

EA 1112-001 Debogorski Diamond Exploration Project

May 30, 2011

Dear Parties:

Re: Opportunity to Comment on Request for Ruling

On May 27, 2011 the Review Board received a Request for Ruling from the Yellowknives Dene First Nation regarding the environmental assessment of Alex Debogorski's Diamond Exploration Project. The request asks the Review Board to make a summary decision to reject the proposal without an environmental review. The Request for Ruling is attached.

The Review Board will consider this Request in accordance with the *Rules of Procedure for Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Review Proceedings May 2005.*

Any parties wishing to provide their views on this request should do so by 5:00pm on Monday June 6th, 2011. The Yellowknives Dene First Nation will then have until noon on Friday June 10th to make a final submission. The Review Board will consider all comments before making its ruling.

Sincerely,

Vern Christensen Executive Director

Attachment



Yellowknives Dene First Nation

P.O. Box 2514, Yellowknife, NT X1A 2P8

May 27th, 2011

Vern Christensen Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board Box 938 Yellowknife, Northwest Territories X1A 2N7 Fax: (867) 766-7074

Dear Mr. Christensen:

Re: Debegorski EA (EA1112-001) - Request for Ruling

The Yellowknives Dene First Nation (YKDFN) would like to officially Request a Ruling from the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board (MVEIRB). Following Form 2 of the MVEIRB Rules of Procedure:

1. <u>Ruling Requested:</u> YKDFN ask the Board, pursuant to paragraph 128(1)(d) of the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* to make a summary decision to reject the proposal without an environmental review.

2. Relevant Facts and Information:

- a. The previous Review Board decisions should inform this process, especially in regards to the level of significance of the area and the potential for significant, irreparable impacts. YKDFN feel that the Review Board has previously recognized the value of the area and the special connection the YKDFN have with this essential part of their traditional territory. An example (of many) of the Review Board's acknowledgement of the connection and importance:
 - i. "Drybones Bay is a vitally important cultural and heritage site for YKDFN...It was the site of ongoing year round use by Aboriginal community, holds many burial sites and archaeological sites, and is used extensively today for hunting, trapping and providing youth with cultural exposure to traditional activities and the land." (EA03-002)
- b. The Review Board has held six (6) previous EAs for this area (EA03-002, EA03-003, EA03-004, EA03-006, EA0506-005, EA0506-006), producing a significant number of mitigation measures aimed at ensuring the level of impacts would not be significant. For instance, in EA0506-005 decision the MVEIRB stated "Collectively, these measures will avoid or reduce the otherwise significant impacts that would have occurred."

There has been little follow up to evaluate these measures, suggestions and recommendations to determine not just if they have been implemented, but also to assess if they have been effective. While this is a question that can be argued (as the YKDFN believe that the measures and mitigations have not protected the area from significant impacts caused by development), what cannot be argued is that many of the mitigations

advanced by the Review Board remain outstanding. Even the Measures <u>required</u> by the Board, the binding mitigations that must be emplaced prior to development to prevent significant impacts, have not fully implemented or enforced. YKDFN ask the Board to review the previous mitigation measures and acknowledge that in the absence of their implementation, the proposed development will continue to result in significant environmental and cultural impacts.

Of the non-binding Suggestions, every one remains outstanding, including the critical suggestion from the Board that "No new land use permits should be issued for new developments with the Shoreline Zone and within Drybones Bay and Wool Bay proper, until a plan has been developed to identify the vision, objectives and management goals based on the resource and cultural values for the area" has not been acted upon. YKDFN acknowledge that suggestions are not binding, but we argue that the Review Board is not issuing them without good cause – the implementation of these suggestions would have avoided their restating as measures in the subsequent EAs (CGV and Sidon) and have prevented the same issues from being raised time and time again. This unambiguous failure of implementation tells the parties that the Crown's stance towards the EA decisions will be responded to in only the narrowest of terms, avoiding any proactive activity and effectively limiting any potential accommodations to the YKDFN's concerns.

As mentioned in previous Environmental Assessments, the absence or failure to implement these mitigations suggests that "Unless the measures recommended in this Report of Environmental Assessment are implemented, the Review Board does not believe the significant adverse environmental impact can be mitigated and the associated public concern can be addressed". This begs the question - Unless the outcome of the process is meaningful, what reassurance can the community draw from it?

