

Review Comment Table

Board:	MVEIRB
Review Item:	IRs on the Chedabucto Project land use permit application package and supporting documents, used instead of a DAR
File(s):	
Proponent:	Husky Oil Operations Ltd.
Document(s):	Archaeological Impact Assessment Report (0.4 MB) Land Use Permit Application (9 MB) Closure and Reclamation Plan (0.2 MB) Emergency Procedures and General Field Camp Safety document (0.2 MB) Engagement Plan (8 MB) Spill Contingency Plan (1 MB) Waste Management Plan (0.1 MB) Wildlife Management Plan (0.8 MB) Preliminary Screening Review Summary and attachments (5 MB) Husky Response to Review Board IR (2 MB)
Item For Review Distributed On:	Mar 17 at 10:10 Distribution List
Reviewer Comments Due By:	Apr 10, 2015
Proponent Responses Due By:	Apr 24, 2015
Item Description:	<p>In December 2014 Husky Oil Operations Limited (Husky) submitted a land use permit application to the WLWB for exploration activities on its mineral claims in the Whitebeach Point area. The purpose of the project is to delineate and evaluate silica deposits in the area. The project will occur over two to three years and includes drilling approximately 200 drill holes, ground based geophysics and bulk sampling. In February 2015 the project was referred to the Review Board.</p> <p>The Review Board is proposing to tailor its EA process to reflect the scale of the Chedabucto project. For this EA the Review Board will use Husky's land use permit application and any additional information generated through Information Requests that you may have as a substitute for the Developers Assessment Report. The process is outlined in the Proposed Scoping Document which also contains a proposed scope of development and assessment.</p> <p>The purpose of an information request is to give parties and the Review Board the information needed to help reach conclusions about potentially significant impacts of the development on</p>

	<p>the environment and people.</p> <p>Additional information is located on the Review Board's Public Registry at, http://reviewboard.ca/registry</p>
General Reviewer Information:	<p>The deadline for information requests is April 10, 2015.</p> <p>The deadline for Husky to respond is April 24, 2015.</p> <p>Guidance on the submission of information requests can be found in Appendix F of the <i>Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines 2004</i> at the following link: http://www.reviewboard.ca/upload/ref_library/MVE%20EIA%20Guidelines_1195078754.pdf</p> <p>The Review Board is using the ORS and Excel spreadsheet format for information requests from parties and responses from Husky. The "topic" column contains the reference to the Document that you are reviewing , the "comment" column contains the preamble and rationale for your IR and the "recommendation" column contains your information request.</p> <p>Reviewers are encouraged to submit Information Requests prior to the deadline of April 10, 2015.</p>
Contact Information:	<p>Sachi De Souza Simon Toogood 867 766-7053</p>

Comment Summary

Husky Oil Operations Ltd. (Proponent)				
ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Bo Sta Re
1	General File	<p>Comment (doc) (Submitted after Due Date) NT086 IBA North Arm, Great Slave Lake with Husky mineral claim area (to provide context for Husky's response to Environment Canada's Information Request).</p> <p>Recommendation</p>		
Environment Canada: Loretta Ransom				
ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Bo Sta Re
1	General File	<p>Comment (doc) EC Information Requests Cover Letter</p> <p>Recommendation</p>		

		<p>impacts, please also describe proposed mitigation measures to reduce the impacts.</p>	<p>does cross the Dinā gĀ Wek'Ā'ḥodĀ candidate area; a tracked snowcat on snow covered trails will be used, so no winter road or ice bridge construction will be required. The staging area for the proposed drilling and mini bulk sampling programs will be the existing DoT Quarry, so no new disturbance will be required. The DoT Quarry is located several kilometres from the nearest water body and the floor of the Quarry is bedrock so there is minimal risk of pollution from a spill. None of the proposed exploration field operations will create significant amounts of silica dust. Water use for the diamond drilling rig is 40 cubic metres per hole which is below the threshold requiring a water license. Ground water and lake samples taken during the drilling program would be 2 litres in size. The risk of the exploration program affecting water levels in the program area is nil. Additional details of the proposed mitigation measures is contained in the Land Use Permit application and the responses to Information</p>
--	--	--	---

			Requests submitted to the Registry.
3	<p>Closure and Reclamation Plan</p>	<p>Comment The location of several leases overlap the original area of interest put forward through the Protected Area Strategy for the candidate Dinǎ gǎ Wek'ǎ`hodǎ National Wildlife Area. These lands would likely be incorporated into the candidate National Wildlife Area, should this project not go ahead or the leases expire. As the current sponsor for the candidate Dinǎ gǎ Wek'ǎ`hodǎ National Wildlife Area, Environment Canada has a strong interest in ensuring that reclamation in these areas of interest is done using best practices.</p> <p>Recommendation To the Proponent: The closure and reclamation plan refers to using industry best practices. Please provide specific details on exactly which reclamation best practices that Husky commits to do and references to the industry best practices.</p>	<p>Apr 30: To minimize environmental impact of the exploration program, a staging area with temporary facilities consisting of a first aid tent, core logging tent, fuel storage and equipment/consumable storage, will be set up within the existing DoT Quarry. Equipment and materials will be removed from the program area at the end of the field season. For the drilling phase, drill pads will be on snow-covered frozen ground. If tree covered, the drill site will be cleared and wood will be bucked-up to 1 metre lengths and stacked in a orderly fashion at the margin of the site. For the mini bulk sampling phase, after the sample is taken, the resulting test pits will be recontoured and any vegetative cover will be replaced to blend in with the surrounding topography. Garbage will be removed from all sites. Whole rock core recovered from the diamond drilling program will be logged and sampled then placed in core boxes, labelled and stacked in a repository adjacent to the DoT Quarry. Drip</p>

			pans will be placed under idle equipment. Spills will be cleaned up immediately and any contaminated materials removed from site and disposed of in Yellowknife.
4	Impacts Outside Leases	<p>Comment The Proponent provided a revised 1:50,000 map in their Land Use Permit application package. The map shows the location of possible water sources for project activities, including one drawing from a watercourse outside the Proponent's lease area within the interim land withdrawal for the candidate Din g Wek' hod National Wildlife Area.</p> <p>Recommendation To the Proponent: Please confirm the intended use of the water source within the interim land withdrawal area.</p>	<p>Apr 30: Acknowledged, one of the possible water sources identified on Husky's program map is in the Interim Land Withdrawal area. The Northwest Territories Protected Areas Strategy Guidelines for Interim Protection of Candidate Protected Areas, states that "A land withdrawal is applicable to federal Crown land only and does not preclude any activity from occurring which does not require a land use permit or water license". Withdrawal of water from the proposed water source is below the threshold requiring a water license. To date Husky has not been made aware of any issues with obtaining water for the diamond drilling program from any of the possible water sources.</p>
5	Species at Risk	<p>Comment The Proponent commits to avoid Species at Risk as the primary mitigation measure in their response to EC's screening comments related to the Land Use Permit application. The Proponent also states that their field staff and subcontractors onsite are not trained or qualified to identify or record</p>	<p>Apr 30: The Review Board has determined that the following species at risk (SARA/COSEWIC) may potentially be impacted by this project: Boreal</p>

