdrawals around Coates Lake. The purpose of the zone is to protect important habitat and traditional land use and occupancy in the area. The zone provides opportunities for mineral and oil and gas activity.

Conservation Values
Woodland caribou (northern mountain population) and the grizzly bear are listed as species of special concern by COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. The unique landscape and range of big game species make this an important area. As mentioned above, this zone provides critical habitat for sheep, goats, and grizzly bears within the mountain ranges. Moose are also found along the creeks and tributaries.

Resource Potential
There is no recorded potential for agriculture or forestry in the area. There are small areas of moderate tourism potential. Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential to be limited to a few areas of <50 million m³ / quarter grid. There are a few areas of low oil and gas potential. The mineral development potential is high in many parts of the zone and very high around the existing mineral (copper) deposits at Coates Lake.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 39. Zone 20 - Peel River Plateau
Zone 21: Southeastern Mackenzie Mountains

Permitted Uses

- Oil & Gas
- Mining
- Forestry
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives

Zone 21 has two main areas, one north of the Johnson River (Ehk’eedaarëh), the other from the Wrigley River (lower part Gozhíhîlî and upper part Pe Vap’î Deha), down to the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem boundary (Map 40). The lower section was delineated using the Canadian Wildlife Service Migratory Bird site and existing land withdrawals around Fish Trap Creek. It is supported by critical habitat for boreal woodland caribou. The northern section is based on community mapping and supported by critical habitat for moose. This area is also supported by TLUO data. The zone is meant to protect the above conservation values and also allow for tourism and non-renewable resource development.

Conservation Values

There is a diverse range of habitats and species found in this zone. The primary species of concern include boreal woodland caribou and peregrine falcons (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), which are both considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the *Species at Risk Act*. Wolverine and grizzly bears are also found in this area and listed as species of special concern under COSEWIC. Other species include moose, sheep and goats in the mountainous areas. Much of the area is important for waterfowl and includes the nesting area for 15% of the Canadian population of trumpeter swans. The valley travel routes are culturally significant and important areas for subsistence harvesting.

Resource Potential

Research indicates no agriculture or forestry potential within this zone. Tourism potential is moderate in the southern half of the zone. Drummond characterizes this zone as having remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m³ / quarter grid. Mineral development potential is largely low or uncertain although there are strands of high potential in the southern section on the border of the Northwest Rivers Conservation Zone (Zone 18).

Specific Conformity Requirements

- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 40. Zone 21 - Southeastern Mackenzie Mountains
Zone 22: Franklin Mountains

Permitted Uses
- Forestry
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone was proposed by Pehdzeh Kî First Nation to capture forestry potential in the region and provide opportunities for community-based forest management. The zone (Map 41) follows the east bank of the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) beginning a few miles north of Wrigley (Pehdzeh Kî) and extending down to Edéhzhíe. The highway to Wrigley (Pehdzeh Kî) passes through the zone. The zone will be managed to protect the water, critical habitat and traditional land use and occupancy in the area and provide for sustainable forestry. The area was identified through community mapping and is supported by forestry potential maps, the conservation intersect, wildlife, and traditional land use and occupancy data.

Conservation Values
The people of Pehdzeh Kî First Nation have a strong history, and traditional activities remain a critical part of Dene culture. The supply of fresh drinking water is also important for the community and traditional land use and occupancy in the surrounding area. The area is rich in wildlife and includes critical habitat for moose, waterfowl, and boreal woodland caribou and wolverine which are both listed under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. There have been extensive fires in Pehdzeh Kî Ndeh area over recent years and a renewed interest in sustainable forest management practices.

Resource Potential
Drummond characterizes this area as having remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m³ / quarter grid. Research indicates moderate to high potential for minerals along the Franklin Mountains, just east of the Mackenzie River (Dehcho). Agricultural potential is low, but the community has recently shown some interest in this land use. There is a good distribution of spruce sawlogs along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) and significant tourism potential and community interest in developing both resources, although the lack of infrastructure and isolation may present a challenge.

The proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline falls within the Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor and will run the length of this zone from north to south just inside the western boundary. DFN, the Pehdzeh Kî First Nation, and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada recently negotiated extension to the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Infrastructure Corridor through this area. As a result, Zone 34 has been extended to recognize this corridor.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Zone 23: Rabbitskin / Ndulee

Permitted Uses
- Forestry
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
The zone is in two parts, one extending north from the Mackenzie River (Dehcho) buffer up to Edéhzhíe, the other extending south to Conservation Zone 3 as defined by community mapping (Map 42). The zone was created to support forestry and tourism interests, and traditional land use and occupancy, and is named after the two watersheds it encompasses.

Conservation Values
There are a number of important areas for traditional land use and occupancy in this zone and the supply of clean drinking water is essential. The zone includes critical habitat for moose and furbearers, waterfowl and for boreal woodland caribou and wolverine, which are both listed as threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act.

Resource Potential
Agriculture shows little potential in this area. The community is interested in the forestry sector and there are some stands of potential sawlogs. The area may have good opportunities for tourism given the interest of local people and its proximity to scenic lakes, rivers and the Mackenzie Highway. Mineral development potential is low or uncertain in this zone. Drummond characterizes this zone as having remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m$^3$/quarter grid. The proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Infrastructure Corridor runs northwest to southeast through the length of the northern portion of this zone.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
**Zone 24: Grainger / Liard Rivers**

**Permitted Uses**
- Forestry
- Tourism
- Agriculture

**Zone Description and Objectives**
The zone was delineated by community mapping (Map 43). The western boundary follows the edge of the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem and then the buffer around the Tetcela River (Tehts'éliá). The purpose of the zone was to protect the water and critical habitat in areas of important traditional land use and occupancy for the community. There is also community interest in sustainable forestry and tourism operations which maintain resources for future generations. The zone is supported by the existing land withdrawals and the conservation intersect.

**Conservation Values**
Subsistence harvesting is particularly important for Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) and this is reflected in the mapping. The rivers also provide essential clean drinking water in the community and for traditional land use and occupancy. The area is rich in wildlife and includes critical habitat for COSEWIC listed species including woodland caribou, grizzly bears, wolverine and bison. There are also critical areas for sheep, goats, and waterfowl. The Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) has identified parts of this zone as a nesting site for 15% of the Canadian population of trumpeter swans.

**Resource Potential**
The zone has moderate potential for agriculture and there is forestry (sawlogs) potential along the southern part of the zone adjacent to the Liard River (Acho Tine Deh). Tourism potential is moderate to high in many parts of the zone and there is very high potential along the Liard River (Acho Tine Deh) adjacent to the community of Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó). Both Blackstone Territorial Park and Lindberg Landing (a tourism lodge where all canoeists drifting down the South Nahanni River (Nahæâ Dehé) end up) fall within this zone. Drummond estimates the zones remaining recoverable gas potential to be generally <50 million m³ / quarter grid with areas of higher potential (100-500 million m³ / quarter grid) in the south and western portion of the zone. The zone includes areas of high mineral development potential down the centre of the zone with the remainder having low or uncertain potential.

**Specific Conformity Requirements**
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 43. Zone 24 - Grainger / Liard Rivers
Zone 25: Blackstone / Lower Petitot Rivers

Permitted Uses
- Oil & Gas
- Forestry
- Tourism
- Agriculture

Zone Description and Objectives
There are 2 parts to Zone 25 (Map 44); one extends from the northern edge of Zone 26 at 60°40'00" N (and 60°50'00" N in the northeast corner) up to the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem and across to the Sambaa k’e PAS Candidate Protected Area in the east. The other part extends from the eastern edge of Zone 26 (122°30'00" W) across to the Sambaa k’e PAS Candidate Protected Area, from the Arrowhead River (Dene Dahthedaah) in the north down to the Petitot River (Mbehchoólaáh Dehé) on the Alberta Border (60° Parallel). The zone skirts around the proposed oil and gas issuance area illustrated in Zone 26, which extends further east to 122°15'00" W. The communities want to protect critical habitat for a range of species important for traditional land use and occupancy, while allowing sustainable development to proceed.

Conservation Values
The zone includes critical habitat for wolverine and grizzly bears, listed as species of special concern under COSEWIC, and boreal woodland caribou which are considered threatened under COSEWIC. These species are protected by the Species at Risk Act. The area is also important for waterfowl, and the CWS has identified critical nesting habitat for trumpeter swans in the area. The Fort Liard (Echaot'îê Kûé) area is also recognized as having an abundant song bird population. Other important species with critical habitat in the area include goats, moose and bison. The whole area around Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kûé) down to the BC border is full of archaeological sites, a testimony to traditional land use and occupancy in the area. Traditional activities continue to be an important part of community life for residents of Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kûé), Nahanni Butte (Tthenáágó) and Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e). The rivers also provide an important source of drinking water.

Resource Potential
The Liard River Valley includes areas of moderate agricultural potential along the river and the highest density of forestry potential (sawlogs) in the Dehcho territory, reflective of the excellent growing conditions. There is community interest in developing the high tourism potential along the upper Kotanelee River (Kotanelee Deh) and moderate potential in other parts of the zone. Drummond estimates potential of 50-100 to 100-500 million m³ / quarter grid over most of the area, with a few areas with <50 million m³ / quarter grid. The Netlá-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 35) crosses Zones 25. It delineates a study corridor for a proposed pipeline and associated infrastructure in the Netlá-Arrowhead and surrounding area, which would allow for the commercialization of existing discoveries. Mineral development potential is generally low or uncertain although there is moderate-high potential adjacent to the Liard River (Acho Tine Deh).
Specific Conformity Requirements

- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #12: Netlá-Arrowhead Pipeline
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 44. Zone 25 - Blackstone / Lower Petitot Rivers
Zone 26: Liard Range

Permitted Uses

- Oil & Gas
- Forestry
- Tourism
- Agriculture

Zone Description and Objectives
The primary purpose of this Special Management Zone is to promote responsible oil and gas (or other specified resource) activity in an area known to have significant resource potential. Less conservative cumulative effects thresholds have been adopted for this area to ease restrictions on the oil and gas industry, recognizing that this may increase risk for the most sensitive wildlife or land uses. This Special Management Zone can serve as an intensive development experiment (the “adaptive management approach”), and boreal woodland caribou population dynamics should be monitored to document actual response to resource development and the alternative cumulative effects thresholds applied in this area.

In addition to oil and gas, there is interest in the sustainable development of the rich forestry, agricultural and tourism potential of the region, while ensuring that significant ecological and cultural areas are protected through other aspects of the Plan and the existing regulatory system. There is no immediate interest in developing the mineral development potential of the region although this may be accommodated in future revisions. Zone 26 (Map 45) extends north and west of the IMA boundary to 60°40’00” north latitude and west to 122°30’00” west longitude and identifies an area for oil and gas rights issuance extending to 60°50’00” and 122°15’00” in the north east corner.

Oil and Gas Issuance Area
This part of Zone 26 identifies, for illustrative purposes only, a block in the Netlá-Arrowhead area for an immediate “call for nominations” for petroleum rights issuance consistent with the requirements of the Canada Petroleum Resources Act, the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement and the Dehcho First Nations Interim Resource Development Agreement. This area does not imply support or consent for the petroleum rights issuance by the affected First Nations; it only delineates an area for it. Due to the location of this issuance area in an area of overlap between three communities, the Acho Dene Koe Band, Fort Liard Métis Local # 67, Sambaa K’e Dene Band and the Naahdee First Nation must provide written confirmation of their support and be consulted on the terms and conditions for an issuance cycle, before a new cycle is initiated, as per S.41 of the IMA and S.14 of IRDA.

The zone is overlayed by the Netlá-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor.

Conservation Values
In addition to traditional land use and occupancy, the zone includes critical habitat for caribou which are listed as threatened under COSEWIC and wolverine and grizzly bears, which are listed as species of special concern. All are protected by the Species at Risk Act. The area is also important for waterfowl and the Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) has identified parts of this area as critical nesting habitat for trumpeter swans. Critical habitat for sheep and goats extends along the higher ground and the area is important for furbearers, moose and bison. The Fort
Liard (Echaot'îê Kû'ê) area is also recognized as having an abundant song bird population. The whole area around Fort Liard (Echaot'îê Kû'ê) down to the BC border is full of archaeological sites, a testimony to traditional land use and occupancy in the area. Traditional activities continue to be an important part of community life. The rivers provide an important source of drinking water for the community and for traditional land use and occupancy in the area.

Resource Potential
The Liard River Valley contains the only high agricultural potential within the Dehcho territory and the highest density of forestry potential (sawlogs), reflective of the excellent growing conditions existing in this valley. There is also high tourism potential along the Kotaneelee River (Kotaneelee Deh) and moderate potential in other parts of the zone, which the community is interested in developing. The area is rich in natural gas resources. Drummonds analysis estimates between 100-500 million m³ / quarter grid and >500 million m³ quarter grid of remaining recoverable gas. There are numerous significant discovery licences and production licences in the southwest corner of the Dehcho territory including the top producing well, K-29 in Zone 26, which has produced 3.7 billion m³ of gas since 2000^{250}. The Netlâ-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 35) crosses Zones 26. This delineates a study corridor for a proposed pipeline and associated infrastructure in the Netlâ-Arrowhead and surrounding area, which would allow for the commercialization of existing discoveries. Mineral development potential is generally low or uncertain although there are areas of moderate and high potential adjacent to the Liard River (Acho Tîne Deh).

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR#12: Netlâ-Arrowhead Pipeline
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 45. Zone 26 - Liard Range
Zone 27: Trout River

Permitted Uses
- Oil & Gas

Zone Description and Objectives
Zone 27 (Map 46) lies in the middle of the Sambaa K’e PAS Candidate Protected Area. The community recognized the oil and gas potential of the area and felt this would be an appropriate location for carefully planned, long-term, sustainable development carried out in full consultation with the community to protect critical caribou habitat and areas of cultural significance. The zone is delineated by the conservation intersect, existing land withdrawals, and community mapping from both Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) and Fort Simpson (Leodlií Kúé). The zone includes the access corridor to Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e). The community would like access strictly managed to maintain corridor aesthetics and the isolation of the community.

Conservation Values
The area includes critical habitat for boreal woodland caribou, which are considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. The zone also has important habitat for moose and waterfowl. There are two small spiritually significant sites for Sambaa K’e that form part of Zone 5, lying in the middle and southern portion of this zone.

Resource Potential
Research indicates low potential for agriculture and forestry (sawlogs). Tourism potential is restricted to the Trout River (Sambaalíğh). Mineral development potential is low or uncertain throughout the zone. Drummond indicates a mix of remaining recoverable gas potential ranging from <50 million m³ / quarter grid to 100-500 million m³ / quarter grid. The very prospective Slave Point edge cuts across the south eastern half of this zone. The northwest side of it is far less prospective. Further exploration may identify additional resources. The proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Special Infrastructure Corridor crosses the middle of the zone from northwest to southeast.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 46. Zone 27 - Trout River
Zone 28: Jean Marie River - South

Permitted Uses
- Oil and Gas
- Forestry
- Tourism
- Agriculture

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone was delineated by the community to capture forestry potential in the region, to support existing operations in Jean Marie River (Tthets’èhk’èdèlî) and provide opportunities for oil and gas exploration and development (Map 47). The zone extends around the buffers to Deep Lake (Dechį Ná rh) and McGill Lake (Tthets’èhk’è) which are part of the JMR Five Lakes conservation zone. The Conformity Requirements of the Plan and the community’s forestry operational standards are designed to protect the water, critical habitat and traditional land use and occupancy in the area. This is important given the close proximity to JMR 5 Lakes and their importance to the community. The zone is supported by community mapping, the existing land withdrawals and wildlife data.

Conservation Values
The area includes critical habitat for moose and waterfowl. Boreal woodland caribou also use the area and are considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. Flocks of white pelicans have also been observed in the summer months. The community continues to pursue traditional land use and occupancy activities in the area.

Resource Potential
Sustainable forest management practices are employed to protect the conservation values of the region. There is particular interest in the aspen sawlog potential. Further inventories will be required to assess potential. There is no potential for agriculture in the zone. There is moderate potential for tourism along the highway and Jean Marie River (Tthets’èhk’èdèlî) and there is an interest in community based initiatives. There is low or uncertain mineral development potential in this zone. Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential to be in the region of 50-100 million m$^3$ / quarter grid in the west with potential of <50 million m$^3$ / quarter grid to the east. The proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Special Infrastructure Corridor crosses the middle of the zone from southeast to northwest.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 47. Zone 28 - Jean Marie River - South
Zone 29: Jean Marie River - North

Permitted Uses
- Forestry
- Tourism
- Agriculture

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone is meant to support existing community-based forestry and sawmill operations in Jean Marie River (Tthets’èhk’edélî) (Map 48). It was delineated by the community to capture the forestry potential of the region and provide the capacity for community-based development. The Mackenzie River (Dehcho) passes in a north westerly direction through the zone towards the Arctic Ocean. The Plan and the community’s forestry operational standards are designed to protect the water, critical habitat and traditional land use and occupancy in the area. The rivers provide an essential source of drinking water to the community and in support of traditional land use and occupancy. The zone is supported by community mapping, the existing land withdrawals and wildlife data.

Conservation Values
The area includes critical habitat for moose and waterfowl, and boreal woodland caribou which are considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. Flocks of White Pelicans have also been observed in the summer months. The community continues to pursue traditional land use and occupancy activities in the area.

Resource Potential
There are patches of moderate agriculture potential and considerable forestry potential in the area, particularly for aspen sawlogs. Sustainable forest management practices are employed to protect the conservation values of the region. The Mackenzie River (Dehcho) within the zone has very high tourism potential and there is interest from the community in this sector. There is low or uncertain mineral development potential in this zone. Drummond estimates remaining recoverable gas potential to be <50 million m³ / quarter grid across the the zone. The proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Special Infrastructure Corridor crosses from southeast to the northwest of the zone.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 48. Zone 29 - Jean Marie River - North
**Zone 30: Bluefish Creek**

**Permitted Uses**
- Forestry
- Tourism
- Agriculture

**Zone Description and Objectives**
The area was identified to protect a range of community interests including traditional land use and occupancy, local resources, critical habitat for moose and furbearers. There is also an interest in developing forestry related businesses and maintain the aesthetics of the area for tourism. The zone is shown in (Map 49) and was delineated by the existing subsurface land withdrawals and density of traditional land use and occupancy mapping, and connects with Edéhzhie.

**Conservation Values**
The area follows the Upper Mackenzie River (Dehcho) Conservation Zone (Zone 10) to Mills Lake (Tuah), a recognised Migratory bird site. The region provides critical habitat for waterfowl, moose and wood bison, which are listed as threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the *Species at Risk Act*. The area is important for traditional land use and occupancy and it is important sources of clean drinking water are protected.

**Resource Potential**
The zone shows moderate potential for agriculture and the presence of forestry potential (sawlogs). The zone includes moderate potential for tourism. Drummond characterizes this zone as having remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m$^3$ / quarter grid. Mineral development potential is reported to be low or uncertain.

**Specific Conformity Requirements**
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 49. Zone 30 - Bluefish Creek
Zone 31: Birch - Falaise Corridor

Permitted Uses
- Oil & Gas
- Mining
- Forestry
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
Birch - Falaise Corridor extends from the northern IMA boundary adjacent to Birch Lake (K'î Tué) south to the Falaise Lake Wetland Complex (Map 50). The area was delineated by critical habitat for boreal woodland caribou up to the Conservation Zones adjacent to Great Slave Lake (Tucho). The purpose was to protect critical habitat for boreal woodland caribou and waterfowl while allowing for development of mineral potential. The area is recognised as a good area for trapping by local people and supported by community mapping and the critical wildlife areas.

Conservation Values
In addition to the boreal woodland caribou, the zone includes critical habitat for wood bison, which are also listed as threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. The area is important for other species including furbearers, moose and waterfowl. This is an important harvesting and traditional land use and occupancy area for Fort Providence (Zhahti Kúé). The community has identified a particularly important sacred site in this zone which provides water for spiritual purposes. This zone is part of the Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary.

Resource Potential
There is a small area of moderate potential for agriculture in this zone and no forestry (saw log) potential. Research suggests there is moderate tourism potential south of the highway. Dehcho Wilderness Tours provides guiding services for a limited number of wood bison hunting tags for non-residents in this zone. Drummond characterizes this zone as having remaining recoverable gas potential of <50 million m³ / quarter grid. Most of the zone has moderate mineral development potential with some high deposits in the south (Pine Point deposits). These deposits were extracted from Conservation Zones 16 and 17 to provide the opportunity for these deposits to be developed.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 50. Zone 31 - Birch - Falaise Corridor
Zone 32: Lower Big Buffalo

Permitted Uses
- Oil & Gas
- Mining
- Forestry

Zone Description and Objectives
Zone 32 (Map 51) extends from the Alberta border northwards to the Great Slave Lake (Tucho) shoreline, with breaks of conservation where it meets Zone 15. There is interest in developing forestry, oil and gas and mineral potential in this zone if it is managed carefully. The community does not wish to have any new tourism or agricultural development at this time. The zone is named after the Lower Big Buffalo watershed and protecting the water remains a priority for the affected communities. The zone also holds cultural and historical value for the communities.

Conservation Values
The area includes critical habitat for woodland caribou which are considered threatened under COSEWIC and protected by the Species at Risk Act. The wetlands also have particular value for many waterfowl species. Furbearers and larger mammals including moose are found in the area. The community is moving the adjacent zone under the Protected Areas Strategy to protect Buffalo Lake (Ejie Tú) and watershed. If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy prior to Plan review, any areas omitted from the approved protected area boundary would take on the zone designation and Plan requirements applicable to the predominant adjacent zone until the area can be fully addressed during subsequent Plan revisions or amendment.

Resource Potential
Research suggests there is very little potential for agriculture in this zone. There is no documented forestry potential (sawlogs) in the area. There is little immediate interest in tourism and limited potential according to recent studies. Mineral development potential ranges from moderate in the southern portion to high in the north eastern portion, reflecting the deposits around Pine Point. The remaining recoverable gas is estimated by Drummond to be from <50 million m$^3$ / quarter grid to 50-100 million m$^3$ / quarter grid in the southern part of the zone. The remaining recoverable oil is >30,000 m$^3$ in the southern portion of the zone.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 51. Zone 32 - Lower Big Buffalo
Zone 33: Cameron Hills

Permitted Uses
- Oil & Gas
- Mining
- Forestry
- Tourism

Zone Description and Objectives
This zone follows the southern IMA border and the southern boundaries of Zones 5 and 14 across to Zone 25 (Map 52). The Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé) is one of the two key areas of resource development activity in the Dehcho territory. The purpose of this zone is to provide opportunities to continue resource development while minimizing the impacts to critical habitat, particularly for boreal woodland caribou, which are listed as threatened by COSEWIC and protected under the Species at Risk Act. This habitat defines a large part of the zone. The area also has cultural significance for many communities.

Conservation Values
In addition to caribou, the zone contains critical habitat for wolverine and other furbearers such as marten, and larger mammals such as moose. There have been sightings of grizzly bears in the area. Both caribou and grizzly bears are listed as a species of special concern by COSEWIC. The wetlands also have particular value for many waterfowl species.

Resource Potential
Research suggests there is very little potential for agriculture in this zone. There is some good forestry potential (sawlogs), along the side slopes of the escarpment on the east side of Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé). Patterson Sawmills has been operating in the Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé) since the 1970's with an annual harvest of 4000 m$^3$ of white spruce. The mill squares off the sawlogs for export to southern markets. The square milling makes them ideal for further processing into a variety of lumber products and commands a good price. There is low tourism potential. Mineral development potential is also low or uncertain. This zone includes key areas for oil and gas development, with estimates of 100-500 million m$^3$ / quarter grid remaining recoverable gas in the Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé) and the Jean Marie Play in the Trout Lake (Sambaa K’ė) area, surrounded by areas of 50-100 million m$^3$ / quarter grid in surrounding areas$^{251}$. The remaining recoverable oil potential is >30,000 m$^3$ / quarter grid. There are a number of significant discovery licences and production licences in the Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé). The proposed Mackenzie Gas Pipeline runs predominantly north to south through this zone to connect with the transmission system in northern Alberta.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Map 52. Zone 33 - Cameron Hills
5.5 Special Infrastructure Corridors

Special Infrastructure Corridors delineate two study corridors for proposed pipeline projects. The construction and operation of a pipeline is permitted within these corridors, subject to the Plan’s Conformity Requirements, even where the corridors cross Zones where oil and gas operations are not permitted otherwise. All zone requirements and restrictions continue to apply in the corridors except where and to the extent that the Plan states an exception.

Zone 34: Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor

Permitted Uses
- Mackenzie Valley Pipeline

Zone Description and Objectives
The Plan recognizes that applications for a proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline are in progress. The Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 34) delineates a study corridor for the proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline and associated infrastructure. The intent is to constrain pipeline construction to this corridor and provide direction for pipeline construction, operation and reclamation within the Dehcho territory. Should the pipeline and associated infrastructure or an alternative pipeline with similar specifications be approved, CR#1(3) and CR #2 will apply to its development in the Dehcho territory.

The Plan recognizes the need for access and infrastructure outside of the designated corridor. Additional access, gravel resources, camps and essential infrastructure will be managed in accordance with the Conformity Requirements of the Plan (primarily Community Involvement, Transportation Corridors, Granular Resources and Public Infrastructure) and further conditions imposed in the course of regulatory approval.

The zone reflects a combination of existing land withdrawals south of Fort Simpson (Łúdlįį Kúįį) a new corridor recently negotiated by DFN, the Pehdzeh Kï First Nation, and INAC, and the 1 km wide corridor proposed by the applicant. Zone 34 has been amended to reflect the recently negotiated corridor, which extends north of Fort Simpson (Łúdlįį Kúįį) to the boundary with the Sahtú Settlement Area. The withdrawn portions of the corridor south of Fort Simpson ( Łúdlįį Kúįį) varies from 2-5 km, whereas the corridor north of Fort Simpson (Łúdlįį Kúįį) is generally less than 2 km. Zone 34 overlays 0.6% of the Plan Area.

The Special Infrastructure Corridor crosses Zones 1, 3, 4, 5, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29 and 33, with additional infrastructure lying in Zone 2. The applicant for the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline or an alternative pipeline with similar specifications is encouraged to consider the values and intent of the Plan’s underlying zones, and harmonize its activities with the intent of those zones wherever possible.

Conservation Values
The corridor contains critical habitat for boreal woodland caribou and wolverine, which are listed by COSEWIC as threatened and species of special concern respectively, and are protected under the Species at Risk Act. There is also critical habitat for moose and waterfowl within this
zone. The corridor passes through many culturally significant areas with high levels of traditional land use and occupancy.

**Resource Potential**

There are small areas of agricultural potential around Jean Marie River (T'hets'éhk'edélî) and some forestry (sawlog) potential along the corridor west of Jean Marie River (T'hets'éhk'edélî). Tourism potential is restricted to small areas of high potential along the Mackenzie River (Dehcho). The estimated remaining recoverable gas potential is <50 million m³/quarter grid, with the exception of crossing an area of 50-100 million m³/quarter grid potential in the Trout River Zone (Zone 27). Mineral development potential is also low or uncertain within the zone delineation.

**Specific Conformity Requirements**
- CR #2: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline
Map 53. Zone 34 - Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor
Zone 35: Netlá-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor

Permitted Uses
- Netlá-Arrowhead Pipeline

Zone Description and Objectives
The Netlá-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 35) delineates a study corridor for a proposed pipeline and associated infrastructure in the Netlá-Arrowhead and surrounding area, which would allow for the commercialization of existing discoveries (Map 54.) The corridor crosses Zones 25 and 26 and covers 0.2% of the Plan Area. All zone requirements and restrictions continue to apply in the corridor except where and to the extent that the Plan states an exception. The pipeline corridor, additional access, gravel resources, camps and minor infrastructure will be managed in accordance with the Conformity Requirements of the Plan, specifically CR #12, and further conditions imposed in the course of regulatory approval. Due to the location of this corridor in an area of overlap between three communities, the Acho Dene Koe Band, Fort Liard Métis Local 67, the Sambaa K’e Dene Band and the Nahanni Butte Dene Band will work together to maximize benefits, consistent with section 42 of the IMA, from the proposed development.

Conservation Values
The corridor contains critical habitat for boreal woodland caribou and wolverine, which are listed by COSEWIC as threatened and species of special concern respectively, and are protected under the Species at Risk Act. There is also critical habitat for bison, moose, waterfowl and an abundant song bird population within this zone. The corridor passes through many culturally significant areas with high levels of traditional land use and occupancy.

Resource Potential
There are small areas of agricultural potential around the Liard River (Acho Tine Deh) and some forestry (sawlog) potential along the corridor. Tourism potential is restricted to small areas of very high potential along the Liard River (Acho Tine Deh) and high potential to the west. Remaining recoverable gas potential is estimated to be between 100-500 million m³ / quarter grid to 500 million m³ / quarter grid. The zone includes remaining recoverable oil potential of 2-10,000 m³ / quarter grid in the west. The top producing well K-29, which lies in Zone 26, is also within the Netlá-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor.

Mineral development potential is also low or uncertain with strands of high potential to the west of the Liard River (Acho Tine Deh).

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #12: Netlá-Arrowhead Pipeline
Map 54. Zone 35 - Netlá-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor
5.6 General Use Zones

Permitted Uses
- Oil & Gas
- Mining
- Forestry
- Tourism
- Agriculture

Zone Description and Objectives
The areas outside Conservation and Special Management Zones are designated as General Use Zones. These areas are open to all land uses, subject to existing acts and regulations and regulatory approvals. All the Conformity Requirements outlined in the Plan other than those specifically limited to certain zones, apply in these areas.

Conservation Values
All of the General Use Zones possess some conservation values. Traditional land use and occupancy values and critical wildlife habitat for all the species considered are scattered through the General Use Zones, though not in high enough densities to warrant restrictions on land use. Specific values for each zone can be determined by comparing the area in question to other maps found throughout the Plan and Background Report.

Resource Potential
There is agricultural potential between Blackstone River (Ttheht’eah) and Liard River (Acho Tine Deh) and also in parts of the zone around Fort Providence (Zhahtì Kúé) and Hay River (K’át’odehé). There is tourism potential throughout the Dehcho territory. Mineral development potential is high in General Use Zones across the whole western section of the Dehcho territory. Moderate mineral development potential is found in the east adjacent to Zone 17 and low or uncertain potential is found in the central region. The Drummond analysis indicates remaining recoverable gas potential of 50-100 million m$^3$ / quarter grid predominantly in the south east and north and <50 million m$^3$ / quarter grid in General Use Zones in the central and western part of the Dehcho. Remaining recoverable oil potential is between >30,000 m$^3$ / quarter grid and 2-10,000 m$^3$ / quarter grid in the southeast and southern Dehcho.

Specific Conformity Requirements
- CR #11: Feeder Pipelines
- CR #24: Cumulative Effects Management
Chapter 6: Plan Assessment

Feeding the Fire at the Regional Forum on Hay River Reserve (K’át’l’odeeche). Photo Credit: Arthur Boutillier

NOTE: The maps provided in this Background Report are for illustrative purposes only. While the DLUPC uses the best information available at the time of writing, we make no guarantees of completeness or accuracy. The maps may become outdated after print. Interested persons or organizations requiring up to date information should contact the data source for the most current files.
6.1 Introduction

This section provides an assessment of the Plan as defined by our analysis. It demonstrates how the zoning will affect current and future uses, and achieves conservation goals. It reviews the results of the cumulative effects and economic development assessments.

6.2 Comparison to Existing Uses

Map 55 shows the Land Use Zones in relation to the location of existing uses. Past and current development in the Dehcho territory has been concentrated within a few small areas – notably around Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kújé), Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zihé), Pine Point, Cantung Mine and Prairie Creek. Beyond these areas, development or exploration activities have been few and scattered. The Plan recognizes the importance of these development areas to the Dehcho economy and has provided the opportunity for land uses to continue. Sahtú settlement lands also fall within the Dehcho Plan Area. These are fee simple surface lands.

Existing use means any rights, titles, interests, entitlements, licences, permits, authorizations, reservations, reservations by notation, benefits and privileges existing in the Dehcho territory on the day prior to Plan approval. Existing uses are exempt from the Plan, even if a land use permit, lease or other land interest, water licence, commercial fishing licence, big game outfitter licence, or outfitter licence is required. For greater clarity,

- Existing uses include successor rights or land uses arising from existing rights present on the day prior to Plan approval, and includes expansions in area of use that are reasonably necessary to enable the existing use to continue, even if the land uses do not conform to the zoning or other Conformity Requirements of the Plan;
- Renewal of permits, licences and authorizations for existing uses are permitted;
- An existing use ceases to be considered existing if the permits, licences and authorizations expire or lapse, unless a complete application to renew is submitted to the appropriate Responsible Authority within the periods designated in the appropriate legislation for renewals.

Existing uses in the Dehcho territory are encouraged to consider the values and intent of the surrounding zone and use best available technology to minimize impacts wherever possible.
Map 55. Existing Uses
6.3 Land Use Comparisons

This section examines the Plan from the perspective of each land use. Each set of land use maps shows where the potential exists based on the data collected over the last few years. The potential of each land use was taken into consideration during community mapping, subsequent re-zoning and Plan development. Community mapping helped identify where communities supported or non-support each land use. Communities were asked to map their priorities with the understanding that not all of these would be accepted. The final decisions of the Committee, after consideration of all the available information are reflected in the Plan’s Land Use Zones (third map). The second map shows where each use is currently permitted in relation to the existing land withdrawals.

It is important to remember that the final maps reflect a combination of current knowledge, community values, priorities and broader considerations. The Plan will be reviewed every five years to see if revisions are required. No decision made through land use planning is ever final. If the data, community support or other considerations change during this period, those changes will be addressed and reflected in future revisions of the Plan.

6.3.1 Agriculture

Map 56 shows the comparisons for agriculture. The agricultural potential of the Dehcho territory has been digitized along the Upper Mackenzie River (Dehcho), Liard River (Acho Tine Deh) and Hay River (K’át’odehé). There is limited potential outside the mapped areas. Inadequate water drainage, climate and stoniness are major limiting factors and greatly reduce the productivity and range of agricultural products that can be grown.

Agriculture is not permitted on any surface withdrawn lands under the existing land withdrawals but is permitted everywhere outside of this.

Communities in areas of known agriculture potential are generally supportive where there is a history or familiarity with this land use. Communities do not want to see extensive agriculture that would involve vast clearing of land or the use of chemicals. They were supportive of smaller operations that could provide better quality local products (e.g. potato farming) that wouldn’t affect wildlife or traditional land use, occupancy and harvesting activities. Communities outside the agriculture potential belt had little experience with or interest in agriculture.

The Plan provides the opportunity for agriculture in most of the moderate to high areas of potential, where communities expressed support for it. Most agricultural operations at present tend to be small and community based, so are not affected by the Plan. Should there be significant interest in pursuing larger operations outside of communities in the future, this can be revisited during Plan review.
Map 56. Agricultural Potential, Existing Land Withdrawals and Plan Land Use Zoning
Map 57. Forestry Potential, Existing Land Withdrawals and Plan Land Use Zoning
6.3.2 Forestry

Map 57 shows the comparisons for forestry. The forestry potential map shows the location of possible white spruce (*Picea glauca* (Moench) Voss), jackpine (*Pinus banksiana* Lamb.), and aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx) sawlogs within inventoried areas of the Dehcho territory. The best timber is in the Liard Valley with some good saw log stands in the Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé). The remaining potential is scattered along the Mackenzie Valley. While there may be additional potential outside inventoried areas, there is insufficient data to conclude this.

Commercial timber harvesting is restricted on lands with existing surface and subsurface withdrawals. Subsurface only withdrawals were used to allow harvesting of productive stands on lands otherwise critical for protection. The remainder of the Dehcho territory is open to forestry though there is limited potential.

Communities are generally supportive of forestry operations in the Dehcho territory within a limited definition. Due to environmental sensitivity, operations need to be conducted in the winter when frozen ground minimizes environmental impacts. Communities are supportive of selective harvesting, but not clear-cut operations. Outside the timber productive areas, there is little interest or support for commercial operations, though communities will continue to use available timber for traditional and domestic purposes.

