

# **SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS ASSESSMENT IN THE YUKON**

## **Workshop**

### **VERBATIM RECORD**

February 3, 2005  
Westmark Ballroom  
201 Wood Street  
Whitehorse, Yukon

---

The workshop reconvened February 3, 2005, at 9:03 a.m.

#### **18.0 Welcome and Introduction to the Day's Theme**

LINDSAY STAPLES: Good morning everybody if we could start. If we could today, I would like to start on Ottawa time and not on Yukon time, because there's a lot to cover this morning.

What I would like to do is just begin before I review the day with you, I'd just like to recognize a few people. Sometimes this recognition doesn't happen until kind of late on the last day. Some people have been working extremely hard here, and I would like to pay tribute to them. First of all, I would really like to recognize Steve Phillip, who has been doing the audio with us. I can't say enough about how great the sound has been, Steve. So, thanks so much for your effort.

As well, I think you know that these forms you're filling out and sending to the front of the room, this information is being inputted by a team of people: Shane Andre, Diane Gunter and Carenn Kormos. There are about 200 of you in the room, so you can imagine what these people are having to do. The idea is to get something back to you this afternoon. Again, if you could just recognize those people for their outstanding effort, please.

And I would just like to thank all of you for just the tremendous help you've been, both at your tables and just generally. I've really enjoyed myself. I've had a great time, and I really appreciate the positive energy and the fact that people are moving from table to table and sharing so much with each other. That has really made for a much richer event. So, thank you on my behalf.

I would like to go through the day if I could. This morning, we're concluding the presentations; but we've got three very important presentations this morning. We're looking at health impact assessments this morning, a really interesting area that's emerging as a really important area in Canada and, in fact, around the world, and you'll hear more about that this morning. And in the area of what

some of us call “resiliency”, resiliency of communities and institutions; and of course, the flip side of resiliency is capacity. We’ve been hearing a lot about capacity as it relates to the capacities of communities, not just to participate in the assessment process but the capacity of communities to respond to change, to adapt to change and to respond to proposed developments. So, we’re going to be hearing about that this morning.

Then, as well, of course, we’re going to be hearing about the experience of the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board and the learning curve in their experience since their inception and what we might take away from that as it applies to the Yukon.

Then in the afternoon, we’re moving into really applying what everybody has learned here, and we’ve got half a dozen case studies or scenarios that we’re going to have the tables work through and essentially do impact effects assessments of these projects. The scenarios are really interesting ones. It’s like a gaming exercise almost, only we don’t have the software program. You’re the software in this instance. So, it’s not Sim City, but it’s getting close.

As well, in addition, we’re going to take the comments that you’ve been offering up over the last two days and feed those back to you, and we’re going to ask if you could bring priority to the range of comments that have been offered up here. One of the purposes of this workshop was to try and get the areas that mattered to you most on the radar screen so that all of those who are involved in the work of implementing effects assessment in the Yukon are aware of what they need to be thinking about. So, that’s the opportunity that this workshop provides for them is for them to come away with your comments, but particularly what you think is important for where attention needs to be focused over the course of the next so many months as this process is built, guidelines are developed, procedures are developed and so on. I think again your contribution is really going to be important in that regard.

Finally just a quick note on the schedule for today, particularly this morning. We’re going to be running about 25 minutes behind schedule. The reason for that is I was really hoping that we could take 15, 20 minutes this morning first thing for you to talk at your tables about what you heard at the end of the day yesterday from the First Nations Panel. It was a really rich presentation. There were quite a variety of perspectives, which, of course, is the way that it should be; and I’d just like to review with you quickly, maybe just to refresh your memories in part, about some of the important points that were made yesterday, and maybe that might be, in part, the point of departure for some of your discussions. Again, we were hoping you could take just a few moments this morning to reflect on what was said yesterday. We don’t want to deny people that opportunity to have that discussion.

Just very quickly, some of the highlights that I took out of the discussion was first how important it is in the process of assessment to accommodate not just First Nations' participation but to think about how important oral speech and communications are for First Nations peoples in bringing forth and articulating their interests and their concerns and particularly their world view. I think the point that Brian made is there are certain processes that can be extremely contrary. They don't present the kind of environment, especially in quasijudicial processes, for people to speak about customary laws and traditions and so on. Certainly I think those of us who recall back to the Berger process, it was a landmark process, partly because of the communications dimension of that process; and as Tom was indicating the other morning, the effort that his commission took to enable people in small communities and from every walk of life to basically come forward and in their own words, as he puts it in his report, "to speak to them things that matter most to them." I think it was really interesting yesterday when Pearl Callaghan read out the Declaration that the Teslin Tlingit Council has drafted and developed with respect to the importance of traditional customs and customary law. Of course, those are exactly the kind of things that are vital to First Nations and assessment processes need to be recognizing and thinking about.

Finally, just on the point of communications, of course, the most profound perhaps recognition -- or the most profound event that was a failing on the part of, in this case, a judicial process to recognize the significance of First Nations' oral abilities and communications was, of course, the first *Delgamuukw* Court Case, in which the judge ruled a significant amount of oral evidence to be essentially *ultra vires* or outside of the deliberations. Of course, subsequent court decisions overturned that view by that judge and recognized the significance and importance of communications and oral testimony for First Nations people. I think that's an important point for us to be thinking about.

We heard about the long-term effects. There were a number of speakers who talked about how projects that have come and gone have left behind effects, social, economic and environmental, that continue to persist decades and decades later; so that speaks certainly to something about the scope of the project.

I think we heard about not just the temporal scope of the project but the geographical or spatial scope and boundaries of projects and what needs to be thought about there; and the notion was it needs to be considered quite carefully, especially when one is thinking about hunting territories; and as Bill was commenting yesterday, the whole notion of thinking of systems on a regional basis and perhaps not being too narrow. It's one thing to take into account local interests but to understand that those so-called "local interests" often extend over very, very large areas of land.

As well, we heard from people yesterday about the whole area of -- how can I put this -- the concept of what one person called "the whole land"; and again, I think this speaks to having to look at systems. We talked a lot about systems yesterday; but just as we talked about ecosystems, we need to be thinking about social systems and how they affect the way that people live on the land. I think Bill was the person who coined the phrase "whole land", and I think that's something again for us to be thinking about.

Then, as well, there was the issue of capacity, capacity at the local level to participate in these types of processes. A couple of people said there hasn't been a great deal of experience recently with EA at the community level, and that's about to change, of course, as a result of the location of designated offices in Yukon communities, and other communities, of course, will be affected by that. You know, there's a lot to be thinking about that in terms of not just getting designated offices up and running but just the capacity of First Nations to participate in the EA process, given their governmental responsibilities.

So, those are some quick points that I took away. You have yours obviously, but I would like to suggest we just take 15 minutes now to talk about some of the issues that emerged from yesterday and the ones perhaps that you thought are most important. Lyn, did you want to add anything to that?

Sorry, it's the orange sheet of paper that we're directing you to. We'll take 15 minutes. Thanks very much.

[PEACH SHEET]

(Workshop Adjourned at 9:15 a.m.)

(Workshop Resumed at 9:27 a.m.)

LYN HARTLEY: Welcome back.

Wanda Leaf is our gal who has been doing a fabulous job, organizing and getting all the registration. I was talking with Wanda, and she has never, ever seen this before in a workshop that we actually are oversubscribed, and we keep growing as each day goes on. So, there is obviously some interest here. The organizers anticipated losing 20 percent, and we haven't at all. Note that it is growing in size for whatever reason, and Wanda, in all her years doing that, has never seen that before.

(Announcements: Check in with Wanda Leaf)

## **19.0 Determinants of Human Health and Health Impact Assessment - Carolyn Dunn**

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thanks very much. A couple of years ago I was first introduced to the work that Health Canada is doing in the area of health impact assessment and was just staggered by the really, really interesting work that that department is doing in the small unit within Health Canada. I went to their website and downloaded at that point the two-volume handbook on the health impact assessment. I'll tell you, I couldn't recommend a better book if anybody coming out of this workshop wants to really get to the fundamentals of impact or effects assessment, that health impact assessment handbook from Health Canada, the way its written, the clarity, it's just outstanding. You're going to hear more about it this morning, because it's actually four volumes now, I understand. Carolyn Dunn, from Health Canada, will be telling you more about that. of course, it also introduces a very exciting area of the social determinants and other determinants of health, which I think more Yukon communities are becoming increasingly aware of.

Carolyn Dunn is well-suited to the talk. She has a graduate degree in environmental assessment. She specializes in that area within Health Canada and in the area of health impact assessments, health indicators, determinants of health and so on. Carolyn has got a presentation this morning, which refreshingly is going to break from the format of the last couple of days. It's going to be interactive, so it's not a case of a person talks, and then, you do your table thing. This is going to be a bit different, so that will be a refreshing change. Please welcome Carolyn.

CAROLYN DUNN: Well, thank you, Lindsay, and I just want to say what an honour it is to be here, speaking among so many faulous participants and speakers. So, it's a real honour today. To get underway, I have titled my talk "The Determinants of Health in Environmental Assessments Undertaken for Projects in the Yukon Territory". I guess the term "environmental assessment" is just showing my background in the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*; but what I really mean is development assessment in general, and specific to what we are talking about today has been called "environmental and socio-economic effects assessment"; but the terminology that we like to use at Health Canada is "human impact assessment", because it's all about people and the impacts of development projects on people, whether it be the social, the economic or the health aspects of development projects and their impacts on people. I'll be switching back and forth between the terms "effects" and "impacts"; because for me, they're interchangeable, and it means basically the same thing.

So, to get to the participation aspect, I want to start off by discussing with you, because I believe everybody has an idea of their own health and what affects their own health and how they can be unhealthy or healthy -- so, I want to start off by discussing with all of you what are some of the things that determine your health. So, anybody just jump up and throw some ideas out. I'm going to be taking notes on the overhead projector on things that you see as affecting your health, and then, I will be incorporating your comments into my presentation.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS:

- NUMBER OF SMILES PER DAY
- NUMBER OF BRIEFING NOTES PER DAY
- GETTING OUT IN MY CANOE

CAROLYN DUNN: Now, is that for recreation or for undertaking traditional activities, getting out in your canoe?

AUDIENCE COMMENTS (Con't.):

- IT'S RECREATION
- THE WELLNESS OF PEOPLE AROUND YOU
- NUTRITION
- INCOME SECURITY
- MOOSEMEAT
- VOLUME OF COFFEE
- MOBILITY
- HUMOUR
- CONNECTION TO YOUR COMMUNITY
- FAMILY
- CLEAN WATER
- CLEAN AIR
- SUNSHINE

CAROLYN DUNN: Wonderful; I'm finding this really interesting because so far, we've gotten a lot of the things I'm going to be talking about, which are the social determinants of health. What is really interesting in this list that we've got so far is nobody has really mentioned disease.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS (Con't.):

- HEALTHY CHILDREN IS REALLY IMPORTANT FOR LOTS OF FAMILIES. IF THE KIDS AREN'T WELL, THE HOUSE ISN'T WELL.
- SPIRITUALITY.
- ADEQUATE SHELTER
- WHEN I SAID I THINK "MOOSEMEAT", I REALLY MEANT BEING ABLE TO GET OUT AND HARVEST IT.

CAROLYN DUNN: Getting out on the land in other words.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS (Con't.):

- ACCESS TO GOOD FOOD IN GENERAL.
- AND GOOD WINE.
- FITNESS.
- CHOCOLATE.
- FRIENDSHIP.
- MUSIC.
- SAFETY.

CAROLYN DUNN: Safety is a key one when we're talking about development projects and looking at occupational health associated with development projects. So, that's definitely key.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS (Con't.):

- IDENTITY - PEOPLE ARE HEALTHIER WHEN THEY CAN UNDERSTAND WHAT THEY ARE AND WHERE THEY ARE IN THEIR COMMUNITIES.
- SAFE SEX.
- GREAT SEX.
- SOME SEX.
- LAUGHTER.
- FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES.
- LACK OF PAIN.
- PASSION.
- HOBBIES.
- HAVING A HEALTHY SELFESTEEM.
- CHOICE.
- BEING SOBER AND DRUG-FREE, NOT BEING HUNG-OVER.
- FREEDOM.

CAROLYN DUNN: Wonderful; so, now I'm going to get back to my presentation, and I'll try and incorporate these ideas into my presentation as we go.

So, that was some really good input there. I think a lot of you have an instinctive idea of what your health is and how to improve it. I won't go into this slide very deeply because we spent the last two days talking about YESAA; but one thing that I wanted to touch on, which is really important to us at Health Canada when we're looking at development projects, is this clause in YESAA that says:

(f) to recognize and ... enhance the traditional economy of Yukon Indian persons and their special relationship with the wilderness environment;

At Health Canada, when we're looking at environmental assessments, one of the things that I almost always ask when I'm looking at, say, a northern mine is "Will

this project impact on traditional activities and on country foods?" And when I'm talking about that, I'm talking about the contamination of country foods, the taste of country foods, the texture of country foods, as was mentioned yesterday; but I'm also talking about that spiritual and cultural aspect associated with getting out on the land, which people mentioned just now; and that special relationship with the wilderness, we're always looking at that.

One thing I'm working on presently is the Mackenzie Gas Project, which I'm sure a lot of you know about; and I've got two experts at Health Canada who are looking into the country foods aspect, because it is so crucial to the north.

So, moving into the determinants of health, this a nine determinants framework that was developed by a federal, provincial territorial committee on environmental and occupational health back in the 1990's; and since then, other frameworks for the determinants of health have been developed, but this is the one we're working with, because it's not just something that Health Canada thought up. It's something that input from people here in the Yukon Territory, as well as the other territories and all the provinces, gave input to. So, I'll be looking at each one of these determinants of health in turn.

First of all, physical environment - this is the health determinant that is usually looked at in environmental assessment; and you can see there, we're looking at all the aspects of the physical environment, including water, food, soil, air and noise. And one aspect of the physical environment that's rarely considered but it was very, very important, especially to Canadians in cold climates, is that the indoor environment has a greater influence on health than the outdoor environment, because we all spend more time indoors than outdoors; and this is rarely looked at in development assessments.

