

# TASR WMMP OVERVIEW MEETING NOTES

---

**DATE** October 3, 2017

**PROJECT No.** 1665943

**LOCATION** INF NGB4 Large Boardroom

**TIME** 1:30 pm to 3:00 pm

**PRESENT Golder Associates Ltd.:**

Grabke, Michele  
Panayi, Damian

**Government of the Northwest Territories:**

Campbell, Darren, Lands  
Hodson, James, ENR  
McGregor, Laurie, ENR  
Neudorf, Russell, INF  
Niven, Stu, INF  
Rozestraten, Katie, INF

**Tłı̨chǫ Government:**

Leech, Susan, Firelight (on phone)  
Nevitt, Zabey, TG (on phone)

**Wek'èezhì Renewable Resources Board:**

Gunn, Anne (on phone)  
Pellissey, Jody

**NSMA:** Sent regrets; unable to attend.

**YKDFN:** Absent.

---

## Meeting Report from the Overview Session for the updated Tłı̨chǫ All-Season Road (TASR) Wildlife Management and Monitoring Plan (WMMP)

Presentation (Presenter)	Notes	Response/Action
<b>Introductions</b> (GNWT, Russell Neudorf) Start 1:35pm End 1:36pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Intent of meeting is to walk through various aspects of the WMMP and encourage a discussion so everyone is comfortable with the contents and is tangential to EA process.</li><li>Meeting is also a commitment from tech session.</li><li>A meeting summary will be posted to the public registry.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A copy of the presentation is available in <a href="#">PR#209</a> along with the Sept 28 meeting summary.</li></ul>
<b>Wildlife</b> (Golder, Damian Panayi) Start 1:36pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Presentation as per slide deck, which was circulated to parties in advance of meeting.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>None</li></ul>

---

End 2:13pm		
<b>Question and Answer Session</b>  Start 2:13pm End 3:03pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to Question and Answer table below.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to Question and Answer table below.</li> </ul>
<b>Closing Remarks</b>  (GNWT - INF) End: 3:03pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>

