

**RECORD OF CONSULTATION OR CONTACT**

**Meeting: X Telephone:**

**Project #: Client Name: DOT**

<b>Title/ Topic:</b>	<b>Inuvik to Tuktoyaktuk Highway</b>				
<b>Date:</b>	<b>September 28, 2012</b>				
<b>Time:</b>	<b>0900-1000</b>				
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Westmark Hotel, Whitehorse Yukon</b>				
<b>Person(s) Involved:</b>	<p><b><u>Fisheries Joint Management Committee</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vic Gillman – Chair</li> <li>• Burton Ayles</li> <li>• Brian Zytaruk</li> <li>• James Malone – Resource person</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Other</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larry Dow –DFO</li> <li>• Amanda Joynt - DFO</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Project Team</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jim Stevens (DOT-GNWT)</li> <li>• Walter Orr (KAVIK-STANTEC)</li> <li>• Doug Chiperzak (KAVIK-STANTEC)</li> <li>• Michael Fabijan (KAVIK-STANTEC)</li> </ul>				
<b>Meeting Notes:</b>	<p><b>NOTE:</b> Notes are not verbatim transcripts of the meeting, the questions and answers are summaries of what was said at the meeting and are intended to capture the intent of what was said. Q: Question/comment from meeting participants A: Answer/ response from proponent project team</p>				
	<b>Questioner Name</b>	<b>Question/ Concern</b>	<b>Responder Name</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Follow up</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vic Gilman</li> </ul>	<p>FJMC is “happy “that DOT has taken the time to meet with the committee. Noted that the Tuktoyaktuk working group and the FJMC had previously invited</p>	n/a	Comment noted	



		DOT to meet with them. DOT did not avail themselves of the opportunity. FJMC sees this as having hurt both parties.			
	• Amanda Joynt	Is Draft Hydrotechnical report on EIRB site?	Walter Orr	Interim Hydrotechnical Report is on Registry site	Final report will be submitted October 5
	• Brian Zytaruk	Do you have the hydrotechnical report with you?	Walter Orr	Have PDF version and will provide FJMC with the final report next week when provided to EIRB.	Provide report to FJMC
	• Burton Ayles	Clarification: Crossing overview information - what is 0.5m/s flow rate?	Walter Orr	Peak rainfall event that drives engineering crossing design	
	• Burton Ayles	What happens when the flow rate is higher?	Walter Orr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minor crossings designed to meet 10 year event without over-topping</li> <li>- 100 year event allows for some over-topping</li> </ul>	
	• Brian Zytaruk	What kinds of winter flows are there at Hans Creek?	Walter Orr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Very low. You can walk across the creek.</li> </ul>	
	• Brian Zytarik	This was a useful presentation. I am looking forward to seeing the final hydrotechnical report.			
	• Vic Gilman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FJMC concerned with adjacent impacts due to increased access.</li> <li>• FJMC is comfortable with for crossing design with DFO's approach and requirements Satisfy these and FJMC will be "happy" to support the DFO position .</li> <li>• This will not satisfy adjacent anticipated impacts beyond the corridor, to known fish stocks.</li> <li>• Need a plan to address</li> </ul>			



		<p>adjacent impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already seeing impacts as a result of road from Tuktoyaktuk to source 177.</li> <li>• Need Monitoring – to guarantee that crossing mitigation works</li> <li>• Fisheries management plan – proponent should fund development of plan including fishing plans</li> </ul>			
1-	Vic Gilman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inuvik Tuktoyaktuk Working Group have concerns about fisheries in regional area. These were not addressed in EA</li> <li>• FJMC wants the proponent to engage in a monitoring program for a reasonable period of time, seen as three years post completion of construction.</li> <li>• Agree that FJMC has a responsibility for monitoring and management. However proponent has responsibility to monitor and will be initiator of action.</li> </ul>	Jim Stevens	Agree. DOT recognizes that with this new highway there are things we need to do that we do not normally do.	
2-	Vic Gilman	James Malone can facilitate setting up a meeting with the working group.	Doug Chiperzak	Next step to talk to TIWG	
3-	Vic Gilman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Members are appointed by the HTC.</li> <li>- Will consult with the HTC once they have a plan</li> <li>- Suggest that an FJMC member attend the TIWG.</li> </ul>	Doug Chiperzak	How does TIWG interact with the FJMC and the HTCs?	
4-			Doug Chiperzak	Want to develop frame work for management	