		<p>observations of birds.</p> <p>Recommendation To the Proponent: Please explain what plans will be in place to properly mitigate impacts to Species at Risk, in particular birds, in the absence of trained or qualified staff should work be conducted during the migratory bird season.</p>	<p>Caribou, Little Brown Myotis, Wolverine, Wood Bison, Bank Swallow, Barn Swallow, Common Nighthawk, Horned Grebe, Olive-sided Flycatcher, Rusty Blackbird, Short-eared Owl, and Yellow Rail. Of the species listed only Boreal Caribou, Wolverine, Wood Bison, and Short-eared Owl may be found in the project area during the March-April field season. Like most animals, these species have certain life stages when they are more vulnerable to human activity. Of these sensitive life stages for the aforementioned species, only grizzly bear and wolverine denning will correspond to the winter drilling timing. The majority of the project will be completed in the winter, outside of the breeding season for most bird and bat species and most species of concern potentially occurring in the area. Actions affecting wildlife primarily include temporary disturbance from visual and audio stimuli during helicopter overflights and drilling, and short term increase in road mortality due to collisions with tracked</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>vehicles (snowcat). Noise will be limited to individual drill locations and helicopter flights which will be transient, local, and temporary. It is not anticipated that there will be any long term impacts to wildlife due to the short duration of the field program. Primary mitigations for wildlife and wildlife species at risk include utilizing existing linear corridors and conducting exploration activity outside of the breeding period for most species utilizing the area during their breeding periods. Also, the project is not expected to directly impact wetlands, water bodies or water courses and therefore is not expected to impact water birds or overwintering sites for amphibians.</p>
6	<p>Closure and Reclamation and Spill Contingency Plans</p>	<p>Comment Section 5.1 of the Migratory Birds Convention Act prohibits persons from depositing substances harmful to migratory birds in waters or areas frequented by migratory birds or in a place from which the substance may enter such waters or such an area. At each drill hole, the Proponent proposes to direct up to 20 gallons of drilling waste containing unspecified amounts of "Poly Drill" fluid to a natural depression, avoiding swamps, during their winter exploration. Although the proposed activity will occur in winter, it is unclear whether the drilling waste will still be present in the environment in spring and whether there is a risk of birds or other wildlife (including Species at Risk) coming in contact with this potentially harmful</p>	<p>Apr 30: Potential harmful effects of "Poly Drill" on bird and other wildlife and wildlife habitat: As historically the MVLWB and GNWT inspectors have accepted "Poly Drill is a suitable drill polymer, the proponent expects that the GNWT has conducted a suitable level of diligence in reaching this conclusion in the context of Section 5.1 of the MBCA. The proponent has included</p>

		<p>substance.</p> <p>Recommendation To the Proponent: Please state all potential harmful effects that the drilling waste might have on birds and other wildlife, and on wildlife habitat. Are there alternative disposal methods that could be used for the drilling fluid rather than disposing of it in natural depressions? If so, why were these alternate methods not considered? What mitigation measures would be used to avoid potential impacts that the drilling waste might have on birds, other wildlife, and wildlife habitat?</p>	<p>the MSDS sheet for "Poly Drill" in the original application. To the proponents knowledge, there have been no studies on the short term or long term effects of this liquid polymer on birds and other wildlife, therefore the proponent cannot accurately comment. As stated on the MSDS, the health hazard (Section 5) is determined to be "Practically non-harmful". This rating is determined for 100% concentration of the polymer. The polymer concentration utilized on site would be very diluted approximately 1.5% (of total drill fluid), the 'cuttings' are mostly ground rock - the proponent has not calculated (currently or historically) the concentration of the polymer in the cuttings. Disposing drill cuttings into a suitable depression when drilling on land is the recommended method of disposal. When drilling on ice, the cuttings are collected, transported, and deposited in suitable depression on land.</p>
--	--	--	---

Fisheries and Oceans Canada: Mark D Aguiar

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Bo Sta Re
----	-------	---------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------

1	DFO participation	Comment please see the cover letter attached in the <i>Proposed Scoping Document</i> review comments Recommendation see above		
---	-------------------	--	--	--

GNWT - Lands: Charlotte Henry

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Bo Sta Re
1	General File	Comment (doc) GNWT cover letter for Information Requests. Recommendation		
2	Wildlife & Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan (WWHPP). Land Use Permit Application Review Comment Table, page 25.	Comment (doc) GNWT recommended in Preliminary Screening comments that the developer shall submit a WWHPP. The developer's response was that a WWHPP is not warranted for this time (Phase 1 and Phase 2). The GNWT believes that a WWHPP appropriate to the scale of the project, including wildlife sighting logs, should be submitted annually to regulatory agencies for review to ensure that negative effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat are minimized. GNWT believes that the wildlife aspects of the submitted Wildlife, Archeological, and Environmental Awareness Plans could be strengthened. GNWT has attached a copy of the DRAFT GNWT Wildlife & Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan and Wildlife Effects Monitoring Program Guidelines to assist Husky in preparing a WWHPP. Recommendation The GNWT requests revised Wildlife, Archeological, and Environmental Awareness Plans that incorporate information from the attached DRAFT GNWT Wildlife & Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan and Wildlife Effects Monitoring Program Guidelines.	Apr 30: (doc) In Husky's response to Environment Canada and GNWT comments during the Preliminary Screening process, Husky indicated that we will endeavour to record general wildlife sightings using the "Wildlife Observation" form provided by GNWT-ENR. Husky will submit completed forms to ENR at the end of each field operating season In addition, Husky commits to reviewing the Wildlife, Archeological, and Environmental Awareness Plan and, where appropriate, incorporate information from the DRAFT GNWT Wildlife & Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan and Wildlife Effects Monitoring Program Guidelines, while keeping it scaled to the actual scope of the project which is	

