



GWICH'IN LAND USE PLANNING BOARD

**THE PROCESS OF LAND USE PLANNING  
IN THE  
GWICH'IN SETTLEMENT AREA**

DRAFT  
NOVEMBER 1999

*This document is for discussion purposes only. It is intended to help refine future planning processes through continued discussion and revision.*

P.O. BOX 2478 • INUVIK, NT • X0E 0T0  
PHONE: 867-777-3506 • FAX: 867-777-2616  
EMAIL: [planner@gwichinplanning.nt.ca](mailto:planner@gwichinplanning.nt.ca)

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3.0 THE APPROACH OF THE PLANNING BOARD</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>4.0 WHAT IS IN THE LAND USE PLAN: A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF PLANNING DESIGNATIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>5.0 HOW WERE PLANNING DESIGNATIONS ESTABLISHED FOR EACH AREA: STEPS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS?</b> .....	<b>3</b>
5.1 STEP 1. IDENTIFYING LAND USE POTENTIAL AND LAND REQUIREMENTS IN THE GWICH’IN SETTLEMENT AREA .....	3
5.2 STEP 2. OUTLINING PLAN OPTIONS .....	4
5.3 STEP 3. IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL PROTECTED AREAS WITH COMMUNITIES .....	5
<b>6.0 PRELIMINARY DRAFT LAND USE PLAN GENERAL EVALUATION METHODOLOGY</b> .6	
<b>7.0 EVALUATING THE PROPOSED PROTECTED AREAS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
7.10 OIL AND GAS PIPELINE POTENTIAL .....	7
7.11 OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION POTENTIAL.....	7
7.12 SAND, GRAVEL AND CRUSHED ROCK.....	7
7.13 MINERAL POTENTIAL .....	7
7.14 HIGHWAYS AND BARGE ROUTES .....	8
7.15 TOURISM.....	8
7.16 ARCHEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE .....	8
7.17 CABIN/CAMP ANALYSIS .....	8
7.18 HARVEST STUDY ANALYSIS .....	8
7.19 TRADITIONAL TRAIL USE .....	9
7.20 FISHERIES RESOURCES.....	9
7.21 WILDLIFE RESOURCES.....	9
7.22 ENDANGERED, THREATENED OR VULNERABLE SPECIES .....	10
7.23 FORESTS AND VEGETATION RESOURCES .....	10
7.24 UNIQUE LANDSCAPE FEATURES .....	10
<b>8.0 PRIORITIZING THE RESULTS</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>9.0 INFORMATION GAPS AND THE LEVEL OF CONFIDENCES WITH THE INFORMATION USED IN THE EVALUATION</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>10.0 REFERENCES USED IN THE PLANNING PROCESS</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>11.0 APPENDIX A: LAND USE PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUPS</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>12.0 APPENDIX B: RESPONSES TO PLAN OPTION FOR THE GWICH’IN SETTLEMENT AREA LAND USE PLAN</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>13.0 APPENDIX C: RESPONSES TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR THE GWICH’IN SETTLEMENT AREA LAND USE PLAN</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>14.0 APPENDIX D: IDENTIFYING AREAS WITH HIGH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL TO MINIMIZE CONFLICTS WITH PROPOSED PROTECTED AREAS</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>15.0 APPENDIX E: EVALUATING CRITERIA FOR PROPOSED PROTECTED AREAS</b> .....	<b>41</b>



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Gwich'in Land Use Planning Board (planning board), after extensive consultation with land users and managers, has drafted a land use plan for the Gwich'in Settlement Area. Development of the plan has been a long and involved process. Over the past five years, the planning board has built upon past planning initiatives to develop a new plan for the area that strikes a balance between the need for conservation and for regional economic development. Since its' establishment, the planning board has envisioned a Land Use Plan for the Gwich'in Settlement Area where land, water, wildlife and other resources are conserved, developed and used for the benefit of the people of the area, considering the needs of all Canadians.

This paper describes each step in the plan's development. The goal of the paper is to ensure that the planning process is apparent and is understood by all stakeholders. After a brief description of the planning board's creation and mandate, the paper outlines, chronologically, the steps in the planning process, from information collection, to identifying and evaluating proposed protected areas and their boundaries. The consultation and review process is described at each step.

Note: the Plan designation of Gwich'in Protected Areas has been renamed Gwich'in Conservation Zones though the policy of no development remains the same. The change was made to avoid confusion with the Northwest Territories Protected Areas Strategy and the Conservation Areas defined in the Gwich'in Land Claim.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

The need for land use planning in the Gwich'in Settlement Area was identified in the Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement (GCLCA) in 1992. Guiding principles for planning in the area, as defined in the agreement, are as follows:

- 1) The purpose of land use planning is to protect and promote the existing and future well-being of the residents and communities of the settlement area having regard to the interests of all Canadians (Section 24.2.4a).
- 2) Special attention shall be devoted to:
  - (i) protecting and promoting the existing and future social, cultural and economic well-being of the Gwich'in;
  - (ii) lands used by the Gwich'in for harvesting and other uses of resources;
  - (iii) the rights of the Gwich'in under this agreement (Section 24.2.4b).
- 3) Land use planning shall directly involve communities and designated Gwich'in organizations (Section 24.2.4c).
- 4) The plan developed through the planning process shall provide for the conservation, development and utilization of land, resources and waters (Section 24.2.4d).
- 5) Water resources planning within the Mackenzie Valley is an integral part of land use planning (Section 24.2.5).

With the proclamation of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act, on 22 December 1998, the Gwich'in Land Use Planning Board assumed its responsibilities. The act established the mandates, duties and responsibilities of land use planning boards throughout the Mackenzie Valley. Under the act, land use planning boards are responsible for developing plans to guide the use of Crown, settlement and other private lands and the use of water in their respective settlement areas. The plan requires approval from the land claim authority and the territorial and federal governments. Once approved, regulatory bodies issuing licenses and permits relating to the use of land or water, including First Nation organizations, and federal and territorial governments and agencies, are to conduct their operations in accordance with the plan.

An interim land use planning board was established in the Gwich'in Settlement Area in 1993. The planning board, building on previous land use plans in the area, began the current planning process soon after it was established. When the planning board officially assumed its responsibilities under the MVRMA in 1998, the current land use planning process was well developed. By June 1999, a land use plan for the Gwich'in Settlement Area will be presented to the Gwich'in Tribal Council for formal approval.

### **3.0 THE APPROACH OF THE PLANNING BOARD**

Following the principles established in the Gwich'in land claim, the planning board's work has been driven by the communities. Taking care of the land in the Gwich'in context means looking after the whole environment including the people, land, water, wildlife, heritage and other resources. The planning board has taken a similar approach to land use planning by viewing and considering land inclusively and holistically. In this sense, the proposed plan goes beyond a traditional land use plan to reflect the values of the Gwich'in.

The goal of the plan is to provide for the conservation and development of lands. Great care has been taken to include all the information on both conservation and current and potential developments. The plan seeks to achieve a balance between these two needs.

Consultation and review have been a central point in the land use planning process. Every document and every stage in the process has been reviewed and consultation has been sought from communities, government agencies, co-management groups, environmental organizations and industry.

## **4.0 WHAT IS IN THE LAND USE PLAN?: A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF PLANNING DESIGNATIONS**

The Gwich'in Land Use Planning Board is proposing a land use plan for the area in which land is designated into three categories:

- Gwich'in Protected Areas (GPA): land uses are restricted to small scale community approved renewable resource activities. All other activities are prohibited. Included in this designation, and subject to the same restrictions, are Gwich'in Heritage Protected Areas (GHPA)
- Gwich'in Special Management Areas (GSMA): all land uses are possible providing certain terms and conditions described in the plan are met by all users requiring permits, licenses or other authorizations
- Gwich'in General Use Areas (GGUA): all land uses are possible with no additional terms beyond those associated with the current regulatory system

The plan includes all private and crown lands in the settlement area. Areas within municipal boundaries are excluded from the plan.

The plan will be subject to a complete review in five years. Any of the designations or conditions associated with land use in a certain area may be changed at that time. Within the five year life of the plan, the planning board will consider exceptions that allow for non-conforming activities to take place, and amendments to the plan. The processes for making exceptions and amendments are outlined in the plan.

## **5.0 HOW WERE PLANNING DESIGNATIONS ESTABLISHED FOR EACH AREA?: STEPS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS**

### **5.1 STEP 1. IDENTIFYING LAND USE POTENTIAL AND LAND REQUIREMENTS IN THE GWICH'IN SETTLEMENT AREA**

Background literature on past, current and potential land uses in the settlement area was extensively studied. The process of identifying potential land uses is an ongoing process with new information and research always being considered. Based on the literature reviewed, the planning board produced inventory and assessment reports examining current and potential land uses in the area. Potential land uses are viewed under three broad categories, and inventory and assessment reports were produced for each subcategory:

1. Renewable Resources
  - forestry
  - water
  - wildlife
  - fish
  - tourism

2. Non-Renewable Resources
  - sand and gravel
  - oil and gas
  - minerals
3. Public Developments
  - transportation
  - communication and utilities
  - waste management
  - military activities

The reports provide a basis for the planning process, but were not intended for public distribution. Each report examines historical, current and long and short term potential land uses. The reports are accompanied by a series of maps, at varying scales, which show locations of significant resources and resource use.

Additional literature, research and mapped documents were reviewed and an extensive geographic information system (GIS) database has been developed. In 1997, the planning board summarized its analysis of current and future land use in the area and produced a public document entitled, *Summary of Land and Water Activities in the Gwich'in Settlement Area*.

