Government of Northwest Territories

CONNECTING TO OPPORTUNITIES

Mount Gaudet Access Road Construction Project

Engagement Plan

Government of the Northwest Territories – Department of Infrastructure

August 2020

Plan Maintenance and Control

The Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) Department of Infrastructure (INF) is responsible for the distribution, maintenance and updating of this Engagement Plan.

The Engagement Plan will be updated annually and distributed as required. Potential changes that trigger updates could include the following:

- Changed phone numbers, names of individuals
- Changes to the Project design or execution
- New regulatory applications or amendments to existing authorizations
- Changes to the Affected Parties
- Changes to the engagement methods
- Guidance from the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB)

Plan updates will be issued and distributed to each of the parties identified on the Engagement Plan distribution list.

Engagement Plan Document History

Version #	Section(s) Revised	Description of Revision	Prepared by	Issue Date
0	Not applicable	Original version	INF	August 2020

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Abbreviations

GNWT	Government of the Northwest Territories
ENR	GNWT Department of Environment and Natural Resources
IGOs	Indigenous Government Organizations
INF	Department of Infrastructure
km	kilometre
MGAR	Mount Gaudet Access Road
MVLWB	Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board
MVWR	Mackenzie Valley Winter Road
Project	Mount Gaudet Access Road Construction Project
PWNHC	Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Center

1 Introduction

The Government of the Northwest Territories (GNWT) Department of Infrastructure (INF) has prepared this Engagement Plan for the Mount Gaudet Access Road (MGAR) construction project (the Project). The purpose of the Engagement Plan is to:

- Confirm that the Affected Parties understand the Project
- Provide an avenue for feedback on issues of concern on the Project
- Build relationships between INF and Affected Parties

As part of the Project planning process, INF has initiated engagement activities with Indigenous government organizations (IGOs), the public, and regulatory authorities. Each of the engagement activities completed have been documented in the Engagement Summary and Engagement Log, provided in Appendices A and B, respectively. While MGAR construction will be completed by the selected contractor for the Project, responsibility for engagement rests with INF.

This Engagement Plan has been developed in accordance with the Engagement and Consultation Policy developed by the MVLWB (MVLWB 2018a) as well as the Engagement Guidelines for Applicants and Holders of Water Licenses and Land Use Permits (MVLWB 2018b).

2 Project Description

The purpose of the Project is to provide year-round access to the Mount Gaudet Quarry, creating employment, training, and business opportunities for the community of Wrigley. When constructed, the MGAR will consist of a 21 kilometre (km) all-season access road extending from the end of Highway 1 (located south of Wrigley) to a proposed quarry (Mount Gaudet Quarry). With the exception of one area at Hodgson Creek, the MGAR will follow the existing alignment for the Mackenzie Valley Winter Road (MVWR). Due to the potential construction of a new bridge at Hodgson Creek, a portion of the road may deviate up to 2.77 km east of the MVWR.

The MGAR is located within Pehdzéh Kį́ N'deh, the traditional territory of the Pehdzéh Kį́ First Nation (PKFN) and is located entirely on territorial and commissioner's land.

The Project will require a Type "A" Land Use Permit (LUP) and a Type "B" Water Licence (WL) from the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB).

3 Project Contacts

Primary GNWT Contact
Sonya Saunders
Director
Strategic Infrastructure
Department of Infrastructure
Government of the Northwest Territories
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife NT X1A 2L9
Telephone 867.767.9081 x31025
Email sonya_saunders@gov.nt.ca

Alternate GNWT Contact
Joe Acorn
Manager, Mackenzie Valley Highway Project
Strategic Infrastructure
Department of Infrastructure
Government of the Northwest Territories
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife NT X1A 2L9
Telephone 867.767.9081 x31029
Email joe_acorn@gov.nt.ca

4 Engagement Goals

This Engagement Plan was developed to support meaningful, inclusive engagement throughout the life of the Project. The overarching goals of engagement (for all stages of the Project) are to:

- Proactively develop relationships with affected IGOs and maintain these relationships throughout the Project through regular communications.
- Use open, honest and transparent ways of communication.
- Inform parties about the proposed development, location and schedule of Project activities and update parties regularly about the current status and anticipated changes to the Project.
- Develop procedures for all Affected Parties by which concerns, or issues can be raised, and maintain a record of these issues and concerns.
- Through a collaborative, transparent process, develop solutions to concerns and issues from Affected Parties and record these.
- Develop a process that shows how input and concerns received may result in modifications to the Project.

5 Affected Parties

Engagement will focus on those parties that are likely to be directly affected by the Project including each of the communities, affected IGOs, other potential parties and relevant regulatory authorities.

Engagement with IGOs under this Plan will be focused on groups with established, asserted, and/or traditional territories overlapping with the Project.

IGOs with established, asserted, and/or traditional territories overlapping with the Project, and those that will be most directly affected due to their proximity to the Project include:

- Pehdzéh Kį First Nation
- Dehcho First Nations
- Fort Simpson Métis Nation
- Łíídlıį Kúé First Nation

INF will also engage with the other Dehcho Interim Measures Agreement signatories, though these groups are farther away from the Project and less likely to be directly affected by it. These groups include:

- Fort Providence Métis Council
- Jean Marie River First Nation
- Deh Gáh Got'ıe First Nation
- Ka'a'gee Tu First Nation
- West Point First Nation
- Sambaa K'e First Nation
- Nahanni Butte Dene Band
- Kátł'odeeche First Nation
- Acho Dene Koe First Nation

The Affected Parties to be engaged are listed in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1 List of Affected Parties

Organization	Contact Name	Contact Information
IGOs		
Pehdzéh Kį First Nation	Chief Maurice Moses	P.O. Box 56 Wrigley, NT X0E 1E0 Phone: 867-581-3321 Fax: 867-581-3229 Email: pkfn2017chiefmoses@outlook.com
Dehcho First Nations	Grand Chief Gladys Norwegian	P.O. Box 89 Fort Simpson, NT X0E 0N0 Phone: 867-695-2610 Fax: 867-695-2038 Email: gladys_norwegian@dehcho.org
Fort Simpson Métis Nation	President Danny Peterson	P.O. Box 408 Fort Simpson, NT X0E 0N0

Organization	Contact Name	Contact Information
		Phone: 867-695-2431 Fax: 867-695-2040 Email: metisnation52@northwestel.net
Łíídlıį Kų́ę́ First Nation	Chief Gerald Antoine	P.O. Box 469 Fort Simpson, NT X0E 0N0 Phone: 867-695-3131 Fax: 867-695-2665 Email: chief@liidliikue.com
Fort Providence Métis Council	President Clifford McLeod	P.O. Box 319 Fort Providence, NT X0E 0L0 Phone: 867-699-4320 Fax: 867-699-4319 Email: fpmcpres@northwestel.net
Jean Marie River First Nation	Chief Stanley Sanguez	General Delivery Jean Marie River, NT X0E 0N0 Phone: 867-809-2000 Fax: 867-809-2002 Email: chief@jmrfn.com
Deh Gáh Got'ıe First Nation	Chief Joachim Bonnetrouge	P.O. Box 200 Fort Providence, NT X0E 0L0 Phone: 867-699-7000 Fax: 867-699-3134 Email: chief@dehgahgotie.ca
Ka'a'gee Tu First Nation	Chief Lloyd Chicot	P.O. Box 4428 Hay River, NT X0E 1G3 Phone: 867-825-2000 Fax: 867-825-2002 Email: kaageetu_chief@northwestel.net
West Point First Nation	Chief Kenny Cayen	1-47031 Mackenzie Highway Hay River, NT X0E 0R9 Phone: 867-874-6677 Fax: 867-874-2486 Email: chief@wpfn.ca
Sambaa K'e First Nation	Chief Dolphus Jumbo	P.O. Box 10 Sambaa k'e, NT X0E 1Z0 Phone: 867-206-2800

Organization	Contact Name	Contact Information
		Fax: 867-206-2828 Email: chief@sambaakefn.com
Nahanni Butte Dene Band	Chief Darrel Betsaka	General Delivery Nahanni Butte, NT X0E 0N0 Phone: 867-602-2900 Fax: 867-602-2910 Email: Chief.nbdb@gmail.com
Kátł'odeeche First Nation	Chief April Martel	P.O. Box 3060 Hay River, NT X0E 1G4 Phone: 867-874-6701 Fax: 867-874-3229 Email: kfnchief@katlodeeche.com
Acho Dene Koe First Nation	Chief Eugene Hope	General Delivery Fort Liard NT X0G 0A0 Phone: 867-770-4571 ext 265 Fax: 867-770-4573 Email: chief@adkfirstnation.ca
Affected Communities		
Wrigley	Chief Maurice Moses	P.O. Box 56 Wrigley, NT X0E 1E0 Phone: 867-581-3321 Fax: 867-581-3229 Email: pkfn2017chiefmoses@outlook.com
Village of Fort Simpson	Mayor Sean Whelly	PO Box 315 Fort Simpson, NT X0E 0N0 Phone: 867-695-2253 Fax: 867-695-2005 Email: swhelly@northwestel.net
Co-Management/Regulatory Authorities and Additional Stakeholders		
Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board (MVLWB)		P.O Box 2130 4922 - 48th Street Yellowknife, NT X1A 2P6 Phone: 867-669-0506 Fax: 867-873-6610
Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada		520 Exmouth Street Sarnia, ON N7T 8B1

Organization	Contact Name	Contact Information
		Phone: 866-290-3731 Fax: 519-464-5128 Email: info@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Natural Resources Canada (NRCAN)		4th Floor, Greenstone Building 5101 50th Avenue, Room 410 PO Box 668 Yellowknife, NT X1A 2N5 Telephone: 867-766-8530 Fax: 867-766-8533
Government of the Northwest Territories – Lands	Melanie Williams, Director, Lands Administration	PO Box 1320 Yellowknife, NT X1A 2L9 Phone: 867-767-9184 ext. 24090 Melanie_Williams@gov.nt.ca
Government of the Northwest Territories – Prince of Wales Northern Heritage Centre	Glen MacKay, Territorial Archaeologist	PO Box 1320 Yellowknife, NT X1A 2L9 Phone: 867-767-9347 ext. 71251 Glen_MacKay@gov.nt.ca
Aurora College	Education and Training Division	PO Box 1290 Fort Smith, NT X0E 0P0 Phone: (867) 872-7019 or (867) 872-7580

6 Engagement Methods

INF will employ a number of methods to engage Affected Parties, depending on the nature and/or urgency of the information to be communicated. Methods that may be employed at different stages of the Project are summarized below. Communication will predominantly occur in English; however, INF will offer translation into Indigenous languages upon request wherever the associated resources (such as translators) are available.