			temporary and short duration.	
North Slave Metis Alliance: Shin Shiga				
ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Bo Sta Re
1	General File	Comment (doc) Cover letter Recommendation		
2	P-7, 2.3.1. Cumulative Effects "Proposed Scoping Document"	Comment Appendix H of the Review Board's Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines specifies that the Developer will ". [specify] if and how adaptive management will be used..." Recommendation In reponse to MVEIRB's IR#3, the Developer did not provide answer to this clause. Please provide Developer's adaptive management approach. It the Proponent is not going to incorporate such approach, please explain why. In your response please, at minimum, take into account a situation situation where the work team encountered Boreal Woodland Caribou (species at risk).	Apr 30: Husky's Operational Integrity Management System (HOIMS) was implemented in 2008 to enhance the Company's approach to managing health, safety and environmental performance. HOIMS integrates both occupational and process safety in one comprehensive management system. HOIMS Element 14 is about Performance Assessment and Continuous Improvement. Husky has extensive experience managing and conducting field operations and has been operating in the NWT for more than a decade. It is Husky's practice to review the performance of the completed field season and communicate on what was done back to the affected land owners and stakeholders. Husky plans to conduct summer inspections of program area to determine the impact of	

			<p>the winter field operations and effectiveness of the mitigation plans. Incorporation of learnings and further engagement will be part of the planning process for Year-two and subsequent field programs. The Phase I drilling program is helicopter supported; in the event that Caribou or other wildlife are seen at a proposed drilling location, we can skip over to the next drill site then come back when the area is clear.</p>
3	<p>Appendix II "Closure and Reclamation Plan"</p>	<p>Comment The Proponent referst to "exploration insutry best practices" Recommendation Please specify what the "industry best practices" is.</p>	<p>Apr 30: Wikipedia provides the following definition: "A best practice is a method or technique that has consistently shown results superior to those achieved with other means, and that is used as a benchmark. In addition, a "best" practice can evolve to become better as improvements are discovered. Best practice is considered by some as a business buzzword, used to describe the process of developing and following a standard way of doing things that multiple organizations can use." As an example, Industry best practice(s) as written in Appendix II: [Closure and</p>

			<p>Reclamation Plan] are that all garbage and project materials are removed and the site is cleaned to as closely as possible resemble its initial state. Whole rock core recovered from the diamond drilling program will be logged and sampled then placed in core boxes, labelled and stacked in a repository adjacent to the DoT Quarry. Timber that may have been cleared is neatly stacked at the side of the site. The appropriate equipment (i.e. suited to the specific task) will be utilized, in order to minimize additional compromise of the site during reclamation. Drip pans will be placed under equipment that is idle.</p>
--	--	--	--

NWT Chapter Council of Canadians: Peter Redvers

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Bo Sta Re
1	IR#1 - NWT chapter of the Council of Canadians IR regarding Public input	<p>Comment CoCNWT further notes that Husky’s Engagement Plan encompasses input from First Nation governments, territorial and federal governments, and member-driven agencies such the NWT Chamber of Commerce and NWT Chamber of Mines, but does not include a plan for gathering broader public input into its Project.</p> <p>Recommendation In order to address the WLWB’s determination that “public concern [about the Project] is widespread”, what specific steps does Husky Oil Operations Limited intend to take to solicit public input on</p>	<p>Apr 30: During the Preliminary Screening the WLWB determined that there might be cause for public concern and referred Husky's application the MVEIRB for an Environmental Assessment. MVEIRB's final scoping document will determine how Husky should respond to the concerns raised.</p>	

		the Project and respond in a meaningful way to the concerns raised?		
Tlicho Lands Protection Department: Sjoerd van der Wielen				
ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Bo Sta Re
1	Benefits to the Tlicho	<p>Comment There is very little information on jobs, business opportunities, and also impacts and costs to the Tlicho.</p> <p>Recommendation Please indicate what the job, business, and possible benefits of exploration will be to the Tlicho. Also please indicate the costs, impacts and potential risks to the Tlicho.</p>	<p>Apr 30: The small footprint, short duration nature of Husky's proposed exploration program will afford only limited employment and business opportunities. Aboriginal businesses will have an opportunity to tender bids for certain short duration field operation positions and service contracting opportunities. Husky did commission the Tlicho Land Protection Department to conduct a Traditional Knowledge and Land Use Study, a copy of which has been submitted to the Registry. To avoid potential conflicts, Husky will provide written notification prior to commencement of field operations.</p>	
2	Snow cat vehicles and use of the winter access routes into the region	<p>Comment Even though snow cats do not use roads, but use winter trails, and no new roads will be built, there is gouging and trenching and disturbance of the land noted with the use of snowmobiles and snow cats. The concern for the Tlicho is to not increase access to a region or impact through heavy use of trails by heavy equipment of the already existing trails.</p> <p>Recommendation We note the mitigation measures on page 3 of the IR responses to the Review Board (e.g., frozen ground, site orientation, restrictions of traffic, speed</p>	<p>Apr 30: Existing winter access to the DoT Quarry was previously used by heavy haul trucks transporting crushed rock to Yellowknife for road construction. None of the equipment that would be used in Husky's exploration program will be close to</p>	

		<p>restrictions, no recreation policies). Please identify policies that will be developed to educate employees, as well as whether there will be weight restrictions. Innovative mitigation measures are required to reduce gouging, trenching and deepening of the trails into the region.</p>	<p>the weight of the loaded haul trucks. To minimize environmental impact, the proposed field operations will be conducted during the winter months under frozen ground conditions with overlying snowpack. Gouging and trenching of the land by a snow machine or snowcat and sled under these conditions is not expected - or even likely. Existing trails are to be used whenever possible to avoid increasing access to the land. If required, new pioneering trails, would respect natural barriers to access; so as to not introduce new access to the property. Aurora Geosciences has internal policies and training programs that educate employees to responsibility and safety in operating relevant equipment. These procedures are in accordance with the proponents values toward safety and environmental stewardship. Equipment specifications and weights intended for the proposed field operations are provided in the Land Use Permit application.</p>
3	The Tlicho Government Traditional Knowledge study	Comment The level of traditional use is higher than might have been estimated by	Apr 30: Husky's intention by

