

Danny Yakeleya  
P.O. Box 45  
Tulita, NT  
XOE OKO

April 23, 2014

Ian Brown  
Regulatory Specialist  
Sahtu Land and Water Board  
P.O. Box 1  
Fort Good Hope, NT  
XOE OHO

**RE: Land Use and Water Licence Application – S14A-003/S14L1-002 – EL 474 in the Tulita District, 2014 Slater River Exploration Horizontal Drilling, Completions and Flow Testing Program.**

As a member and Board of Director of the Fort Norman Metis Land Corporation, I am writing this letter in support on Husky Oil Operations Ltd. (Husky Oil) application as noted above. I believe that projects of this nature, once proven that there is a project, should undergo an environmental assessment and review, but not as these early days when companies are in the exploration stage and trying to determine if there is a project that can be taken to the commercial development stage.

Our communities have the tools to have a direct say in oil and gas development through various local and regional land claim organizations, under our Sahtu Dene and Metis Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement (SDCLCA). Our first opportunity arises during initial community consultation with Canada, when notification is issued to the Sahtu Dene and Metis communities, of Canada's intent to place lands out for nomination. The Sahtu Dene and Metis have an opportunity to request that certain lands or all lands within their district not be placed for nominations.

Our communities have utilized this tool in the past, and most recently when Fort Good Hope (Kasho) District requested in 2010 that lands with their district not be placed for nomination, and which Canada agreed to. The following year, the Fort Good Hope District, reversed their decision and requested that lands be open for nomination, which resulted in a successful bid of 2 blocks to Shell Canada Limited.

We in the Tulita District in 2010 agreed that lands be placed for nominations, which resulted in 11 blocks being awarded to 5 companies. This decision was taken in light of more than twenty years of work in negotiating the SDCLCA where we selected surface and subsurface lands, special harvesting area and designating certain areas as future parks (i.e. Canol Trail/DoDo Canyon and Kelly Lake). We further participated in the development of the Sahtu Land Use Plan in ensuring our interest was recognized and

acknowledge in how land was to be used in the Sahtu. Further, we also participated in the establishment of the Na'a'ts'ihch;oh National Park Reserve, again another reminder that we have always advanced our interest in the management of land in the Sahtu.

To elaborate further on, "The Sahtu Land Use Plan" which came into effect April 8, 2013. This plan was started in early 1990's and reflected an intensive community input through numerous meeting and workshops. It was at the community level that people could voice their comments, concerns and aspirations of how they felt and believed lands in the Sahtu Settlement Area would be used, protected and managed for the benefit of the residents of the Sahtu.

Further, another document prepared under clause 26.4.3 of the Sahtu Land Claim was released in January 2000 entitled "Rakekee Gok'e Godi: Places we take of" a report of the Sahtu Heritage Places and Site Joint Working Group, also list and documents places important to the Sahtu people which are duplicated in the Sahtu Land Use Plan. The point I am making is that the Sahtu people gave a lot of thought and consideration in identifying places and areas in the Sahtu for protection and conservation, and those areas that should be open for development.

Throughout, this planning process, most the oil and gas activity was taking place in the Colville Lake area and south of the Mackenzie River from Tulita and east of Little Bear River. Exploration was focused on conventional oil and gas deposits. The area south of the Mackenzie River from Norman Wells and west of Little Bear River had very little oil and gas exploration activity. Of note, this may have contributed to the area receiving little attention by community land users, except for the MacDonald family who identified Three Day Lake in the Sahtu Land Use Plan.

As such, this may have resulted in the area being classified as a "General Use Zones with a strip for "Special Management Zone". A "General Use Zone" is defined in the Plan as "allow all land use except bulk water removal, subject to the general conditions outlined in this plan." Thus Husky Oil's application is in compliance with the Sahtu Land Use Plan.

I understand that the recent oil and gas development raises a new and controversial aspect, horizontal hydraulic fracturing, and given that these companies are in the exploration stage, and need to utilize this new technology to prove up their work to determine that a project is economical, we should allow this work to proceed at this stage. If the fields prove to be uneconomical, the companies will leave. If they prove to be economical, then the companies will move to the next stage, which could be 10 years away, and it is at this stage the project should go to an environmental assessment and review.