Next, income and social status - this was mentioned in our little talk this morning. This is, by southern studies, recognized to be the most important determinant of health; and it's not just how much money somebody has. It has to do with the distribution of wealth in a community; and the more equitable the distribution of wealth in a community, the healthier the entire population is. And related to income is social status, and the better relative social status that one has, the better their health is; and this is interesting, because it's not just the very poor in a community compared to the very rich. Each step up the ladder of social status, health has been shown to improve. This is also related to the degree of control that one has over their lives, and that was mentioned -- choice and freedom was mentioned this morning. So, that's related to income and social status, as well, the freedom to choose, which unfortunately is related to how much money one has. And an indicator that can be used to get at this determinant of health is median income; and this is a better measure than average income, because average income can be skewed by say there's one billionaire in a community, the average will be higher than the real experience of people in the community, whereas the median is the middle number in the whole range of incomes for the



whole community. So, that's a better measure for looking at income in a community.

One thing to consider when looking at income in the north is money management issues, and that's how the money is used; because if somebody gets a job in a mine and suddenly has this huge influx of cash that they've never dealt with before, they may use their new cash in ways that aren't healthy for the community or for themselves. They might suddenly go into substance abuse, buy more alcohol and all this, and this can have very detrimental effects on the community. So, although income is seen as the most important determinant of health, in the north a new influx of cash can have some pretty adverse health and social effects.

Next, related to income, is employment and working conditions, and this picture I have here is an actual picture from the Diavek Diamond Mine in the NWT. So, that's just one example of the kind of working conditions that people can have in the north. So, there is the fact of whether you have a job or not, looking at unemployment and the unemployment rate; but there's also the concept of safety that was mentioned this morning, and there is also a less quantifiable measure of the control that somebody has over their job, and this is really important in how healthy somebody feels, and that's once again related to the concept of choice and freedom, and that's how much control you have over your daily life.

So, moving on, education - this isn't only the number of years spent in primary school, secondary school and university. Important for development projects is training opportunities that are offered in association with development projects, and this can really lead to better health if somebody has, once again, more control over their daily lives, and they're also more educated to make better choices in their daily lives. This can easily be measured by the number of years of schooling that people have, and this is tied in to other determinants of health, such as the social status that one has in their community. An example that I have, I've been working on an environmental assessment of a northern diamond mine, and the proponents for this project are opening a training facility on a reserve in this First Nation community to encourage local citizens to be able to work in the mine.

Next, and this was definitely mentioned in our little list this morning, social and family support networks, this is key. The more social contacts that somebody has, the better their health is; and this also gets at the physical aspects of health, because the more family and friends that somebody has in the community, the better off they are in hard times. They have people to fall back on to support them in their lives. And when we're facing change in a northern community, you need strong families, communities that are conducive to social interaction where a community where there's less discrimination and more social tolerance. A negative indicator of social and family support networks is levels of family violence, and this measure has actually been included in environmental

assessments, where proponents undertaking an environmental assessment have spoken to local RCMP officers to get an idea of whether family violence has changed or what the baseline condition is in the community. So, that's actually looked at in environmental assessment; and this determinant of health is tied into things that we heard yesterday. For example, Patt Larcombe spoke about social systems, and this is all tied into this determinant of health; and Bob Couchman spoke about social cohesion, which is also tied into this determinant of health. It's a key indicator to look at when doing social impact assessment.

Next is an indicator of individual health, which we spoke about this morning when talking about nutrition and coffee and wine and chocolate and all sorts of things; and this is personal health practices and coping skills. Personal practices include smoking, alcohol, drugs, eating habits, nutrition and physical activity; recreation, like getting out in your canoe. An indicator where you can get information from is Statistics Canada, who measure this as the amount of leisure time physical activity that people undertake in a community; and what I find really interesting about this indicator is that generally, you people here in the west are more physically active and in better shape when it comes to this indicator than people out in central Canada or in the east. I don't know, maybe it's that you have more beautiful nature to get out into and enjoy, but that's what the stats say about western Canada.

Related to this is coping skills, and this is a more psychological determinant of health related to people's ability to cope, to be self-reliant, to solve problems and make informed choices that enhance their health.

Next, this was also mentioned, the amount of healthy children in your community; so, a healthy childhood development starts in the prenatal stage with pregnant women. I was just reading an article in the local paper this morning about foetal alcohol syndrome. So, your healthy childhood development starts before a child is even born. An interesting thing about childhood health is that children are not simply little adults. They have different behaviours, such as crawling and putting everything in their mouths, that put them at greater risk to health problems, and they also have a different physiology, which simply means that their bodies are different. They're growing and developing, so they're at different stages of development. Their brains or their bones or other aspects of their bodies are more susceptible to health problems; and when it comes to contaminants in the community, say from development projects, children are at higher risk, because they have little body weight compared to the amount of contaminants that everybody is exposed to; and this ties into one of the other determinants I was talking about, which is the indoor environment. Children are especially susceptible to contaminants in the indoor environment, such as lead-based paint, which they're exposed to in their places of childcare and in the home; and an indicator that's an example of this is childhood asthma prevalence. Now, this is a serious concern in the south, but I really don't know how much of a concern it is

in the north. So, I have a question for you: How many in this room know of a child who has asthma, please raise your hand.

So, it is pretty substantial up here, as well as in the south; and this is definitely related to air quality. If you're looking at a new highway development or other projects that impact on air quality, such as a development project that will cause a lot of dust and particulate matter in the air, especially farm particulate matter, this is definitely related to the amount of childhood asthma that will occur in a community.

The next indicator is biology and genetic endowment. This is what we are born with, and we can't control this very much; but it is definitely important to look at one aspect of this in environmental assessment, and that's gender. Gender is an important determinant of health to look at in environmental assessment, because women can be impacted differently from a development project than men, because let's face it, even today when you have, say, a mine coming into a northern community, we have more men working at the mine than women, and women are often left behind in the community to look after the families and the elders and to uphold the community strength. So, gender is definitely important to look at in environmental assessment and in development assessment more generally; and I have actually seen this looked at in the northern mine project that I'm working on currently.

Next this is a determinant of health that is often looked at in development assessment, and that's health services; and this can be quite a struggle in the north, because often there is limited availability of health professionals in the north, and a development project can really exacerbate this issue. So, you can measure the strain on health services by talking to local health professionals and finding out what the baseline situation is and looking at whether the companies will bring in extra health services, whether they're going to provide health services to their workers or whether they're trying to fall back on the governments to provide those health services; and an example of this is with the Mackenzie Gas Project, which I'm working on, and the proponent has left a lot of the health services to be dealt with by the GNWT, and this is a serious problem, because you could be bringing in a whole new population in the work camps, and that can't just be left up to an already stretched health budget and health services. So, this is a serious consideration to look at in a development assessment.

So, that's it for the nine determinants of health in this framework that was developed in the 1990's, but there are other determinants of health that aren't part of our older framework that are crucial to look at; and the main one that I'm talking about here is culture. This is crucial to look at in northern development assessment, and what I've got here is a little map that I took off of the internet. This shows the traditional languages in the Yukon. I'm sure you all know more about this than I do, but language is a crucial part of culture, and language retention can be looked at in environmental assessment, and it's really key to

consider whether peoples' traditional languages are recognized in the environmental assessment process. For example, does the proponent and do the people going out to the communities to consult, do they provide translation services, or do they expect it all to happen in English. This is crucial to the social impacts that can occur from development projects before the shovel is even put in the ground, and it's an aspect of the trust that's created in the community consultation, whether their languages are recognized.

One thing that really touched me yesterday when the First Nations Panel was talking was the legacy of historical development and the legacy of residential schools, as discussed by people yesterday; and I see this determinant of health related to culture and the ability to retain your identity as a people, and this is a spiritual, emotional, mental and even physical determinant of health, and it's crucial here in the north. And this is tied in to the special relationship with the wilderness, which is referred to in YESAA and the ability to continue maintaining traditional activities and the ability to continue being out on the land, and Health Canada will continue to look at this determinant of health in environmental assessments and to encourage proponent and responsible authorities or designated -- what's the term here in the Yukon -- designated offices to continue to use culturally-appropriate methods when consulting communities.

So, to wrap up, health and environmental assessment or development assessment, as we may call it here in the north in the Yukon, health indicators, I gave you an example of one of those for each of the determinants of health, these are quantitative indicators of health that can be used, not to fully capture the whole sense of the determinants of health but just to get added a little bit, and these can be used in socio-economic baseline studies; and these indicators can be collected by looking at the online database of Statistics Canada, which is their health indicators database; but unfortunately, that data is only available for the Yukon as a whole. It doesn't break it down into smaller regions. So, I don't know how valuable you all would find that, but there is that free information available on the web; and the data can also be collected by going and talking to people in the local community, going and talking to the healthcare professionals and the RCMP and other local people in the community to get a picture of what communities are going through at this point in time, in the past and into the future.

So, social impact assessment or human impact assessment can predict qualitatively or quantitatively how these indicators will change with the project, taking into consideration that the social environment is dynamic. You can't take a snapshot at one point in time and expect it to stay the same for the next 25 years. You have to take into consideration how it's evolving with or without the project.

So, that's about it for my presentation, and to give you some references; there's a Canadian Handbook on Health Impact Assessment that was referred to earlier,

and I will be getting a list of participants from this workshop, and I will be sending out our new CD of this handbook to everybody if you're interested in getting it. It should be developed next fiscal year, and it's going to be in four volumes, and I have a handout here, printed out, that gives you an outline of what's coming on that CD so you have an idea what kind of resource you'll have to read. It's a really great volume, there are four volumes actually now, looking at all the different aspects of social impact assessment, health impact assessment, economic impact assessment, it's all in there, and it's a really great resource that we've spent probably a decade developing. Also, for more information, you can go to the Health Canada website to find out more about the determinants of health; and my own office is called "Environmental Health Assessments Services", that's EHAS, and that's our website there. Then, of course, there's the Statistics Canada database, which may or may not be useful to you. So, that's it. Thank you very much.

### **19.1 Questions/Comments - Determinants of Human Health and Health Impact Assessment**

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thank you very much, Carolyn, that was really something. We can take a couple of questions for Carolyn if anybody has some.

IAN ROBERTSON: Carolyn, Ian Robertson; Carolyn, could you perhaps break down the scale here. Now, I'm going to take the role of a proponent for a small project. Most of the examples you were using I sense were in the context of quite large projects. So, could you give us an example of how you would apply some of your determinants and indicators to a relatively small project, for example, let's take a new school in a community of 400 people.

CAROLYN DUNN: Well, for smaller projects, we don't tend to look at all nine or ten determinants of health. We tend to focus on the determinants of health that are relevant to the project. So, for a school, obviously you're going to look at education and training opportunities, as well as healthy childhood development. So, we would look at what's this building going to be made of? Is it going to have any contaminants or any things that would endanger children, looking at health and safety of children, as well. And we would also look at the educational opportunities that this new facility would be providing. And another thing that could be looked at for a development project like that would be the aesthetics and the completed look, whether this building is being designed in a way that is culturally appropriate for the group that will be using the facility. I don't know if that gets to the answer that you're looking for, but that's basically how we do it at Health Canada. We're responsible for small health facilities on First Nation reserves; and when we're doing those very small environmental assessments, we tend to look at only the determinants that are directly related to that building.

LINDSAY STAPLES: If I could on that, I think Ian's question applies across many of the talks we've had over the last two days; and what he's introduced is how is the effects assessment process altered as you go from, if you will, megaproject to microproject; and it was mentioned to me actually yesterday by a couple of speakers, and it's something to think about and carry forward, and I'm not sure that we're going to fully address that question in this workshop, but it's a really important question. Again, I think it applies over many of the areas we've been talking about over the last two days, so thanks for the question, Ian.

RON SUMANIK: Ron Sumanik, Oil and Gas Business Development. First of all, I want to commend you on an excellent presentation. It was extremely valuable to me.

CAROLYN DUNN: Thank you.

RON SUMANIK: I guess the follow-up question to that is: It's great, and I think we all recognize those determinants of health. You laid it out very well. On your website or in your offices, do you go to the next step and talk about measures or mitigative measures, whatever measures or steps you can take when faced with a large or small project to maintain those healthy communities?

CAROLYN DUNN: Right; well, the handbook that we'll be sending out to you, and I also want to point out that there will be these handouts about the handbook in the next room, I'll put them out on the table there for everybody to take, and Volume 4 of our handbook goes by Industrial sector, and it lists the major health issues associated with development projects, and then, goes through the mitigation measures that can be used to manage some of those health impacts. So, that is in the handbook.

BARNEY SMITH: Carolyn, you talked about coping strategies. One of the psychological areas that maybe important is the degree of optimism or pessimism over future quality of life for individuals and families; and certainly with all the climate change news and negative news about the way the future is going, that is certainly a prevalent view that we're hearing about in communities and often from elders that this can't be sustained, and here is one more event that's coming on and maybe a disinterest in participating. It's not a pleasant thing to talk about, perceptions of bleak futures; but the notion is that may be something to add into the determinants or may already be included. I don't know what kind of indicator you would put into that, but just to be able to have a conversation around that.

CAROLYN DUNN: Right; I don't really have an answer to that, except that I think what's important in development is that it's community-controlled and that people really feel that they have a say in where their

community is going in the future so that they feel hope for the future and for future generations. That's related to the degree of control one has over one's life, the feeling that they know where their community is going and that it's going in a good direction.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thanks for that, and just a quick follow-up on that, Barney, I appreciate your comment; and actually, if you look at a lot of the work that's been done in Alaska, looking at project assessments, psychological stress is actually a huge issue for people who are being forced to make choices between time on the land, time on the job and it obviously speaks to -- it's one of those phrases that just repeatedly comes up in IESes over there, and your point is really well taken.