## 5.2 STEP 2. OUTLINING PLAN OPTIONS

In February 1997, the planning board produced a paper entitled *Plan Options, Gwich'in Settlement Area Land Use Plan: A Discussion Paper for the Land and Water Managers and Users of the Gwich'in Settlement Area*. The paper identifies land use planning principles and goals, analyses the regulatory system, makes recommendations for a land use classifications system, discusses alternatives for implementation and review of the land use plan and reviews land use sector issues. The paper was circulated extensively for review (see Appendix A). Comments and responses to the paper are summarized in Appendix B.

The proposed land use classification system, in the options paper, is based on:

- the system developed by the Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Plan (MDBSLUP)
- the objectives of the land claim agreement
- the references to land use planning in the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act
- the mandates of the agencies that will be responsible for approving and implementing the land use plan
- the nature of the resources of the GSA
- the values of area residents and land users.

The proposed land use classification system in the options paper includes five potential designations for lands in the area:

- year round protected areas
- seasonally protected areas
- commercial non-renewable resource development areas
- commercial renewable resource development areas
- public development areas

Based on comments to the options paper (Appendix B), this system was revised to its current three-tier classification.

Considerations in establishing proposed protected areas included:

- Endangered, threatened or vulnerable species' habitat, breeding and nesting sites or migration routes
- Breeding, nesting and spawning sites, migration routes, staging areas and critical habitat of other species
- Ecologically significant areas which could include significant stream and river channels, lakes, wetlands, flood plains, headwater areas, areas of high biodiversity, etc.
- Unique or significant features including landforms, sites of rare vegetation or areas of scientific interest
- Culturally significant sites, including archaeological sites, historical sites and current traditional sites

The options paper made explicit that the planning process would include both traditional, or local community knowledge and scientific knowledge on an equal footing in its evaluation of potential protected areas. The process for evaluating potential land uses would be based on the impacts of those uses on the resources, the society, economy and culture of the region, and on the compatibility of land uses. Based on the inventory and assessment reports, issues and options associated with land use sectors were addressed publicly in the options paper.

### **5.3 STEP 3. IDENTIFYING POTENTIAL PROTECTED AREAS WITH COMMUNITIES**

The first step communities wanted to take in the planning process was to identify potential protected areas based on their use and knowledge of those areas. In consultation with communities, the first list of proposed protected areas was developed in 1997 and distributed by the planning board in a document entitled *Proposed Community Protected Areas*. The community members identified areas that warranted protection and areas that allowed for conditional use. At this stage, some areas were highlighted in the process but their proposed designation was not always agreed. The process also identified critical areas in the primary and secondary use areas in the Yukon that communities wanted to highlight for potential protection or conditional use.



The document is based on a series of three workshops held in each Gwich'in community. Community members mapped the resources and areas which they identified as needing protection within the plan. Communities identified important areas for protection based on their knowledge of fish and wildlife habitat, use of traditional areas and identification of cultural sites. To assist the process, the planning board presented to community members all the protected areas which had been suggested in the past by the communities, government departments and non-governmental agencies. In particular, many community members had worked closely with the Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission and the Peel River Watershed Advisory Group and wanted to build upon this work. The planning board, therefore, encouraged the planning process to be an ongoing process that incorporated and moved forward from past initiatives.

The document was circulated extensively for review. Land users and managers were asked to comment on the proposed protected areas and offer information that confirmed or challenged the boundaries. The response from most agencies was that the total area designated for complete protection was too large based on the need for resources for regional economic development.

To help prioritize the proposed protected areas identified by the communities, a workshop was held, 24-26 November 1997, involving the communities, regional management groups and government. From this workshop, valued resources were identified and criteria were developed for evaluating the proposed community protected areas. This methodology was presented in the Preliminary Draft Land Use Plan for the Gwich'in Settlement Area.

## **6.0 PRELIMINARY DRAFT LAND USE PLAN GENERAL EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

The *Preliminary Draft Land Use Plan for the Gwich'in Settlement Area* presents the methodology used for evaluating the proposed protected areas. The approach divides the valuation of proposed protected areas into three general classifications for consideration:

1. traditional use and heritage resources associated with an area
2. the 'land' or environmental values associated with an area
3. resource potential of areas.

Appendix B, in the preliminary draft plan outlines the proposed features that were to be evaluated within each classification. The proposed methodology was circulated extensively for review. Based on comments (Appendix C), the methodology was revised to assign more explicit valuations in the identification of resource development potential.

## **7.0 EVALUATING THE PROPOSED PROTECTED AREAS**

In order to evaluate the overall significance of each proposed protected area, the written and mapped information sources from both the literature review and those submitted by stakeholders, including all land users, government and management agencies, were used to develop a numeric ranking process. This section describes the values associated with each resource and how they were ranked.

Generally, areas with high significance were assigned a “3”, those with moderate significance “2” and those with low significance “1”. If the resource did not exist in the area a “0” was assigned. Results of the scoring procedure are found in Appendices D and E.

### **7.10 OIL AND GAS PIPELINE POTENTIAL**

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – proposed pipeline through protected area
- 0 – no proposed pipeline through protected area

### **7.11 OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION POTENTIAL**

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – average estimated petroleum content 100-300 thousand barrels of oil per square mile
- 2 – average estimated petroleum content 30-100 thousand barrels of oil per square mile
- 1 – average estimated petroleum content 20-50 thousand barrels of oil per square mile
- 0 – minimal estimated petroleum reserves

### **7.12 SAND, GRAVEL AND CRUSHED ROCK**

Scoring Technique

- 3 – existing or proposed pit sites
- 2 – known sources with development potential
- 0 – no known potential

### **7.13 MINERAL POTENTIAL**

Scoring Technique

- 3 – known significant discovery
- 2 – medium mineral potential
- 1 – medium-low mineral potential
- 0 – low mineral potential

#### 7.14 HIGHWAYS AND BARGE ROUTES

Scoring Technique

- 3 – existing or proposed highways
- 2 – existing barge routes
- 1 – minor travel and historic routes
- 0 – no existing or proposed routes

#### 7.15 TOURISM

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – important and accessible routes, either highway or river and/or unique landscape
- 2 – less important and accessible routes and/or unique landscapes
- 1 – unimportant current routes and/or historical routes

#### 7.16 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – density of 4 or more archaeological sites per 10 km<sup>2</sup>. A " \*" beside a number indicates that within the area there is a cluster of archaeological sites or a large and important site is known.
- 2 – density of between 2 and 4 archaeological sites per 10 km<sup>2</sup>
- 1 – density of less than 2 archaeological sites per 10 km<sup>2</sup>

*Comments: We have not examined the details on all these sites so we do not distinguish between an important site such as where an entire community may have existed and a relatively unimportant site where a single arrowhead was found.*

#### 7.17 CABIN/CAMP ANALYSIS

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – density of 3 or more cabins per 10 km<sup>2</sup>. A " \*" beside a number indicates that within the area there is a cluster of cabins or camps.
- 2 – density of 2 - 3 cabins per 10 km<sup>2</sup>
- 1 – density of less than 2 cabins per 10 km<sup>2</sup>

#### 7.18 HARVEST STUDY ANALYSIS

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas where over 60% of harvesting took place for any given wildlife species
- 2 – areas where 30% to 59% of harvesting took place for any given wildlife species
- 1 – areas where 0 to 29% of harvesting took place for any given wildlife species

### **7.19 TRADITIONAL TRAIL USE**

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas with the highest trail density
- 2 – areas with moderate trail densities
- 1 – areas rarely traveled
- 0 – areas never used
- Travel corridors through protected areas were noted and an “\*” placed beside the score.

### **7.20 FISHERIES RESOURCES**

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas containing exceptional spawning/nursery areas, staging areas, known high seasonal or permanent fish population or a unique species
- 2 – areas containing at least one of the above features but was not considered to be exceptional
- 1 – areas known to have a population of locally important species (whitefish, loche, inconnu, char)
- 0 – areas where no significant fish species are present

### **7.21 WILDLIFE RESOURCES**

#### **DALL’S SHEEP**

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – known Dall's sheep lambing areas
- 2 – areas of seasonal habitat for Dall’s sheep
- 0 – areas where no significant sheep population is present
- ? – indicates a lack of information.

#### **MOOSE**

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas known to have an exceptionally high moose population
- 2 – areas where moose are known to be abundant
- 1 – areas where moose were known to be present but not abundant
- 0 – areas where no significant moose population is present

#### **FURBEARING SPECIES**

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas known to have an exceptionally high furbearer population
- 2 – areas known to have abundant furbearer population
- 1 – areas where furbearers are present but not abundant
- 0 – areas where no significant furbearer population are present
- ? – indicates a lack of information

## CARIBOU

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas where caribou migrate or occupy land more than 40% of the years
- 2 – areas where the caribou migrate more than 20 % of the years
- 1 – areas where caribou are known to migrate or occupy occasionally (less than 20% more than 0%)
- 0 – areas where no significant caribou population is present

## WATERFOWL

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas known to have exceptional breeding or staging populations
- 2 – areas where waterfowl are to be abundant
- 1 – areas where waterfowl are known to be present but not abundant
- 0 – areas where no significant waterfowl population is present
- ? – indicates a lack of information

### 7.22 ENDANGERED, THREATENED OR VULNERABLE SPECIES

There are three species known to inhabit the GSA that are listed as vulnerable, threatened or endangered: wolverine (*Gulo gulo*), grizzly bears (*Ursus arctos*) and peregrine falcon (*Falcon peregrinus anatum*).

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – area contains breeding habitat of an endangered species
- 2 – area contains breeding habitat of a vulnerable species
- 1 – areas contains breeding habitat of a threatened species

### 7.23 FORESTS AND VEGETATION RESOURCES

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas known to have unique vegetation or vegetation community and/or significant regional forests (large white spruce)
- 2 – areas with moderate forest cover or containing vegetation species of some interest
- 1 – areas where forests are known to be present
- 0 – areas where no forests were present

### 7.24 UNIQUE LANDSCAPE FEATURES

Scoring Technique:

- 3 – areas known to contain an exceptional, unique landform feature or many interesting landforms
- 2 – areas with interesting landforms
- 1 – areas with land features of lower interest
- 0 – areas that contain no known features of interest

## 8.0 PRIORITIZING THE RESULTS

This section describes the final ranking and weighting of each numeric evaluation and how those evaluations translated into proposed protected area boundaries.