The following sections differentiate between written and verbal (including face-to-face) communications. Table 7-1 and Table 7-2 provide an overview of engagement triggers and communication approaches.

6.1 Written Communications

Written communications will primarily be used as a method to inform parties about Project activities or plans. Written communications can be an effective method for the distribution of Project information. Written communications methods can be further divided into the two categories:

- Direct communications (i.e., e-mail, faxes and/or letters) addressed directly to the Affected Party.
- Indirect communications (i.e., newsletters, news releases, website, and social media) through which information can be made available to those who choose to access it.

Written communications can take several forms as indicated below.

6.1.1 E-mail, Faxes, and/or Letters

E-mail will be used to contact parties to provide Project information, arrange for teleconferences or meetings or for routine communications. When e-mail is not available or easily accessible by Affected Parties, faxes and/or letters delivered by post may be used. Representatives of Affected Parties will be updated if contact information changes (Table 5-1).

Letters (sent electronically, by fax or by mail) will be directly addressed to the Affected Party and objectives will be clearly stated. Follow-up communication will occur, in most cases, via phone call (see Section 6.2.1).

6.1.2 Fact Sheets/Newsletters

Fact sheets or newsletters may be issued to report on past activities, announce upcoming activities, and generally communicate MGAR issues or initiatives. Fact sheets are not intended to replace the direct written communications (e-mail, fax and letter). They are intended as an additional information source that may or may not be accessed by the members of the Affected Parties.

6.1.3 News Releases/ Posters/Public Advertisements

News releases, posters, and public advertisements may be issued to announce significant milestones, communicate upcoming activities or in response to events. News releases are not intended to replace the direct written communications (e-mail, fax and letter). They are intended as an additional information source that may or may not be accessed by the members of the Affected Parties.

6.1.4 Website

The MGAR website will provide highlights and status updates on the Project. The current website address is **https://www.inf.gov.nt.ca/en/MGAR**. The website is not intended to replace the direct written communications (e-mail, fax and letter). It is intended as an additional information source that may or may not be accessed by the members of the Affected Parties.

6.1.5 Social Media

The GNWT Facebook and Twitter accounts (including future forms of social media) can be used to provide immediate notification of updates and can provide the public with an additional information source. Social media are not intended to replace the direct written communications (e-

mail, fax and letter). They are intended as an additional information source that may or may not be accessed by members of the Affected Parties.

6.2 Verbal Communications

Verbal communications allow for focused presentation of information, immediate feedback, interactive discussion and problem solving. Verbal communications would typically be used when there is a need to present and discuss high priority issues and/or immediate feedback is desired.

6.2.1 Telephone Calls/Teleconferences

Telephone calls or teleconferences with affected parties are an efficient method of communicating information quickly and receiving feedback from parties on an individual basis. Teleconferences can be organized to engage more than one party in the discussion, enabling a variety of perspectives to be presented and discussed collectively. Telephone calls will also be placed after written materials are sent to confirm receipt and follow up on any immediate questions or concerns by the Affected Party.

6.2.2 Meetings

Face-to-face meetings with the Affected Party can be more effective than telephone calls or teleconferences, as participants typically commit more time and visual aids can be used more effectively. Meetings will be held with the appropriate representatives as identified by the Affected Party. Interpretation may be provided if required and follow-up communications will be distributed after the meeting (to summarize the outcome and determine next steps). As face-to-face meetings require far more resources, planning, and time commitments by all parties, their use should reflect the importance of the issue.

Meetings will also be held with the public. These meetings will be open to everyone in the community. The advantage of public meetings is that participants all hear the same information and may benefit from participating in discussions among various organizations or perspectives. In such cases, it is important to provide an inclusive setting in which attendees feel comfortable about participating, regardless of their perspective. If required, interpretation will be provided.

All comments, concerns and input received during these meetings will be recorded and included in the Engagement Record. Public meeting records will list comments and concerns raised but will not attribute those comments and concerns to individuals.

6.2.3 Regional Offices

The GNWT's Regional Offices are available for residents to provide comments and concerns, or to ask questions regarding the GNWT's activities on their own accord and at their own discretion. Often, copies of proposed works or activities are available at the local GNWT office as a resource for the local community. As a result of the GNWT's open lines of communication, well-established relationships have been built with the people and communities of the Northwest Territories.

The INF Regional Office in Fort Simpson will be available as an additional source of information on this Project.

6.2.4 Workshops and Working Groups

Workshops may be used when information needs to be shared with a large number of people or if technical issues arise that require a deep understanding from Affected Parties. INF will offer translation services during workshops. Workshop outcomes will be documented and made available to the participants and included in the Engagement Record. Key deliverables which will be made available to workshop participants include:

- agenda
- meeting notes
- participant list
- presentations
- action items
- follow-up notes

6.3 Issues Management

For engagement to be successful, parties must have an opportunity to be informed, provide input and be confident that their input is being considered. This requires that issues raised by the parties are documented, tracked and a response provided. INF will manage issues raised during engagement as follows:

- Issues raised will be documented in meeting records which will be made available to the parties involved.
- INF will maintain an Engagement Record which will identify issues raised, the party raising the issue, and the response provided by INF.
- Issues raised will be logged in an electronic database along with any commitments and the status of these commitments where applicable.

To succinctly summarize the issues management process described above, INF will use a Project-specific Engagement Record.

7 Engagement Plan

Engagement will be documented for both pre-submission engagement and during the life of the Project in accordance with the Engagement Guidelines for Applicants and Holders of Water Licenses and Land Use Permits (MVLWB 2018b).

Table 7-1 and Table 7-2 illustrate triggers to engagement during the Project. Table 7-1 includes the various engagement triggers associated with regulatory applications, and Table 7-2 includes triggers associated with road construction. INF may amend proposed engagement activities in response to changes in schedule, direction from the Affected Parties, or due to unforeseen events.

Table 7-1 Engagement Triggers and Methods for Water Licence and Land Use Permit Applications

Engagement Trigger	Primary Purpose	Primary Methods
Pre-application engagement (including renewals)	Develop relationships and to understand and address concerns of Affected Parties	Written notification Verbal communication (via phone and in person)
Permit application submission (including renewals) with the MVLWB	Dissemination of information of Affected Parties to allow for input	Written notification
Receipt of Water Licence and Land Use Permit applications	To inform Affected Parties that work may be initiated	Written notification
Any extensions, modifications or amendments to the existing permits or licences to allow for change in work plan or scope	Inform stakeholders of changes to planned activities and additional activities that were not previously communicated	Written notification Verbal communication if requested
Any other time as required by the parties or MVLWB	Dissemination of information to Affected Parties to allow for input	Written notification Verbal communication if requested
Application for any other permit or authorization that requires engagement	To share information with Affected Parties and to allow for input	Written notification

Table 7-2 Engagement Triggers and Methods during Construction

Engagement Trigger	Primary Purpose	Primary Methods
Selection of Project Contractor	To inform Affected Parties of the successful proponent	Written notification
Prior to commencing operations/construction	Discuss timing and any specific issues crews may face with operations/construction	Written notification
Occurrence of a spill	Inform regulators and communities as required by authorizations	Written notification (including NWT Spill Report Line)
Incident/wildlife incident	Inform appropriate regulating authorities and other stakeholders if required	Written notification (including ENR wildlife emergency number or big game vehicle collision

Engagement Trigger	Primary Purpose	Primary Methods
		number)
Discovery of suspected archaeological, historical or burial site	Inform regulator, PWNHC, and communities/IGOs as required by authorizations	Written notification (including to the PWNHC Territorial Archaeologist)
Once the MGAR is open and ready for public use	To advise interested parties of the road opening	Written notification
Any other time as required by the respective IGOs or the MVLWB	Dissemination of information of Affected Parties to allow for input	Written notification

7.1 Engagement Record

In accordance with MVLWB guidance, the Engagement Record will include an Engagement Summary describing each engagement undertaken in relation to the Project and an Engagement Log which will provide more detailed information on individual communications. A summary of the contents of the Engagement Record and the Engagement Log are provided below:

- **Engagement Summary:** Summary of engagement with each Affected Party. This would include the names of each participant, date(s) of engagement, reasons for engagement, overview of the issues resolved and/or unresolved.
- **Engagement Log:** A detailed account of all engagement activities. This would include the date, parties attending, engagement activity type, issues raised by Affected Party, recommendations provided by the Affected Party, and proponent response. The log will also include any information materials provided with the Affected Party (e.g. presentations), as well as any meeting minutes recorded.

7.2 Reporting

The GNWT will report annually on engagement activities undertaken, participants, issues raised and how they have been addressed by submitting an updated chronological engagement log to the MVLWB and Affected Parties.

INF will develop and maintain an electronic database of all communications related to engagement on the MGAR Project. This database will be designed to store information on issues raised during engagements, the GNWT's response to issues raised, and any commitments made during engagements. The database will also be used to generate Engagement Records which will be submitted to the MVLWB.

