

Kimberley Cliffe-Phillips

From: Shirley Maaskant [Shirley.Maaskant@paramountres.com]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2004 3:05 PM
To: Kimberley Cliffe-Phillips
Cc: Jody Irish
Subject: Fwd: GNWT Questions



GNWT
Questions.doc

Kim

These are the questions that GNWT was going to have their biologist respond to in writing (as noted in the Hearing). I assume you will forward these to Gavin. Thanks.

>>> "Johannesen, Daryl" <Daryl_Johannesen@golder.com> 2/20/2004 2:51:12 PM >>>
Shirley:

Please see attached. Slight changes made for clarification.

DJ

Associate, Manager Oil and Gas
Golder Associates Ltd.
Calgary, Alberta
tel: (403) 299-5613
email: daryl_johannesen@golder.com <mailto:daryl_johannesen@golder.com>

This e-mail transmission is confidential and may contain proprietary information for the express use of the intended recipient. Any use, distribution or copying of this transmission, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. Electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration, and incompatibility. Accordingly, the electronic media version of any work product may not be relied upon.

1. Paramount was asked earlier, if they had identified critical boreal caribou habitat. Can you confirm that the GNWT is responsible for the recovery strategy and the identification of critical boreal caribou habitat in the NWT?
2. The GNWT has referred to several instances of caribou data. I'm wondering if they could provide Paramount with caribou data related to Cameron Hills, including any collaring efforts undertaken, within the Cameron Hills?
3. GNWT states that Paramount used habitat modelling but that the model did not include a wide enough range of habitats. Considering that Paramount used RWED data on habitat vegetation classification and mapped all of the habitat types within the cumulative effects study area, could you please indicate which habitat types that we did not consider?
4. On one of the slides we received on the registry it noted that the rating of high for indirect habitat loss may be an underestimate given the uncertainties about a zone of influence. We're just looking for a clarification as to how we could have rated that higher.
5. There was a statement made about line spacing, 3-D seismic program buffering to two hundred and fifty (250) metres that would effectively reduce an area in the southern portion of the SDL to zero habitat effectiveness. Considering the evidence that was presented in the DAR and what was discussed today, I'm wondering if you could provide some support for the fact that suggests that habitat next to seismic lines, particularly low impact seismic, is effectively reducing habitat to zero.
6. GNWT suggests that the buffering of the seismic lines should be two hundred and fifty (250) metres and that no habitat for caribou exists in that buffer. We'd like some clarification with the application of the scientific information in the peer reviewed document by Mr. Dyer, 1999 and how that would conflict with the DAR's methodology, where indeed we do not use an average weighting for the zone of influence but use a conservative approach.
7. Would the GNWT recognize that the avoidance type cutting that we've done on our seismic project is indeed different from conventional cutting, and as it applies to the Dyer report?
8. Paramount would be interested to see their seismic lines that are extending to the north out of the SDL into the moose habitat that Deb is referring to?
9. I'm just wondering if the GNWT could elaborate on the consideration of the cut line use related to human activity and the effect that that has on caribou, recognizing the fact that seismic lines have not been shown to be buffers, and that indeed it is roads, that act as semi-permeable barriers to caribou movement and how that is related to the two hundred and fifty (250) metre buffer and how that pertains to any discrepancies between GNWT's concerns and the information provided in the DAR?
10. The information provided in the DAR took a very clear, transparent approach to the zones of influence in caribou habitat. Again, recognizing the scientific data presented by a very recognized paper by Dyer, 1999, Mr. More's comments just stated that they've noticed that caribou may be avoiding some cut lines, which would suggest to us that they are using the habitat in association with those seismic lines. Therefore, I'm just wondering what consideration the use around seismic lines is, in response to human disturbance?
11. Mr. More made reference to a biologist knowing threshold levels of three (3) kilometres per kilometre squared of cut lines, precluding caribou use. I'm just wondering, I'm familiar with some literature, could you comment on whether or not, this is peer reviewed or is it a target, considering that some jurisdictions dealing with caribou habitat at the present time, are reluctant to discuss thresholds?