With respect to water use and disposal in the fracturing process, I would like to make note that, any development always has a water impact, from general camp use, watering of roads, pad sites, drill sites, and drilling activities, to name the more common ones. In a

review of some of the prior water licenses issued, the volume authorized for usage varies as noted below:

Licence Number	Years Approved	Company	Authorized Use
SL13L 1-004	2013 - 2017	ConocoPhillips	30,570 m3/Year
S12L1 1-005	2012-2017	ConocoPhillips	174,710 m3/Year
S07L1 1-005	2007-2012	Petro-Canada	235,153 m3
S12L 3-002	2012-2017	Plummer's Lodge	1,000 m3/Year
S04L 1-009	2004-2009	Paramount	5,100 m3
S04L 1-016	2005-2007	Imperial Oil Ventures	7,790 m3
S03L 1-016	2003-2008	Apache Canada	13,325 m3
S04L 1-011	2004-2009	Apache Canada	16,230 m3
S05L 1-004	2005-2010	Husky Oil	23,900 m3
S07L1 1-004	2007-2012	Husky Oil	115,670 m3
S1111 1-005	2012-2017	Husky Oil	1,135 m3
S02L1-003	2003-2008	Northrock Resources	8,090 m3
S07L1 1-006	2008-2013	Explor Geophysical	36,690 m3
S01L 1-002	2001-2006	EOG Resources	8,500 m3
S03L 1-002	2003-2005	EnCana Corporation	33,850 m3

Please note, the above was extracted from the SWLB site, and to determine more information, please go to the source, as I wanted to provide a high level snapshot of water approvals for various projects. The water extractions were from various lake and the Mackenzie River, and used for a variety of applications

I must comment of the recent application by Imperial oil Resources N.W.T. Limited (IOR) for renewal of its Type "A" Water Licence (S03L 1-001 as amended), which as stated in IOR documents "The current water licence allows for the removal of 3,500,000 m3/year of fresh water from the Mackenzie River. Between 2004 and 2012, an average of 2,633,291 m3/year of water was withdrawn from the River. Of this total water withdrawal, an average of 1,128,039 m3/year of water is injected into the reservoir for pressure maintenance and an average of 1,501,598 m3/year of fresh water is returned to the river."

Husky Oil in a recent (December 2013), series of community consultation meetings indicated that they would be applying for a four well horizontal drilling program, utilizing fracture stimulation; and from the application they will be utilizing 14,620 m3 per well with an anticipated annual volume on two well per year of 29,240 m3. In review, I believe that Husky Oil's current application is well within an acceptable range of past practices and volume of water extraction. Community members have expressed concerns on extracting water from lakes, concerns on extracting water from fish lakes, others expressing concern extracting from the Mackenzie River. In going forward, we need the communities and residents to provide guidelines on where to water should be extracted from; lakes, rivers, or water wells.

In regards to disposal of water waste, either from the camps, drill rigs or flow back from the fracture process, I support the current practice of hauling out the water to an approved permitted waste disposal site. Without a current waste disposal site, that transportation of this waste brings a risk; mainly spillage from an accident. To minimize the risk we to incorporate best practices of transporting either by trucking or barging, or start exploring a local waste disposal site option.

In regards to the chemical additives utilized in the fracturing operation, I encourage both government and industry to come to common ground in establishing transparent best practices. If anything, I would like to see movement towards full additives disclosure and benign additives. I believe that we have to place this question of chemical additives within perspective of the world around us, and work towards reducing the risk to ourselves, just as we do with smoking, second hand smoke, too much sugar, too much salt, etc., We need to develop a NWT best practices that will guide companies in the area and ensure residents are protected and are in the best interest of the Sahtu and the North.

We also made the decision to place the lands out for exploration in also in part due to the change in our economy from a traditional to a wages based economy. The majority of our people now rely on wages and with a growing young population; we recognized that this is our new reality. We respect our past and the traditional way of life, but the reality is that a wage based economy is the world we live in now and the world our young people are growing up in. We must give our youth a future of economic freedom to grow, rather than subject them to a government support system of welfare, or relocating for employment.

The Sahtu regional and local economy can be characterized into four sectors; large scale infrastructure development projects, oil and gas exploration, traditional activities and community based.