8 References

MVLWB (Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board). 2018a. Engagement and Consultation Policy. https://mvlwb.com/sites/default/files/mvlwb_engagement_and_consultation_policy_-_nov_25_19.pdf.

MVLWB. 2018b. Engagement Guidelines for Applicants and Holders of Water Licenses and Land Use Permits. https://mvlwb.com/sites/default/files/mvlwb_engagement_guidelines_for_holders_of_lups_and_wls_-_october_2_19.pdf.

Appendix A

MGAR Engagement Summary

Pre-submission Engagement Summary

Name of Proponent: Government of the Northwest Territories – Department of Infrastructure (GNWT – INF)

Name of Affected Party: Pehdzéh Kį First Nation (PKFN)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Maurice Moses PKFN John Dempsey, SAO, PKFN Rose Moses SAO, PKFN Oleg Skywolf SAO, PKFN Sharon Pellissey, Lands Director, PKFN Community of Wrigley/PKFN PKFN Band Council	October 26th, 2017 - Present	Pre-submission engagement prior to the submission of regulatory package for the Mount Gaudet Access Road (MGAR) (the Project)	Draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) established between PKFN and GNWT to clarify how the two parties will work together on the Project INF and PKFN discussed arrangements for Heavy Equipment Operator (HEO) and other training for the community of Wrigley Wrigley Training Committee established, with representatives from PKFN and the GNWT departments of ECE, ITI, Aurora College, and INF. TK summary prepared by INF based on previous information from the MVH. Document reviewed and accepted by PKFN. Identification of moose pasture area of interest through helicopter survey conducted by two INF staff accompanied by	Official signing of MOU still pending. Date of HEO training still to be confirmed.

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
			two PKFN representatives. Pasture determined to be outside proposed Project boundaries PKFN acceptance of Project Description Report (PDR) to be submitted to the MVLWB	

Name of Affected Party: Dehcho First Nations (DFN)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Gladys Norwegian DFN Jackson McDermot Executive Assistant to Grand Chief, DFN	May 14th, 2019 June 30th, 2020	Pre-submission engagement prior to the submission of regulatory package for the Mount Gaudet Access Road (MGAR) (the Project)	No issues raised	No response on draft PDR sent out by INF.

Name of Affected Party: Łíídlıı̨ Kų́ę́ First Nation (LKFN)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Gerald Antoine LKFN LKFN Band Council	May 14th, 2019 January 26th, 2020 June 30th, 2020	Pre-submission engagement prior to the submission of regulatory package for the Mount Gaudet Access Road (MGAR) (the Project)	Agreement that LKFN supports the Project as long as PKFN does.	No response on draft PDR sent out by INF.

Name of Affected Party: Fort Simpson Métis Nation (FSMN)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
President Danny Peterson FSMN	January 26th, 2020 June 30th, 2020	Pre-submission engagement prior to the submission of regulatory package for the Mount Gaudet Access Road (MGAR) (the Project)	No issues raised	No response on draft PDR sent out by INF.

Name of Affected Party: Village of Fort Simpson (VOFS)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Sean Whelly, Mayor of Fort Simpson Darrell White, SAO, Village of Fort Simpson VOFS Town Council	February 28th, 2019 January 28th, 2020 May 26th, 2020 June 4th, 2020 June 30th, 2020	Pre-submission engagement prior to the submission of regulatory package for the Mount Gaudet Access Road (MGAR) (the Project)	VOFS stated that they continue to support the MGAR and all measures that would be required in order to advance this Project. Conditional letter of support from VOFS regarding the acceptance of waste from the MGAR Project.	Additional details on anticipated waste volumes from the MGAR and the start and end dates for the required waste disposal need to be determined and provided to VOFS. Official authorization for the use of FS landfill for the MGAR will need to be arranged between the selected MGAR contractor and VoFS. Comments not yet received on draft PDR sent out by INF.

Name of Affected Party: Acho Dene Koe First Nation (ADKFN)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Eugene Hope ADKFN	June 30th, 2020	INF sent ADKFN a letter updating them on the status of the MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.	Confirmed receipt the Project update and PDR Summary that was sent by INF, and said that they would be in touch if they had any questions on the Project. No further responses were received from ADKFN	No issues raised

Name of Affected Party: Deh Gáh Got'ıe First Nation (DGGFN)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Joachim Bonnetrouge DGGFN	June 30th, 2020	INF sent DGGFN a letter updating them on the status of the MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.	DGG said that if PKFN has no concerns about the Project, then DGGFN would be in support as well.	None

Name of Affected Party: Fort Providence Métis Council

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
President Clifford McLeod Fort Providence Métis Council	June 30th, 2020	INF sent Fort Providence Métis Council a letter updating them on the status of the MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.	None.	No response received on PDR.

Name of Affected Party: Jean Marie River First Nation (JMRFN)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Stanley Sanguez JMRFN	June 30th, 2020	INF sent JMRFN a letter updating them on the status of the MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.	JMRFN acceptance of PDR to be sent to MVLWB. JMRFN interested in seeing MGAR generate jobs for Jean Marie River residents, which INF said was a likely possibility. JMRFN said they supported the Project as long as PKFN did.	None

Name of Affected Party: Ka'a'gee Tu First Nation

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Lloyd Chicot Ka'a'gee Tu First Nation	June 30th, 2020	INF sent Ka'a'gee Tu a letter updating them on the status of the MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.	None	No response received on PDR.

Name of Affected Party: Nahanni Butte Dene Band (NBDB)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Darrel Betsaka NBDB	June 30th, 2020	INF sent NBDB a letter updating them on the status of the MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.	No issues raised	No response received on PDR

Name of Affected Party: Sambaa k'e First Nation

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Dolphus Jumbo Sambaa k'e First Nation	June 30th, 2020	INF sent Sambaa k'e First Nation a letter updating them on the status of the MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.	No issues raised	No response received on PDR

Name of Affected Party: West Point First Nation

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief Kenny Cayen West Point First Nation	June 30th, 2020	INF sent West Point First Nation a letter updating them on the status of the	No issues raised	No response received on PDR

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
		MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.		

Name of Affected Party: Kátł'odeeche First Nation (KFN)

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Chief April Martel KFN	June 30th, 2020	INF sent KFN a letter updating them on the status of the MGAR Project, along with a Summary Project Description Report (PDR) for them to review.	KFN said that they would not be providing any comments on the Project, as the Project does not overlap with their traditional territory.	None

Name of Affected Party: Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board

Name(s) of representative(s) from affected party who participated in engagement	Dates of Engagement	Reason(s) for Engagement	Overview of Issues Resolved	Overview of Issues Unresolved
Tyree Mullaney, Regulatory Specialist, MVLWB	February 23rd, 2020 August 25th, 2020	Board notification of Project planning activities and renewal of relevant permits and licenses prior to the submission of regulatory package for the Mount Gaudet Access Road (MGAR) (the Project)	No issues raised	None

