

Community Scoping Meetings: Draft EIS Terms of Reference
Inuvik: October 13, 2010

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
General	Meeting attendees asked questions and raised comments about the necessity of the road.	<i>The Terms of Reference should request clarification of the purpose of the road.</i>	Section 5.2
		In response to the Developer's statement that Tuktoyaktuk has requested a road for 50 years, a meeting participant commented that ... <i>some of the Elders in Tuktoyaktuk did not want this road 50 years ago.</i>	Section 5.2
		<i>The government wants to build the road so that it will be easier for industry.</i>	Section 5.2
		<i>I thought that the people from Tuk wouldn't want the road as much, because there are less people there and now there will be more.</i>	Section 5.2
		<i>I agree with his comments. People who want the road have money in their eyes and they have always had money in their eyes. The road will cause many problems.</i>	Section 5.2
		<i>There is division among people who want the road and don't want the road.</i>	Section 5.2

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
Consultation Process	Meeting attendees asked questions and raised comments about the consultation process with communities.	<p><i>How many times will the EIRB consult with the communities?</i></p> <p>The EIRB representative provided a response, and clarified that separate roles of the EIRB, the ILA, and the Developer.</p> <p>A representative from the ILA provided a response regarding the community meetings that the ILA will conduct.</p>	
		<p><i>Are you consulting with people who have cabins along the route? With landowners?</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response.</p>	
		<i>You need to consult with everyone who has a cabin.</i>	
		<i>You should have the HTC's identify the cabins and locations.</i>	
		<i>More advertising, and better advertising, is needed for these meetings, so that people would know when to attend as the road is a big project. Cable TV, radio, paper, facebook, etc could all be used.</i>	
		<i>There should be a joint meeting with Tuktoyaktuk and Inuvik, so that we are aware of concerns and perspectives and so that we can discuss these with each other.</i>	

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
		<i>You need to have separate meetings with the Elders in each of Inuvik and Tuktoyaktuk, and you need to have workshops that include both Inuvik and Tuktoyaktuk.</i>	
		<i>Contractors should not be included in the community meetings.</i> The EIRB representative responded, and clarified the roles between the EIRB and the Developer representatives.	
Routing: Preferred Route	Questions were asked regarding term “preferred route”.	<i>You refer to “preferred route”, but preferred according to who?</i> The EIRB representative provided a response, and clarified that it was the Developer’s preferred route.	Section 6.1, 7.2
	Questions and comments were raised asking why and how the preferred route was selected.	<i>The area selected for the preferred route may take more money for road maintenance. The preferred route is not preferable, in my opinion.</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2
	Meeting attendees asked questions about the differences in terrain between the proposed route and the Dempster Highway.		Section 6.1, 7.2 Section 10.1.1
Routing: Upland Route	Meeting attendees asked questions and voiced their opinions of the upland route.	<i>How was the upland route selected? Isn’t that the result of the upland route, that it’s based on people’s feedback?</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
		The Developer provided a response.	
		<p><i>For the upland route, even if it's not the safest, your engineers would design it so that there is signage on it, for hills, speed limits, etc.</i></p> <p><i>It might also be the shorter route.</i></p>	Section 6.1, 7.2
Routing: Other	Meeting attendees proposed alternate routing options.	<i>Maybe Inuvik should draw up their preferred route, around Parsons Lake.</i>	Section 6.1, 7.2
Project Cost and Funding	Comments were raised in response to information from the developer regarding the cost of the Upland Route.	<p><i>With the cost of the upland route, that would actually generate jobs to create it, and would create more jobs to maintain it from the Tuk side.</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response.</p>	Section 6.3
Land Use Impacts	Several comments were raised regarding the impact of the road on land use.	<p><i>I have used the area for my traditional harvesting, I have a cabin in the area. I use the area for fishing and hunting geese. The area is very sensitive to disturbance. There are a lot of fish in the Hans Bay area and in many of the creeks. I used to hunt caribou before the ban. The road [2009 route] is proposed to go 1-2 km from my cabin. I also have a cabin on one of your major gravel sources near Parsons Lake. I don't know how you're going to address taking away the peacefulness of the place, it is a spiritual place, and there are wolf, wolverines, grizzly bears, etc. There will be traffic,</i></p>	Section 10.2.8, 10.2.9 (Other Section 10)