BRIAN PELLETIER: It's Brian Pelletier with the Yukon Department of Environment, and it's just a quick question on process and who the players are on the health impact assessment side. How will the role of Health Canada -- will they be taking the lead on this, or will it be the Health & Social Services Department in the Yukon, and how will you work together on the health impact assessment side of this?

CAROLYN DUNN: We're still figuring that one out. Carl, right here, is the person for the B.C. and Yukon region, Health Canada, who looks at environmental assessments; and we're really not sure yet whether we'll be taking the lead or whether the Government of the Yukon will be taking the lead. We're really not sure, because this process is still in development, and it's not clear what Health Canada's role will be, because we're very clear what our role is under CEAA; but under YESAA, we really don't know yet.

JODI BUTLER-WALKER: I have a question. My name is Jodi Butler-Walker, and I'm with the Yukon Public Health Association. I'm just wondering if you could comment, Carolyn, on the indicator for education as number of years of schooling, if you could comment on how traditional knowledge could be incorporated into that indicator.

CAROLYN DUNN: Well, I wouldn't say that traditional knowledge could be included in the quantitative indicator of numbers of years of schooling; because that's a piece of data that's usually collected by Statistics Canada or another statistical body, and it's referring only to the public school system, the conventional school system. But traditional education can be looked at from a qualitative point of view through training and time on the land; and when you're looking at the social baseline description, it can be got at in that way, but I don't think it's something that you would measure. That's why I like to emphasize, when doing human impact assessment that it's so important not only to quantify things but also to look at qualitative indicators.

LINDSAY STAPLES: I think, as well, what Carolyn is speaking to is just the importance of good information, and I think on Brian's point, as well; and this is something a number of people mentioned to me yesterday and asked if this workshop was going to address the issue of jurisdiction and jurisdictional responsibilities, whether it's information-sharing or who's taking the lead in providing this kind of baseline data or who's got regulatory responsibility; and I think it's fair to say that this whole area of roles and responsibilities, I know the Board is really quite interested in this whole area. It matters to them with respect to who's doing what and what are the working relationships and so on, that this is an area that's very, very important and again, I'm not sure that we're going to grapple with that one adequately or fully obviously in this workshop, but certainly I think it should be up there on the radar screen of discussions that need to occur.

PAULA BANKS: Paula Banks with Champagne & Aishihik First Nations, and my question is more of a follow-up of what Jodi had mentioned: Are you familiar if there are tools being developed that will more adequately capture the First Nation way of life; because a lot of the indicators are about, you know, median income, and a lot of the indicators just aren't necessarily appropriate for the First Nation communities. Is there somebody working on that now that we could work with. I'd be interested to hear what you know for resources in that regard.

CAROLYN DUNN: My only experience in environmental assessments that look at First Nations' traditional economies is that the proponent or the people undertaking the studies will go and speak to local communities and speak to local hunters and trappers associations, and they'll get information on the quantity of the harvest and how many meals per year are provided by country foods in the traditional economy. So, that's how it's gotten at through the studies that I've seen. I don't know if that answers your question.

LINDSAY STAPLES: And I think, Paula, maybe this also speaks to the role of the First Nations' Health and Social Departments and the whole aspect of traditional knowledge as it applies to the health field and what those departments could contribute with respect to, I think as you importantly point out, raising or bringing forward those indicators that are going to really be meaningful and significant to First Nations' health.

WENDY NIXON: Wendy Nixon, Environment Canada; on the environmental assessment side, there is a growing science dealing with cumulative effects. I'm just interested in knowing on the human impact side how you have in the past or see in the future dealing with cumulative effects of human impacts.

CAROLYN DUNN: I would say that's still a newborn science in looking at cumulative social and health effects. I'd say it's gotten at more on the



physical health side. We've developed more, for example, by looking at cumulative effects on health through water pollution or air pollution or the accumulation of noise from various activities in one area. So, when we're looking at physical health, it's definitely developing by looking at the quantitative accumulation of pollutants in the environment; but when it comes to the social aspect of health, it's really through talking to communities and through traditional knowledge studies and things like that that you get at the burden that a population bears from past development and projected future development.

LINDSAY STAPLES:                    Anyone else?

(No audible response)

LINDSAY STAPLES:                    I was going to suggest with the blue sheet of paper, if you do have time over the health break that I'm now announcing, we'll take a 15-minute health break, and Lyn has an announcement.

(Announcement - List of Contact Information to be distributed in afternoon, not on CD)

(Hearing Adjourned at 10:15 a.m.)

(Hearing Resumed at 10:33 a.m.)

LINDSAY STAPLES:                    I was just reminded over the break, and this is an interesting update, in the past, under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, socio-economic effects assessment, considering these as direct effects was discretionary; and Ian Church reminded me now that with the last set of amendments to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, largely as a function of the work that Health Canada did, health impact assessment and environmental impact assessment are now on an equal footing. So, I think that just lends greater weight, if you will, to work in this area.

It's a real privilege for me and a rare one to introduce a sociologist. I'm one, and it's a lonely life here in the Yukon; but I'm thrilled that we were able to bring Naomi Krogman from the University of Alberta. She's an environmental sociologist in the Department of Rural Development, and for those of you who know the Northern Ecosystem Initiative, Naomi is involved with that. She has done a lot of work in the area of social development and community development. In particular, she has given a lot of thought to this area that I think more and more of us are becoming interested and concerned about of community resiliency as it relates to the potential effects of projects on communities, and that's what she will be speaking about today. Many of you, I know, particularly in communities, have been talking about the capacity of communities; and, of course, there is a relationship between resiliency and

capacity as it relates to how communities respond to change. So, please welcome Naomi Krogman.

## **20.0 Resilient Communities - Lessons for Socio-economic Effects Assessment in the Yukon - Naomi Krogman**

NAOMI KROGMAN: I want to tell you that when I first came to this conference, I wasn't so nervous about presenting, because I teach a few classes, and I do present fairly regularly; but the more I sat in the crowd, the more nervous I became, partly because I just have so much respect for the people in this audience. I find you incredibly energized; and if you've heard about Mazlo's "Hierarchy of needs", where at the bottom you need shelter and you need food and at the top, you are self-actualized; I think many of you are close to the top there. So, I can appreciate why you are so vigilant and so concerned about YESAA, because you have a lot at stake, and you also have a lot that you want to keep, you want to maintain; because this is a very special place.

I want to give you just a little background on myself so you know where I'm coming from. I've observed the impacts of oil and gas development at different periods in my life, and so I've been quite sensitized to large-scale development projects in general in my career. In 1977, I lived in Java, Indonesia as a 12-year-old. My father, a mechanical engineer, worked for Fleur Oil Company, overseeing the maintenance of an oil facility. I recall the armed guards who escorted him to meetings and stood guard around the facility and learning about the tension and transition around the Indonesian Government reducing foreign ownership and control over their oil and gas development.

A year later, I recall living in Texas, where the pump jacks dotted the landscape and where images of extreme opulence and poverty dance around in my memory.

Flash farther ahead to my PhD. work, where I studied the implementation of a wetlands policy in Louisiana. As you may know, there has been a moratorium on offshore oil and gas development along the California coast for a number of years, yet oil and gas development has continued for the last 70 years, with several booms and busts, first on the land and more so, in the last 30 years, offshore on the Gulf Coast. This offshore development has been a major contributor to the 5,000 miles of canals along the Louisiana coast, home to a 10-mile band of wetlands. The coastal landscape, from an aerial view, is much like the regions of Alberta, with a criss-cross set of lines across the landscape, indicating significant land disturbance; and for Louisiana, significant wetland loss. While oil and gas has periodically brought abundant wealth to Texas and Louisiana, those who have appeared to benefit less are the African Americans, rarely employed in the oilpatch and women, especially those not married to someone who works for the industry, who make up well over half of the population.

Petrochemical companies along the Mississippi River have been notorious for emitting pollutants in the air and in the river. In fact, there is a large area where the Mississippi River dumps into the Gulf Coast, called the “dead zone” where no plant life exists. This is also attributed to non-point source pollution from agriculture. While the booms have brought great wealth to the state, long-lasting benefits are less pronounced. It is one of the poorest states in the United States; and next to Mississippi, it has the worst environmental record and education levels. When I lived there, we would always say to each other, “Thank God for Mississippi!”

For the past eight years, I have lived in Edmonton, Alberta, studying alternative institutions of resource management, such as integrated resource management. It is ironic that I left one of the most active oil and gas regions in North America to move to another one, and there are very few of them, this time in Canada. One of my recent projects involved interviewing key informants in industry, principally oil and gas and forestry, government land management positions, aboriginal leaders, especially those associated with forest management or environmental portfolios, and environmental nongovernmental organizations about the opportunities and barriers to integrated resource management. Repeatedly, interviewees from each of these groups noted that the oil and gas tenure system operates on its own time scale, one that structurally prevents planning for the long term; and forest companies are often at odds with the oil and gas companies, because they generally have 20-year leases. So, they do plan ahead; and this oil and gas leasing system, all the stages of development, is largely hidden from public scrutiny. There have been big conflicts in Alberta. There have been two murders associated with oil and gas conflicts and many conflicts. It’s been a very difficult period, the last 10 years. Interviewees also felt the province had over-allocated oil and gas leases and that they are in a difficult position to claw back allocations, especially in light of new information about impacts to caribou and many other species, and they feel that changing the oil and gas system is just politically not feasible. In short, oil and gas rule.

This brings me to some key points I would like to make to bring us back to the big picture before I talk about community resiliency. The first point has been made by Lindsay and Patt and Paul, but it deserves repeating, especially if we consider the nature of many of the developments. The nature of many of the developments is that they are capital-intensive, not labour-intensive. The nature of these developments is that the key proponents of many of these projects have yearly earnings far higher than the GDP of the Yukon, which I learned at this workshop is one-tenth of one percent of Canada’s GDP and that many of these companies do have excellent human resources in law and finance from their vast experiences across the globe. The nature of many of these developments is that much of the labour is unskilled and that the skilled labour has often been imported from outside the community or region. The nature of these new developments is that most of it is considered men’s work, and the work requires

men to be away from their families, often two weeks or longer at a time. There are periods when many people are needed, such as the initial construction phase, but this is usually short-lived. This means that housing, social services and safety issues often become important to community members as the influx of new people move into a place, often single men in their 20s, a period some might call “testosterone overload”, which is hard to prepare for when the needs of the bulge in the population are temporary.

The second point seems to resonate with people in this audience: Grand Chief Ed Schultz talked about the many companies that have come to the Yukon. Sometimes the resource is exhausted, but more likely, it becomes too expensive to extract the resource, and the company, most of which have multiple operations, may decide that they can cut their losses at one place and make more money elsewhere. We have seen this with many forest companies in the provinces, where even when a mill was profitable and timber resources were accessible, it wasn't as profitable as investing the money for that mill elsewhere. I have heard several people here throw around the idea of slowing the pace of development so that the jobs may be held longer, thereby fostering more stability for that community. Remember that when the market prices are good, companies are likely going to want to extract the resources fast as is permitted and reduce employment costs when prices are lower.

The final point is that there may be less room for error here, given the fragility of some of the regions in the Yukon and the direct effects people may experience from a change in environmental conditions. Bill Slater talked about the precautionary principle and adaptive management. In a nutshell, this is moving ahead with prudence and allowing feedback into decisions about impacts, many of which may have not been expected.

As we all know, change is inevitable. With or without new developments in the Yukon, the interplay of ecosystems and social systems continues on; but resiliency becomes all the more important when we come clean and admit that while we can predict many likely impacts, given the lessons from elsewhere, given the experiences and observations of local people and the advances of natural and social sciences methods, there is still a great deal that is unknown. A case in point is the interplay of global climate change with development impacts. Most scientists would agree that the combination of increased development with global climate change may produce all sorts of unexpected impacts. Remember that social effects assessment is anticipatory. Without experiences to compare with elsewhere, it is an open book as to all the effects that may occur. If part of social effects assessment, for example, is to ask elders how their harvest patterns may change in light of Development “X”, the answer will incorporate the changes they have already seen from global climate change from other developments; but they, like anyone else, may be at a loss to address “what if” scenarios for changes with which they have had no experience.

Another area of uncertainty is simply the cost. I read a book last year, a new publication, reviewing megaprojects around the world and how well they have turned out; and one of the claims in the book is that megaprojects, in general, have cost 40 percent more than they were projected to cost.

Another area of uncertainty, of course, is the environmental impacts, wetlands reclamation, for example. It is one thing to plant a hardy wetland plant in a region that is periodically flooded. It is quite another to recreate the complexity of plants, invertebrates, waterfowl, soil chemistry, et cetera. We cannot remove peat lands and simply replace them. We cannot dramatically disturb caribou habitat and simply assume that they will thrive elsewhere, given the best science and the best intentions. In human systems especially, it is difficult to talk about cumulative impacts, which was suggested by one of the people who asked the question about that. I am working with a group of natural and social scientists on a project designed to track cumulative impacts in a region in the north. The natural scientists can tell you when a species appears to be in trouble, often because their numbers precipitously drop.

In human systems, when are the negative effects of development outweighing the positive effects? While income may be good, for example, family dynamics may be worsened. David Lawrence's presentation on significance has shed some light on this; but as he and Tony Penikett so clearly assert, what is significant, what is a cumulative effect that is no longer tolerable is a social judgment. Humans are highly adaptable, and human perceptions about a high quality of life across the life course are highly variable, especially in terms of the weight placed on individual well-being versus collective well-being.

So, the large industry players in the Yukon are responding to a number of international factors that will be hidden from your view. Now, I don't really know who all the industry players are in the Yukon. I'm basing this more on my knowledge of Alberta. So, forgive me if there are much smaller companies here and I'm naïve about the constellation of players that may be coming to the Yukon; but they're mostly U.S.-owned companies that have had a huge influence in Alberta and several Canadian companies. These companies, some of their decision-making logic will not be entirely predictable. Add in there the possibility for world events, such as 9/11 to change geo-politics in a big way or elections of key elected leaders to reprioritize the role of energy development in the Territory. In this context, it becomes all the more important to consider what allows people to adapt over time as developments come and go. Social effects assessment, in my view, should tap into these features of communities that are associated with resiliency. If the pace of proposed developments picks up substantially in the Yukon, there may be political pressure on regulatory agencies to make decisions even if they are understaffed or when extra expertise is needed to make a decision. A long list of required considerations for each project may be simplified when the screeners, for example, are faced with far more work than they can carefully do and when there are no rewards in their system. If that is the case,

which sometimes has happened in other places, if there are no rewards in their system for taking the extra time and spending the extra money to carefully cover all of the considerations.