Over the years various large scale infrastructure projects have being either being developed or contemplated. The only recent infrastructure project developed in the Sahtu was the Enbridge pipe line, back in the 1980's. Since this last development, other large scale infrastructure projects were considered are: the Mackenzie Valley Highway, dam(s) on Great Bear River, coal development, and still on the books, the Mackenzie Gas Project. Some movement has being made on some of the contemplated projects, but nothing of significant to anticipate any project moving to a development phase in the foreseeable future.

The oil and gas industry sector over the past 93 years, since the 1921 find at Norman Wells, can be characterized by the industry as trying to find the next Norman Wells. The industry has always being in the exploration stage which is sporadic with a lot of starts and stops and a short work window normally from November to March, with a good source of short term employment and business opportunities for the communities. When oil and gas activity happens, you see an increase in local employment and business activity, and a decrease in income support.

Tulita, was founded on the traditional (hunting, fishing, trapping and producing arts and crafts) economy and has being a mainstay for many generations. Over the years this sector has being largely replaced by the wage based economy. Local residents will continue to participate in the traditional economy, but not to the extent that it used to happen.

GNWT Statistics reflect the decline, but not the demise, of the traditional economy in the Sahtu.

**Persons 15 & over who trapped in previous year, by community, Northwest Territories 1989-2009. For the Community of Tulita.**

1989 – 19.7%  
1994 – 12.2%  
1999 – 6.8%  
2004 – 17.0%  
2009 – 12.0%

**Persons 15 & over who hunted or fished in previous year, by community, Northwest Territories 1999-2009. For the Community of Tulita.**

1999 – 45.3%  
2004 – 52.1%  
2009 – 41.7%

Being on the ground in Tulita, I still see people engaged in the traditional economy, but what I am not seeing is the youth participate in this way of life as a way to sustain their livelihood. Given this trend, over the years, I believe the traditional economy will continue to decline and we as a community will need to find means to ensure the young people have a future, to continue to live in our community.

The local Tulita workforce is employed in the following four sectors of government (GNWT and Hamlet), Land claim organization(s), local aboriginal organizations, and local businesses. The local employment base of Tulita, number of jobs available, has topped out and is stagnant with no projected growth potential. Most local employees are from the older generation and are retaining their positions for longer period of time, most to retirement age, as there are limited employment opportunities. Therefore, employment opportunities for the younger population within the Hamlet of Tulita boundaries are limited with no foreseeable projected growth. The employment opportunities for the younger generation will be from work outside of Tulita; in areas such as the Canol Shale oil play, moving to a larger center, or rotational work at mine sites, to name a few.

The 2012 GNWT Statistical profile for Tulita show a population of 567, with 141 (24.8%) between the age of 15-14 years and 136 (23.9%) between 25 and 44 years of age. The number of young people under 24 years old is 265 or 46.7% of the population.

From the 2009 (latest data) statistics the labour force activity for the population of 15 and over is 410 with 171 employed. Further, data show 36.0% of the Tulita aboriginal population employed and 80.8% of the Tulita non-aboriginal population employed.

Further, another telling statistics is beneficiaries (monthly average) payments for Tulita; 2006 – 27; 2007 – 37; 2008 – 51; 2009 – 74; 2010 – 54; 2011 – 44 and 2012 – 34. In 2008 exploration activity all but ceased and started again in 2010/11 with the winners on the 2010 exploration call beginning their work.

From the 2008 (latest data) Tulita statistics 41.7% of the people hunted and fished, 12% trapped, 13.7 % produced arts and crafts and 78.2% consumed country foods.

*I have attached the 2012 Tulita – Statistical Profile for reference.*

I know our people speak of the land, water, air, animals and fish, and I do not disregard their concerns, but I point out that we must find a sustainable balance where we can live in a wage based economy, that oil and gas development brings, and still be able to protect the environment, hunt, fish, trap and consume country foods. This will be ours and everyone's task as we move forward.

Lastly, I would like to clarify the process that occurs within the Tulita District with respect to land ownership and management in particular when it comes to dealing with oil and gas companies.

