



Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee

November 10, 2004

Philip Wright, Mineral Economist
Indian and Northern Affairs, Special Project Division
10 Wellington Street
Gatineau, Quebec
K1A 0H4

RE: Deh Cho Land Use Options Feedback

Dear Philip,

Thank you for your comments emailed September 7, 2004 regarding the Deh Cho Land Use Planning Options. We will consider them as we move forward in our planning process.

At this time however, I would like to address your comment on the rights of third party interests. You are concerned that Prairie Creek Mine (as an example) is not developed in Options 2-5 and that this implies those rights will either be voluntarily forfeited or expropriated. Thank you for raising this important concern so that we may take steps to correct our communications. This is definitely not the message the Committee wants to send. I would like to take this opportunity to more clearly explain the meaning and intent of the options.

First, let me state unequivocally that the Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee is not assuming or proposing that the existing mineral deposits used in the options (Prairie Creek, Cantung, and Coates Lake) would be closed, forfeited or expropriated. Canada's Representative, Adrian Boyd, has made it clear to the Board and Staff that 3rd party interests within the planning region must be protected in the plan. As you mentioned, the introduction to our Options Atlas affirms that the land use plan will not apply to existing third party interests.

The purpose of the options was to initiate discussions on where **future** development may be permitted or not and show the effect on the economy. Since the Dehcho has had little mineral exploration to date, **using existing mines and deposits as surrogates for future mine development** was the only way we could show the effect of a new mine on the Dehcho economy, until better data can be found.

We chose the Prairie Creek, Cantung and Coates Lake deposits because they are the most likely to see development and have sufficient information publicly available to permit economic modelling. Thus, when we showed these mines as being developed or not in the options, it was not intended to predict the future of those mineral deposits specifically, but rather to show the relationship between zoning (where mining is permitted or not) and the effects that could have on the economy.

Given your comment and similar discussions with others, it is clear we did not explain this properly and we apologize for the confusion. While we will not be revising the current options atlas, we will ensure this is clearly explained in all future documentation as we move forward in our process. As we are posting written comments on our website, this response will also be included for the purpose of clarifying our intentions with all our planning partners. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at (867) 699-3164 or hwiebe@dehcholands.org.

Sincerely,



Heidi Wiebe, Executive Director
Deh Cho Land Use Planning Committee