The Generalized Density of Traditional Land Use and Occupancy shows areas of moderate to very high use from the Dehcho First Nations research compiled by Herb Norwegian and Petr Cizek. They documented places where harvesters and Elders killed animals, set traps, gathered plants, used cabins or camp-sites and knew of spiritual sites.

The density analysis summarizes overall use by Dehcho communities. Areas used by more 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 Wildlife Constraint Layer generally shows critical wildlife areas (breeding areas, birthing areas, migration corridors, and mineral licks) for the following species: Woodland caribou, Moose, Wood Bison, Sheep, Goats, Grizzly bears, Wolverine, Fish, Waterfowl, Peregrine Falcons (subspecies anatum), Trumpeter Swans, and Whooping Cranes. Woodland caribou home range data from satellite collars and habitat suitability data from RWED were also included in the constraint layer due to the sensitivity of this species.

The Conservation Intersect was created in ArcView software by identifying all areas in which both critical wildlife areas (as defined above) and moderate to very high traditional use areas overlap.

The Conservation Intersect was used as the basis for the Conservation Zones. The Wildlife Constraint Layer and the Traditional Use Constraint Layer were both used in the development of Special Management Zones.
The oil and gas potential reflects the updated research completing by Ken Drummond in 2004 on oil and gas field size distributions. The complete report is available in the documents section of our website www.dehchoslands.org. The highest geological potential is in the southwest corner of the Dehcho. There is also high geological potential in the Cameron Hills Trout Lake areas. However, the economic cost and exploration risk has to be factored in.

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 developments 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.

Due to the economic importance of this resource use to the Dehcho, the Committee has kept as many high value areas as possible open to development, subject to the Terms of the Plan and existing regulatory requirements. While most of the southern Dehcho is in a Special Management to protect sensitive wildlife species, oil and gas is permitted. The Fort Liard region was left primarily in a General Use Zone due to strong community support of the industry. Trout Lake is currently trying to advance a large area for permanent protection under the PAS and so restricted support for oil and gas to the northeast of their traditional area.
The Mineral Potential map reflects the known potential of the Dehcho. To date, there has been little exploration in the Dehcho on which to base concrete conclusions, so there is lower confidence in the overall accuracy of potential mapping by industry and government representatives. New discoveries could drastically change what is known about the potential of this region. That said, current mapping shows the greatest potential for minerals in the western tip of the Dehcho, extending into the Yukon Territory.

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 supported mining outside of areas they wished to have protected.

The Committee recognizes the concerns communities have with mining but have tried to address those concerns through Terms rather than restricting the use altogether. However, in areas put forth by communities for protection, mining will be restricted as an incompatible use. In the Greater Nahanni Ecosystem where the highest potential lies, the Committee has generally maintained the existing land withdrawals to await results from the detailed studies coming out of the Nahanni Park Expansion Process. Some boundary revisions were made to the north of the existing park to address new woodland caribou data from RWED and to better reflect existing mineral dispositions.

Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee
Regional Forum Information Package
March 29 - 31, 2005
Hay River Reserve
The forestry potential shows the location of possible aspen, white spruce and jack pine saw logs within inventoried areas of the Dehcho. The best timber is in the Liard Valley with some good saw log stands in the Cameron Hills. 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 at the moment.

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

The productive timber areas were generally left open for forestry development. Some Special Management Zones were expressly developed to support community-based forestry operations. Areas identified by communities for protection were closed to forestry operations.
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Non-Consumptive Tourism

Tourism potential in the Dehcho tends to be concentrated around communities, water and mountains as these provide access to services and incredible scenic areas. Big attractions in the Dehcho include the South Nahanni, North Nahanni, Mackenzie and Liard Rivers, as well as Great Slave Lake, Trout Lake and Kakisa Lake. While tourism is not yet well developed in the Dehcho, most agree there is considerable potential in the region.

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. Communities felt some areas should be off limits to tourists as well and maintained strictly for community traditional use and harvesting.

Tourism is permitted in most parts of the Dehcho except where it is currently excluded by existing land withdrawals (Edéhzhìe, Greater Nahanni Ecosystem) and in some smaller areas identified by communities for exclusive community use. Special terms to encourage appropriate use cover some of the permitted areas.

Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee
Regional Forum Information Package
March 29 - 31, 2005
Hay River Reserve
The agricultural potential of the Dehcho has been digitized along the Upper Mackenzie and Liard River Valleys. There is also known potential around the Hay River corridor though this has not been captured digitally at this time. 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. Agricultural potential for the purposes of land use planning is defined as cultivation of the soil and the grazing of livestock outside of community boundaries, not including confined barn livestock production, greenhouses, and game-ranching.

Communities in areas of known agriculture potential are generally supportive where there is a history or familiarity with agricultural development. 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 use and harvesting activities. Communities outside the agriculture potential belt had little experience with or interest in agriculture.

The Committee has provided the opportunity for agricultural development on 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 the next plan revision cycle.