The Plan has left the productive timber areas open for forestry. Some Special Management Zones were expressly developed to support community-based forestry operations. These include Fort Providence (Zhahtì Kùję) (Zone 30), Jean Marie River (Tthets'ék'ëdél)' (Zone 28, 29), Nahanni Butte (Tthenâágó) (Zone 24) and Wrigley (Pehdzeh Kì) (Zone 22). Areas identified by communities for conservation were closed to forestry operations.
6.3.3 Mining

Map 58 shows the comparisons for mining. The mineral development potential map reflects the known potential of the Dehcho territory. It is important to emphasise that to date, there has been little exploration in the Dehcho territory on which to base concrete conclusions, so there is lower confidence in the overall accuracy of potential mapping by industry and government representatives. The Committee contracted the C.S. Lord Northern Geoscience Centre\textsuperscript{253} to evaluate mineral potential for the Dehcho territory based primarily on publically available information on geology and mineral showings\textsuperscript{254}. New discoveries could drastically change what is known about the potential of this region. Current mapping shows the greatest potential for minerals in the western tip of the Dehcho territory, extending into the Yukon Territory.

Mining is not permitted on existing land withdrawals but are permitted on other lands within the Dehcho territory, subject to existing laws and regulatory approval.

Communities have expressed considerable concern about the mining industry through our consultations, due in part to the legacy of past mining practices. They are concerned about the possible contamination of the environment, especially the water and wildlife on which they depend. Only Hay River Reserve (K’átt’odeeeche) supported mining outside of areas they wished to have protected, although there had been some initial interest from Fort Liard (Echaot’íle Kúé).

The Plan restricts mining in all conservation areas and nine of the Special Management Zones. The area of highest potential in the western tip of the Dehcho territory is included in a Conservation Zone due to overwhelming community direction and support from several other organizations to protect the entire South Nahanni watershed. However, existing uses will be allowed to continue, including successor rights or land uses arising from existing rights present on the day prior to Plan approval. The Nahanni Expansion Process is undertaking detailed Mineral, Energy and Resource Assessments (MERAs) to better identify the resource potential of the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem. This data will be considered during the park expansion process and may affect the final boundaries of Nahanni National Park. Future Plan amendments will reflect the outcome of this process. Areas of high potential in the north, northwest and around Great Slave Lake (Tucho) allow for exploration and development of mineral resources.
Map 58. Mineral Development Potential, Existing Land Withdrawals and Plan Land Use Zoning
Map 59. Oil and Gas Potential, Existing Land Withdrawals and Plan Land Use Zoning
6.3.4 Oil and Gas

Map 59 shows the comparisons for oil and gas. The oil and gas potential reflects the updated research completed by Ken Drummond in 2004\textsuperscript{255} on oil and gas field size distributions. The highest geological potential is in the southwest corner of the Dehcho territory. There is also high potential in the Cameron Hills (Nagáh Zhíhé) and Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) areas. It should be noted that high potential areas only become recognized as such through exploration, which is an important consideration given the huge investment required at an early stage of development. During consultations, participants asked that the economic risks associated with Northern exploration be considered in the analysis. Economic risks include the lack of existing infrastructure and limited geological assessments that can increase development costs and decrease revenues considerably.

Oil and gas activity is not permitted on existing land withdrawals but is permitted on other lands within the Dehcho territory, subject to existing laws and regulatory approval.

Communities recognize the economic benefits that can come from oil and gas and are aware of the areas where operations have focused to date. They wish to see operations continue in those areas, while restricting new development in areas that are important to them for cultural or ecological reasons. Communities are generally supportive of oil and gas development in most of the high potential areas.

The Plan recognizes the economic importance of oil and gas resources in the Dehcho territory. Industry was invited to assist in identifying high value areas to leave open for this land use, subject to the Conformity Requirements of the Plan and existing regulatory requirements. Ken Drummond also produced a detailed report of “Oil and Gas Field Size Distribution of the Dehcho territory” to estimate the volume and distribution of oil and gas using industry accepted modeling techniques\textsuperscript{256}. It should be noted that the report provides estimates not certainties and as mentioned earlier further exploration is required to confirm high potential areas. It is estimated that around 81\% (129.4 billion m\textsuperscript{3}) of the 147 billion m\textsuperscript{3} of remaining recoverable gas remains to be discovered in the region. Around 136.8 billion m\textsuperscript{3} of this remaining recoverable gas lies within the Dehcho Plan Area excluding Edézhíie PAS Zone and more than 64\% (87.8 billion m\textsuperscript{3}) of this is within the General Use and Special Management Zones where oil and gas is permitted. Another 49 billion m\textsuperscript{3} (36\%) of the remaining recoverable gas is currently not open for development within Conservation and Special Management Zones. Estimate remaining recoverable gas reserves is provided in Table 14 for each zone.

While most of the southern Dehcho territory is in a Special Management Zone to protect sensitive wildlife species, oil and gas exploration and development is permitted. Resource potential illustrated in Map 59 is not evenly distributed between zones, which could have implications for this land use. For example there are high concentrations of remaining recoverable gas around the community of Fort Liard (Echaot’îê Kújé). Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e) is currently trying to advance a large area for permanent protection under the PAS, so restricted support for oil and gas development to lands outside the Sambaa K’e PAS Candidate Protected Area and to a portion of land in the northeast of their traditional area.

The Acho Dene Koe Band has expressed an interest in seeing a pipeline developed in the Nettlá-Arrowhead area, which is required to move a number of existing gas discoveries into production. The Plan delineates a study corridor for this pipeline as defined in Zone 35. Zone
26 also identifies for illustrative purposes a block in the Netlá-Arrowhead area for an immediate "call for nominations" for petroleum rights issuance consistent with the requirements of the Canada Petroleum Resources Act, the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement and the Dehcho First Nations Interim Resource Development Agreement.

The Plan recognizes that applications for a proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline are in progress and provides direction for pipeline construction, operation and reclamation within the Dehcho territory. The Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 34) delineates a study corridor for the proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline and associated infrastructure.

Of special note is S. 43 of the IMA, where Canada and DFN agreed to identify areas where non-exclusive geophysical operations would be restricted. These areas are shown in the Plan in Map 2.

**6.3.5 Tourism**

Map 60 shows the land use comparison for tourism. Tourism potential in the Dehcho territory tends to be concentrated around communities, water and mountains as these provide access to services and incredible scenic areas. Big attractions in the Dehcho territory include the South Nahanni (Nahază Dehé), North Nahanni (Mehzê Deh), Mackenzie (Dehcho) and Liard Rivers (Acho Tine Deh), as well as Great Slave Lake (Tucho), Trout Lake (Sambaa K’e), Cli Lake (Tuẖth’į), Little Doctor Lake (Tuehgåh), and Kakisa Lake (K’ágée Tu). While tourism is not yet well developed in the Dehcho territory, most agree there is considerable potential in the region.

Tourism is not permitted on existing surface land withdrawals but is permitted on other lands within the Dehcho territory, subject to existing laws and regulatory approval.

There is strong support from communities for tourism businesses as this is an area they can more easily participate in. Communities are interested in and supportive of cultural tourism or ecotourism type businesses that are respectful of the local community and culture and provide opportunities for local involvement and benefits. Communities felt some areas should be off limits to tourists as well and maintained strictly for community traditional land use, occupancy and harvesting.

Under the Land Use Zones, tourism is permitted in most parts of the Dehcho territory except some areas identified by communities for exclusive community use. Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations are included in the Plan to guide appropriate tourism development for the region.
Map 60. Tourism Potential, Existing Land Withdrawals and Plan Land Use Zoning
6.4 Comparison of Land Use Zones to the Conservation Intersect

In Chapter 4, the Background Report describes the conservation intersect – where both wildlife and traditional land use and occupancy values overlap, as the basis for the Conservation Zones. However, later steps in the planning process allowed for parts of the Intersect to become Special Management Zones to address community issues and allow for development of high potential areas. It also allowed for areas of exceptional community importance to be designated as Conservation Zones. (Map 61) shows the conservation intersect in relation to the Land Use Zones. Almost 20% of the original conservation intersect (or 4% of the Dehcho Plan Area) was converted to Special Management or General Use Zones to allow for development of high potential areas.

On the other hand, Conservation Zones expanded beyond the original intersect from 20% to 38.1% of the Dehcho Plan Area. They encompass the current boundaries of PAS Areas of Interest and the Nahanni Expansion Area but do not include Edéhzhie which covers a further 12% of the Plan Area. There were also a number of smaller areas where communities delineated Conservation Zones based on more detailed but confidential traditional land use and occupancy information that is not part of the Committee’s datasets. This is most evident in the northwest corner. There is a long history of use along the river valleys as hunting and travel routes but this is not reflected in the summary of traditional land use and occupancy data as shown in Map 2. Hence, the Conservation Zones still meet the criteria of having both ecological and cultural significance but it is not captured in the publicly available data.

The level of conservation reflects both the high value the Dehcho communities place on protecting the land and maintaining traditional land use and occupancy, and also their commitment to long-term stewardship. It is consistent with the guiding principles of “respect for the land as understood and explained by the Dehcho Elders, and sustainable development”, as described in S. 4 of the IMA. It is also consistent with DIAND’s Sustainable Development Strategy 2004-2006 which quotes the Great Law of the Iroquois Confederacy: “In our every deliberation we must consider the impact of our decisions on the next seven generations”.

The Dehcho people approach development cautiously, recognizing that once decisions are made to open lands to development and rights are disposed of, the decision becomes irreversible - those rights and dispositions may always exist. If the area were to be protected later, it would have to recognize those existing rights and dispositions and allow them to continue, even if it compromised the values to be protected. On the other hand, lands conserved today may still be opened to development tomorrow. The conservation-first approach is reversible when the time is right, while the development-first approach is not.

Given the uncertainty in the Dehcho Process – that issues such as revenue-sharing, decision-making authority and self-governance are still being negotiated, it is wise to conserve important lands until such decisions have been made. Once the Dehcho Final Agreement is signed and there is more certainty around these important issues, the Plan will be revised to reflect the Final Agreement, and the Dehcho residents and other planning partners will have the opportunity to revisit zoning to determine if changes are warranted. In the intervening time, sustainable development can occur in the remaining 49.9% of the region, in cooperation with communities, to provide them with new, positive experiences which may foster more interest in future development.
Map 61. Comparison of the Land Use Zones to the Conservation Intersect
6.5 Ecological Representation Analysis

It is a stated goal of the PAS “to protect core representative areas within each ecoregion”. The Plan complements PAS efforts to establish protected areas through Conservation Zones so it is important to demonstrate how the Plan contributes to the representation goals. World Wildlife Fund-Canada has developed an automated routine that assesses areas (for example, proposed Conservation Zones or proposed protected areas) to determine how well they represent ecological features. There are a number of approaches available to assess ecological representation. The NWT PAS Secretariat is currently assessing various programs for this purpose. The WWF-Canada analysis assesses both ecoregions, and enduring features – physical habitat or landscape components defined by climate, topography, soil texture and surficial deposits. Enduring features provide a more detailed level of assessment. The ecoregion level assessment was also run to provide an indication of how well the Plan meets PAS goals to adequately represent ecoregions within protected areas.

For a coarse-scale gap analysis WWF-Canada determined that the following criteria should be used to assess representation:

- Protected Area Size and Adjacency;
- Environmental Gradients (elevation ranges);
- Important Community Types (e.g. Shoreline); and
- Habitat Quality.

The focus is on protected area size guidelines, environmental variation and connectivity. Protected area size guidelines are developed based on spatial scales of ecological processes and/or faunal requirements. Representation of community variation along environmental gradients (e.g. high and low elevation areas) is considered for the protected areas network intersecting each enduring feature or landform type. Design principles regarding connectivity of a core reserve network are also incorporated into the assessment.

The representation criteria, decision rules and thresholds for enduring features in the automated gap analysis tool are provided in Appendix 8. Protected area size and adjacency is the most important criteria, worth 5 of 8 points in the analysis. Each of the other criteria is only worth 1 point. Scores are identified for each criterion then added to provide an overall indicator of representation. The possible levels of representation are:

- Little or none,
- Partially represented,
- Moderately represented, and
- Adequately represented.

Map 62 and Map 63 show the degree to which Conservation Zones represent ecoregions and enduring features present within the Dehcho territory. Most of the enduring features present are adequately represented by the Plan’s Conservation Zones. The level of representation drops for ecoregions. This is because ecoregions are larger than enduring features and many extend beyond the Dehcho territory into other settlement regions.

The results of ecoregion representation are shown in Table 15. The Nahanni Plateau, Horn Plateau (Edéhzhíe) and Hyland Highland are adequately represented by the Plan’s Conservation Zones. Four other ecoregions are moderately represented, five have partial representation and one has little to no representation. The ecoregions with partial or little representation are those where most of the ecoregion falls outside the Dehcho territory.
Map 62. Ecological Representation of Ecoregions

Map 63. Ecological Representation of Enduring Features
Table 15. Level of Ecoregion Representation within the Dehcho territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecoregion Name</th>
<th>Level of Representation</th>
<th>% of Ecoregion within the Dehcho territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibbeston Lake Plain</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahanni Plateau</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Alberta Uplands</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn Plateau</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyland Highland</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay River Lowland</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Mountains</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn Mountains</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel River Plateau</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Slave Lake Plain</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Range</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie River Plain</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Lake Plain</td>
<td>Little or None</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Cumulative Effects Assessment

Cumulative effects are a growing concern across Canada. Most governments now have a responsibility to consider cumulative effects before approving land uses under their jurisdiction and are in various stages of developing processes to manage them. The Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act (MVRMA), under S.146. states "The Responsible Authority shall, subject to the regulations, analyze data collected by it, scientific data, traditional knowledge and other pertinent information for the purpose of monitoring the cumulative impact on the environment of concurrent and sequential uses of land and water and deposits of waste in the Mackenzie Valley". Land uses need to be reviewed in the context of the larger effects on the ecosystem, in terms of how they contribute to habitat loss, fragmentation and disruption.

The Plan includes four cumulative effects indicators and thresholds. The Conformity Requirement requires Responsible Authorities to consider the proposed thresholds to manage cumulative effects in General Use and Special Management Zones. The Conformity Requirement does not apply in Conservation Zones as only tourism is permitted in these zones. Due to the planned intensity of oil and gas operations in the Fort Liard (Echaot’iê Kûgé) area, a less restrictive set of indicators and thresholds has been proposed for Zone 26. The thresholds do not apply to activities that do not trigger an application under the Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations or to existing uses, that is, existing uses and activities within the Special Infrastructure Corridor’s will not be subject to the thresholds, but they will add to the level of disturbance and will be included in cumulative effects assessments of future land uses within the area. Boreal woodland caribou and grizzly bears, as the most sensitive terrestrial species, are the primary focus for establishing and implementing thresholds.

The guidelines for cumulative effects indicators and thresholds are described in Chapter 2 of the Plan and further background information is provided in Chapter 4 of the Background Report. This section outlines the current level of cumulative effects in the Dehcho territory as per the Conformity Requirement, based on the best available data.

6.6.1 Current Level of Disturbance

A database of human disturbance is required to determine the current level of cumulative effects in relation to the thresholds. Existing human disturbance has been digitized from 5 metre resolution IRS satellite imagery. Anything visible when viewed at a scale of 1:10,000 and compared to 1:50,000 NTS mapsheets was captured in the dataset. This includes roads, trails, seismic lines, cutblocks, utility corridors, communities, airstrips, wellsites and anything else visible in the imagery using the described parameters. The current level of disturbance within the Dehcho territory is shown in (Map 64). This map forms the basis of cumulative effects analysis for each of the four Indicators.

6.6.2 Corridor / Road Density

Map 65 shows the areas which have exceeded the critical threshold for corridor density for boreal woodland caribou in the Dehcho territory. The threshold is 1.8 km/km² within Special Management Zones and General Use Zones. It is calculated using oil and gas¼ grids. Parts of the Cameron Hills (Nágáh Zhíhé) and Fort Liard (Echaot’iê Kûgé) development areas have already exceeded the critical thresholds proposed. The same is true for the area east of Hay
River (K’átť’odehé) and south of Great Slave Lake (Tucho) around the Pine Point Mine site. Outside these areas, most of the Dehcho territory falls below the threshold.

Map 66 shows the areas which have exceeded the critical threshold for road density for grizzly bears in the Dehcho territory. The threshold is 0.6 km/km² within Special Management Zones and General Use Zones. It is calculated using oil and gas ¼ grids. Current road densities fall below the threshold in all areas where this threshold applies.

Once the thresholds have been reached, applicants may be required to:

- Employ technologies or mitigation methods that do not lead to an increase in cumulative effects. This may include re-using existing disturbed areas or employing minimal impact seismic, or to a lesser extent, low impact seismic (as defined by the MVEIRB\textsuperscript{259} and in the front of this document) wherever possible to ensure new disturbance does not trigger a land use permit application used to assess cumulative effects);
- With the approval of Responsible Authorities, reclaim other lands of similar ecological value, equivalent to the amount of land to be disturbed by their proposal such that the threshold will not be exceeded by the proposed land use activity; or
- Submit new, more detailed or updated data/studies (e.g. a cutline regeneration survey) demonstrating that the overall level of disturbance, including the proposed land use activity is below the thresholds.
Map 64. Current Level of Disturbance
Map 65. Corridor Density Analysis
Map 66. Road Density Analysis
6.6.3 Minimum Core Area

Map 67 rolls up minimum patch size data to show the distribution of disturbance, non-core, medium core (minimum size for caribou) and large core areas (minimum size required for grizzly bears) for the Dehcho territory in relation to the Land Use Zones. Conservation Zones are “whited out” as they are not considered in this analysis. The threshold for Special Management Zones and General Use Zones is to maintain greater than 65% of the zone in core areas.

Table 16 shows how much land falls into core areas for each Special Management Zone and General Use Zones. Currently, only one Special Management Zone - Blackstone / Lower Petitot Rivers exceeds the threshold for grizzly bears. None of the zones exceeds the thresholds for caribou. Land use within the General Use Zone currently falls well below the critical threshold. The Special Infrastructure Corridor is exempt from this Conformity Requirement as are existing uses.

Table 16. Assessment of Zones Relative to Woodland Caribou and Grizzly Bear Core Area Thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Zone Name</th>
<th>Disturbance</th>
<th>Non Core &lt; 515 Ha</th>
<th>Core Caribou (&gt;515 Ha)</th>
<th>Core Grizzly Bear (&gt;1000 Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peel River Plateau</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Southeastern Mackenzie Mountains</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Franklin Mountains</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rabbitskin / Ndulee</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Grainger / Liard Rivers</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Blackstone / Lower Petitot Rivers</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Liard Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exempt from this threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Trout River</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jean Marie River - South</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jean Marie River - North</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bluefish Creek</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Birch - Falaise Corridor</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lower Big Buffalo</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cameron Hills</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exempt from this threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Netlá / Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Use Zone</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.4 Stream Crossing Density

Map 68 shows stream crossing density as calculated using oil and gas ¼ grids. The critical threshold is set at 0.5 crossings / km² for Special Management Zones and General Use Zones. The threshold has only been exceeded in one ¼ grid near Fisherman Lake (The Dehee).
Map 67. Core Area Analysis
Map 68. Stream Crossing Density Analysis
6.6.5 Habitat Availability

Habitat availability has been calculated in Table 17 for each Special Management Zone and General Use Zones. The threshold is less than 10% habitat loss for each zone. There has been very little disturbance to date, as determined by the actual footprint (not buffered). Less than 1% of each zone has been disturbed by land use activities.

Table 17. Habitat Availability within the Dehcho territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Zone Name</th>
<th>IRS Disturbance (Ha)</th>
<th>% Loss of Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peel River Plateau</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Southeastern Mackenzie Mountains</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Franklin Mountains</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rabbitskin / Ndulee</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Grainger / Liard Rivers</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Blackstone / Lower Petitot Rivers</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Liard Range</td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Trout River</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jean Marie River - South</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jean Marie River - North</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bluefish Creek</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Birch - Falaise Corridor</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lower Big Buffalo</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cameron Hills</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mackenzie Valley Special Infrastructure Corridor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Netlá / Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Use Zone</td>
<td>7,187</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.6 Conclusions

Despite a low level of disturbance overall, the areas where land use activities have been concentrated are already exceeding the critical thresholds in places. If caribou and other species of concern are to continue to exist in such areas, special measures will be required to ensure overall impacts are minimized. Cumulative effects assessment contributes to this goal by monitoring and assessing the impacts each new proposal would have on the area. As critical thresholds are approached, this Conformity Requirement will promote the use of best practices to maximize the level of land use activity while maintaining overall impacts below acceptable levels. Continuous monitoring will provide timely information about the cumulative effects of planned land use activities so that informed decisions can be made for the sustainable development of the Dehcho territory.
6.7 Economic Development Assessment

The Economic Development Assessment Model (EDA Model) is described in Chapter 4. It is used to assess the costs and benefits of different planning options. These results compare the Plan’s zoning (“Plan”), the existing land withdrawals (“Existing”) and the full development scenario over a 20-year period from 2005-2025. The results capture the possible impacts of the land use planning decisions within the Dehcho Plan Area associated with each scenario. All calculations exclude Nahanni National Park Reserve, areas within community boundaries, Edéhzhíe PAS Zone and the Special Infrastructure Corridors to avoid counting potential in areas not managed by the Plan or double counting areas within Special Infrastructure Corridor’s which overlay other Land Use Zones.

In all scenarios resource development will continue to drive the Dehcho economy and be an important source of revenue for self government. However, only a fraction of the “available” potential is likely to be “developed” over the period. Production levels equivalent to the full development scenario could easily be supported by the potential zoned as available in the Plan zoning. Nonetheless, development will increase the demand for skilled labour, which is not readily available in the region. This is an important consideration. The model assumes local participation will increase as education becomes more of a priority. But there will always be a balance between increasing development and the influx of southern labour to meet the demand. The model predicts the population will grow by 35% under the Plan’s zoning compared to over 48% for the full development scenario.

6.7.1 Detailed Results

The full development scenario illustrates the maximum level of development expected in the region over the period. All the potential is zoned as available and the potential developed in each sector is determined by assumptions outlined in Chapter 4 and previous reports.

In the Plan and existing land withdrawals scenario the potential developed is related to the potential falling within permitted zones and available. For tourism and mining the potential reflects actual sites or deposits (except hypothetical mines illustrating wider potential). More potential falls within permitted use zones and may be developed in the Plan’s zoning compared to the existing land withdrawals. For natural gas, forestry and agriculture, the potential developed is proportional to the area or volume available. In this instance, the model may underestimate the potential developed in the Plan’s zoning and overestimate what might be expected under the “existing land withdrawals” because the Plan’s zoning is more closely related to areas of high potential.

From a regional perspective the available potential or opportunities in all scenarios, far exceeds the maximum which could realistically be developed over the period. This is reflected in Table 18 and Figure 9, Figure 10, and Figure 11, showing developed and available potential for agriculture, forestry and natural gas for the 20 year period. Even if all areas were open to development, only a small fraction of available resources would actually be developed. The amount of resources available for development through the Land Use Zoning far exceeds realistic development scenarios, allowing many opportunities for sustainable growth and development in all sectors.
Table 18. Potential Available and Developed in Scenarios Over 20 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Full Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>805,088 ha</td>
<td>898,575 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>54,547 ha</td>
<td>63,219 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>436,502 ha</td>
<td>451,627 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>13,507 ha</td>
<td>13,970 ha -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>854,460 m³</td>
<td>904,623 m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>63.2 Billion m³</td>
<td>59.9 Billion m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>10.7 Billion m³</td>
<td>9.9 Billion m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>36 Production wells</td>
<td>33 Production wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>199 Exploration wells</td>
<td>177 Exploration wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Cantung, Prairie Creek, Coates Lake</td>
<td>Cantung, Prairie Creek, Coates Lake, Pine Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>73 sites</td>
<td>145 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>43 sites</td>
<td>93 sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Agriculture - Developed and Available Potential Over 20 Years
The existing land withdrawals scenario reflects the situation if the existing land withdrawals were kept in place over the next 20 years. Similarly, the Plan scenario forecasts the results of the alternative zoning for the period. Neither of these appears to reflect what is happening on the ground and a significant increase in development will be required to achieve projected production levels. Many factors determine the actual level of development - the amount of infrastructure available, market values, changes in regulations, environmental issues, etc.

Political uncertainty over self-government, resource revenue and land jurisdiction is currently a major impediment to development in the region. Through the Dehcho Process negotiations, many of these issues will be addressed. The existing land withdrawals were established as an Interim Measure until negotiations are complete. Once the parties approve and implement the Plan, it will improve certainty for communities and applicants alike and encourage development.

By comparing the scenarios we can observe a number of general trends. Model output increases with the level of development. For example Figure 12 and Figure 13 illustrate that the gross expenditure and gross domestic product is greatest in the full development scenario which has the highest level of development compared to the other scenarios. Similar trends are observed for employment, labour income, tax revenues and population growth. A high proportion of gross expenditure (81%), gross domestic product (91%), employment (79%) and labour income (75%), can also be attributed directly to development activities in each scenario.

**Figure 12. Dehcho Gross Expenditure Over 20 Years**
The increasing performance of the economy over the period can largely be attributed to non-renewable resource development activities, particularly mining and oil & gas. These sectors involve large capital expenditures and create employment. However, a number of factors were considered in arriving at the Plan to ensure appropriate zoning and benefits to the region.

Table 19 provides the approximate value of resources currently in “permitted” and in “not permitted” zones in the Plan. These estimates assume all the resource potential is fully developed over the 20 year period and uses present day values. This should not be confused with the scenarios developed for the EDA model where the full development scenario illustrates realistic development levels expected in the region over the period.

Agriculture and forestry are renewable resources. Table 19 indicates that around 69% of the total agricultural potential (1,298,190 ha) falls within “permitted” zones in the Plan. If this was all developed it would be equivalent to $1.8 billion per year. The majority of agricultural potential is classed as medium potential. The model scenarios assume only 10% of the medium and high agricultural potential would realistically be developed every year for the first 20 years of the Plan. Harvesting is not permitted in only 4% of Aspen and 16% of spruce potential saw log stands. If this was developed with a 70 and 120 year rotation for aspen and spruce the annual harvest would be valued at $2.3 million. In the Plan virtually all the zones permit tourism and only four potential tourism sites fall outside permitted zones.
Table 19. Comparison of Value of Resource Potential Falling into “Permitted” and “Not Permitted” Zones in the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>$ / Unit</th>
<th>Ha (Million m$^3$)</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Million $ per year</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Value Million $ per year</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>447,830</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7747</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>818,480</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40449</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>31,880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,298,190</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,348</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>174,424</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>339,298</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2174.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>513,722</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2261.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas &gt; 50 million m$^3$ per quarter grid</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94,968</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23742</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas &lt; 50 million m$^3$ per quarter grid</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,789</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10447</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &gt; 0 million m$^3$ per quarter grid</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136,765</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34191</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumptive</td>
<td>427,260</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotourism</td>
<td>350,288</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Adventure</td>
<td>50,731</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Adventure</td>
<td>165,173</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantung</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Creek</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates Lake</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Mine</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem Mine</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Mine</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6247</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non renewable resources include oil and gas and mining. The Drummond report estimates that 69.4% of natural gas potential, equivalent to 95 billion m$^3$ of the 137 billion m$^3$ within the Plan Area (excluding Edéhzhie PAS Zone), is found in grid squares > 50 million m$^3$ per quarter grid. The Plan permits development of 63 billion m$^3$ or 66.2% of these reserves. Gas potential > 50 million m$^3$ per quarter grid and falling outside permitted zones is valued at $8.0 billion. Although the report indicates additional oil and gas potential in non permitted zones, it is estimated to be at generally low volumes. It should be noted that the Drummond report provides probabilistic distribution estimates not certainties. High potential areas only become recognized as such through exploration and an estimated 81% of the remaining recoverable gas remains to be discovered. Some Conservation Zones could potentially be rezoned during future Plan amendments, making these volumes available for development if increasing infrastructure and technology makes smaller deposits economical. Exploration activity leading to exploratory drilling is also plausible in areas adjoining the proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline in the northern Dehcho although this is not addressed in the model.

Mining is permitted in around 35.7% of the Dehcho territory, but determining which areas of potential will translate into a mine is not possible. The Plan zoning provides development opportunities for each sector. Every five years there will be an opportunity to review the zoning and new development opportunities may be made available. Both the Protected Areas Strategy and Nahanni Park Expansion Process require resource assessments (NRA and MERA) which may provide additional information for future revisions. The various resource assessments are considering not only mineral reserves (proven occurrence), but geological potential and favourability for the occurrence of mineralization and mineral deposits.

Currently unemployment is estimated to be 20.7% of the whole Dehcho territory. This translates into approximately 1,035 people unemployed and wanting a job from a labour force of 5,006 people. There is a heavy reliance on the government sector for jobs, particularly in smaller communities. The major source of revenue for the region is federal transfer payments and other external funding sources.

The Dehcho territory faces a number of challenges as the region moves towards a wage-based economy. Increasing development will place significant demands on skilled labour and services in the region. This demand could easily absorb the supply of local people looking for this type of work with the necessary skills. This is illustrated in Figure 14 - Direct Employment for the Plan zoning, which indicates a significant number of southern workers would be required to support the anticipated level of development. This is particularly noticeable with larger short term projects such as the Mackenzie Gas Project in the early years. This trend is observed in all scenarios as indicated in Figure 15.
With sustained labour demand the model predicts the population would increase by 30%, 35% and 48% under the existing land withdrawals, Plan and full development scenarios (Figure 16).
Again this increase would be largely from southern workers taking up residency in the region with their families, rather than natural increases. This is supported by projected birth and death rates in Figure 17. The population will eventually decline without in-migration of new residents.

Although the local labour force will not grow significantly, there will be opportunities for local people to move into higher paid jobs. Figure 18 - Impact on Labour Income, illustrates how jobs related to development generate the most income in the region. However, development also drives in-migration to meet specific labour demands. There will always be a balance between development generating new jobs and increased labour income, and the in-migration of skilled labour to meet the demand. Education must become a priority if local people are to secure high skilled jobs with higher incomes and benefit from development. In this respect the model assumes an increasing participation rate (effectively a training factor) over the period. Indeed many large developments offer training opportunities for local community members. However, this is often organized on a project by project or piecemeal basis with little regard for the overall strategic plan for the region, employment interests of local residents or long term success.

Many local community members retain strong cultural values and family ties. Small community size means there is a challenge in matching skill levels and training with appropriate jobs in the same spot. This is reflected in Figure 19 which shows that under the Plan’s zoning there would always be some unemployed. Furthermore Figure 20 illustrates that more development, for example in the full development scenario would not necessarily reduce or eliminate the aboriginal unemployment rate over the period. Often people must choose whether to stay in their home community and be unemployed (or employed in different jobs), or move away to find a job to match their training interests and skills. Providing local jobs and training appropriate to local peoples interests and skills must be a priority if unemployment rates are to decrease.
Figure 17. Dehcho Projected Birth and Death Rates Over 20 Years

Figure 18. Impact on Dehcho Labour Income Over 20 Years
Figure 19. Dehcho Employed and Unemployed – Plan Over 20 Years

Figure 20. Dehcho Unemployment - All Scenarios Over 20 Years
This presents many challenges particularly in developing isolated mineral deposits. In the past mine town sites were developed to accommodate miners and their families. Nowadays, fly-in, fly-out operations are favoured to at least cushion the impact when large projects come and go. However, Figure 20 indicates that in all scenarios unemployment fluctuates significantly during the period, which is largely related to the size of individual developments in the mining and oil and gas sectors and the relatively short term nature of local participation.

TD Bank Financial Group (2003)\textsuperscript{261} suggests a heavy reliance on non-renewable resources is risky and stresses the importance of diversifying into other industries such as tourism. This is something that communities strongly supported and is reflected in the Plan’s zoning. It will also be important to diversify into secondary industries to build local capacity, add value, increase revenue, local jobs and reduce vulnerability to the price for raw materials. An example of where this is already in practice is in the forestry sector with JMR Log Homes and Patterson Sawmills. The model indicates that without adding value through secondary processing into log homes or squaring off logs to haul south neither operation would be viable.

As mentioned earlier, non-renewable resources will play a major role in driving the economy over the period. Although the total gross domestic product over 20 years, from the existing land withdrawals ($8.6 billion) and Plan’s zoning ($9.2 billion) are both below that of the full development scenario ($13.3 billion) both remain heavily reliant on development in the mining and oil and gas sector. In addition to providing opportunities for development to go ahead, the priority should be to maximize benefits to local communities. Education will be a major priority. As the region moves away from dependence on transfer payments and external funding sources it will be important to ensure a larger portion of total revenue (Figure 21) remains in the north to support the infrastructure and services upon which sustainable development depends.

Figure 21. Impact on Revenue - Scenarios Over 20 Years
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Appendix 1. History and Milestones of Land Use Planning in the Dehcho Territory

Land Use Planning has a long history in the Dehcho territory. Previous mapping projects included the Dene Nation - Dene Mapping Project (1974-1983) and an initiative funded through the Northern Land Use Planning Program (1990-91). Unfortunately, neither of these proved legally defensible due to a lack of documentation.

This current land use planning initiative is one part of the overall Dehcho Process – the negotiations process on lands, resources and self-governance. The following are important milestones in the Dehcho Process relevant to land use planning.

- 1993 – The Dehcho Declaration was adopted during the 1st Annual Dehcho Assembly in Kakisa Lake (Ka’a’gee Tu).
- 1994 - Dehcho Chiefs met with the Minister of Indian Affairs and presented their Self-Government paper “The Dehcho Proposal”.
- 1996-2002 - The Dehcho First Nations (DFN) set out to document land use and occupancy data in eight DFN communities that could be submitted as evidence to a court of law.
- 1997 – Delegates of 5th Annual Dehcho Assembly resolved to implement a Moratorium over mining, oil and gas, forestry and other resource development.
- May 2001 – The Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement (IMA) was signed, committing Canada, the GNWT and the DFN to negotiate agreements on land, resources, and governance, and to recognize appropriate interim measures in the Dehcho Territory for negotiations to advance. The DLUPC is established under this agreement and given four years to complete a land use plan for the Dehcho territory.

- February 2002 – The Committee members are selected and begin work. The Committee adopts the IMA Planning Guidelines as the Terms of Reference which sets out four Phases:
  - Phase 1: Committee Establishment and Office Setup
  - Phase 2: Information Gathering and Analysis
  - Phase 3: Plan Preparation
  - Phase 4: Plan Implementation – To begin after Plan approval
- 2002 - The Dehcho/ Tli’chxw Boundary negotiations were finalized, revising the IMA boundary.
- Fall 2002 - DLUPC initiates research contracts on wildlife, oil and gas, minerals, forestry, tourism and agriculture. See Table 1 for a complete list of research completed to date.
- April 2003 - The Interim Land Withdrawals were signed, withdrawing land from disposal and mineral staking under the Territorial Lands Act for five years to allow time for land use planning and the completion of Dehcho Process negotiations. The Interim Resource Development Agreement (IRDA) was also signed in 2003 committing Canada and the DFN to negotiate terms and conditions for a new exploration cycle rights issuance.
- Summer-Fall 2003 - DLUPC begins Information Sessions (Table 2) and distributes the first round of research reports and the new Dehcho Atlas V. 2b.
- August 2003 - The 5-year Interim Land Withdrawals are approved
- Winter 2003-04 - DLUPC begins development of Land Use Options, the Economic Development Assessment Model and research on cumulative effects indicators and thresholds for the Dehcho territory
- Summer 2004 - DLUPC begins consultations on Land Use Options (Table 3) including mapping sessions with communities.
- Fall 2004 - The Committee completes additional forestry, oil and gas and mining research and undertakes revisions to the EDA model to address feedback
- Winter 2004-05 - DLUPC develops a Working Draft Map, Terms and Recommendations for discussion at a Regional Forum
• March 29th, 2005 - DLUPC hold Regional Forum to discuss Working Draft Land Use Plan with planning partners.
• May-June 2005 - DLUPC undertake re-zoning sessions with communities and finalize Draft Land Use Plan - June 2005 including Cumulative Effects Assessment and Economic Development Assessment Model.
• Summer 2005 - DLUPC consultations on Draft Land Use Plan (Table 3) including opportunities for re-zoning with communities.
• Fall-2005 - further follow-up completed and finalised Revised Draft Plan and separate Background Document
• December - January 2006 - hold pre-forum information sessions with planning partners.
• February 2006 - DLUPC hold second Regional Forum on Hay River Reserve
• May 2006 - DLUPC complete and submit Final Draft Land Use Plan and submit to Dehcho First Nations.
Appendix 2. Traditional Knowledge Policies and Protocol

Deh Cho First Nation

Traditional Knowledge Research Protocol

By; Samuel Gargan
Assistant Negotiator
Traditional Knowledge Research Protocol

Introduction
The following Traditional Knowledge Research Protocol is intended for the sole consideration of the Dehcho First Nation(s). The purpose of the Traditional Knowledge Research Protocol is to provide guidelines that can assist Deh Cho communities in negotiating Terms and Conditions for the use of Traditional Knowledge in external research studies and industrial development.