Something to guard against is a term in the sociology literature we call “bureaucratic slippage”, and it’s where you have a policy that everyone feels quite good about, about balancing social, economic and environmental interests; but as it’s implemented, it’s whittled down or it’s watered down so that the actual outcome is a far cry from the initial intention, and that is where “The devil is in the details”; but I do have a lot of faith in the people in this audience. You’re paying attention to details, and I think bureaucratic slippage is less of a risk here than it’s been, for example in Alberta.

As so many of you have emphasized, there are positive impacts of development. These positive impacts are emphasized by the proponents in many cases. You should see Syncrude’s new “Info Marshall”. It makes me want to move to Fort McMurray. And often by governments who, generally speaking in the industrialized world, most governments are pro-growth, and they see that the revenue could turn into roads and schools and better healthcare; and we are still in an ideological framework in the world where we believe more growth is better.

So, the idea is with the positive injection, mostly of money, there will be all these spin-off benefits that will trickle down to all sorts of people through training and education and self-esteem, many of those factors that you associated with health. Companies and governments are less likely to educate the public about the potential negative effects; and many of those that have occurred many times over in different places are not addressed in the literature review of social impact assessments in many of the ones that are done that I have seen, at least in Alberta.

Recently I attended an international impact assessment meeting in Vancouver, people from all over the world talking about the methods and what they found for different cases. I tried to go to every single session on development in the north. I was dismayed by the lack of comparative work that Patt Larcombe mentioned is so important done by social effects practitioners. In other words, each project was treated like it was its own thing.

So, I’m going to very quickly go through some of these negative impacts, because I think that David Lawrence and Carolyn Dunn have already done a nice job hitting on these. Remember that negative effects and positive effects are unique to different types of development. Of course, a dam is different than a major pipeline development, and there are phases: the construction phase, the operation phase, the maintenance phase, and then, the decommissioning, which have already been talked about.

Just briefly, these are things to look out for. I won't spend a lot of time. So, what's interesting about this literature is that even during times of busts when you would think everything would be great, booms and busts are associated with these effects. So, sudden change is what seems to be the trigger for many of these problems.

Some of the unintended consequences, and Carolyn also touched on this, is the greater stratification of the community. What we find in resource-dependent towns, for example, is they have bigger pockets of poverty than in agriculturally-based, rural communities.

Another interesting finding that's been repeated in the literature is that technological accidents associated with large-scale developments tend to tear communities apart, where natural disasters tend to bring communities together. So, if there is a plant explosion or whatever, oftentimes the people who work for the plant, for example, might feel somewhat loyal to the company and not want to be as critical; and the people who are not employed may feel angry with the company, let's say if it was the company's fault. So, there's this division. And you see many cases where, especially in contaminated communities, social relations were problematic for years to come after the accident.

A term in sociological literature is also "overadaptation" where communities actually over prepare for that particular industry. So, it means people are trained to work in the mine or work in the mill, and the problem is these appealing wages discourage higher education, and the specialized skill requirements maybe make workers unadaptable to easily move into another job, should that mine close or that job become obsolete. Seniority benefit policies also create incentives to "wait out the bad times" when a person maybe should retool, given the likelihood of the business continuing, they maybe don't, because they've put in so much time there, hoping to ride it out, and they've seen booms and busts in the past, so they're waiting for the next boom. It becomes a problem if many specialized businesses develop around the particular type of industry; and so, as that industry declines, so do all these support businesses.

A number of studies show that the rotation work schedules can be hard on families. Tony Penikett mentioned the importance of childcare to Yukoners during the Yukon 2000 planning process. It could be that such a social benefit becomes very important for women who may feel somewhat isolated.

In forest-dependent towns, for example, women report lower life satisfaction and I'm hearing from other people that work in gender areas that because of the opportunity structure in some of these places and the isolation and the lack of services that maybe have developed to that date, women don't find them pleasant places to live in some cases.

So, the heart of this talk: These two terms have been thrown around quite a bit. These are working definitions. You all probably know what “community capacity” means intuitively, and it’s simply a community’s ability to address their own problems and challenges and act on a basis of self-awareness. Resilience is very similar, but it’s the idea that you can maintain what you care about most, the ability to maintain, renew or reorganize social system functions and ecological functions. So, resilience combines social and ecological functions. This is a term that has been written about by Fikret Burkus at the University of Manitoba. Both of these terms imply subsidiarity, which has been mentioned over and over again the last two days. Those closest to a resource should have the greatest decision-making responsibility where the knowledge and ability resides to address problems.

Now, this doesn’t mean that subsidiarity means that only local people should have a voice. It also is sensitive to the idea that at different levels, you need a broader representation of interests; but those linkages have to be there, those communication channels.

I just want to unpack those terms a little bit more. “Political capacity” is something that I think has been implied by “community capacity”. This refers to the ability of people to be involved in decisions regarding the distribution of resources, peoples’ rights over aspects of the environment, impacts of current decisions on future generations and interests in other species. It refers to the ability of people to get the attention they need from external decision-makers and place their items of concern on an action agenda.

Social capital is very similar to community capacity. The definition I see in academia, anyway, is much like Bob Couchman referred to. That’s the reciprocity of relationships. So, it’s trust. It’s information exchange. It’s norms and networks that facilitate collective action.

Social learning is also kind of a new term in the literature in sociology; but it’s more about this idea that when people are involved in collective action, they should be learning, and that should empower them to be involved in future developments or future collective efforts. Bob Couchman also emphasized this in his talk when he talked about I think it was Judy Jacobs and how people are willing to be self-critical and listen even when they think they really have things figured out.

The strength of TEK, traditional ecological knowledge, the continuity of traditional ecological knowledge, this comes up again and again in the resilience literature where, of course, the younger generations are learning traditional knowledge, and there’s a strengthened identity and commitment to one’s community.

Sense of place, this is a term that’s more often used in non-aboriginal communities. It’s similar to traditional ecological knowledge but usually not as



deep. The same historical relationships are not there. Sometimes the level of intimacy is not there, but that's the strength of connection and belongingness to one's place.

I appreciated Bill's assertion on the First Nation Panel, for example, about the importance of being out on the land to know the land, to instill a land ethic.

And then, some other terms: identify; identify is maintained through memory, tradition and reputation. This historical sense of place provides the foundation for values and commitments. Pearl Callaghan, on the First Nations Panel, emphasized how central identity is to the Teslin Tlingit people. Lori added to this with her explanation of some of the damage done by the loss of identity.

Institutional memory - this refers to people who have lived a long time in a place and worked for a particular organization and know what has been tried and what has failed. They know which networks are important to get something done and how some good ideas and bad ideas continue to resurface with different names.

Leadership, that goes without much explanation. This is part of human capital, people who are willing to provide vision and talk about how to get there. I recently went to a talk by John Ralston Saul, who some of you may know, a famous philosopher in Canada; and he argued that we are in an era where there are too many -- we're in an era of managerialism instead of leadership, where we're training people how to manage things and reduce risk and keep the wheels rolling, rather than to actually ask how could things be better? How could things be different? He warns against that when we're looking to the future.

Linkages with outside organizations - again bottom-up development doesn't usually work, top-down development doesn't usually work. It's something in between.

So, what have I heard from you in the last couple of days? Over and over again, community participation; and you're asking for greater empowerment and planning and decision-making. You're saying that the process may be more important than the product. You're saying that justice is probably more important than economic rationality. This is my own spin on things, so I may have it wrong here. What else have I heard from you on resilience? Support traditional land use, support retention of language, respect existing rights, provide opportunities for a diversity of people, not just those who will obtain jobs in the new development; and be more supportive of companies that are likely to stay in the Yukon for many years.

The last part of my talk is on public participation. I just want to say that we can think about this as one and the same with social effects assessment, but I think it's different. Public participation tends to focus on whether or not people like the proposed action. Most of the vehicles for public participation are where people

come and tell you what they're worried about. Social effects assessment is more the projection, what is likely to happen to people that live near the proposed action.

Patt Larcombe went over many of the methods used in social effects assessment, but I want to focus on public participation. It could be one of the most important parts of your SEEA because of the venue it truly is for struggles over your alternative futures. So, the question becomes how to interconnect and coordinate the different but inherently interdependent discourses of citizens and experts; and in order to do that, you have to have people from the different areas altogether in a public involvement process.

Just a quick overview of public involvement methods. These have been tried extensively in the provinces for forestry, because most provinces require, in their forest management plans, to have public involvement. So, there's lots of work on these, assessing how well they have worked. Now, the first three: open houses, many of you know what that is, a presentation usually from the proponent to get your feedback; public hearings, that's more where a decision is actually going to be made. Remember how Brian talked about how public hearings didn't go that well in his experience for the Champagne Aishihik people because they did not meet community expectations. Focus groups, one thing I just want to say about these is that the more two-way flow of information there is, the better they are. Rather than say, "Okay, I'm going to go to you and ask you what you're worried about and I'll just write it down and go away," rather people often want to discuss. They want to ask questions. They want to say, "Can you tell me why you are going to do it this way, rather than this way, and why can't we consider this instead of that." The people who are proponents and the people who are presenting these things should be able to answer tough questions. So, as you go down this set of items, those at the bottom are the more participatory ones, the ones where people actually decide on the process.

Some features of good public involvement - incorporate a representation. I think that's really important, because I don't think one of these methods is going to get you everything. I think you need more than one method to get at public concerns. Is it accessible? Are the meetings at a time and a place where people could realistically go? Does it allow new participants over time? I'm hearing from many of you about the fatigue and the burnout of some of the First Nation leaders especially who are overtaxed already for showing up at this or that. Is there a way to bring new people so that new leaders can emerge as some of them decide to back off for a while?

In some cases, anonymity is important when issues are emotionally-charged or where the sponsors of a process have the power or are perceived to have the power to extract retribution from those who oppose their preferred options.

The depth is important. People seem to have a real good handle on the difference between consultation, for example, and listening and dialogue.

Flexibility refers to the design of specific activities on ability to place items on the agenda that people want on the agenda and opportunities for open and frank discussion. Transparency and credibility, let's say a First Nation says, "We want to know how this will affect the riparian zones" or something. Can their interest in those effects go back and actually show up in a new study or more information? So, the credibility of the people who are holding the knowledge, the data. As many of you probably know, one of the first tenets of conflict resolution is where people trust sources of information. They don't think that they're biased in one direction or another.

And relationship-building, sometimes some of these processes benefit from having codes of conduct. "You may not scream and yell and walk out," for example, because that can have such long-lasting negative effects on relationships.

There are a handful of these. Relevance just refers to will the decisions in that public involvement actually go back to the people who make the decisions? In Alberta, we've had a big problem with that, lots of consultation processes that the ultimate decisions did not reflect that public involvement.

So, I'm going to jump ahead to my last couple of slides, because I'm running out of time; but these are somewhat self-explanatory. One of the last things I want to say is I think Patt did a nice job of saying how important it is at the scoping stage to have a good project description and to have openness about how the consultation, the involvement, will unfold from thereon out. I would like to just emphasize that because a lot of these impacts from development are unpredictable or there will be unintended, unexpected consequences, it's important, I think, that as the development unfolds, there are mechanisms in place that allow people to renegotiate agreements to say, "I'm concerned about this impact. We would like to see this diminished. We would like you to see this addressed" so that there is truly adaptive management there and that it truly is precautionary; because otherwise, what happens a lot of times is the SEEAs are done and the development proceeds and everyone is happy with their benefit impact agreements or whatever; and then, there's no recourse for people three years down the road, five years down the road. And if the benefit impact agreement is private, for example, there might not even be a way to hold the company accountable in some cases. So, it's really important that there are mechanisms in place later on for people to question what's happening.

So, like in so many places in Canada, and two recent environmental policy books argue this: That social impact assessment in many parts of Canada has been somewhat of a rubber stamp. You're going to do things differently here, I trust that, and it's really encouraging. This really means involving communities in the

whole process of how it's done. I really appreciated Tony Penikett's argument that the trick is to continue the dialogue.

Finally, social impact assessments are more likely to foster community capacity and resilience if they incorporate continued community involvement, call for monitoring of key indicators and the return of that information to the community and the opportunity for agreements made with the company or the government to be revisited and renegotiated over time. Thank you.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thanks very much, Naomi. If we could, Naomi is going to be with us the rest of the day, so -- she's not going to be with us the rest of the day. So, if there are any questions you want to put to her, I would suggest you do it sooner than later. We appreciate your being here. Thank you.

Could we go directly into the discussions with respect to many of the points Naomi has raised. It's the pink sheet. Thank you.

[PINK SHEET]

(Hearing Adjourned at 11:10 a.m.)

(Hearing Resumed at 11:25 a.m.)

## **21.0 Building Socio-economic Impacts into Environmental Assessment - The Experience of the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board - Mary Tapsell**

LINDSAY STAPLES: If we could, I'd like to move on to our final presentation of the morning. Our next presentation is taking matters to a very practical level. We've covered a lot of ground over the last two-and-a-half days, and it's all come down to Mary Tapsell. I don't really mean that, Mary. Mary is a long-term northerner. I was talking with her last night, and she's been in communities basically from the Baffin right across to the Yukon. You'll be pleased to know that Mary is a Yukoner to the extent that she owns property at Bear Creek up in Dawson, and I think that qualifies her for membership. She is a long-term northerner. She's worked in all aspects of environmental management and conservation planning and most recently, she's working with the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board and is here to basically I think acquaint us with the work of the board and the path that the board has taken in getting to where it is today and the challenges that the board has had in establishing itself and developing relationships between itself and communities in the Northwest Territories. With that, please welcome Mary Tapsell.

