

**\*Disclaimer**

These summary notes were recorded by SLUP staff and have not been proofed or vetted by meeting participants. They are subject to errors of interpretation or omission. This document presents a summary of key discussion points. It is not intended to serve as transcripts of the meetings.

Requested changes documented in these notes do not mean that the Board will make these changes. Some requests are beyond the Board's mandate or jurisdiction to address. The Board must consider all comments and requests and balance the interests of multiple parties. The Board will revise the Plan as it deems appropriate to achieve the right balance.

# **Yellowknife Draft 3 General Community Consultation Summary Notes**

**Tuesday, September 7, 2010, 9am - 12 noon**

**Explorer Hotel**

---

## **Participants:**

Bob Overvold, SLUPB

Stephen Kakfwi, SLUPB

Heidi Wiebe, SLUPB

Ida Mak, SLUPB

Linda Holowaychuk, NWT Housing Corporation

Margaret Kralt, Dillon Consulting (Tlicho Land Use Plan)

Glenn Sorensen, Minerals Oil & Gas, GNWT

Roshan Begg, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Internal Relations, GNWT

Claudia Haas, ENR, GNWT

Jessica Budgell, ITI, GNWT

Joel Holder, ENT, GNWT

Trevor Sinclair, DFO

Melissa Bard, Mining Recorder's Office, INAC

Arthur Boutillier, Environment & Conservation, Renewable Resources and Environment, INAC

Ataur Rahman, NT Regional Office, INAC

Greg Yeoman, Environment & Conservation, Renewable Resources and Environment, INAC

Shannon Ward, MVLWB

Start time: 9:15 am

Bob Overvold: Opening Address

Heidi went through the introduction slides and into zoning.

Break: 10:05 am

Return from break: 10:25 am

Heidi started going through Conformity Requirements.

Greg: Is CR#2 intended to be completed before an application is submitted?

Heidi: Yes. The SLWB already looks for evidence of consultation when an application is submitted. We are providing more specific direction to applicants to consult with communities, and supporting the land and water board with what they are already doing.

Shannon: Under the MVLWB , all land and water boards are working together to draft consistent policies and guidelines for consultation. This will provide consistent guidelines across the Mackenzie Valley for consultation. Our draft guidelines will go out this fall so please keep an eye out for them.

Greg: If the SLWB is already requesting consultation, why does the Plan need to repeat that direction?

Heidi: Although the SLWB has been requesting that proponents consult with communities before submitting an application, they are doing so without the broader direction on the issue which should come from the Plan. The Plan should have been in place years ago and should have provided that direction and authority to the land and water boards. We are supporting existing processes and providing a foundation for them as opposed to duplicating practices.

Margaret: Re: CR#3 – Is it up to the community to decide to what extent it should benefit from development?

Heidi: No, all decisions regarding conformity are up to the one doing the conformity determination – either the preliminary screener, or the SLUPB. This will encourage the regulator to look at the applications and evaluate whether or not the communities will benefit, not only financially, but in general from the project.

Shannon: One of the guideline details that the MVLWB working group will consider is the project's lifespan and the extent of community involvement. The public engagement plan will also address this.

Greg: Does this mean that it is up to the regulator to decide whether or not the community has benefitted appropriately from a project? What happens if there is disagreement about community benefits?

Heidi: The MVRMA is clear in stating that where there are disputes, the SLUPB has final say in carrying out conformity determinations. The SLUPB or regulators may check for conformity but where there is doubt or disputes, the SLUPB will make the final decision.

Heidi went through the terms and some of the major themes in the Plan: Collaboration, Filling the Gaps, Building Community Capacity and Involvement.

Greg: CRs and As are binding but Rs are not? How are Actions binding? What is the implementation mechanism that allows the Board to make them binding?

Heidi: Under the MVRMA, S.46 (1) says that a first nation, the federal and territorial government will carry out their powers in accordance with an approved land use plan. S. 41(3) says the Plan may include...written statements, policies, guidelines and forecasts” so the Plan is able to provide direction on issues other than just permit requirements.

Heidi talked about implementation, supporting documents, public hearing and the implementation workshop.

Meeting ended: 11:17 am