This protocol has been drafted with guidance from the Sambaa K’e Dene Band’s Policy Regarding the Gathering, Use, and Distribution of Traditional Knowledge, the ACUNS Ethical Principles for the Conduct of Research in the North, the West Kitikmeot Slave Study, the Gwich’in Tribal Council’s draft, Traditional Knowledge Policy, and the Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee’s Traditional Knowledge Policy.

This third and final draft of the Traditional Knowledge Research Protocol incorporates comments and concerns from DFN Leadership, Elders, staff, membership, interested individual and organizations. This third draft is intended for discussion purpose only with its membership, and is a working document that will be revised as needed.

Once the general principles of a Protocol have been agreed upon, Deh Cho First Nation(s) can work towards drafting a Consent Form and a Research Agreement template. A Research Agreement template may assist communities in negotiating the specific Terms and Conditions for external projects that involve Traditional Knowledge.
Mission Statement

We the Dene of Dehcho continue to flourish on this, “our homeland” since time immemorial. Our survival depends on our values of caring and sharing. We live for each other and our collective knowledge of our past shapes us all for today and what we do now will ensure the destiny of our future generation. This is our duty and obligation.

Statement of Protocol

As First Nations we continue to exercise our vast storage of Traditional Knowledge through centuries of observation, experience and practices. We live in harmony with the land and all living things. The Dehcho Government recognizes that Traditional Knowledge is valid and essential source of information for today and into the future.

Definition

First Nation Communities or Groups in the Dehcho Territory that promotes, practice and exercise their language, culture and heritage regardless of status under the Indian Act.

Researchers Includes, Governments, Learning Institutions, Industries, Developers and Interest groups.

Traditional Knowledge The collective intellectual property of Dehcho First Nations’ members to Stories, Customs, Experiences, Knowledge, Practices, Beliefs and Spiritual Teaching passed on by our parents from our ancestors. This Knowledge will continue to exist and be passed on to our children and future generation. The rights to this knowledge must be protected.

Dehcho Territory Inserted map of asserted Dehcho Territory

Preamble

The Dene continue to possessed Traditional Knowledge, including traditional land use and occupancy mapping which has been documented by Dehcho First Nation. This body of knowledge reflects the knowledge, teachings, practices, experiences, beliefs, customs, values and principal of the Deh Cho People. Numerous Dehcho members contributed to this body of documented Traditional Knowledge. However, this information in whole, or in part, is not considered to constitute all the Traditional Knowledge of the Dehcho First Nations(s).

The Dehcho First Nation(s) have the exclusive rights and interests in continuing their documentation of traditional knowledge information and recognize that written, verbal and visual
documentation of Traditional Knowledge are important tools by which knowledge can be stored, displayed, and analyzed to assist in land and resource decision-making. Dehcho communities are at various stages of documenting Traditional Knowledge and have specific goals regarding the gathering, use, storage and sharing of this Knowledge.

However, Dehcho First Nation(s) are under increasing pressure from outside agencies, researchers, and Industry regarding the acquisition, sharing, and use of Traditional Knowledge, whether documented or not. Dehcho First Nation(s) recognize that outside agencies, researchers, and Industry may seek to use Dehcho Traditional Knowledge to further their own interests in Dehcho lands and resources. Dehcho First Nation(s) further recognize that this may, or may not be, in the best interest of their members.

Therefore, the Dehcho First Nations Traditional Knowledge Research Protocol is intended to provide regional guidelines for the documentation, use, and distribution of Traditional Knowledge by external agencies. This Protocol is intended to assist Dehcho communities in facilitating discussion with outside agencies, researchers, and Industry regarding the use of Traditional Knowledge. This Policy may serve as a finished document, or as a template for communities to develop their own community-specific Protocol for the use of Traditional Knowledge.

**Research Policy: Guidelines for Communities**

**Stewardship**

The Dehcho First Nations have always considered the land to be spiritual and ancestral, therefore they collectively, share stewardship and full rights over the gathering, use, distribution, and storage of Traditional Knowledge. Decisions concerning the use of Traditional Knowledge by outside agencies must therefore be made through a Governing body which would include the Dehcho Resource Management Authority.

**Gathering and Use**

Through this shared stewardship, Dehcho First Nation(s) are the primary guardians, protectors and interpreters of Traditional Knowledge. Dehcho First Nation(s) require informed consent prior to outside agencies, Industry, government, researchers, or other interested parties receiving access to any documented Dehcho Traditional Knowledge. The Dehcho communities have the right to deny any outside party access to any documented Traditional Knowledge that they possess.

For clarity, informed consent requires that Dehcho communities receive written requests that detail the nature of the request, the reason for the request, and how the information will be used. Informed consent also requires that outside parties adhere to community policies. All requests granted by Deh Cho First Nation(s) will be subject to written confidentiality agreements that contain limited use and distribution clauses.

As the primary guardian, protectors and interpreters of Traditional Knowledge, Deh Cho First Nation(s) communities will retain primary management of research studies and projects that
involve Traditional Knowledge. Co-management arrangements may be made with outside agencies, at the discretion of the community.

Traditional Knowledge may only be gathered for use by outside agencies for specific purposes only as outlined in signed Agreements including clarity on intellectual property.

**Distribution and Storage**

Any Traditional Knowledge documented by outside party may only be used for the purposes outlined in a signed agreements, or as otherwise agreed to in writing, individual Dehcho members will retain anonymity when Traditional Knowledge is utilized and/or distributed by outside agencies.

All research studies containing Traditional Knowledge shall be summarized in a plain language report (English and Slavey, as determined by the community) and on audiotape (in Slavey, as determined by the community). Final research reports shall be approved by the respective Dehcho community before being released to any external agency.

Copies of all Traditional Knowledge gathered will be kept and stored by the Dehcho First Nation(s). Information designated confidential will be treated as confidential by the community, as represented by the local First Nation(s), or other designated body. Traditional Knowledge in any documented form shall not be appropriated or stored by outside agencies without prior consent.

Research studies or development projects that seek to utilize Traditional Knowledge shall offer Dehcho community members training and/or employment opportunities, in order that members can participate in the research.

**Benefits**

External agencies, such as Government, Industry, Researchers, and even the Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee often request that Dehcho communities and members participate in research studies and development projects. Often, these projects involve the sharing of Traditional Knowledge. Fair compensation will be provided to individuals who participate in various studies and research.

Subject to informed consent and confidentiality agreements, outside parties, including researchers, government, and Industry will compensate members of the Dehcho First Nation(s) for their participation in any project, including projects that involve Traditional Knowledge or expertise. Rates for participating in research studies and development projects will be based on Knowledge being shared but not sold. The suggested day rate will be an honorarium set though negotiation with the Research Proponent and the Dehcho Resource Management Authority.
Employment Opportunities

Dehcho First Nation(s) recognize that certain research studies, development proposals, and other initiatives are occurring, or are proposed, within Dehcho Territory that offer Dehcho members opportunity for employment either through their expertise, knowledge or equipment. Dehcho First Nation(s) recognize that there is uncertainty and potential conflict when Dehcho members are employed by Industrial developments, research studies, and other initiatives that conflict with the Dehcho Process, local First Nation(s) Resolutions, or regional Leadership positions.

Dehcho First Nation(s) recognize that there are employment needs within the region and Dehcho members have the right to choose their own employment. Dehcho First Nation(s) assert that employment in a specific project or development does not constitute individual consent or support for any project or project component. Similarly, employment by Dehcho members or companies in particular research or development projects does not constitute community or regional support of projects, in whole, or in part. Dehcho First Nation(s) assert that the employment of individual Dehcho members or Dehcho companies is entirely without prejudice to the Dehcho Process, Community First Nation Resolutions, and or regional Leadership and Assembly resolutions.

In order to protect the collective interests of the Dehcho Dene any Traditional Knowledge that is shared with outside agencies through employment or research opportunities, that is not subject to a community-approved Agreement, is not in whole, or in part, representative of the collective Traditional Knowledge of the Dehcho people and cannot be used to represent Dehcho First Nation(s) in any capacity.

Research Steps: Guidelines for Researchers

Researcher

A researcher is any person, agency, government body, public or private organization proposing a research project in Dehcho territory that requires a license, permit, or other authorization under the Scientists Act, Wildlife Act, Archaeological Sites Regulations, Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations, Northwest Territories Waters Act, Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act, Fisheries Act, or other applicable legislation or regulations.

Researchers will abide by any Dene laws, regulations, customs, or protocols in place in the Dehcho communities and region.

No research will begin before the researcher has signed a community-approved research Agreement and has obtained informed consent of individuals who might be affected, or their guardian.

No undue pressure will be applied to obtain consent for participation in a research project.
The research should take into account the knowledge and experience of the people, and respect that knowledge and experience in the research process.

The research must respect the privacy and dignity of the people. Researchers are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the culture and traditions of communities.

Greater consideration should be placed on the risks to physical, cultural, environmental, and humane values than to the potential contribution of the research.

A signed Agreement pertaining to any research project is deemed a Memorandum of Understanding, and is not a legally binding document for Deh Cho First Nation(s). Individuals or communities may withdraw from research projects at any time.

**Steps**

- Researchers(s) will meet with the community to develop the research area and project. The general test for approval will be the successful demonstration of how research will serve Dehcho interests. Before finances are secured the researcher or research project must with meet the community to set standards and topic areas. The research proponent may be provided with an outline based on previous research to be used as a basis for negotiating a research agreement.
- Prior to filing an application for research, the research Proponent shall first meet with the community to explain what information is required, the purpose, intended use, potential benefits, and the potential harms of the research. Researchers will clearly identify research sponsors, funding sources, and any persons involved in the research.
- The community will provide a copy of the Traditional Knowledge Protocol to the Proponent and discuss the types of working arrangements that may be established.
- All meetings initiated by the Proponent will be subject to reasonable administrative, honorarium, interpreter, equipment, and facility fees, as determined by community policy.
- During the preliminary meeting, the community will review the information provided and determine whether to support the research, subject to Terms and Conditions and the negotiation of an acceptable Agreement, or to reject the research proposal.
- If the community agrees in principle to support the research proposal, further meetings may be required to work out the Terms and Conditions for support.
- Costs for subsequent meetings will be determined by community policy.
- Where the community requires outside technical assistance, the Proponent shall fund the community to retain, at reasonable cost, technical consulting services.
- Where the community supports the research activity in principle, a committee will be established, funded by the Proponent, to develop a Research Agreement. The committee will have representatives of the local First Nation, Elders, community members and the Proponent.
A Research Agreement will specify:
- The type of information being gathered;
- The specific use for the information;
- The Terms and Conditions attached to the research process, including local hiring and contractual arrangements;
- The Terms and Conditions for the gathering, use, storage, and distribution of information;
- The Terms and Conditions for the use of existing materials and documented knowledge;
- The Terms and Conditions pertaining to confidentiality;
- Any other Terms and Conditions, as required.

The Agreement shall be approved through a First Nation Resolution.

Where an Agreement has been signed, the Dehcho Resource Management Authority will play a lead role in project implementation. Where an Agreement has been violated, the Deh Cho First Nation(s) will either assume full authority over any project activities until any outstanding issues have been resolved, or terminate the Agreement without further notice.

Summary documents of the research activity shall be prepared and submitted by the Proponent, subcontractor(s) and or the Dehcho Resource Management Authority to the community. Copies of all research activity and working documents including, but not limited to, field collection tally sheets, notes, photographs, drawings, interview transcripts, audiotapes, and maps shall be submitted to the community.

The summary documents and working documents shall be reviewed by the community, or its designated body, to determine the reliability and validity of the information submitted. The summary documents shall also be reviewed for consistency with the community Traditional Knowledge Protocol and the Agreement. The summary documents may be returned to the Proponent for further revision, as deemed necessary, prior to authorizing further use.

Disagreement over the general content of the summary documents shall first be negotiated and subsequently arbitrated according to a process agreed upon by the Deh Cho First Nation(s) and the Proponent. However, the Deh Cho First Nation(s) (community) retains the exclusive right to remove raw information or individual identifiers from any document.

Where the Deh Cho First Nation(s) and the Proponent agree on a final project reports, they shall indicate such agreement in writing. All information collected will be permanently stored and treated as confidential by the community.
Preamble

Whereas the Sambaa K’e Dene have lived in close relationship with the land in the southern Northwest Territories, northern Alberta, and northern British Columbia since time immemorial; and

Whereas the Sambaa K’e Dene Band (SKDB) believes strongly that the ongoing survival of its people depends to a great extent on the knowledge and experience of the elders and other experienced users of the land; and

Whereas the ongoing integrity of the land is of utmost concern to the Sambaa K’e Dene;

Therefore be it Resolved that the Sambaa K’e Dene Band will take all steps necessary to ensure that all land use and resource development activities in the Sambaa K’e traditional land use area incorporate yúndíit’õh (traditional knowledge) at all phases of development -- including research and planning, project implementation, ongoing project monitoring, and closure/remediation – according to the principles and procedures identified in this policy document.

Definition

For the purposes of this policy, yúndíit’õh includes:

• The collective and evolving stories, experiences, practices, knowledge, and beliefs of our ancestors that developed from a close relationship with the land and are held in trust by our elders for future generations, and

• Knowledge and information gained through previous experiences with land and resource development in this area and through contemporary land use activities and practices.

Waiver

This Yúndíit’õh Policy has been prepared without prejudice to the Deh Cho Process and the inherent governance and land use rights of the Sambaa K’e Dene.

1 Yúndíit’õh [yoo-ndi-t’oh -- [where t’ is a sharp sound and oh is a nasal sound] might be translated as “the past time of the land” or as “our heritage” and includes all of the stories, legends, experiences, practices, beliefs, etc. of the Sambaa K’e Dene people from time immemorial.
Principles

The gathering, use, and distribution of Sambaa K’e yúndíit’õh will be guided by the following principles:

- Yúndíit’õh is derived from a traditional process of intuition, observation, testing, and validation and is of equal value to western scientific processes.

- Yúndíit’õh belongs to the Sambaa K’e Dene as a whole and is therefore a collective responsibility. Decisions concerning what Yúndíit’õh information to share with outside agencies must be made through a community process, with the full and active involvement of the elders.

- Yúndíit’õh is closely linked with, and dependent on, the language in which it is rooted and must therefore be documented and shared to the greatest extent possible in the Sambaa K’e Dene Yatie dialect.

- Primary management of research and other activities involving yúndíit’õh should remain with the Sambaa K’e Dene Band or its designated body, although co-management arrangements may be negotiated as needed to further the interests of the SKDB.

- Ownership and copyright of all Sambaa K’e yúndíit’õh remains with the community as a whole, as represented by the Sambaa K’e Dene Band, and may only be gathered and used by outside agencies for specific purposes under a Yúndíit’õh Research Agreement and with the permission of the community.

- Yúndíit’õh is held by both men and women, so women should be involved in Yúndíit’õh research activities to the greatest extent possible.

- Research and other activities that utilize both yúndíit’õh and a western scientific component must include training, so that Sambaa K’e Dene Band members can learn to use and apply western approaches and technology to the gathering and use of land and resource information.

- Yúndíit’õh gathered for the use of outside agencies must be summarized in a plain language report (in English) and on audio tape (in Dene Yatie) and must be reviewed and ratified by the Sambaa K’e Dene Band before being released.

- Copies of all yúndíit’õh information gathered within the Sambaa K’e traditional land use area must be provided to the SKDB for secure filing. Information designated confidential will be treated as such by the SKDB.
Yündít’óh Research Procedures

Step 1

The research Proponent must first meet with the Sambaa K’e Dene Band (SKDB) to state what information is required and the purpose and use of the information requested. The SKDB will provide further information on its Yündít’óh Policy and the types of working arrangements that can be established between the Proponent and the community.

Where the Proponent has called this preliminary meeting or initiated the research, the Proponent will pay the SKDB an Administration Fee to cover the costs of the meeting according to rates established by the community (see Appendix A). This fee will cover all administrative, honoraria, and facility costs borne by the SKDB with respect to the meeting. The proponent will also cover the costs of local interpreter services and equipment provided by the SKDB at rates established by the community (see Appendix A). Catering and other costs will be extra, on an as-needed, as-negotiated basis.

Step 2

The SKDB will review the information provided at the preliminary meeting and determine whether to support the research, pending negotiation of an acceptable Yündít’óh Research Agreement. The SKDB may recommend terms and conditions for its support. Further meetings with the proponent may be required, and the natures and costs of these meetings will be negotiated between the SKDB and Proponent as needed. Where the SKDB requires technical advice regarding the research proposal, and where this advice is not available through existing personnel, the Proponent shall fund the SKDB to retain, at reasonable cost, technical consulting services.

Step 3

Where the SKDB supports the research activity in principle, a Project Working Group will be established, funded by the Proponent. This Working Group will normally include representatives of the SKDB, the Sambaa K’e Development Corporation, and the Proponent. The Sambaa K’e Dene Band may request funded to retain technical consulting services, as needed, for the project.

The Working Group will develop a Sambaa K’e Yündít’óh Research Agreement or other appropriate agreement that will specify:

- The type(s) of information being gathered
- The specific use(s) for this information
- Any terms or conditions attached to the research process, including local hiring and potential contractual arrangements with the Sambaa K’e Development Corporation or other community agencies
- Any terms or conditions for the use of existing materials, such as traditional maps
- Terms of usage, copyright, storage, ownership, etc.
- Other terms as may be required.
This Agreement may be negotiated, as required, to suit the needs of the community and Proponent. Where local participation is warranted, the Sambaa K’e Development Corporation will provide resource people and other services on a contractual basis to the Proponent. For larger or longer term projects, the SKDC may be the primary contractor or subcontractor for the gathering of certain types of information and preparation of summary documents and reports. This Agreement will be approved through a SKDB Band Council Resolution.

This Agreement will allow the Proponent to use the information gathered for the purposes identified, at no additional expense. However, use or transfer of the information for purposes other than those specified in the Agreement would require the permission of the Sambaa K’e Dene Band and may entail additional cost.

Step 4

Where a Research Agreement has been signed, the Project Working Group will play a lead role in project implementation, as long as the terms of Yúndit’õh Research Agreement are being fulfilled. Where the Agreement has been violated, the Sambaa K’e Dene Band will assume full authority over any project activities until any outstanding issues have been resolved.

Step 5

Summary documents of the research activity shall be prepared and submitted by the Proponent, subcontractor(s), and/or Working Group to the Sambaa K’e Dene Band. Copies of all research activity working documents (such as, but not limited to, field collection tally sheets, notes, pictures, interview transcripts, and/or audio-video tapes, etc.) shall also be submitted to the SKDB. All information shall be regarded as confidential.

Step 6

The summary documents shall be reviewed by the SKDB or a designated body to determine the reliability and validity of the information submitted and its consistency with the Yúndit’õh Research Agreement. The SKDB may return the documents for further revision and re-submission, as needed, prior to authorizing their use. Disagreement over the use of certain information or materials will first be negotiated and subsequently arbitrated according to a process agreed upon by the SKDB and the Proponent.
Resolved:

RE: LUPC-Density of Traditional Use

WHEREAS, the Deh Cho Land use Planning Committee are using the generalized 'density of traditional use' map for the planning process, but do not have access to the original data, and;

WHEREAS, the DCLUPC recognizes the confidential nature of traditional use information and will not display, print or distribute information without explicit permission from the Deh Cho Communities, and;

WHEREAS, the DCFN passed resolution #13 at the Winter 2004 Leadership Meeting (February 17th-19th, 2004) in Fort Providence to publish a summary report which includes the generalized Density of Traditional Use Map and have placed this report on their website for public distribution, and;

WHEREAS, the DCLUPC is requesting permission to use the Density of Traditional Use map in their reports and presentations on land use planning in pdf, jpeg or other image formats (not GIS shape files) up to 11"X17", and;

WHEREAS, the DCLUPC documents are widely distributed to communities, governments, businesses and other planning partners and will be placed on our website for public distributions;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the DCFN agrees to allow the DCLUPC to display, print and distribute the generalized DCFN Density of Traditional Use Map in oral, written and graphical reports.
Resolution # 5

RE: Provision of Dene Place Names for the Deh Cho Land Use Plan

WHEREAS, Deh Cho First Nations members have requested the Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee show Dene names on their maps,

WHEREAS, the Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee only shows names of zones and major rivers, lakes, mountains, and features on their maps,

WHEREAS, the Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee has developed a list of English names shown on their maps for which they need to find Dene names and have provided this to all Deh Cho First Nations,

WHEREAS, some Deh Cho First Nations communities have completed Place Name Mapping Projects,

WHEREAS, Deh Cho First Nations hold the rights to all Place Name information on their traditional lands,

WHEREAS, the Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee requires permission and assistance to access available Dene Place Name information before it can put those names on its maps,
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Deh Cho First Nations grants permission for the Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee to access existing documented sources of Dene Place names for the sole purpose of determining Dene names for the list provided, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, in the absence of documented Place Names or where a Deh Cho First Nation has specifically requested that documented work not be used, the Deh Cho First Nation will designate a knowledgeable person in their community to assist the Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee determine Dene names for their maps.
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Resolution #02

RE: Proposed Hydro Dams on the Mackenzie River

WHEREAS, the GNWT Minister of Finance has proposed building several hydro dams on the Mackenzie River and its tributaries in order to generate electricity for export purposes; and

WHEREAS, the information provided by the GNWT to the Association of Municipalities (but not to First Nations) reveals that these dams will result in massive flooding along the Mackenzie and its tributaries; and

WHEREAS, traditional land use mapping by the DCFNs shows that approximately 30% of all traditional harvesting takes place within 1 km of the Mackenzie and its tributaries; and

WHEREAS, the information provided by the GNWT to the municipalities but not to First Nations also show that the flooding caused by the dams will result in the entire village of Jean Marie River being flooded;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the DCFNs oppose Minister Handley’s proposals and call on the GNWT to immediately abandon plans to dam the Mackenzie and its tributaries and to respect the Deh Cho Process that deals directly with these issues.
Resolution # 4

RE: Big Game Outfitters

WHEREAS, the Deh Cho First Nations support the protection of watersheds, ecologically sensitive areas and preservation of harvesting areas in the Deh Cho Territory; and

WHEREAS, the Deh Cho First Nations are currently developing a land use plan and would like to limit industrial and commercial access to First Nation traditional lands;

WHEREAS, the presence of big game outfitters on Deh Cho Territory has conflicted with traditional land users; and

WHEREAS, Deh Cho First Nations recognize the lack of enforcement of the rules and regulations at the Federal and Territorial levels;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. Deh Cho First Nations will not support any Big Game outfitters in Deh Cho Territory

2. Deh Cho First Nations would like to see ultimate removal of big game outfitters within the Deh Cho Territory
DEH CHO FIRST NATIONS
BRANCH OFFICE - BOX 89, FORT SIMPSON, N.W.T. X0E 0N0
TEL: (867) 695-2355 FAX: (867) 695-2038
E-Mail: dehchofn@cancom.net

Leadership Meeting
Ft. Providence, NT
October 29-31, 2002

Resolution #06

RE: SOUTH NAHANNI WATERSHED

WHEREAS, the people of Naha Dehe have hunted, fished, trapped, gathered plants, and occupied the South Nahanni River Watershed since time immemorial; and

WHEREAS, the people of Naha Dehe are now represented by the Nahanni Butte Dene Band Council; and

WHEREAS, the people of Naha Dehe nor the Nahanni Butte Dene Band have never ceded, released, or surrendered their aboriginal title and rights in the South Nahanni Watershed; and

WHEREAS, the Nahanni National Park Reserve does not provide sufficient protection to water quality, wildlife habitat, and the unique landscapes; and

WHEREAS, a public meeting was held in Nahanni Butte on October 23, 2002 with representatives of Deh Cho First Nations and Parks Canada, and attended by the Nahanni Butte Dene Band members, as attached; and

Moved by:

[Signature]
Chief Rita Cli
Liidlil Kue First Nation

Seconded by:

[Signature]
Chief Lloyd Chicot
Ka’a’gee Tu First Nation

CARRIED

Certified copy of resolution made at Ft. Providence, NT dated October 31, 2002

[Signature]
Michael Nadli
Grand Chief
WHEREAS, the draft land withdrawal map showing the proposed land withdrawals in the South Nahanni Watershed, Karstlands, and Ram Plateau was presented and discussed; and

WHEREAS, the people of Naha Dehe wish to become more involved in decisions which effect their traditional lands and waters.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, in addition to those lands proposed for withdrawal on the map dated October 16, 2002, the surface and sub-surface of the entire South Nahanni Watershed be withdrawn under the Deh Cho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement;

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Naha Dehe Consensus Team immediately prepare a draft Memorandum of Understanding outlining the steps necessary to expand the Nahanni National Park Reserve and establish a full National Park under the Deh Cho Final Agreement;

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Naha Dehe Consensus Team immediately begins to study boundaries for the expansion of the Nahanni National Park Reserve with the goal of establishing a full National Park under a Deh Cho Final Agreement.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Naha Dehe consensus Team and the Deh Cho First Nations Negotiating Team will consult with the people of Nahanni Butte regarding all matters regarding their traditional lands and that final approval of these matter must be approved by the Chief and Council of Nahanni Butte Dene Band.
DEH CHO FIRST NATIONS

Leadership Meeting
Wrigley, NT
February 17-21, 2003

Resolution # 04

Nahanni National Park Reserve Interim
Agreements

Moved by:

Elder Ernest Cazon
Liídlii Kue First Nation

Seconded by:

Chief Leon Konisenta
Nahanni Butte Dene Band

Carried Unanimously

WHEREAS, the Naha Deh Consensus team was established by the Deh Cho Interim Measures Agreement signed on May 23, 2001; and

WHEREAS, the Naha Deh Consensus Team mandate required it to draft an Interim Park Management Arrangement, a Park Management Plan, an Ecological Integrity Statement, and an Memorandum of Understanding on issues related to expansion of the park and protection of the South Nahanni watershed; and

WHEREAS, the Naha Deh Consensus Team has presented an Interim Park Management Arrangement, a Park Management Plan, an Ecological Integrity Statement and Memorandum of Understanding to the Leadership for approval;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that:

1. The Deh Cho First Nations accept the draft agreements presented by the Naha Deh Consensus Team and direct the Grand Chief to sign the agreements as soon as Canada has indicated that it will also sign the agreements and an appropriate signing ceremony can be arranged; and
2. The Grand Chief is directed to continue working for the protection of the entire South Nahanni watershed.
DEH CHO FIRST NATIONS
BRANCH OFFICE - BOX 89, FORT SIMPSON, N.W.T. X0E 0N0
TEL: (867) 695-2355 FAX: (867) 695-2038
E-Mail: dcfm@dehchofirstnations.com

Spring Leadership Meeting
Hay River Reserve, NT
May 4-6th, 2004

Resolution #3

RE: Prairie Creek Road

WHEREAS, the Deh Cho First Nations support watershed protection in the Deh Cho Territory;

WHEREAS, the Prairie Creek winter road would have significant environmental impacts in the Nahanni watershed, and greater Nahanni eco-system; and

WHEREAS, the Deh Cho First Nations would like to limit access to First Nation traditional lands for commercial purposes;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The Deh Cho First Nations will not support any development of the Prairie Creek Road.

Moved by:
President Marie Lafferty
Fort Simpson Metis Local

Seconded by:
Chief Berna Landry
Deh Gah Gotie First Nations

unanimous

Certified copy of resolution made at Hay River Reserve, NT dated May 6th, 2004

Herb Norwegian
Grand Chief
Resolution # 14

RE: Protection of the South Nahanni Watershed

WHEREAS, the greater South Nahanni watershed is within the traditional land use area of the Nahanni Butte Dene Band; and

WHEREAS, the community dependence on the Watershed of the South Nahanni is engrained in their traditional occupancy of the area; and

WHEREAS, the current land withdrawals does not encompass the entire watershed; and

WHEREAS, the Nahanni Butte Dene Band desires full protection of the South Nahanni watershed, and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Negotiating team be directed to address further withdrawals in the South Nahanni watershed to include the entire South Nahanni watershed

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Deh Cho Leadership direct the Land use planning committee to extend the conservation zone to cover the South Nahanni Watershed.
Spring Leadership Meeting
Fort Liard, NT
May 24-26th, 2005

Resolution # 4

RE: Approval of New Land Use Zones for
the Deh Cho Land Use Plan

WHEREAS, Jean Marie River First Nation
requested Zone 19 boundaries be revised to
reflect their study area for potential timber
harvesting at the Regional Forum,

WHEREAS, Liidlii Kue First Nation (LKFN),
Pehdzeh Ki First Nation (PKFN) and Acho
Dene Koe First Nation (ADK) requested new
mapping sessions to revise zones presented
at the March 2005 Regional Forum,

WHEREAS, LKFN, PKFN and ADK have
completed their mapping and proposed
revisions to the DCLUPC land use zones,

WHEREAS, the revisions from those 3 First
Nations have been presented to other
affected First Nations for discussion,

WHEREAS, all affected First Nations have
agreed to the proposed rezoning as presented
today,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Deh
Cho First Nations accept and support the new
Land Use Zone Map presented today for
inclusion in the Draft Land Use Plan to be
released this June 2005.

Moved by:

Chief Fred Norwegian
Jean Marie River Dene
Band

Seconded by:

Chief David Moses
Pehdzeh Ki First Nations

Carried Unanimously

Certified copy of
resolution made at Acho
Dene Koe, dated May
26th, 2005

Herb Norwegian
Grand Chief
Winter Leadership Meeting
Fort Simpson, NT
March 7-9th, 2006

Resolution # 2

RE: Final Revisions to the Revised Draft Dehcho Land Use Plan

WHEREAS, the Dehcho First Nations have been actively participating in the development of a land use plan for the Dehcho territory over the last four years; and,

WHEREAS, the Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee (the “Committee”) released the Revised Draft Dehcho Land Use Plan (the “Plan”) in November 2005; and

WHEREAS, the Committee has presented the Plan to the DFN communities for consideration and comment; and

WHEREAS, Canada and the GNWT have expressed concerns with the level of conservation put forth in the Plan and have requested additional areas be opened to development; and

WHEREAS, the DFN communities have identified additional revisions to the land use zones which provide for further land use restrictions; and

WHEREAS, these revisions, as presented and discussed with DFN Leadership on March 8, 2006, are required to promote the social, cultural and economic well-being of the communities and residents of the Dehcho territory, as per the Committee’s mandate; and

Moved by:

[Signature]
Chief Karen Felker
West Point First Nations

Seconded by:

[Signature]
President Marie Lafferty
Fort Simpson Metis Local 52

Passed Unanimously

Certified copy of resolution made in Fort Simpson, NT, dated March 9th, 2006.

[Signature]
Herb Norwegian
Grand Chief
WHEREAS, the DFN communities have outstanding issues with the definition of community boundaries on defined Territorial Legislation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Dehcho First Nations direct the Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee to accept and incorporate all changes to the land use zones requested by the DFN communities into the Final Draft Dehcho Land Use Plan in order to secure DFN Approval of the Plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that DFN directs Canada and the GNWT to recognize that the level of conservation in the Plan is a reflection of the DFN communities’ past and current experience with land and resource management under Canada’s and the GNWT’s jurisdiction; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Plan will be reviewed in five years time and DFN may consider revisions of the Plan at that time; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, acceptance of the Land Use Zones as defined in the resolution does not mean acceptance of community boundaries as defined Territorial Legislation.
Resolution # 4

RE: DFN Approval of Final Draft Dehcho Land Use Plan

WHEREAS, the Dehcho First Nations have been participating in the development of a land use plan for the Dehcho territory; and,

WHEREAS, the Dehcho First Nations will be the first to approve the Land Use Plan as per Section 9 of the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement; and,

WHEREAS, the IMA did not specify how DFN will approve the Plan;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that DFN will indicate their approval of the Final Draft Dehcho Land Use Plan through a resolution passed at a Regional DFN Leadership Meeting or at the Annual DFN Assembly in Kakisa.

Certified copy of resolution made in Fort Simpson, NT, dated March 9th, 2006.

Herb Norwegian
Grand Chief
Appendix 4. Terms of Reference for Dehcho Land Use Planning Committee

INTRODUCTION

Regional land use planning in the Dehcho territory is intended to form part of an integrated land and resource management regime and outline what types of activities should occur, generally where they should take place, and terms and conditions necessary to guide land use proposals and development projects over time. The Plan will involve finding a balance between development opportunities, social and ecological constraints, which reflect community values and priorities while taking into consideration the values of all Canadians. The Parties share the objective that upon approval of a Dehcho Final Agreement, the approved Plan will be a land management tool that provides legally-binding direction and guidance to regulatory agencies and decision-makers in the evaluation of development projects, protected area proposals, and other potential land uses.

Land use planning in the Dehcho territory will take place in four phases:

1. Phase I will address the administrative and operational requirements of the land use planning committee and begin following the signing of an Interim Measures Agreement.

2. Phase II, the technical stage, will begin immediately following the completion of Phase I, as it is important to maintain momentum and community involvement built during the first phase of the planning project. This will be a detailed planning exercise, which will lead to the development of a preliminary draft land use plan in Phase III. It is during this stage that the planning committee will need to identify significant development and conservation initiatives.

3. Phase III, plan preparation, will see the preparation of a preliminary draft land use plan(s). The draft plan will be circulated to the Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, stakeholders and interested groups for feedback, input, and consideration.

4. Phase IV, plan implementation will commence as soon as the plan is approved by Dehcho First Nations and the GNWT and considered by Canada.

Phase I - Planning Committee Establishment

5. Canada and the Dehcho First Nations will establish a Planning Committee composed of five appointees to co-ordinate the production and analysis of maps and data. The Dehcho First Nations will appoint two appointees, Canada one appointee and the GNWT one appointee. Upon recommendation of the Planning Committee, the parties will appoint a fifth member as chair of the Committee.

6. As part of the initial set up of the planning committee bridge funding will be provided.

7. This phase will require the establishment of an office, hiring of a project manager, and
establishment of the planning committee. Following the initial set-up of the planning committee, a formal terms of reference, including a detailed budget and workplan, will need to be prepared. The terms of reference will be approved by the Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, and Canada.

**Phase II - Information Gathering and Analysis**

8. Dehcho First Nations, will produce a series of maps identifying sensitive lands for traditional use and occupancy, including harvesting areas and cultural sites. Communities are expected to be at different stages of readiness to produce these maps. Resulting analysed “sensitivity” maps will be provided to the Planning Committee, but the original raw data will be made available to the Planning Committee as requested on a case-by-case basis for viewing only.

9. The Planning Committee will co-ordinate the production of a series of maps identifying sensitive cultural sites, critical habitat, and related harvesting patterns throughout the Dehcho territory. These maps will be distributed to Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders.

10. The Planning Committee will co-ordinate the production of a series of maps identifying resource development potential in the mineral, hydrocarbon, forestry, tourism, and agricultural sectors throughout the Dehcho territory. These maps will be distributed to Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders.

11. The Planning Committee will co-ordinate the production of a socio-demographic forecast to identify job creation and training needs within the Dehcho territory over the next twenty years. This forecast will be distributed to Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders.

12. The Planning Committee will co-ordinate an economic development assessment to determine what entrepreneurial opportunities may exist currently and in the future. This exercise will build upon the analyses of 8 through 11 and assist with the identification of land use and economic opportunities, where practical. This assessment will be distributed to Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders.