Appendix B

MGAR Engagement Log

Pre-submission Engagement Log

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
10/26/2017	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN	phone call		During a phone call with PKFN, the GNWT Minister of INF informed PKFN that the GNWT would be applying for federal funding for the extension of the Mackenzie Valley Highway between Wrigley and Norman Wells, and that part of this funding could be used to cover the construction of an access road between Wrigley and Mount Gaudet. Mentioned that this Project would bring training, employment, and business opportunities to Wrigley.	No	No
08/08/2018	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN John Dempsey SAO, PKFN Owen and Jack Rowe Rowe's Construction	phone call	During meeting with INF Minister and MLA for the Dehcho, PKFN said they were interested in working on the portion of the proposed MVH that goes through their traditional lands, including the MGAR.	Said INF was looking forward to opportunities to build community capacity through the MGAR project. Said department officials were expecting to be in the community of Wrigley during the coming fall to discuss capacity building and opportunities to work together on project permitting, planning and environmental studies and the proposed alignment.	No	No
10/17/2018	Chief Maurice Moses, PKFN John Dempsey, Senior Administrative Officer (SAO), PKFN PKFN Band Council	In-person meeting	PKFN agreed the construction of the MGAR should start as soon as possible and expressed support for removing the MGAR portion of the MVH from the Environmental Assessment (EA) process in order to proceed to construction sooner. PKFN agreed to enter into an MOU with the GNWT to clarify how the parties would work together to advance the MVH and the MGAR.	Acknowledged comments and thanked PKFN for their support on the Project.	No	Yes
02/07/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	e-mail	Relayed PKFN's suggested revisions for draft MOU between PKFN and GNWT, which would provide a framework for how the two parties would work	INF acknowledged the revisions, and proposed both a follow-up phone call with John Dempsey and a meeting in Wrigley with the Chief and Council and	Yes, Draft MOU with PKFN	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			together on the MVH and the MGAR.	the public.		
02/21/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	e-mail	In response to previous e-mail from INF, PKFN confirmed the use of the term "traditional lands" in the MOU was appropriate. PKFN also expressed interest in having another PKFN member added to the MOU Steering Committee. It was recommended that the Chief and Band Manager for PKFN be members of the committee.	INF would have a phone call with John Dempsey to follow up further on the matter of steering committee membership. This matter was also run by EIA for their review. INF ultimately agreed to include another PKFN band member in addition to the Chief on the Steering Committee, but not the Band Manager, as the committee was intended to be political.	Yes Draft MOU with PKFN	No
02/27/2019	Community of Wrigley/PKFN	Public meeting	Questions were raised about Project timelines and training opportunities associated with the Project. Mentioned potential socio-economic impacts associated with tourism from the road, and asked whether GNWT was having discussions about this. Most community members said that they were eager to get this road built, but they wanted to ensure that the Project brought as much benefit to the community as possible in terms of jobs and training.	INF clarified some of the technical details on the Project including anticipated timelines. Said that GNWT was looking into creating training programs for the community, and that the road would likely bring increased tourism which could help Wrigley economically. Said that they would be doing further studies on potential socio-economic impacts and how to mitigate these. Mentioned that TK study would be completed for the Project area. INF thanked community members for their attendance and their comments.	Yes PowerPoint Presentation	Yes
02/28/2019	VOFS Town Council	In-person meeting	During engagement meeting with VOFS, the Village had some questions about contracting arrangements for the Project, training programs, and Project costs.	INF indicated that they had not sorted out the contracting approach yet and that they hadn't determined details on cost and funding for the MGAR, but that they were looking into training programs for Wrigley and the Dehcho.	No	Yes
03/01/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN Sharon Pellissey, Director of Lands, PKFN	e-mail		INF sent an updated MOU that included changes suggested at the most recent meeting with PKFN Chief and Council. INF was seeking final review of the document prior to the MOU signing ceremony.	Yes Draft MOU with PKFN	No
03/01/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	e-mail		INF sent an updated MOU that included the changes brought up during the latest	Yes Draft MOU with	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
	Sharon Pellissey, Director of Lands, PKFN			meeting with PKFN. GNWT confirmed addition of PKFN council member to Steering Committee.	PKFN	
03/12/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email	In response to previous emails regarding the MOU, John Dempsey confirmed that Chief Moses was satisfied with the current MOU draft, and that the document was ready for official signing.	INF informed John Dempsey that the MOU would be going through the final approval process within the GNWT.	No	No
04/05/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN Sharon Pellissey, Director of Lands, PKFN	email		INF wanted to arrange a meeting (teleconference) to discuss the signing of the MOU with PKFN.	No	No
04/10/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN Sharon Pellissey, Director of Lands, PKFN	email		Further follow up with PKFN regarding the draft MOU, inquiring about signing dates and providing further opportunity for edits.	Yes Draft MOU Document	No
04/10/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email	In response to latest email about MOU, Mr. Dempsey informed INF that a signing date was not determined, as the recently planned community council meeting was cancelled. Chief Moses was interested in meeting directly with the Minister of Infrastructure about the MOU signing.	INF said they would follow up with the Minister's office about a date and time for the meeting.	No	No
4/11/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		PKFN was informed that the Minister of Infrastructure could not meet with Chief Moses in Wrigley, but could meet in Yellowknife to discuss MOU.	No	No
4/11/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		INF informed Mr. Dempsey that the Minister was available to go to Wrigley on June 25th to meet with the chief, but that the MOU could be signed sooner if the Chief was able to come to Yellowknife in the next few weeks.	No	No
05/08/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		INF wished to arrange a phone call with Mr. Dempsey to check in about the MOU	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
	Sharon Pellissey, Director of Lands, PKFN			with PKFN.		
05/14/2019	Jackson McDermot Executive Assistant to Grand Chief, DFN Josanne Tanche Manager, ICEP	In-person meeting	Asked about expected job numbers associated with the Project and what training opportunities it would provide. Said that further discussion would be carried out with the Grand Chief to determine what level of involvement DFN wanted to have in the Project.	Provided details in response to DFN's questions and thanked them for meeting.	No	Yes
05/14/2019	Fort Simpson Public	Public meeting	Most questions asked were about MVH EA. Some community members did ask about potential socio-economic impacts from building new roads in the Dehcho.	INF said they would need to investigate the socio-economic impacts from the road further, but that there were many mitigation measures that could be put in place such as adjusting construction schedules to community needs.	Yes PowerPoint Presentation	Yes
05/14/2019	Chief Gerald Antoine, LKFN Climate Muyambo Acting Executive Director, LKFN LKFN Council: Ernest McPherson, Cathy Nahanni, Hilda Tsetso	In-person meeting	Asked about the possibility of the GNWT doing an MOU with LKFN similar to the one they did with PKFN. Said that LKFN was interested in seeing training opportunities for the Dehcho region and building a stronger collaborative relationship with the GNWT.	Said they could look into possibility of MOU with LKFN but that they would have to consider how this would fit with PKFN's MOU.	Yes Powerpoint Presentation	Yes
05/16/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN Sharon Pellissey, Director of Lands, PKFN	email		INF wanted to follow-up with PKFN leadership regarding recent meetings in Fort Simpson, and suggested that further meetings should be arranged with PKFN to discuss the MGAR permitting process. Suggested meeting with PKFN the following week.	No	No
05/21/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	Meeting	Confirmed that the chief would be interested in a meeting with the Minister in Wrigley during the week of June 24th to discuss the MOU signing.		No	YNo
05/21/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	Meeting	Mentioned that Łíídlıı Kúé First Nation (LKFN) would like to sign an MOU with the GNWT on the MVH / MGAR projects, and suggested that PKFN		No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			could sign their MOU at the same time. Also mentioned that the Chief of PKFN would like to have further discussions with GNWT about the role of each party under the MOU.			
05/21/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	Meeting	Suggested that HEO Training in Wrigley be carried out some time during the fall.	Said that HEO training would be further discussed during meeting at the end of June.	No	No
05/30/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		Emailed to confirm whether Chief and Council would be able to meet with INF on June 24th for update on the project and the status of the MOU.	No	No
06/04/2019	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN	Written letter	In a letter sent to the Minister of Infrastructure, the Chief of PKFN indicated that PKFN was pleased with the way INF had been engaging with them on the development of the MOU. Said that MVH and MGAR Project staff appeared to recognize the importance traditional lands to PKFN, and that PKFN was looking forward to working further with INF to bring new opportunities to the community of Wrigley.			
06/04/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		Follow–up with PKFN regarding HEO training for community members (up to 6 individuals). PKFN was informed that other organizations could help provide this training. Suggested meeting during the following week to further discuss HEO training arrangements.	No	No
06/04/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email	Confirmed that a meeting during the following week to discuss HEO training would work.		No	No
06/05/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		Asked whether PKFN Chief and Band Manager could meet with INF staff in YK during the week.	No	No
06/10/2019	John Dempsey SAO, PKFN Sharon Pellissey	In-person meeting		INF met with PKEN representatives to discuss details and plan arrangements for HEO training in Wrigley.	No	Yes