First, each area was ranked according to highest overall score. This ranking identified the Rat River, Peel, Aklavik and Husky Channel and Travaillant Lake areas as having significant value for protected area status. A second analysis, focused on identifying those areas with the highest frequency of significant values. Through this process, again, greatest significance was afforded to the Rat River and the Husky, Aklavik and Peel Channel. The Travaillant Lake area also figured prominently.

The planning board determined that those areas where protection should be made a priority were areas that shared both the highest cultural values and the highest scientific values. Cultural information that was considered included archaeological sites, cabins, traditional trails and harvesting areas. Scientific information that was considered included critical habitats and ranges, breeding sites and endangered, threatened and vulnerable species habitat. Equal representation of ecoregions and unique landscape features were also considered.

Together, these considerations helped to identify areas with high scientific and cultural values. The areas with the highest values were given priority. In some cases, particularly when evaluating ecoregion representation, there was not enough information to warrant protected area status for certain regions. Only those areas where currently literature concurs to their values were given priority.

When general areas had been identified, the planning board had to determine the appropriate boundaries for the protected areas. The values associated with each area for existing and potential developments were studied closely. The values associated with developments, calculated in Appendix D, revealed no major conflicts with potential protected areas.

Conflicts that did exist between current and potential developments and proposed protected areas were addressed and mitigated by the planning board. A two kilometer wide corridor along the length of the Dempster Highway reduces the conflict between protected areas and transportation and potential utility uses, such as pipelines. Similarly, in the Travaillant Lake area, potential transportation and utility conflicts with a proposed protected area have been mitigated by allowing a corridor for development.

In one region, protected area status was dismissed because of potential conflicts with development. Significant mineral discoveries have been made in the Mackenzie Mountain region. Although this was identified as a potential protected area, based on the limited scientific and traditional knowledge and the development potential for the area, the Mackenzie Mountain region was designated a special management area.

Appropriate boundaries were also determined by examining the resources that areas were designed to protect. The boundaries were modified to include watersheds, sub-

watersheds, specific breeding sites, migration areas, and buffers around rivers. The current boundaries seek to ensure adequate protection for the specific resource.

## **9.0 INFORMATION GAPS AND THE LEVEL OF CONFIDENCES WITH THE INFORMATION USED IN THE EVALUATION**

Considerable variation in the knowledge base exists for areas throughout the GSA. Although traditional and scientific knowledge was used throughout the process, the planning board is aware that information and knowledge for certain sectors, in different areas, is scarce. The plan allows for possible exceptions and amendments to the proposed protected areas if new information is revealed within the five-year life of the plan. The planning board encourages stakeholders to continue to research, work with communities and further develop the information base. Many of the areas and issues that need to be addressed, and gaps that need to be filled, are included in the plan. As part of the plan's implementation, the planning board will be working with other groups and agencies to fill those gaps. At the five-year review the new information will be incorporated into the plan.

## 10.0 REFERENCES USED IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

- Arctic Institute of North America. 1996. **Gwich'in Tourism Road Map Workshop, 3-4 December 1996.** Inuvik, NWT.
- Barichello, Norman and Jean Carey. 1989. **Movement Patterns of Dall's Sheep in the Northern Richardson Mountains,** Yukon Renewable Resources, Whitehorse, YT.
- Barichello, Norman, Jean Carey and Kent Jingfors. 1989. **Population Ecology, Range Use and Movement Patterns of Dall's Sheep in the Northern Richardson Mountains.** Yukon Renewable Resources, Whitehorse, YT.
- Barichello, Norman, Jean Carey and Ron Sumanik. 1989. **Current Status of Dall's Sheep In the Southern Richardson Mountains.** Yukon Renewable Resources, Whitehorse, YT.
- Barr, William. 1972. **Landforms of the Lower Mackenzie Valley and Northern Yukon.** National Park and Historic Parks Branch.
- Beckel, Dorothy K.B. 1975. **IBP Ecological Sites in the Subarctic Canada.** Canadian Committee of the International Biological Program; Conservation of Terrestrial Biological Communities Subcommittee, Region 10 Panel.
- Berger, B.D. 1978. **Modern Petroleum: A Basic Primer of the Industry.** Petroleum Publishing Corporation Co., Tulsa, Oklahoma.
- Bruce, James and Bruce Mitchell. 1995. **Broadening Perspectives on Water Issues.** Prepared for the Canadian Global Change Program and the Canadian Water Resources Association. Ottawa.
- Campbell, Monica, Diana Spear and Virginia Maclaren. 1996. **Measuring Up: A Resource Guide for Municipal State of the Environment Reporting.** Prepared for Environment Canada.
- Canada Oil & Gas Lands Administration. 1988. **Oil and gas rights disposition - Canada Lands Map 3. Scale 1:1,000,000.**
- Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited. 1974. **Application and Summaries of Initial Supporting Material: Application to the National Energy Board, March 1974.**
- Canadian Arctic Resources Committee. 1996. **Aboriginal Communities and Mining in Northern Canada: report of a project and a proposal to the Walter and Duncan Gordon Charitable Foundation.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. 1994. **Mackenzie River (Kilometer 1500 to Inuvik) East Channel. Scale 1:50,000.**
- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. 1994. **Mackenzie River West Channel Aklavik to Shallow Bay. Scale 1:50,000.**



- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. 1993. **Peel River Mackenzie River to Road Island. Scale 1:50,000.**
- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. 1987. **Mackenzie River (Kilometer 1590 to Kilometer 1650) Napoiak Channel including Schooner and Taylor Channels. Scale 1:50,000.**
- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. 1984. **Mackenzie River Peel Channel including Husky and Phillips Channels. Scale 1:50,000.**
- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. 1984. **Peel River Road Island to Snake River. Scale 1:50,000.**
- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. 1984. **Mackenzie River (Kilometer 1670 to Kilometer 1730) Middle Channel Tununuk Point to Mackenzie Bay. Scale 1:50,000.**
- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. 1987. **Mackenzie River Reindeer Channel Tununuk Point to Shallow Bay. Scale 1:50,000.**
- Canadian Hydrographic Service, Minister of Fisheries & Oceans, Canada. **1984 Arctic Red River Arctic Red River to Martin House. Scale 1:50,000.**
- Canadian Petroleum Association. 1989. **Land Use Requirements for Anticipated Hydrocarbon Development in the Mackenzie Delta - Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Region.** Produced by R.A. Owens Environmental Services Ltd., Calgary, AB.
- Canadian Petroleum Association. 1988. **Petroleum Related Activity And Resource Potential Within The Mackenzie Delta -Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Area.** Calgary, AB.
- Canadian Wildlife Service. 1997. **Draft Recommended Minimum Altitudes for Aircraft Flying near Birds in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region.**
- Canadian Wildlife Service. 1994. **Status of Waterfowl in the Gwich'in Settlement Area.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Canadian Wildlife Service: Western and Northern Region, 1984, **Key Migratory Bird Terrestrial Habitat Sites in the Northwest Territories, Technical Report No. 84-6,** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Centre for Traditional Knowledge. 1997. **Guidelines for Environmental Assessments and Traditional Knowledge.** Prepared for the World Council of Indigenous People. Environment Canada. Hull, QC.
- Chipertzak, Doug. 1997. Personal Communication. Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Inuvik Regional Office, NWT.
- Committee On the Status of Endangered Wildlife In Canada. 1995. **Canadian Species at Risk, April 1995.** Ottawa, ON.

- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. 1992. **Status Report on the Tundra Peregrine Falcon, Falco peregrinus tundrius in Canada. Status report on endangered wildlife in Canada.** Ottawa, ON.
- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. 1991. **Updated status report on the Grizzly Bear, Ursus arctos horribilis in Canada. Status report on endangered wildlife in Canada.** Ottawa, ON.
- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. 1989. **Status report on the Lynx, Lynx canadensis in Canada. Status report on endangered wildlife in Canada.** Ottawa, ON.
- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. 1989. **Status report on the Wolverine, Gulo gulo in Canada. Status report on endangered wildlife in Canada.** Ottawa, ON.
- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. 1984. **Status report on the Woodland Caribou Rangifer Tarandus Dawsoni and Rangifer Tarandus Caribou in Canada. Status report on endangered wildlife in Canada.** Ottawa, ON.
- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. 1978. **Status report on the Peregrine Falcon, Falco peregrinus in Canada. Status report on endangered wildlife in Canada.** Ottawa, ON.
- Davies M. and B. Sadler. 1990. **Environmental Protection Series: Post-project Analysis and the Improvement of Guidelines for Environmental Monitoring and Audit.** Prepared for the Environmental Assessment Division, Conservation and Protection, Environment Canada. Ottawa, ON.
- Lanz, Walter. 1990. **Along the Dempster: An Outdoor Guide to Canada's Northernmost Highway.** Oak House Publishing: Vancouver, BC.
- Dene Nation. 1972-79. **Dene Mapping Project: Land Use and Occupancy Maps.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Department of Economic Development and Tourism. 1995. **A Comparison of Economic Statistics Between Nunavut and the Western Arctic.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Department of Economic Development and Tourism. 1993. **Arctic Red River Heritage River Management Plan Support Document #3: A Preliminary Examination of the Potential for a Territorial Park in the Jackfish Creek Area of the Arctic Red River.** Arctic Red River, NWT.
- Department of Economic Development and Tourism. 1993. **Canadian Heritage Rivers System Management Plan for the Arctic Red River, Northwest Territories.** Arctic Red River, NWT.
- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1996. **The Arctic Environmental Strategy : Five Years of Progress.** Ottawa, ON.

- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1992. **Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement Between Her Majesty in Right of Canada and the Gwich'in as represented by the Gwich'in Tribal Council.** Ottawa, ON.
- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1992. **Implementation Plan for the Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement.** Ottawa, ON.
- Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada and Department of Renewable Resources. 1990. **The Interests And Needs Of The Northwest Territories In Transboundary Water Negotiations In The Mackenzie River Basin.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1989. **Seasonal Land Use Maps: Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Department of Renewable Resources. 1993. **Forest Inventory Report 1993, Fort McPherson Inventory Cruise Delta Forest Management Unit M – 18.** Fort Smith, NWT.
- Department of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development. 1999. **Cabin and Camps Database for the Inuvialuit and Gwich'in Settlement Areas,** Inuvik, NWT.
- Department of Resources Wildlife and Economic Development. 1996. **NWT Visitor Information Centres: General Results of the 1996 Visitor Survey.** NWT.
- Department of Resources Wildlife and Economic Development. 1995. **1994 NWT Exit Survey: General Report on Visitors to the Northwest Territories, Draft.** NWT.
- Department of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development. 1996. **Draft Management Plan for the Bluenose Caribou Herd.** Inuvik, NWT.
- Department of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development. 1993. **Forest Cover Type: Ft McPherson.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Department of the Environment, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1972. **Land Use Information Series.** Ottawa, ON.
- Department of Transportation. 1989. **Mackenzie Highway: Wrigley to Inuvik Extension.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Dyke, Larry D. and Gregory R. Brooks. 1998. **The Physical Environment of the Mackenzie Valley: a Baseline for the Assessment of Environmental Change,** Geological Survey of Canada.
- Environment Canada. 1995. **Toxic Substances Management policy - Persistence and Bioaccumulation Criteria.** Government of Canada. Ottawa.
- Environment Canada. 1995. **Toxic Substances Management Policy.** Government of Canada. Ottawa.

- Environment Canada. 1997. **Draft Arctic Regional Chapter of Canada's National Program of Action for the Protection of Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities.** NWT Division, Environment Protection Branch, Environment Canada. Yellowknife, NWT.
- Environment Canada. 1997. **Mackenzie Basin Impact Study: Final Report.** Atmospheric Environment Service. Downsview, Ontario.
- Environment Protection Board. 1974. **Environmental Impact Assessment of the Portion of the Mackenzie Gas Pipeline from Alaska to the Alberta, September, 1974.**
- Environmental Impact Review Board. 1994. **Public Review of Driftwood Lumber's Salvage Proposal.** Inuvik, NWT.
- Environmental Impact Review Board. 1990. **Public Review of the Gulf Canada Resources Limited Kulluk Drilling Program 1990 - 1992.** Inuvik, NWT.
- Environmental Impact Review Board. 1989. **Public Review of the ESSO Chevron et al ISSERK I-15 Drilling Program.** Inuvik, NWT.
- ESSA Technologies Ltd. 1996. **Federal Environmental Monitoring Programs in the Mackenzie Valley and Selected Areas of Canada.** Prepared for Claims Planning and Implementation Office, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.
- ESSA Technologies Ltd, Hornal Consultants Ltd and Bryant Environmental Consultants Ltd. 1995. **Tools for Assessing Cumulative Environmental Effects in the Slave Geological Province, NWT: Development Scenarios, Ecological Footprints, Impact Hypotheses, and Procedural Framework.** Prepared for the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Yellowknife, NWT.
- Ferguson, Robert S. 1987. **Wildlife Areas of Special Interest to the Department of Renewable Resources.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Forest Management Service, Indian and Northern Affairs. 1966. **Forest Inventory of the Arctic Red River.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Forestry Management Institute. 1971. **Vegetation Types of the Mackenzie Corridor.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1974. **Mount Eduni, NWT, 106A. Geology Maps, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1974. **Bonnet Plume Lake, YT-NWT, 106B. Geology Maps, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1974. **Nadaleen River, YT-NWT, 106C. Geology Maps, Scale 1:250,000.**

- Geological Survey of Canada. 1965. **Dawson, Yukon Territory, Map 1170A, Surficial Geology, Scale 1:253, 440.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1981. **Fort McPherson, District of Mackenzie, Map 1520A. Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1981. **Arctic Red River, District of Mackenzie, Map 1521A. Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1981. **Martin House, Yukon-Northwest Territories, Map 1525A. Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Fort Good Hope, District of Mackenzie, Map 1741A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Ontaratue River, District of Mackenzie, Map 1742A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Martin House, Yukon-Northwest Territories, Map 1743A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Trail River-Eagle River, Yukon-Northwest Territories, Map 1744A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Arctic Red River, District of Mackenzie, Map 1746A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Travaillant Lake, District of Mackenzie, Map 1747A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Canot Lake, District of Mackenzie, Map 1748A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Upper Ramparts River, District of Mackenzie, Map 1783A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1992. **Sans Sault Rapids, District of Mackenzie, Map 1784A. Surficial Geology, Scale 1:250,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1982. **Engineer Creek, Yukon Territory, Map 8-1982. Surficial Geology and Geomorphology, Scale 1:100,000.**
- Geological Survey of Canada. 1982. **Lower Ogilvie River, Yukon Territory, Map 9-1982. Surficial Geology and Geomorphology, Scale 1:100,000.**
- GeoNorth Limited and North/South Consultants Inc. 1997. **Draft Guidance Document for Northern Aquatic Effects Monitoring Programs.** Prepared for Water Resources Division, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Yellowknife, NWT.

- Government of the Northwest Territories. 1997. **GNWT Comments: Gwich'in Settlement Area Land Use Plan - Plan Options Paper**. Yellowknife, NWT.
- Government of Yukon, Government of Canada and Mayo District Renewable Resources Council. 1996. **Draft Bonnet Plume Heritage River Management Plan**.
- Green, Jeffrey E. 1991. **Options for Integrated Resource Management in the Mackenzie Delta - Beaufort Sea Region**. Prepared for the Canadian Petroleum Association. Calgary, AB.
- Gwich'in Interim Land Use Planning Board. 1997. **Plan Options Paper: Gwich'in Settlement Area Land Use Plan**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Land and Water Board and Gwich'in Interim Land Use Planning Board. 1997. **Integrated Resource Management and Land Use Planning Workshop Report: March 18 - 21, 1997**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1998. **Status of Large Mammals in the Gwich'in Settlement Area**, Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1998. **Gwich'in Harvest Study Data Report: 1997**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1998. **Gwich'in Harvest Study, August 1995-December 1996**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1998. **Status of Small Mammals in the Gwich'in Settlement Area**, Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1997. **Gwich'in Settlement Area Forest Use Survey for 1996**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1997. **Recommendations for the Gwich'in Land Use Planning Process**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1997. **Draft Place Names by Species**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1997. **Draft Grizzly Bear Management Plan for the Gwich'in Settlement Area, Northwest Territories, 1997 - 2001**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board. 1996. **Draft Status of Fish and Wildlife Species in the Gwich'in Settlement Area**. Inuvik, NWT.
- Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute. 1997. **The Mackenzie River Through Gwichya Gwich'in History And Culture; Historic Sites And Monuments Board Of Canada Agenda Paper**. Yellowknife, NWT.
- Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute. 1994. **A Study of Gwichya Gwich'in Place Names in the Gwich'in Settlement Area - Phase III**. Tsiigehtchic, NWT.

- Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute. 1993. **A Study of Gwichya Gwich'in Place Names in the Gwich'in Settlement Area.** Arctic Red River, NWT.
- Hannigan, Peter. 1997. **Petroleum and Mineral Potential of the Gwich'in Settlement Area,** Presentation at the Gwich'in Integrated Resource Management and Land Use Planning Workshop, Inuvik, March 18-21, 1997. Prepared for the Geological Survey of Canada. Calgary, AB.
- Heritage Canada, **Canadian Archaeological Information Network: Archaeological Site Database,** Ottawa
- Integrated Resource Planning Program of the Alberta Department of Environmental Protection. 1994. **Northeast Region Regional Integrated Resource Plan, Draft Plan.** Edmonton, AB.
- Interdisciplinary System Ltd. 1980. **Report on Natural Areas of Canadian Significance and Natural Sites of Canadian Significance in Natural Region 8.** Parks Canada, Ottawa, ON.
- International Porcupine Caribou Board. 1993. **Sensitive Habitats of the Porcupine Caribou Herd.** Whitehorse, YT.
- Inuvialuit Community in Aklavik, et al. 1993. **Aklavik Inuvialuit Community Conservation Plan.** Aklavik, NWT.
- Inuvialuit Community in Inuvik, et al. 1993. **Inuvik Inuvialuit Community Conservation Plan.** Inuvik, NWT.
- Jones, Dave. 1996. **Gwich'in Settlement Area Inventory and Assessment Report - Wildlife: Mammals, Birds and Fish.** Inuvik, NWT.
- Kusick, R. and Stephen P. Goff. 1995. **Exploration Overview 1994 Northwest Territories: Mining, Exploration and Geological Investigations.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Lancaster Sound Regional Land Use Planning Commission. 1991. **Lancaster Sound Regional Land Use Plan.** Nunavut Planning Commission. Yellowknife, NWT.
- Latour, Paul. Department of Renewable Resources, GNWT, 1992, **A Survey of Dall's Sheep in Zone E/1-1,** Northern Mackenzie Mountains, Manuscript Report No. 44.
- Lombard North Group for Foothills Pipelines Ltd. 1974. **Environmental and Vegetation Maps for Foothills Pipeline Ltd.**
- MacDonald, Donald D. 1996. **Peel River Watershed Advisory Committee Workshop on Land and Water Management, March 19-21.** Mayo, Yukon.
- Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission. 1991. **A Community-Based Regional Land Use Plan for the Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Region.** Inuvik, NWT.

- Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission. 1990. **A Draft Community Based Regional Land Use Plan for the Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Region. Volume 2 of 2: A Comprehensive System of Protected Areas.** Inuvik, NWT.
- Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission. 1990. **Mackenzie Delta - Beaufort Sea; Plan Options Paper.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission. 1989. **Workshop Proceedings Economic Development and Tourism In The Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Region.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission. 1989. **Options Paper: Non - Renewable Resources Development.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Mackenzie Delta Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission. 1989. **Compendium of Community Working Group Reports on Economic Development and Tourism.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Regional Land Use Planning Commission. 1989. **Transportation and Military Options Paper.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea Land Use Planning Commission. 1989. **Conservation and Protected Areas-Options Paper, First Draft.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Mackenzie River Basin Committee. 1981. **Mackenzie River Basin Study Report.** Ottawa, ON.
- McCready, Mary, ed. 1995. **Canoeing Canada Northwest Territories: A Paddlers' Guide.** Canadian Recreational Canoeing Association: Hyde Park, ON.
- McCrossan, R.G. 1973. **The Future Petroleum Provinces of Canada: Their Geology and Potential.** Canadian Society of Petroleum Geologists, Calgary, AB.
- Nagy, John. 1998. Personal Communication. Department of Resource Wildlife and Economic Development, Inuvik, NWT.
- Nesbitt, Thomas. 1997. **Draft General Comments/Summary of Legal Options to Establish Protected Areas in the NWT.**
- Nettleship, David N. and Smith, Paulin. 1975. **Ecological Site in Northern Canada.** Canadian Committee for the International Biological Program (Conservation Terrestrial Panel 9).
- Norris, D. K., Ed., 1997. **Geology and Mineral and Hydrocarbon Potential of the Northern Yukon Territory and the Northwestern District of Mackenzie.** Natural Resources Canada.
- Norris, D.K. 1985. **Geology of the Northern Yukon and Northwestern District of Mackenzie Map 1581A Scale 1:500,000.**



- Northern Land Use Planning Office. 1986. **A Review Of Legislative And Regulatory Processes Relevant To Land Use Planning In The Northwest Territories.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Northern Land Use Planning Office. 1985. **Land Data Mapping Systems Available in Yellowknife N.W.T. - Wide Coverage.** Yellowknife, NWT.
- Northern Oil and Gas Directorate, Indian and Northern Affairs. 1995. **Petroleum Exploration in Northern Canada.**
- NorthWest Geographic Services Ltd. **Non-renewable resource development in the Northwest Territories Western Arctic, Map.**
- Nunavut Impact Review Board. 1997. **Nunavut Impact Review Board Operational Procedures.** Cambridge Bay, NT.
- Nunavut Planning Commission. 1991. **Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan.** Rankin Inlet, NWT.
- Nunavut Planning Commission. 1997. **Draft West Kitikmeot Regional Land Use Plan.** Taloyoak, Northwest Territories.
- Peel River Watershed Advisory Committee. 1996. **Peel River Watershed Advisory Committee Workshop on Land and Water Management Workshop Summary Report.** Mayo, Yukon.
- Peepre, J.S. and Associates. 1993. **Yukon Parks System Plan Implementation Project for the Porcupine-Peel Landscape #7.** Whitehorse, YT.
- Pollution Prevention Legislative Task Force. 1993. **Pollution Prevention Legislative Task Force Final Report.** Sponsored by Environment Canada. Hull, QC.
- Porcupine Caribou Technical Committee. 1993. **Sensitive Habitats of the Porcupine Caribou Herd.** Porcupine Caribou Technical Committee.
- Poston, H.J., A.J. Doberstein and S.R. Barber. 1973. **Part of a Wildlife Habitat Inventory of the Mackenzie Valley and Northern Yukon.** Canadian Wildlife Service.
- Procter, R.M., G.C. Taylor, J.A. Wade and Geological Survey of Canada. 1984. **Oil and Natural Gas Resources of Canada – 1983.** Hull, QC.
- Rat River Charr Fishing Plan Working Group. 1996. **Rat River Fishing Plan.** Aklavik, NWT.
- Richardson, Nigel. 1989. **Land Use Planning and Sustainable Development in Canada.** Prepared for the Canadian Environmental Advisory Committee. Ottawa, ON.
- Ritchie, J.C. 1976. "The Campbell Dolomite Upland Near Inuvik, N.W.T. -A Unique Scientific Resource." *Musk Ox*. 18.
- Simmon, Norman, NWT Wildlife Service, 1982, **Seasonal Distribution of Dall's Sheep in the Mackenzie Mountains,** File Report No. 21, Yellowknife, NWT.

Statistics Canada. 1999. <http://www.statcan.ca/start.html>

Stewart, D. B., 1996. **A Review of the Status and Harvest of Fish Stocks in the Gwich'in Settlement Area.** Canada Manuscript Report Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, No. 2336.

Wagner, Gary. 1995. **Cumulative Environmental Impact Monitoring and Environmental Auditing Systems in the Mackenzie River Valley.** Prepared for the Gwich'in Tribal Council. Fort McPherson, NWT.

Wagner, Gary. 1994. **Towards Systematic Cumulative Impact Assessment and Environmental Monitoring in the Mackenzie River Valley.** Prepared for the Gwich'in Tribal Council. Fort McPherson, NWT.

Western Arctic Transportation Services. 1996. **A summary of Western Arctic Transport Trends; the annual sub-project report on the marten study; and raptor nest information forms.**

Wheeler, J.D., A.J. Brookfield, H. Gabrielse, J.W.H. Monger, H.W. Tipper, G.J Woodsworth. 1991. **Terrain map of the Canadian Cordillera, Map 1713A Scale 1:2,000,000.**

## 11.0 APPENDIX A

### **Land Use Planning Consultation Groups**

- Aurora Research Institute
- Canadian Arctic Resource Committee
- Canadian Heritage
- Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society
- Department of Education, Culture and Employment
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans
- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development  
Department of National Defense
- Department of Resources, Wildlife & Economic Development
- Department of Transportation
- Deline Land Corporation
- Diavik Diamond Mines Inc.
- Environment Canada
- Geological Survey of Canada
- Gwich'in Elder and Youth groups
- Gwich'in Land Administration
- Gwich'in Land and Water Board
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board
- Gwich'in Renewable Resource Councils
- Gwich'in Social and Cultural Institute
- Gwich'in Tribal Council
- Interprovincial Pipelines Ltd.
- Hamlet of Aklavik
- Hamlet of Fort McPherson
- Inuvialuit Environmental Impact Screening Committee
- Inuvialuit Joint Secretariat
- Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Working Group
- Municipal and Community Affairs
- National Energy Board
- Natural Resources Canada
- Northern Transportation Company Limited
- Northwest Territories Water Board
- NorthwesTel
- NWT Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists
- NWT Chamber of Mines
- Peel River Watershed Advisory Committee
- Sahtu Renewable Resource Board
- Sahtu Land & Water Board
- Town of Inuvik
- Vuntut Gwich'in First Nation
- Wildlife Management Advisory Council (Yukon North Slope)
- World Wildlife Fund
- Yukon Land Use Planning Council
- Yukon Parks Service

## **List of Land Use Planning Meetings**

- February, 1994** - Issues Identification, Planning Board and four communities
- October, 1995** - Information Gathering Meetings, Planning Board and four communities
- December, 1996** - Mapping and Land Classification work. Planning Board, Tsiigehtchic Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Tsiigehtchic
- December, 1996** - Mapping and Land Classification work. Planning Board, Nihtat Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Inuvik
- December, 1996** - Mapping and Land Classification work. Planning Board, Teetl'it Gwich'in Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Fort McPherson
- January, 1997** - Mapping and Land Classification work. Planning Board, Ehdiitat Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Aklavik
- March, 1997** - Integrated Resource Management and Land Use Planning Workshop, Inuvik.
- June, 1997** - Plan Options Consultation. Planning Board and Federal Departments, Yellowknife
- June, 1997** - Plan Options Consultation. Planning Board and Territorial Departments, Yellowknife
- June, 1997** - Plan Options Consultation. Planning Board and Oil, Gas and Mineral interests, Yellowknife
- June, 1997** - Mapping and Plan Options Review. Planning Board, Tsiigehtchic Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Tsiigehtchic
- June, 1997** - Mapping and Plan Options Review. Planning Board, Nihtat Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Inuvik
- June, 1997** - Mapping and Plan Options Review. Planning Board, Teetl'it Gwich'in Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Fort McPherson
- June, 1997** - Mapping and Plan Options Review. Planning Board, Ehdiitat Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Aklavik
- October, 1997** - Forecasting and Issues. Planning Board, Tsiigehtchic Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Tsiigehtchic
- October, 1997** - Forecasting and Issues. Planning Board, Nihtat Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Inuvik
- October, 1997** - Forecasting and Issues. Planning Board, Teetl'it Gwich'in Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Fort McPherson
- October, 1997** - Forecasting and Issues. Planning Board, Ehdiitat Renewable Resource Council and other community representatives, Aklavik
- November, 1997** - Protected Areas Strategy for the Gwich'in Settlement Region, Inuvik