Under the land claim process the Sahtu Dene and Metis received title to approximately 16,000 square miles of surface lands. Titles to these lands were registered as follows: Tulita District Land Corporation (TDLC) – 5,348.1 square miles; K'ahsho Got'ine District (KGD) – 5,283.0 square and; Deline Land Corporation (DLC) – 5,367.1 square miles. The approximately 16,000 square miles included approximately 700 square miles of subsurface (mines and minerals). Title to the mines and minerals were registered as follows: TDLC – 162.6 square miles; KGD – 378.7 square miles; and DLC – 158.7 square miles.

When it came to ownership of the lands and the mines and minerals the Sahtu Dene and Metis seized upon the idea of “Districts” to keep the land holdings closer to the community level, while allowing for sensible administration. The origin of the “Districts” was the Fort Good Hope/Colville Lake Group Trapping Area. The fundamental principle behind this idea was that *legal* title would be held by the “Districts” which would allow the “Districts” to make decisions regarding the lands and the mines and minerals while *beneficial* title would be held by the respective Land Corporations.

The concept of beneficial ownership meant that profits earned from the land and mines and minerals would be paid to the “District Land Corporations”, and members wanted this benefits to flow to all Sahtu members, thus agreeing to and signing a “Sahtu Master Land

Agreement” where financial benefits are shares among all three Districts and their respective members.

Under the Sahtu Land Claim Agreement the “Access Chapter” 21.4.6 (a) states “Subject to (b) any person having a right to explore, develop or produce minerals under or on Sahtu lands has a right of access to Sahtu lands and waters overlying such lands for the purpose of exploring, developing, producing or transporting minerals with the agreement of the designated Sahtu organization or failing such agreement, an order of the Surface Rights Board.”

This clause has a long history and goes back to the failed 1990 Dene/Metis Comprehensive Land, and further, was a fundamental principle of Canada in negotiations. When the 1990 Land Claim Agreement failed, Canada proposed negotiating regional claims based on the 1990 Land Claim Agreement. So, the Sahtu leadership, had to accept this clause, like other clauses in the 1990 Land Claim Agreement to conclude a Sahtu Land Claim Agreement

Therefore, if our Tulita Lands are in an EL and access is required over our Tulita Lands by the developer, the TDLC is obligated by the Land Claim Agreement to negotiate an access agreement with a holder of the EL. The TDLC in the early days after the Land Claim Agreement concluded that it was better to try to reach a negotiated access agreement, rather than have a access order issued by the Surface Rights Board. We have always maintained this position.

If there are no Tulita Lands in an EL no access agreement is required as the Crown is the owner.

The negotiations of an Access Agreement and Benefits Agreement are managed by the Management Committee of the TDLC. One member is appointed by the Fort Norman Metis Land Corporation, one by the Norman Wells Land Corporation and two by the Tulita Land Corporation. The management committee retains a negotiator to conduct the negotiations, time to time utilizing other resources such as an economist, accountant and energy consultants. Over the past twenty years that the TDLC has been negotiating, the agreements have become standardized through developments and improvements

Once the negotiator and management committee have concluded discussion with a developer, the agreements are sent to each Land Corporation for ratification. On the Access Agreement the three Land Corporations upon review deem the agreement acceptable a motion is made to have the President of the TDLC signed the agreement. On the Benefits Agreements, if each Land Corporation upon review deems the agreement acceptable a motion is passed to have its President sign on behalf of that Corporation. The benefits agreement is managed by the Tulita District Benefits Corporation (TDBC) on behalf of the three Land Corporation.

Once an obligated access agreement is negotiated along with a benefits agreement, these agreements are placed on file.

Once a developer determined that they want to conduct its exploratory work (seismic, drilling program, etc.) it prepares its application to the Sahtu Land and Water Board. Part of the developer's application is the Traditional Knowledge study, another very important document for our people. This document gives voice to the traditional knowledge of harvesting and trapping usage, fishing, wood harvesting, animal and bird usage, etc., and documents this knowledge, so that emphasis can be afforded to the area used by our people.

A land use and/or water use application is received and proceeds through the system where a land use permit and/or water licence is granted, rejected, or sent to the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board for an environmental assessment or review.

When regulatory approval is granted to a company and the company wants to proceed with its project, the Access and Benefit agreements are taken from the file, and the TDLC and the TDBC begin the task of implementing both agreements.