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
	PKFN					
06/11/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		Asked whether a meeting with the Chief and Council could be scheduled for some time during the following week to discuss various MGAR-related matters including HEO training.	No	No
06/17/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email	Indicated that a meeting in Fort Simpson may be possible.		No	No
06/18/2019	Sharon Pellissey, Director of Lands, PKFN	email	Wanted to know whether Aurora College could assist with providing HEO training. Mentioned that early training would help prepare community members prior to high volumes of construction during the summer.		No	No
06/26/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email	Requested up-to-date version of the draft MOU.	Latest version of MOU was sent.	Yes Draft MOU document	No
07/03/2019	Chief Maurice Moses, PKFN	In-person communication	Expressed interest in having a community meeting in the near future. Content of MOU would be discussed, and signing would occur upon approval of document.	Scheduled a meeting in Wrigley for July 18.	No	No
07/18/2019	Chief Maurice Moses, PKFN John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN Community of Wrigley / PKFN	Public meeting	PKFN indicated that they wanted more commitments from the GNWT with regards to creating training and employment and funding. Requested a committee be set up to identify training and employment opportunities for the community. Concern about the fact that Project would be on PKFN traditional land and that wildlife and traditional resources would be affected.	INF agreed to the establishment of a working group to address employment, training, and other economic opportunities in relation to the MGAR / MVH. INF promised to continue working with PKFN and Wrigley to identify impacts on land and traditional lifestyle and finding appropriate ways to address these impacts.	Yes Project Update PowerPoint	Yes
07/25/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN Various Wrigley Community Members	phone call	Following CBC interview on the recent community meeting, some community members brought up comments about meeting format, and that the set-up of tables and position of GNWT representatives was intimidating. It was suggested that future meeting	INF will consider this input when planning future engagement meetings.	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			formats be more open, perhaps with participants sitting in a circle with no tables.			
07/25/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	phone call	With regard to training and employment for the MGAR, community said they were interested in seeing a Wrigley Training Committee formed.	A draft TOR would be developed for the training committee, and final committee would be designed to address business opportunities in a broad sense, not just training and employment. Meeting with ECE, ITI, ENR, and INF reps about business opportunities was scheduled for late August.	No	No
07/25/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	phone call	Stated that TK studies in the MGAR area would be a good idea. Pointed out that there are a number of trap-lines in the area	GNWT indicated that they would send staff to Wrigley in the fall to conduct TK studies and get updates on wildlife. Discussions between INF and ENR would be performed to address issues that the MGAR project could cause with regard to trap-lines.	No	No
09/19/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	phone call	With regards to INF staff driving the MGAR route to perform a visual assessment, suggested that INF wait about two weeks since the community was out hunting moose.	Followed up with PKFN to determine the best time for the survey.	No	No
09/19/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	phone call	Re-affirmed recommendation that the GNWT set up a Wrigley Training Committee.	Would send the draft TOR for the training committee. Indicated that the target date for submitting regulatory applications for MGAR construction was January 2020, but that community support would be required. Said that following the receipt of permits, a training program could be established during the summer of 2020. Suggested public meeting in Wrigley following the territorial election period.	No	No
09/19/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	phone call	Asked for GNWT to recognize that PKFN is being asked to give up the land for MVH and MGAR construction.	Said that these concerns would be further discussed during the next community meeting. Mentioned that a note would be sent to PKFN prior to the meeting, informing	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
				them of the INF's intent to perform geotechnical work for the MGAR.		
09/19/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		Informed PKFN of their plan to conduct quarrying activities at the Mount Gaudet Quarry, which would require that geotechnical investigations be carried out at the potential quarry site. Indicated that they would continue to update PKFN on any developments in relation to INF's geotechnical studies.	No	No
10/21/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		Indicated that a contract had been signed with Tetratech to perform geotechnical work at Mount Gaudet. Asked whether a community member was available to act as a wildlife monitor during this work.	No	No
10/22/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email	Confirmed receipt of INF's previous email and said that he would be in touch with Tetratech to discuss arrangements for the wildlife monitor.		No	No
11/29/2019	John Dempsey, Band Manager, PKFN	email		Suggested a meeting in January to discuss training opportunities with the community.	No	No
11/12/2019	Sharon Pellisey, Lands Director, PKFN	email		INF provided Ms. Pellisey with a summary of comments during a phone conversation between the two parties earlier that day. Points related to the MGAR included the following: • Land Use Permit applications are being drafted for the geotechnical work scheduled for winter 2020. • A completed Archaeological Overview Assessment has identified the proposed quarry location and proposed new bridge location and associated alignment as areas that require an Archaeological Impact Assessment, which would need to be completed in the spring/summer.	Yes Wrigley Training Committee Draft TOR	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
				• For this winter only, geotechnical drilling along the Mackenzie Valley Winter Road alignment from the end of Highway 1 to Mount Gaudet Quarry will be possible. The other locations will be drilled following the results of the AIA. Timing is to be determined. • The regulatory package for the construction of the Mount Gaudet Access road is being prepared. It was also agreed that a community meeting would be held in Wrigley during the week of January 13th or January 20th of 2019		
12/20/2019	Sharon Pellissey, Lands Director, PKFN	email		INF sent PKFN a draft review of Traditional Knowledge and Land Use information for the area between Wrigley and Mount Gaudet, based on information obtained from the 2012 Mackenzie Valley Highway – Dehcho Region PDR.	Yes Draft TK Review: Wrigley to Mount Gaudet.	No
01/10/2020	Sharon Pellissey, Lands Director, PKFN	email		INF invited Ms. Pellissey to have a phone call regarding the upcoming community engagement and Training Committee meetings in Wrigley.	No	No
01/14/2020	Darrell White, Senior Administrative Officer, Village of Fort Simpson	email		INF informed Mr. White that their staff would be travelling to the Dehcho later in the month, and asked whether the VOFS Mayor and Council would be interested in having an in-person discussion regarding the MVH and MGAR projects.	No	No
01/16/2020	Liza McPherson, Executive Director, LKFN	email		INF informed LKFN that their staff would be travelling to the Dehcho later in the month, and asked whether LKFN would be interested in having in-person discussions regarding the MVH and MGAR projects.	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
01/16/2020	Executive Director, Fort Simpson Métis Nation	email		INF informed FSMN that their staff would be travelling to the Dehcho later in the month, and asked whether members would be interested in having in-person discussions regarding the MVH and MGAR projects.	No	No
01/17/2020	Liza McPherson, Executive Director, LKFN	email	Indicated to INF that the LKFN council would be able to meet on January 26th to discuss the MVH and MGAR projects.		No	No
01/24/2020	Sharon Pellissey, Lands Director, PKFN	email		Provided PKFN with the latest version of the draft MOU to review.	Yes Draft MOU with PKFN	No
01/26/2020	LKFN: Chief Eric Menicoche; Liza McPherson; Cathy Nahanni; Ernest McPherson; Brian Martineau; Sharon Allen FSMN: Cheryl Sibbesttson Duane Lafferty	In-Person meeting	Chief Menicoche said that LKFN will support whatever PKFN supports, but there were some concerns about the impacts of increase in traffic through the area and increased hunting pressures. LKFN inquired about regional training programs for the Project construction phase and whether resources were available for these programs. LKFN and FSMN inquired about the current status of land in the proposed area and who would own the road once it is built. LKFN raised concerns about the services in the community being able to accommodate the increased traffic from the road. LKFN said that they were happy with the way that the GNWT had been proceeding with consultations.	INF provided responses to these questions and concerns, and said that they would follow up and work with LKFN / FSMN to resolve them.	Yes PowerPoint Presentation	Yes
01/27/2020	Community of Wrigley / PKFN	Public Meeting	PKFN indicated that the GNWT needs to make more of an effort to engage PKFN on the Project and to bring	Said that the GNWT is currently making plans to fund training programs for the community in relation to the Project.	Yes PowerPoint Presentation	Yes

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			training opportunities to the community. Suggested that GNWT draft a letter of intent and have this signed with the community. Concerns were also raised about the moose pasture near Mount Gaudet and that INF will need to design the highway around this. PKFN suggested setting up a liaison position between the community and the GNWT to help oversee the Project.	INF said that alternative routes to avoid the moose pasture would be looked at for the MVH, but that the MGAR would not involve construction into that area.		
01/27/2020	Chief Maurice Moses, PKFN Sharon Pellissey SAO, PKFN Charlie Hardistey PKFN 2 Other PKFN representatives (names not given) Owen Rowe Rowe's Construction	In-person meeting		INF met with PKEN representatives to discuss details and plan arrangements for MGAR training programs in Wrigley. Contracting for the Project was also discussed.	No	Yes
01/28/2020	Sean Whelly, Mayor of Fort Simpson Darrel White SAO, Fort Simpson Kevin Corrigan Assistant SAO, Fort Simpson	In-person meeting	Questions about the planned routing from the MGAR and what the construction approach would be, what the overall cost and funding for the Project would be, and the contracting approach for the Project. Said that VOFS would like to see the MGAR move forward as soon as possible.	INF said that they still needed to sort most of these details out but they would keep the Village informed as new information became available and details of the Project became clearer. Thanked VOFS Mayor and Council for taking the time to meet with the GNWT for an update on the MVH and MGAR.	Yes PowerPoint Presentation	Yes
01/28/2020	Sharon Pellissey, Lands Director, PKFN	In-person meeting	Confirmed the organizational details for the upcoming engagement meeting in Wrigley. Relayed the following comments from the community: • PKFN members are aware of the project	• Senior staff to meet with the Chief and Council following the community meeting to discuss next steps with regards to the project. Staff not attending this meeting will be available to answer any	Yes Draft MOU with PKFN, Draft TOR for Wrigley Training Committee	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			• Primary issue is the need for training • Some questions regarding the TK summary that was sent in December. • Community is looking forward to the project, but needs training and employment. • Would like maps, timelines, and posters to be left at the meeting venue following the meeting. • Some concerns about the plan to move Hodgson Creek Bridge upstream. • INF should create a letter of intent, detailing that the GNWT will notify community members and work with them on the project.	remaining questions from community members. • INF to receive comments on the TK report and answer any questions on the content of this report raised during the community meeting. • Clarified that no official decision had been made yet with regards to moving the bridge, but that the matter would be discussed further during community engagement. • Inquired about whether draft MOU could serve an equivalent function to letter of intent, and stated that the latest version of the MOU would be sent to PKFN as soon as possible. Latest Draft TOR for the Training Committee was also provided to PKFN following this meeting.		
01/31/2020	Sharon Pellissey, PKFN	email	Thanked INF for meeting with PKFN in Wrigley earlier in the week. Indicated that because the Chief and Council wanted to have a draft letter of intent as a condition of working with the GNWT on the MGAR, the MOU should be updated to refer to the letter of intent.	Acknowledged response and scheduled a phone-call for further discussions between the two parties.		
02/03/2020	Tyree Mullaney, Regulatory Specialist, MVLWB	email		Provided an updated version of the Waste Management Plan, Spill Contingency Plan for Land Use Permit "MV2016E006: Operations and Maintenance for Highway 1" in order to cover 2020 geotechnical activities for the MGAR. An engagement record for MGAR geotechnical activities was also provided.	Yes Waste Management Plan, Spill Contingency Plan, Engagement Record.	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
02/18/2020	Rose Moses Acting SAO, PKFN	email		INF sent an updated version of the TK summary which included previously suggested edits to section on moose pasture area.	Yes Draft TK Summary	No
02/25/2020	Rose Moses, Acting SAO, PKFN Chief Maurice Moses, PKFN	email		INF informed PKFN that Tetratech would begin geotechnical drilling of the MGAR alignment that week. INF indicated that the drilling would occur every 500m along the alignment, and that Tetratech would contact PKFN about hiring a wildlife monitor during the work.	No	No
02/26/2020	Rose Moses Acting SAO, PKFN	email	Chief Maurice Moses wanted to know if the MOU had been revised and if it included a letter of intent. PKFN wanted an update on the MOU since geotech drilling would be beginning that week.	INF would get in contact with Rose Moses by phone to provide update on MOU and clarify any questions regarding the drilling program.	No	No
03/02/2020	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN Rose Moses Acting SAO, PKFN PKFN Band Council Jack Rowe Rowe's Construction Owen Rowe Rowe's Construction	phone call with follow up email	During a phone meeting with INF, PKFN suggested some edits to the MOU surrounding the details of the Wrigley Training Committee. PKFN mentioned PKFN's concerns about geotechnical drilling staff behaving inappropriately and causing a disturbance in the community. PKFN confirmed that it would like a negotiated contract for the MGAR, through a joint venture with Rowe's Construction and asked that INF share the draft PDR with Rowe's once completed so that they could make an assessment of the project requirements PKFN requested a draft Letter of Intent stating that INF commits to giving PKFN all construction contracts for	INF emailed a revised MOU to PKFN, which included additional details on Wrigley Training Committee. INF invited PKFN to provide additional comments on the MOU. INF committed to following up to ensure behaviour issues with the drilling staff were addressed, and asked that PKFN advise of any future incidents right away INF said they would send the draft PDR over to Rowe's construction once this document was completed. INF said that they were not in a position to make the commitments being requested by PKFN in the Letter of Intent until the MVH project is further advanced through the EA and regulatory processes and construction funding has been obtained.	Yes Draft MOU with PKFN	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			construction projects between Wrigley and Blackwater River.			
03/09/2020	Jocelyn Skeard, Assistant SAO, PKFN	email	Provided PKFN's draft letter of support for the MGAR Project which had been sent to the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board.	Recommended holding off on letter of support until PKFN received and had the chance to review the Draft Project Description Report for the MGAR.	Yes PKFN letter of support	
03/11/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email	While INF suggested that the letter of support and MOU should wait until after the PDR had been reviewed, PKFN suggested that the MOU should be settled prior to developing the PDR, as there was concern about proposing funding arrangements for the road before the issue of building on PKFN traditional lands had been settled.	Stated that while no MOU had yet been signed, the PDR was to be developed and shared in the spirit of the MOU. Explained that the PDR document would provide more details to PKFN on the nature of the MGAR Project which would assist in deciding on construction options.	No	No
03/18/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email		Explained the proposed scope of the Project as being a 15km road from Wrigley to Mount Gaudet. Mentioned that the Project may involve a new location for the Hodgson Creek Bridge, and that further discussions would need to be had with the community about installing the new bridge. Explained that the installation of a new bridge would affect the route of the MGAR around Hodgson Creek.	No	No
03/26/2020	Jack Rowe PKFN/Rowes Construction Owen Rowe PKFN/Rowes Construction	email	Asked whether a PDR for the MGAR was ready to be sent over to PKFN. Requested that this document be sent either in electronic format or by courier.	Informed PKFN that the MGAR PDR was still being worked on, and that the process of developing the PDR had been delayed somewhat due to challenges presented by COVID-19. Proposed a tentative date of April 20th for having the draft ready for PKFN review.	No	No
04/23/2020	Jack Rowe PKFN/Rowes Construction Owen Rowe	email	Brought up INF's previous comment about having the MGAR PDR ready for review on the week of April 20th. Asked whether this timeline would still be achieved.	Again mentioned that work on the PDR was progressing more slowly than initially expected due to COVID-19. Also explained the fact that internal review with other GNWT departments would	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
	PKFN/Rowes Construction			need to be completed before the document could be given to PKFN for review. Mentioned that the aim was still to have the final PDR in to the Land and Water Boards by June of 2020 and that even with delays in the application process, the overall timeline for MGAR planning and construction was not likely to be affected.		
04/30/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email	Provided letter from Chief Moses outlining PKFN's response to the draft TK summary for the MGAR. Letter mentioned concerns about planning the Project around the moose pasture north of Mount Gaudet, boreal caribou range near the Project, and traplines in the area.	Contacted Rose Moses with a preliminary outline of the Moose Pasture, and asked whether the actual boundaries as understood by PKFN differed from this estimate.	Yes Letter from Chief Moses to INF Preliminary map of moose pasture boundaries	No
05/15/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email	Told INF that two elders from the PKFN council were familiar with the moose pasture near Mount Gaudet, and would like to do a helicopter survey to get a better idea of the extent of the pasture. Asked whether the GNWT would be able to cover the costs of this helicopter survey, and if INF staff would be available to accompany the elders.	Responded that the department could arrange and cover the costs for the helicopter flight. Asked about how many PKFN members would be coming along on the survey, and what dates would work for doing the survey.	No	No
05/15/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email	Informed INF that council would be having further discussions with the Chief about arrangements for the moose pasture survey. Indicated that they would like to see this survey happen as soon as can be arranged.		No	No
05/21/2020	Darrell White SAO, Village of Fort Simpson	email		Asked VOFS whether they would approve of INF disposing of waste generated from the MGAR at the local landfill facility. Asked whether VOFS could provide a conditional letter of approval if they agreed with the proposed arrangement.	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
05/26/2020	Darrell White SAO, Village of Fort Simpson	email	Responded to previous e-mail about disposing of MGAR-associated waste at the Fort Simpson landfill. Indicated that INF would need to provide estimates of anticipated waste disposal volumes and timelines for VOFS to be able to provide full approval.	Mentioned that there was not enough information at this point to give estimates of waste disposal volumes and timelines. Stated that because INF needed to submit for regulatory approvals from the MVLWB prior to determining many technical details of the Project, a conditional letter of support from VOFS would be needed, indicating that they would agree to receive waste from the MGAR, pending the provision of final waste volume estimates and an agreement with the selected MGAR contractor.	No	No
05/26/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email		Provided an update to PKFN about planning for the moose pasture survey. Mentioned that the trip was awaiting approval from GNWT Human Resources due to travel restrictions in place due to COVID-19. Asked PKFN when their soonest availability would be for conducting the survey.	No	No
05/27/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email		Another update to PKFN regarding planning for the moose pasture survey. Mentioned that the trip was still awaiting Deputy Minister's approval due to ongoing COVID-19 measures. Indicated that PKFN would be notified once travel arrangements had been confirmed, and asked whether PKFN could confirm the number of members who would be joining on the survey.	No	No
06/04/2020	Darrell White SAO, Village of Fort Simpson	e-mail	Provided a conditional letter of approval for disposing of waste from the MGAR at local waste facilities, pending further information about waste volumes and waste streams.		Yes Conditional approval letter for waste disposal	