**Open Question and Answer Session:**

Topic/Keyword	Question/Comment	Response
<b>Commitment 10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jody: Where is the response to commitment 10?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">PR#181</a> and <a href="#">PR#192</a> provide the protocols requested in commitment 10.</li> </ul>
<b>Caribou Collaring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jody: With regard to the commitment to deploy further collars on boreal caribou: When will consultation with the community of Whatì occur? There was no community consultation prior to deployment of the existing boreal caribou collars, which is why the WRRB did not approve the previous deployment.</li> <li>WRRB recommended that ENR do a face to face meeting with the communities (at least Whatì) to follow up about the program and describe what was done and what info will be collected. WRRB was told that this would not occur and that perhaps a poster or technical report would be sent into the community. This is a concern of the WRRB. WRRB has not received a response back from the GNWT why it did not heed WRRB's recommendation.</li> <li>In the case of collaring, wildlife research permit consultations should involve face-to-face meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>James: There are currently 20 collars deployed with the plan to add another 5 this winter (there were 5 collars leftover in March 2017). An additional 5 collars would need to be purchased and then deployed at a later date to reach the sample size mentioned in the WMMP. The 30 collars would be the total amount of collars deployed for the life of the program.</li> <li>In order to deploy the additional collars this winter, ENR would need to apply for another wildlife research permit. The wildlife research permit does normally include consultation.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jody: What expectations or requirements will there be for the environmental monitors (what kind of training or experience?)? WRRB would like to see appropriately trained/qualified monitors without excluding local candidates. WRRB is willing to help in defining these qualifications and expects TG can also offer advice.</li> <li>Zabey: There is a wealth of local expertise available from programs such as Boots on the Ground and the Tłıchǝ Aquatic Monitoring Program. Our partnership approach with the GNWT will enable us to develop the process that will make sure the right people are involved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GNWT agrees that there should be minimum requirements for the environmental monitoring position.</li> <li>GNWT is open to suggestions from WRRB on how to find appropriately qualified people locally.</li> <li>Agreement that this is a detail that can be worked out at the regulatory phase with GNWT, WRRB and TG.</li> </ul>
<b>Access and Harvest Monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jody: Plan to move the existing winter road checkpoint to the TASR should involve consultation with the WRRB.</li> <li>Concerned that checkpoints are not the most effective way of collecting harvest information.</li> <li>Reliance on checkpoints are a concern of the WRRB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>because there is no requirement for people to stop.</li> <li>WRRB happy to see the community monitors but notes there are also challenges associated with those positions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Barren-Ground Caribou</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jody: Barren-ground caribou were recently assessed by COSEWIC as threatened. It is important in your messaging to highlight this.</li> <li>Bathurst mobile zone is not identified in the document, but it is part of their range. It is necessary to keep the mobile zone in mind in the future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged. This listing is included in the WMMP but was not mentioned during the presentation.</li> </ul>
<b>Moose and Bison Monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jody: Section 5.2.5 proposes that moose and bison surveys will occur in 2018 prior to construction and that construction will not happen until after the EA is complete. Will the survey happen in early spring?</li> <li>Will WRRB be consulted prior to the surveys taking place?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>James: Yes, correct, we would like the surveys to occur in March.</li> <li>WRRB will be consulted prior to the surveys.</li> <li>Russ: Also note that there is the P3 procurement process which needs to be completed prior to construction starting. It's likely that construction will only begin in early 2019.</li> </ul>
<b>WMMP Approval Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anne: What is the criteria for a public review of the WMMP after the EA process is complete? By that, when the GNWT has received the REA or do you have another timeline for when the EA is complete. For example with the public record is closed?</li> <li>When will the GNWT consider a public review and when will that be?</li> <li>Looking at the TK report, there are recommendations that would be applicable to the WMMP and the WRRB will be providing comments in our technical report so we want to make sure that there is the expectation of a revised draft before it goes to the WLWB.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>James: We don't have a specific criteria right now. But a public review will likely be fairly standard. Timing it will be after the Report of EA and could be conducted at the same time as the WL/LUP process.</li> <li>Laurie: This is not the final draft of the WMMP. You can comment in your technical reports. It will need to be updated before it is submitted to ENR for approval. Last two EAs had the requirement for a public review of the WMMP so it is likely to be a measure for this EA.</li> </ul>
<b>Mitigation Monitoring versus Effects Monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anne: Would you be able to explain the difference between mitigation monitoring vs. effects monitoring on slide 10 (Section 5.1 vs 5.2)?</li> <li>Missing the ease of relating this to the ASR and how effective this monitoring is expected to be.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Damian: Agreed that there is some overlap between both types of monitoring. This is partly a remnant of the older WWHPP and WEMP approach, and is also intended to facilitate review for those already familiar with the WMMP version 1 and the conceptual WEMP. At a high level, mitigation monitoring will focus on Project-specific, construction phase issues, while effects monitoring considers more large-scale, indirect and operational phase issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Adaptive Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anne: Found the adaptive management section to be short.</li> <li>Why does the document separate the wildlife effects monitoring thresholds (Section 5.1) from the adaptive management section?</li> <li>WRRB technical report will likely focus on adaptive management plan.</li> <li>Another dimension to monitoring that indicates the level and intensity of detecting effect size is a component that seems to be missing. It would be relatively easy in the next version to add a matrix approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>James: There are some thresholds in section 5.2 which may not have been summarized again in the adaptive management section.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Construction versus Operation Monitoring</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anne: There is a difference between construction and operation monitoring? Even though the WMMP is both construction and operation, the WMMP will only be construction?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Damian: Once the Project reaches operation and maintenance, it will require the same permits or licences that are required for any other operational road in the NWT.</li> <li>The operational phase of the road is expected to be monitored and treated in the same manner as every other public highway. The operational monitoring that is currently done on Hwy 3 and the Thcho winter road is comparable to what will be done on the TASR. For example, there is currently a checkpoint, harvest monitoring, traffic monitoring, collared barren-ground caribou, moose and bison monitoring, etc. that already take place on the winter road; these programs would continue. The WMMP attempts to show how the existing operations will be applied to this road or will be modified as required for this Project.</li> <li>Mitigation monitoring pertains to the mitigations implemented and managed strictly by the proponent, while the wildlife effects monitoring is more of a GNWT led management approach that extends into the operational phase. Many of these wildlife effects monitoring programs are already in place and are ongoing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Monitoring and Mitigation of changes to Predator-Prey Relationships</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Susan: Boreal caribou gap – the risk with the road is that it will potentially facilitate additional development, leading to more linear disturbances.</li> <li>Concern when a road is developed there is the potential with the predator-prey dynamic, which can be changed by linear disturbances. No monitoring of this dynamic in the operation phase. How will that be noted and how will that be mitigated? Where is the mitigation and monitoring for this concern?</li> <li>If the population trend is downward, what is that trigger in terms of further mitigation? And what would that mitigation be? Missing effectiveness of the monitoring.</li> <li>Jody: The concerns that Susan has mentioned have been brought up by the WRRB as well. Where there has been a lot of fire, we are seeing increased numbers of bison, which are getting closing to Whatl. The number of moose is expected to explode and that is certainly going to increase the number of predators. By how much, we aren't going to know because there is no dedicated predator monitoring program. If they are not addressed in the WMMP, then they should be.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Damian: There is an existing ROW (Old winter road corridor) on the landscape. Landscape-level changes are occurring, such as forest fires. The reasonably foreseeable future projects were considered in the EA process. Overall conclusion is that an effect at the population level is not anticipated.</li> <li>These changes were considered as a pathway in the ASR. This pathway was rolled into the Pathway Category of Habitat Loss or Alteration. Table 4 of WMMP includes this Pathway. Section 4.2 on page 20 includes the mitigation for Indirect Habitat Loss or Alteration.</li> <li>This potential scenario is beginning to leave the realm of the project-specific WMMP, and enter the area covered by ongoing ENR wildlife management operations at a regional level.</li> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>

**Distribution List:**

Ginger Gibson, Firelight Group <a href="mailto:Ginger.gibson@thefirelightgroup.com">Ginger.gibson@thefirelightgroup.com</a>
Susan Leech, Firelight Group <a href="mailto:susan.leech@thefirelightgroup.com">susan.leech@thefirelightgroup.com</a>
Jessica Hum, Tłı̨chǫ Government <a href="mailto:jessicahum@tlicho.com">jessicahum@tlicho.com</a>
Tyanna Steinwand, Tłı̨chǫ Government <a href="mailto:tyannasteinwand@tlicho.com">tyannasteinwand@tlicho.com</a>
Shin Shiga, NSMA <a href="mailto:Shin.shiga@nsma.net">Shin.shiga@nsma.net</a>
Alex Power, YKDFN <a href="mailto:apower@ykdene.com">apower@ykdene.com</a>
Anne Gunn, WRRB <a href="mailto:gunnan@telus.net">gunnan@telus.net</a>
Allice Legat, WRRB <a href="mailto:alegat@gagos.ca">alegat@gagos.ca</a>
Jody Pellissey, WRRB <a href="mailto:jpellissey@wrrb.ca">jpellissey@wrrb.ca</a>
GNWT & Golder Associates Ltd.