MARY TAPSELL: Thank you. This is a great privilege to be over here. I was so excited to be asked to come, because I have a lot of good friends

over in the Yukon. Both professionally it was a great opportunity and personally, it's been a wonderful opportunity, as well.

I've sort of been in this dilemma as the days have gone by, because I keep going, "Oh, they're saying what I wanted to say. Maybe I shouldn't say that and maybe I should say this." I started to redo my presentation, and then, I went, "No, I'll keep it where it is." I added a little bit more, and I'll just talk. A little bit more about Mary, just so you have an understanding of where I'm coming from on this, I've worked with several different environmental assessment processes, going back to the EARP-GO days, the *Environmental Assessment Review Process Guideline Orders*; then into CEEA, *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* to the new environmental legislation, the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* in the Mackenzie Valley. I have been working with institutions of public government both in Nunavut, up in the Inuvialuit settlement region, and now in the Mackenzie Valley. I've worked at the Territorial Government level and Federal Government level, and now I'm working for an institution of public government. For the last seven years, I've been sort of at the helm, coordinating decisions coming in from environmental assessments; and now I'm working for the board that's creating the environmental assessments going to the decision-makers. So, I feel that I'm able to hopefully share with you and bring some unique perspectives that may or may not have application to you over here in the Yukon.

Another thing I would like to point out is it's the "Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board". We are not the Mackenzie Gas Joint Project Secretariat who is doing the review on the pipeline right now. Although we have had some early involvement with that project, our board is not directly involved with the review of the Mackenzie Gas Project. We appointed three nominees to that panel and now they are separate from our board and functioning on that panel.

Just again to make sure you're all on the same page as far as the MVRMA came to be, I thought I should give you a little bit more background and context and shouldn't assume that everybody knows everything. The MVRMA is the lower part. The Inuvialuit Settlement Area, of course, was finalized in I think it was 1984. We had a lot of different processes, looking at settlement of claims in the rest of the Northwest Territories. Unfortunately, we did not have an umbrella agreement, such as you did here; but when the Gwich'in and Sahtu Claims were settled in the early '90's, I think it was '93 and '94, coming out of them came the requirement for this new environmental legislation called the "*Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act*". It was envisioned that this act would bring together the different land claimant groups to look at things a little bit more wholistically and co-management system. We have currently -- and this is an old map, I apologize -- in the North Slave, which is the K'ahsho area, we have another claim that is just about to go into effect as far as they've been signed and it's gone through parliament.

The Deh Cho has got an interim measures agreement, and they're moving along with the establishment of their claim. And the South Slave, which is the Acho Dene Koe, is another area that is still an unsettled claim area. So, there are a lot of challenges, in that we have settled claims and unsettled claims. We have some groups that in some ways resent the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act*, because they feel that it was not their act, that it didn't come out of their claim negotiation. However, the act was drafted to allow for bringing in more parties as claims got settled; but there are a lot of politics, and I'll just mention that now.

The board that I work for now, the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board, has the responsibility for conducting environmental assessments for the whole Mackenzie Valley. I've just given you a bit of background. The MVRMA was proclaimed in 1998, and it's been a learning curve ever since; and throughout my discussion today, I would like to share some of the things that we have gone through. They're quite interesting. Our board, the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board, is a quasijudicial board, an institution of public government. It's made up of nominees from aboriginal organizations and government. It's nonpartisan and representative of the people. The board takes very seriously their roles and responsibilities. They are an advisory board in the sense that they provide a recommendation to the Federal and responsible ministers and NEB, National Energy Board, in some instances. However, they consider themselves to be a decision board, as well, because they do make a decision on their environmental assessments. With environmental assessment, and I've been trying to look at parallels between the *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* and YESAA to try and make things more real, although I find it a little difficult navigating some of the YESAA myself. So, I'll talk more on our process, and perhaps there will be things that I mention that you'll be able to apply to your situation. Our overall look is at environmental impact assessment, which includes three stages when we look at review. There is your preliminary screening, which is a fairly cursory checklist. I would say 90/95 percent of the projects go through a preliminary screening.

There are different ways that a project can be referred to an environmental assessment; and when an environmental assessment happens, that's when our board kicks in. We have about 28 communities in the Mackenzie Valley; and to date, since the act has been in effect, I would say that we have conducted roughly 25 environmental assessments. So, we have had quite a lot of experience and a lot of "water under the bridge" so to speak in those experiences.

The third level, being an environmental impact review, we have never conducted an environmental impact review. I guess you could say there is the current pipeline project, which was referred to a joint panel process; and that is part of that, but our board itself has never done an impact review, because we do so much detail in our environmental assessments.

As far as the socio-economic side of things, the act defines “impact on the environment” as anything that will have an effect on the air, water, land, biophysical environment, as well as the social, cultural and heritage resources. So, it’s very firm in stating the important part of the social and economic side of things.

The act also further goes on to say that in our environmental assessments, we must consider the protection of the social, cultural and economic well beings of residents and communities in the Mackenzie Valley during environmental impact assessments. So, it’s right there, and it’s been a real “in-your-face, this is now going to happen.” It’s not the CEEA definition. This is the MVRMA definition, and I think that we do have a lot of similarities there on how the importance of looking at socio-economic factors now is being brought into environmental assessments.

Now, I’ll apologize in some sense, because some of my information is going to be basically a review of what you have gone through in the last two-and-a-half days, and I am not an expert in social and economic matters, although I do feel that I am an expert in assessment. You’ve certainly heard from many people here who have shared with you a lot of excellent knowledge. So, I’m not going to try and outdo any of them; but today I do want to talk about why and what we do in our socio-economic impact assessments, steps that our board has taken to date to incorporate and include and develop that, challenges that lie ahead for us and next steps where we’re going. A little of my talk maybe today is going to deviate from some of the socio-economic direct things to process in general, because I think it was actually Naomi who was talking just a few minutes ago about process being a big thing; and environmental assessment is very much about people and process. You can figure out all the bits and pieces and you have lots of knowledge out there, but it’s how you bring all that together and use it the best is one of your biggest challenges. So, I’ll also be looking at that.

Again, why we do our socio-economic impact assessment, this is nothing new to you; but they are looking at changes in the human condition. Understanding the nature of these social and economic impacts, any impact is a change in conditions caused by development; nothing new here, but again I’m just reiterating. I was framing my frame of mind.

One thing that our board has really taken a very strong approach on and attitude about is sustainability. You know, we’re looking at an economy that is largely from non-renewable resource development; and sustainability is a very challenging concept, and it’s been talked a lot about here. I just want to again mention that that’s something that the board holds very near and dear. Have we got it all figured out yet? I wish I could say that we have, but we haven’t. More and more I think we’re going to really look hard at that question, particularly in the Northwest Territories right now. Recently we have got two large diamond mines

that employ a large number of people. We have a third diamond mine currently under construction; and I found out just before coming here that I'll probably have another one on my doorstep this summer for an assessment. At some point, you go, "Wow, when is enough enough? How many people need to be employed," especially on the social and economic side of things. I can't remember who directly has talked about this, but mines are being market-driven, and the time to hit for them is now. Community people are saying, "But the diamonds will still be in the ground 30 years from now." So, there is a lot of pressure on balancing between economics, community desires, social things; and I know that our next assessment, which will be on a diamond mine, a lot of this is really going to come to the forefront. It didn't so much in the earlier ones; a little bit on our third review, but on our fourth, I think the sustainability question will be quite large. Of course, I'm looking at the socio-economic side of things, but we also have to think of the environmental part of it, too, and that gets into the cumulative effects and all that.

We have all gone through the steps. I think several presenters have talked about the important steps in socio-economic assessment. I'm curious, with this group of renowned folks and talented people, how many people in this room have actually been involved in an environmental assessment, as in reviewing, inputting?

Now everyone's hands are up. So, you've all participated in environmental assessment, a large number. That's excellent actually, that's really good; because I think one of the challenges we have is just making sure that people are familiar with the terminologies, what it means and where you fit in and how you fit in.

As I said, some of this will be review; but then, I figure I'm the last speaker, and review is always good for the class. So, you get me to do a bit of a review. Scoping, I can't stress the importance of scoping. You've got to focus on the most relevant social and economic issues and set your appropriate boundaries. It is what will guide your whole environmental assessment, and one of the big challenges is what are the current trends and conditions. Of course, you've got to get out there and hear from communities to do that. Now, proponents do a lot of scoping and they give you their take. What we find, when an environmental assessment comes to us as a board, we often will want to do additional scoping, and we will actually go out into the communities to make sure that upfront we identify the really important issues so that when we conduct our environmental assessment we are making sure that we address the concerns and the issues that are there, particularly if an environmental assessment has been referred to us for public concern. A lot of that is often related to cultural, social and economic reasons.

This is just again to reiterate that baseline studies are many and that socio-economic are just one of many things. I should have really had all these things



interconnected. I think it's become quite obvious here that when people have talked about social and economic, they've also talked about environment. They've talked about heritage. They've talked about culture. Really all these things are so intertwined; but because we have specialists and we have departments and we have experts, we tend to hive them off.

Predicting and analyzing the impacts - the simplest way to put that is ask yourself the question: What would the future be like without development? What would it be like with development? And then, the difference between the two futures is the impact or the effect of the development, a pretty simple, straightforward concept, and it's a really good way to get people to think about that at a community level, because sometimes, we go, "Oh, this is so much stuff and blah, blah, blah," and you really have to sort of focus people as to what is it we're looking at; and that helps them draw the lines and determine what really is important for them at a community and individual basis.

We've heard this time and time again, and I'll re-emphasize it: Many social issues have multiple causes, cumulative effects; and we may have to analyze qualitative data and not quantitative data. One of the big things about our board is that our board is made up of aboriginal nominees, nominees also that have got business background, environment background, industry background. These people come to the table with a lot of knowledge and a lot of different viewpoints, but they do look at the information that they have in front of them in a very impartial way, and they have a huge respect for each other and the values and interpretations that they all bring to the table, which helps a lot when you're looking at qualitative data.

Tools for social analysis - Patt and various people have done a much better job in going through this. I was just touching again the iceberg. One thing that we have found in the north, and I'm sure it's similar over in the Yukon, is your best way to meet is often outside in the environment, in an environment that inspires people for what's important and make that connection. You should always, when you're looking at how you're going to develop your information or get your information, you've got to talk to the people who you're getting that information from and say, "Well, how do you want to participate and what works for you?"

The tools for economic analysis Paul covered off quite adequately, and I won't even try to go there; although one of the real challenges facing us is about the intangibles. There's been a lot of work where you can equate perhaps a dollar value to country foods. You can look at the cost to replace it in the store, the cost to go out hunting, the nutritional value of it; but how do you put a dollar value on the life and the time that you spend in the camp while you're gathering that food? There are a lot of value things that it's hard to put a dollar figure to or an aesthetic thing or whatever it is. So, that's a real challenge.

Just for your information, that's a picture of Diavek Diamond Mine. I was in charge of that environmental assessment. It just about killed me, so diamonds are not my best friend! But it's a fascinating project, and we did look a lot at socio-economic. Even though that project was assessed under CEAA, we did it in the spirit of the MVRMA, and we did do quite a large consideration of socio-economic effects. There was a very detailed socio-economic agreement. I'll be getting into those things later in my project, but for your information, that great big blue thing is their processing plant, and they're actually huge buildings. It's probably the size of three football fields. It's quite large. That camp is located 390 kilometres northeast of Yellowknife, accessible only by an ice road. I could talk forever about it.

Mitigation and significance, obviously projects have effects, and once you've identified the effect on the socio-economic side, you need to also come up with ways of how you're going to mitigate it. There are a lot of, again, great discussions that have happened here on that. One of the big things that has really worked well in the communities in the north has been on-the-job training, an involvement of people early on in the process; also really helping shore-up an increased social service support. The challenge for a lot of us, and it's been brought up again; so, I'm reviewing with you, class, the absence of thresholds on which to help base significance determinations. Our board has the ability, it says, "In your opinion" they can make a significance determination; and they do that, but we always make sure that the evidence is also there to help people understand and justify how we've come to a significance determination. And where something may not be significant, again it's the degree of significance. That's been a challenge.

Steps we have taken - I've passed out on the tables a discussion paper that we commissioned to get people thinking on the same page about social and economic impact assessment. You didn't get the nice coloured ones, I'm sorry. I just printed you some black and whites. It's also available on our website, but it's a good paper, and I think it has lots of application for you, and it will help stimulate ideas and approaches, and I hope that you find that useful. What that paper does is it looks at issues, theories and concepts related to non-renewable resource development impacts, and it helps put a good framing into what it means to have sustainable development in relationship to socio-economic impacts. So, again a really good grounding document for you.

The second part of that paper looks at current process that we are doing in the NWT to approach our socio-economic concerns and mandates of the various departments. I think it's been brought up here several times about really understanding the roles and responsibilities of different agencies.

We had a workshop where we brought together a lot of different agencies and expertise that have responsibility for socio-economic things, and we actually

shared information. We had working groups and came up with approaches and ideas on how we'll address the development of guidelines.

Challenges that lie ahead for us, and these are challenges that everybody has, are identifying the new role of environmental impact assessment for agencies with that mandate. When I say "the new role", changing how people think and getting everyone on the same page. You know, traditionally with environmental assessment, we've really focused on the biophysical; and it really takes a paradigm shift. You've got to really get people out of the box and make them think differently when you're looking at socio-economic, and it's a challenge. I know, I've been living that for a while.

Another huge challenge ahead, and it's been brought up several times, is how do we enforce mitigation or ensure that mitigation happens related to socio-economic measures that are put in for mitigation? It's simple to look at water and say, "Okay, you put that in your water licence," but we don't have legislated instruments for socio-economic. There has been talk of impact benefit agreements. There are benefit plans, and there are socio-economic agreements that have been negotiated for large projects that help create some mechanism to ensure that there is follow-up and adaptive management.