<p>has indicated important travel routes, cultural sites, trapping and harvesting sites, burial sites, among others.</p>	<p>Husky (response to IR #3 on cumulative effects).</p> <p>Recommendation Please indicate whether sensitive sites, cultural sites, and burial sites as well as critical harvesting and trapping areas will also cause Husky to relocate the drilling program, as has been reported in Husky Response to IR 5) in which Husky reports that based on the outcome of the Archaeological Impact Assessment, nine proposed drill hole locations were omitted from the 2015 program (Golder Archeological Report).</p>	<p>commissioning both Archaeological and TK studies was to ensure that known cultural sites, burial sites, and existing traplines would not be disturbed by the proposed exploration program. Husky has reviewed the Traditional Knowledge (TK) study as prepared by the Tlicho Lands Protection Department recently submitted to Husky on April 11, 2015. It appears that there are no conflicts with cultural sites or burial sites (Page 20 of the TK preliminary study report) however there is a polygon area at Wrigley Point and surrounding Chedabucto Lake referenced as a "Suggested Protected Area". This is the first time that Husky has been made aware of these areas and will warrant further clarification by the Tlicho Lands Protection Dept. If there are specific sensitive sites, cultural sites, burial sites as well as critical harvesting and trapping areas that the Tlicho Lands Protection Dept. is requesting that Husky refrain from conducting exploration activity then Husky will require further dialogue on this</p>
--	---	--

			<p>matter and will also require geographic coordinates and shape files so that these can be mapped in our system. Husky would prefer to work with the Tlic'ho Lands Protection Dept. to find a solution where exploration activity can be conducted while minimizing impacts to the land and to harvesters.</p>
4	<p>Migratory birds and the connection of the four parcels that are within the proposed Dinã gã Wekâ€™hodiã (North Arm Park)</p>	<p>Comment Please indicate what knowledge has come forward about potential impacts to migratory birds. What information, if any, has surfaced from the traditional knowledge perspective.</p> <p>Recommendation Please summarize impacts to migratory birds. Please indicate if the four northern parcels that are connected to the south of the PAS are within the migratory bird paths.</p>	<p>Apr 30: The NWT Protected Area Strategy (PAS) Working Group has identified the North Arm of Great Slave Lake as an area to protect. Of primary concern is the Important Bird Area in Canada (IBA) located along the north-eastern shore of the North Arm where the majority of migratory birds congregate. Husky would look to organizations such as Environment Canada to confirm if the four northern parcels are within a "migratory bird path". However, we do acknowledge that migratory birds may be present in the area during the spring to fall period. In the 2015 Preliminary TK Study report as prepared by the Tlic'ho Lands Protection Department, it makes reference to harvesting ducks in the</p>

			<p>summer when they migrate back to the Whitebeach Point area and also that most of the traditional land use and harvesting occurs along the shoreline of TideÃ [Great Slave Lake]. Husky acknowledges that there are migratory birds in the area and that they may be impacted by the noise and the presence of equipment and crew but again, this impact will be localized at the drilling sites and will be minimal due to the short duration (3-6 weeks in the March/April period) and transient nature of this program. If additional field mapping and geophysical surveys will be conducted during the late summer-fall time period and will typically involve a crew of approximately 4-6 persons transported in one helicopter. It will involve the crew walking on the land carrying their equipment as they record their information and return to Yellowknife at the end of each field day. Duration of this field work is expected to last approximately 4-6 weeks. No trees will be cut during this period of field work, so disturbance to nests and</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>eggs will be minimal. A local community member will be employed as a wildlife monitor, who will assist in the identification nests and nesting areas. If nests containing eggs or young of migratory birds are located or discovered, the crew will be notified and activities in the nesting area will be halted until nesting is completed.</p>
5	<p>Drilling and closure</p>	<p>Comment Tlicho harvesters have experience with drilling throughout the territory. A key concern is that all drill sites will be closed properly, and in accordance with guidelines. Recommendation Please clarify the closure approach that Husky intends with respect to the drill sites, as well as the mini-bulk sampling sites.</p>	<p>Apr 30: If required, drill sites will be cleared of any tree cover. Timber will be bucked up into 1 metre lengths and stacked at the edge of the drill pad. When drilling operations at a site have been concluded, the drill casing will be pulled out and the sides of the hole will be allowed to collapse in; each drill hole will be marked by a wood stake with a metal tag showing the drill hole identification number and its location (in NAD83 coordinates) and flagging. Whole rock core recovered from the diamond drilling program will be logged and sampled then placed in core boxes, labelled and stacked in a repository adjacent to the DoT Quarry. For the mini-bulk sampling phase, approximately 6</p>

			<p>ore bags (10 tons), or as one local resident put it "the equivalent of three outhouses of sand", will be removed from each sampling site. After the sample is taken, the resulting test pit will be recontoured and any available vegetation cover replaced. All equipment and waste (human and mechanical) will be removed from site. The drill sites and mini bulk sample sites will be inspected the following summer to insure that the areas are left in a proper condition.</p>
6	<p>Exploration and impacts on harvesting of ungulates and furbearing animals</p>	<p>Comment Harvesting is particularly important for the Tlicho, for food consumption, clothes, and selling fur into the market. Elders are concerned with the impact of operational machinery (helicopters, drill rigs and snow cats traveling through the area). The unfamiliar noise and traffic and disturbance, and shaking from the snowcats and drilling operations, can cause habitat disturbance, fragmentation and scare away animal populations. Decreased animal populations will impact the success of trapping and hunting.</p> <p>Recommendation Please indicate the mitigation measures to minimize impacts on ungulates and furbearing animals and more generally on the practice of rights and access by Tlicho harvesters throughout the area.</p>	<p>Apr 30: It is Husky's intent to minimize impacts on all wildlife species throughout the project area and would employ mitigation measures such as: - Local environmental/wildlife monitors will be employed throughout the duration of the field program. The monitors will be expected to work with the Project Field Supervisor to identify potential denning locations and nesting habitats, and to make the Field Crew aware of any areas of concern, so that potential wildlife conflicts can be avoided; - During the site orientation all workers</p>