13. The Planning Committee will integrate the maps produced in Phase II in order to identify development opportunities, social and ecological constraints. This phase of the process may include the identification, analysis, and consideration of: potential land use projects, potential core representative areas within each ecoregion, and any other issues appropriate for consideration in the land use plan.

14. The Planning Committee will also identify potential surface/sub-surface land withdrawals, and sub-surface land withdrawals only.

15. A set of land use options will be developed from the information in this Phase for consideration by the Parties and other stakeholders.
Phase III - Plan Preparation

16. Dehcho communities, each Dehcho First Nation, Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders will review the proposed land use options and provide feedback to the Planning Committee on matters within their respective interests or jurisdictions.

17. The Planning Committee will prepare a revised set of land use options based on the feedback received in 16.

18. The review process described in 16 and 17 may be repeated, at the discretion of the Planning Committee in order to identify an option that best reflects the interests and objectives of the Parties and stakeholders.

19. The Planning Committee will prepare a draft land use plan based on the option identified.

20. Dehcho communities, each Dehcho First Nation, Dehcho First Nations, GNWT, Canada, and interested stakeholders will review the proposed draft land use plan and provide feedback to the Planning Committee on matters within their respective interests or jurisdictions.

21. The Planning Committee will revise the plan based on the feedback received in 20.

22. The Planning Committee will present a final draft land use plan to the Parties for approval and consideration pursuant to section 10 of the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement.

23. The land use plan will also include proposed land withdrawals which will be presented for negotiations pursuant to 13 of the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement.

Phase IV - Plan Implementation

24. Following consideration and plan approval, the Planning Committee will monitor land use in the Dehcho territory for conformity to the plan.

25. Following the signing of a Dehcho Final Agreement, the land use plan will be revised and updated to reflect the provisions of the Final Agreement.
Appendix 5. Native Women’s Association of the NWT Recommendations for Sustainable Development (Dehcho Region)

For Leaders:
1. Approach companies to put money into social programs in the region. Companies should accept and support community recommendations (e.g. with respect to ceremonies and back to the land programs).
2. Communicate with community members about the projects.
3. Share information from workshops and give feedback.
4. Involve more youth.
5. Settle land claims and get resources (to invest in) for the people.
6. Advocate for and start financial training now for individuals and families. It is important that local people benefit from resource development. We need to reduce social problems.
7. Review legislation to make sure it is working for the protection of people and the quality of their lives.
8. Equal pay and benefits and access to jobs and training for women.
9. Train and employ our people first before bringing in southerners.
10. Monitor and enforce commitments and agreements.
11. Require companies to invest in community infrastructure.

For the NWA-NWT:
12. Push for more training for youth and women especially for trades and professional roles (geologists).

Both Leaders and NWA-NWT:
13. Make better use of elders (e.g. share TK).
14. Ensure that our water is protected. Put water on the radar screen.
15. Protect medicinal plants. If they are lost, they will be lost forever.
16. Get resources for and practice traditional knowledge, language, and preservation of traditional healing, rituals and ceremonies.
17. Protect intellectual property rights over TK (e.g. knowledge of medicines and plants). Information is power.
18. Invest in promoting and teaching traditional arts and crafts to make sure the next generation has these skills/knowledge.
19. Develop and take action on organized crime rings.
20. Self defence training for women to ensure their safety especially when the bridge comes.
21. More recognition and opportunities for women’s achievement in small and big ways that better our communities.
22. Land includes water and air. Promote this holistic definition.
23. Harmonize time and benefits, cultural interests, stress and workplace issues among all workplaces to enable greater flexibility for workers and greater benefits to families (NWA-NWT 2004)

The Committee wishes to thank the Native Women’s Association of the NWT for choosing such a timely theme and inviting us to participate in these discussions. The Committee supports the recommendations put forth and encourages the responsible authorities to implement those recommendations within their mandate.
### Appendix 6: Research Completed to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Resources and Field Size Distribution of the Dehcho Territory</td>
<td>Drummond Consulting (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Spatial Analysis and Literature review of Timber Potential in the Dehcho Territory,</td>
<td>PACTeam (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Run Sustainable Yield</td>
<td>RWED, GNWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Economic Development Assessment Model 1.0</td>
<td>Ellis Consulting Services (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Effects Management in the Dehcho Territory: Preliminary Assessment and Results</td>
<td>DLUPC (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Economic Development Assessment Model 1.5: Working Draft Revisions and Results</td>
<td>DLUPC (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Forum Information Package</td>
<td>DLUPC (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7. Consultations Completed to Date


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>Fort Providence Tri Council</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td>West Point First Nation</td>
<td>West Point Band Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19</td>
<td>Jean Marie First Nation</td>
<td>Jean Marie River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>Fort Simpson Tri-Council</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28</td>
<td>Katlodeeche First Nation</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29</td>
<td>Pehdzeh Ki First Nation</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2</td>
<td>GNWT/RWED</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>Town Council</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>RWED/Fisheries</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5</td>
<td>Government of the Northwest Territories</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8</td>
<td>Kaagee Tu First Nation</td>
<td>Kakisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>Tourism Sector</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24</td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>Industry/Regulators</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>Sambaa K’e Dene Band</td>
<td>Trout Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte Dene Band</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Use Options Consultations (2004)
(All Community Consultations included a mapping session)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 12-13-2004</td>
<td>Katlodeeche First Nation</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13</td>
<td>Agriculture Sector</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14</td>
<td>Hay River Town Council</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14</td>
<td>Government Sector</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15-16</td>
<td>West Point First Nation</td>
<td>West Point Band Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22-23</td>
<td>Jean Marie First Nation</td>
<td>Jean Marie River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Jean Marie River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27-28</td>
<td>Fort Simpson Tri-Council</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29</td>
<td>Forestry Sector</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>Government Sector</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 3 – 4</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte Dene Band/Public Meeting</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 5-6</td>
<td>Sambaa K’e Dene Band</td>
<td>Trout Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 5-6</td>
<td>Fort Providence Tri-Council/Public</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9-10</td>
<td>Pehdzeh Ki First Nation</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12-13</td>
<td>Fort Liard Tri-Council</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17</td>
<td>Government of the Northwest Territories</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td>Government of Canada</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td>GNWT Tourism Association</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19</td>
<td>ENGOs</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20</td>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 23</td>
<td>Government of Canada</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25</td>
<td>Oil and Gas Sector</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27</td>
<td>Mining Sector</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>Kaagee Tu First Nation</td>
<td>Kakisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>DFO (George Low)</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Forum (2005 and 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 29-31</td>
<td>Open / Planning Partners</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7-9</td>
<td>Open / Planning Partners</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Re-Zoning Sessions (2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>Fort Liard Tri-Council</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>Fort Simpson Tri-Council</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25-26</td>
<td>Dehcho First Nations Leadership</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 7</td>
<td>Kaagee Tu First Nation</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft Plan Consultations (2005)**

*(All Community Consultations provided an opportunity for zone revisions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 11</td>
<td>Fort Providence Tri-Council, Business, Public</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12</td>
<td>Kaagee Tu First Nation</td>
<td>Kakisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13</td>
<td>Hay River Town Council</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13</td>
<td>Government and Business</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14</td>
<td>West Point First Nation</td>
<td>West Point Band Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Katlodeeche First Nation</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>Jean Marie First Nation</td>
<td>Jean Marie River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19</td>
<td>Fort Liard Tri-Council, Business, Public</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19</td>
<td>Fort Liard Public</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20</td>
<td>Government &amp; Business</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20</td>
<td>Fort Simpson Tri Council (LKFN, Metis and Village Council)</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Revised Draft Plan – Pre-Forum Information Sessions (2006)
*(All Community Consultations provided an opportunity for zone revisions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>Ka’a’gee Tu First Nation</td>
<td>Kakisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 29</td>
<td>Enterprise Council, Business, Public</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 30</td>
<td>Government and Business</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 30</td>
<td>Hay River Town Council</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1</td>
<td>Katlodeeche First Nation</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2</td>
<td>West Point First Nation</td>
<td>West Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>Jean Marie First Nation</td>
<td>Jean Marie River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 8</td>
<td>Fort Liard Tri-Council</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Government, Business, NGO’s</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 16</td>
<td>Oil and Gas Industry</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 5</td>
<td>Government of Canada, Public</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 9</td>
<td>Pehdzeh Ki First Nation</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td>Government &amp; Business</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td>Fort Simpson Tri Council (LKFN, Metis and Village Council)</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11</td>
<td>LKFN meeting with Chief</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte Dene Band</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>Sambaa K’e Dene Band</td>
<td>Trout Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Fort Providence Tri-Council, Business, Public</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overlap Sessions (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 7</td>
<td>SKDB, JMR, LKFN</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 8</td>
<td>SKDB, Nahanni, ADK</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10</td>
<td>SKDB, Nahanni, ADK</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Follow-up Sessions (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 15</td>
<td>Łíídlįį Kṳįį First Nation</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 27</td>
<td>Pehdzeh Ki First Nation</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 28</td>
<td>Acho Dene Koe Band</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte Dene Band</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>Pehdzeh Ki First Nation</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 7</td>
<td>Peter Marcellais Nahanni</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Forums</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2003</td>
<td>Northern Planners Workshop</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Annual CEAM Gathering 2003</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2004</td>
<td>Annual CEAM Gathering 2004</td>
<td>Inuvik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Annual CEAM Gathering 2005</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2004</td>
<td>Cordilleron (Board Roudup) Mining</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2004</td>
<td>NWT Tourism Association</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2003</td>
<td>Northern Geoscience Forum</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2004</td>
<td>Northern Geoscience Forum</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2005</td>
<td>Northern Geoscience Forum</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2005</td>
<td>ARDA/ ASEP Capacity Building and Governance Workshop</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2005</td>
<td>Elders Meeting Update</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Independent Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2004</td>
<td>Nahanni Park Expansion Team and Naha Dehe Consensus Team</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP)</td>
<td>Hay River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 5 2004</td>
<td>Canadian Zinc (Prairie Creek Mine Visit)</td>
<td>Prairie Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>Federal Negotiation Team Update</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13-14</td>
<td>GNWT – Deputy Ministers Meeting</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td>Legal Meeting</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leadership Meetings and Assemblies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2003</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Wrigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Jean Marie River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2004</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2004</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2005</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Hay River Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Fort Liard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Kakisa Assembly</td>
<td>Kakisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Kakisa Assembly</td>
<td>Kakisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Kakisa Assembly</td>
<td>Kakisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2005</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2006</td>
<td>Leadership – Negotiation Strategy Meeting</td>
<td>Trout Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Special Workshops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2003</td>
<td>Wildlife Working Group Workshop</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2004</td>
<td>Dene Nahodhe Workshop</td>
<td>Fort Providence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8. WWF Area of Representation Decision Criteria

Representation criteria decision rules and thresholds for enduring features in the automated gap analysis tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring Guidelines for Representation Criteria (scores are indicated in brackets)</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTED AREA SIZE AND ADJACENCY</td>
<td>Largest Single Protected Area Block on Enduring Feature: Meets size guideline (&gt;95% of recommended size is protected) (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is at least 75% of the recommended size (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is at least 50% of the recommended size (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is at least 25% of the recommended size (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is &gt; 200 ha and &lt;25% of the recommended size (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area Protected on Enduring Feature:</td>
<td>Meets size guideline (&gt;= 95% of recommended size is protected) (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Contiguous Protected Area Complex Intersecting the Enduring Feature (Adjacency):</td>
<td>Meets size guideline (&gt;= 95% of recommended size is protected) (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is at least 50% of the recommended size (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADIENTS</td>
<td>80% of elevation classes within effective range captured in a portion of the protected area. (1)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-80% of elevation classes within effective range captured in a portion of the protected area. (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;50% of elevation classes within effective range captured in a portion of the protected area. (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY TYPES (SHORELINE)</td>
<td>Shoreline habitat in protected areas proportionate to distribution in the enduring feature. (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoreline habitat in protected areas but in lower proportion than occurs in the enduring feature. (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No shoreline habitat in protected areas. (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABITAT QUALITY</td>
<td>Protected portion is relatively intact: road density &lt; 0.5m/ha. (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected portion is less intact: road density &gt; 0.5m/ha and &lt; 1.75m/ha. (thresholds interpreted from Noss 1995) (0.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected portion is not intact: road density &gt; 1.75m/ha. (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score Interpretation: 6.5-8 (Adequately Represented), 4-6 (Moderately Represented), 1-3.5 (Partially Represented), 0-0.5 (Little or No Representation)
Decision rules for natural region representation classes

Region graded as “adequate” if:
• > 90% of the region is adequately represented at the Enduring Feature level

If the above does not apply, then Natural Region graded as “moderate” if:
• At least 50% of the region is adequate and at least 80% of the remaining enduring features are either partial or moderate
• At least 80% of the region is moderate
• The combination of adequate and moderate enduring features is >80% of the natural region

If the above does not apply, then Natural Region graded as “partial” if:
• The combination of moderate and partial and adequate enduring features is at least 80% of the natural region
• The combination of moderate and partial enduring features is at least 80% of the natural region
• The combination of adequate and partial enduring features is at least 80% of the natural region
• If 50% of the natural region is moderate
• If 80% of the natural region is partial
• If the adequate portion of the natural region is > 0%

If the above does not apply, then Natural Region graded as “little or none”
• None of the above mentioned cases exists
Appendix 9. Sustainable Model for Arctic Regional Tourism (SMART)

**Mission:** Assist the arctic tourism sector to adopt and innovate economically, environmentally and culturally sustainable tourism practices.

**Basic principles for SMART**

These principles should be seen as goals and guidelines, not as conditions. The principles are recommended for use in tourism companies, communities, regional tourist boards, and landowners.

**Sustainable Arctic Tourism:**

**Supports the local economy** Supporting stands for employing staff, buying goods and services and paying tax locally. Tangible benefits from tourism are a positive force.

**Operates environmental friendly** Establish and continuously improve environment policies. Transportation, waste and lodging impact policies are adjusted to local conditions.

**Supports the conservation of local nature** The ecological carrying capacity of the area must be respected. The local inhabitants and tourism operators have a right to participate in land-use planning on local and regional level. The operator should have thorough knowledge and co-operate with other actors and should give active support to preferably local conservation projects.

**Respects and involves the local community** Promoting and preserving local cultures, lifestyles and values set limits and rules to tourism. Quality tourism depends on active support from and benefit to local people. The networking between different stakeholders in the region is highly encouraged.

**Ensures quality and safety in all business operations** Sustainable tourism is quality tourism. This includes administration, planning, acting as a good host and implementing safety issues in quality management policy.

**Educates visitors about local nature & culture** Sustainable tourism is based on curious and respectful visitors. Operators use knowledgeable guides and constantly improve the awareness level of the personnel. The visitor is given information of the sustainable tourism in the region.

**SMART is a multinational project combining the resources of partners from Finland, Sweden, Norway and Canada. The mission of the project is to assist the arctic tourism sector to adopt and innovate economically, environmentally and culturally sustainable tourism practices. The activities of the project are aimed for the benefit of tourism companies in the Arctic area.**

[http://www.arctictourism.net/](http://www.arctictourism.net/)
Appendix 10. Comments on the November 2005 Draft Plan and DLUPC Responses

This table includes comments made in written submissions or orally at meetings from November 2005 until April 2006. However, discussions held with GNWT Deputy Ministers on March 14, 2006, the Legal Meeting with DFN, GNWT, EC and DIAND on April 11th, 2006, and the GNWT’s detailed comments submitted April 7th could not be adequately summarized in this format so are not included. We have paraphrased many comments for brevity. Only comments which prompted a change or raised significant questions for the Committee are included. While we appreciate comments of support (no change) they are not included here, though they were considered equally with those requesting changes. Please note that all references to page, section, zone or term numbers, and term names in comments refer to the numbers and names used in the November 2005 Revised Draft unless otherwise specified. Please refer to the Table of Contents for updated names and numbers used in the Final Draft. The comments have been sorted and reorganized to facilitate revisions so are no longer in the same order as provided in the original submissions. There is also some repetition as some comments were raised orally at meetings, then in submissions, both as general comments and again as specific examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization or Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Committee Response / Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/10/05</td>
<td>Chuck Brumwell - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Encourages the DLUPC to remain open to the possible adoption of further thresholds and limits of acceptable change as they are identified and as considered appropriate for the Dehcho region.</td>
<td>Accepted: This is addressed in the Cumulative Effects Research Actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/05</td>
<td>Sam Gargan - DFN (Elders Committee)</td>
<td>Raised concern regarding the statement “the Plan does not address Scientific Research Permits”. Need to encourage the use of Traditional Knowledge in regards to research permits.</td>
<td>The Plan will apply to any research activities that also require a land use permit or water licence. Such activities will be subject to the Plan’s Conformity Requirements which require the collection of relevant traditional knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/05</td>
<td>Dave Nickerson - Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>Mine Reclamation Term: Why is it not only the regulatory authority making a decision on security deposits? Why the need for a third party. I don’t know why you would need that.</td>
<td>Accepted: The Mine Reclamation CR has been revised to specify that security amounts will be set by the Responsible Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/05</td>
<td>Leni Keough - Consultant</td>
<td>What happens when a permit lapses? Some of these lapse and you can’t apply for until they have lapsed, things like drilling permits. This could be a loop hole and might provide an opportunity to delay regulatory approval.</td>
<td>Existing use term has been revised to address renewal of permits and licenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/05</td>
<td>Leni Keough - Consultant</td>
<td>Wording “Developer” is misleading and problematic. There could be lots of exploration without moving into production. The people could benefit from all sorts of employment.</td>
<td>Accepted: Replaced “Developer” with “applicant” throughout most of the Plan and Background Report. “Developer” was maintained in a few situations where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/11/05</td>
<td>Archie Lang - Yukon Minister</td>
<td>Access: Zone 26 is adjacent to the Yukon portion of the La Biche drainage basin which contains active Kotaneelee gas leases and significant potential for oil and gas and forestry. Planning for the development of these resources will need to incorporate access to the Yukon.</td>
<td>Accepted: Access is not restricted in the Plan in any zone, though we do set conditions for access to reduce impacts and ensure proper planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/11/05</td>
<td>Archie Lang - Yukon Minister</td>
<td>Water Monitoring / Management (2): Regarding the need to meet or exceed CCME standards for waste water - Yukon supports these guidelines but any activity involving water use and waste disposal must comply with the laws of general applications.</td>
<td>Again, the terms in the Plan only apply within the Dehcho territory. The Plan does not supersede any legislation or existing agreements. This term was also revised in the November Draft to provide greater flexibility where it is not possible to meet these guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/11/05</td>
<td>Archie Lang - Yukon Minister</td>
<td>Water Monitoring / Management (3): &quot;no hydroelectric development...will be allowed on the Mackenzie and Liard Rivers&quot;. It would appear this section only applies to the portion of the rivers within the Deh Cho Planning region.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording to include &quot;within the Dehcho territory&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/11/05</td>
<td>Archie Lang - Yukon Minister</td>
<td>Zone 6 restricts option for continued exploration and discovery around the Cantung mine and other deposits which will restrict the life of the mine and contribution to the Yukon economy. There is high mineral potential and active claims (including Cantung) along the NWT/Yukon border.</td>
<td>Access to and development of existing uses or rights are not restricted by the Plan. Zone 6 is being studied for park expansion which includes a Mineral Evaluation and Resource Assessment (MERA). The boundaries may be revised by this process. The Plan will be amended to reflect the results of that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/11/05</td>
<td>Elder Ted Landry - Fort Providence</td>
<td>Dene place name: Willow Lake is not the correct name. It is meant to be called Mountain Lake.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: As a Regional Plan we have taken the more regionally common name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/11/05</td>
<td>Chief Lloyd Chicot, Julian Landry - KFN</td>
<td>Requested rezoning lower section of Zone 14 bordering with Zone 21 / Cameron Hills. It is a highly sensitive area for the people. There is a lot of moose and caribou in that area and it is important for local trappers.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Zone 14 has been revised to reflect the new PAS area which does not include this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/11/05</td>
<td>Chief Lloyd Chicot, Julian Landry - KFN</td>
<td>Requested rezoning of Zone 14 around Muskeg River a sensitive spawning area, also important for moose and caribou migration.</td>
<td>Accepted: Changed boundary between Zone 13 and 14 and confirmed new delineation with West Point. Updated Zone Descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/11/05</td>
<td>Julian Landry - Kakisa</td>
<td>Explained that if companies rights are grandfathered under the Plan they may still be required to get a new licence under the existing regulatory system.</td>
<td>Existing rights are grandfathered as are any new licences, permits and authorizations the applicant may be required to apply for in order to access or develop those rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/11/05</td>
<td>Vivian Cadiux - Enterprise</td>
<td>Discussed concerns over reclamation of developments other than mining including gravel extraction.</td>
<td>The mine reclamation CR only applies to mine development. Concerns about reclamation of other land uses can be dealt with through the normal review process for land use permits and water licences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/05</td>
<td>Jennifer Bailey - ENR</td>
<td>What is the power of the one year review for the Cumulative Effects term?</td>
<td>If the annual review identifies required changes to the CR, then the Plan would have to be amended and ratified by all three Parties to accept those changes. The text has been revised to clarify this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/05</td>
<td>Sam Gargan - DFN (Elders Committee)</td>
<td>We need to complete Dene Place Name Mapping for the Dehcho territory.</td>
<td>Accepted: The Committee has completed the Dene Place Name map and referenced all names collected throughout the text. We also included this point in the recommendation to preserve Dene culture and language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/05</td>
<td>Tom Lakusta - GNWT-ENR</td>
<td>The intention is not to give research permits a separate identity and a separate use under the Plan. Do not provide a loop hole for developers to get their permits easier.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The Plan will apply to any research activities that also require a land use permit or water licence, but will not apply to minor research activities which only require research authorizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Chief Roy Fabian Hay River Reserve</td>
<td>Requested revisions to Zone 15 and General Use Zone in Hay River / Buffalo Lake area.</td>
<td>Accepted: Rezoned the area and updated zone descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Acknowledgements: Please acknowledge the contribution of Violet Sanguez, who was an essential force in this work and, I hope, will continue to play a lead role in cultural and language revitalization in the Dehcho.</td>
<td>Accepted as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Forestry (Page 26): Fire management is of significant concern to communities - fires burn out of control and damage significant land areas. Is it possible to mention the need for Environment and Natural Resources (ENR) to consult with communities with greater diligence regarding fire management practices?</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The Plan is primarily focused on terms to guide resource development. Communities should raise their concerns regarding general forest management practices directly with ENR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Forestry (Page 26): I am surprised by the statement that 'old growth' forests should be avoided in that, in some cases, for example around Wrigley, these areas are at high risk of fire and insect infestation.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Fire and insect management activities are addressed in CR#21. The wording on old growth forests was requested by GNWT Forest Management Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Page 34, Table 3: Under the 'migration' heading, you have used NA for Woodland Caribou. The SKDB and K'agee Tu elders have documented migration paths and routes for Woodland Caribou.</td>
<td>Not accepted: We do not have sufficient information to provide further direction here at this time. The community can still raise this through the regulatory process as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Page 38, R#28-29: Although I agree with the substance, I'm not sure this is a matter for a land use plan (Money Management).</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The purpose of the Plan (IMA s.3) is to promote the social, cultural and economic well being of residents and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Page xii: DFN is now legally no longer registered as Deh Cho Tribal Council, but is legally registered as Dehcho First Nations, so the term Tribal Council would no longer apply.</td>
<td>Accepted as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Page, 19, CR#8, A#5: SKDB had negotiated the removal of the southwest portion of the proposed PAS area from a proposed 2D seismic program (which never went ahead) and is clearly against any 2D seismic work in that portion of their territory.</td>
<td>The Committee recognizes that non-exclusive geophysical seismic restriction areas were actively negotiated under s. 43 of the IMA and we have respected those negotiated areas. We have recommended they be renegotiated to better align with Conservation Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Page, 23, CR#13, A#8: Check with Akaitcho Territory Government on this matter before making any statements. The ATG is looking into the possibility of negotiating a co-management agreement with Department of Fisheries and Oceans, outside of but with without prejudice to claims negotiations, that would, if successful, lead to the GSLAC being replaced by First Nation / GSLAC co-management Board. You may not want to pre-empt this process by stating that Great Slave Lake or water generally must be managed by GSLAC.</td>
<td>Accepted: The wording has been revised to allow for a future co-management body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Page, 23, CR#13, A#8: GSLAC only deals with fish management, not water, so this is not an accurate statement regardless. More work needed here.</td>
<td>Accepted: DFO provided revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>Table 1, Page 11: I am surprised that Sambaa K'e did not include tourism as a permitted use in the Special Management (Zone 22). They are currently planning a Multi-Use Lodge.</td>
<td>This is the direction provided by the community. Our understanding is that the multi-use lodge is being planned for Zone 5 and is related to their existing outfitter licence (upgraded facility).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>The correct legal term is the Sambaa K'e Dene Band, not First Nation.</td>
<td>Accepted as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>The ‘exact’ boundary of the Conservation Zone is very critical in the K'etosee area. Imperial has identified 2 potential borrow sites outside MGP corridor, thereby giving SKDB greater say. Are the conservation maps being used of legal status, or is there a requirement for more detailed GPS to clearly define boundaries?</td>
<td>Once the Plan is approved, restrictions in Conservation Zones will be implemented through land withdrawals and binding policy direction so the approved zone boundaries will have legal effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent Associates</td>
<td>The GHL hunting issue is not just a beneficiary - non-aboriginal issue. Your recommendation actually contradicts (name may not quite be accurate) the Natural Resources Act of the 1940s, in which Status</td>
<td>This term is only a recommendation and the language has been generalized to avoid this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent</td>
<td>Indians are granted the inherent right to hunt for subsistence throughout Western Canada.</td>
<td>Accepted: Confirmed Dene Place names with communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>Use Dene Fonts and proper Dene spelling for Liidii K’ue, K’at’udeeche, K’agee Tu, or the Dene name for JMR.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording to specify commercial operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/05</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - Crosscurrent</td>
<td>Visitor Quotas (Page 26), R#20: You need to be more specific about the restrictions on visitor quotas. Should not apply to non-commercial visitation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/05</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>What is the process whereby the Dehcho Land Use Plan is approved? Specifically does the plan need the consent of the Acho Dene Koe where it impacts our Territory?</td>
<td>This is DFN(s) decision. Resolution#4, passed at the March 7-9th, 2006 Leadership meeting stated that approval would be by a Regional Leadership Resolution rather than community level ratification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/05</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>The Acho Dene Koe does not support the expansion of the Nahanni National Park to an area known to us as the Tlogotsho Plateau.</td>
<td>ADK Accepted Zone 6 in meeting on February 8th 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/05</td>
<td>Mark Prystupa - DIAND</td>
<td>CR 21 - Salvage logging. You require community support for these activities. The IMA requires this but also talks about an appeals process that could overturn DFN non-support. The language in this term doesn’t provide for that.</td>
<td>Accepted: The support clauses have been removed from the Plan. The IMA requirements for community support still stand regardless of whether they are mentioned in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/05</td>
<td>Mike Walsh - DIAND</td>
<td>The Mackenzie Gas Project has a wider corridor showing an “area of flexibility” beyond the narrow Preliminary Information Package (PIP) corridor. You should consider using that in your zoning as it provides more flexibility for infrastructure.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The proponent must stay within the corridor delineated in the PIP or they would have to initiate a brand new application. All the studies done only pertain to the corridor delineated in the PIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/05</td>
<td>Phillip Gibson - DIAND</td>
<td>In CR # 11 and 12 you suggest that TLUO cannot be disturbed. This sets a very high test for the developer. Have you discussed this with the Mackenzie Gas Project?</td>
<td>These terms have been revised to require the applicant to minimize their impacts to TLUO activities within Conservation Zones through appropriate mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/05</td>
<td>Phillip Gibson - DIAND</td>
<td>The Consultation term (CR#4) is inaccurate regarding the Developer’s and Crown’s duty to consult. Referred to S. 35 rights with respect to consultation term.</td>
<td>Accepted: This term has been completely revised - it now refers to community involvement rather than consultation and focuses on the applicant. Government still has a duty to consult First Nations but the Plan provides no further guidance on this legal issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/05</td>
<td>Phillip Gibson - DIAND</td>
<td>You use First Nations support in several terms. This can create problems for the developers if the communities don’t support it. It gives communities a veto.</td>
<td>As a result of the legal meeting on April 11, the Committee has removed all consent clauses except 2 - Commercial fishing which pertains to DFO and has been accepted by them, and granular resources, which reflects the commitments made in the IMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/05</td>
<td>Tim Christian - DIAND</td>
<td>The wording used in the Settlement Agreement is appropriate regarding consultation (CR#4).</td>
<td>The consultation term has been completely revised - it now refers to community involvement rather than consultation and focuses on the applicant. Government still has a duty to consult First Nations but the Plan provides no further guidance on this legal issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/05</td>
<td>Tim Christian - DIAND</td>
<td>Your consultation term (CR#4) imposes consultation requirements on the Developer. This is not consistent with the latest case law that says the Developer has no duty to consult, only the Crown, but the crown may delegate some of that duty to the developer.</td>
<td>The consultation term has been completely revised - it now refers to community involvement rather than consultation and focuses on the applicant. Government still has a duty to consult First Nations but the Plan provides no further guidance on this legal issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Ann Walsh - Anadarko</td>
<td>Where non-exclusive geophysical surveys are permitted but exclusive geophysical surveys are not, you force us to inb additional contracts with other businesses and it increases the costs.</td>
<td>The intent of such areas is not to permit oil and gas exploration for the purposes of development - it is to allow the collection of regional geophysical data to further government's understanding of regional geological potential. It is being recognized in the Plan because it was negotiated under s. 43 of the IMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Doug Mead - Shell Canada</td>
<td>&quot;Wherever possible&quot; is not practical (Water Monitoring / Management CR #14-15). Extremely high price for the developer to pay. It might be possible but not economical.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Water quality is the most important value held by the residents and communities and should be protected wherever possible. However, the term provides some flexibility to provide for extenuating circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Doug Mead - Shell Canada</td>
<td>CR #15. Shorelines and wetlands are constantly changing. For water monitoring and management what is the baseline?</td>
<td>The term has been revised to require no net loss of wetlands and shorelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Doug Mead - Shell Canada</td>
<td>Does Mine Reclamation Planning and Security (CR #17) apply to gravel extraction as well?</td>
<td>No it doesn't. The term only applies to mine development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Doug Mead - Shell Canada</td>
<td>How are we supposed to know what and where Significant habitat features are? (CR #26)</td>
<td>As per the term, this information can be provided by Responsible Authorities and DFN(s) during pre-application community involvement activities. The term now specifies &quot;known&quot; features and refers to existing sources of information collected by the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Doug Mead - Shell Canada</td>
<td>It is really important to know how the plan is approved so you would know if you are an existing use. It may take years to approve.</td>
<td>The Plan will come into effect on the date all three of the following mechanisms are completed: the Plan has been favourably considered by the Minister of DIAND, the Order in Council for land withdrawals has been approved, and the binding policy direction from the Minister of DIAND to the MVLWB is signed. These should all have the same date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Doug Mead - Shell Canada</td>
<td>Under Access (CR #12), suggest changing sentence &quot;Regulatory Authorities should direct larger infrastructure requirements to be located in General Use Zones and Special Management Zones in order of preference.&quot;</td>
<td>Not Accepted: &quot;Should&quot; provides too much flexibility. Applicants have to demonstrate that it is not possible to route the corridor through a General Use Zone before Special Management Zones or Conservation Zones are considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Jim Hawkins - Imperial Oil</td>
<td>CR #24 - 30 days is too short for submitting post-operation files. Many land use permits specify within a year.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The term now requires reporting to be submitted consistent with reporting requirements in the relevant existing legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Jim Hawkins - Imperial Oil</td>
<td>Dene in the Sahtu, and the Dene Tha have traditional use areas within Dehcho territory. Plan says this is for exclusive use of the Dehcho First Nation (R#19).</td>
<td>Accepted: This term now only refers to the issue to be negotiated. &quot;Exclusive use&quot; has been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Jim Hawkins - Imperial Oil</td>
<td>Heidi It looks like the boundary goes through the community of Wrigley? Pehdzeh Kì Déh Zone.</td>
<td>The zone boundaries exclude communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Jim Hawkins - Imperial Oil</td>
<td>Minor Infrastructure - Mackenzie Gas Project would be applying for Type B Permits in Special Management Zones. The term should not need to say anything any special management or general use zones.</td>
<td>Accepted: The term only applied to Conservation Zones so reference to Special Management Zones and General Use Zones has been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Jim Hawkins - Imperial Oil</td>
<td>Need a clear statement on the developer’s duty to consult and the communities’ duty to participate (problems with poor participation). Then the developers will.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Communities often lack the capacity to participate effectively. An Action has been added for DFN to make best efforts to participate in community involvement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Mike Peters - CAPP</td>
<td>In CR #3 who is responsible for identifying individuals and TLUO sites? Should not be developer.</td>
<td>Local First Nations will identify affected individuals and TLUO sites. The wording has been revised to reflect this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/05</td>
<td>Sean Britt - Y2Y</td>
<td>If the developer reclaims an area to reduce cumulative effects but there is a time lag would it hurt other developers?</td>
<td>There would be a time lag before the area has been reclaimed during which new developments that cause the thresholds to be exceeded should not be authorized. Wording has been added to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Response / Revision

the term to reflect this.

Accepted: Appropriate wording has been added to the preamble to reflect this.

Accepted: Explanation remains for the term and reasoning behind accurately reflects 43 of the IMA.

16/12/05
Sean Britt - Y2Y
Organization or Name
Comment
Industry may have different requirements for guides and monitors and may require a guide or monitor to have a firearms license.

Accepting industry's role as a partner in the Plan is vital to the success of the Plan.

Federal government access for geological mapping. If so I would reword this to indicate that, otherwise the assumption - which you heard expressed at the meeting - will be that exploration and development should logically be allowed to follow. Not an unreasonable position for proponents to take.

12/19/05
Peter Zimmerman
Organization or Name
Comment
Allowing "non-exclusive" geophysical surveys in virtually all the lands, irrespective of land classification is problematic. It could be a lever for future entry into these areas. Perhaps the intent of this is to allow the Federal government access for geological mapping. If so I would reword this to indicate that, otherwise the assumption - which you heard expressed at the meeting - will be that exploration and development should logically be allowed to follow. Not an unreasonable position for proponents to take.

Accepted: Explained rationale for the term and reasoning behind the negotiations in the IMA. The term has been amended to accurately reflect s. 43 of the IMA.

16/12/05
Sean Britt - Y2Y
Organization or Name
Comment
Regarding R#26. I would suggest wording such as "Government and Developers should give the Dehcho and Northern businesses first consideration for providing services required for implementation of their plans." This may be more palatable to industry and yet still achieve your goals for the community.

This Recommendation has been merged into the Economic Development Strategy Action so no longer exists.

19/12/05
Peter Zimmerman
Organization or Name
Comment
The phrase "where possible" tends to weaken the statement. (1) Suggested "best available current technology" e.g.CR#14….

This is best left to the regulatory system to impose on a case by case basis as required rather than making this a blanket requirement of all authorizations.

12/19/05
Peter Zimmerman
Organization or Name
Comment
You may wish to consider having some condition that requires proponents to audit their work and submit these audit reports to DFN as a method of proving compliance with their stated practices and mitigation measures. If communities say no to consultation? Is that an acceptable response?

Accepted: Revised preamble to explain that Guides and monitors report to local First Nation and act as a liaison between developer, contractor and community, and described possible roles.

05/01/06
Glen Stephens - DIAND
Organization or Name
Comment
What happens if communities say no to consultation? Is that an acceptable response?

Communities do not always have the capacity to meet industry deadlines and participate effectively. Applicants are required to document their community involvement efforts as per current application requirements. It is up to the Responsible Authority to decide when the requirements have been met.

10/01/06
Chuck Byrne - Nunavut Planning Commission
Organization or Name
Comment
How will Regulatory Authorities know what is an "appropriate" level of consultation? Is that an acceptable response?

 Responsible Authorities determine what is appropriate. We have inserted a recommendation in Chapter 3 for Responsible Authorities to develop criteria and processes to determine conformity before the Plan is approved.

10/01/06
Mark Wilson - ITI
Organization or Name
Comment
The local guide and monitor: do you have guidelines on roles and responsibilities of what they would report to?