Other challenges that have been identified, and a lot of these are discussed in this paper that you have - the absence of a lot of land use planning on how we fit things in together. We do have a completed and approved land use plan in the Gwich'in settlement area, which is quite helpful. When you're looking at socio-economic assessments, they're developer-driven analyses. So, how far do you take that, and how much additional stuff do you need to look at?

The challenge of incorporating traditional knowledge, people have always looked at it more on the science side as in hard physical science. So, how are we bringing traditional knowledge into the social and cultural side of things? We're often missing baseline data; and again, I just reiterated the thresholds.

The development of CEAA guidelines, we have a lot of bumps on the tundra so to speak. Our board has the authority to develop guidelines under our legislation, and we are currently -- I think it's kind of funny, because I've been involved with all the guideline developments on the other side of the fence, and now I'm picking up all the pieces to finalize things; but when we started the development of the socio-economic guidelines of the board, there wasn't the overarching guideline of how EA works, and I think that was a real detriment. Since we first started our challenges, we've developed a guideline process that helps us fit things together.

More challenges engaging the public, so important; and our board has taken a real heart-to-heart seriousness on public engagement. They're out there all the time. They go to the public. They consult directly with the public. They tell them

the process. They tell them how they can get involved. If you want to get that input, then people have to understand what assessment means and what their role is in it.

Timelines and timeliness, I could probably take up the whole rest of the period talking about that. Needless to say, there are pressures for everybody. You're either too long, too short. Everybody will always be under the gun on that, and all I want to say is ensure that the quality and integrity of your EA does not get any less attention than it needs because of pressures; and make sure that people have adequate time to respond and review information, or you're not going to have the stuff to make a good decision.

On the back end, all I can say to decision makers is you've got your work cut out for you, because you've got a huge coordination thing there, and I could just talk for hours about that.

Understanding roles and responsibilities, a huge, huge thing here. I've had many workshops in which I've brought people together. I've had them present and say, "I'm from DFO, I'm from Health Canada, whatever. This is what we do. This is our mandate. This is what we look at when an EA comes in." People need to hear that, board members need to hear that. Everyone needs to hear the same information so that you know where there are gaps, where you need to get outside expertise, and you can go to people when you have questions.

Boards, all I can say is independent does not mean isolation. I know it's been something our board has really wrestled with. I've worked with a lot of different boards. Because they are under the laws of natural justice, they are to be nonpartisan. They don't want to look biased, however, you can have communication, you can have discussions. So, just remember that one.

Significant determination again is always an issue, and when you develop guidelines, they should be descriptive, not prescriptive.

This is a document that was missing when we first started developing our guidelines. We now have an excellent guidance book. I can send people hard copies if they want it. I've got it on CD, and it's also on our website. It's a great guidance book, and now what I find -- in fact, two mornings ago, I was actually awarding a request for proposals to do more work on our socio-economic guidelines. We now have the motherboard to fit things into. So, you need to have a starting spot, and then, you need to sort of know how you're going to fit into it.

We also, on our website right now, have been doing a lot of work on traditional knowledge guidelines, I'm quite happy with them, but I'm sure we're going to get chewed apart; we've had a very in-depth public consultation process for that, and we're going to be pulling that together come February the 11<sup>th</sup>.

The road ahead, this is my nearly-last slide, I picked a nice road. I talk about the road ahead for us, and I talk about the road ahead for you. You've got to draw your maps, you've got to build your road; and when you build your road, you're going to get to where you want to go. I think that you are in a really exciting situation here in the Yukon, and you've got a really great sense of what is important to Yukoners. I think that you will have head-butting and differences of opinions here and there, but I think you all have a vision. I think you want to maintain a positive, beautiful environment. You want to have economic opportunities. You want traditional lifestyles maintained. If you can all keep your vision together, then how you find it will be a good journey; and smile a lot, because you can always resolve problems when you laugh. And being the typical, I had to have something, I said: YESAA, You have your work cut out for you, but "Yukon" do it. So, with that, thank you very much.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Mary is going to be with us the rest of the day, so if you've got questions for her, you know by now that she's most approachable. So, please take advantage of her being here.

What we would like to do, as we did following Carolyn's talk this morning, we asked you to fill out forms on your table relating to that health discussion. A number of tables did that, and we really appreciate that. We have also taken the questions from the floor and incorporated that into the Record. With Mary's talk, as well, if people could as soon as possible fill out that form and bring them to the front of the room, that would be helpful.

With respect to this afternoon, this afternoon is going to be important to basically reviewing and assessing where we're at relative to all the discussion we've had over the last two-and-a-half days. It's very much a hands-on group discussion. The work at the tables is going to be critical this afternoon. As sometimes occurs, and I know it's not going to happen today, the last afternoon of day three, we are counting on you being here, because we need to finish off the work that we started several mornings ago.

As well, we've got a brief opportunity to hear from Dale Eftoda, who is the Chair of the YESAA Board, and I would like to provide Dale an opportunity, before the lunch hour, just to offer up some remarks based on what he's been hearing over the last couple of days. So, Dale, welcome to the front.

## **21.0 Remarks YESAA Chair - Dale Eftoda**

DALE EFTODA: I know you're all getting ready to head for the door, and I want to thank you very much for your patience. I also want to very much express, on behalf of the Board and Board staff the work and preparation for this, YTG and the facilitators for keeping the flow going, for the presenters. I mean, the information that we need on the social and economic aspects is kind

of lacking; but hearing it all at one time, we've certainly increased our list of practitioners, and we can tap into the resources that have made themselves available.

Several times through the presentations, through the preambles, the focus has been on the YESAA Board and the challenges that are before us. We certainly recognize, even though the social and economic aspects are somewhat overwhelming from some of the experience and expertise that we've heard from all the presenters, both local and from, what we say, the "Outside" here, knowing that those people are there, we could at any time avail their expertise and help us manifest a very pragmatic and working set of rules.

The Board was appointed on June 7<sup>th</sup>, and I won't list all the activities that the Board has done since that time; but to get to this point, our principal activity has been the development of our Rules of Procedure in three areas: One, in the designated offices. We're very fortunate here that the designers and developers of the YESAA Act, one of who is sitting here right now, he's a member of the Board, in locating the capabilities in our designated offices, six of which are spread throughout the Territory, where we can proficiently and efficiently conduct our assessments. Probably 80 percent of our assessments will be done in the communities, and we've just about finished wrapping up the Designated Office Rules; but within the Act, there is an obligation for the Board to collaborate with the assessment officers in the communities in finalizing those rules.

I know at the beginning it was a bit of a surprise when Lindsay asked the Board to stand up, and the Board has been present here for most of the two-and-a-half days so far. Unfortunately, I'm not going to be able to be here this afternoon, but I know Board members are going to stay; and I'd just like the Board members, I know it's a little uncomfortable, to stand up again. Just if you could. Stephen Mills is on the Board, Tara Christie and Carl Sidney, and I know that Dave Keenan was sitting in the back somewhere. We're missing one right now, he's doing Board business, Scott Kent. We're missing one Board member that has still to be appointed by the Federal minister, and I know there's an ad out now, seeking interest towards that position. But the development of our rules are critical, and the Board and staff have been working on them. We also have four members of the Board staff here, and we have four of the six designated office senior assessment officers. So, I'm sure that you've talked to some of them. It's been invaluable to be here to network with the experience and expertise that is in this room. I was very pleased to hear this morning that over the two-and-a-half days, the capacity in the room has lessened because more people are here. So, that's been very rewarding in itself.

The amount of information that has come out in the past few days has certainly been uplifting and somewhat overwhelming, but over the next half-day, we'll continue to try and absorb as much as we can and it will certainly be an asset.

Again, thank you very much to all the folks here, and I look forward to further discussions. I know again, and I mentioned earlier, that there was a lot of focus on the YESAA Board and its roles and responsibilities. That's part of the equation. We recognize that we're an advisory board. There are a significant number of decision bodies out there, all the Federal Government's branches are decision bodies, YTG is a decision body, and all First Nations are a decision body. So, our recommendations, wherever the project might be, go to those decision bodies for them to create a decision document. So, even though the Board recognizes its responsibilities in creating meaningful recommendations, we will have to engage, over the next little while, with the decision bodies, the First Nations, Territorial Government and the Federal Government; and having those recommendations that we prepare understood and seek from them what it is exactly that they need from the Board in creating a meaningful -- we've heard time and time again, it's critical that there be open, meaningful dialogue, and a lot of that has already started, and I hope that that continues. Thank you very much.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Just before we head off for lunch, Lyn has got a couple of matters.

(Lyn Hartley - announcement - book launch and participants list)

(Workshop Adjourned at 12:10 p.m.)

(Workshop Resumed at 1:00 p.m.)

## **22.0 Exploring Potential Approaches for SEEA in the Yukon - Lindsay Staples**

LINDSAY STAPLES: For this next exercise, you're going to want a little more horsepower at your table, intellectual; not to diminish what's there, but you might like the increased capacity. So, if we could "bulk-up" at the table otherwise you're going to find this fairly demanding.

You are the survivors! I think we all know that the last afternoon of a three-day workshop is where it's a great opportunity to pull the pieces together.

(Everyone at tables introduces themselves)

LINDSAY STAPLES: I would just like to map out the afternoon for you. There are really two exercises we're going to go through. One is we're going to take the next hour to basically go through a number of development scenarios. We've basically done six scenarios, three from the past, and they're great. You get to go back and do the '98 Gold Rush, you get to do the Alaska Highway, and you get to do an assessment on the Faro Mine. Then we've got three looking forward to the future. The idea is each table will have two questions, and in a moment, Rob will introduce you to the questions and how it

will work. That's the first exercise. The idea is to take a lot of what you've been hearing, these concepts from the last two-and-a-half days, and start to think about how they would be applied in a practical situation. Then what we'd like to do is take a brief amount of time, ideally, we want to avoid people duplicating one another, but to report back how you've gone about the work of assessing the project as described in the handout. That's the first piece of work we're going to do.

The second is people are continuing to compile all the comments you've been submitting over the last two-and-a-half days, and we're expecting to have them around 2:00/2:30; and what we want each table to do is review those and prioritize or say, "Look, given all of these considerations that we've talked about over the last couple of days, as a table -- first of all as individuals and as a table, we'd really like to try and flag what matters most down this whole list here." It's not to diminish any individual comment, but if one was to say, "Okay, here's a radar screen cast quite broadly with the whole range of questions and issues we've had," we can also narrow that down five points to really focus on the key ones that perhaps need special attention over the course of the next few months and year, as both governments, First Nation and Territorial, as well as the Board, try to move forward with the implementation of assessment generally and socio-economic effects specifically.

So, Rob will introduce the exercise to you. Again, in terms of the time this afternoon, we'll see how we do. Usually in these last afternoons, I'm not really too concerned about what the agenda says for how long it's going to take and how long we're going to be here. So, we'll do the work and see how we do.

ROB WALKER: Thank you very much, Lindsay. First of all, does everybody have a new sheet of some colour on their table? Does anybody need a blue, green or pink sheet?

So, Lindsay's been talking about these scenarios all week. You can see actually they're very short. They're just a brief thing to get you thinking. The purpose is to give you an opportunity to think about what you've been hearing and learning from another way. So, it's a practical exercise. Maybe some new ideas will come out, or some things will make sense in another way. They're short so that you can fill in the details, the exact details of maybe how many men are involved or how many kilometres of road are being constructed aren't maybe all that critical. It's more of at a general level for you to consider how these are going to let you understand what you've been thinking about.

So, on the one side are past scenarios. So, there's the Alcan Highway, the goldrush and Faro Mine. Actually this is what got me thinking that I didn't need to put in a lot of details here, because I think the experience of the people in this room with these creatures and our knowledge of history and so on provides the detail for people to work from.



The other side has three different scenarios. Some of them are pretty real, I hope that's all right. One is about urban development in the Whitehorse area. the other one is about a potential resort development in the Kluane Park area, and the third one is a little more fanciful about Hippedy-Bippedy-Bump national Park somewhere along the Alaska Highway. So, I would invite you to explore your approaches with these things.

The general questions are: How will development affect Yukoners and who will be affected? You can answer other questions if you think that's useful to you. So, with that, I guess, any questions about these scenarios before we start?

Take it away, then. You've got an hour to discuss these around your table and divide the two scenarios wherever you like. If this isn't enough for you, I probably have some more in my back pocket I can throw your way.

(Workshop Adjourned at 1:10 p.m.)

(Workshop Resumed at 2:00 p.m.)

### **23.0 Background for Scoping - Scenario 1 Goldrush**

LINDSAY STAPLES: As you know, there are timelines in regulation, and your clock just ran out. We've got to go through the complicated process of amending the regulation and all the public process around that if you want more time.

What I would like to do is we're going to report back, but I have some suggestions how we could streamline this, because there are a lot of tables. I was going to suggest we take a scenario and get a table to report back on their work; and then, the other tables that did that same scenario can add to it. You won't repeat, but if you've got additional points to add to it, you could. I'm going to suggest that we start with the goldrush, and not all of you will have seen this scenario, so I'm going to read it out, and I'm going to be looking for a table to volunteer kicking off the goldrush assessment. So, the goldrush scenario reads like this:

In the closing years of the 1800's gold was discovered in the Yukon. In the following years, tens of thousands of stampederes, mostly men, entered the Yukon from all parts of the world in search of gold. The Northwest Mounted Police managed to ensure that most stampederes had enough supplies for their first year in the Yukon. How did the goldrush affect Yukoners, and who was affected?

Really, the exercise, as I think you know by now, is about scoping. What effects are you scoping for? It's to give you a sense, especially based on the last couple

of days, how broad or how narrow are you going to cast the net? You've got the beauty, unlike those who are looking at the future, of 20-20 hindsight. So, the tables that did work on the goldrush, can I have a volunteer table to take the initial stab at reporting back on your assessment, what you scoped in and who was involved. That's the pink sheet of paper.