			<p>will receive awareness training which will include discussions on: not feeding the wildlife; no hunting/fishing; and no harassment of wildlife. All work crews will be encouraged to support the work that the wildlife monitors do; - Restricting vehicle/equipment to the defined exploration program area (no off-roading); - All vehicle/equipment operators associated with the program will be instructed, should they encounter wildlife, to stop and allow the wildlife to access and/or cross the vehicle's path without harassment; - Food and waste management throughout program operations; - All grease and oils from the exploration activities will be stored in sealed plastic pails and removed daily to reduce the release of odours and prevents wildlife from accessing the attractants; - Husky employees and contractors working on the exploration program will be prohibited from hunting, fishing, and trapping; - Unnecessary over-flights of fixed-wing aircraft and helicopters will be avoided; - Helicopters will not land in any area</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>where wildlife are present, except in documented emergency situations; - Wildlife sightings will be recorded by all field program personnel using the GNWT Wildlife Observation forms to collect data on observations such as: species type, date, time, location, and animal activity; - All activities will cease when caribou are present and may only resume once they have moved on; - Small berms or drip trays will be used during transfer fuel operations at each drill site or water pump setup. Opened fuel barrels will be stored in secondary containment. Spills that may occur will be handled using small refueling berm kits and with absorbent pads at each transfer location with absorbent pads that will be available at each fuel transfer site. Spill kits will be located at the fuel cache and at each of the drilling rigs. By keeping the field programs (winter drilling, summer/fall geophysics, and winter mini-bulk sampling) all to a short duration Husky anticipates keeping impact to the practice of rights and access by Tlicho</p>
--	--	--	---

			harvesters throughout the project area to a minimum.
7	Exploration and impacts on animals and habitat	<p>Comment The sand is a unique habitat for animals such as wolves, foxes and bears, to make dens for hibernation and to raise offspring. Drill sites and snow cat trails can impact preferable denning locations. Potential spill of fuel can impact animal habitat on land and water. The entire area is woodland caribou habitat, a species listed under Canada's species at risk act. Helicopters, snow cats, drilling operations and human camps will create noise and disturbance that will scare woodland caribou, moose and other animals away from area.</p> <p>Recommendation Please indicate mitigations measures to avoid denning locations, and important animal habitat, particularly woodland caribou habitat.</p>	<p>Apr 30: As stated in Husky's Land Use Permit application, and reiterated in our responses to comments during the Preliminary Screening process, Husky commits to employing local environmental/wildlife monitors throughout the duration of the field program. It would be the expectation that these experienced monitors capable of identifying potential denning locations and notify the Project Field Supervisor. Specifically during Phase 2 (mini-bulk sampling test pits), the monitors will also be responsible for identifying potential denning locations as part of the pre-scouting that will occur on snowmobiles prior to mobilization of the snowcat. In order to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat, Husky would employ mitigation measures such as: - Drilling activity will be localized to the proposed hole locations; - Due to the fact that the drilling rigs are heliportable, the drilling rig footprint can be kept to a minimum</p>

			<p>(approximately 6 m x 6 m for the RC pads and 8 m x 8 m for the DD pads). - There will be no permanent camp; and the temporary emergency shelter/first aid tent and core shack will be located in the existing cleared DOT Quarry; - Wherever possible, existing clearings will be utilized for heli-pads to limit new clearing; - Frozen ground conditions will mitigate potential damage to ground vegetation, surface soils and permafrost. Care will be taken in ensuring that impacts to the ground are minimized - The active program area will be monitored ruts/gouges and repairs will be made as required using snow fills; - Husky and its contractors will work closely with the Land Use Inspector particularly at the end of the winter operating season to ensure the ground surface is not disturbed; - Should over land access be required for a mini-bulk sample, a rubber tracked snow cat or equivalent vehicle with a sloop or sled will be employed to access program area along the existing winter access to the DOT rock quarry and on snow covered</p>
--	--	--	--

			trail from the quarry to the sampling site. Trails will be scouted on foot or snowmobile to select a route around forested areas so that slashing can be kept to a minimum and large stands of trees will be avoided.
--	--	--	---

Yellowknives Dene First Nation: Todd Slack

ID	Topic	Reviewer Comment/Recommendation	Proponent Response	Bo Sta Re
1	YKDFN IR#1 Archaeology Mitigations Husky Submission Package, Aurora Geoscience Archeology Policy	<p>Comment To GNWT The project's developer has an archaeology policy. YKDFN wants to know how this policy has been implemented and how the Prince of Wales (or other Government divisions) have acted in response to the information generated by that policy.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) Please provide all examples of instances when Aurora Geoscience has reported an archaeological site, with a generalized location and description. 2) Please indicate what the PWNHC did to verify or inspect these reports, including what guidance was</p>		
2	YKDFN IR#2 Archaeology Mitigations Husky Submission Package, Aurora Geoscience Archeology Policy	<p>Comment To Proponent The project's contractor (Aurora Geoscience) has an archaeology policy. YKDFN wishes to know how this policy has been implemented.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) Please provide a list of all projects that Aurora Geoscience has worked on in the NWT over the last 10 years. 2) For each archaeological site that was discovery, please indicate what management or operational modifications were made.</p>	<p>Apr 30: 1) Aurora Geosciences has worked on more than 40 field programs in the NWT over the past ten years. Many of the contracts between proponents and Aurora require confidentiality. The YKFDN is encouraged to access the assessment report index as maintained by the GNWT, to collect what non-confidential information is available in the public domain. 2) Appendix III in the Land</p>	

			<p>Use Permit application outlines Aurora's procedure when a possible archaeological site is discovered, including the steps to follow for reporting the find to the Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre ("PWNHC"). Aurora follows proper protocol in requesting location of known archaeological sites through PWNHC. Known archaeological sites are not to be disturbed. For the Husky exploration program, archaeological assessments were completed for the Year-one proposed 100 drilling locations; as a result, nine drilling locations were cancelled to avoid possible heritage resource sites. Over 80% of Aurora's field programs have been completed in winter months on snow covered ground. There has been no recognition of new possible archaeological sites during field operations conducted by Aurora.</p>
3	<p>YKDFN IR#3 Failed Mitigation Consequences Drybones Bay EA and subsequent operations</p>	<p>Comment To GNWT Drybones Bay is a critical cultural area that, despite 7 Environmental Assessment hearings, has seen exploration activities have disastrous consequences. History has shown that exploration companies can operate with virtual impunity - that responsible development is a mirage and GNWT has done little to ensure</p>	

