



## Draft Workplan

Debogorski

Diamond Exploration - Drybones Bay

EA 1112-001

May 10, 2011

## 1 Introduction

On April 14, 2011 the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board referred the land use permit application (MV2011C0002) for diamond exploration operation to the Review Board to conduct an environmental assessment based on the “likelihood that that the proposed development might be a cause for public concern.” The decision was based on the following observations:

- a) The contentious history of other applications in the Drybones Bay area;
- b) The previous recommendation by the Review Board in February 2004 that no new land use permits be issued within the Shoreline Zone and within the Drybones Bay and Wool Bay proper until a plan has been developed;
- c) The Review Board’s most recent statement that the “cumulative cultural impacts [in the Drybones Bay and Wool Bay areas] are at a critical threshold” - Defeat Lake EA February 2008 (Sidon); and
- d) Significant public concern regarding the integrity of the cultural and spiritual values associated with the Drybones Bay area with continued development identified through reviewer comments.

The Debogorski Diamond Exploration project is located 44km south-east of Dettah, the nearest community, and 50km south-east of Yellowknife and N’dilo. The proposed project is within the “Shoreline Zone”<sup>1</sup> of the Drybones Bay area, an area of great cultural importance to the Yellowknives Dene. The proposed project is within the developer’s mineral claim No. K03016 SMITSKI #1, registered on July 7, 2006.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) is subject to the requirements of Part 5 of the MVRMA. It is also subject to the MVEIRB’s *Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines* and the *Rules of Procedure*. Both of these documents are available online at [www.reviewboard.ca](http://www.reviewboard.ca). The definitions of MVRMA s. 111 apply in this document and throughout the EA. Terms not defined in the MVRMA are used in their

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “Shoreline Zone,” as used in the Work Plan, refers to the portion of the subject area found between Wool Bay and Gros Cap within three kilometers of any part of the shore of Great Slave Lake. This is an area with the highest levels of traditional use and the highest density of heritage sites. It is consistent with the area described as the Shoreline Zone in previous Reports of Environment Assessments.

general sense and do not imply specific activities or standards that may be associated with the term in other jurisdictions.

### 3 Scope of Development

The Developer has proposed a diamond exploration project that includes up to ten drill-holes over a five-year period. The first drill-hole location has been identified near the Snowfield Camp; additional locations will be identified depending upon test results. The developer is proposing to drill in both winter and summer seasons. Initial drilling is land based, although future drilling may be based on land, water or both. The developer has proposed that during exploration activities, workers will stay at an existing camp owned by Snowfield and located on the developer's claim block.

The Review Board has determined the scope of development to be that described in Debogorski's application for a land use permit to the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB) which was deemed complete and distributed for preliminary screening on March 3, 2011. The application and additional project information can be accessed on the Review Board's public registry at: [reviewboard.ca/registry/](http://reviewboard.ca/registry/).

### 3 Scope of Assessment

Six Environmental Assessments have previously been conducted in the vicinity of the proposed development: Snowfield Development Corp. (EA03-006); New Shoshoni Ventures (EA03-004); North American General Resources Corp. (EA03-003); Consolidated Goldwin Ventures (EA03-002); Sidon International Resources (EA0506-006); and Consolidated Goldwin Ventures (EA05-006). A vast amount of relevant evidence has been collected throughout these processes about the cultural importance of the Shoreline Zone within which the proposed development is located. The Review Board has considered its past assessments and will incorporate the public record from these six assessments into the public record for the assessment of the proposed Debogorski Diamond Exploration Project. To determine the scope of assessment the Review Board has considered previous evidence and findings for the above noted EAs and additional evidence put forward during the preliminary screening.

The review Board has determined the scope of the issues to be considered in the Environmental Assessment to be as follows:

## ***1. Social and Cultural Issues***

### **1.1 Project Specific Impacts to Heritage Resources and Burial Grounds**

The area surrounding the proposed development is historically important to the Aboriginal people who have used it. Evidence shows that the density of heritage resources along the shoreline where the development is proposed is very high<sup>2</sup> and many heritage resources remain unidentified. The scope of EA includes examination of project specific impacts to heritage resources that may result from the proposed project.

### **1.2 Cumulative Impacts on Traditional Land Use and Culture**

Evidence shows that the area surrounding the proposed development is culturally significant to the Aboriginal people who have historically used, and continue to use the land.<sup>3</sup> The landscape is being cumulatively affected by many different human activities.<sup>4</sup> Aboriginal groups have expressed concern about the cumulative effects of development on their ability to practice and pass on traditional activities. The scope of EA includes cultural impacts from this development in combination with impacts from all other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future development on the landscape.

## ***2. Relevant Measures and Suggestions of Earlier Shoreline Zone Environmental Assessments***

The preliminary screening record indicates public concern about unimplemented mitigation measures and outstanding issues from previous Environmental Assessments conducted for proposed projects in the Shoreline Zone. The scope of EA includes an examination of the status of the relevant measures and suggestions.