Replaced project with land use throughout the Plan other than where appropriate and defined land use.

12/19/05
Peter Zimmerman
Organization or Name
Comment
You may wish to consider having some condition that requires proponents to audit their work and submit these audit reports to DFN as a method of proving compliance with their stated practices and mitigation measures. If communities say no to consultation? Is that an acceptable response?

Accepted: Revised preamble to explain that Guides and monitors report to local First Nation and act as a liaison between developer, contractor and community, and described possible roles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>Organization or Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Committee Response / Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/01/06</td>
<td>Mark Wilson - ITI</td>
<td>What type of authority would the Planning Committee have after approval?</td>
<td>Discussions at the legal meeting on April 11 suggested the Committee would generally monitor conformity with the Plan. We would be copied on all correspondence for new authorizations, and where requested, provide an opinion on conformity for the consideration of the Responsible Authority. We would also be responsible for Plan amendments and revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01/06</td>
<td>Tom Wilson - Village of Fort Simpson</td>
<td>Bridges may be required for the road north of Wrigley to go ahead. Would CR #11 allow this type of access through a Conservation Zone?</td>
<td>Yes, if it could be demonstrated that routing the road through a General Use or Special Management Zone was not feasible and that the other conditions regarding minimizing impacts were met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Berna Landry:</td>
<td>The community has identified a particularly important sacred site in this zone which provides water for spiritual purposes. Therefore it should be added with Zone 16 (Falaise Lake Wetland Complex).</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The site has been referenced in the Zone Description for Zone 24 but not shown to protect the location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/06</td>
<td>John Bartlett - Fort Providence</td>
<td>Existing Uses: It is up to the MVLWB as to whether a renewal is exempt or not as per S. 151(2) of the MVRMA.</td>
<td>The Plan does not supersede existing Acts and Regulations. If the Plan exempts a renewal of an application, it just means the Plan is not restricting it. The Responsible Authority still has to follow its own legislation in deciding whether to renew an authorization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/06</td>
<td>John Bartlett - Fort Providence</td>
<td>Is there a definition on the size of the community water intake area?</td>
<td>It is up to the developer to demonstrate they are not going to impact the community water intake. The area to be assessed would be determined at the scoping stage with the Responsible Authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/06</td>
<td>John Bartlett / Chief Berna Landry - Fort Providence</td>
<td>Industry is going through the back door. They find ways to get other permits (Research Permits) for their development projects.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: We have included definition of Research Authorizations and clarified that the exemption is constrained to those research activities that do not require any other type of authorization (See Scope and Application in Chapter 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/06</td>
<td>Sam Gargan - DFN</td>
<td>Guides and Monitors (R#11-12, A#3): It is happening in Nunavut, companies are hiring people and they tell them to go home and not use them. They sit at home and receive pay.</td>
<td>Since guides and monitors report to the community, should this occur the communities can raise the issue with the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/06</td>
<td>Sam Gargan - DFN</td>
<td>I would like to see a 2 kilometer buffer on the Redknife and Axe Point River. It is actively used by membership for subsistence harvesting of moose and beaver, and fish also spawn here.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised zoning at that meeting to capture important tributaries south of the Mackenzie River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01/06</td>
<td>Sam Gargan - DFN (Elders Committee)</td>
<td>The Traditional Knowledge Protocol needs to be mentioned in the Land Use Plan.</td>
<td>Accepted: DFN’s and Sambaa Ke protocols are referenced in R #9 (new recommendation) and included in Appendix 2 of the Background Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Eric Betsaka - Nahanni Butte</td>
<td>Our Community has never agreed With Fort Liard's Interpretation of where the boundary should be respecting traditional lands, they are attempting to claim our land for their own benefit that is adjacent to our winter road and obviously very close to our community. We oppose any development on these disputed lands until a settlement is reached.</td>
<td>Fort Liard, Nahanni Butte and Trout Lake attended a rezoning session held in Fort Simpson on March 10th, 2006 to identify appropriate zoning for the overlap area. The Land Use Plan does not deal with traditional boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/01/06</td>
<td>Rob Buffler - Yellowstone to Yukon</td>
<td>No geophysical activity should be permitted in protected areas or conservation zones. Non-exclusive geophysical surveys could impact wildlife. First stage development-surveys could provide an inroad for greater development in future (e.g. exploration, drilling, etc.) which would have a devastating impact on wildlife.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The plan has to be consistent with the IMA. We have recommended these areas be renegotiated to harmonize the restricted areas with Conservation Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/01/06</td>
<td>Rob Buffler - Yellowstone to Yukon</td>
<td>Non-exclusive geo-physical surveys should not be permitted within PAS and conservation zones to ensure the integrity of the DLUPC zone management strategy. Reference potential negative impacts on wildlife and risk of providing inroad for greater development.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: We have to be consistent with the IMA (S.43 IMA). The preamble to the term has been revised to describe the potential impacts of allowing seismic in Conservation Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/06</td>
<td>Peter Dimmell - PDAC</td>
<td>Given the need for additional research and consultation, we are requesting that the deadline for finalization and adoption of the land use plan be delayed for one year.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The Committee has spent the last four years collecting research and input and providing opportunities for discussions between industry and communities. The Plan is based on the results of that work. Any new research and discussions initiated now can be considered in future Plan amendments or revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/06</td>
<td>Peter Dimmell - PDAC</td>
<td>Page 188 of the background report to the November 2005 draft states: “Currently unemployment is estimated to be 20.7% of the whole Dehcho region”. “There is a heavy reliance on the government sector for jobs, particularly in smaller communities. The major source of revenue for the region is federal transfer payments and other external funding sources.” However, the plan then fails to propose strategies to reduce unemployment or reliance on transfer payments but, rather, offers only vague recommendations regarding capacity building. It ignores the experiences in other regions of the NWT that demonstrate that development can bring benefits.</td>
<td>The zoning provides for considerable development opportunities for the next 5 years. DLUPC modeling demonstrates that even moderate increases in development as provided for in the zoning will dramatically increase employment opportunities for both residents and non residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/06</td>
<td>Peter Dimmell - PDAC</td>
<td>While the draft land use plan mentions an economic development strategy, the economic modeling revealed at the November 14 meeting was questionable, and the plan does not appear to have examined the truly positive effects of exploration and mining in other communities in Canada’s north and in other regions of Canada.</td>
<td>Modeling was undertaken by Roy Ellis who has modeled many major projects in the North including diamond mines and MGP. GNWT and Canada assisted in developing appropriate scenarios. While we understand the economic benefits of mining, there are other over-riding considerations for the communities at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/06</td>
<td>Rachel Plotkin - Sierra Club, Mara Kerry - Nature Canada</td>
<td>Access: The revised DCLUP includes a number of disclaimers that indicate zoning requirements do not apply to pre-existing 3rd party rights. Where this disclaimer is used to allow access, for example through a conservation zone, the benefits of the conservation zone designation are impaired. This potential threat obliges the plan to set strict limits and conditions for the access.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Existing rights and Agreements must be respected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/06</td>
<td>Rachel Plotkin - Sierra Club, Mara Kerry - Nature Canada</td>
<td>Thresholds: The current plan identifies only “critical” level thresholds. The inclusion of quantitative thresholds is an important tool for assessing impairment to ecological integrity. If mitigation measures are initiated only once critical thresholds are reached, damage to the ecosystem may be beyond repair. For clarity purposes, a “cautionary” threshold should be identified for species at risk, water and air quality and other ecosystem elements as identified by technical experts.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The Cumulative Effects Management term will be revised as new data is received. The Research Actions identify the need to assess tiered thresholds and other indicators. The Plan recommends an annual review of cumulative effects thresholds. The lack of tiered thresholds in the Plan does not prevent Responsible Authorities from considering and applying these in the regulatory system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/01/06</td>
<td>Rachel Plotkin - Sierra Club, Mara Kerry - Nature Canada</td>
<td>To truly protect the entire watershed is to prohibit all industrial activity within the watershed. Perhaps, a more pragmatic approach may be to designate all of the adjacent lands of CZ as SMZs and to make best practices mandatory within these zones.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: We have generally not used Special Management Zones as buffers. These are areas with special objectives or terms. The proposed revisions are not in line with the processes we have used to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>1.2 - Statement 5. Traditional Land Use and Occupancy. The Committee should not give the impression in the wording that the Plan provides authority for traditional land use, occupancy and harvesting activities through legislation.</td>
<td>Accepted: This statement has been clarified to suggest that the Plan does not manage or restrict TLUO activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>2.1.1 (Page 6): In the 2nd sentence here, the reference to the people being stewards should include government and regulatory agencies, otherwise it could give the impression that the government and regulatory agencies do not play a stewardship role.</td>
<td>Governments and Regulatory agencies are include people. The Vision statement is general so as not to omit anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>2.2 In the 2nd sentence under the Protected Area Strategy Zone bullet, change “is” to “will be” and replace “the Park” with “an applicable”, so the latter part of the sentence reads as: “... which will be managed under the legislation and authority of the sponsoring agency and an applicable Management Plan.”</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>2.2 Land Use Zones (page 7): Concerning the list of 7 overarching principles (bullets), add an 8th: “Regard the interests of all Canadians.” to fully reflect the mandate of DLUPC pursuant to the IMA.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>2.2 Land Use Zones (page 7): In the very first sentence of this section, regarding the reference to “consultation with communities and Planning Partners”, reference should be made to others consulted throughout the land use planning process.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Planning Partners is a general phrase for everyone we consult with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2 - For clarity, no Protected Area Management Committees have been established under the Protected Areas Strategy process in the Dehcho region. Correct wording and definition.</td>
<td>Accepted: Corrected wording throughout the Plan and Background Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2 It is strongly recommended that the size and extent of the Conservation Zones and Special Management Zones be reduced so that they are more comparable with the extent of the original land withdrawals in 2003 (not including the roughly 12,626 km² related to the Nahanni National Park Reserve).</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Conservation Zones have dropped to 38.1% (was 40.7%) while Special Management Zones have increased to 24.4% (was 24.1%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2 Plan Implementation (page 44), 3rd complete paragraph, last sentence reads: “No new legislation is required to implement the plan immediately - only policy direction from the responsible Ministers to their departments and agencies, directing them to conduct their operations in conformity with the Approved Land Use Plan, and minor changes to existing processes as explained below.” In other words, the Committee is stating that the Plan can be implemented without any legislative changes. DIAND believes that this statement needs to be tested by, at the least, having each regulatory authority confirm that the tools listed for implementation (land withdrawal, policy direction to MVLBW, the Canada Mining Regulations, etc) can achieve what the Committee hopes to do. The regulatory authorities will therefore need to seek such appropriate legal advice and also advise the Committee to perform a similar assessment.</td>
<td>It is the government’s responsibility to seek their own legal advice and inform the Committee if there is anything in the Plan they cannot legally implement. The Committee has kept all relevant Responsible Authorities informed, including the MVLBW and invited comments from all of them. Not all have done so. The Committee has sought its own legal advice and the Plan has been revised substantially in form and content to reflect that advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2 Plan Implementation: Include the implementation roles of the DFN, the local First Nations, and the municipalities if applicable.</td>
<td>Accepted: A section on DFN(s) implementation responsibilities has been included in Chapter 3 of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2 Plan Implementation: Regulators such as the Land and Water Board should be consulted as to what effects the Plan might have on their operations.</td>
<td>The MVLBW (and all Responsible Authorities) have been kept informed of the planning process since the beginning and specifically invited to comment on several occasions. They have chosen not to provide comprehensive feedback on the Plan. Earlier statements (Regional Forum 2005) suggest they welcome the Plan because it provides clarity and direction to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2.2 In the second and third paragraphs of this Section, there are references to Pehdzeh Ki Deh and Edehzhie, but a reference to the mineral and energy resource assessment (MERA) work in the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem needs to be included as well.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This section is talking about major changes to land withdrawals not MERA work. This is out of context for this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2.3. - In the third paragraph of this sub-section, a small ‘r’ recommendation is made by the Committee that Regulatory Authorities develop standard criteria and processes for determining conformity, to facilitate implementation of the Plan. An implementation workshop with the Committee and Regulatory Authorities may be useful to all parties to help achieve this recommendation.</td>
<td>This is now a big &quot;R&quot; recommendation! The Committee cannot commit to participating in such a workshop at this time, as our workplan and budget for 2006-07 are still under discussion with DIAND’s Implementation branch. However, it would be a good idea for Responsible Authorities to organize such a workshop amongst themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2.4 Inspections and Enforcement (Figure 1) In the purple box in the mid-left hand side of the diagram, whose text begins “The MVLWB issues permit with Conformity Requirements and recommended measures,” add “and/or licence” after “permit.” (Note that the MVRMA and the NWT Waters Act use the spelling ‘licence’, not ‘license.’)</td>
<td>Accepted: Amended diagram and spelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2.4. (Figure 1) After the “Is the application complete?” box, add a new box saying “MVLWB determines whether a preliminary screening is required”. The “no” arrow should point to the purple box in the lower right hand corner of the diagram, whose text begins “MVLWB incorporates Conformity Requirements... The “yes” arrow should point to the purple box starting “MVLWB conducts a Preliminary Screening... “ This step is different from the grandfathering step described in the first purple box in the diagram. For example, if a developer is requesting a “renewal” of a water licence for a project that has already been screened or gone to environmental assessment, the MVLWB may rule that a preliminary screening is not required.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: If preliminary screening is not required because it relates to a renewal, then as far as the Plan is concerned it is grandfathered and not subject to a conformity check. If preliminary screening is not required because it is related to something the MVLWB exempts within their own processes, then a conformity check with the Plan is still required. A preliminary screening box has been added but the arrow goes from there to the conformity check box below (two down).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2.4. (Figure 1) Regarding the yellow coloured box in the lower, centre part of Figure 1, specifically the term “concurrent conformity checks”, what happens if these result in different conflicting results?</td>
<td>If multiple authorities have different opinions on the same CR, the decision would rest with the Authority that issues the authorization to which the CR is directed. All relevant CRs have to pass the check for the authorization to be issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2.4. Inspections and Enforcement - DIAND Lands is of the opinion that DIAND inspectors would not inspect and monitor Developers to ensure they comply with the Plan (1) the Plan is not a legally enforceable document (2) would only inspect for compliance to the regulatory approval, being the land use permit or water licence.</td>
<td>Accepted: This was an error. The Plan will be implemented by means of incorporating the CRs into the terms and conditions of permits or licences, or ensuring they are met before the authorization is issued. So by inspecting for compliance to the regulatory approval, the inspectors are in effect also monitoring for compliance with the Plan. This has been clarified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2.4. It should be reiterated that when DIAND authorizes the use of land, e.g. quarry permit, then DIAND is a Regulatory Authority for the purposes of the Plan. When DIAND is giving an interest in land, e.g. lease, it is not acting as a Regulatory Authority and should therefore not be considered one under the Plan for that purpose.</td>
<td>Accepted: The Plan no longer points out specific Responsible Authorities except in a few cases where the Committee needed to direct a CR at specific departments or agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.2.4. Revise Figure 2 to include the possibility of the application being referred to environmental assessment. Developments can be referred to EA when the MVLWB is not involved. To address this comment on Figure 2, the Committee may wish to generalize Figure 1 to include preliminary screeners other than the MVLWB.</td>
<td>Accepted as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>3.4 Plan Exceptions: In the list of five considerations (bullets) which the Committee will use in making its decision, there is no reference to the “interests of all Canadians”. Given that the IMA states that the Plan should also have “regard to the interests of all Canadians”, a sixth bullet should be added to the other five for use by the Committee in making decisions.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Exceptions are no longer discussed in the Plan as per the legal meeting on April 11th. This whole section has been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>4.9 (Background) Economic Development Assessment Model: Insert qualification that: “INAC is not in a position to endorse the output of the Ellis model and the implications the model outputs have for projections of revenue from future oil and gas production in the Dehcho.”</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Revised with comment in endnote &quot;.....though they have not conducted a full review of the outputs&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>4.9.1 (Background): Modeling assumptions ignore the influence of the MGP in stimulating exploration, particularly in the northern Dehcho. This could lead to the conclusion that there would be no industry interest in northern Dehcho. Comment could be inserted that some exploration activity leading to exploratory drilling is plausible in areas adjoining the MGP corridor in northern Dehcho.</td>
<td>Accepted: We are not modeling these areas but the text has been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>6.7 (Background) Economic Development Assessment: Roll up of economic contributions from all industrial sectors reduces transparency and comprehension (Economic Development Assessment page 193). For each column in Figure 23 break down contribution by industrial sector so effects can be better evaluated, or provide summary of contribution to revenue and GDP by sector.</td>
<td>Not accepted: The model is not designed to evaluate individual sectors or businesses in isolation (referring to figure 21 not 23).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>6.7 (Background) Economic Development Assessment: Question plausibility of projections for revenue as illustrated by Figure 21, Impact on Revenue - scenarios over 20 years. Review the input and assumptions of the model with regard to oil and gas development taking into account the factors mentioned here.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Development projections were developed based on feedback from industry and planning partners and are calculated using existing royalty regimes. It describes the revenues that could be generated if available resources were developed according to the modeled scenarios. Current development levels are far below &quot;potential&quot; scenarios so are not readily comparable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Accepting the experimental nature of the proposal (CR #25), clarify and simplify the application process, optimize and integrate feedback, and ensure a fair appeal and review process for conformity determination. A suggestion is to create a standing joint industry/Committee staff Working Group to allow for industry presentations on the cumulative impact of proposals.</td>
<td>The Cumulative Effects Management term now only requires Responsible Authorities to consider the thresholds in their regulation of land uses. The Plan includes a recommendation for annual review by the Committee, governments and other interested planning partners and Actions to study and improve our understanding of cumulative effects with industry participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Acronyms (page xi): RRSPs should be RRSP; SEDEX should be “Sedimentary Exhalative Sulphide Deposit”.</td>
<td>Accepted as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Add an explicit statement about cumulative effects thresholds in Chapter 1 of the Plan (e.g. under Section 1.2. Scope and Application of the Dehcho Land Use Plan, sub-section 4. Land Uses, page 2), since the thresholds could have as great an impact on allowable activities as zoning.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The Cumulative Effects Management term now only requires Responsible Authorities to consider the thresholds in their regulation of land uses so the impact of this Term may not be as significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Add the following bullet to CR #6: “Should an existing oil and gas licence be replaced in whole or in part by a successor right (Significant Discovery or Production Licence), the successor right shall be regarded as an ‘existing right’”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Wording around successor rights has been added and clarified in sections pertaining to existing uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>All references to the Cantung Mine should be updated to reflect the Mine’s reopening in the fall of 2005, including at the top of page 119 of the Background Report.</td>
<td>Accepted: Updated Background document as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Before threshold activities are now exempt from this CR. However threshold activities are now exempt from this CR. The Committee should agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to a process by which the balance of withdrawn land in the Dehcho will be studied for non-renewable resource potential. The Committee should agree that the baseline disturbance per zone (for Cumulative Effects Assessment CR#25) be defined by a multi-stakeholder committee, including on-the-ground ecological impacts in addition to the remote sensing data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>As previously stated, DIAND recommends that the C2s and SMZs be reduced in size to better conform to the Interim Land Withdrawals (ILW). To assist the Committee in this exercise, DIAND has provided a list of considerations, including areas where non-renewable resource potential is significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Conservation Zones have been reduced as a result of the land withdrawal negotiations around Pehdzeh Ki Ndeh (reflected in the Plan). The remainder of the zones reflect extensive community planning and consultation and cannot change without jeopardizing community support for the Plan. Federal/territorial conservation initiatives (PAS and Nahanni Park Expansion) are responsible for the largest C2s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Because the definition of “mining” as it stands now would inhibit even prospection, it should be defined separately from “mineral exploration.” What precisely constitutes a permit license of authorization should also be defined at the front of the document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The scope of the Plan now clearly defines the types of authorizations the Plan applies to— it does not apply to minor “below threshold” activities such as prospecting. For clarity, exploration activities that require a land use permit or water licence are within the scope of the Plan and so are included in the definition of mining.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Chapter 6 (Background), Page 156, 4th bullet near bottom of page: “seizes” should be “ceases.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Concerning the statement: “Nothing in this Land Use Plan will impact or reduce in any way, the treaty and aboriginal rights and activities of the Dehcho Dene Descendants. Traditional Land Use, Occupancy and Harvesting will continue in all areas at all times.”, it appears that the Committee is placing traditional land use and occupancy “a priori” to the Plan. DIAND is of the opinion that it is misleading to say that the Plan will not impact or reduce traditional land use, as many authorized activities will necessarily curtail traditional land use. It therefore seems incorrect to say that the Plan, when implemented, cannot restrict the exercise of section 35 rights.</td>
<td>Accepted: These statements have been revised throughout the Plan. The intention was to specify that the Plan would not manage or restrict traditional land use and occupancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Consultation CR#4: It is questionable whether this “full and meaningful consultation” can begin before an application is received. DIAND suggests that this be changed to read: “It is preferable that consultation begin prior to the application.” However, in any case, the Applicant will be advised that consultation must begin as soon as being notified as to receipt of the application, and the need to continue consulting throughout the life of the proposed development.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: MVLWB requires applicants to initiate discussions with communities prior to submitting their application to explain the project, gather information and propose mitigation to address concerns. The applicant is missing half the information if they haven’t talked to the community before submitting an application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR #1 (page 8): Can it be assumed that the MVLWB is the designated Regulatory Authority here? It should be spelled out rather than having to look in Section 3.2.3 for confirmation. Also, Plan Exceptions are permitted as outlined in Section 3.4, so this should probably be mentioned here as well.</td>
<td>For the most part it will be the MVLWB but in other cases they may not be involved in reviewing an application so the appropriate Responsible Authority would have to check conformity with zoning. The Plan no longer allows for exceptions of any kind as a result of discussions at the legal meeting on April 11th. This can be revisited in future Plan reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR #17 Reclamation Security: The 4th bullet deals with the form of security which is already specified in existing legislation. Suggest bullet read “Security will be in a form specified through section 17 (1) of the Northwest Territories Waters Act and section 12 (3) of the Northwest Territories Waters Regulations (not reachable by the Developer’s creditors under bankruptcy)”.</td>
<td>Accepted: But also included reference to the MVLUR for situations where security is collected on the land use permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR #2 exceeds Section 26 of the MVLU Regulations which allows a number of specific conditions to be imposed in a permit and “any other matters not inconsistent with these Regulations, for the protection of the biological or physical characteristics of the lands.” It is unclear whether the traditional knowledge (TK) protocols protect the biological or physical characteristics of the land or not. The Committee should delete the requirement that a first nation will only support an application if it is satisfied respecting the protection of TK. Alternatively, if a Regulatory Authority has a discretion broad enough to allow for consideration of protection of traditional knowledge, DLUPC should set out in the Plan requirements an applicant might have to follow to protect TK.</td>
<td>Accepted: The requirement to follow existing TK policies has been changed to a recommendation. Copies of existing policies have also been included in the Background Report appendices for reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR #24: This is not a MVLWB requirement. Make CR#24 into an Action or Recommendation that the appropriate Regulatory Authority would have to add this requirement to the appropriate permit, licence or authorization.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: DLUPC and Responsible Authorities need these files to conduct cumulative effects assessments for consideration in deciding whether to authorize the permit or licence so it needs to be submitted with the application. The term provides flexibility in the type of data; small operators with limited capabilities can GPS coordinates and submit those.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR #6 it is unclear what is meant by “altering” an existing non-conforming use? Reference to Section 27 (1) of the Canada Mining Regulations states that “the holder of a recorded claim has the exclusive right to prospect for minerals and to develop any mine on the land within the boundaries of the claim”. DIAND recommend that bullet 5 state “If an application is made for a permit, license or authorization for a land use other than the allowed non-conforming use, then the application is considered a new activity and is subject to the full extent of the Plan”.</td>
<td>Accepted: The Committee has removed wording pertaining to alteration of use under the Existing Use term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR #8: Although non-exclusive geophysical surveys are allowed in the Edehzhie PAS Zone, the area’s candidate protected area status may affect licence issuance.</td>
<td>The same consideration should be given to the Plan’s Conservation Zones in advance of negotiations being completed to harmonize geophysical restrictions. Seismic activity is not compatible with Conservation Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR#17, 5th &amp; 6th bullets address how the security deposit is to be used and made available. Suggested additional bullets: “The security deposit must be secured and held as a guarantee of closure and reclamation work on the proposed mining activity”. “Security should be held in trust by the Developer as a guarantee that accepted closure and reclamation activities pursuant to an accepted Final Reclamation Plan are performed whereupon it will be refunded as per section 17 (5) of the NWT Waters Act”.</td>
<td>Accepted: With one change - the deposit is held by DIAND in trust for the developer...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR#25: Since many parties will be involved and potential data gaps, will environmental agreements be necessary to ensure (a) filling these information gaps and (b) possible overlap in roles and responsibilities?</td>
<td>The Committee will run the assessments for each application and provide the data to the Responsible Authority that issues the authorization under review. DIAND will have to coordinate with other Responsible Authorities to fill data gaps and coordinate overall roles and responsibilities on cumulative effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR#25: “regulatory authorities will determine conformity…” raises some concerns since more than one agency will do the conformity determination to track cumulative effects digitally. Change to a single Regulatory Authority (such as MVLWB) with sole responsibility for conducting the conformity determination.</td>
<td>Accepted: This was an error. The Committee will run the assessments. The Term has been revised so that the Committee will run the assessments for the Responsible Authority’s consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR#25: Where there has been reclamation and there is ecological value in the disturbed land, are such areas included in the calculation? Explain how this form of reclamation can be incorporated in Habitat Availability (note- this is really an item for the regulator and not the Committee).</td>
<td>If the area has been reclaimed and the applicant can demonstrate that it no longer presents a disturbance to woodland caribou then we would remove the disturbance in question from the database for new assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR#25: Minimum Patch Size and Core Area (Page 32) on item 4 about lakes being excluded from the Core Area calculations, what about natural run-off and excessive sedimentation from erosion?</td>
<td>This indicator is measuring the effects of terrestrial habitat fragmentation on core area availability. Disturbance to water bodies from run-off and sedimentation is handled under the stream crossing indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR#25: The Plan should state what weight each of the Cumulative Effects thresholds has.</td>
<td>All of the indicators/thresholds is given equal weight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR#25: There are also concerns about the possible delays in the determining process given the fact that an assessment of several indicators has to be done. What are some of the alternatives that can be applied by the Committee if there are delays in the project review process?</td>
<td>The Committee has been running these assessments for a year now and can complete an assessment in less than a day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td><strong>CR#25:</strong> There should be more scientific information provided to explain the Stream Crossing Density threshold and to show that it is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td><strong>CR#26:</strong> If significant features are known, they should be identified in the Plan. If the threshold of disturbance is such that it might not be captured in the existing regulatory process, they should be part of the Conservation Zone category. Otherwise, the Plan will present a false impression of what areas can be developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td><strong>Definition of “Mining” is very loose and includes exploration as well as development and extraction. Add separate term for “Mineral Exploration.”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td><strong>Delete the definition of the term “Regulatory Authority” on page xv and replace the term throughout the Plan with the name of the specific regulatory agency or agencies (i.e. specify MVEIRB, MVLWB, DFO etc., as well as including Table 4 of agencies at the front of the Plan).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td><strong>Economic Development Strategy:</strong> Remove statement “the Dehcho will benefit far less than if Dehcho companies are the ones actually doing the development.” It ignores capacity of Dehcho companies to undertake business, how private companies are determined to be Dehcho companies, and who within the Dehcho may benefit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td><strong>Economic Development Strategy (page 35):</strong> It is stated that the model allows for comparison of costs and benefits of opening up different lands. This was true at an earlier stage of the planning process but in this document it is used to generate specific outputs for the Plan. Include a statement qualifying uncertainty of the economic outputs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional background information is provided in the Background Report.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization or Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Committee Response / Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Exclusion of the Conservation Zones from all cumulative effects assessment (CR #25) changes and biases the nature of the calculations and determinations. The large areas under Conservation Zones obviously set aside a large proportion of habitat for many VECs. Why does this factor not appear in any cumulative effects metric? Develop a habitat availability metric which includes the Conservation Zones.</td>
<td>New land uses are not permitted in Conservation Zones so we do not need to track cumulative effects as closely. The idea of cumulative effects management is to manage development where it is occurring, not where it is not occurring. Some of the assessments (road, corridor and water crossing density) were run for the entire Dehcho territory, regardless of zone type and the results are clearly shown on those maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Health and Social Issues (R #27): With reference to government providing increased funding, this goes outside the scope of the Plan and should therefore be deleted.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The purpose of the Plan is to promote the social, cultural and economic well being of communities and residents (IMA). This is a recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>In CR #14 (Water Monitoring / Management), “CCME” should be spelled out Canadian Council of Ministers for the Environment.</td>
<td>Accepted: The standards are now spelled out in the Plan and CCME is used and spelled out in the Notes and References section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>In CR #16, remove the last sentence “rivers and tributaries in the Dehcho region will remain substantially unaffected in quality, quantity and flow” is more of a goal than a conformity requirement because water quantity and flow is related not only to human activities but to overall climate change as well, making the conformity checks on this requirement difficult.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed - moved to goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>In CR #17 on page 25, the 2nd sentence reads “For minor or short-term activities for which separate C&amp;R Plans are not currently required, reclamation plans will be clearly described in the project application and security amounts will be determined based on those activities.” This requirement needs to be clarified because in some situations security is not required under existing regulations.</td>
<td>This CR now only applies to mine construction, operation and closure. Below threshold activities such as prospecting and exploration are not subject to this term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>In CR #23 (Fishing Lodges), DIAND believes that this is a fettering of discretion as there is no legal authority to do this. The Plan should say what can be done, not by whom. Amend this CR or delete.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This wording was reviewed and accepted by DFO, who is the Responsible Authority on this CR. It has been revised to direct this CR at DFO alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>In CR #4, the wording suggests continuing consultation throughout the life of a project. Add the qualifier that “consultation should be timely and at intervals appropriate to the scale and nature of the project.”</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: proposed development .....at intervals appropriate to the nature of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>In the fourth bullet of CR #11, second sub-bullet, concerning the reference to not disturbing “traditional land use and occupancy activities in the area”, this goes beyond existing legislation and provides too difficult a test for development to proceed. Amend this requirement to state that the regulators must take into account the disturbance to traditional activities when making their decisions.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised to require applicants to minimize disturbance to TLUO activities within Conservation Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>In the third paragraph (page 24), concerning the application of conditions relating to air quality, it should be noted in the Plan that the NEB has a “general” mandate to address air quality under COGOA.</td>
<td>This has been clarified in the preamble to the recommendations on air monitoring and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>It should be stated that prospecting and exploration activities conducted under a Prospectors Licence issued under the Canada Mining Regulations and for which no other permits are required, are not considered “mining activities” for the purpose of CR 17.</td>
<td>Accepted: This term now only applies to mine construction, operation and closure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>It would be useful to add an explicit statement about cumulative effects thresholds in Chapter 1 of the Plan (e.g. under Section 1.2. Scope and Application of the Dehcho Land Use Plan, sub-section 4. Land Uses,</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This section is meant to talk about land uses, not terms for development. The thresholds are now only guidelines for the consideration of Responsible Authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Mackenzie Valley Pipeline: Concerning the possible need for a wider corridor, the existing corridor may not provide sufficient flexibility to avoid sensitive areas or because some areas are not feasible for geotechnical reasons. Use a wider zone of 2.5 km as developed by the proponent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Accepted: The pipeline cannot go outside the corridor specified in the application currently under review without triggering a whole new application and studies for the new location. In other areas, the pipeline is confined to the corridor by the surrounding surface land withdrawals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Mine Reclamation Planning and Security (CR#17) ignores the federal Mine Site Reclamation Guidelines which are currently going through revisions and should be out this year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is incorrect. Many of the requirements in this term are consistent with the reclamation guidelines but the guidelines were not referenced in the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Minor Infrastructure (page 19): It would be useful to also state in this sub-section that seismic lines of 1.5 metres or less in width are below the threshold for requiring a land use permit, and are therefore not affected by the Plan, and can take place throughout the Dehcho region unless otherwise prohibited (e.g. Nahanni National Park Reserve).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Accepted: Seismic lines are not considered minor infrastructure. However, they are small and narrow enough to not require a land use permit, than they are not subject to the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Page xii: Definition of &quot;Developers&quot;: This statement indicates that a person applying for a Crown Lease would not be a Developer, because a Crown Lease is not a licence, permit or authorization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted: We now use the word applicant throughout the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Perhaps remove the specific and substitute &quot;Applicant&quot; and change to read: &quot;Regulatory Authorities: Any government department or agency or institution responsible for issuing an authorization from a federal or territorial government department, agency or institution, and who with the power to issue an authorization. The Plan does not apply to an application for a land use permit made to the Federal Minister responsible for Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) ...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted: Clarified references to the &quot;Dehcho&quot; residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>being referred to (page xii).</td>
<td>communities, territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Question re CR #25: Because DIAND is not a Regulatory Authority in some situations covered by the Plan, Lands cannot approve new applications for land use. So, is DIAND required to verify cumulative effects and whether they cross a threshold, bearing in mind that some activities could be approved without a land use permit, e.g. a 10m X 10m trapper’s cabin?</td>
<td>No the DLUPC does this, and only on those applications requiring a land use permit or water licence or other authorization defined in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>R #19 (GHL Hunting) references to what should be negotiated in the Deh Cho Process which goes outside the scope of the Plan. Remove this reference or just state that the issue should be addressed, without identifying the outcome.</td>
<td>Accepted: Wording has been revised as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Reclamation Planning (page 25): Seventh bullet: Assigning enforceable deadlines to reclamation can cause hardship on industry. Mine planning/operations planning is dynamic and constantly changing based on local and international markets and industrial factors which are largely out of the control of the proponent.</td>
<td>Accepted: This has been revised to require the use of best available technologies to reduce reclamation time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Reclamation Planning (page 25): Third bullet: It appears that the First Nations have a veto on acceptance of the “mining legacy” portions of a reclamation project. Lands has a problem with this as the ball will be solely in the court of industry if the “mining legacy” is not accepted by the First Nations. The First Nations will essentially force the proponent to exhaust all resources to prevent something that is accepted and understood as part of “mining”.</td>
<td>The larger issue here is that it is the wrong people who “accept and understand” mining legacies while those affected are not adequately involved. The consent clause has been removed from this section of CR 17 as a result of legal discussions on April 11, and has been replaced with language from the NWT Mine Site Reclamation Guidelines and the need for the applicant to fully inform and involve affected communities in reclamation discussions and decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Reclamation Security (CR#17), 6th sub-bullet listed under the first bullet relates to full cost of security for unpredicted catastrophes. It is impossible to provide the full cost of something you cannot predict. Suggest “unpredicted catastrophes” be changed to “worst case scenarios”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Reference should be made in the definition of “Precautionary Principle” to the document “A framework for the application of precaution in science based decision-making about risk” (Canada). (<a href="http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/docs/Publications/precaution/precaution_e.pdf">www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/docs/Publications/precaution/precaution_e.pdf</a>).</td>
<td>Accepted: Referenced document &quot;A framework for the application of precaution in science based decision-making about risk&quot; and revised Definition and text accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Reference to the Deh Cho Resource Management Authority (DCRMA) in the last sentence of this first paragraph on page 43 should be deleted as it could prejudice the Deh Cho Process concerning the powers and authorities of the DCRMA which have yet to be negotiated.</td>
<td>Responsible Authorities, including the possible DCRMA are no longer listed anywhere in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Regarding A #5 immediately following CR # 8 on page 19, the word “directed” should be changed to “encouraged”.</td>