Section 117(2)(a) of the MVRMA discusses the impact of malfunctions and accidents and cumulative effects, while EA03-004 stated: "Any activity conducted in the vicinity of burial grounds could have significant adverse impact on the social and cultural environment. The effect of the development is not physical but represents a diminished value of sacred sites because the burial sites are viewed as sacred." Activities permitted through the Snowfield EA started a large file which impacted one of the known cemeteries plus an unknown amount of other culturally significant sites. By the Board's words, this obviously had a significant adverse impact, not just on the cultural landscape, but also the environment as a whole. The truck at the bottom of the Bay has also served to create a looming concern for the environment. These are just the easily quantified impacts from development — a thousand acres, a thousand litres — the larger impacts, as heard by the Board in the original hearings have resulted in a real change, a significant change, to the way that the people see and use the land.

Section 114(c) of the MVRMA requires the concerns of Aboriginal people to be addressed in the process. If the Board and the Crown fail to implement prior Recommendations, Measures and Suggestions, then the mitigations that the Board determined were necessary to avoid significant adverse environmental impacts are absent. In their absence, the concerns of the Yellowknives Dene have not been taken into account and the Drybones Bay area has experienced adverse environmental impacts of such significance that further projects cannot be justified.

Thus, the YKDFN are once again forced to trust to a Board that seemingly cannot

provide for effective mitigation to community concerns — either in earlier EAs or in the recommendations and reconsideration of the Measures in the CGV and Sidon files. This, plus the complete failure of the Crown to effectively Consult and Accommodate the concerns raised by the YKDFN means that the process cannot be relied upon to fulfil the guiding principles of the MVRMA and the application must be rejected at this time.

3. Authority or grounds for the Ruling:

- Environmental Assessment Reports EA03-002, EA03-003, EA03-004, EA03-006, EA0506-005, EA0506-006
- Section 114, 115 of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act
- Section 117(2)(a) of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act
- Section 128(1)(d) of the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act

The Yellowknives Dene have consistently made their position clear when it comes to developments in Drybones Bay. This project, like the others before it, will have real and significant impacts to the First Nation. This is not news to either the Review Board or the Crown. Previous Environmental Assessments have seen the Review Board accept the critical nature of Drybones Bay to the YKDFN. Since that point in time, development has continued unabated because the Crown has failed to implement appropriate mitigations as required and suggested by the Board. After reviewing previous decisions and the transcripts it is clear that the impacts, be it direct, accidental or cumulative in nature, have exceeded the acceptable threshold for lands fundamental to the wellbeing and identity of the Yellowknives Dene. Section 115(a) of the MVRMA lays out the guiding principle that the Board must protect the environment from significant impacts from the proposed developments. Within the present regulatory environment, it is not possible for the Board to create the mechanisms to institute appropriate mitigations or accommodations for future operations, and this project must be rejected.

Sincerely,

Chief Ted Tsetta

Yellowknives Dene First Nation (Ndilo)

Copy:

Chief Edward Sangris, YKDFN Chief, Dettah, NT (867) 873-5969

Alex Debogorski, Yellowknife, NT (867) 873-8727

Matt Spence, Northern Project Management Office - CANNOR, Yellowknife NT, Fax: (867) 766-8469

Don Aubrey, Crown Consultation Support Unit - INAC, Yellowknife, NT (867) 669-2540



Yellowknives Dene First Nation Lands Management / Land & Environment Office

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET				
Vern C COMPANY: MVFIR	hristense S	DATE:	KDFN LEE	
FAX NUMBER:	7074		NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING CON	VER:
Deboc	jorski Ek	7 (EA1112 -	0a) Request	for Buling
☐ URGENT	☐ FOR REVIEW	☐ PLEASE COMMENT	PLEASE REPLY	☐ PLEASE RECYCLE
NOTES/COMMENT	S:	THE STATE OF THE S		20

Copy:

Chief Edward Sangris D 873-4307 Alex Debogorski D 873-8727 Matt Spence D 766-8469 Don Aubrey D 669-2540



Yellowknives Dene First Nation P.O. Box 2514 Yellowknife, NT X1A 2P8 Telephone: (867) 766-3496 Facsimile: (867) 766-3497