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
06/05/2020	Charlie Tale PKFN Dave Hardisty PKFN	In-person meeting	Two INF staff members conducted a helicopter survey attended by two members of the PKFN band council, who identified the location and extent of the moose pasture near Mount Gaudet from the helicopter. INF recorded the location of the moose pasture using a GPS. PKFN members confirmed that the location of the moose pasture was well outside the proposed footprint for the MGAR and Mount Gaudet Quarry.		Yes Navigational map showing the MGAR alignment and proposed Quarry boundaries.	No
06/30/2020	Grand Chief Gladys Norwegian DFN Chief Gerald Antoine LKFN President Danny Peterson FSMN Chief Maurice Moses PKFN	Written letter		INF provided a written letter to the Dehcho IGOs updating them on the status and plans for MGAR field programs. Also sent a letter notifying these groups of INF's application for a research permit from the Aurora Research Institute (ARI) to conduct fish habitat and hydrology assessments.	Yes MGAR Field Program Update Letter MGAR ARI Application Notification Letter	No
06/30/2020	Mayor Sean Whelly Village of fort Simpson	Written letter		Provided a written letter notifying VOFS of INF's application for a research permit from ARI to conduct fish and hydrology assessments.	Yes MGAR ARI Application Notification Letter	No
06/30/2020	Chief Gerald Antoine LKFN	e-mail	In response to the update letter sent by INF earlier that day, LKFN requested that a briefing note on the Project also be sent to them	Responded with an email summarizing INF's planned field programs, a summary PDR, and an MGAR Environmental Overview document.	Yes MGAR Draft PDR MGAR Draft Environmental Overview	No
06/30/2020	Grand Chief Gladys Norwegian DFN Chief Gerald Antoine	email		INF sent a Draft PDR and Environmental Overview for the MGAR Project	Yes MGAR Draft PDR MGAR Draft Environmental	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
	LKFN President Danny Peterson FSMN				Overview	
06/30/2020	Chief Eugene Hope Acho Dene Koe First Nation Chief Joachim Bonnetrouge Deh Gáh Got'ıe First Nation President Clifford McLeod Fort Providence Métis Council Chief Stanley Sanguez Jean Marie River First Nation Chief Lloyd Chicot Ka'a'gee Tu First Nation Chief Darrel Betsaka Nahanni Butte Dene Band Chief Dolphus Jumbo Sambaa k'e First Nation Chief Kenny Cayen West Point First Nation Chief April Martel Kátł'odeeche First Nation	email		INF sent an email with attached update letter and Summary PDR to provide an update to Dehcho IGOs on the status of the MGAR Project.	Yes MGAR Project Update Letter MGAR Summary PDR	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
07/02/2020	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN	email		Sent PKFN an update on the MGAR Project, along with a Summary PDR, Draft PDR, and Environmental Overview	Yes MGAR Draft PDR MGAR Summary PDR MGAR Environmental Overview	No
07/06/2020	Chief Stanley Sanguez Jean Marie River First Nation	email	In response to summary PDR sent by INF, asked if training would be included in Project scope for the MGAR Asked if there would be an opportunity for residents of Jean Marie River to be involved in training.	Confirmed that there would be a training aspect to the work. Mentioned that INF would work with Aurora College to deliver the training to PKFN ASAP. Said that there would be opportunities for people from various Dehcho communities since the Project would likely be too big for PKFN etc. Said that construction contracting will not happen for a while but that hiring and training locally will likely be an important issue in that process.	No	No
07/20/2020	Oleg Skywolf SAO PKFN	email/ phone call	Mentioned that he was PKFN's new SAO, and asked INF for an update on their work on the MVH extension from Wrigley.	Provided PKFNs new SAO, Oleg Skywolf, with an update on the status of the MGAR Project. Question was raised about whether Rowe's would be selected as the contractor for the Project, and INF indicated that there would need to be further discussion with PKFN and Rowe's to determine who would be selected. PKFN had also been considering using their development corporation for the Project. INF said most important thing was selecting a contractor that could deliver on the Project, which is large and complex. Also clarified that bridge work would be done under a separate contract, which would be tendered due to the complex and specialized nature of the work.	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
07/22/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email / phone call	Asked to have a phone-call for an update on the MGAR Project.	Provided an update to Mr. Steiner on the status of the MGAR project via phone call. Also discussed the matter of contracting for the Project. Following the call, Mr. Steiner was provided with a copy of the MGAR Draft PDR, Environmental Overview, and Engagement Record.	Yes MGAR Draft PDR MGAR Environmental Overview	No
07/22/2020	Chief Joachim Bonnetrouge Deh Gáh Got'ıe First Nation	email	Asked INF to clarify timelines on the MGAR Project. Mentioned that if PKFN had no concerns, then DGGFN would be in support of the Project, but they wanted to ensure that protocols and respect for DGGFN's land and environment were maintained. Said that it was good that PKFN would benefit from economic activity along the proposed right of way.	Clarified the timeline for the MGAR Project, saying that construction activities were planned to start in winter 2021, though this was dependent on discussions with PKFN, submission of the LUP application to the MVLWB, and receipt of regulatory approvals. Mentioned that INF still needs to conduct additional studies including hydro-technical and geotechnical surveys and an AIA prior to proceeding with MGAR construction. The Chief acknowledged and accepted INF's response.	No	No
07/22/2020	Peter Redvers Lead, Negotiations and consultation, Kátł'odeeche Fırst Natıon	e-mail	In response to the MGAR PDR Summary that was sent to KFN for review, indicated that KFN did not wish to comment on the Project, since it would occur well outside of the Kátł'odeeche Fırst Natıon traditional territory.	No further follow-up	No	No
07/23/2020	Meghan Buckham Lands Manager Acho Dene Koe First Nation	e-mail	Confirmed receipt the Project update and PDR Summary that was sent by INF, and said that they would be in touch if they had any questions on the Project.	No further follow-up	No	No
07/23/2020	Liza McPherson Executive Director, LKFN Nicole Hardisty Regional Technical Coordinator DFN	Phone-call	Raised concerns about consulting staff coming into Dehcho communities to perform fish habitat and hydrology assessments for the MGAR and being exempt from 14-day self-isolation, given the risks of COVID-19 transmission.	Clarified that while consulting staff had requested an exemption from the 14-day self-isolation period so that Project planning could stay on schedule, the staff would still be subject to adherence to all other COVID-related measures including wearing PPE including face masks and	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
				maintaining social distance. Also said that INF would try to staff this work with individuals already in the NWT if possible, and that the field staff would bring sufficient supplies to avoid having to enter the communities during the course of their work. Informed the parties that PKFN was satisfied with the COVID-related precautions that would be in place, and that they would be ok with consulting staff performing the indicated work without the usual isolation period.		
07/24/2020	Chief Stanley Sanguez Jean Marie River First Nations	e-mail	In response to Project update and summary PDR that was sent out by INF, said that JMRFN had no comments, but that they were interested in seeing jobs for their community come out of the Project.		No	No
07/27/2020	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN Oleg Skywolf SAO, PKFN Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN Rose Moses PKFN Gaylene Moses PKFN Raymond Pellissey PKFN	Phone meeting	Mentioned that PKFN was formally withdrawing from the Dehcho process and that when talking about Project benefits and training opportunities for the Dehcho, INF should keep in mind that land being developed is entirely PKFN land. Asked about whether environmental monitors would be hired from Wrigley for upcoming MGAR planning studies that had been planned for that summer and fall. Commented about contracting, and that they would like to see the contracting arrangements for construction provide as much benefit as possible directly to Wrigley and PKFN.	Said that Dehcho region being referred to in Project overview was the Dehcho administrative region of the GNWT, which still applied even if PKFN withdrew from the Dehcho process. Said that regulatory applications were ready to go as soon as PKFN provided comments back on the PDR. Said that discussions about contracting and environmental concerns need to be kept separate for reporting purposes. Said they are currently working with Chief Public Health Officer to bring in consultants to do AIA, hydrology, and other field programs this summer and fall, given that COVID-related travel restrictions remain in place. Said that environmental monitors would be hired from Wrigley if this work proceeded.	Yes Powerpoint Presentation	Yes