## **22.1 Comments on Scoping - Groups - Scenario 1 Goldrush**

### **A. Goldrush**

- Based on the last couple of days, we broke it into environment, social and economic impacts. Basically all the impacts were negative that we listed, but we have quite a list.
- On the environment side, there were new trails, timber cutting, clearcutting, Tlingit trails or trading routes impacted, waterways polluted, caribou populations were decreased, fish populations went down, trash and garbage left on the land, berries and traditional medicines were impacted, wildlife corridors disrupted. There was erosion and scarring of sensitive habitat, a change in the ecosystem with traffic, river traffic; Canyon City. Development was unplanned, and then, dredges -- all these new technologies came to town, and the communities were gone on the environment side.
- On social impacts: cultureshock, diseases of all kinds, alcoholism; we have on the drug side tobacco, snuff, chewing tobacco; changes of clothing, changes of lifestyle, loss of language, change of housing, change of hunting patterns, nomadic way of life altered, spiritual way was now religious-based. People were displaced, prostitution and sexual violence, rape, unwed mothers (halfbreeds), intermarriages, values changed, First Nation gathering and harvesting changed, First Nation communities were displaced. Greed and envy was introduced, violence, First Nation family breakdown, extended family breakdown, First Nation self-esteem and self-worth were lost and identity was lost.
- On the economic side, we have the boom and bust cycle, monetary system introduced, new technology replaced old traditional ways, example use of nails for crafting boats and rafts and whatnot, gold resources removed from the Yukon to the rest of the world, individuals from Outside took land parcels and transferred them to their offspring, ownership of property, First Nation lost land with no compensation, there was no planning, traditional economy was replaced, and the accumulation of wealth.

### **B. Goldrush**

- Our list looked a lot like that. First of all, we had a problem coming to an agreement that there was a proponent for this project, because it seemed instead it was more like a tsunami where there were hundreds of

thousands out for themselves as individuals; but in any case, we went on to think, given these impacts what in the world was done in the way of mitigative measures. Someone mentioned the RCMP had the first machinegun in Canada. Other efforts they made to mitigate the large numbers of people coming into the Yukon Territory were their efforts to try and make sure people carried enough goods. That could be seen as a type of mitigative measure. Apparently the church implemented some measures to protect their space so they had land and weren't overrun. We felt Chief Jim Boss' efforts to initiate a land settlement-type arrangement with the Federal Government showed insight, given that influx of people and he was trying to do something even at that time for his people. The Mounties even had done their duty as far as collecting baseline data, because they were recording births and deaths while they were on duty.

## **22.2 Additional Public Comments - Scenario 1 Goldrush**

IAN CHURCH: One thing I was listening for was there would be a lot of economic and, in fact, also social and also political effects that were national and international in scope as a result of that activity; where up until that point in time, if you would have asked someone in Ottawa where the Yukon was, they probably wouldn't know. In fact, the Minister of the Interior arrived in the Yukon and spent a summer up here I think about two years after, in the 1900's. So, there was an incredible focus that changed and the evolution of the Yukon driven by that awareness.

LINDSAY STAPLES: So, it's the notion that even though the footprint of the project itself followed a river system and a creek system, waterbodies, that as you put it, even beyond the region, you could scope in a much, much broader geographical area.

CLAIRE: In the same pattern, the economic impact went beyond the Yukon, because the goldrush and the alleged Canadian route to it was one of the main kickstarts for the City of Edmonton; and the political impact was, too, that the Yukon, as a territory, exists because of the goldrush. It was created very quickly in order to prevent the Americans taking it. So, there were national, both political and economic implications of that.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thank you for that. Again that speaks to scope. The first table we're speaking to the scope, not in spatial terms, but time, how in this concentrated period of a year or two, you had this massive movement of people; but of course, the effects percolated for decades and generations beyond.

ROB WALKER: Lindsay and I were talking while you guys were working on this, and it sort of occurred to me if there was a proponent for a

project today, would we scope this to think about the communities where all these people came from? Would there have been an impact there, as well?

SPEAKER: I can make an analogy with the hoards of mushroom pickers coming up, due to arrive in Mayish.

## **24.0 Background for Scoping - Scenario 2 Alcan Highway**

LINDSAY STAPLES: Okay, I'll just read this out, not that anybody who knows their history doesn't know the scenario; but it is the early 1940's. The U.S. Army is pushing a highway from the south through the Yukon to Alaska. Along the way, the route passes near several Yukon communities. Many men, pieces of equipment and large volumes of material from the south are moving into the Yukon as the construction proceeds. Every effort is made to advance the highway as quickly as possible. As the work continues, supply lines get longer, slowing progress. More and more local resources are used to support the effort, from construction materials to men and supplies. In 1945, the route is completed, and the construction effort winds down. So, what changes did the construction of the highway produce or bring to the Yukon communities and who were affected?

### **24.1 Comments on Scoping - Groups - Scenario 2 Alcan Highway**

#### **A. Alcan Highway**

- We split this into construction phase and after construction, because there was pretty clearly a very intensive construction phase, and then, everything ever after. So, during the construction phase, we considered the following kinds of impacts or effects on Yukoners:
- One would be that there was some employment of local people, especially as more people were needed and called in to work on it.
- There were lots of guys around for a short while, so we expected there probably were more diseases present at that time, more pregnancies, those kinds of things, social disruption, social patterns, pregnancies.
- There would probably have been a fair bit of fear going on, because the army was pushing through probably without much notice with people who hadn't really seen anything like this or these kinds of machines before; and they would become aware that we were at war and wondering what the heck was going on and whether we were going to blow up or not.
- Probably we expect there would be a higher level of injuries and deaths going on during the construction because of the speed of construction and the urgency to get it done at all costs.
- There were probably fuel and fuel spills and improper handling of wastes and spills and garbage along the way without much need to pay attention to that, because that wasn't the priority.

- There would have been displacement of wildlife and disturbance or destruction of habitat of wildlife; also some opening up of access to wildlife that didn't exist before and considerable overhunting, both for food and for sport, as a form of recreation for the people building the road.
- There were probably new communities formed along the way. There was certainly construction of communities that started up then. There probably would have been a little boom of cottage industries along the way for food, fuel, supplies, moccasins, alcohol, drugs, all those things.
- Some considerable disruption of family structure as people went to work for a short time in a wage-based economy so left the communities, and there would have been a temporary big boom in a wage economy that was not sustained afterwards.
- After construction, there was probably a permanent shift in travel routes in the region all around. Their prior routes that would have been the main travel routes along rivers and trails would have now been replaced with this or changed substantially in terms of who travelled where. This would have also affected the location of communities so the communities on the road would have probably grown and changed substantially in terms of what they had access to. Some communities would have shrunk if they were off the road and probably grown if they were on the route.
- There was a more or less permanent presence of the army now, especially with the housing that had been set up and was being set up with things like hospitals and so on. So, there was new infrastructure that was built and made available. So, this could have had pluses and certainly changes to communities.
- There was more accessibility to the south and to products from the south, supplies and technologies.
- There was increased pressure on game in the road corridor and access routes around the road corridor.
- Probably changes in roles, for example, women's roles as a food preparer would have altered as imported foods came in; and men's role as a food provider may have changed, as well.
- Effects on traditional language, as communities were no longer intact or had more access to other people and other places so the language usage would have changed.
- Communities were no longer isolated in a sense, so that would have affected social fabric.
- Changes in relationships between communities, so communities that had formerly been linked and close, for example, by river travel now may not go and see each other that much, because they'd now choose to go by road to see somebody else.
- Whitehorse became the capital in 1953 here partly because of the kind of access made available by the highway that Dawson didn't have and certainly would have affected economic development elements, like the increase of tourism, making that easier, all sorts of other activities that

- could come up here more easily and, therefore, became more appealing for development.
- Who was affected, not an exhaustive list - certainly lots of guys were hired for a short while. So, the families from whom they came would have been affected. Communities along the route certainly would have grown and changed considerably with the influx of new people living there and different people living there from before potentially; changing the mix quite considerably. If it had been a First Nations community primarily, now you would have had a very mixed community.
  - Communities off the route would have shrunk and felt the change as resources moved out. It would have affected small businesses certainly at the time of the highway being constructed and after.
  - First Nations people in terms of way of life and access and the mix of their communities.

LINDSAY STAPLES: That's a good panel report. I'm impressed!

B. Alcan Highway

- We did this one, too, and we have very little to add to that. We had some very good conversation around it, though. I think the one thing that came up for us big was the language and the form of education from taking people off the land where they currently lived and putting them into institutions.
- We also felt that the Alaska Highway didn't change communities. It created those communities. Where they are now is not necessarily the communities that existed when the Alaska Highway went through.

LINDSAY STAPLES: That's excellent. Thank you for that.

C. Alcan Highway

- We came up with very, very similar to what everybody else got, but also the fact that the road made it possible to remove kids from their families and send them to residential schools and other places, so that really contributed to that.
- Clearly more modern things like opening up the area for resource developments, mining, forestry, those kinds of things.
- We also talked about the thing where Whitehorse became the capital.
- Tourism, it really opened up the Yukon for tourism.
- It connected Alaska to the Lower 48.

LINDSAY STAPLES: So, induced development; it's not just this development but it induces a whole stream of supplementary development and long term.

#### D. Alcan Highway

- Our table also had the Alcan Alaska Highway. We do have something down here we can share. The Alaska Highway brought a lot of new things to us as First Nation people with the introduction of alcohol and other problems that comes along with it.
- They also had the Canol Road constructed, other development from the Alaska Highway construction, such as the Canol Road; and that affected a lot of our people, as well, and First Nation people along the route and introduced a lot more people and changes came along with that, too, as well, that affected the people.
- The effects are still felt today with each generation. A lot of stuff was left behind. We had a look at that over the years, and there are still contaminated areas along that route where they had camps, and there are still effects from that.
- We also talked a bit about the use of traditional knowledge at that time, because a lot of our First Nation people knew the route where the trails were. So, the road basically used the trail and the knowledge of our people there that know their way, and they had to make this road quickly so they utilized all that.
- There are also jobs that came along with it. A lot of people were introduced to money and work and those kind of things that come along with those changes.
- The game was affected. A lot of people report that along the road, game, fish and wildlife were also affected and taken wherever these were plentiful because of the amount of people they had to feed. People were also taking animals that weren't really needed along the way. You can see that some of the bears were even taken right out of the dens in some cases. I think there were films, too, on that, as well.
- The other stuff that was mentioned already were just the social problems that came along with that.

#### E. Alcan Highway

- We had the Alcan Highway, as well. We had a long discussion and came up with a very long list. I think it's mostly been covered off.
- To provide some benefit to all the folks who weren't at our table, we thought we'd have Dave tell one or two of the stories that he told us that our discussion got a lot of benefit from.

LINDSAY STAPLES: So, your panel allowed oral testimony as a part of its review of the project, excellent.

#### **24.2 Oral Testimony - Scenario 2 Alcan Highway - Dave Keenan**

DAVE KEENAN: These aren't really my stories, but I've had the pleasure of listening to people from that generation, my mother and my aunt and others who were directly affected by it. I remember negotiating self government and sitting down and saying, "What does it truly mean, and how can we take an oral history and an experience and put it onto a piece of paper and go through all these stages?"

So, I've got two little stories I can tell that would show impact on people. Everything that everybody here has said is so very true. You have to remember that in 1942 when the road was coming through, my mother was a beautiful young lady of 22 years of age. Her father was 45 years older than her. She was the person who kept the family together. Through subsistence economy, she ran the fishnets. She was up the mountain trail hauling wood. She was running a mink ranch at the same time, setting fishnets to feed the mink; and she tells me the story of when she was going up the mountain trail. She was off up on the mountain trail. It's a place called "12 Mile". It's 12 miles out of Teslin. She was going up the mountain trail, and there's a little T-spot that you can sit and look over, and you can observe what's happening; and ma said she seen this puff of smoke, "poof, poof," and these noises going "grgrgrgr-poof, grgrgrgr-poof". Now, you can imagine a beautiful young woman of 22 years old wondering, "What in the hell is this?" So, she snuck down, looked upon it; and coming over the hill and over the trail, off the mountain trail where the highway is now, she saw a Caterpillar, and it scared her, and she ran all the way home and talked to her dad about it.

He said, "Well, you know, little one, this is what it is." So, there were all these things that happened. That's my mother's story of how things were at that time and how it changed.

So, further on in negotiations, I talked to my mother and I talked to my uncles, and I talked to my Aunt Virginia. I said, "You know, auntie, we've got to capture these values, and we've got to say, 'How can we move forward,' and what does it mean to you?"

My auntie looked me in the eye and she says, "I don't like reading from a bitch light no more." Now, for those of you who don't know what a 'bitch light' is, it's a grease light. It's just a grease lamp with some whatever available oil you had or whatever, and that's what people used to sit there and try and read or carve snowshoes or bead to; and she said, "I don't want to do that ever more. I've done that, and that's no fun. I like that the telephone went by. I like all those type of things." So, there was a lot of goodness that came from a personal perspective; but it was kind of a sad thing, because as it came through, my mother, being a Tlingit mother with a Scottish father, growing up deep in the forest I guess you could say, everybody was one, worked from a subsistence economy and very tightly knit with the Tlingit tradition; went to Whitehorse for the very first time to sell some fur, and she took I think it was the Thistle steamboat



down from there. She walked into the movie theatre. The highway was through here then at that point in time, and she walked into a movie theatre, and for the very first time in her life, she felt prejudiced. She felt segregated, because my grandfather could sit on the bottom, she was told she had to “go to heaven” and sit up on this balcony. I’m sure you all know how it was referred to at that point in time. And she came back, and she still tells that story with hurt in her eyes. That’s her story, and there are many of our parents and relations in this room have other stories to share; but the most important thing, I think, from this personal perspective is that there was a lot of goodness that came with it, also. Thank you.

LINDSAY STAPLES:

Thank you, Dave, that’s wonderful.

Again I think it’s a reminder, we spent a lot of time in this workshop talking about data and baseline information and so on; I think again Dave’s stories that he’s relayed to us are a reminder of how important oral history is. It’s not just in computers and databanks. So, thanks again for that. It’s a good reminder.