		<p>responsible development.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) In the early 2000's, an exploration company had a truck sink through the ice. Please indicate what the consequences were to company? 2) In the latter half of the decade, an exploration company was found guilty of starting a forest fire that burned one of the cemeteries in Drybones Bay. What were the consequences of this action? 3) Please indicate what actions the GNWT undertook to recover the costs of that forest fire and what the consequences of any failure to pay were? 4) In the mid 2010's, an exploration company in Drybones Bay went bankrupt. Please indicate the consequences of this action? 5) In 2014 a mining company killed 4 Bathurst Caribou on the winter road. Meanwhile, YKDFN are prohibited from harvesting Bathurst Caribou, the species that they have had a special relationship with for thousands of years " being charged for doing what they have always done, putting meat on the table for their families. Please explain what actions the GNWT undertook to follow up and what the consequences to the company were? 6) Please explain what steps the GNWT has implemented to ensure that none of these incidents will occur again, or if they do what punishments will be imposed.</p>	
4	<p>YKDFN IR#4 Failed Mitigation Consequences Archeology Effort in the area</p>	<p>Comment To GNWT Companies often check with the Prince of Wales to determine what known archaeological sites are in their area. IN the past this information has been presented as though it meant that there were no archaeological sites in the area - when the reality is that few areas had actually been the focus of work. YKDFN are aware of two quick shoreline surveys that we did in the early 2000's, discovering a large number of sites relative to the effort.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) Please provide a map that indicates where researchers have been on the ground and undertaken systematic surveys to evaluate the area for archaeological resources. 2) Please provide a discussion that</p>	

		<p>helps non-archaeologists understand the past nature of the use in the area, based on the existing research. 3) Given the number of artefacts already found (relative to the effort) and the traditional knowledge informing us of the importance of this area, does the PWNHC believe that it constitutes an archeologic landscape.</p>		
5	<p>YKDFN IR#5 Known Exercise of Aboriginal Treaty Rights April 2nd, 2015 Letter from Matt Spence</p>	<p>Comment To Canada (CANNOR, AANDC) CANNOR, the department now responsible for coordinating action involving Aboriginal Affairs has asked First Nations to provide information at the hearing related to the exercise of Treaty rights. However, it's not clear what level of understanding that Canada has currently. We are being forced to use the EA process to discharge numerous requirements, without clarity on what needs to be done. AANDC and its former incarnation INAC, have been in existence for decades. YKDFN cannot believe that they have no information on how First Nations have used this area - if not, they should have to address this failure in front of the Board. Furthermore, YKDFN wish to see the entirety of the onus on demonstrating impacts moved from the First Nation with extremely limited resources, to a more collaborative relationship with Canada (with much broader resources and a long history of responsibility) that recognizes the fiduciary duty that the latter owes to the YKDFN. Canada continuously pretends that it knows nothing about any First Nation matter, consequently placing all the responsibility on the shoulders of the First Nation. In doing so, it ignores its duty.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) Please provide a discussion on how Canada understands that the Yellowknives Dene use the Whitebeach Point, based on their experiences over the 110 years since Treaty was signed. 2) Please provide any documentation that advances this effort, particularly related to the development efforts of Gary Jaeb in the early 2000s, the Anglo American development proposal in 2008 (when the Consultation Support Unit</p>		

		<p>existed), and any other information that AANDC or other Federal departments may hold. 3) Please provide examples of past developments where First Nations have asserted that their Treaty Rights and indicate:</p> <p>a. What actions Canada undertook to review the matter b. What accommodations Canada sought to ensure that the concerns of the First Nation were addressed</p>	
6	<p>YKDFN IR#6 Known Exercise of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights April 7th, 2015 Letter from Terry Hall</p>	<p>Comment To GNWT Lands, the department now responsible for coordinating action involving Aboriginal Affairs has asked First Nations to provide information at the hearing related to the exercise of Treaty rights. However, it's not clear what level of understanding that GNWT has currently. We are being forced to use the EA process to discharge numerous requirements, without clarity on what needs to be done. The GNWT has been in existence for decades and must have some understanding and evidence on how the First Nation has used exercised their rights in this area in the past. YKDFN cannot believe that they have no information on how First Nations have used this area - if not, they should have to address this failure in front of the Board. Furthermore, YKDFN wish to see the entirety of the onus on demonstrating impacts moved from the First Nation with extremely limited resources, to a more collaborative relationship with GNWT (with much broader resources and a long history of responsibility) that recognizes the fiduciary duty that the latter owes to the YKDFN. We do not need more ineffective form letters before and after the Environmental Assessment that simply attempt to create the perception that GNWT is listening - even in the Snap Lake case where Lutsel K'e sought to have it's concerns addressed, the GNWT stated that they were unable to act to ensure the measures were implemented. The government, despite its fiduciary duty, did nothing during the subsequent water licensing to ensure that the concerns of the First Nation was addressed. GNWT cannot pretend that it knows nothing</p>	

		<p>about any First Nation matter, consequently placing all the responsibility on the shoulders of the First Nation. In doing so, it ignores its duty.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) Please provide a discussion on how GNWT understands that the Yellowknives Dene use the Whitebeach Point, based on their inactions with the First Nation since the GNWT being established. 2) Please provide any documentation that advances our understanding of this. We suggest that GNWT review its records particularly related to the development efforts of Gary Jaeb in the early 2000s, the Anglo American development proposal in 2008, and any other information that Lands, ECE, ITI or any other Territorial departments may hold. 3) Please provide examples of past developments where First Nations have asserted that their Treaty Rights and indicate: a. What actions Canada undertook to review the matter b. What accommodations Canada sought to ensure that the concerns of the First Nation were addressed</p>	
7	YKDFN IR#7 Moose Density	<p>Comment To GNWT YKDFN have previously expressed concern with the level of harvesting on Moose, particularly as residents of the NWT have been forced to seek alternative species. In recent years, our harvesters have noted a much higher number of people on the land, in areas that non-Dene are traditionally not observed.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) Please explain what new actions GNWT has undertaken to monitor the harvesting pressure and the population abundance of Moose, particularly with reference to the area in and around Yellowknife.</p>	
8	YKDFN IR#8 Additional Information	<p>Comment To Proponent An Environmental Assessment has a much broader range of considerations than that of the Water Board. YKDFN are seeking to clarify what additional information is available to help meet the burden that the developer carries - to show that it has met the public concern.</p>	<p>Apr 30: From March 31 to April 2, Husky held a series of engagement meetings to provide additional information and clarity on the proposed scope of work</p>