<td>Accepted as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Regarding CR #8 in this sub-section, DIAND supports this CR which allows non-exclusive geophysical surveys (“seismic on speculation”) in all areas except those identified in s 43 of the IMA, and shown on Map 2 (page 20). For clarity list all the zones where oil and gas is not a permitted use, but that are open for non-exclusive geophysical surveys. Perhaps such a list could be built into Table 1.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: We revised the map (Map 2) to overlay the restricted areas with the revised land withdrawals required to implement zone restrictions to show the information requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Regarding the reference to “Terms” in the second paragraph on page 43, “Terms” are defined on page 12 as Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations. However it further states on page 12 that recommendations are not requirements. In this paragraph, “Terms” should be replaced with “Conformity Requirements and Actions”.</td>
<td>Accepted: “Terms” where it refers to CRs, Actions and Recommendations, has been removed completely from the Plan and Background Report to avoid confusions with “terms and conditions” used in the regulatory process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Regarding the third Term “Consultation” (Table 4, Implementation Vehicles for Zoning and Key Terms), the statement that Federal Government departments’ and agencies’ consultation go beyond the definitions in the IMA and the MVRMA represents an opinion that may or may not be accurate. Delete this reference which is not relevant.</td>
<td>Accepted: Deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Section 2.3.2 Protection of Significant Traditional Land Use and Occupancy Sites (page 16). In CR #3, in the last sentence there is a reference to “DFN lands”, which gives the impression that the lands are recognized as being DFN lands. Replace this term with a reference to the Deh Cho territory and leave the ownership issue neutral.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Special Management Zone 21 (Page 139) is a very large and attenuated zone with high development potential at both east and west ends. It is hard to rationalize how development at the east end should constrain development at the west end. Split this zone into two. (Perhaps east and west of the MGP corridor).</td>
<td>Accepted: Zone 21 has now been split in two. The Map and Zone Descriptions have been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Table 2 (CR#25). Regarding the Corridor or Road Density indicator, the basis of 1.8 km/km² for species such as Woodland Caribou may be scientifically untested at this point in time. The basic footprint of a 3D seismic program may cause the threshold to be exceeded. Remove this requirement from the Plan.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The Minister of DIAND has already approved this threshold in the Paramount EA. It was developed based on extensive studies in northern Alberta under similar ecological conditions. 3-D seismic conducted using minimum impact seismic will not cause the threshold to be exceeded. The term now only requires Responsible Authorities to consider the thresholds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Table 8. - On Page 95 (Background), Table 8 indicates a total of 433 oil and gas wells (62 Production; 371 Exploration). It does not appear that this number of wells can be drilled without exceeding thresholds for disturbance. The effect of cumulative effects regulation is not therefore taken into account in the economic modeling presented in support of the Plan.</td>
<td>Modeling shows what is possible. The cumulative effects thresholds will ensure that the method of development is appropriate. The thresholds allow for minimal impact development to proceed. Furthermore, the thresholds are now only guidelines for consideration of the Responsible Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The complexity of the cumulative effects calculations (CR #25) with the multiple indicators needs to be examined. Select and/or amalgamate indicators.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: They all measure different things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The definition for “traditional land use and occupancy” seems to equate occupancy with Aboriginal title. It may be that a favourable consideration of the Plan by the Minister will be assumed to be an acknowledgement of existing Aboriginal title. DLUPC should consider options to address concern: (1) State explicitly that the Plan does not regulate traditional land use and occupancy but that activities authorized in conformity with the Plan might restrict traditional land use and occupancy; (2) Delete references to “occupancy”; (3) Include a disclaimer clause to the effect that favourable consideration of the Plan by the Minister is not an acknowledgement that the Deh Cho First Nations have any Aboriginal rights, including title, flowing from any traditional land use (or occupancy) referred to in the Plan; and (4) Delete the requirements in CR #11 and</td>
<td>Accepted: Used a combination of options (3) and (4) to address DIAND's concerns. The disclaimer is found in S. 1.3 of the Plan (and copied elsewhere as appropriate) and the wording in CR 11 and 12 have changed to require applicants to minimize disturbance to traditional land use and occupancy within Conservation Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>CR #12 (and any others missed) that require that traditional land use and occupancy not be affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The definition of traditional knowledge in the Plan assumes traditional knowledge falls in the legal category of “intellectual property”, with uncertain legal and policy implications. The Committee should therefore amend the definition by replacing “intellectual property” with “accumulated body of knowledge”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised to use the definition from the Yukon Environmental and Socio-Economic Assessment Act as per discussions at the legal meeting on April 11, 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The Department is concerned with what it sees to be inappropriate fettering of the decision making responsibilities of DIAND and other federal agencies through the proposed “Conformity Requirements” (CRs), i.e. mandatory use of traditional knowledge policies and protocols, traditional land use and occupancy constraints and consultation obligations. The Department’s preliminary legal review of the CRs indicates that a large number of them would require amendments to existing legislation. In the interim, the Department has no mandate to amend legislation to implement the Plan, prior to concluding a Deh Cho Process.</td>
<td>Accepted: These were discussed at the April 11th legal meeting. The Plan has been revised to remove most community consent clauses. The use of traditional knowledge policies and protocols is now a recommendation to avoid potential conflicts with legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The Department recommends the Committee make the cumulative effects framework element of the Plan a Recommendation rather than a CR. This would enable the various parties to test the framework and adapt it as need be, rather than be bound by an inflexible and potentially unworkable system.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The Cumulative Effects Management CR now requires Responsible Authorities to consider the thresholds (now considered guidelines) in decision-making rather than rejecting applications that exceed them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The identification of lands around the community of Wrigley, negotiated under Section 8 of the Settlement Agreement, to be added to the Dehcho Process Interim Land Withdrawals, provides an opportunity for the Committee to update the boundaries of Pehdzeh Ki Deh (Conservation Zone 1) to more closely reflect the results of those negotiations.</td>
<td>Accepted: Zone 1 has been updated to reflect the land withdrawal negotiations while still keeping other important areas captured in the previous zoning (Old Wrigley, burial sites and linkage to Edehzhie).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The Plan (especially CR #16 and CR #22) appears to provide the Dehcho First Nations with more than they would obtain under a section 35 agreement.</td>
<td>The Plan is an interim measure similar to land withdrawals and the IRDA and will be revised upon the conclusion of the Dehcho Final Agreement. The Plan now includes a &quot;without prejudice&quot; clause to clarify this (s. 1.3). The Plan is consistent with the direction provided in the IMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The Plan infers that the Committee is a planning board when it references s.47 (1) of the MVRMA (on page 49). This section provides certain powers to a planning board, but the DLUPC is not a planning board within the meaning of that Act. According to Appendix II, section 24 of IMA states: “Following consideration and plan approval, the Planning Committee will monitor land use in the Deh Cho territory for conformity to the Plan.” Regarding this monitoring role in the Plan, the Committee needs to ensure that board-like powers are not inferred on the Committee.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised to mirror section 47 (1) in terms of the ability of others to refer an application to the Committee, but the Committee will submit an opinion of conformity to the Responsible Authority to consider, as per discussions at the April 11th legal meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The Plan is not meant to prejudice the outcome of on-going negotiations. Rather, it is results of the Deh Cho Process that will continue to inform and shape the Plan over time until the parties achieve a Final Agreement.</td>
<td>The Plan does not prejudice negotiations - a clause has been added to the Plan to clarify this. The Plan will be revised upon the conclusion of the Dehcho Final Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The Plan, and not only the Background Report, should make it clear that if the boundaries are changed through the PAS process, the Plan will reflect those changes. Also the Plan should make it clearer that CZ 6 will be revised to reflect the outcome of the National Park Expansion Process.</td>
<td>Accepted: If zone boundaries are adjusted through the NWT Protected Areas Strategy or the Nahanni Park Expansion Process prior to Plan Review omitted areas will take on the zone designation and requirements of the predominant adjacent zone type until such time as the Plan can be amended. This has been clarified throughout the Plan and Background Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>The requirements for consultation in CR #3 and CR #4 ignore the common law requirement that the strength of the claim to section 35 rights needs to be assessed, which are the foundation of the requirement to consult.</td>
<td>The Plan no longer refers to consultation in these terms, but rather to community involvement, to avoid the legal issues surrounding &quot;consultation&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>These non-exclusive seismic activities should be permitted (CR #8) as nonconforming uses within those areas of the CZs which overlie the interim land withdrawals where this activity was not excluded under s.43 of the IMA.</td>
<td>That was the case in the November Draft and has not changed. The wording has been clarified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Use and Recognition of Traditional and Cultural Knowledge (CR #2): will likely entail considerable cost and may be prohibitive to the small operator. Questions: (1) will the documentation generated be available to future operators or will they be required to endlessly re-do traditional knowledge studies; (2) what happens when &quot;traditional knowledge Policies and Protocols&quot; do not exist; and (3) what constitutes an &quot;appropriate&quot; level of data collection and who decides what is &quot;appropriate&quot;?</td>
<td>(1) TK is site / project specific so would likely require project specific collection. It is also generally confidential. (2) Existing policies are included in the Background Report. It is now only a recommendation to follow these. If communities don't have one, then DFN's should be followed. (3) This would be decided by the Responsible Authority that issues the authorization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Use of Guides and Monitors (page 17): In A #3 of this section, reference is made to DFN outlining contract terms and list of community members which gives the impression that the contract terms and list of people must be used, but there is no legal authority to do this. Clarify the language so that the DFN will recommend the contract terms and list of community residents.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Reworded a bit to be consistent with the fact that the use of guides and monitors is not required (recommendation). However, if used, the applicant would be expected use the contractors and terms spelled out by communities. Contractors always set their own terms and rates. If they are not reasonable, applicants won't use them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Use of Guides and Monitors R#11, R#12, A #3: In the first sentence, reference is made to &quot;traditional lands&quot;, which gives the impression that the lands are recognized as being DFN lands. Use instead &quot;in their traditional territory&quot;.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised to &quot;the Dehcho territory&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Who is to be tasked with overall coordination and monitoring of the cumulative effects (CR #25) as defined in the Plan?</td>
<td>Accepted: The DLUPC would run the assessments and provide the results to the Responsible Authority based on data submitted by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Zoning: Differing cumulative effects constraints in the two adjoining zones (SMZs 26 and 21) may unduly restrict economic and efficient development of gas resources in this area. Build flexibility into the Plan to create special zones for petroleum development where exploration and development trends have been established and where there is potential for development with a short time frame. Recognize these areas as non-conforming areas as if they were existing dispositions.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Zone 26 has been rezoned with lowered CE Thresholds to promote Oil and Gas Development in an area known to have significant resource potential. The cumulative effects thresholds are now guidelines for the consideration of Responsible Authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(1) 1.2, Page 2 (Background, 2nd paragraph: &quot;are predominantly non-aboriginal&quot;, maybe change to non-aboriginal populations, or communities?</td>
<td>Accepted: Referred to population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(10) 2.3.10, Page 46 (Background), 3rd paragraph: Revise Final sentence to read &quot;This focused on 20 stratigraphic intervals of similar geology called hydrocarbon plays and ranked these according to whether they were confirmed or hypothetical plays. The number of plays in a given area was then tallied.&quot;] This is closer to explaining what was actually done.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(11) 2.3.10, Page 46 (Background), final paragraph: ‘The rankings for gas are provided below’. Should be “The rankings for gas volume estimates…” Also after the “Moderate” rank, there is an apostrophe following the word grid that is mis-placed.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(11) Drummond Analysis does not agree with Gal and Jones (2003): By using the 50 million cubic metre cutoff as Low, I think you are assigning low potential to large areas of ground that in my estimation have high potential based on geology, rather than statistical distributions.</td>
<td>Accepted: The 50 million m3/quarter grid was provided by industry as an appropriate cut off. The Drummond study is now expressed in volumes without high, medium and low rankings. Plan has been revised accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(12) 2.3.11 (Background), first paragraph: “…Northwest Territories and Nunavut have been dominated by the diamond industry…” This is only in the recent past (15 years). The territories have a long and rich heritage of mining for many commodities. Also in the paragraph it says Pine Point may re-open (more properly these are un-mined deposits that lie west of Pine Point, discovered by Westmin back in the 1980s).</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording to reflect comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(13) 2.3.11, Page 48 (Background), 2nd paragraph: Suggested wording as follows: “An initial comparison of geological conditions against known mineral deposit types allowed them to focus the research on 9 types…”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(14) 2.3.11, Page 48 (Background), 5th paragraph: CS Lord Northern Geoscience Centre is now called Northwest Territories Geoscience Office, and should be referred to as such in any current or recent studies, as are discussed in this paragraph.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(15) 3.3.2, Page 56 (Background), first paragraph: “This species…has been shown to be very sensitive to industrial development”. A reference would be good here.</td>
<td>Accepted: Included reference from Dzus, E. 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(16) 3.3.4, Page 56 (Background), first paragraph: “from the existing legislative base under which oil and gas is conducted”. Oil and Gas Exploration and Development better?</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(17) 3.8.1, Page 74 (Background), first paragraph: capitalize “Secretariat”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(18) 3.8.1, Page 74 (Background), 2nd paragraph: it says “...before submitting the final proposal for approval.” Approval by whom/what body?</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised with wording from NWT Protected Area Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(18) 3.8.1, Page 74 (Background), 2nd paragraph: “The PAS can result in a range of protection…and community members”. Better add “the legislated powers of the sponsoring agency”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(19) 4.5, Page 85 (Background), last paragraph: “Special infrastructure Corridor” - capitalize “Infrastructure”. Also in this paragraph it says “The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline is encouraged…” Should be “Proponents of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline are encouraged.”</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(2) 1.2, Page 2 (Background), 3rd paragraph: “by the main highway system”; maybe change to the NWT highway system, since they are</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(20) 4.7, Page 87 (Background), first paragraph: “NEW LAND USES, SUCH AS Oil and gas.” Oil and Gas is not a land use, but I guess this is ok for simplicity (like in the plain language document maybe).</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised to “oil and gas exploration and development”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(21) 4.7, Page 87 (Background), last paragraph: “the irreversible nature of change”. Sounds overly dramatic, and could certainly be argued.</td>
<td>Accepted: Replaced with something less dramatic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(22) 4.9.1, Page 95 (Background), first paragraph: “Ken Drummond’s report...” should be &quot;Ken Drummond’s report.”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(22) 4.9.1, Page 95 (Background), Table 8, the assumptions seem strange somehow (Oil and Gas Development). The model has 224 exploration wells in Trout Lake (where so much of the prospective ground is alienated). Also 31 production wells (which you could argue represents a success rate of 12%), and a well cost of only 3 million dollars? Compare to Liard area, where there is more open ground, only exploration 32 wells? And they cost 15 million (despite better access and infrastructure?) - Why the variance? Maybe all the Trout Lake wells are being accessed from south of the border? But still, seems disparate somehow.</td>
<td>Assumptions were derived from the best available data and industry sources and reflect the input of planning partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(23) Chapter 5 (Background), page 104-105. Chapter 5 tab, page 104-105. Its good to have this table included, but the data could be as easily be presented in a way that shows the possible lost opportunity in some conservation zones.</td>
<td>Perhaps DIAND should focus on the opportunities that are available and find ways to promote development within permitted areas. These contain far more resources than can possibly be developed in the next 20 years. Since the Plan will be reviewed every five years, development opportunities are not lost; they are deferred and will be revisited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(24) 5.2, Page 106 (Background), resource potential: “oil and gas potential is...low or no potential in the north”. I dispute this. The Mackenzie Plain area in the northern part of Dehcho has good potential (Gal and Udell, 2005). If DCLUPC is using Drummond’s volume estimate classifications, (low, medium, high) then that is how they should be portrayed in the zone-by-zone reviews as on map 16.</td>
<td>Accepted: References to Drummond study is now expressed in volumes without high, medium and low rankings. Refer to specific reports for detailed methodology and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(24) Chapter 5 (Background). There are a bunch of cases like this, I’ll only point out ones (resource potential estimates) I feel are glaringly wrong (again, my interpretation). Zone 3 - Plan says low oil and gas potential, I feel high in the southern half Zone 14 - Plan says low to moderate, I say very high. Zone 19 - Plan says low, I say high.</td>
<td>Accepted: References to Drummond study is now expressed in volumes without high, medium and low rankings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(25) Chapter 5, Page 108 (Background), also in this section “The Drummond report indicates low potential” should be DCLUPC infers low potential from the Drummond report – see previous comments.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Replaced ranking with volumes provided by Drummond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(25) Chapter 5, Page 108 (Background), resource potential: For clarity, the Edehzhie Working Group does not work on or produce non-renewable resource assessments. That is done by Northwest Territories Geoscience Office. (As per NWT PAS NRA guidelines).</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised to reflect comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(26) 5.4, Page 110 (Background), “PAS Candidate Sites” – I believe the correct terms are Candidate Protected Areas, and Areas of Interest.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised relevant Zone Descriptions and Map and included definitions for Area of Interest, Candidate Protected Area and Candidate Protected Area with Interim Protection in section 3.8.1 of the Background Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(27) Chapter 5, Page 111 (Background), Zone 1; 3rd paragraph: “will be designated through the appropriate legislation...” - should amend to “legislation of its sponsor.”</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(28) Chapter 5, Page 130 (Background), Zone 16, resource potential. “which is the northern extent of the pine point lead zinc deposits...” I think it rather more proper to say “the northern extent of a belt of Pine Point style lead-zinc deposits”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(29) Chapter 5, Page 131, Zone 17, Zone descriptions - “the area is defined by Whooping Crane data on the left hand side...” should substitute west side for left hand?</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(30) Chapter 5, Page 140 (Background), Zone 22, Zone descriptions: “The community recognized the oil and gas potential of the area and felt this would be an appropriate location.” Unfortunately you can’t always decide where you want gas pools to occur. The very prospective Slave Point edge (every bit as prospective as the Jean Marie play mentioned on pg. 138, if not more so- e.g. Ladyfern - cuts across the SE half of this zone. The NW side of it is far less prospective.</td>
<td>The community symbol is larger so it is more visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(31) Chapter 5, Page 141 (Background), Zone 23, resource potential. “oil and gas shows low potential” – this wording is awkward.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(32) Chapter 6, Page 156 (Background), 4th bullet near bottom of page: “seizes” should be “ceases”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(33) 6.3.4, Page 165 (Background), first paragraph. “However, the economic cost and exploration risk has to be factored in”. I raised concerns about this sentence on the last draft (or two), and was left unsatisfied. I still don’t understand its meaning. Does not the exploration risk in mining have to be considered, the risk in setting up a tourism operation, forestry, etc? Why is there no mention of “economic cost” or “risk” with the other activities? What does “economic cost” mean?</td>
<td>Accepted: The Oil and Gas industry raised specific concerns regarding the risks associated with exploration. There is a public perception that exploration and development costs for oil and gas are low while generating huge profits for the companies. The industry wanted the realities of high infrastructure costs, and low probability of finding anything economical reflected and communicated in the Plan. The text has been revised where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(34) Chapter 6, Page 185 (Background), third paragraph. This paragraph is really hard to follow. Rewrite?</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(4) 2.1.4, Page 9 (Background), Dene Principles: Number 3, “as the one’s who came from...” should this be “as the ones who came ...”</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(5) Figure 4, Page 20 (Background): the last column in the graph should be titled “Northwest Territories”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(6) 2.3.1, Page 23, 3rd paragraph (Background): “Permafrost is...” Most of Dehcho is in Discontinuous Permafrost zone (as mentioned later in text).</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised text to reflect comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(7) Map 5, Page 24 (Background): Does Muskwa Plateau (in legend) even show up on the map?</td>
<td>We have taken it off the map because it was not visible at the map scale provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(8) 2.3.3, Page 27 (Background), 2nd paragraph. “This data predicts a...over the next 30 years”. Not strictly true, as there is a gap between first periods to 2030 and 2nd period, starting 2041. It should say “over</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(9) And Table 7 on Page 37 (Background), should there not be “Fish” listed under VEC grouping heading?</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised Table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>(9) Chapter 2, Page 37 (Background): “whooping crane (Grua americana)” should be Grua americana. Similarly in last paragraph on page, Martes americana should be Martes americana.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Chapter 6, Page 188 (Background), first paragraph: “Although the report indicates additional reserves of oil and gas in non-permitted zones, they are generally at low volumes and are unlikely to be developed in the near future”. Firstly, reserves should probably not be used, these are probabilistic distribution estimates and “reserves” are generally used for proven quantities; Secondly, they are obviously unlikely to be developed because they are in non-permitted zones, so this part of the sentence should be deleted. Also says “81% of...gas remains to be discovered”. Should change it to “an estimated 81%...”</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAND</td>
<td>Chapter 6, Page 188 (Background), second paragraph: “additional reserves within the IMA boundary”. The various resource assessments are considering not only mineral reserves (again a term that should only be used for a proven occurrence), but geological potential and favourability for the occurrence of mineralization, mineral deposits, etc. Reserve estimates are probably only available for Cantung and Prairie Creek, but there is much more mineral potential in the area, perhaps mineral deposits awaiting discovery.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording to reflect comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAN</td>
<td>(1) 2.3.11 “Mining”, page 48 (Background), first paragraph should read - “Cantung, a tungsten mine, recently closed (December 2003) but reopened in October 2005”; and “Prairie Creek, a proposed lead-zinc-silver mine...”</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAN</td>
<td>(2) Section 2.3.11 “Mining”, page 48, first paragraph says - Pine Point may re-open. More properly it should say that exploration is being done on un-mined deposits that lie west of Pine Point, discovered by Westmin back in the 1980s.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording to reflect comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAN</td>
<td>(3) Section 2.3.11 “Mining”, page 48, first paragraph says - “…Northwest Territories and Nunavut have been dominated by the diamond industry...” This has been for only about 15 years. Gold has been historically more important.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording to reflect comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAN</td>
<td>(4) 2.3.11 (Background), “Mining”, third paragraph overemphasize amount of exploration work done. Given both the newness of the exploration technique and the limited exploration, the diamond potential of the Dehcho area is essentially unknown.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised text as appropriate to reflect comments. Included specific references from NWT Geoscience Centre Reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAN</td>
<td>(5) 6.3.3 “Mining”, page 162 (Background), first paragraph reads – “To date there has been little exploration in the Dehcho on which to base concrete conclusions”. I would strongly emphasize this point. The document refers to the mineral potential study of Larivee 2003 (ref: 113); and this is only an educated guess based primarily on publicly available information on geology and mineral showings.</td>
<td>Accepted: Provided more detail in 2.3.11 and 6.3.3 based on comments provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Overvold - DIAN</td>
<td>(6) 6.3.3 “Mining”, page 162 (Background), third paragraph “The Nahanni expansion process is undertaking detailed mineral and resource assessments (MERA) to better identify the resource potential of the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem”. The importance of this study should be emphasized given that the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem covers about 50% of the area of moderate to very high mineral potential within the Dehcho area (see Map 17, p.49). Land selection decisions within this area could, therefore, have a crucial effect on future mineral development options in the Dehcho area.</td>
<td>It is clearly stated in various places throughout the Plan and Background Report that the Plan will be revised to reflect decisions made in the Park Expansion process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>10) Forestry: insert ‘or unique ecological areas’ after ‘important areas such as old growth forests...’ (pg. 26).</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised to achieve the same intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>11) With regard to R#20, CBI recommends that the Committee examine the Gwaii Haanas model as an example of how First Nations and Parks Canada have applied a precautionary approach to determining visitor quotas in sensitive areas.</td>
<td>It would be up to DFN and the Responsible Authority to decide how to establish visitor quotas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>12) CR#25 would exempt existing activities from the application of the cumulative effects thresholds model. This significantly weakens the overall cumulative effects management framework and would effectively shift the burden of compliance with thresholds to future developments, one of which may be more appropriate and sustainable than existing developments. Existing developments should be assessed within the framework and decisions about how such effects are to be managed should be properly taken by Regulatory Authorities in accordance with applicable law.</td>
<td>Existing uses add into calculations of new ones but can’t be blocked themselves as they are grandfathered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>3) That disturbance thresholds be further refined and improved through the rigorous implementation of an adaptive management approach. We note that implementation of disturbance thresholds will be of special importance in southern parts of the Dehcho territory where development is likely to be most intense and protection is lowest.</td>
<td>Accepted: The Committee has included several Actions and recommended an annual review of the cumulative effects thresholds and indicators to improve knowledge and understanding and ensure the CR is achieving its intended goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>5) 2.3.1: Upgrade R#3 (Show Respect) to a Conformity Requirement. There should be an obligation for Industries to consult affected First Nations.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: There is no mechanism for this to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>6) That R#4 under 2.3.1 should also be upgraded to an Conformity Requirement, as there may be little impetus for developers to conform to sharing their resource revenues or to invest in training and jobs for local communities.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: There is no mechanism for this to be required at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>7) Revise CR#3 to recognize that traditional land use and occupancy (TLUO) research is ongoing; and developers can play a role in improving the current knowledge base beyond that held by the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre and local Dehcho First Nations. There should be an incentive for developers to not only assess the impact of proposed activities on known sites, but to support new research to improve the knowledge base for traditional land use and occupancy research.</td>
<td>This is addressed under CR #2 which directs developers to collect and use TK data, which includes TLUO data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>8) R#11 may not be strong enough. There should be requirements for developers to notify affected Dehcho First Nations of locations of their activities. Guides can be hired where mutually agreeable. Reporting</td>
<td>Not Accepted: There is no mechanism for this to be required at this time. This is a subject for Dehcho Process negotiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>9) CR #13: where possible, First Nations should be given first right of refusal for commercial fishing licenses. These discussions can occur via Action #6.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This requirement has not been raised by communities during DLUPC consultations. However, nothing prevents Responsible Authorities from complying with this request should it be raised in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>CR #25: That cutlines 1.5 m or narrower be included when calculating disturbance thresholds. The Plan currently proposes not to include such cutlines. This omission could result in high densities of narrow cutlines.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This is the minimum width required by the Workers Compensation Board. Below 1.5 m the impact to wildlife is considered insignificant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>Cumulative Effects Management: On page 30, the Plan states that development can continue once thresholds are reached if other lands of similar ecological values are reclaimed. We recommend the wording be changed such that it is clear that reclamation must be successfully completed before additional development occurs. “Reclamation habitat needs must achieve revegetation standards based on wildlife habitat needs (see A #14) before additional development can occur.”</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Wording has been inserted recognizing the time lag on this and suggesting that new activities which will increase cumulative effects not be authorized in those areas until reclamation is complete. However, the thresholds are now only a guideline for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Cathy Wilkinson - Canadian Boreal Initiative</td>
<td>Recommend that the Plan be revised to restrict industrial activity in Conservation Zones. We are concerned that CR #8 (geophysical surveys) and CR #21 (salvage logging) will permit industrial activity to occur within conservation zones. Protection of their ecological value of conservation zones will be jeopardized.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Existing rights and Agreements must be respected. Exceptions for salvage logging are included to allow proper forest management activities to proceed and prevent unnecessary damage or waste or resources. This does not take away from IMA requirements for community consent on new forest authorizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>(4) Engage Northern Oil and Gas (DIAND) in an immediate “Call for Nominations” in the area identified. The Rights Issuance will be consistent with the requirements of the Canada Petroleum Resources Act and awarded on the basis of a Work Bid.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The Committee is not involved in the actual process of an oil and gas issuance cycle. We can only show it as an area of interest. It is up to the DFN(s) to pursue this directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Freya Nales - WWF-Canada</td>
<td>2.3.3 Cumulative Effects Indicators and Thresholds: We notice that the cautionary target thresholds have been dropped. The cautionary target thresholds would still be useful for Responsible Authorities when checking conformity to the Plan in case the monitoring frequency does not evaluate significant changes within a short time frame.</td>
<td>Just because they are not in the Plan does not preclude Responsible Authorities from setting them and using them in their regulation and decision-making on new land use activities on a case by case basis. But there is not sufficient agreement among the Parties to include these in the Plan at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Freya Nales - WWF-Canada</td>
<td>2.3.3, Access: The Plan allows access for development through Conservation Zones under certain conditions. WWF recommends that any proposal for new access through a Conservation Zone requires a full environmental assessment, including a discussion of options.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This should be decided on a project specific basis. The Plan is meant to reduce the number of projects sent to Environmental Assessments by incorporating community values about appropriate land use into decision-making processes so the Plan should not itself require EAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Freya Nales - WWF-Canada</td>
<td>2.3.3, Contaminated Sites: Recommend that an environmental assessment be conducted on any development that has the potential of impacting a contaminated site.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This should be raised on a project specific basis with the Responsible Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Freya Nales - WWF-Canada</td>
<td>2.3.3, Forestry: One of the actions prescribed in the Plan is to establish appropriate silviculture practices for the Dehcho. WWF recommends considering forest management practices that meet or exceed the highest certification standards. Currently the accepted certification standards in Canada are those developed by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC).</td>
<td>This can be considered by DFN and Regulatory Authorities in their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Freya Nales - WWF-Canada</td>
<td>2.3.3, Pipelines: A Special Infrastructure Corridor intersects several Conservation Zones, which means that feeder pipelines and associated infrastructure may also be allowed in Conservation Zones under certain restrictions. WWF recommends that developers submit a routing study with all applications for any proposed feeder pipelines which considers alternative routings in order to minimize area, and environmental and cultural impacts in the Conservation Zone.</td>
<td>Pipelines have been taken out of the access term (now transportation) and given their own term (Feeder Pipelines) which applies to General Use and Special Management Zones. Feeder pipelines are not permitted in Conservation Zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Freya Nales - WWF-Canada</td>
<td>3.2 Plan Implementation: What constitutes a “new” application in Figure 2? There may be instances where a development proposal is related to an existing right, but the proposed development essentially constitutes a new project because of a change in the scope and/or magnitude of the project. Is this accounted for in the conformity checking process?</td>
<td>Responsible Authorities will have to determine whether the application relates to an existing use as defined in the Plan. If it does, then the application is exempt from the Plan's requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Freya Nales - WWF-Canada</td>
<td>Section 2.3.3, Contaminated Sites: Does not address impacts of development on existing contaminated sites. WWF recommends that a map and/or a list of contaminated sites in the Dehcho Region be provided as an appendix to the Plan.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This is the responsibility of the Responsible Authority. The Committee does not have this type of data at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Freya Nales - WWF-Canada</td>
<td>The WWF submission (Appendix 1) provides: An assessment of the incorporation of national and international agreements and/or commitments in the Dehcho Land Use Plan</td>
<td>Accepted: The Comments have been reviewed and the Plan revised to reference relevant agreement and commitments in section 3.5.11 (Final Draft numbering) of the Background Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jason Charlwood - Ducks Unlimited Canada</td>
<td>Canada’s Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation supports these water and wetland protection goals as its objective is to “promote the conservation of Canada’s wetlands to sustain their ecological and socio-economic functions, now and in the future.” Also supports the concept of no net loss of wetland habitat. Recommend it be referenced to support Water Monitoring and Management, Cumulative Effects management and those zones that contain important wetland habitats whether they are within SMZ, CZ, or GUZ.</td>
<td>Accepted: Included outline of Canada’s Federal Policy on Wetland Conservation in Policy section of Chapter 3 (Background Report) and referenced under Water Monitoring / Management CR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jennifer Morin - CPAWS-NWT</td>
<td>Similar to previous submission, suggested revision in bold to 4th bullet of CR #11: New access corridors through Conservation Zones are “not consistent with the intent of the zone designation”. - “the proposed corridor must be the shortest possible length through the Conservation Zone, while avoiding and “providing an adequate buffer around the most sensitive ecological and cultural areas and ensuring the Dehcho First Nations traditional land use and occupancy activities in the area are not disturbed; and - “additional developments or infrastructure (e.g. gravel pits, fuel storage areas) associated with the new access corridor are kept to a minimum within the Conservation Zone”.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The access term has been revised significantly with respect to minimizing impacts on traditional use activities which captures the general intent of the suggested change. Since pipelines are no longer included in the access term, the second recommendation regarding infrastructure is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jennifer Morin - CPAWS-NWT</td>
<td>CR #25: CPAWS-NWT strongly recommends the reintroduction of the tiered thresholds in the Final Draft of the Plan as a means to track linear disturbance and trigger monitoring and action before such disturbances reach the critical threshold at which negative impacts on key wildlife species would be anticipated.</td>
<td>There is insufficient support and agreement among the Parties to include it at this time. However, the lack of tiered thresholds in the Plan does not prevent Responsible Authorities from considering and implementing these on a case by case basis as appropriate in the regulatory system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization of Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jennifer Morin</td>
<td>Impacts from previous linear disturbance: Recommend interim,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPAWS-NWT</td>
<td>and detailed surveys be conducted on a regular basis. The results of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this work should be used to help in planning and design, and to identify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and assess potential impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jennifer Morin</td>
<td>A qualitative survey could include questions such as: 1) GPS verification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPAWS-NWT</td>
<td>of the seismic line; 2) visibility from air/ground; 3) type of vegetation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>present (trees, shrubs, forbs); 4) approximate difference of height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between vegetation on the seismic line and surrounding forest; 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>type of vegetation present; and 6) evidence of recent or actual access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use (ATVs, snowmobiles, trucks, exploration equipment, etc).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jennifer Morin</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This is something perhaps better suited to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPAWS-NWT</td>
<td>Committee’s mandate to consider impacts resulting from infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>projects on a volunteer basis. Although the added action would help in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>identifying general trends and issues prior to proactive site visits, it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>may be more effectively determined through other mechanisms such as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>further study of the areas impacted, or by undertaking pre-existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>baseline surveys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jennifer Morin</td>
<td>Seismic Disturbances at Stream Crossings (CR #25): Given that there is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPAWS-NWT</td>
<td>an extremely low percentage of the Dehcho Region that is close to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critical threshold of 0.5 stream crossings/km², it is suggested that this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CR be added to the list of CRs to be studied prior to the Committee’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consideration of development proposals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jennifer Morin</td>
<td>Existing Rights, Dispositions, Authorizations and Activities: Attempts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPAWS-NWT</td>
<td>to harmonize mining activities within a designated conservation zone would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be virtually impossible and not good planning practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Jennifer Morin</td>
<td>Concerned Zone No. 6 (Greater Nahanni Ecosystem) has been entirely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPAWS-NWT</td>
<td>classified as a “Conservation Zone” and as such all development, except</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tourism, is prohibited therein. We suggest that the Committee recognizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the park expansion process underway. These studies and the additional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MERA studies will be considered in the Plan/CR reviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>CR #6, which attempts to deal with existing rights and activities, as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>draft, is a recipe for trouble. No adequate definitions or descriptions of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>those provisions are provided or the concept that any new activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with those existing rights or activities, or any new activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subject to the full extent of the Plan is simply unworkable and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>Accepted: Existing uses has been revised to clarify that later stages of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>development are included in the Plan, but not all existing uses are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included. The Plan will be amended to reflect the results of those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>Concerned Zone No. 6 (Greater Nahanni Ecosystem) has been entirely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>classified as a “Conservation Zone” and as such all development, except</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tourism, is prohibited therein. We suggest that the Committee recognizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the park expansion process underway. These studies and the additional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MERA studies will be considered in the Plan/CR reviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>CR #6, which attempts to deal with existing rights and activities, as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>draft, is a recipe for trouble. No adequate definitions or descriptions of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>those provisions are provided or the concept that any new activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with those existing rights or activities, or any new activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subject to the full extent of the Plan is simply unworkable and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>Accepted: Existing uses has been revised to clarify that later stages of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>development are included in the Plan, but not all existing uses are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included. The Plan will be amended to reflect the results of those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>Concerned Zone No. 6 (Greater Nahanni Ecosystem) has been entirely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>classified as a “Conservation Zone” and as such all development, except</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tourism, is prohibited therein. We suggest that the Committee recognizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the park expansion process underway. These studies and the additional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MERA studies will be considered in the Plan/CR reviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>CR #6, which attempts to deal with existing rights and activities, as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>draft, is a recipe for trouble. No adequate definitions or descriptions of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>those provisions are provided or the concept that any new activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with those existing rights or activities, or any new activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subject to the full extent of the Plan is simply unworkable and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>Accepted: Existing uses has been revised to clarify that later stages of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>development are included in the Plan, but not all existing uses are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included. The Plan will be amended to reflect the results of those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John F. Kearney</td>