## 12.0 APPENDIX B: RESPONSES TO PLAN OPTION FOR THE GWICH'IN SETTLEMENT AREA LAND USE PLAN

	Land Use Planning General	Goals and Principles	Land Use Regulatory Process	Land Use Classification System	Amendments and Exceptions	Plan Review and Implementation	Land Use Sector Issues and Options
<b>Department of Resources Wildlife &amp; Economic Development, GNWT</b>	a) development is defined negatively instead as neutral/ development should be defined broadly to include any human activity	a) two sets of goals and principles is confusing (put discussion in an appendix)/ there should be a vision statement	a) it will likely be difficult to integrate a Land Use plan with a regulatory system in transition/ regardless a well designed Land Use Plan will be useful	a) consider using categories similar to the MDBSLUP or the Aklavik Inuvialuit Community Conservation Plan/ in both cases there is no distinction between renewable and non-renewable resources	a) as well as amendments and exceptions variances should be considered/ variances would be informal administrative actions to deal with minor situations not anticipated in the plan	a) for implementation, GILUPB may wish to explore preliminary work done to prepare for the CALYX system	a) this section should be moved to an appendix or companion document
	b) for broad support all stakeholders need to be involved in the process/ formally add individual resource developers, tourism operators, pipeline companies, financial sector and airlines	b) Goal 3 excludes Gwich'in from participating in the territorial economy/ Goal 3 should be rewritten to say "optimum resource protection"	b) to increase the usefulness of the Land Use Plan contact and references could be included in the land use plan for proponents like in the Aklavik Inuvialuit Community Conservation Plan	b)"protection from development is an unfortunate theme of many land use plans...we should approach development positively, with a realistic understanding of the opportunities and constraints various activities may create or offer"	b)as a general rule, the more rigid or prescriptive the land use classification system becomes, the more pressure there will likely be to amend/or make exceptions to the plan	b) the assessment process identified for evaluating the land use plan should be developed as an integral part of the plan and not developed later	b) Forestry: work remains to be done from a forestry perspective
	c) Land Use Plan should focus on resources to be protected instead of land uses	c) Goal 4 should be to achieve the vision which should be identified at the outset by the residents	c) should consider non-regulatory ways of taking care of the land	c) the classification system seems adequate to protect cultural resources	c) we support the adoption of Option 2 as the preferable Exemption Approval Process	c) having an assessment process within the plan will ensure that critical information is collected on an on going basis	c) Sand and Gravel: the Town of Inuvik pit is located at 251.2 rather than at km 269/ airports' rock quarrying pit is not mentioned
	d) planning documents should be edited by one person and avoid jargon	d) Goal 5 should be rewritten	d) should look at the Whitehorse Mining Initiative	d) the distinction between non-renewable and renewable resource development is not needed	d) the criteria should include: "addresses or includes an activity not contemplated or considered in the Land use plan	d) the assessment process should be understandable, uncomplicated and easy to follow	d) Sand and Gravel: this section does not mention crushed gravel produced from pit-run (e.g. Frog Creek pit)
	e) Land Use Plan needs a terms of reference	e) Goal 8 should be reworded to say "working towards self-sufficiency"	e) look at the environmental policies of the Mining Association of Canada and Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers	e) for mineral, oil and gas development to occur, exploration needs to be permitted on as wide a geographical scale as possible		e) there should be preidentified benchmarks or standards reflected in the goals and principles established	e) Mineral, Oil and Gas: this type of staged development should only move forward if extraction is ultimately possible
	f) better maps are needed	f) might consider a goal supporting multiple use	f) the most important information on non-regulatory methods of protection are found with industry	f) the proposed land classification does not appear to recognize multiple use as the norm		f) goals and principles should be valid for a long time and apply to the whole GSA	f) Transportation: add "identify new sand and gravel sites"/ this is very important for highway maintenance and construction
	g) will the GLUPB accept the work of the GILUPB when the act is passed?	g) if the goals are intended as direct results then few statements qualify as goals	g) there are many ways to protect resources that are not taken into account in the Plan Options	g) the classification system should clearly identify what are the values being protected and what levels of protection are required		g) goals to be assessed should be simple, clear and reasonably achievable	g) Transportation: to refer to the Mackenzie Highway as proposed is too strong

	Land Use Planning General	Goals and Principles	Land Use Regulatory Process	Land Use Classification System	Amendments and Exceptions	Plan Review and Implementation	Land Use Sector Issues and Options
<b>DRWED, cont'd</b>	h) suggest having 9 stages for the land use planning process	h) the link between planning and IRM is not clear in principle #5/more detail in general is needed on IRM	h) GSA residents need assurance that responsibilities not under the co-management boards will be taken care of by government agencies	h) it is commendable that there are two zones for conservation/ however the terms "conservation" and "protection" need to be defined		h) there should be indicators to reflect the level of success in achieving the goals and principles	h) Transportation: this section has a number of inaccuracies (eight) that should be corrected
	i) should look at other northern land use plans	i) does the Board have any jurisdiction over air?	i) responsibilities that will remain with existing governments should be identified	i) the three land development zones do not specify what type of land use regulations will be imposed to ensure the environmentally sustainable use of resources		i) indicators should be described in both quantitative and qualitative terms	i) Cultural Heritage: the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Center will provide whatever information it may have
			j) add the Prospector's and Developer's Association of Canada as a regulatory agency	j) the distinction between commercial and public development is artificial and not useful e.g. transportation can be both private and public but the impacts are the same		j) see specific comments on annotated copy of the Plan Options	j) Cultural Heritage: to protect cultural resources it is not enough to have a map or inventory of cultural sites
			k) questions the need of GLUPB assessing conformity	k) the task of identifying all allowable and non-allowable land and water uses for each classification is a challenge e.g.. many activities are missing from the Plan Options list			k) Cultural Heritage: to protect cultural heritage it is important to have the capability of assessing areas for unknown/unrecorded cultural sites
				l) if the land classification system is going to reflect the regulatory system all authorizations should be reflected/the GILUPB may want to avoid this approach			l) Cultural Heritage: a protocol for the management of cultural and historical sites is being developed and should be referred to in the Land Use Plan
				n) the evaluation criteria for land use conflicts fall short of their goal			
<b>Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development</b>	a) should be clear that the permanent board not the interim board will submit the Draft Final Land Use Plan for approval	a) goals may need to be restated as something to be sought -- e.g. the Land Use Plan will seek to protect	a) what is meant by "integrating the Land Use Plan with the regulatory system?"	a) there is an unnecessary distinction between non-renewable resource development and renewable resource development	a) amendments and reviews are two completely separate processes		
			b) what is meant by "using a classification system that reflects the regulatory system"	b) should focus on the impacts of development not on the type of development/need a multiple use category	b) exceptions are permissive not mandatory		

	Land Use Planning General	Goals and Principles	Land Use Regulatory Process	Land Use Classification System	Amendments and Exceptions	Plan Review and Implementation	Land Use Sector Issues and Options
Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Continued			c) compliance with the plan: is the board the window? / a process for how conformity is decided upon is not clearly outlined  d) it is not sufficient to have a regulatory authority refer an application to the board only when it is unsure of conformity	c) seasonal protection can be enforced through the terms and conditions of regulatory mechanisms / areas of seasonal use may change from areas mapped  d) complete protection can only be afforded through land withdrawals	c) the exception process should be detailed or the mechanism could be used to subvert the intent of the Plan		
Natural Resources Canada				a) Mining: exploration could be excluded in sensitive areas and have the rest left open to exploration as very little is known about the mining potential of areas			a) Sand and Gravel: include information on permafrost and ground ice and there impacts on quarrying and rehabilitation  b) Sand and Gravel: address potential for depletion of resource  c) Mining: exploration could be excluded in sensitive areas and have the rest left open  d) two information gaps: mineral potential of areas and contacts in the mining industry
Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board	a) noted reference to the GILUPB having responsibility for implementation/ should be the permanent board	a) discussion on goals and principles confusing  b) concept of well being needs more work/ look at Maslow's work	a) you may find it difficult to link LUP with the regulatory process/LUP is about setting broad policy direction  b) besides proponents, preliminary screeners must realize conformity with the LUP does not mean the application is approved			a) other groups beyond the GLWB will be involved in the cumulative effects monitoring program  b) consider constraint planning (i.e.. thresholds of change)	
World Wildlife Fund				a) pleased to see that protected areas will be identified by bringing together traditional knowledge and scientific knowledge  b) would like to see a specific effort to protect biodiversity using ecological representation as a criteria			

	Land Use Planning General	Goals and Principles	Land Use Regulatory Process	Land Use Classification System	Amendments and Exceptions	Plan Review and Implementation	Land Use Sector Issues and Options
<b>Gwich'in Renewable Resource Board</b>	<p>a) the Plan Options is well written and many of the concerns from the previous draft have been addressed</p> <p>b) the Land Use Plan should be written based on the limited information available and be flexible enough to add relevant information as it becomes available</p> <p>c) when GRRB has meetings on management plans for fish, wildlife and forestry the GILUPB should participate to collect joint information for planning</p> <p>d) the roles of GLUPB versus the GILUPB should be clarified</p>	<p>a) the justification for guiding principles 1 and 3 is still not completely clear</p>		<p>a) there needs to be a distinction between consumptive and non-consumptive activities</p> <p>b) is an exhaustive list of land use activities going to be produced?</p> <p>c) how will the Land Use plan deal with small scale non-commercial and/or traditional activities that may be affecting other areas, for example, the Aklavik Trail?</p> <p>d) is isn't quite clear how land use activities can be discreetly divided up</p>		<p>a) the section on preparing a Comprehensive Review and Implementation is excellent</p>	<p>a) Forestry: GRRB's Forestry Management Plan will consider environmental concerns, identify information gaps and prioritize research</p> <p>b) Forestry: GILUPB may want to include information from the aerial photographs that the GRRB purchased/the information will be in digital form by March 1998</p> <p>c) Forestry: consideration should be given to forest fires that are increasing due to climate change/ the connection between climate change and diseases is not clear</p> <p>d) Water: monitor water quality and quantity using a system similar to the Peel River Ecological Maintenance Indicators involving communities and traditional knowledge/could be tied to the Ecological Monitoring and Assessment Network in the Yukon</p> <p>e) Wildlife: status report is on-going/research priorities are set in January</p> <p>f) Contaminants: research is being collected on metal levels in residents which could be used as a monitoring tool</p> <p>g) Water: global warming should be considered in the context of water</p> <p>h) Wildlife: monitoring programs could be a condition of development proposals</p>