Sometimes, even if all regulatory approvals are in place a developer may decide that it will not proceed with its project, such as the Mackenzie Gas Project. The access and benefits agreements that were concluded continue to sit in the file.

In conclusion, I am also a concerned resident, and want to ensure that development benefits our people and ensures that the future generation has an opportunity to secure employment, training, develop a career, establish a business, continue to utilize the land, hunt, trap, fish and lastly, enjoy living in the Sahtu. We need to work together to ensure the long term prosperity of the resident of the Sahtu and that our environment is protected within the scope of development that is happening with the Canol Oil play.

I am also acutely aware that this new technology, horizontal hydraulic fracturing, carries risk, but I want to identify those risk and ensure that they are dealt with and to this end some of questions, I want to understand what are: (1) what chemicals are used, (2) what is the volume of chemicals, (3) if using what, what is the volume used, (4) what is the volume used in relationship to the total volume used on the project, (4) when the water is pumped for the frack what % stays down and what % come back up, (5) what happens to the water that comes back up, (6) what is the distance that a fracture travels from the horizontal drill pipe, (7) what is the risk that water mixture travelling from the fracture location to the water table, (8) how would you know if water escapes to the water table, (9) what would you do if water escapes to the water table, (10) what is the risk the casing integrity is compromised and the water mixture, oil or gas escapes, and (11) how would you know and what contingency plans are in place. These are some of the questions I have, and will have more, and want to continue this dialogue with companies and government.

I believe that we are years away from a project development phase, given the Canol Oil Play economics are proven, and with only two of the five companies from the 2010 exploration call are currently working, we are not experiencing a rush of exploration

activity, as evident by the recent presentation by the Fort Nelson First Nation presentation, which limits the pressure on the environment, wildlife, water, communities and people, thus giving us the time to adjust and deal with this new activity, and keep pace and prepare for the future development that may occur.

Yours truly,

  
Danny Yakeleya

# Tulita - Statistical Profile

	Tulita	Northwest Territories		Tulita	Northwest Territories
<b>POPULATION</b>			<i>Number of Births</i>		
<i>Population (2012)</i>			2001	3	613
Total	567	43,349	2002	7	635
Males	279	22,460	2003	8	701
Females	288	20,889	2004	7	698
0 - 4 Years	39	3,316	2005	13	712
5 - 9 Years	41	3,095	2006	5	687
10 - 14 Years	44	2,848	2007	7	725
15 - 24 Years	141	7,060	2008	8	721
25 - 44 Years	136	13,583	2009	9	711
45 - 59 Years	92	8,831	2010	8	700
60 Yrs. & Older	74	4,616	<i>Teen Births</i>		
Aboriginal	501	22,065	2001	1	70
Non-Aboriginal	66	21,284	2002	1	72
<i>Population Dependency Ratio (2012)</i>			2003	-	72
< 15 Yrs.	0.34	0.31	2004	2	86
60 Yrs. & Older	0.20	0.16	2005	1	68
<i>Historical Population</i>			2006	-	73
2001	501	40,844	2007	1	65
2002	506	41,665	2008	2	56
2003	508	42,561	2009	2	61
2004	504	43,301	2010	1	65
2005	525	43,399	<i>Number of Deaths</i>		
2006	523	43,198	2000	1	156
2007	535	43,551	2001	5	163
2008	549	43,692	2002	-	169
2009	562	43,637	2003	3	202
2010	567	43,873	2004	2	153
2011	574	44,212	2005	2	148
2012	567	43,349	2006	3	182
<i>Avg. Annual % Growth (01-12)</i>			2007	3	174
Total Population	1.4	0.5	2008	5	201
< 15 Yrs.	-4.4	-1.4	2009	-	186
60 Yrs. & Older	5.8	5.6	<i>Injury Deaths (inc. suicides)</i>		
<b>HEALTH &amp; VITAL STATS</b>			2000	-	31
<i>% of Population that Currently Smoke</i>			2001	2	31
2009	47.6	35.2	2002	-	24
			2003	-	36
			2004	-	23
			2005	-	21
			2006	3	36
			2007	-	32
			2008	2	29
			2009	-	28
			<i>Suicides</i>		
			2000	-	7
			2001	-	8
			2002	-	8
			2003	-	10
			2004	-	11
			2005	-	4
			2006	-	5
			2007	-	9
			2008	-	10
			2009	-	7

