



December 20, 2024

Notice of Proceeding

Mackenzie Valley Highway, Government of the Northwest Territories

RE: Questions to parties about routing

The Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board needs to understand the alternate routing that parties have described to the Review Board on the record in community sessions, technical sessions and information requests. The Review Board is asking parties for high-level information about the re-routing they have identified as necessary. The Review Board is asking parties to please provide this information **by January 30th**.

The Review Board respectfully requests that parties focus on providing information about **which parts of the Right of Way need to be moved**, and, if applicable, **where the route should go**. It would be useful for the Review Board to understand **why**. (Parties do not need to submit confidential TK in response. The Review Board will continue to work with parties to get any relevant confidential Traditional Knowledge in a way that keeps it confidential.)

Based on the responses, the Review Board may require the Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT or developer) to provide information about the potential impacts of alternate routes beyond the proposed corridor, as described by parties, compared to the developer's preferred route. This will allow the Review Board to ask questions of the developer prior to it submitting its DAR addendum.¹

¹ The Review Board is not limited to asking information requests at any time.



The Review Board appreciates the time and resources required to provide this information, which is important to the Review Board in making its informed decision and understanding the potential impacts of the project.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Catherine Fairbairn at 867-766-7054 or cfairbairn@reviewboard.ca.



Information request Round 2

Table of Information Requests to parties regarding routing

IR Topic	To	Reference	Preamble (background)	Information Request
<p>Alternatives</p> <p>Scope of Development</p>	<p>PKFN</p>	<p>Section 5.2.3 table 5.2 section 7.2 Technical sessions day 3 PR#289 PKFN questions on routing</p>	<p>Pehdzeh Ki Frist Nation has consistently raised the issue of proposed reroutes, outside of the proposed corridor, during the environmental assessment. Starting in Table 5.2 in section 5.2.3 of the DAR, the Dehcho community recommendation in row two of this table is to “move the highway away from the river onto ‘the bluff’. This section also mentions moving the project at least 5 km from the river.</p> <p>At the technical sessions, PKFN mentioned both a Traditional Land and Resource Use study and a study on its proposed rerouting of the project. The Review Board understands that PKFN is in the process of finalizing these documents and is open to working with the Review Board to submit both under confidential cover.</p> <p>In the meantime, the Review Board is interested in knowing enough about the proposed reroutes, beyond the winter road corridor, to support the Review Board in asking more questions of the developer about potential impacts of any alternate routings.</p> <p>Knowing the PKFN will likely be submitting more detailed documents in the future, could PKFN please consider the questions in this IR and</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Which stretches of road alignment has PKFN indicated need to be rerouted? Please describe: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the general area(s) and length of the proposed route that needs to be moved to address PKFN’s concerns b. details of where the route should be moved to, if applicable. 2. What are the reasons for requesting the route realignment? 3. Has GNWT proposed re-routing to address your concerns? If so, where and how?

IR Topic	To	Reference	Preamble (background)	Information Request
			<p>answer in whatever detail it can without compromising any Traditional Knowledge PKFN wishes to keep confidential.</p> <p>The Review Board asks that PKFN respond by January 30th.</p>	
Road re-alignment at Bear Rock and Big Smith Creek	All Tulita organizations who wish to respond	DAR Vol 1 Section 6.3, 7.2.3.3, Table 6.2 and 6.3, Tech session day 1, page 64-65	<p>Section 7.2.3.3 of the DAR states that the Bear Rock Alignment Option is the preferred option for Indigenous organizations along this portion of the project route, but that the GNWT has not made a decision yet about which route to advance.</p> <p>The Bear Rock alignment was discussed during the technical session. The transcripts describe individuals or organizations in Tulita working with GNWT on a route two km to the north. The transcripts also include a discussion between GNWT and individuals or organizations in Tulita on the road routing options at Big Smith Creek. The Review Board wants to confirm road routing.</p> <p>The Review Board asks for responses by January 30th.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe discussions with GNWT about rerouting around Bear Rock and at Big Smith Creek. Is the current alignment around Bear Rock and at Big Smith Creek acceptable? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the proposed re-routing sufficient to address all concerns? 2. Are there any additional reroutes required to address concerns raised by individuals or organizations in Tulita?
Road re-alignment at Bear Rock and Big Smith Creek	GNWT-INF	DAR Vol 1 Section 6.3, 7.2.3.3, Table 6.2 and 6.3Tech session day 1, page 64-65	<p>Section 7.2.3.3 of the DAR states that the Bear Rock Alignment Option is the preferred option for Indigenous organizations along this portion of the project route, but the GNWT has not yet made a decision about which route to advance.</p> <p>The Bear Rock alignment was discussed during the technical session. The transcripts describe</p>	Confirm results of engagement with Tulita regarding road re-alignment around Bear Rock and on routing at Big Smith Creek. Describe any resolution on re-alignments at these two locations.

IR Topic	To	Reference	Preamble (background)	Information Request
			<p>Tulita working with GNWT on a route to the north that avoids Bear Rock. The transcripts also include a discussion between GNWT and Tulita on the road routing options at Big Smith Creek. The Review Board wants to confirm road routing.</p> <p>The Review Board asks for responses by January 30th.</p>	
Road Route	All Indigenous organizations (other than PKFN and Tulita organizations) that wish to respond	NA	<p>The developer's preferred route primarily follows the existing winter road corridor. In the DAR, the developer also identified an alternative upland route in response to concerns.</p> <p>The Review Board is working with parties to receive relevant Traditional Land and Resource Use studies that may include information about Traditional Knowledge relevant to routing.</p> <p>In the meantime, the Review Board wishes to hear from parties about the engagement that has been done on the proposed route to date.</p> <p>The Review Board asks for responses by January 30th.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please describe any concerns your organization has raised regarding routing, and how those concerns were addressed by the GNWT. 2. Please describe any reroutes your organization has identified as necessary that have not been incorporated into project design by the GNWT, and what has been incorporated.