				plan. Fill in agency responsibilities. ILA can set up rules and regulations on private lands.	
5- Vic Gilman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Get a plan that is approved by the TIWG</li> <li>- Once the plan is approved then can set a time period for monitoring.</li> </ul>				
6-		Doug Chiperzak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to see who does the monitoring after and who funds the monitoring.</li> </ul>		
7- Vic Gilman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FJMC funding is limited</li> <li>- Currently FJMC is fully extended</li> <li>- FJMC works on community recommended initiatives</li> </ul>				
8-		Jim Stevens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently there is no funding for the ITH.</li> <li>- In principle can give a commitment but currently do not have funding. This will be better defined as we go forward.</li> </ul>		
9- Amanda Joynt	ITWG has idea for a plan				
10- Vic Gilman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lake trout is a big concern</li> <li>- No guarantee on support for a plan but feel that it is a good thing to do</li> </ul>				
11- Amanda Joynt	Klaus Ganthner did some predictive modeling on fish in the corridor.				
12- Vic Gilman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have draft Husky lakes management plan</li> <li>- Suggest working with TIWG and getting community endorsement. FJMC will see this as a success.</li> </ul>	Doug Chiperzak	Will be meeting with the HTC's during October-November		



13-		Doug Chipertzak	- Would like to set a timetable to complete the plan	
14- Amanda Joynt	- The TIWG has new members that need to be brought up to speed - I will coordinate to set up a meeting.			
15- Vic Gilman	- Need to produce an increased assessment beyond current one and compare with working group information	Doug Chipertzak	- Can use currently available information	
16- Vic Gilman	- Recognize that access will change fishing pressure on known fisheries and some new fisheries.	Doug Chipertzak	- Could produce a map at the first meeting	
17- Burton Ayles	- FJMC should provide information on what should be in a management plan			
18- Vic Gilman	TIWG recommended to HTC that there be no fishing at Big Lake. Currently this seems to have been listened to.			
19- Amanda Joynt	TIWG - Has been working for 1.5yrs - Tuktoyakutuk has done TK and has maps. - Still waiting on Inuvik maps			
20- Vic Gilman	- FJMC will continue to fund the working group through this process as they have to this date. Building the new plans will require new funds from the developer.			
21-		Jim Stevens	- Could discuss with IRC to put in request to get special/additional implementation funding for this work as a one of	



				project.	
	22-		Doug Chipertzak	- Try to set up a meeting in October-November with the TIWG	
	23- Vic Gilman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project will require monitoring. See this as a shared responsibility in the long term. DOT first period of action.</li> <li>- 1-November get back to each other to see where we are at.</li> <li>- Brian Zytaruk has the highway folder and will stay involved.</li> <li>- FJMC will report to EIRB on the success of this meeting.</li> <li>- Will send joint minutes of this meeting.</li> <li>- Will attend TIWG</li> </ul>	Jim Stevens	Will provide draft minutes for review before joint submission to EIRB	
	24- Brian Zytarik	How are the load design of the bridges determined?	Walter Orr	CL-800 – Designed for largest B train.	
	25- Brian Zytarik	Did you consider offshore development that may use Tuktoyaktuk Harbour?	Doug Chipertzak	Now considering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IOL has not decided yet and will have to go through the whole EA process</li> <li>- CPC is more than 10 years out for Amauligak</li> </ul>	

<b>Summary</b>	<p><b><u>Summary meeting notes for joint submission with FJMC to EIRB.</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- FJMC was happy that the Inuvik to Tuktoyaktuk highway proponent has taken the time to meet with the committee to address the concerns and make some progress on community plans.</li> <li>2- Hydrotechnical report – proponent will provide final report to FJMC next week. Will send pdf version.</li> <li>3- Clarification on creek crossing flow rates and crossing design             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Peak rainfall events drive crossing design</li> <li>b. Minor crossings designed to meet 10 year event without topping</li> <li>c. 100 year event allows for some over topping</li> </ol> </li> <li>4- Hans creek clarification on winter flow rates.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Hans creek has low winter flow rates. You can walk across the creek</li> </ol> </li> <li>5- Clarification on bridge load designs.</li> </ol>
----------------	--