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
07/28/2020	Oleg Skywolf SAO, PKFN	email	Official confirmation that PKFN consented to having consulting staff perform fish and hydrology assessments for the MGAR, with an exclusion under the NWT's COVID-related self-isolation restrictions, so long as all reasonable precautions were taken to limit the risks of COVID transmission by staff (social distancing, regular reporting to health authorities etc.).		No	No
08/08/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email	Daniel Steiner relayed some questions and comments raised by PKFN Chief and Council about the contents of INF's LUP application which included the following: 1. Proposed area for the MGAR includes habitat frequented by moose and caribou. PKFN was concerned that the effects associated with the road would lead to a decline in ungulates which would negatively impact hunting and trapping activity. Asked if a noise impact assessment had been completed for the Project. 2. Pointed out that the Mount Gaudet Quarry had been previously operated by Enbridge, as indicated in the PDR. Said that they would like INF to identify the area of the quarry that had already been excavated by Enbridge and how this area compared to the proposed boundaries. 3. Requested clarification on whether or not INF was already authorized to operate the quarry under LUP MV2016E0006 for	Responded to PKFNs questions and comments on the PDR as follows: 1. A noise impact assessment has not been completed for the Project, although as detailed in the PDR, noise impacts are expected to be low, and would be mitigated through the measures outlined in table 12-2 of the PDR. 2. Clarified that the operation of the Mount Gaudet Quarry for the MGAR would be considered an expansion of an existing quarry development. Said that they would send PKFN a map with the two quarry areas. 3. Confirmed that operation of the quarry was already covered under LUP MV2016E0006, but that INF wanted to also associate the quarry with the LUP for the MGAR, which would simplify regulatory reporting since the quarry would be used to supply material for MGAR construction. 4. Responded that the renewal of the LUP for winter road maintenance would be handled by a different group within INF and that PKFN would need to discuss with this division about what the LUP	No	Yes

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			MVWR maintenance. 4. Pointed out that LUP MV2016E0006 would expire in June 2021, and asked about the process for renewing the permit and whether PKFN would be involved in this. 5. Wanted to know if environmental monitors from Wrigley would be involved in the upcoming fisheries and hydrology assessments for the MGAR. Also asked if INF would be providing PKFN with funding to train environmental monitors for these assessments. 6. Requested that INF provide a copy of the MGAR AOA report. 7. Requested more information on the geotechnical work that would be completed following issuance of the LUP. 8. Asked about what information INF was using to make the claim that the quarry consists of "mostly fine-grained, high strength limestone" with a "low potential for Acid Rock Drainage and Metal Leaching". 9. Indicated that the potential of the project infringing or breaking the Migratory Bird Convention Act and/or the Wildlife Act will always be present, and that PKFN Environmental Monitors need to be employed at every stage of the project. 10. Pointed out that there were two aquatic species at risk occurring in the Project area (Shortjaw Cisco and Bull Trout), so a review by DFO would need to be completed.	renewal process would entail. 5. Mentioned that Tetra Tech and Kalo Stantec had been instructed to contact PKFN to make arrangements for hiring an environmental monitor from the community. Said that further training on the identification of Species at Risk (when relevant to the purpose of the field work) could be a component of the field work. 6. Said they would provide the AOA report to PKFN. 7. Said that INF would be carrying out geotechnical work at the Mount Gaudet Quarry (would involve drilling 4 boreholes using a geotechnical drilling rig), and along the MGAR alignment to the potential new bridge. Said that drilling along the alignment to the bridge would not likely happen until winter 2021. 8. Said that statements about the quarry material characteristics were based on the geotechnical reconnaissance study conducted in November 2019, and that INF could provide PKFN with a copy of that report. 9. Said that PKFN environmental monitors would be employed throughout the Project, and would be a part of the discussions with the construction contractor for the project. Indicated that aerial nest surveys were organized and conducted by ENR, and that the timing of the next survey would be timed to the potential start of construction. 10. Said that INF has no control over the		

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			Also asked whether PKFN would have the opportunity to be involved in DFO's review. 11. Expressed concern about the range of daily water use being right at the limit for a type B water licence. Asked if it was possible that water use may occasionally exceed this range and, if so, why INF was not applying for a Type A Water Licence. 12. Asked for more specifics about how merchantable timber generated from the Project would be handled.	process that DFO uses in its review process, but that they expect PKFN would be able to participate in the review of the Project by DFO. INF said they expect to continue working with PKFN as we are for the review of the PDR and the submission of the WL and LUP applications to the Land and Water Board and that they would prefer to work directly with PKFN on any issues rather than relying on third parties like the LWB or DFO to resolve matters. Mentioned that the mitigation practices that INF was intending to apply as well as the lack of in-water work associated with the project meant that there would be no impacts to fish. Said that the results of the fish habitat assessments would indicate if any additional mitigation would be required. 11. Clarified that the range of water use given (150 – 299 m^3/day) did not indicate the actual likely range for the Project, but was merely a statement of the fact that whatever the actual range of water use was, it would be within the limits for a Type B licence. Also mentioned that all water was going to be withdrawn from the Mackenzie River, which has a huge water volume, so impacts on water volume would not be an issue. Said that INF would apply for a Type A water licence should it later be determined that water use would exceed 300 m^3/day but at the moment, this was considered unlikely.		