Land Use Planning General	Goals and Principles	Land Use Regulatory Process	Land Use Classification System	Amendments and Exceptions	Plan Review and Implementation	Land Use Sector Issues and Options
GRRB cont'd.						<p>i) Wildlife: within the species management plans should there be GILUPB work sheet to indicate what action will be taken through the Land Use Plan</p> <p>j) Fish: an integrated plan is being worked on by the Gwich'in, Sahtu, Inuvialuit and DFO</p> <p>k) Tourism: the Land Use Plan may not be the appropriate place to resolve what types of development are appropriate/ take direction from management plans</p> <p>l) Tourism: recognize that there is one Class A outfitter in the Mackenzie Mountains/include outfitters in the land use planning process</p> <p>m) Gas: is there a gas proposal being considered in the Tree River Area</p>

### 13.0 APPENDIX C: RESPONSES TO PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR THE GWICH'IN SETTLEMENT AREA LAND USE PLAN

	Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
DRWED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>include names of planning board in plan</li> <li>define "land" at the beginning and remove quotation marks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support integrated planning process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>should ensure the natural ecoregions are adequately represented</li> <li>3. elaborate on conservation of ecosystems beyond GSA boundaries</li> <li>4. General Use Areas - identify conforming activities, how areas were identified, recognition of their values</li> <li>5. Special Management Areas – clarify allowances made for existing uses(are allowances outlined in claim or recommended by board?); is restoration required?</li> <li>6. Protected Areas – process for proposing legislated protected areas should be clearly stated; identify types of protected areas that can be legislated</li> <li>7. consider potential for low-impact tourism in protected areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide additional guidance on achieving balance between development and conservation</li> <li>provide informative analysis of issues, could be strengthened to move through goals, objectives, analysis and action</li> <li>Issue 2 – be more specific about development actions that balance conservation principles</li> <li>Issue 2, Rec. 1- suggest coordinated effort with other bodies implementing MVRMA</li> <li>Issue 2, Rec. 2 – explain how map would provide additional information and identify target audience</li> <li>Issue 2, Rec. 3 – provide more detail</li> <li>Issue 3 – no action on developing cultural landscape concept</li> <li>Issue 4 – how would plan ensure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implementation plan would be more effective as part of this plan</li> <li>clarify role of regulatory authority</li> <li>clarify whether conformity to the plan means that all groups are also required to implement the plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. category 1 – specify 'forest use'</li> <li>5. chart 2 – are only two ecological processes to be considered; if so, are they adequate?</li> <li>6. encourage the board to ensure all ecoregions are represented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>program to monitor status of indicators would be useful</li> <li>include recreational and aesthetic values as valued resources</li> <li>explain how terms and conditions will be implemented and monitored</li> <li>cumulative effects should be considered for all development, not just large scale; cumulative effects references should be consistent with MVRMA</li> </ul>

Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
		<p>8. provide more detail on rationale for and type of exceptions to be considered ; is public consultation required for exceptions? elaborate (pg45) on process of identifying land classifications</p>	<p>conservation of watershed and transboundary effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Issue 6 – additional direction needed on how to achieve first two objectives</li> <li>▪ Issue 8 – address whether new transportation corridors are required</li> <li>▪ Issue 9 – clarify potential for tourism in Protected Areas</li> <li>Issue 10 – be more specific in actions</li> </ul>			
<b>PWNHC</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Issue 3, Action 3; amend action to say that when archaeological investigations are required, must follow NWT archaeological sites regulations</li> </ul>			
<b>CWS</b>		<p>7. present more detailed discussion involving legislative protection options for specific protected areas in relation to conservation goals for the area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● good, succinct account of major land use issues in GSA</li> <li>● Issue 5; actions 1&amp;2 are conflicting</li> </ul>	<p>3. contradiction about conformity – how could an activity be in non-conformity, yet in keeping with the goals and objectives of the plan</p>		

	Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
PAS		1. consider an ecological representation procedure parallel to community interests to help ensure GSA protected areas will be capable of conserving ecosystems and ecological processes					
DOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figure 10; km 146, shale pit not shown; km 251.5 quarry on other side of road</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>plans to widen Dempster highway should be considered as it will require additional sand/gravel resources</li> <li>pit expansions should be considered on a case by case basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 6; add action item, "DIAND will plan for the clean-up of abandoned and old pits on Crown Lands. This will include the installation of safety gates"; also state that DOT will be allowed free access to Frog Creek Pit and km 146 pit</li> <li>Issue 8; supports actions 1, but DFO should also be included</li> </ul>			
DFO	9. elaborate on land and water use application process			<p>8. Issue 4-Action2; change 'shall' to 'should' because Board has no regulatory authority</p> <p>9. Issue 5-Action2; remove action 2; if amendments will be made for mgmt. plans, why would they ever not be in conformity with the plan?</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>needs to be a mechanism whereby potential cumulative effects can be monitored for a series of small activities</li> <li>as the terms and conditions listed in relationship to land use permits and water licenses, note that other</li> </ul>

Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
			<p>10. forest and veg. objectives; specifically not wildlife and fish habitat in issues</p> <p>11. Issue6; first tow objectives are incompatible – remove the first one</p>			<p>conditions may apply depending on the application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• activities in spawning areas, regardless of spawning seasons, may also be subject to restrictions</li> <li>• include that there should be no alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat</li> <li>• note the size of buffers around water bodies</li> <li>• suggested wording on winter road crossings; “DFO recommends that winter stream/lake crossings be located to minimize approach grades. The use of material other than ice or snow to construct a temporary crossing over any ice-covered stream is prohibited under Section 11 of the NWT Fisheries Regulations unless authorized by a Fishery Officer. It is also recommended</li> </ul>

	Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
<b>NWT Chamber of Mines</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>need to see full-fledged MERA to make better decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reference close links between infrastructure development and mining/oil industry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GPA; clarity of statements are good for potential investors</li> <li>decision making; need to conduct MERA and integrate results in plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 6; add 'business opportunities' to list of community benefits</li> <li>Issue 6; Actions add "a MERA will be requested in areas considered for protected area status"</li> <li>Issue 8; discuss positive aspects of transportation development</li> </ul>			that all winter crossings be removed prior to break up."
<b>GTC</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. reference and explain the numerical ranking system for areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Issue 6; as most pits are on private lands, it is the role of the GTC to develop management plans, not DIAND</li> <li>10. Issue 10; make better reference to the transboundary processes already in place</li> </ul>			

	Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
DIAND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• where in the GCLCA are trail cutting/cabin construction identified as traditional uses?</li> <li>• when claim is referenced applicable clause number should also be given</li> <li>• some known mineral resources need to be identified and it must be stated that few mineral potential studies have been undertaken</li> <li>• if Peel River Preserve is not a significant designation, should the status be rescinded</li> <li>• land leases and quarry permits should be included in the list of authorizations issued by DIAND on Crown land</li> <li>• Land ownership figure gives good overview</li> <li>• include as appendix contact list for permitting process</li> </ul>	<p>4. board must include government, non-beneficiaries, industry and the private sector in consultation process</p>	<p>3. because no allocations of lands has been made according to the proposed classification, makes adequate review difficult</p> <p>4. SMA: some of the conditions stipulated in SMA's are already in place under existing regulations; why do they differ from GUA's?</p> <p>5. specify relationship of GPA to existing protected areas</p> <p>contradiction about development activities being in conformity with the LUP before permits can be issued or conformity be determined</p> <p>6. clear process must be outlined for determining exceptions to the plan</p> <p>7. all groups must be consulted in the evaluation process</p> <p>8. what type of community sponsored projects will be considered exceptions</p> <p>9. change 'waste &amp;</p>	<p>1. many action items give direction to public agencies, but it is not clear if the board has this power</p> <p>2. Issue 1; look to how to involve communities more effectively in the future rather than just evaluating what has happened</p> <p>3. Issue 2; what does 'resource activities' mean?</p> <p>4. Issue 3; define difference between archaeological site and heritage sites; arch. sites are already protected</p> <p>5. be clear if legislative protected area status is the goal for the future</p> <p>6. Issue 3, Action 2; rather than alternatives for protecting sites, use mitigation measures; will the inventory list ever be 'complete?'; cost for heritage studies cannot be passed to proponent!; not practical to hold up issuance of authorizations until assessments are</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• implementation plan should be integral part of LUP</li> <li>• why would exceptions be necessary if the proposal was 'in keeping' with the plan</li> <li>• aren't emergencies exempted from screening and therefore from conformity checks?</li> <li>• explain 'one time basis'</li> <li>• emphasis for review and monitoring should be on review land classification categories and number of potential exceptions and amendments to these categories</li> <li>• focus on success of recommendations for action in review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cumulative effects should refer to cumulative impact monitoring process</li> <li>• caribou calving is noted, are there any calving grounds in the GSR?</li> <li>• flying height difficult to enforce, make it part of code of good ethics; similarly for bear monitors</li> <li>• some suggestions duplicate existing legislation, simply quote the regulations</li> </ul>	

Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>oil and gas discoveries should not be called 'reserves'</li> <li>oil and gas potential should not be limited to south and west of the Mackenzie it should be noted that there is a broad spectrum of oil and gas activities and development – impacts and scenarios can vary enormously</li> </ul>		<p>power' from list of excluded activities to 'waste disposal and power development'</p> <p>10. ref. source material for mineral potential</p> <p>11. reviewers need clear maps of the areas in question</p> <p>12. clear criteria for site selection is critical</p>	<p>complete</p> <p>7. Issue 4; these actions cannot be prescribed by the board</p> <p>8. Issue 6; tone is that development is a threat, perhaps include an action item to disseminate information on the new regulatory process; parcels are not awarded to companies, only exploration licenses</p> <p>9. Issue 6, Action 1; no commitment by DIAND to do management plan; recommendation should also extend to private lands</p> <p>10. Issue 6, Action 2; redundant – already integral to permits and licenses</p> <p>11. Issue 7, Action 1 &amp; 2; nature of commitments needs to be confirmed</p> <p>12. Issue 8, Action 1; not DIAND responsibility</p> <p>Issue 10; both Sahtu and Yukon have started LUP process</p>			



	Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
<b>MVEIRWG</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ note establishment of Sahtu ILUPB</li> <li>▪ description of MVEIRB is missing</li> <li>▪ make title for MVLWB consistent with GLWB</li> <li>▪ checking for conformity with the LUP is not always linked to the application of a license or permit; compliance with the plan is a broader obligation of gov't, GTC and RA's</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Protected Areas; explain relationship with existing land uses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ do priorities given to issues and actions vary with land use classification?</li> <li>▪ clarify interpretation of recommended actions for RA's, GTC and gov't</li> <li>▪ Issue 1; be more specific with timelines rather than saying 'historically'</li> <li>▪ proposed action items are beyond authority of Board to implement; change wording to 'shall encourage'</li> <li>▪ Issue 2; consider opinions of non-beneficiary GSA residents</li> <li>▪ Issue 4; will water volume be addressed</li> <li>▪ Issue 5; get comments from land owners as well</li> <li>Issue 7: address garbage on roads and unwanted waste sites</li> <li>▪ Issue 8; ferry landings will be the responsibility of GLWB; include communities and GLWB in code of conduct</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ draft implementation plan concurrently with land use plan</li> <li>▪ clarify 'one-time basis' as it relates to exceptions</li> </ul>		<p>3. place terms and conditions in body text, each classification should have its own terms and conditions</p>

	Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
<b>GRRB</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● validity of secondary area boundary?</li> <li>● updated harvest information is available</li> <li>● do not use 'Gwich'in people'; simply use Gwich'in</li> <li>● use both dialects when using Gwich'in names for wildlife</li> <li>● updated COESWIC list for short-eared owl</li> <li>●</li> </ul>						
<b>GLWB</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ accurately covers history of land use in the area</li> <li>▪ update approach to permitting/licensing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the board should provide poster-size maps of the area, based on the land classification system</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ addresses current land use issues</li> <li>▪ Issue 2 – Action 1; GLWB would like to be involved</li> <li>▪ Issue 3-Action 3; who is responsible for ensuring the applicant has the requisite information, and who decides more information is needed; GSCI are noted as the only judges; must all data collection be done before a permit issued and are there qualified people to do it</li> <li>▪ Issue 4- Action 1; not the duty of the</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ will the terms and conditions outlined here be included in permits/licenses issued by the GLWB</li> </ul>

Background Information	Vision and Approach	Land Classification System	Issues and Recommended Actions	Implementation	Appendix B	Appendix C
			<p>GLWB to produce a status report on water quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Issue 6-Action1; may not be a DIAND responsibility, give terms of reference and timeline</li> <li>▪ Issue 7-Action 2; GLWB has no mandate to develop a strategy for clean-up; should be DIAND or EC</li> </ul> <p>Issue 7- Action 3; GLWB will be developing new permits for landfills and waste storage, but not necessarily a 'code of good conduct'; remove words 'will create'</p>			

## 14.0 APPENDIX D: IDENTIFYING AREAS WITH HIGH DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL TO MINIMIZE CONFLICTS WITH PROPOSED PROTECTED AREAS

	Oil and Gas Pipeline Potential	Oil and Gas Potential (production)	Tourism	Sand and Gravel/Rock Crush	Mineral	Highways and Barge Routes	Total	Rank
1. James Creek	3	0	3	3	1	3	13	3
2. Frog Creek	3	3	2	3	0	3	13	2
3. Neyado Lake	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
4. Rat River	0	3	3	2	1	1	10	
5. Canoe Lake	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	
6. Travaillant Lake	3	3	2	2	0	3	13	3
7. Swan Lake	0	3	2	2	0	0	7	
8. Cardinal Lakes		2	1	2	0	1	7	
9. Bernard Creek	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
10. Jackfish Creek	0	2	3	0	0	0	5	
11. Jackfish Creek Head Waters	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
12. Campbell Hills	3	1	3	3	0	1	11	4
13. Black Mountain	0	1	3	3	1	1	9	
14. SW Mackenzie Delta	0	2	2	0	0	1	5	
15. Beaver Lake	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
16. Headwaters Arctic Red River	0	0	2	0	3	0	5	
17. Arctic Red River Canyon	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
18. Source Peaks	0	0	2	0	2	0	4	
19. Weldon Creek	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
20. 8 mile	3	3	3	3	0	3	15	1
21. Husky Lake	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
22. Vittrekwa River	0	2	2	3	1	3	11	4
23. Stoney Creek	0	2	1	3	1	1	8	
24. Three Cabin	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
25. Martin House	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
26. Thunder River	3	2	2	0	0	3	10	4
27. Tree River	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	
28. Tsiigehtchic Trapping	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	

<b>29. Mouth of the Arctic Red River</b>	0	2	3	3	0	3	11	4
<b>30. Delta Forestry Area</b>	0	2	2	0	0	1	5	
<b>31. Husky, Aklavik and Peel Channel</b>	0	3	3	0	0	1	7	
<b>32. Peel River Trapping Area</b>	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
<b>33. Vinih K'yu Area</b>	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
<b>34. Dachan Joo Area</b>	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
<b>35. Mackenzie Delta - Inuvik</b>	0	2	3	0	0	0	5	
<b>36. Kalinik Channel</b>	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
<b>37. Rengleng River</b>	3	3	3	3	0	3	15	1
<b>38. Mackenzie Islands</b>	0	2	2	0	0	1	5	
<b>39. Middle Mackenzie Islands</b>	0	2	2	0	0	1	5	
<b>40. River Corridors</b>	3	2	3	0	1	2	11	4

## 15.0 APPENDIX E: EVALUATING CRITERIA FOR PROPOSED PROTECTED AREAS

	Arch. Sites	Traditional Trail Network	Harvest Study Analysis	Cabins in Use	Fish	Caribou	Sheep	Moose	Furbearers	Waterfowl	Endangered Species	Forest / Vegetation	Unique Features	Total	Rank
1. James Creek	0	1	3	0	1?	3	0?	1	1	1	1	0	2	14	
2. Frog Creek	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	16	
3. Neyado Lake	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	16	
4. Rat River	2?	3	1	1	3	2	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	29	1
5. Canoe Lake	1	2	2	2	1	2	0	1	2	1	1	3	3	21	9
6. Travillant Lake	2	3	3*	1*	3*	2	0	2	2	3	1	1	1?	24	4
7. Swan Lake	0	1	3	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	1	1	2	17	
8. Cardinal Lakes	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	17	
9. Bernard Creek	3	2	3	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	1	2?	1	22	5
10. Jackfish Creek	1	1	3	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	3	17	
11. Jackfish Creek Headwaters	0	1	1	1	1?	0	0	1?	2	2	1	2	1	14	
12. Campbell Hills	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	1	3	17	
13. Black Mountain	2	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	2	19	8
14. South West Mackenzie Delta	2	2	3	3*	2	1	0	2	2	3	1	3	1	25	3
15. Beaver Lake	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1?	1	11	
16. Arctic Red River Headwaters	1?	0	1	1	?	2?	3?	1	1	1	3	1?	3?	17	
17. Arctic Red River Canyon	0	0	1*	0	1?	1?	0?	1?	1	1	3?	1?	3	11	
18. Source Peaks	0?	0	1	0	1?	2?	3?	1	1	1	1?	1?	3	14	
19. Weldon Creek	0?	1	1	0	3	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	13	
20. 8 mile	2	2	3	3*	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3	21	6

	Arch. Sites	Traditional Trail Network	Harvest Study Analysis	Cabins in Use	Fish	Caribou	Sheep	Moose	Furbearers	Waterfowl	Endangered Species	Forest / Vegetation	Unique Features	Total	Rank
21. Husky Lake	0	3	2	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	2	18	
22. Vittrekwa River	0	3	1	1	3?	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	15	
23. Stoney Creek	1	3	1	2	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	17	
24. Three Cabin	1	3	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	18	
25. Martin House	3	3	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	1	2	3	21	6
26. Thunder River	2?	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	16	
27. Tree River	1	3	1	3*	2	1	0	2	2	1	1	2	2	21	6
28. Tsiigehtchic Trapping	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	12	
29. Mouth of the Arctic Red River	2	3	3	3*	3	1	0	1	2	1	3	1	2	25	3
30. Delta Forestry Area	0	3	1	3	1	1	0	2	2	3	1	3	1	21	6
31. Husky, Aklavik and Peel Channel	3	3	3	3*	3	1	0	2	1	2	1	3	2	27	2
32. Peel River Trapping Area	0?	3	1	2	2	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	1	19	8
33. Vinih K'yu Area	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	14	
34. Dachan Joo Area	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	14	
35. Mackenzie Delta - Inuvik	0	3	2	3*	2	1	0	1	2	2	1	3	2	22	5
36. Kalinik Channel	0	3	3	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	19	6
37. Rengleng River	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	
38. Mackenzie Islands	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	2	2	3	1	2	1	18	
39. Middle Mackenzie Islands	0	3	1	1	2	1	0	2	2	3	1	3	1	20	7
40. River Corridors	1	3	1	1	3	1	0	1	2	2	2	3	2	22	5