<td>Concerned Zone No. 6 (Greater Nahanni Ecosystem) has been entirely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Canadian Zinc</td>
<td>classified as a “Conservation Zone” and as such all development, except</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tourism, is prohibited therein. We suggest that the Committee recognizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the park expansion process underway. These studies and the additional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MERA studies will be considered in the Plan/CR reviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>Organization or Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Committee Response / Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John Korec - National Energy Board</td>
<td>(2) As an independent board, NEB regulates oil and gas activities under the NEB Act and COGOA. Neither provides the NEB with the authority to require land use terms and conditions set out in the Plan. It is expected such terms and conditions would be included in Land Use Permits or Water-Licences issued by the Land and Water Board for the Dehcho area or other authorizations issued by &quot;Governments&quot;.</td>
<td>The MVLWB is the key Responsible Authority for implementing most CRs. The Plan states that all Responsible Authorities will implement CRs to the extent of their authority and mandate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John Korec - National Energy Board</td>
<td>(3) The definition of &quot;Geophysical Operation&quot; in the Plan (table xiii) is drawn from the Canada Oil and Gas Geophysical Operations Regulations. However, other industries such as mining and construction also employ geophysical methods. New definition provided.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: We are using the definition from the IMA to be consistent with the wording used in section 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John Korec - National Energy Board</td>
<td>(4) A definition exists in the Canadian Environmental Protection Act for toxic substances. &quot;The use of &quot;Toxic Air Pollutants&quot; may not be consistent with that definition. In the Plan, &quot;toxic air pollutants&quot; (pages xv-xvi) is also referred to as &quot;non-criteria pollutants&quot;, Define air pollutants as &quot;non-criteria pollutants&quot; rather than &quot;toxic air pollutants.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>John Korec - National Energy Board</td>
<td>In CR # 25, consideration should be given to allow the Review Board to determine, through an environmental assessment, whether a developer's proposed mitigation measures would likely contribute to species population-level protection</td>
<td>Not Accepted: CR #25 has been revised to make the thresholds guidelines to be considered by Responsible Authorities in their decisions. Not all applications will go to EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Peter Dimmell - PDAC</td>
<td>Set aside administrative deadlines (March 31st 2006). We are planning consultations in February and developing a toolkit to ensure that communities are informed of mineral exploration and mining practices. Working with Federal Government on this.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The DLUPC has delayed submission long enough to address the Parties concerns. The Plan recommends such activities (e.g. Resource Development Awareness - R#33) so supports this work. This may help the industry build trust and awareness in the communities and could influence community input regarding mining in future Plan reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>It is inappropriate to state that all rights or authorizations continue to exist. The government retains the right to cancel or terminate permits or authorizations when it deems appropriate.</td>
<td>Accepted: Reworded to specify that existing uses are exempt from the Plan, and any renewals of existing uses are allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>1.3.2 is unclear. By stating what &quot;Terms&quot; mean may help provide clarity.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: &quot;Terms&quot; has been deleted throughout the Plan and Background Report and replaced with Conformity Requirements, Actions and Recommendations (or any combination of those depending on the context).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>A#13 to A#16 impose obligations on government to do certain things within 4 years. Even though EC supports the general intent of the Action items as noted above the time frame for this requires discussion.</td>
<td>We have set four years to allow the Parties sufficient time to develop workplans and budgets to address these in time to be considered in the 5-year review cycle. Actions are now worded as &quot;make best efforts&quot; rather than &quot;will&quot; to allow greater flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Action 1 (A#1) requires that departments will do something (in this case research and document harvest statistics). Arguably, this should only be a recommendation. In any event, each department has to decide whether it wants to participate in the work demanded by the Land Use Plan.</td>
<td>Actions have been revised to require the Parties to &quot;make best efforts&quot; to complete the activities. By approving the Plan, the Parties agree to implement those Actions pertaining to them within the extent of their authority and mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>CR #25 The plan states that the cumulative effects term is to be reviewed annually. Is this practical and were other time periods considered (e.g., review every two years)?</td>
<td>Accepted: Added &quot;or at any other interval agreed to by DFN, GNWT and Canada&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>CR #25: The use of cautionary and target thresholds will provide incentive for industry to use best practices from the outset rather than waiting until a critical threshold is approached or reached.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: There is insufficient support and agreement between the Parties to set tiered thresholds in the Plan. However, nothing prevents Responsible Authorities from applying tiered thresholds on a case by case basis within the regulatory system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>CR #25: EC agrees that the current focus on Woodland Caribou is appropriate; we encourage the DLUPC to continue to investigate and develop further thresholds in other areas such as water quality and air quality.</td>
<td>Accepted: Already included in A#13. The Plan already includes &quot;thresholds&quot; for water and air quality but they are not under the cumulative effects section. See CR #15 for water and R #16 (now R #18) for air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>CR#16: firmly states that there will be no further hydroelectric development - in accordance with Dehcho First Nation Leadership Resolution. Again, the government cannot completely fetter its discretion to the Dehcho First Nation.</td>
<td>The government regularly imposes moratoriums on certain land uses where or when required (e.g. land withdrawals, protected areas, moratorium on the Mackenzie Valley pipeline in the '70s, locations of prospecting permits issued this February). It fetters its discretion when doing so. The consent clause has been removed but the prohibition on hydro development remains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>CR#25 deals with Cumulative Effects. As drafted, regulatory authorities are not allowed to approve new applications unless supported by the Committee. This is inappropriate.</td>
<td>Accepted: This CR has been revised to require Responsible Authorities to consider the thresholds in their decisions (guidelines only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>CR#3 appears to change the common law consultation requirement and maintains that &quot;the degree of consultation and mitigation will be appropriate to the scale and nature of the activity and the potential to impact TLUO sites&quot;. Does not involve an assessment of the strength of those rights. This is inappropriate.</td>
<td>The sentence referenced in quotes was added at the request of the MVLWB to give them flexibility to deal with various scales and types of activities (large vs small). Regardless, &quot;consultation&quot; has been revised to &quot;community involvement&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>CR#4 inappropriately deals with consultation. The reference to &quot;fiduciary duties&quot; to consultation is inappropriate. In addition, the obligation on the Developer to conduct &quot;full and meaningful consultation&quot; is arguably inappropriate.</td>
<td>Accepted: This term has been revised to talk about community involvement in line with current requirements of the MVLWB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Cumulative Effects Management: Option 4 (bullet) in this list provides the developer with the opportunity to apply to the Committee for an exception to the thresholds. EC suggests that since the plan has been revised to include the use of &quot;critical&quot; thresholds only, that very few if any such exceptions should be considered. It is prudent to consider the definition of a &quot;critical threshold&quot; - a science-based target reflecting the continuous maximum amount of stress that an environmental or social system can support without long-term harm.</td>
<td>Accepted: The Plan no longer provides for any exceptions as a result of discussions at the legal meeting on April 11th. Included definition provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>It is incorrect to suggest that consultation does not require an assessment of the strength of the claim (e.g. CR3). Arguably premature to overrule the common law under the Dehcho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement.</td>
<td>The fact that the government is negotiating the Dehcho Process with DFN should indicate sufficient strength of claim. Regardless, the word &quot;consultation&quot; has been revised to &quot;community involvement&quot; throughout most of the Plan. &quot;Consultation&quot; is now only used in a few specific circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>It is not clear how CR#3 under &quot;Protection of Significant TLUO Sites&quot; differs from CR#2 under &quot;Use and Recognition of Traditional and Cultural Knowledge&quot;. Both appear to be aimed at determining the &quot;potential to impact traditional land use and occupancy&quot;. CWS suggests that perhaps there could be some consolidation of information here.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: CR #2 identifies conditions for the collection of traditional knowledge (TK). CR #3 provides conditions for protecting traditional land use and occupancy (TLUO) sites. TK goes far beyond identifying TLUO sites but would include such information. They have not been amalgamated because they set different requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>On page 3, “Traditional land use and occupancy” is to be recognized and protected. However, it is incorrect to say that the LUP cannot affect those activities because many authorized activities may curtail traditional uses. The LUP cannot go beyond the common law and prevent any and all impacts on aboriginal rights and uses. Furthermore, it is incorrect to say that the LUP, when implemented, cannot restrict the exercise of s. 35 rights. Again, this is beyond the protections under the common law.</td>
<td>Accepted: This statement has been clarified to suggest that the Plan does not manage or restrict TLUO activities. An additional “disclaimer” clause was added stating that “Approval of this Plan will not have the effect of recognizing, denying or altering Aboriginal rights, Aboriginal title, or Treaty rights.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>P. 36(Background): All taxonomic names (Oreamnos americanus) should be italicized.</td>
<td>Accepted: As proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>P. 37 (Background): Second para., the term ‘Species of special concern’ is a particular COSEWIC category. Some clarification on wording is required here. If intent was species of concern to Dehcho then the wording should reflect that.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording from &quot;special concern&quot; to &quot;special interest&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>P. 42 - We question the relevance of 50 year old data to assess agricultural potential. Recent weather patterns and possible climate change factors being at play in the north bring into question the use of old data such as this.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This is the best available data. If new data becomes available it can be used in future revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 13: Recommendation 1 (R#1) appears to require conformity with Dene laws. It is inappropriate to state this - particularly when such laws may not be clearly set out.</td>
<td>Accepted: It’s a recommendation. Changed wording to “consider”. The Dene Laws, Values and Principles are provided in Chapter 2 of the Background Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 16: CR#3 states what &quot;regulatory authorities will require&quot; in applications. This is inappropriate as it removes the departments' discretion.</td>
<td>The Plan will be implemented through binding policy direction from the Minister of DIAND to the MVLB - the key Responsible Authority and through a revised set of land withdrawals. These implementation mechanisms give legal effect to the Plan’s CRs, and require governments to exercise their discretion and authority to conduct their activities in conformity with the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 17: CR#5 is another example of mandatory language and the loss of departmental discretion.</td>
<td>The Plan will be implemented through binding policy direction from the Minister of DIAND to the MVLB - the key Responsible Authority and through a revised set of land withdrawals. These implementation mechanisms give legal effect to the Plan’s CRs, and require governments to exercise their discretion and authority to conduct their activities in conformity with the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 2: The &quot;legal context&quot; is provided. It states that the LUP does not supersede any Acts or Regulations. However, this is arguably inconsistent with provisions elsewhere in the LUP. As drafted, the LUP supersedes many acts and regulations - telling government what to consider and amend.</td>
<td>These issues were discussed at the April 11th legal meeting. The Plan is clear that it does not supersede any acts or regulations. The Plan has gone through significant revisions to ensure it is consistent with legislation where clear examples of inconsistencies were raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 21: CR#11 again affects discretion as departments are required (i.e. &quot;will manage access&quot;) to manage and decide in a particular way.</td>
<td>The Plan will be implemented through binding policy direction from the Minister of DIAND to the MVLB - the key Responsible Authority and through a revised set of land withdrawals. These implementation mechanisms give legal effect to the Plan’s CRs, and require governments to exercise their discretion and authority to conduct their activities in conformity with the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 22: It is unclear as to whether CR#12 overrules the regulatory authorities in relation to the Mackenzie Gas Project (e.g. the route).</td>
<td>CR #12 sets conditions for the Mackenzie Gas Project which Responsible Authorities agree to implement by approving the Plan. This CR has been revised to address key concerns raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 23: CR#14 and CR#15 require management in accordance with CCME Guidelines or &quot;best practices&quot;. As with other CRs, there is the loss of departmental discretion.</td>
<td>This is consistent with the implementation mechanisms spelled out in the IMA (binding policy direction).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 24: A#7 directs that new regulations be developed, and that they be done within 4 years. Departments cannot agree to this as we cannot bind Parliament.</td>
<td>Accepted: Changed to a Recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 25: CR#17: Demands that a security deposit be provided and that certain conditions - including consent - are met. This is inappropriate.</td>
<td>DIAN and the MVLWB currently require security for large projects. This is consistent with practice, policy and legislation. The consent clause has been removed based on discussions at the legal meeting on April 11th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 3: Point 5 repeats the clause discussed on page iii above. The Plan does not apply to scientific research permits. Perhaps for clarification, a definition of &quot;scientific research permit&quot; should be included in the Definitions. What kind of scientific permits are being contemplated here? For example EC and ENR issue permits related to wildlife research.</td>
<td>Accepted: Included definition of Research Licences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 30: Paragraph 3 Option 3 (bullet) in this list provides the developer with the option of providing &quot;better data and studies demonstrating … the proposed development is below thresholds&quot;. EC questions how it will be determined that the data and studies are &quot;better&quot; in this circumstance? Also, in the event that it cannot be clearly demonstrated that the data and studies are &quot;better&quot; then EC suggests that the precautionary principle should be applied and the most conservative approach taken.</td>
<td>Better data means new data or updated data. For instance, if the developer conducts a seismic line regeneration study in the affected area and identifies lines that have regrown to specific standards, then we would update the files based on this information and any assessments run on this new data would be considered by the Responsible Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 33: A#13: New - EC supports the use of a tiered thresholds approach and would like to see the precautionary and target thresholds identified in the earlier draft of the plan reinstated where the Committee considers that appropriate. EC supports and encourages the Committee to assess other indicators and thresholds for inclusion in future revisions. Cautionary and target thresholds should be developed (where feasible), in addition to critical thresholds, for any new indicators included in subsequent revisions of the plan.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: There is insufficient support and agreement between the Parties to set tiered thresholds in the Plan. We would encourage you to discuss this with DIAN, who has long suggested that all the thresholds be a recommendation only. Nothing prevents Responsible Authorities from applying tiered thresholds on a case by case basis within the regulatory system. The Action still stands to allow the Parties to study these and reinstate them during future revisions if desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 34: CR#26 the 250 meter distance separation from &quot;Significant Habitat Features&quot;. This distance could be problematic when given specific situations, i.e. fish spawning and the activity is 250 meters upstream. This distance may not be adequate to ensure protection of the fisheries.</td>
<td>The Plan provides a minimum setback. Should Responsible Authorities feel a greater buffer is required on a case by case basis, nothing prevents them from going beyond what is provided for in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page 43: The Land Use Plan maintains that the &quot;Committee has a shared role in monitoring conformity with those government departments&quot;. In the absence of legislation dealing with this issue, there is a concern with the suggestion that the Committee is on an equal footing with departments.</td>
<td>The Committee has revised its implementation role based on discussions at the April 11th legal meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht</td>
<td>Page 43: CWS suggests a Table could be added that provides more detail as to what the specific roles and jurisdictional authorities are for these various Regulatory Authorities. For example, what kinds of permits/licences are issued under what legislation? Table 4 supplies some of this information, but not all agencies listed on p. 43 are included. Action #24 clearly required a change in legislation, other CRs where clear inconsistencies were pointed out have been revised, but those included in this Table have not. Not Accepted: This is best done by the Responsible Authorities who are more familiar with their mandate and jurisdictional responsibilities. This could be addressed through implementation discussions as proposed by DIAND.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht</td>
<td>Page 44: It appears that the Land Use Plan is suggesting that legislative amendments are not necessary. However, this is arguably inconsistent with many CRs and As (ie A#7). Action #7 clearly required a change in legislation and has since been revised to a recommendation. Other CRs where clear inconsistencies were pointed out have been revised to remove them from the Plan. As discussed at the legal meeting on April 11th, this section has been reviewed to allow the Committee to provide an opinion on conformity with the Responsible Authority. Accepted: Revised wording to specify that the Plan does not manage or restrict traditional use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht</td>
<td>Page 45: Table 4 implementation vehicles for zoning and key terms: appears inconsistent with the many CRs and As. For example, A#7 deals with Air monitoring and the need for standards, but there is nothing in the Table dealing with the issue. Accepted: Updated Table 4 for all CRs. Actions are general activities unrelated to applications so are not included in this Table. They will be implemented by the appropriate authority within the extent of their mandate and how only acquire &quot;best efforts.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht</td>
<td>Page 49: Section 3.2.3 refers to the IMA and the Committee. Does S 24 of the IMA in combination with Section 47(1) of the MVRMA actually give the Committee the authority to &quot;check conformity on Conformity Requirements&quot;? As discussed at the legal meeting on April 11th, this section has been revised to allow the Committee to provide an opinion on conformity with the Responsible Authority. Accepted: Revised wording to suggest that the Plan does not manage or restrict traditional use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht</td>
<td>Page iii: The clause provides that &quot;Nothing in this LUP will impact or reduce in any way, the treaty and aboriginal rights and activities of the Dehcho Dene Descendants. Harvesting will continue in all areas at all times.&quot; Arguably, the LUP cannot state this. Accepted: This statement has been clarified to suggest that the Plan does not manage or restrict TLUO activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht</td>
<td>Page iv: &quot;Conformity Requirements&quot; (CR) generally indicate what must be done. There is generally a corresponding obligation imposed on government authorities. The Plan contains many obligations that &quot;must be met.&quot; This is inappropriate. The Plan will be implemented through binding policy direction from the Minister of DIAND to the MVLWB, the key Responsible Authority, and through a revised set of land withdrawals. These implementation mechanisms give legal effect to the Plan’s CRs and are consistent with the core responsibilities of MVLWB and DIAND. Accepted: Revised wording as proposed including reference to section 43 to recognize the wording and intent of those negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**326**
<p>| Date       | Organization or Name | Page(s) (Background) | Comment                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Accepted: | Revised wording as proposed. | Partially Accepted: Peel River Plateau is the best name for Zone 25 (ecoregion). Zone 26 has been revised to Liard Range. Other zone names have also been revised where appropriate. | Not Accepted: This is best done by the Responsible Authorities who are more familiar with their mandate and jurisdiction. This could be addressed through implementation discussions as needed. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization or Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Committee Response / Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27/01/06</td>
<td>Stephen Harbicht - Environment Canada</td>
<td>Page. 74 (Background): In the second para., it is not reasonable to expect that the non-renewable resource assessments for candidate protected areas will identify “Oil and Gas resources previously unknown”. NRA are designed to make a determination on potential of the area. Only additional seismic exploration and drilling would identify hydrocarbon resources.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>(1) Create a new development area with different land management rules in the same Call for Nominations area used between 1993 and 1996. This ‘Special Management Zone’ would be set aside in the region to support an activity of national and local importance (Map provided with submission).</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Identified boundaries, objectives and terms for zones 25 and 26 at March 10th, 2006 meeting between ADK, Nahanni Butte and Trout Lake. Zone 26 includes a proposed pipeline corridor and a proposed area for a future oil and gas issuance area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>(2) This Special Management Zone (Zone 26) is to promote responsible oil and gas (or other specified resource) development in an area known to have significant resource potential and of importance to our community and our values. Submission proposes thresholds for the area.</td>
<td>Accepted: Zone Description, Map and Terms revised as per March 10th, 2006 Meeting and submissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>(3) We also think that this Special Management Zone (Zone 26) should be treated as an intensive development experiment (the ‘adaptive management approach’), and woodland (muskeg) caribou population dynamics should be monitored to document actual response to resource development. This intent has been added to the zone description for Zone 26. The cumulative effects CR and associated actions and recommendations provide for an annual review and ongoing research to further our understanding of woodland caribou response to resource development.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>(4) Create a new ‘Special Infrastructure Corridor’ that reflects the right-of-way for the Netla Arrowhead corridor and surrounding area proposed pipeline (Map provided with submission). The Special Infrastructure Corridor allows for the commercialization of existing discoveries.</td>
<td>Accepted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Background, page. 112. Zone 1: Pehdzeh Ki Deh: The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline as currently proposed will run the length of this zone from north to south just inside the western boundary. DFN, the Pehdzeh Ki First Nation, and the Indian and Northern Affairs Canada recently negotiated an infrastructure corridor through this area. As a result, Zone 30 will be extended to recognize this corridor.</td>
<td>Accepted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Background, page. 113. Zone 2: JMR 5 Lakes: Resource Potential: Infrastructure associated with the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline will be required in this zone. Specific Terms:</td>
<td>Accepted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Background, page. 141, The proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline runs northwest to southeast through the length of the northern portion of this zone. DFN, the Pehdzeh KI First Nation, and the Indian and Northern Affairs Canada recently negotiated an infrastructure corridor through this area. As a result, Zone 30 will be extended to recognize this corridor.</td>
<td>The revision is not required as it is clearly shown on the map as included in the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Background, page. 150, DFN, the Pehdzeh KI First Nation, and the Indian and Northern Affairs Canada recently negotiated an infrastructure corridor through this area. As a result, Zone 30 will be extended to recognize this corridor.</td>
<td>Accepted: This is now Zone 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Background, page. 152, A Special Infrastructure Corridor (SIC) was established to address the proposed Mackenzie Valley Pipeline and associated infrastructure. The proposed routing crosses Zones 1, 3, 4, 5, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 29, all of which have different objectives. This SIC delineates a corridor within which the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline can occur, subject to regulatory approval and any conditions imposed on them by the appropriate Regulatory Authorities and Agencies, and the Mackenzie Valley Term described in the Plan (CR #12). This zone overlays or floats over the underlying zones instead of cutting through them. The intent is to add an additional permitted use (the Mackenzie Valley pipeline and associated infrastructure) and set of conditions for pipeline development within a restricted portion of each of those zones. The Mackenzie Valley...</td>
<td>Accepted: This is now Zone 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Background, page. 152, The current zone reflects a combination of existing land withdrawals south of Fort Simpson and an infrastructure corridor that was recently negotiated by the DFN, the Pehdzeh KI First Nation, and the Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Zone 30 has been amended to reflect this corridor, which extends north of Fort Simpson to the boundary with the Sahtu Settlement Area. The corridor south of Fort Simpson varies from 2-5 km, whereas the corridor north of Fort Simpson is generally less than 2km.</td>
<td>Accepted: This is now Zone 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Imperial has determined that certain infrastructure developments, in particular a borrow site and access road associated with the Mackenzie Valley pipeline will be located in the proposed JMR Five Lakes (Zone 2) conservation zone. We recognize that your previous considerations of our requests have resulted in the proposal of a pipeline corridor through Zone 2. We request that the boundary to Zone 2 be further modified to provide for the proposed borrow site and connecting access road. Not Accepted: Based on further follow-up with Imperial Oil, the boundary of Zone 2 does not require modification because the Plan does not restrict borrow pits within Conservation Zones - it just sets conditions for them based on the IMA. The access road actually falls outside of Zone 2. Zone 2 has been added to the list of zones affected by the pipeline in all parts of the Plan and Background Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Imperial requests that the conformity requirement (CR #12) for the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline be added to the land use zone description for Zone 2 (Background Report).</td>
<td>Accepted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, p. 22, 61, CR #12: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline (continued): All future expansions or tie-ins and related infrastructure, will be subject to the applicable conditions in each of the underlying zones. Any requests to address future expansion of the pipeline and related infrastructure, or to extend feeder pipelines across any Conservation Zone, will be addressed by exception or amendment to the Plan. Partially Accepted: The Plan no longer provides for exceptions as a result of discussions at the legal meeting on April 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, p. 22, 61, CR #12: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline (continued): Regulatory Authorities should direct larger infrastructure requirements to be located in General Use Zones and Special Management Zones in order of preference and where practical. Pipeline and associated infrastructure will be considered a permitted use in Conservation Zones providing it meets the following conditions: there is no reasonably feasible alternative to the proposed location of infrastructure in the CZ; the proposed infrastructure avoids the most sensitive ecological and cultural areas and reduces disturbances to Dehcho First nation(s) traditional land use and occupancy activities in the area; the proposed infrastructure reduces the area affected, the intensity of disturbance, and uses established practices to reduce environmental impacts; and the Developer can demonstrate that meaningful consultation has been held with affected First Nations on the construction, operation, reclamation and abandonment of the infrastructure.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The portion of the CR pertaining to preferred zones has been revised to reflect the fact that the entire pipeline and infrastructure will fall in either Conservation or Special Management Zones and focuses on the conditions for development within Conservation Zones. In Conservation Zones, the Committee requires applicants to &quot;minimize&quot; disturbances to TLVO activities and the environment. &quot;Consultation&quot; has been revised to &quot;community involvement&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, p. 22, 61, CR #12: Mackenzie Valley Pipeline: Subject to regulatory approval and any conditions imposed on them by the appropriate Regulatory Authorities and Agencies, development of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline and associated infrastructure, or an alternative pipeline with similar specifications, will be permitted within the Special Infrastructure Corridor, including the recently negotiated corridor north of Fort Simpson to the boundary with Sahtu Settlement Area (Zone 30). The Plan recognizes the need for access and infrastructure outside of this corridor. The pipeline corridor, additional access, gravel resources, camps and minor infrastructure will be managed in accordance with regulatory approvals and any conditions imposed on them by the appropriate Regulatory Authorities and Agencies. The terms for Access, Granular Resources and Minor Infrastructure in the approved Plan should be considered by the Regulatory Authorities and agencies in the regulatory approvals granted and the conditions imposed on them.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Included &quot;associated infrastructure&quot; everywhere; included discussion of recently negotiated corridor north of Fort Simpson; if the Plan is approved before the pipeline then the Terms of the Plan will apply to the pipeline so &quot;should&quot; is not the appropriate word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, p. 30, 65, CR # 25: Cumulative Effects Management: A pipeline constructed and operated in Zone 30, as extended north of Simpson to the Sahtu Settlement Area boundary, will also be exempt from this term.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This is true but the revisions are not required as all the mapping and descriptions now show the entire pipeline corridor, including the northern extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, p. iii, Background Report, p. iii, 85 …..40.7% of the Plan Area. The Special Infrastructure Corridor provides a passage through four Conservation Zones.</td>
<td>Accepted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, p. iv, 7, Background Report, p. iv, 85, The Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 30) delineates a corridor for the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline and associated infrastructure based on the routing of the proponent and negotiated corridors through current withdrawals. This corridor overlaps the other zone types rather than cutting a portion out of them. The current routing crosses Zones 1, 3, 4, 5, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 29. A pipeline and infrastructure corridors have recently been negotiated north of Fort Simpson to the Sahtu Settlement Area boundary, which includes a passage through Zone 1 (Pehdzeh Kí Deh). This zone covers 0.4% of the Plan Area. The final routing of the corridor north of Fort Simpson will be reflected in the Plan as an extension to the Special Infrastructure Corridor.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Included &quot;associated infrastructure&quot; everywhere; updated affected zone numbers, mentioned the newly negotiated corridor within the CRs and MV Special Infrastructure Corridor Zone description (now Zone 34) but not in all other locations (not required as it is clearly shown as including the new portion in all maps).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, p. xiii-xiv, Background Report, p. xix, Imperial requests that the next draft of the Dehcho land use plan revert to the June 2005 definition of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, as it provides a better and more accurate depiction of MVP development activities.</td>
<td>Accepted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, page. 22, 69, R #14: The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline and associated infrastructure is expected to cross Zones 1, 3, 4, 5, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 29 and lie within Zone 30 (the Special Infrastructure Corridor). Infrastructure associated with the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline will also be required in Zone 2.</td>
<td>Accepted: Added Zone 2 everywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan, Page. iv, Pipeline and associated infrastructure or a similar pipeline will be allowed in the special infrastructure corridor (Zone 30). The pipeline corridor crosses many Conservation Zones so the Developer should reduce impacts.</td>
<td>Accepted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>Table 1 (Page 11) This zone overlays, or floats, over the underlying zones. The intent is to add an additional permitted use (the Mackenzie Valley pipeline and associated infrastructure) and set of conditions for pipeline development within a restricted portion of each of those zones.</td>
<td>Accepted: but refer to &quot;a pipeline and associated infrastructure&quot; because we now have two Special Infrastructure Corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/01/06</td>
<td>R.J. Ottenbreit - Imperial</td>
<td>The November 2005 draft indicates that, once the corridor negotiations are included in the Land Use Plan, the Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 30) will be extended through zones 1 and 29. Imperial supports the results of these negotiations, and requests that this extension and revision to Zone 30 be incorporated into the next draft of the Dehcho land use plan.</td>
<td>Accepted: Map has been revised according to negotiated corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.2 Visual Quality (Page. 17): Remove recommendations R#10 from this section.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Recommendations have been kept in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>1.1 Introduction: The last sentence under this heading, &quot;Once approved, the LUP will provide legally binding direction....&quot;, should be changed to reflect the wording in Appendix II of the IMA which reads as follows: &quot;The Parties share the objective that upon approval of a Dehcho Final Agreement, the approved Dehcho Land Use Plan will be a land management tool that provides legally-binding direction and guidance to regulatory agencies and decision-makers in the evaluation of development projects, protected area proposals and other potential land uses&quot;.</td>
<td>Revised to include both the recommended statement and more accurate language regarding the authority of the Plan prior to a Final Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>1.2 Scope and Application (Page. 2): Social Context - put a period after &quot;all Canadians&quot; and remove the rest of the sentence.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This explains why the Plan includes CRs, Actions and Recommendations related to these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>1.2 Scope and Application (Page. 2): The first sentence should be written to reflect the intent expressed in Appendix II of the IMA for the LUP: &quot;Regional land use planning in the Dehcho territory is intended to form part of an integrated land and resource management regime and outline what types of activities should occur, generally where they should take place and terms and conditions necessary to guide land use proposals and development projects over time&quot;.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: This is reflected earlier in Section 1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>1.2 Scope and Application (Page. 3): Audience - the first sentence, &quot;The Plan is primarily directed at Regulatory Authorities who are responsible for implementing the Terms of the Plan&quot;, should be removed. The second sentence should refer only to the Plan and be re-worded so that potential land users are encouraged to review the Plan and are not being directed to do so. The last sentence should be removed completely.</td>
<td>The wording has been modified slightly to address your concerns (and moved to S. 1.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>1.2 Scope and Application (Page. 3): Emergency Use - the content under this section will need to be re-worded to reflect the appropriate mechanisms currently in place.</td>
<td>Accepted: Referenced any measures provided for in current legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.1.1-2.1.2 Vision and Goals (Page. 6): Consider an increased focus on land use planning. Provided examples of goals and vision from Haida land Use Plan and Pikangikum Land Use Strategy.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Land use affects all aspects of people's lives so should be guided by a holistic vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.1.1-2.1.2 Vision and Goals (Page. 6): To clearly place a land use plan as a tool within integrated land and resource management.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Is the intent to add this to the scope and application section? The intent is covered under S. 1.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.2 (Page 7,8) Additional wording may be required with respect to potential higher impact land uses that are not covered in any of the five uses discussed.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: We are addressing the key land uses identified in our Terms of Reference. Requests to address other uses should have been raised earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.2 Land Use Zones (Page. 8): &quot;Tourism&quot; the Travel and Tourism Act (as referred to) should be identified as GNWT legislation.</td>
<td>It is in the Reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3 Dene Culture (Page. 13, 14): The Recommendations (R#1 - R#6) should be removed from this section of the Plan.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Recommendations have been kept in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3 Terms (Page. 12): Actions - All sentences with the exception of the first one should be removed since they direct and commit the Parties and other third party organizations to undertake specific activities within specified timeframes. This language is not appropriate for a guidance document.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This identifies the Parties implementation responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3 Terms (Page. 12): Reference to recommendation(s) as Terms and any other sentences describing the intent of recommendations should be removed throughout this section.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: &quot;Terms&quot; is no longer used in the Plan. Recommendations are clearly defined to have no legal obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3 Terms (Page. 12): The sentence starting with &quot;Appendix 1....&quot; Will need to be re-worded to remove the reference to the word recommendations.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Recommendations have been kept in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3 Terms (Page. 12): The zoning definition directs the GNWT and other Parties to take on additional responsibilities. For purposes of the final draft plan, the first two sentences should remain, the rest of the sentences under this heading started with &quot;CR's&quot; will be checked... should be removed.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This identifies the Parties implementation responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/06)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3 Terms (Page. 13): The first paragraph under the &quot;Respect Dene Laws, Values and Principles&quot; heading makes reference to Chapter 2 of the Background Report. This reference should be removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.1 Culture and Language (Page. 14): Remove recommendations R#9 from this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.2 Use and Recognition of Traditional and Cultural Knowledge (Page. 18): Remove recommendations R#11 and R#12 from this section. Additionally, the paragraph should be re-worded to reflect the importance of developers communicating and building strong relationships with the communities when activities are proposed on Dehcho Traditional lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.3 Agricultural Practices (Page. 27): Remove Recommendations #21 &amp; #22 from this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.3 Forestry, CR#19 (Page 27): Still under consideration by GNWT. This has been removed from the Plan as there are no differences from the IMA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.3 Mackenzie Valley Pipeline (Page. 32): All references to Dehcho land should be changed to the Dehcho territory for consistency in language throughout the Plan and in this section. The IMA refers to land use planning occurring in the Dehcho Territory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.3 Secondary Industry (Page. 36): Remove recommendation R#25 from this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.3 Existing Rights, Dispositions, Authorizations and Activities (Page. 33): Remove recommendation R#13 from this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.3 Forestry, CR#17 (Page 27): Remove the conditions for new community infrastructure as they have been merged into this CR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Accepted: This Recommendation has been merged into the Economic Development Strategy Action. Partially Accepted: This CR has been revised to require mitigation to minimize impacts to TLUO areas in Conservation Zones. Accepted: Revised as appropriate. Partially Accepted: Kept one use and changed the other. Accepted: This Recommendation has been merged into the Plan. Accepted: This Recommendation has been kept in the Plan. Partially Accepted: Existing Uses has undergone significant revisions and is now found under S. 1.2 of the Plan (rather than as a CR). Recommendations have been kept in the Plan. Partially Accepted: Existing Uses has undergone significant revisions and is now found under S. 1.2 of the Plan (rather than as a CR). Recommendations have been kept in the Plan. Partially Accepted: Existing Uses has undergone significant revisions and is now found under S. 1.2 of the Plan (rather than as a CR). Recommendations have been kept in the Plan. Partially Accepted: Existing Uses has undergone significant revisions and is now found under S. 1.2 of the Plan (rather than as a CR). Recommendations have been kept in the Plan. Partially Accepted: Existing Uses has undergone significant revisions and is now found under S. 1.2 of the Plan (rather than as a CR). Recommendations have been kept in the Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>Organization or Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Committee Response / Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.3 Significant Features and Seasonal Restrictions (Page, 34): Remove recommendation R#24 from this section.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Recommendations have been kept in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.3 Tourism (Page 28): Remove recommendation R#17, 18, 19, 20 from this section. Also, the section under &quot;Big Game Outfitters&quot; should be removed in its entirety.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Recommendations have been kept in the Plan. The restrictions on big game hunting are extremely important to the Dehcho First Nations. Approving new big game outfitting operations, given the level of opposition to this use, will not build positive relationships with communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.4 Community Infrastructure and Expansion (Page, 37): Further consideration of (R#67). Note general comments.</td>
<td>This CR has been deleted. Community infrastructure is dealt with in the CR for minor infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>2.3.4 Health and Social Issues (Page. 37): Starting at the Health and Social issues heading until the end of Page 39 should be removed from the Plan. These items belong more appropriately in the Background Report.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This provides rationale for the Recommendations and explains community concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>3.1 (Page. iv, 42): First Paragraph after the Recommendations definition should be written to reflect s.9 &amp; s.10 of the IMA. Similarly first sentence on page 42 (Plan Approval 3.2) should be reworded.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>3.2.1: Table 4 on Page, 45 is labeled &quot;Implementation Vehicles for Zoning and Key Terms&quot;. Remove table and use internally to identify those that should be in full agreement with each of the related Terms. Table is useful in identifying linkages within an integrated resource management regime and could be used to portray these rather than as &quot;Implementation Vehicles&quot;.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Other Parties have found this table useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>3.2.1: Table 4 on Page, 45: In terms of mandate, the GNWT should also be included regarding consultation, water management, digital mapping, and revegetation.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: GNWT added to Responsible Authorities for water management and revegetation but the CRs for community involvement (no longer consultation) and digital mapping would primarily be implemented by the MVLWB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>3.2.3 Conformity Determination (Page 49): First paragraph gives the DLUPC an expanded mandate and ongoing role. The reference to s. 47 (1) of the MVRMA to substantiate this enhanced role is incorrect since there is not final agreement at this point.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: While this section is still referenced, it's role is clearly defined and the Committee's role in monitoring conformity described in light of legal discussions on April 11th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>3.2.4 Inspections and Enforcement (Page. 50): The paragraph starting with &quot;once a land use permit...&quot; needs to be re-written. Note general comments.</td>