		<p>Recommendation 1) Other than the response to the Board IRs, has the project submitted any additional information to attempt to address or mitigate public concerns?</p>	<p>in the Land Use Permit application. A copy of the presentation materials and minutes from the meeting with the GNWT have been submitted to the Registry.</p>
9	<p>YKDFN IR#9 Closure Plan Enforceability MVEIRB submission, Closure Plan</p>	<p>Comment To Proponent Trenching is specifically exempted from closure requirements under the Mackenzie Valley Land Use Regulations. The closure plan provides no details other than noting they will use industry best practice. Industry best practice is to do nothing, in accordance to the regulations.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) Should the Board allow test pits, over the objections of YKDFN, please provide clarity on what industry best practice consists of? 2) Given that closure is specifically excluded under the MVLUR, how does the project intend to make this any enforceable commitment? 3) How will the project ensure that they have been successful</p>	<p>Apr 30: 1) Industry best practice(s) as written in Appendix II: [Closure and Reclamation Plan] are that all garbage and project materials are to be removed and the site is cleaned to as closely as possible resemble its initial state. Timber that may have been cleared is neatly stacked at the side of the site. The appropriate equipment (i.e. suited to the specific task) is to be utilized, in order to minimize additional compromise of the site during reclamation. Drip pans will be placed under idle equipment. Whole rock core recovered from the diamond drilling program will be logged and sampled then placed in core boxes, labelled and stacked in a repository adjacent to the DoT Quarry. Husky's proposed mini bulk sampling program does not require trenching; samples will be taken from a test pit about 3 metres in diameter. Approximately 6 ore bags (10 tons), or as one</p>

			<p>local resident put it "the equivalent of three outhouses of sand", will be removed from each sampling site. After a sample is taken, the resulting test pit will be recontoured and any available vegetation cover replaced. All equipment and waste (human and mechanical) will be removed from site. 2) Husky will abide by the terms and conditions of the Land Use Permit. 3) The mini bulk sample sites will inspected the following summer to insure that the areas are left in a proper condition.</p>
10	YKDFN IR#10 Improved Access MVEIRB Submission	<p>Comment To GNWT YKDFN are concerned that skidding with heavy loads will create better access and allow for increased squatters and recreational developments. Recommendation 1) What controls currently exist to prevent the creation of authorized recreational users in this critical cultural area? 2) How often does GNWT inspect this area for unauthorized users? Please provide details on when the last inspections were done in this area since Devolution</p>	
11	YKDFN IR#11 MVEIRB Submission	<p>Comment To AANDC YKDFN are concerned that skidding with heavy loads will create better access and allow for increased squatters and recreational developments. Recommendation 1) For the period prior to Devolution, can AANDC provide details on the number of inspections done in the Whitebeach Point area over the last 5 years? 2) Please provide a list of the any evictions or "postings"™</p>	
12	YKDFN IR#12 Wildlife Monitoring and Management	<p>Comment To Proponent YKDFN have reviewed the Wildlife Management Plan</p>	<p>Apr 30: 1) Local environmental/wildlife</p>

		<p>submitted and are unsure on many details relating to the efficacy of the measures contained.</p> <p>Recommendation 1) Section 8 of this plan notes a series of buffers for the operations. Please identify how the project will undertake monitoring to ensure that their operations are not occurring in or around each of the identified den or nesting locations. 2) This plan has been used in a number of operations across the NWT. Please provide a full list of operations where it is applicable, indicating for what years. 3) Please provide a discussion on the reports that have been provided to GNWT for the list mentioned in question 2. 4) The IR response to the Board notes that a wildlife monitor will be used. However, this is not detailed in the Wildlife Management Plan. Please provide clarity in the roles and responsibilities of this monitor, indicating their chain of reporting and authority to effect operational decisions. 5) The first bullet on p4 of the project response to the Board IR notes that the wildlife monitor is responsible for ensuring that environmental protection measures are implemented to minimize impacts based on their observations. Please indicate the what the environmental protection mitigations are and what the criteria are for triggering them. 6) The company consultant has used wildlife monitors on other projects. Please provide a comprehensive list where the monitor has utilized their authority to alter the operational plan to respond to observations undertaken during the wildlife monitoring.</p>	<p>monitors will be employed throughout the duration of the field program to survey the area surrounding the individual locations of exploration activity (i.e. drilling pads). The monitors will be expected to work with the Project Field Supervisor to identify potential denning locations and nesting habitats, and to make the Field Crew aware of any areas of concern, so that potential wildlife conflicts can be avoided. 2) The Wildlife Management Plan submitted with the Land Use Permit application was developed by Aurora; the Plan has evolved over the past thirty years of conducting field programs in the NWT. Similar Plans have been used successfully for other programs conducted by Aurora and have been acceptable to the Land Use Inspector. Husky has not used this form of Wildlife Management Plan before. 3) No such reports exist. Nor is it a requirement of the Wildlife Management Plan as submitted for this permit to generate such a report. 4) Husky commits to revising the</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>Wildlife, Archeological, and Environmental Awareness Plans to strengthen the wildlife aspects and incorporate information from the DRAFT GNWT Wildlife & Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan and Wildlife Effects Monitoring Program Guidelines, while keeping it scaled to the actual scope of the project which is temporary and short duration. In addition, Husky will include details on the role of the monitor. In general, these experienced monitors would be responsible for identifying potential denning locations and notifying the Project Field Supervisor of any potential wildlife conflicts. They will be expected to record their wildlife sightings using the GNWT Wildlife Observation forms to collect data on observations such as: species type, date, time, location, and animal activity. The monitor will be expected to observe and document wildlife and impacts thereon and to ensure implementation of environmental protection measures. All work crews will be</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>encouraged to support the work that the wildlife monitors do. Project crew will be instructed to also record their wildlife sightings and communicate the observations to the wildlife monitor. The monitor's chain of reporting will be directly to the Project Field Supervisor however, the monitor will be encouraged to report their findings to GNWT Land Use Inspector as well as their own organization. 5) The environmental protection mitigations were listed on Page 3 of the proponent's response to the Board IRs. If a monitor observed an action during the field program that was in contradiction with the outline mitigation measures then it would be their responsibility to notify the Project Field Supervisor. Again, they would be encouraged to also report their findings to GNWT Land Use Inspector. 6) There are no instances on a program managed by Aurora Geosciences where the wildlife monitor has exercised this authority. Aurora is conscientious towards wildlife sensitivities and attempts to proactively</p>
--	--	--	--

			minimize wildlife disturbance.	
13	YKDFN IR#13 Wildlife Monitoring and Management MVIERB IR Response, Wildlife Management Plan	<p>Comment To GNWT YKDFN have reviewed the Wildlife Management Plan submitted and are unsure on many details relating to the efficacy of the measures contained.</p> <p>Recommendation The project notes that a wildlife monitor will be present and that reporting will be provided to GNWT. Other than the existing mines, please provide past a comprehensive list of when this has occurred in the past and how GNWT has used this information, with a focus on what GNWT has done to mitigate the impacts associated with the project.</p>		

Distribution List

IRs on the Chedabucto Project land use permit application package and supporting documents, used instead of a DAR

File(s):

Proponent: Husky Oil Operations Ltd.