Tulita Northwest  
Territories

Tulita Northwest  
Territories

### INCOME ASSISTANCE

#### Beneficiaries (monthly average)

2003	14	2,136
2004	11	2,058
2005	10	1,909
2006	27	1,912
2007	37	2,024
2008	51	2,067
2009	74	2,402
2010	54	2,314
2011	44	2,313
2012	34	2,240

#### Cases (monthly average)

2003	8	1,111
2004	6	1,110
2005	6	1,051
2006	12	1,060
2007	21	1,121
2008	26	1,172
2009	39	1,415
2010	30	1,429
2011	26	1,468
2012	25	1,453

#### Payments (\$000)

2003	43	8,945
2004	34	9,270
2005	32	8,610
2006	75	8,534
2007	141	9,783
2008	223	12,048
2009	350	14,573
2010	286	15,116
2011	251	15,810
2012	227	15,984

### TRADITIONAL ACTIVITIES (2008)

Hunted & Fished (%)	41.7	39.4
Trapped (%)	12.0	6.2
Produced Arts & Crafts (%)	13.7	8.7
Households Consuming Country Food (Half or More) (%)	78.5	28.1

### ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES

#### % Aboriginals that Speak an Aboriginal Language

1984	84.8	59.1
1989	82.0	55.6
1994	61.3	50.1
1999	62.9	45.1
2004	47.3	44.0
2009	46.9	38.0

### EDUCATION

#### % with High School Diploma or More

1986	21.3	51.6
1989	38.6	59.8
1991	38.0	59.9
1994	34.3	63.2
1996	43.9	63.5
1999	40.1	66.1
2001	37.9	64.8
2004	39.3	67.5
2006	37.7	67.0
2009	46.6	69.3

#### Employment Rates (2009)

Less than High School Diploma	26.6	35.4
High School Diploma or Greater	57.6	81.2

### LABOUR FORCE

#### Participation Rate

1986	52.2	74.5
1989	58.7	74.9
1991	62.0	78.2
1994	68.0	77.2
1996	68.4	77.2
1999	77.9	78.3
2001	62.1	77.1
2004	64.6	75.6
2006	59.4	76.5
2009	52.9	75.1

#### Unemployment Rate

1986	12.5	11.2
1989	14.1	13.2
1991	22.6	11.3
1994	39.8	14.8
1996	23.1	11.7
1999	24.7	13.7
2001	13.9	9.5
2004	13.8	10.4
2006	17.1	10.4
2009	21.2	10.3

#### Employment Rate

1986	45.7	66.2
1989	50.4	65.0
1991	46.0	69.3
1994	40.9	65.7
1996	54.4	68.2
1999	58.6	67.5
2001	51.7	69.8
2004	55.7	67.8
2006	49.3	68.6
2009	41.7	67.3

	Tulita	Northwest Territories		Tulita	Northwest Territories
<i>Selected Employment Rates (2009)</i>			<i>Average Personal Income (\$)</i>		
Males	40.0	68.1	2001	25,054	39,186
Females	43.4	66.4	2002	26,088	42,047
			2003	27,504	42,572
Aboriginal	36.0	49.8	2004	29,638	44,080
Non-Aboriginal	80.8	83.1	2005	31,197	46,170
			2006	33,045	48,396
15-24	12.9	42.0	2007	32,125	51,072
25-34	53.8	75.5	2008	32,767	52,943
35-44	63.6	81.9	2009	32,081	52,998
45-54	71.2	84.3	2010	31,188	53,978
55-64	61.2	74.6			
65 & Over	2.8	17.1	<i>Employment Income (\$000)</i>		
			2001	4,859	935,854
<i>Labour Force Activity (2009)</i>			2002	5,313	1,016,653
Population 15 & Over	410	33,730	2003	5,842	1,058,922
Employed	171	22,702	2004	6,346	1,101,853
Available Labour Supply	46	2,616	2005	7,557	1,145,168
Not in the Labour Force	193	8,412	2006	7,950	1,208,376
			2007	7,565	1,294,015
			2008	8,400	1,356,780
<i>Potential Available Labour Supply (2009)</i>			2009	8,050	1,356,890
Available Labour Supply	89	4,847	2010	8,170	1,388,490
% Do Rotational	75.3	57.1			
% Male	61.8	59.1	<i>% Change in Emp. Inc. (2001-2010)</i>		
% Aboriginal	95.5	77.2		68.1	48.4
% Less than High School Diploma	50.6	55.9			
			<i>Average Employment Income (\$)</i>		
<i>Employment Profile (2009)</i>			2001	22,086	38,497
% Gov't, Health, Social Serv, Educ	49.7	43.2	2002	24,150	41,428
% Goods Producing	13.5	15.5	2003	25,400	41,904
% Other Industries	33.3	39.2	2004	26,442	43,969
			2005	27,989	45,843
<i>Annual Work Pattern (2008)</i>			2006	31,800	47,856
% Worked	63.7	79.2	2007	29,096	50,627
% Worked More than 26 weeks	54.4	77.4	2008	31,111	52,650
			2009	29,815	52,983
			2010	29,179	53,630