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
				12. Indicated that advertisements would be placed along the road to notify community members of available timber, as per Table 12-8 of the PDR.		
08/17/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email	Requested a status update on the upcoming Training Committee meeting, along with the MGAR AOA report and map of the existing and proposed Mount Gaudet Quarry boundaries	Provided quarry map and AOA report. Indicated that a Training Committee meeting had been proposed for September, and that INF would follow up further with PKFN about specific meeting arrangements.	Yes Quarry comparison map MGAR AOA report	No
08/18/2020	Rose Moses Acting SAO PKFN	email	Proposed a date of September 8th or 9th for engagement meeting with PKFN and to have Training Committee meeting.	Said that this date would need to be confirmed internally.	No	No
08/18/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email	Mentioned that PKFN still had some outstanding questions on the MGAR PDR that INF had not yet addressed.	Referred Mr. Steiner to email which INF sent on August 5th, containing INF's responses to each of PKFN's comments on the PDR. Asked for confirmation on whether or not these responses sufficiently addressed PKFN's concerns. Mentioned that PKFN had requested a copy of the MGAR engagement and plan for the MGAR, and said that INF would send this over as soon as the a final draft of the document had been completed.	Yes Aug 5th email to PKFN	No
08/18/2020	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN Rose Moses Acting SAO, PKFN Sharon Pellissey PKFN	Phone Call	Pointed out that the MOU had not been signed yet. Mentioned that they had asked for a letter of intent on contracting for full MVH to from Wrigley to Blackwater, but that INF had advised GNWT that it is unable to commit until funding for construction is confirmed. Chief indicated that no one had contacted him directly recently and that he had not been briefed on the PDR. They continue to support the Project,	Indicated they would follow up internally on these various matters	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			and be part of the process and planning for it. They do not want to delay filing of the PDR so that construction can commence in upcoming winter.			
08/18/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	Phone Call		INF committed to sharing draft engagement record and plan with Mr. Steiner. Also said they would follow-up with him to ensure any outstanding questions he had on the PDR were addressed.	No	No
08/19/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email		Sent Daniel Steiner a map of the Mount Gaudet Quarry, MGAR, and PKFN-identified moose pasture area which showed that the moose pasture would be outside the footprint for the Project.	Yes MGAR/quarry map with moose pasture	No
08/19/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email		INF was following up with PKFN about the draft MOU, as the document had not been discussed since March, and PKFN had commented the previous day about the document not being signed yet. INF mention that they had been focused on finalizing the PDR over the last several months, with the intention of discussing the MOU further during their meeting with PKFN in September. Referenced that there had been delays in Project planning due to COVID-19.	Yes March 3rd email to PKFN with updated MOU	No
08/21/2020	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN Rose Moses SAO PKFN Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN Jack Rowe	email		INF sent a figure to PKFN showing where boreholes were planned to be drilled at the Mount Gaudet Quarry, and asked for PKFNs confirmation that the borehole drilling would not impact moose pastures in the area and that the program could proceed. Following some further discussions on the location of the moose pasture, PKFN indicated that the geotechnical program was okay to proceed.	Yes Map of boreholes for Mount Gaudet Quarry geotechnical program	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
	Rowe's Construction Owen Rowe Rowe's Construction					
08/21/2019	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN Rose Moses PKFN Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN Jack Rowe Rowe's Construction Owen Rowe Rowe's Construction	email		INF sent PKFN a copy of Chief Moses' comments on the TK report, along with a letter outlining how INF had addressed these comments.	Yes Letter from Chief Moses on TK MGAR Project update letter – June 2020	No
08/21/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN Chief Maurice Moses PKFN	email	PKFN requested a map showing the MGAR development area and moose pasture, as they had not received the maps that INF had sent the previous week.	Sent another copy of the moose pasture maps, which PKFN confirmed receipt of.	Yes Map of MGAR, quarry, and moose pasture	No
08/24/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	phone call	Mr. Steiner said he would relay to the Chief that the work INF is planning to do and the quarry INF is planning to use would be south of the moose pasture, and suggested a meeting with the Minister so the Minister can commit to the measures PKFN has requested in relation to the moose pasture.	Said that the Minister would not be able to give any further commitment than INF staff can, as technical work still needs to be done, but that they understand how important it is for PKFN that the MVH and MGAR routes avoid the moose pasture.	No	No
08/24/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	phone call	Mr. Steiner expressed the community's concern that the GNWT is being non-committal about avoiding the moose pasture	Re-emphasized that they understand PKFN's desire to have the MVH avoid the moose pasture, and that once the LUP application for the MGAR was submitted,	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
				INF would be turning their attention to planning for the rest of the MVH, which would include detailed routing north of Mt Gaudet. Suggested that PKFN may have confused the Mount Gaudet Quarry with an older quarry further north, and indicated that this quarry would not be used for the MGAR.		
08/24/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	phone call	Raised concerns about the MOU and the need to have this signed, following which a steering committee meeting should be arranged so the Chief can talk to the Minister of INF about the moose pasture.	Clarified that the intent of the MOU was to formalize the existing working relationship between PKFN and INF, and that the purpose of the steering committee would be to act as a political level entity that really only meets if there are issues that cannot be resolved at the WG level. Mentioned that PKFN and GNWT had both previously approved the MOU and signing was going to proceed until unrelated issues regarding work on the Blackwater Bridge arose, and the signing was cancelled as a result of this. Said that the MOU is "nice to have" but would not be necessary for INF to continue working with the community.	No	No
08/24/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	phone call	PKFN indicated interest in having several PKFN members survey the MGAR route with INF during the winter to identify paces where impacts on moose and other traditional resources might be a concern.	Agreed that this survey would be a good idea, and that they would have further discussions about the moose pasture area over the course of the coming year, though this would be more of a concern for the MVH past the MGAR. Mr. Steiner agreed, and said that he would relay this message to the Chief.	No	No
08/24/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email	Daniel Steiner requested a map showing the location of the old quarry near Mount Gaudet in relation to the moose pasture.	INF provided a copy of the Mount Gaudet Quarry Operations Plan, with an appended quarry reconnaissance report that showed where the old quarry was located.	Yes MGAR Quarry Operations Plan with appended geotechnical reconnaissance report.	No
08/24/2020	Chief Maurice Moses, PKFN		PKFN confirmed that geotechnical work at the Mount Gaudet Quarry would not overlap with the moose pasture, and	Said that they appreciate the importance of the moose pasture to PKFN, and that they look forward to having further	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN		that they were okay with the program proceeding.	discussions to ensure that community members are comfortable with the final routing of the MGAR and the MVH.		
08/24/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email	Upon being shown the location of the location of the proposed Mount Gaudet Quarry, Daniel Steiner confirmed that the MGAR and the quarry would not be going through the moose pasture. After being shown the location of a second quarry located further north (which would not be used for the MGAR), Mr. Steiner asked for more information on who originally developed this quarry.	Said they would look into information on the northern quarry and get back to PKFN. INF later identified, after doing some background research that Enbridge had been using the quarry in 2006, though they still hadn't identified who had originally developed the quarry and how long it had been there. Said they would contact PKFN if they found any further information.	Yes Map from 2012 MVH PDR	No
08/25/2020	Tyree Mullaney Regulatory Specialist MVLWB	email		INF notified the MVLWB and the Department of Lands of upcoming geotechnical drilling at the Mount Gaudet Quarry and provided contact info for the field supervisors for the drilling program.	Yes	No
08/27/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email		INF notified PKFN of its planned schedule for conducting geotechnical drilling at Mount Gaudet Quarry, as well as fish and hydrology studies, over the next month.	No	No
08/31/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email		INF requested a follow-up with PKFN about arrangements for a community meeting in September.	No	No
09/01/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email	Informed INF that the PKFN wildlife monitor who was supposed to accompany the Mt. Gaudet drilling work had been left at the pad.	Informed PKFN that they had contacted the contracting staff and asked them to bring the helicopter back to the airport to pick up the wildlife monitor. Apologized for the incident and that they would follow up with the contractor on the reason for the error.	No	No
09/02/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	phone call	Informed INF that PKFN Chief and Council would be reviewing the MGAR TK Report and Engagement Plan during a meeting on Friday. Mentioned that the engagement meeting would need	Acknowledged the information provided. Contacted Transportation Division of INF to set up a meeting with PKFN to discuss contracting. Requested a short meeting during the following week to discuss	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
			to be postponed, and that they would follow up with INF about whether the meeting could still happen that month.	arrangements for the meeting on contracting.		
09/09/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email		Informed PKFN that they were planning on arranging access to Argos for conducting fish and hydrology studies for later that month, though they may travel to site by helicopter if Argos are unavailable. Mentioned that they had asked their field crew if they could keep going up the alignment past the Mount Gaudet Quarry, and hadn't yet received confirmation if this would be possible. Indicated that if the field crew continued their surveys past the quarry, the personnel would have to stay longer in Wrigley.	No	No
09/09/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN	email	Told INF that Argos would not be available for the fish and hydrology work, but that quads could be provided if the field crew was able to use these. Said that PKFN monitors were ready to accompany the field crews.	Said that the field crews had advised using Argos due to terrain conditions. Said they would look at getting Argos over from Yellowknife.	No	No
09/09/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	phone call	Told INF that they still hadn't confirmed a date for a community meeting. Said that the Band Council had reviewed the MGAR TK Report and Engagement Plan and found it acceptable.	Confirmed receipt of information.	No	No
09/10/2020	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN Rose Moses SAO, PKFN Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN Jack Rowe	email		Informed PKFN that they were planning to file the MGAR PDR with the Mackenzie Land and Water Board the following day. Asked if PKFN was okay with filing the documents at this time, and if they had any additional questions, comments, or concerns on the documents. Asked about setting up a meeting within the next few days to start formal discussions on contracting.	No	No

Date (MM/DD/YY)	Name(s) of Representatives from Affected Party who Participated	Engagement Activity Type	Issue Raised and Recommendations from Affected Party	Proponent Response to Issue (indicate if issue(s) was resolved or not)	Information Materials Provided to Affected Party (Y/N)	Written Correspondence, Meeting Notes, and/or Minutes
	Rowe's Construction Owen Rowe Rowe's Construction					
09/10/2020	Rose Moses SAO, PKFN Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email	Confirmed that all MGAR LUP application documents had been reviewed, and that PKFN was ready to sign the MOU. Confirmed that PKFN would be able to meet with INF Transportation Division on Tuesday to discuss contracting.	Confirmed receipt of message.	No	No
09/10/2020	Chief Maurice Moses PKFN Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	email	Confirmed that PKFN had no further comments on the MGAR PDR or its supporting documents. Again indicated that the following Tuesday would be the best time for a discussion with Transportation.	Confirmed receipt of message.	No	No
9/10/2020	Daniel Steiner Lands, Resources, and Conservation Coordinator, PKFN	phone call		Thanked him for confirming that PKFN is ok with the PDR. We also discussed that the Transportation team is unavailable on Tuesday to meet so we will need to look for another time.	No	No