Reviewer Comments Due By: Apr 10, 2015

Proponent Comments Due By: Apr 24, 2015

Document(s)

Archaeological Impact Assessment Report

Land Use Permit Application

Closure and Reclamation Plan

Emergency Procedures and General Field Camp Safety document

Engagement Plan

Spill Contingency Plan

Waste Management Plan

Wildlife Management Plan

Preliminary Screening Review Summary and attachments

Husky Response to Review Board IR

Contact Information

Sachi De Souza (sdesouza@reviewboard.ca)

Simon Toogood 867 766-7053(stoogood@reviewboard.ca)

Sent To		
Organization	User	Email
AANDC	AANDC, Mineral Development Division	mdd@aandc-aadnc.gc.ca
AANDC	Sterenberg, Velma	Velma.Sterenberg@aandc-aadnc.gc.ca
Akaitcho IMA Implementation Office	Poole, Stephanie	screeningofficer@eastarm.com
Chamber of Mines NWT & Nunavut	Hoefer, Tom	executivedirector@miningnorth.com
Community Government of Behchoko	Daniels, Clifford	clifforddaniels@tlicho.com
Community Government of Wekweeti	Johnny Arrowmaker, c/o Grace Angel	saowekweti@netkaster.ca
Community Government of Whati	Nitsiza, Alfonz	alfonznitsiza@tlicho.com
Deninu K'ue First Nation	Simon, Patrick	patricksimon777@yahoo.ca
Environment Canada	Environment Canada, EA	EC.EA.NWT@ec.gc.ca
Environment Canada	McMillan, Sarah-Lacey	Sarah-Lacey.McMillan@ec.gc.ca
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Fisheries Protection Program, Triage Group	fisheriesprotection@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
GNWT - Department of Transportation	Campbell, Alexis	Alexis_Campbell@gov.nt.ca

GNWT - Department of Transportation	Abernethy, David	David_Abernethy@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Department of Transportation	Posynick, Jon	Jon_Posynick@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Department of Transportation	Batchelor, Rhonda	rhonda_batchelor@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Department of Transportation	Niven, Stuart	stu_niven@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Environment and Natural Resources	Somers, Gila	Gila_Somers@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Environment and Natural Resources	GNWT, Central Email	gnwt_ea@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Environment and Natural Resources	McGregor, Laurie	laurie_mcgregor@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Environment and Natural Resources	Lee, Nahum	Nahum_Lee@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Environment and Natural Resources	Richea, Nathen	Nathen_Richea@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Health	Fleming, Duane	duane_fleming@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - ITI	Braun Rodriguez, Catherine	Catherine_BraunRodriguez@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - ITI	Johnson, Kris	k_Johnson@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - ITI	Robb, Malcolm	Malcolm_Robb@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - ITI	Fast, Peter	Peter_Fast@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Lands	Ambrose, Clint	clint_ambrose@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Lands	Anderson, Erin	Erin_Anderson@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Lands	Sanderson, Marty	Marty_Sanderson@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Lands	Stewart, Scott	Scott_Stewart@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - MACA	Ingram, Colleen	Colleen_Ingram@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - MACA	Arshad, Iqbal	Iqbal_Arshad@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - MACA	Davy, Mark	mark_davy@gov.nt.ca
GNWT - Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre	Mackay, Glen	Glen_Mackay@gov.nt.ca
Gov of Canada	Alexander, David	david.alexander@cannor.gc.ca
Kitikmeot Inuit Association	Clark, Geoff	geoff@qiniq.com
Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation - Chief or Wildlife, Lands and Environment	Unger, Peter	lkdfnlands@gmail.com
Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation - Chief or Wildlife, Lands and Environment	Almond, Sonya	sonyaalmond@gmail.com
Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board	MVEIRB, Generic	preliminaryscreening@reviewboard.ca
MVLWB	Plautz, Angela	aplautz@mvlwb.com
MVLWB	Briere, Elaine	elaine@mvlwb.com
MVLWB	MVLWB, Central Email	permits@mvlwb.com
MVLWB	Nevitt, Zabey	zabey@mvlwb.com
North Slave Metis Alliance	Taylor, Joanne	general@nsma.net
North Slave Metis Alliance	Enge, Susan	heritage@nsma.net
North Slave Metis Alliance	McGee, Charles	researcher@nsma.net
North Slave Metis Alliance	Shiga, Shin	shin.shiga@nsma.net

Tlicho Government	Edward Erasmus, Grand Chief	grandchiefediwa@tlicho.com
Tlicho Government	Duncan, Laura	lauraduncan@tlicho.com
Tlicho Government	Gibson, Ginger	vgibson@interchange.ubc.ca
Tlicho Lands Protection Department	van der Wielen , Sjoerd	SjoerdvanderWielen@tlicho.com
Wek' eezhii Renewable Resources Board	Snortland, Jody	jsnortland@wrrb.ca
Wekweeti Community Government	Arrowmaker, Johnny	johnnyarrowmaker@tlicho.com
WLWB	Berrill, Elissa	eberrill@wlwb.ca
WLWB	Pacunayen, Jessica	jpacunayen@wlwb.ca
WLWB	Ewaschuk, Patty	pewaschuk@wlwb.ca
WLWB	Fequet, Ryan	rfequet@wlwb.ca
WLWB	Judas, Roberta	rjudas@wlwb.ca
WLWB	Elsasser, Sarah	selsasser@wlwb.ca
Workers' Safety and Compensation Commission	Abernethy, Susan	Susan.Abernethy@wscc.nt.ca
Yellowknives Dene First Nation	Slack, Todd	tslack@ykdene.com