## PERSONAL INCOME

<i>Total Income (\$000)</i>	Tulita	Northwest Territories
2001	6,013	1,058,019
2002	6,522	1,148,300
2003	7,151	1,199,686
2004	7,706	1,246,589
2005	9,047	1,297,842
2006	9,583	1,384,602
2007	8,995	1,469,865
2008	9,830	1,542,755
2009	9,945	1,557,610
2010	9,980	1,599,920
<i>% Change in Total Inc. (2001-2010)</i>	66.0	51.2

## *Percent Taxfilers Less than \$15,000*

Year	Tulita	Northwest Territories
2001	45.8	28.8
2002	48.0	27.6
2003	42.3	28.0
2004	34.6	27.3
2005	34.5	26.0
2006	34.5	24.9
2007	35.7	23.3
2008	40.0	23.7
2009	41.9	23.9
2010	40.6	23.3

## *Percent Taxfilers More than \$50,000*

Year	Tulita	Northwest Territories
2001	16.7	31.4
2002	16.0	34.4
2003	19.2	35.1
2004	23.1	36.5
2005	20.7	38.3
2006	24.1	39.9
2007	21.4	42.7
2008	23.3	43.7
2009	22.6	43.6
2010	21.9	44.2

Tulita Northwest  
Territories

Tulita Northwest  
Territories

**FAMILY INCOME**

*Average Family Income*

Year	Tulita	Northwest Territories
2001	49,780	80,225
2002	50,036	87,143
2003	50,927	88,244
2004	54,708	91,362
2005	64,358	96,171
2006	66,750	101,622
2007	61,042	107,252
2008	69,292	111,796
2009	58,577	112,119
2010	63,250	113,934

*Percent Families Less than \$30,000*

Year	Tulita	Northwest Territories
2001	50.0	20.8
2002	36.4	19.4
2003	36.4	20.3
2004	33.3	20.2
2005	25.0	19.0
2006	25.0	18.0
2007	33.3	16.6
2008	33.3	17.0
2009	38.5	16.7
2010	33.3	16.4

*Percent Families More than \$75,000*

Year	Tulita	Northwest Territories
2001	20.0	47.4
2002	18.2	50.4
2003	18.2	50.7
2004	25.0	52.7
2005	33.3	55.3
2006	33.3	57.1
2007	25.0	59.5
2008	33.3	60.8
2009	23.1	60.7
2010	33.3	61.9

**PRICES**

Year	Tulita	Northwest Territories
2009 Living Cost Diff. (Edm = 100)	162.5	..
2010 Food Price Index (YK = 100)	178.0	..

**ENVIRONMENT**

*Average Temperature (°C)*

Year	Tulita	Northwest Territories
January 2003	-27.7	..
January 2004	-25.7	..
January 2005	-24.3	..
January 2006	-27.9	..
January 2007	-24.1	..
July 2003	18.5	..
July 2004	17.6	..
July 2005	14.8	..
July 2006	16.1	..
July 2007	19.4	..

**COMMUNITY LIVING**

Year	Tulita	Northwest Territories
% Who Volunteered in 2008	28.3	37.7
% of Homes with Internet Access in 2008	46.2	73.5

**SYMBOLS**

- zero or too small to be expressed
- .. not available
- x data suppressed