<td>Accepted: It has been revised to clarify that inspectors check conformity with terms and conditions of authorizations, not the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>5.3 (Background Page, 108): There is a difference in the interpretation of the potential in Edehzhie for oil and gas as reported by the CS Lord Geoscience Centre Phase 1 NRA and the Drummond report. Please include an explanation for this difference in this section.</td>
<td>The Drummond Report provides volume estimates. References to rankings (low, moderate, high, etc) were inappropriate and have been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>5.3 (Background Page, 74, 107): The existing land withdrawal under the PAS process expires on June 30, 2007 NOT in October 2007.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>5.4 (Page 116, 117) (Background): There is also one section in the northwest corner that is in the PAS Area of interest but not put forward in the Plan as part of Conservation Zone 5, but rather as part of Special Management Zone 19.</td>
<td>The Zone boundary has been revised to include the NW corner of the PAS area, as agreed to by affected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>A consideration of air quality standards (R#16, A#7) go beyond an element of a land use plan and should become a recommendation or be removed.</td>
<td>Accepted: They are now a Recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>As stated in earlier submissions, the GNWT still remains concerned with designating greater than 50% of the land in conservation zones. This approach may overly limit development opportunities for Dehcho First Nations proponents as well as others.</td>
<td>The communities are aware of this and will consider opening further lands in future revisions once the Dehcho Final Agreement is ratified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Change A#2, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, to Recommendations. The intent is consistent with existing policy and legislation however additional clarification and discussion is required.</td>
<td>Many of these CRS have been revised to address various comments. A#2 is directed at DFN, not GNWT - only DFN can request this be changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Chapter 2. Any reference to specific guidance documents with respect to Terms should be first to NWT standards, then Canada and then others.</td>
<td>In many areas of interest, the GNWT does not have standards (or they are not yet complete or approved).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Chapter 3. Clear roles need to be articulated with respect to conformity requirements that are limited to the purpose of the proposed final draft land use plan as noted in Appendix II of the IMA.</td>
<td>We recommend that Responsible Authorities organize a workshop to discuss implementation roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Commissioner’s Land, the Town of Hay River, Land Withdrawal, Land and Water Regulation, Forest Management, the NWT Protected Area Strategy and Tourism are matters of the IMA. While these interests may overlap with these sections on Land Use Planning, in the interests of open and fair negotiations, GNWT would not be able to approve an interim draft land use plan that contains elements related to these matters that would impact on processes defined in the IMA or compromise ongoing negotiations.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The IMA requires us to consider these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Ensure the consistency of CR#8, 10 with the Interim Measures Agreement.</td>
<td>These differences exist for a reason. The Plan has been clarified to say that any differences add to, rather than take away from the IMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Granular Resources - Need further discussion by parties to the IMA with respect to intent regarding land withdrawals as opposed to conservation zones.</td>
<td>The Plan will not contain surface land withdrawals so restrictions need to be linked to Conservation Zones to continue the intent of the IMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>If used in a recommendation, Air Monitoring and Management (Page 24 and Chapter 3) terms (Action #7 and Recommendation # 16) wording should be altered and considered collaboratively, that is to say EC and GNWT could help to determine an appropriate wording that would identify what expectations would be placed on who to do what, including who should be consulted in the process in order to protect healthy air.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Action #7 has been changed to a recommendation. Recommendation #16 is already just a recommendation, some of which are currently being used (e.g. the NEB requires industry to use AUEB Guide 60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>In any upcoming documents or public statements regarding the plan, it should be referred to as the Draft Plan.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: A statement has been included at the front of the Plan explaining that it is a draft until approved. The word &quot;draft&quot; has been deleted elsewhere in the Plan and Background Report to avoid the need for revisions once the Plan is approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>In earlier correspondence the GNWT noted that direction with respect to Inspections and Enforcement (3.2.4, Page. 50-52) is not acceptable to the GNWT.</td>
<td>This section has been revised to clarify that inspectors check the terms and conditions of authorizations, not the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>In the November 2005 version of the Plan a considerable number of the Conformity Requirements were added. Many of these additional terms direct regulatory authorities to take specific actions. This is not acceptable to the GNWT as authorities would only change through the negotiation process. As per the IMA, the plan presented for approval is to be a “final draft land use plan”, in other words, interim in nature.</td>
<td>Very few Conformity Requirements were added. Most existed already as Actions, but the definitions for Actions and Conformity Requirements were clarified and terms were reorganized accordingly. Once approved (and favourably considered) the plan becomes a Final Plan (or an Approved Plan) and through the implementation mechanisms described in the IMA, will direct Responsible Authorities in the conduct of their activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>In the present version of the proposed plan (3.4-3.5, Page 53), the DLUPC has extended its authority with respect to plan exceptions and plan amendments. This is unacceptable to the GNWT. These are matters for future negotiations amongst the parties.</td>
<td>This was discussed at the legal meeting on April 11, 2006 and was revised based on those discussions. The Plan no longer provides for exceptions. The Committee will maintain the lead role in coordinating Plan amendments as described in Chapter 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>In the present version of the proposed Plan, the DLUPC has extended its authority with respect to community boundaries, minor infrastructure and cumulative effects. This is unacceptable to the GNWT. These are matters for future negotiations among the Parties.</td>
<td>The Plan has been revised to remove the Committee’s role in granting exceptions. However we have maintained our role in assessing cumulative effects for consideration of the Responsible Authority since we are the only ones equipped to do so at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Individual references to “Recommendations” in the body of the Draft Plan should be removed. For your convenience, Attachment 3 notes a number of references to recommendations; this should not be used as a comprehensive list.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: Recommendations need to be in the body of the Plan or they won’t be read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>It is important that any language and wording used in the final draft land use plan is completely consistent with other areas of discussion in the IMA or are not presented in the proposed plan.</td>
<td>The Final Draft Plan has been revised to ensure it is consistent with the IMA. Any differences in language (e.g. granular resources) are explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>iv: Remove the following: By Approving the Plan, Governments agree to implement the Terms within their jurisdiction and ensure that new land and water uses comply with the Plan.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This is an accurate representation of the Parties implementation responsibilities under the Plan. It has been clarified to differentiate between CRs and Actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>iv: Remove the following: The Background Report supports the Plan by providing context, rationale and methodology but is not subject to the approval by the parties.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: It is important to alert people to the information contained in the Background Report and its role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>iv: Special Infrastructure Corridor - what about access agreements for roads into the corridor?</td>
<td>Access for the pipeline is managed according to the Access CR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Page iii, 7, 9, 11 (Background iii, 85, 107): It is recommended that the name &quot;Protected Areas Strategy Zones&quot; be used consistently throughout all DLUPC documents.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Please clarify in Citation #235 in the Notes and Reference section (Background Page 207) what month the report was published, as there was more than one draft produced in 2005.</td>
<td>Accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Reference to Dehcho First Nation resolutions in a final draft plan would not be acceptable to the GNWT (For example, CR#16 Water Monitoring / Management - Hydroelectric development).</td>
<td>Accepted: They have been removed to the Background Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Regulatory Authorities who would be required to determine conformity to the final draft plan must have their role(s) clearly articulated.</td>
<td>DIAND has suggested the need for an implementation workshop to discuss this. The Plan also includes a recommendation for such work to be done in advance of Plan approval. The Plan does not do this to avoid omitting a Responsible Authority in error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Remove A#1, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17. These are subject to negotiations.</td>
<td>Not accepted: Nothing in the IMA says the Plan cannot address issues subject to ongoing negotiations. The Plan includes a &quot;without prejudice&quot; clause to provide for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Remove A#3, 4, 6. The intent is inconsistent with existing policy and legislation or inappropriate for a land use plan.</td>
<td>A#3, 4, 6 are directed at DFN, not GNWT so it is not for GNWT to tell us to delete them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Remove recommendation #16 from this section on Air Monitoring and Management (Page 24).</td>
<td>Not Accepted: This provides important regulatory guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Section 70 of the IMA clearly states that the IMA does not constitute a binding contract between parties. References in the proposed draft land use plan that imply legally binding obligations should be removed.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The IMA is not legally binding but the implementation mechanisms provided for the Plan have legal effect - Land Withdrawals and binding policy direction, allowing the Plan to direct Responsible Authorities to conduct their activities in conformity with the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Special Infrastructure Corridor (Zone 30) related to the proposed MVP is an example of an existing proposed development, that is being reviewed by other processes in an integrated land and resource management regime. While recognizing that some residents of the Dehcho may not be supportive of the Mackenzie Gas Project, there are other means in place to express thoughts.</td>
<td>The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline term or zone description does not in any way express residents thoughts on the pipeline. The Plan allows for the pipeline, and provides conditions for it similar to the Gwichin Plan to guide its appropriate development through this region. Without this Conformity Requirement, the zoning would restrict the pipeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Subject to Negotiations or Elsewhere in IMA. Remove CR#3, 4, 11, 13, 15, partial, 16, 23, partially, 25, 27.</td>
<td>Not accepted: Nothing in the IMA says the Plan cannot address issues subject to ongoing negotiations. The Plan includes a &quot;without prejudice&quot; clause to provide for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>The DLUPC has extended its authority with respect to conformity requirements. This is unacceptable to the GNWT. This is a matter of negotiation among the Parties.</td>
<td>The DLUPC has extended its authority with respect to conformity requirements. This is unacceptable to the GNWT. This is a matter of negotiation among the Parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>The Final Draft must acknowledge GNWT's authorities with respect to values and implied objectives related to forest, wildlife and habitat interests. Hence there may be a conformity role of the GNWT.</td>
<td>The Plan will be implemented in the interim through binding policy direction from the Minister of DIAND to the MVLWB. As most land uses affected by the Plan require either a land use permit or water license, the Conformity Requirements are implementable through that binding policy direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>The GNWT considers the &quot;Plan Review Process&quot; a matter for Main Table negotiation.</td>
<td>This was discussed at the legal meeting on April 11, 2006. The Committee will maintain the lead role in coordinating Plan reviews as described in Chapter 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>The GNWT does not intend to amend policy or legislation to accommodate a final draft land use plan. Zoning and Terms must be able to be implemented within existing means. If zoning and terms (Chapter 2) direct regulatory authorities, this goes beyond the IMA as well as opens the door to ambiguities. Any terms should offer guidance only.</td>
<td>The GNWT provides for binding policy direction and land withdrawals to implement the Plan - both of which are binding - our Conformity Requirements are consistent with this. The GNWT has not pointed out any specific places where legislation prohibits them from carrying out the requirements of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>The IMA requests that no cross referencing to the Background Report occur except in a clear statement in the first paragraph of the introduction (1.1) to note its existence. Clearly note that the Background document does not constitute part of the proposed plan.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: It is a guide to interpretation of the Plan and will be described as such. It is cross-referenced where appropriate to draw the reader's attention to important information relevant to the section in question. It is clearly stated that the Background Report is not part of the Plan and is not subject to approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>The IMA context needs to be clear throughout the plan. (Reference to s.3., s.4., Appendix II). The Plan is intended to guide, not direct.</td>
<td>The IMA context is clear throughout the Plan. We reference all applicable sections regularly. Guide can also mean direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>The intent is consistent with existing policy and legislation. After revising wording or approach in collaborative means with multiple parties, GNWT could consider aspects of these conditionally: CR# 1, 2, 7, 12, 25.</td>
<td>Many of these CRS have been revised to address various comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The intent of recommendations needs to be consistent throughout the Plan. On page 12 of the Plan and DLUPC presentations note that Recommendations are advisory in nature. Page 43 second full paragraph implies otherwise. Move Recommendations to the Background Report to avoid misinterpretation. GNWT could consider leaving Recommendation’s in an Appendix to plan provided a clear introductory statement as to their intent was given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Accepted: The last statement was removed as it is no longer relevant to a Plan submitted for approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>The limited application of the Plan needs to be fully recognized. Section 2 of the IMA clearly states that the final plan only applies outside existing boundaries of local government and Nahanni National Park Reserve. The plan already does this under Scope and Application (1) Location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially Accepted: The intent of Recommendations has been clarified throughout the Plan - advisory only. However, they have been left in the body of the Plan to ensure they are read and considered where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Tourism development is prohibited in Zone 2 (JMR Five Lakes) and Zone 7 (Birch Lake) which further limits development opportunities. Zone 7 is an important traditional use area for the community - they do not want commercial tourism operations in there. Zone 2 has been opened to tourism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>x &amp; vi: The section on &quot;The Background Report contains six chapters... All references to the Background report should be removed entirely from the Plan. Table 5 has been updated to reflect this. Recent GNWT comments were the basis for revisions to CR #14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>vi: The last sentence on page vi should be re-worded as follows: The Committee has strived to provide as much detail as possible in the Revised Draft Plan in order to address topics raised through written submissions and during summer consultations. The Plan will proceed through a review process until all the Parties interests are satisfied and a final plan is approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>xv: Recommendations - Removal of this definition since the GNWT does not consider Recommendations as part of the proposed draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>xvi: Definitions noted for land, oil and gas, and others do not apply to beyond the context of the Plan. Definitions have been reviewed and revised where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Definitions have been reviewed and revised where appropriate. Many of these CRs have been revised as a result of the legal discussions to remove any legal obstacles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Bob Bailey - GNWT</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: All mention of the DPAM and any other definition and discussions on Responsible Authorities throughout the Plan and Background Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Dennis Deneron - SKDB</td>
<td>Zone Descriptions: Careful consideration of the term “protect” in relation to Conservation Zones should be given as this could be interpreted in different ways - in its extreme to mean non use of a resource or no land use that might affect the status of the aspect being protected. Zone boundaries are not fixed and their location may change as new information comes to light. SKDB position paper (2003) lays out the area of land that the SKDB considers to be of “primary” SKDB interest. The SKDB is still willing to sign a “commercial resource development boundary agreement” previously negotiated with ADK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Pierre Alvarez - CAPP</td>
<td>Conformity Determination: Figure 1, p.51 outlines the process for conformity determination. This Table should be altered to include the process for determining exceptions to the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Chief Dennis Deneron - SKDB</td>
<td>CR #6 Existing Rights, Dispositions, Authorizations and Activities: CAPP requests clarification on the meaning of “alter the non-conforming use” with regards to existing rights, dispositions, authorizations and activities. As development progresses (oil and gas), it should not be seen as a new use but rather as a continuation of the existing use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Pierre Alvarez - CAPP</td>
<td>Linear Disturbance: Why was 1.5m chosen for the linear disturbance when all other indicators were based on the Salmo report? In CAPP’s previous submission, we pointed out that there was no scientific evidence to suggest that 1.5m wide was an ecologically significant barrier. CAPP was informed 1.5m has been chosen because this width triggers regulatory approval. Seismic lines are the single biggest disturbance type on the landscape so steps should be taken to minimize impacts wherever possible. Even if only some of the linear disturbance is 1.5m this is enough to fall below threshold.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Pierre Alvarez - CAPP</td>
<td>Many of the Conformity Requirements, Actions, and Recommendations identified in the Plan are beyond the scope of land use plans and would be better addressed through other means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Pierre Alvarez - CAPP</td>
<td>Reclamation: The Plan has measured the baseline disturbance levels across the region without taking into account reclamation of land or identifying appropriate means to do so. This has most likely resulted in a baseline disturbance level that is higher than actual disturbance on the ground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Pierre Alvarez - CAPP</td>
<td>Several operational constraints limit the appropriateness of Heli-Portable Seismic Issues to the entire Dehcho region under all conditions. Impact on muskeg, daylight limitations, could contravene the intent of R#24 concerning low flying aircraft over significant features and habitat.</td>
<td>1.5 m is wide enough for ground access by ATV or snowmobile - so will not always require heli-portable operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Pierre Alvarez - CAPP</td>
<td>The Draft Plan states that in areas of &quot;concentrated development&quot; the proposed thresholds are being surpassed. Yet oil and gas development will almost certainly occur in concentration. It is unlikely that activity would be evenly spaced but rather concentrated where there is oil and gas potential.</td>
<td>The Cumulative Effects CR has been revised to require Responsible Authorities to consider the thresholds in their decisions, not reject applications because of them. This will provide greater flexibility for the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Pierre Alvarez - CAPP</td>
<td>The Plan as drafted places geographic and operational constraints on industry as oil and gas activity is restricted from most of the Dehcho region. Zoning and Cumulative Effects thresholds place further constraints on industry’s activities in those areas where activity is allowed. The initial conditions put in place are overly burdensome and place uncompetitive conditions on activity in the Dehcho. Ultimately, the Dehcho region could be deprived of the benefits from responsible development.</td>
<td>Oil and Gas is permitted in approximately 55% of the Dehcho territory, including the highest potential areas. There are plenty of resources available for development. The Cumulative Effects CR has been revised to require Responsible Authorities to consider the thresholds in their decisions, not reject applications because of them. This will provide greater flexibility for the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/06</td>
<td>Pierre Alvarez - CAPP</td>
<td>The Plan needs to clearly present the land use vision for the region, focusing on which zones are being protected, what values are being protected, and what type of activities will be prohibited in each type of zone. To this end, we recommend putting the zone descriptions in the Plan and not the Background Report.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: The zone descriptions are not considered legally binding so need to stay in the Background Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/06</td>
<td>Margaret Ireland - JMR</td>
<td>Extend SMZ 19 around the Conservation Zone 2 around Deep Lake and McGill Lake to further minimize the impact. The Elders agree with this request.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/06</td>
<td>Margaret Ireland - JMR</td>
<td>Members are concerned we, JMRFN, are too restrictive on our approach to potential development. Since there is potential oil/gas in the Deep Lake and McGill Lake area we want the area of Special Management Zone 19 (Purple) south of the highway remain the same but open to oil/gas. Special Management Zone 19, south of the Highway only to be open to oil/gas.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised Plan to include new zone JMR - South which allows for oil and gas development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/06</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - for Sambaa K'e Dene Band</td>
<td>(1) Maintain the current PAS boundaries (SKDB)</td>
<td>Accepted: ADK, Trout Lake and Nahanni Butte agreed to maintain the current boundaries for Conservation Zones 5 and 6 at the February 8th overlap meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/06</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - for Sambaa K'e Dene Band</td>
<td>Cumulative Effects: If subsequent development to the west of 122 degrees 30 minutes demonstrates that the ADK-proposed thresholds are adequate to protect the woodland caribou, then SKDB would consider allowing these thresholds to be extended eastwards to 122 degrees 15 minutes, but with the current PAS area boundary remaining the same.</td>
<td>This can be considered during future Plan reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/06</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - for Sambaa K'e Dene Band</td>
<td>Zoning: Allow ADK, if they wish, to amend zoning to the west of 122 degrees 30 minutes (Although sympathetic towards Nahanni, SKDB will not become involved in negotiations between Nahanni and ADK regarding the Northern Zone Boundary).</td>
<td>Zoning of overlap areas (zones 25 and 26 now) between Fort Liard, Trout Lake and Nahanni Butte were agreed to at the March 10th overlap meeting in Fort Simpson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/02/06</td>
<td>Peter Redvers - for Sambaa K'e Dene Band</td>
<td>Zoning: Keep lands east of 122 degree 30 minutes that are not part of the PAS Area as Special Management Zones under existing thresholds criteria (unless the Dehcho as a whole changes its criteria for those</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as per March 10th Rezoning Session. Revised thresholds apply to the whole of Liard Range (Zone 26) with original thresholds applying to Zone 25 (new zone number).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>Chief Keyna Norwegian - LKFN</td>
<td>Concern from her membership that not all their areas are protected that are still being used for traditional use (Popular River, 19, 22, 30).</td>
<td>This was addressed through a rezoning session on February 15, 2006 in Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>Chief Keyna Norwegian - LKFN</td>
<td>Concerned about the municipal boundary around Fort Simpson. I don't think the Mouse family were even aware that their traditional area is now sitting in a municipal boundary.</td>
<td>Block Land Transfers are no longer included within community boundaries in the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>Chief Lloyd Chioot</td>
<td>Put on travel routes to special lakes that the Elders traveled to.</td>
<td>This is related to TK collection and should be handled at the community level with DFN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>Chief Lloyd Chioot - Kakisa</td>
<td>Kakisa has identified a PAS area of interest. Please use this to revise zoning.</td>
<td>Accepted: Zone Maps and Zone Descriptions have been revised to reflect this new area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>Chief Roy Fabian - KFN</td>
<td>The plan would be stronger written in the Dene language.</td>
<td>The Plan needs be written in English because it will have legal effect through implementation and the direction needs to be clear. The Dene Names for Communities, Rivers and Lakes have been used throughout the document. The Plain Language Summary will be translated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>Kelly Pennycook - Ft Simpson Métis</td>
<td>Special Infrastructure Corridor: You got it mentioned as a transportation corridor for hydrocarbons only. I know there's a couple of Elders in the Meander River area that actually see the pipeline transporting water as well in the near future. It might be something that they wanted to consider. - is the corridor for the pipeline only? Consider the pipeline could someday transport water.</td>
<td>The current pipeline application is for gas, not water. It would require a new application to change the pipeline to transport water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>President Marie Lafferty - Ft Simpson Métis</td>
<td>Minor Infrastructure: A Type B land use permit usually requires a sump. This would be impractical in some situations, for example where permafrost is receding and insufficient to hold a sump.</td>
<td>This could be addressed during project reviews and preliminary screening under the existing regulatory regime. This term just sets conditions for the location of infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>President Marie Lafferty - Ft Providence Métis</td>
<td>Requested a definition for consultation</td>
<td>The Plan no longer refers to consultation in these terms, but rather to community involvement, to avoid the legal issues surrounding “consultation”. Community involvement is defined within the CR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>Richard Lafferty: Ft Providence Métis</td>
<td>Concerned about increasing bison road kill due to increased trucking. So there's some real significant work that needs to be done in terms of mitigation and accommodation for that transportation corridor through our region.</td>
<td>This should be addressed through the Joint Review Panel and the Environmental Impact Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02/06</td>
<td>Richard Lafferty: Ft Providence Métis</td>
<td>Concerned about potentially significant impacts of increased barging from Mackenzie Gas Project near Edzhie and the Providence Narrows.</td>
<td>This should be addressed through the Joint Review Panel and the Environmental Impact Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>Chief Gabe Hardisty - PKFN</td>
<td>For me I would like to wait on this Land Use Planning, I want to wait for three (3) months. I want to work on it before I say yes to review the Plan and consult the community.</td>
<td>Meetings held with the community on February 27 and April 4th, 2006 to review it with them and answer questions. The Committee delayed submission until May 2006, giving the community 3 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>David Livingstone - DIAND</td>
<td>Concerned draft has changed from five (5) conformity requirements to twenty-seven (27)</td>
<td>These were all existing requirements. The definitions of CRs and Actions were revised, causing many Actions from the June Draft to become Conformity Requirements in the November Draft (but they were already requirements).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>David Livingstone - DIAND</td>
<td>Concerned the conservation zones identified in the Plan are considerably larger in extent than the conservation zones that were identified in the Interim Land Withdrawal.</td>
<td>The level of Conservation has dropped in the final revisions and is consistent with the level of protection provided in the existing land withdrawals. However, a large portion of the remaining Conservation Zones is supporting federal and territorial conservation initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>David Livingstone - DIAND</td>
<td>Cumulative Effects (CR#25): Move this from a -- a conformity requirement to a recommendation; that way we can work on this collectively but it doesn't become a no-go -- go-no- go decision that -- that may be based on -- on inaccurate or incorrect numbers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>David Livingstone - DIAND</td>
<td>There are conformity requirements that exceed, in our view, legislative authorities. Now, mandatory use of TK policies and protocols implies in some cases a veto by communities that isn't reflected in legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>Mr. Tom Beaulieu - GNWT</td>
<td>And as a party to the Interim Measurements Agreement, the GNWT must respect its intent and process and cannot approve a plan that goes beyond the intent of the Interim Measures Agreement. This is because the GNWT want to be able to implement a plan that aligns with the IMA and the existing policy and legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>Sam Gargan - DFN (Elders Committee)</td>
<td>Use Slavey Names for the places were we are from. We need to tell people where we’re from, where we use this land, and we have to put Slavey names on every one of those places, there's hardly any Slavey names in those areas that we talked about.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>Shane Parrish ADK</td>
<td>Require discussion with Trout Lake and Nahanni Butte regarding overlap (Zoning). Of course there are issues with respect to Trout Lake and Nahanni, that need to be resolved, and that's one of the reasons, I guess we're here; we are going to meet this evening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/06</td>
<td>Shane Parrish ADK</td>
<td>When you look at the conditions that are put on those activities it's - it became pretty obvious pretty quick that there wasn't going to be anything happening on these management zones and the ones we were focusing on were twenty-one (21) and twenty-six (26).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/06</td>
<td>Anadarko</td>
<td>Promised to provide additional info to assist us on thresholds and volume of timber cut.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/06</td>
<td>Mike Peters - CAPP</td>
<td>A 1.5 m linear corridor definition would increase the time to get to an injured worker or remove him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/06</td>
<td>Mike Peters - CAPP</td>
<td>It’s very difficult to reach commercial operations under the thresholds proposed, and there’s no incentive to develop (Example provided with 3D seismic).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/06</td>
<td>Mr. Mike Peters - CAPP</td>
<td>Cumulative Effects (CR#25): Industry is concerned that the Plan as it's drafted, will not allow for the full cycle of activities and perhaps cycle is not the right word, their progression might be a better word, the progression from exploration through to commercial production. Use 1.5 m wide lines and you will not trigger a cumulative effects assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan is consistent with the IMA and existing legislation and does not supersede these. The Plan has been revised significantly to address clear inconsistencies discussed at the legal meeting on April 11th.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization of Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Dehcho First Nation(s) is now used throughout the Plan and includes the regional body plus the 13 community organizations (including Métis). The Plan does not show the traditional boundaries for any communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/02/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>CR#11: ‘If you have development you are going to have to accept some scars’. CR#12: Revised wording from TLUO “not disturbed” to “avoided or mitigated”.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>CR#11: Revised to “in consultation with affected communities”. CR#12: Revised Revegetation Term to allow for some community flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/02/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>CR#18: Revise to “in consultation with affected communities”. Accepted: Revised Revegetation Term to allow for some community flexibility.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>CR#18: Revised to “in consultation with affected communities”. Accepted: Revised Revegetation Term to allow for some community flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Karen Felker - WPFN</td>
<td>Ts’ueh Nda (West Point First Nation-WPFN) needs to be acknowledged on the maps and all further presentations. Accepted: Revised.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted: Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/06</td>
<td>President Marie Lafferty - Fort Simpson Métis</td>
<td>The actual Community Boundaries are within Block Land transfers or Development Control Zones. There are also still some crown lands as well within these Block Land transfers or Development Control Zones as there have been at least 6 other OIC’s since 1971 within the boundaries of Fort Simpson. Block Land Transfers have been deleted from the definition of community boundaries and maps. Accepted: Revised Revegetation Term to reflect comment.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/06</td>
<td>President Marie Lafferty - Fort Simpson Métis</td>
<td>The Northern Boreal Forest is the main habitat for the Flora and Fauna of the DFN Territory. There needs to be a Forest Management Plan for the DFN. Accepted: Revised Revegetation Term to reflect comment.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted: Revised Revegetation Term to reflect comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/06</td>
<td>President Marie Lafferty - Fort Simpson Métis</td>
<td>The revegetation of our lands we believe should be restored to the original state. Therefore we ask that it should be “seed mixes indigenous to the impacted site’s habitat”. Accepted: Revised to reflect comment.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised to reflect comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/06</td>
<td>President Marie Lafferty - Fort Simpson Métis</td>
<td>Was there any movement on our request to the GNWT’s Associate Deputy Minister Tom Beaulieu to have their submission reference the specific policy and legislation? The GNWT provided a new submission on April 7 - basically a tracked changes version of the Plan, which provided a bit more detail on their areas of concern, but it did not specifically point out inconsistencies with legislation. At the legal meeting, they suggested this as anywhere we directed them to do something. Not Accepted: There is no legal mechanism for the Plan to require this at the moment.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Accepted: There is no legal mechanism for the Plan to require this at the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/06</td>
<td>President Marie Lafferty - Fort Simpson Métis</td>
<td>Who do monitors report to? The FSM believe that any monitors monitoring should report first and primarily to the affected First Nation and DFN. Accepted: Revised section to clarify that Guides and monitors report to local First Nation, and act as liaisons between the developer and community.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised section to clarify that Guides and monitors report to local First Nation, and act as liaisons between the developer and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/03/06</td>
<td>President Marie Lafferty - Fort Simpson Métis</td>
<td>With respect to “Use of Traditional Materials” (A#4) change to “must” contact the local first nations for approval and guidance. Not all individuals or affected Dehcho Nations have the resources or capacity to develop their own policies. The Plan should stipulate that, “Dehcho First Nation(s) policies should be used when individual Dehcho First Nation(s) policies are not available”. Not all individuals or affected Dehcho Nations have the resources or capacity to develop their own policies. The Plan should stipulate that, “Dehcho First Nation(s) policies should be used when individual Dehcho First Nation(s) policies are not available”.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted: Revised section to clarify that Guides and monitors report to local First Nation, and act as liaisons between the developer and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Dennis Deneron - SKDB</td>
<td>The term First Nation(s) does not reflect the entire Dehcho member Nations accurately. Include a definition for First Nation(s) that would contain all the Dehcho Nations including the Métis Nations. Alternatively have it written as Dehcho First Nation(s).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted: Revised section to clarify that Guides and monitors report to local First Nation, and act as liaisons between the developer and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Dennis Deneron - SKDB</td>
<td>(2) The Plan must clearly state that any rights issuance and/or other forms of resource development proposed for lands east of 122 degrees 30 minutes West Longitude and south of 61 degrees North latitude, in either 'Zone A' or the proposed 'Oil and Gas Issuance Area', requires Sambaa K'e consent through a General Band Council Resolution. Resource development proposed for 'Zone 26' or that area of the 'Oil and Gas Rights Issuance Area' west of 122 degrees 30 minutes requires consultation with the Sambaa K'e Dene Band regarding traditional land use matters.</td>
<td>Community consent is required for a future oil and gas issuance cycle as per S.41 of the IMA. We cannot require it for all forms of resource development. Zone Descriptions have been reviewed to ensure consistency with existing agreements between the DFN(s) and Canada with respect to consent and or consultation requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Dennis Deneron - SKDB</td>
<td>(3) The Acho Dene Koe must clearly state its support for the Sambaa K'e Candidate Protected Area through a Band Council Resolution, without prejudice to existing ADK Treaty and Inherent Aboriginal rights.</td>
<td>I would encourage you to work directly with Chief Harry Deneron of ADK to secure their written approval. This is not something the DLUPC can address or require. The Plan zoning reflects the current proposed boundaries for the PAS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Dennis Deneron - SKDB</td>
<td>(4) A woodland caribou monitoring program must be put into place in the proposed 'Oil and Gas Rights Issuance Area' in advance of rights issuance and other forms of resource development so that information regarding impacts to these animals can be properly documented within the framework of the 'adaptive management approach' being applied to the area.</td>
<td>ADK have previously expressed interest in research and monitoring. It can be identified as a research priority in final revisions to the Zone Description and Objectives and recommend that the monitoring program be developed in advance. The timing of your approval of the oil and gas issuance cycle will determine if this condition is met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/06</td>
<td>PDAC / Mining Ass. / NNCM</td>
<td>DLUPC should schedule consultation with mining sector to co-inside with major conferences. Since previous request there has only been one.</td>
<td>The information available did not change between the first mining conference and the second or third. We would also encourage the mining industry to attend our events, such as the Regional Forum, so they can discuss their concerns with the communities and other planning partners, not just the Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/06</td>
<td>PDAC / Mining Ass. / NNCM</td>
<td>Draft LUP mentions economic development strategy but economic modeling is questionable. The Plan maintains status quo.</td>
<td>The Plan does not maintain the status quo. Approximately half of the region is open for various types of development, providing for huge increases over the current level of development. By identifying clear rules for development and identifying where it is appropriate, the Plan will increase regulatory certainty and increase economic opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/06</td>
<td>PDAC / Mining Ass. / NNCM</td>
<td>Industry-community dialogue required. Toolkit of background information developed. Requesting the Committee delay submission for one year to allow for further dialogue.</td>
<td>The Committee has delayed long enough to address the Parties concerns. The Committee has been encouraging this form of dialogue for the past three years. It will help to build positive relationships and may influence communities' support of mining over larger areas in future Plan revisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/06</td>
<td>PDAC / Mining Ass. / NNCM</td>
<td>Page 188, 3rd paragraph refers to unemployment but fails to propose strategies to reduce unemployment or reliance on transfer payments.</td>
<td>Read on: &quot;education must become a priority (190)&quot; and revenue must be retained in the north if local people are to benefit (193). Also refer to #17 and #17(s) which address related issues. Zoning identifies areas for development to create employment and revenues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>Under New Terms, Netla-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor Term the Plan refers to &quot;compensation and/ or mitigation of impacts on Dehcho First Nation(s) traditional land use and occupancy activities in the area&quot;. Should issues such as compensation be included in a Land Use Plan or should such a condition be addressed in a Benefits Plan associated with the development?</td>
<td>Compensation has been removed from this CR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yy)</td>
<td>Organization or Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Committee Response / Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>Under New Terms, Netla-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor Term the Plan refers to “uses the best available technology to minimize environmental impacts; and” Who defines best available technology? Could we say something like the company commits to use best practices to minimize environmental impacts?</td>
<td>Best available technology has been defined in the Plan, based on recent use by the MVLWB. The Responsible Authority would determine whether the applicant has met the requirements on this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>With respect to the Netla-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor, we propose the following changes: all three First Nations “will work together to maximize benefits, consistent with section 42 of the IMA, from the proposed development”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised Zone Description to reflect comment and wording in the IMA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>With respect to the Oil and Gas Issuance Area section we again underline our proposed changes: Sambaa K’e Dene Band and the Nahanni Butte Dene Band “agree to initiate discussions on establishing reasonable terms and conditions before a Petroleum Rights Issuance proceeds”.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised Zone Description to reflect comment and wording in the IMA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/06</td>
<td>Peter Marcellais - Nahanni Butte</td>
<td>Nahanni Butte wishes to have conservation zones along the Netla River and 3 tributaries, including Tåáho (Big Bend) where they intend to have a youth camp. Tourism will be permitted. The Netla-Arrowhead SIC should also recognize the sensitive stream bed where it crosses this conservation zone.</td>
<td>Partially Accepted: Added new Zone Description, Maps and Terms to reflect the new zone north of 60 degrees 40 minutes. Existing zoning as agreed to in previous meetings with Fort Liard and Trout Lake was maintained south of this line. The Conservation Zone does not overlap with the Netla-Arrowhead Special Infrastructure Corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/04/06</td>
<td>Chief Harry Deneron - ADK</td>
<td>ADK does not accept the proposed Conservation Zone around the Netla River requested by Nahanni Butte south of 60 degrees 40 minutes. We believe there is sufficient protection for this within the existing regulatory system.</td>
<td>Accepted: The new zone only exists north of 60 degrees 40 minutes. Existing zoning as agreed to in previous meetings with Fort Liard and Trout Lake was maintained south of this line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/06 &amp; 27/03/06</td>
<td>George Low - DFO</td>
<td>Page 23 - second paragraph (suggested wording): ….and other harvester. Because fish, fish habitat and fisheries are transboundary issues, they must continue to be managed by DFO with advice from Great Slave Lake Advisory Committee (GSLAC). Once land claim and treaty entitlements are settled a future committee or board which represents all affected First Nations and other fishery resource users will be set up to manage the lake as a whole.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised wording as agreed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/06 &amp; 27/03/06</td>
<td>George Low - DFO</td>
<td>Page 23, 62 (suggested wording) - CR #13 Regulatory Authorities will only permit commercial fishing on lakes with the support of the affected First Nation. This statement does not apply to Great Slave Lake (Tucho), which will continue to be managed by DFO with advice from the Great Slave Lake Advisory Committee (GSLAC). Once land claims and treaty entitlements are settled a future co-management committee or board which represents all affected First Nations and other fishery resource users will be set up to manage the lake as a whole.</td>
<td>Not Accepted: There was no need to duplicate the additional information in this CR as it is provided in the preamble below. The additional information has been removed from the CR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/06 &amp; 27/03/06</td>
<td>George Low - DFO</td>
<td>Page 29, 66 A #9: Regulatory Authorities will consider community concerns about sport fishing and develop a strategy to address them. This will include looking at information on sports quotas and licences, monitoring and enforcing laws. Communities with concerns will be involved in the process.</td>
<td>Accepted: Revised as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>