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
		<p><i>noise, pollution, garbage, oil spills, etc. I know it will be easier to go to the camps and all, but I think it is too important an area.</i></p> <p>The EIRB Staff member will follow up with the HTC to determine the specific locations of cabins. It was also stated that the ILA has registered cabins mapped.</p> <p>In response to these concerns, the EIRB representative asked whether there was a route that the meeting participant preferred. The meeting participant replied that no route was preferred.</p>	
		<p><i>I have the same concerns. I think you could do it so that it doesn't go so near to Parsons Lake. For the future users of the land, this route is wrong. People have cabins in this area for a reason.</i></p>	
		<p><i>Putting a road in the area [around Parsons Lake] cuts through the heart of very important habitat, and goes against the caribou protection/ban, it defeats the purpose of the hunting ban. Putting a road in there will have a very significant impact on our harvesting, our wildlife, our way of life. It is serious business when you take something like that away from people.</i></p>	<p>Section 10.2.8, 10.2.9 (Other Section 10)</p>

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
Fish Impacts	Comments were raised about fish sampling.	<i>Last summer, we did sampling on a creek that ran north-south (parallel to road), but where it crossed the road, there wasn't water, and we couldn't sample. We tested for fish in a different place.</i> The Developer provided a response.	Section 10.1.6
	Concerns were raised about over-fishing, and conflict between different groups.	<i>What caught my attention on the proposed route is that there are a lot of prime fishing areas along the route. From what we've experienced in the past, there is going to be conflict on fishing, and a lot of over-fishing and people fishing without licences. The government never has enough money to enforce or monitor. To me, the bad outweighs the good of the road.</i>	
Tourism and Socioeconomic Impacts	Comments were raised regarding increased tourism and increased access and impacts to Husky Lakes.	<i>You can't always keep an eye on tourists and their access to Husky Lakes; there are concerns about pollution of Husky Lakes and commercialization of Husky Lakes.</i>	Section 10.2.9
Management and Monitoring: General	Meeting attendees raised comments and suggestions for management of impacts and monitoring potential impacts of the road.	<i>There needs to be a working group to create mitigation measures prior to building the road</i>	Section 13
		<i>There need to be mitigation measures in place, prior to building the road, as the area proposed is pristine.</i>	

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
		<p><i>There needs to be buffers and restrictions in place. Before this road is built, mitigations and management measures need to be in place.</i></p> <p><i>Partnerships could be created to monitor and manage the impacts of the road.</i></p>	
		<p><i>There needs to be a mechanism in place for providing public input. For example, every 5-10 years, the public and communities can voice their concerns about the road and identify where things have changed, how the road is affecting the land.</i></p>	
Management and Monitoring: Land Use		<p><i>There needs to be feedback from cabin owners on the impacts of the road, and some compensation in place.</i></p>	
Management and Monitoring: Wildlife		<p><i>The area may need more wildlife officers to mitigate wildlife habitat loss and wildlife harvesting.</i></p>	
Management and Monitoring: Fish		<p><i>You will need to impose new fishing regulations.</i></p>	
Management and Monitoring: Tourism		<p><i>Is this a road or a highway?</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response.</p> <p><i>Will there be monitors on the road? There will be more tourists with motor homes that may dump their effluent.</i></p>	

Topic	Overall Questions and Comments	Specific Questions and Comments	Addressed in ToR Section
		<p><i>They will need dumping stations.</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response.</p>	
	<p>Meeting attendees suggested ways to manage tourists using the road, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Signing in at each end. 2. Pulling over allowed only at specific locations. 	<p><i>You have a weigh station on the airport road, could you have a weigh scale/station at Inuvik, at the start of the highway? You could also use it as a place to check fish licenses.</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response.</p>	
		<p><i>Could you monitor by writing down the license plates and walkie-talkie these to the other end?</i></p>	
		<p><i>You should monitor where people pullover, and make specific areas where they are allowed to pullover.</i></p> <p>The Developer provided a response. To date there are no areas identified.</p>	
Review Process	Questions were asked about who will decide on the road and the selected route.	The EIRB representative provided a response to clarify the review process.	
		<p><i>Ultimately, are you doing a vote on the road? You could do a petition.</i></p> <p>The EIRB representative provided a response.</p>	