---

<sup>2</sup> MVEIRB, EA 0506-005 Consolidated Goldwin Ventures Inc. Mineral Exploration Program, section 6.1.3. November 30, 2007.

<sup>3</sup> Reports of Environmental Assessment and Reasons for Decision for: Snowfield Development Corp. (EA03-006); New Shoshoni Ventures (EA03-004); North American General Resources Corp. (EA03-003); Consolidated Goldwin Ventures (EA03-002); Sidon International Resources (EA0506-006); and Consolidated Goldwin Ventures (EA05-006).

<sup>4</sup> MVEIRB, EA 0506-005 Consolidated Goldwin Ventures Inc. Mineral Exploration Program, section 6.2.8.4 November 30, 2007

## 4 Roles and Responsibilities

This section explains the roles and responsibilities of the Review Board, the Review Board's staff and other parties involved in the Environmental Assessment process.

For a more detailed treatment of roles and responsibilities in the Review Board's environmental impact assessments, please see sections three and four of the Review Board's *Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines*.

### Review Board

The Review Board's role includes the following in relation to this EA:

- Conduct the EA in accordance with ss.126(1) of the MVRMA;
- Determine the scope of the development, in accordance with ss.117 (1) of the MVRMA;
- Consider environmental assessment factors in accordance with ss.117 (2) of the MVRMA;
- Make a determination regarding the environmental impacts or public concern about the development, in accordance with ss.128 (1) of the MVRMA;
- Report to the Federal Minister in accordance with ss.128 (2) of the MVRMA; and,
- Identify areas and extent of effects, within or outside the Mackenzie Valley in which the development is likely to have a significant adverse impact or be a cause of significant public concern, in accordance with ss.128 (4) of the MVRMA.

### Review Board Staff

The Review Board's Executive Director and staff are the primary contacts for the developer, aboriginal groups, government bodies (federal, territorial and municipal), non-government organizations (NGOs), expert advisors (experts contracted directly by the Review Board), the public and other interested parties. This does not limit or preclude the Developer from contacting other parties during in the EA process.

The Review Board may choose to hire expert advisors to provide technical expertise on specific aspects of the EA.

### Developer

The developer is expected to respond in a suitable and timely manner to directions and requests issued by the Review Board. Such requests include but are not necessarily limited to Information Requests, requests for translation of documents, the request for the developer's presence at Public Hearings, and requests to produce public information material.

The developer may present additional information at any time to the Review Board beyond what was requested during the EA process. The Review Board encourages the developer to continue consulting all potentially affected communities and organizations during the EA process. The Review Board may request that the Developer provide a written record verifying consultation, including how the consultations have influenced the design of any part of the development.

### Parties

Aboriginal groups, communities, or land owners that may potentially be affected by the development can obtain standing as "parties". The standing of an individual or organization as a party is subject to approval by the Review Board. Party status gives the party the right to fully participate in the EA. Public interest groups, non-governmental organizations and other interested parties may participate in the EA as parties.

Parties may present information at any time during the EA and may be given an opportunity to submit information requests for Board approval during the analysis and hearing phases. Party status may be granted at any time during the proceedings. Please note, the developer is granted party status in the EA process from the start-up.

### Government Bodies

Government bodies may be involved in the EA process as a regulatory authority as defined in the MVRMA, a Responsible Minister as defined in the MVRMA, a Federal Minister as defined in the MVRMA, or an advisor to the Review Board.

## 5 EA Schedule

The EA proceeding described below emphasizes face-to-face meetings. Following the approval of a final Work Plan the Review Board's staff will conduct an information session in Dettah, accompanied by the developer. The Review Board will provide logistical support for representatives from other potentially affected communities to travel to Dettah for the information session. The main purpose of this session will be for participants to become better informed about the proposed development and to prepare for the public hearing.

Following the information session and in preparation for the public hearing, parties to the EA will be expected to prepare answers to any questions that were asked and remain unanswered at the information session. The Review Board may issue Information Requests depending upon the outcome of the Community Information Session. A pre-hearing conference will be scheduled in Yellowknife two weeks before the Public Hearing, which will also be held in Dettah. Logistical support will once again be offered to representatives of potentially affected communities to travel to Dettah to participate in the Public Hearing. Following the public hearing, the Review Board may ask parties to provide specific additional information (undertakings) in writing based on the hearing proceedings.

Ea Start-up	April/May 2011
Draft Work Plan	May 10, 2011
Comments Due on Draft Work Plan	May 20th
Final Work Plan	May 27th
Community Information Session - Dettah	End of June
Information Exchange	July to Mid-August
Pre-hearing Conference	2 weeks before the Community Hearing Date
Community Hearing	Late August

Undertakings from Hearing (if required)	September
Report of Environmental Assessment	October/November