- a. CL 800 – designed for the largest B train.
- 6- Did proponent consider offshore development that may use Tuktoyaktuk Harbour?
  - a. No considering
    - i. IOL has not decided yet on what it will do and will have to go through the whole EA process for their drilling program.
    - ii. ConocoPhillips is in an assessment phase for Amauligak and production is at least 10 years out.
  - b. Subsequently heard that offshore seismic programs are using as barge fuel location
- 7- FJMC
  - a. Concern is with adjacent impacts due to increased access
  - b. Comfortable with for crossing designs
    - i. If with DFO's requirements for mitigation and monitoring of stream crossing are met. Meet these and we will be satisfied
    - ii. This will not satisfy concern with adjacent anticipated impacts to known fish stocks beyond the proponents' defined corridor.
  - c. Need a plan to address adjacent impacts
  - d. Already seeing impacts as a result of road from Tuktoyaktuk to source 177.
  - e. Need monitoring to guarantee that crossing mitigations work
  - f. Proponent to fund Fisheries management planning processes and community based fishing plans
- 8- Inuvik Tuktoyaktuk Working Group
  - a. Concerned about fisheries in regional area. This was not addressed in project EA.
  - b. Want proponent to engage in a monitoring program for a reasonable period of time say 3 years post construction.
  - c. FJMC has a responsibility for monitoring and management. See that proponent has responsibility to monitor as a result of the project selected mitigations. DOT agrees that with this new highway there are things that it needs to do that it would not normally do.
  - d. Next step is for ITH proponent to meet with TIWG. James Malone will facilitate setting up a meeting. Try to get a meeting in October.
  - e. FJMC member will attend meeting to represent FJMC – Brian Zytaruk
  - f. Get a plan that is approved by the TIWG.
  - g. Will consult with HTCs once a plan has been developed.
  - h. Once the plan is approved then set a time period for monitoring
    - i. Need to see who does the monitoring and who funds the monitoring
    - ii. FJMC has limited funds and expects proponent to pay for first three years
    - iii. ITH proponent does not currently have project funds. This will be better defined as project moves forward.
  - i. No guarantee that TIWG will support a plan but FJMC feels this is a good thing to do.
  - j. Resources
    - i. Klaus Gautner did some predictive modeling on fish in the corridor
    - ii. Have draft Husky lakes management plan
  - k. TIWG has been working for 1.5years.
    - i. Tuktoyaktuk has undertaken Traditional knowledge work and has maps
    - ii. Inuvik has undertaken Traditional knowledge work. Waiting on maps.
    - iii. TIWG recommended to HTC that there be no fishing at Big Lake. Currently seems to have been listened to.
  - l. FJMC will continue to fund working group through this process of developing a management



	<p>plan as they have for the last 2 years</p> <p>9- Management plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Proponent wants to develop frame work for the management plan and fill in agency responsibilities</li> <li>b. ILA can set up rules and regulations on private lands</li> <li>c. Suggest working with TIWG and getting community endorsement</li> <li>d. Proponent would like to set time line and schedule to complete the plan.</li> <li>e. Can use currently available information and information from the TIWG. May need to develop this more.</li> <li>f. Recognize that access will change fishing pressure on some known and possibly new fisheries.</li> <li>g. FJMC could provide information on what should be in a management plan</li> <li>h. Plan will require monitoring. See this as a shared responsibility between proponent and FJMC. Likely FJMC would address the needs at the end of the three year period.</li> </ol> <p>10- Followup</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Brian Zytaruk will retain file for FJMC</li> <li>b. 1-November ITH proponent will get back to FJMC on status of work</li> <li>c. FJMC will report the success of this meeting to EIRB</li> <li>d. Will send joint minutes (ITH proponent and FJMC) of this meeting to FJMC.</li> </ol>
<b>Commitments for Follow-up:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hydrotechnical report – proponent will provide final report to FJMC next week. Will send pdf version.</li> <li>2. Set up meetings in October-November</li> <li>3. Report back to FJMC 1- November</li> <li>4. Get information from Amanda – draft Husky lakes management plan and Modeling report.</li> </ol>
<b>Recorded By:</b>	Michael Fabijan and reviewed Vic Gillman (FJMC)