### **24.3 Additional Public Comments - Scenario 2 Alcan Highway**

BARNEY SMITH:

Mary talked to us about the change that would be introduced by this development activity versus the change or where it would have been otherwise. So, that was really difficult for us; because it wasn’t just the road that introduced a lot of the changes, there were other things, and you really can’t say whether there would have been a rail system or whether Teslin would have been connected by road to Juneau if the military significance hadn’t pushed the road through.

IAN CHURCH:

I was just going to add a couple of things. People talk about a change of technology that occurred from trails and what have you. Dave actually alluded to it there. There was a real change in terms of western technology in terms of transportation. I don't think we would be a roaded territory now if the Alaska Highway hadn't been built. At this point in time, what would drive Canada to build a road? I think our connections changed at that time. We went from being Seattle, Vancouver up by steamboat to Skagway, onto the train, into this area here; then up by steamboat. That’s how you got around. I think the Alaska Highway was the start of killing the steamboat business. I think it probably obviously built or reinvigorated the Dawson Creek area. It certainly gave us connections to Alberta, which probably wouldn’t have happened as quickly or if it would have happened yet.

There’s another thing that’s really interesting, and I'm not trying to judge these as being positive or negative; but it has attracted an amazing amount of American investment. Like, they’re still paying for the damned road.

LINDSAY STAPLES: That's true. If you live in Haines Junction, you sure know that!

SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I've listened to these, and of course, we've all heard the stories about the Alaska Alcan Highway and remembering it was the "Alaska-Canada Highway", one of the things I would like to put is the development of the park. Because of the loss of the wildlife, that was one of the first initiatives. The other one was the awareness of the world global events, because a lot of Yukon people actually went out to fight in the war.

The other one I would just like to share with you is:

*"Winding in and winding out  
It fills my mind with serious doubt  
Whether the lout that built this route  
Was going to hell or coming out."*

They used a lot of First Nation local knowledge to build that highway from the get-go, because they didn't know where swamps were, and they didn't know this and that. Every economy that was built into the Yukon or the north relied on local traditional knowledge.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thank you, again it's a reminder that oral history and testimony comes not just through stories but through songs.

ROB WALKER: I would just like to reflect that I worked with Mary a bit on the Diavek Diamond Mine, and I know they first sited their camp on the island. They went with some of the elders from the area, and they said, "Why did you put it there? That's where all the mosquitoes are," and they moved the whole thing.

IAN ROBERTSON: The only observation I was going to make is there was a project description for the Alaska Highway project, and it was based in support of the Air Force Program, which was part of the land lease agreement where we actually were flying planes across to the Russians. So, if we were doing an impact assessment, not only would we be looking at Alaska. We would be also looking at Russia in those days.

The other thing about the project description was that it was secret. Now, the other dimension was that the company that had the lead role for constructing the road, Bechtel, is one of the largest engineering firms, if not the largest, in the world; and the same psychology that was applied in 1942 is still applied in the third world to this day. There are a variety of similar projects currently under construction; and if they're not being financed by the World Bank, because the World Bank is finally starting to require impact assessments, they are still

occurring with the same sort of mentality and the same logic. So, as much as things have changed, they are still the same.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thanks for that, Ian, that's interesting.

## **25.0 Background for Scoping - Scenario 3 Faro Mine**

LINDSAY STAPLES: The Faro Mine was a very large base metal mine, constructed a significant distance from any local communities in the Yukon. The highway was extended to the minesite to get supplies in and ore out by truck to Whitehorse, then by rail to the sea at Skagway. The community of Faro was established to support the mine. The electrical grid was expanded and Aishihik hydro and diesel generation was added to meet the energy required by the mine. The scale of the development resulted in a migration of workers to the Yukon. The Faro mine spilled a lot of cash into Yukon communities. The mine suffered temporary shutdowns of up to five years in duration and changes of ownership before its final operator sought bankruptcy protection in 1998. Since '98 the mine has been under the control of a receiver with the Federal Government paying the ongoing maintenance costs. How did the mine development affect Yukon communities and people, and who was affected?

### **25.1 Comments on Scoping - Groups - Scenario 3 Faro Mine**

#### **A. Faro Mine**

- We had a hard time scaling this one, because it affected everybody and everything in the Yukon, nationally and internationally on the perspective of how mines are looked upon. This isn't going to be in any particular order, because we just blurted things out after -- we tried to break it into positives and negatives.
- Some of the positives is it did bring in cash. It led to the development of at least one community, which is Faro, because it was built because of the mine.
- Not many local people benefited from the mine, though, and it created a lot of instances where there were transient workers, which caused more problems.
- It disrupted traditional land uses.
- It was an area, according to the people at our table, that was very productive before the Faro Mine came in.
- Some of the key communities that were affected, not just Faro but Ross River, Carmacks, Whitehorse obviously; Haines Junction, as well as the Champagne & Aishihik First Nation because of the Aishihik dam that was built to supply the needed power to the mine.
- With its outstanding debts with the dam and the mine, Yukoners and Canadians bear that cost.

- There were some positive costs for infrastructure and what it created for that part of the Yukon; but at this table, we really couldn't figure out where the wealth went. It did go to some local businesses, there was some infusion of the money, but the majority of it probably didn't stay in the Yukon.
- It created a powerline, a dam, a road, a town, which we heard burnt down once, and then, they rebuilt it, and bridges.
- Some of the things that suffered was because it was a mine and was built for that particular purpose, businesses, communities, individuals and the Yukon relied on that money; so when it failed, it had a devastating effect.
- It also caused other damage, somebody mentioned windshield replacement businesses were doing really well during that time.
- The cause of the damage to the road by the trucks, but it did as a whole change all of the Yukon.
- Internationally and nationally, Faro was taken as a template as a northern development strategy way to go; and at the time, it was I guess considered a positive. But now it's viewed as what not to do and, in effect, tarnished the mining industry and the ability for other mining companies to do business in the north.
- On the time scale, it not only affected the people of the time and us currently but it will affect future generations because of the closure and the costs that it has incurred.

#### B. Faro Mine

- For this table, we didn't use traditional knowledge. Unfortunately, we didn't have anyone with that input; but we did have local knowledge. The reason I'm here is because of the Faro Mine. I came up with Pacific Western Airlines in 1981, and it was directly due to a marketing survey that the Faro Mine created extra air travel requirements, and an Edmonton-Whitehorse non-stop flight was arranged. The boom-bust, boom-bust, and Fred's still here. I came up for a three-year tenure with the airlines, and that was 23 years ago, 24 years ago.
- I do remember very well the impact the Faro Mine had in closure, and it did affect airlines, and indeed other pickup and delivery and transportation companies suffered greatly, as did the service industries throughout Whitehorse and other smaller areas, but mostly the Whitehorse service industry for equipment, food, et cetera suffered greatly.
- In the last shutdown, I believe there were about 5,000 migrated out. So, there was a dramatic economic impact.
- It left behind a dead town with high mortgages, major debt. I don't believe in the last closure that it was really expected it would close as fast as it did, and the end result was that the workers went up and made a ton of money, and they bought their toys; and then, it shut down without notice. My neighbour went up with a semi and bought an awful lot of cheap boats and motorcycles and resold them down here for a heck of a profit. That's

a bit of a shame. It really is tough on them, and they're stuck with these. The miners were stuck with all these major debts.

- There should have been some foresight and opportunity to have financial security. That's 20/20 hindsight, as we said before.
- There was a redistribution of wealth to some degree, as a local entrepreneur from Whitehorse actually bought the Town of Faro or had enough money to put in to keep it running; and to this day, it is still a functioning town.
- We do feel that there were some dramatic socio-economic impacts, particularly on the traditional lands, an impact on Ross River, I'm sure, occurred, although we don't have statistics to prove it. We can only estimate that that was a devastating loss to that community, as well.
- It went as far as going to Pelly where there were concerns, albeit maybe just psychological or perceived concerns about contaminants in the fish and the moose and the wildlife. Apparently there is a study now to prove or disprove that.
- There is a bioaccumulation of metals that are left behind and blowing in the winds that is causing an environmental impact, it has to be to some degree.
- There was psychological stress and uncertainty that resulted from the closure.
- Proper planning - we would have had to receive a full plan for the assessment at the office, and construction would have been included.
- The employment diversification, economic values, new ideas, access, cultural dynamic, values from in-migration.
- We'd have to look at disease, substance abuse, family violence, teen pregnancies, aesthetics change, all those issues.
- It's a boom-bust operation.
- Psychology of future infusion of cash, there we get into the wealth management issue, it should have been looked at prior, the 20/20 again.
- Community capacity, the best people who work the mines and the stress after the boom.
- Family time away issue.
- The subsistence versus wage and an inflexibility.
- The closure/reopen, job creation, cleanup, overtrained for jobs left after closure.
- The emotions of uncertainty, confusion, anger, social problems and feelings of uselessness.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thank you, that was an outstanding panel report. I'm really conscious of the time and where we're at in the day. Generally, recognizing we've been at this for three days, we're going to try to get people out the door no later than 4:00 today. We really wanted people to go through the exercise. That was the most important part.

Could we take one of the scenarios for the future and report back on one of those, and we'll take a coffee break and come back for the next part of the afternoon.

(Everyone asks for a break now)

(Three handouts from Lyn Hartley for distribution: Summary of all discussions over last three days, "After three days, what matters most?"; Listing of all participants)

(Workshop Adjourned at 2:45 p.m.)

(Workshop Resumed at 3:05 p.m.)

## **26.0 Closing Comments & Final Comments from Participants**

LINDSAY STAPLES: A couple of things: The intent of the last exercise was to give you an opportunity to think about and apply much of what we have been discussing over the last couple of days in a practical exercise. Just based on the scenarios people have reported back on and having the benefit of hindsight, obviously the scope of considerations are very, very broad with respect to any of these projects.

I'm going to suggest that for those tables that did produce a handwritten summary of their discussion, if you could bring that to the front of the room before you leave today, we can build that into the record for the workshop. Again, I think what will happen is the record of your discussions on these scenarios, Rob, I'm assuming it would be feasible to put that on the CD.

ROB WALKER: Absolutely!

LINDSAY STAPLES: The scenario work that people have done is excellent, and I regret that we don't have time to go through them all. We were probably overly-ambitious with respect to -- sorry, we weren't overly-ambitious. We underestimated what you could do in the time that you had. Like I said, it's like a panel report in some cases. If that's acceptable to people, and again, I appreciate the work that people did and we don't want to lose it; so if people can bring that up to the front of the room at the end of the day here, that would be great!

Lyn would like to walk you through this last very small exercise which we would like to do, which in part is a review of what we've been doing over the last two days.

LYN HARTLEY: It's just after 3:00, the end of three days; and what we would like you to be doing right now is thinking back over the last three

days, it seems like almost a week right now, and even just looking around the room, visually tracking the trail that we went down with the presenters. Also, we have given you a copy of the discussion. So, there's a copy in front of you of what we have been thinking about over the last three days. We've asked you, as an individual, to think about what's most important.

Now the last thing, you will see finally this is the last coloured piece of paper, it's pink, and it says "Final group exercise". This is what does this all boil down to. We have two questions that we're going to just give you a short period of time to think about: What matters most? Also, where should we be focusing effort or energy?

Those are the two questions. If you can spend 10 minutes as a small group just thinking about those. We will collect these. As well, if you're willing we will take the individual white one I handed out before the break. Ten minutes to be thinking about those questions, and then, we will be moving to closing comments.

Thank you.

[PINK & WHITE SHEETS]

(Workshop Adjourned at 3:10 p.m.)

(Workshop Resumed at 3:20 p.m.)

LYN HARTLEY: You survived. Welcome back, you are the survivors! In this room, about 90 folks managed to make it through. Thank you very much. Give a round of applause!

My gosh, a lot of brainpower has gone into the last three days. Thank you so much for sticking with it and particularly sticking with it for this afternoon. You have just survived the final exercise. So, that was the last group question I will have for you. Thank you so much.

Just so you know what's going to happen with this information is we are doing to take this and put it together into some sort of format with all these glorious pictures, which Tanya Handley is the artist who did those; we're going to put that together onto a CD, and that will be mailed to you. It's important if you want that CD to make sure the right address is on that participants' list. That's very important. Also know that we will be sending that CD out to the libraries and all the communities. We're going to try and have a wide distribution, so you should be able to find that.

I'll be coming around to collect the pink sheet from the groups. I would love to see some of the things you have decided as an individual are most important.

One last sheet of paper, the yellow sheet, which is the evaluation form. If you are willing, feedback is wonderful. This is the third or fourth conference that we've done, and we keep trying to learn from our experience. If you're willing please provide us that feedback.

[YELLOW SHEET-EVALUATION FORM]

LYN HARTLEY: This information is so important. It's been a generative process, these last three days, of coming up with ideas and now trying to integrate them to see where is it that we need to be putting our focus, because we can't do everything. So, this information, please feel free to take extra copies of this report if you want. Take them back to your offices and get people talking about how are we going to be approaching socio-economic effects here in the Yukon.

We're moving to closing comments, and Lindsay, I'll pass it off to you.

LINDSAY STAPLES: It's funny some of the terminology that's been used to describe how we got through these three days. In some ways, it's like the blurb you read for going to a Buddhist retreat for taking the vow of silence. In this case, it's the "vow of small group work". We really appreciate the level of conversation and the effort that people have made over the course of the last three days to really make this work and to make it productive. I really appreciate the effort all of you have made. You've moved around the room. You've sat beside people you don't know, which isn't always the easiest thing in the world. I really appreciate the effort that you've all made to try and move this forward. That's why there's a real commitment on the part of the organizers to get back to you with the information and to see that that information goes forward to the governments of Yukon First Nations and Yukon Government and to ensure that the board, as well, benefits from this discussion.

What I would like to ask at this point is whether there is anybody who would like to offer up some closing observations or closing remarks, based on the last couple of days, whether there's something that anybody feels that now is an important time to offer it up.

MARY TAPSELL: Just an observation I have of someone coming from the NWT is I think you guys have got a really positive approach on what you're doing here. I can feel a cohesiveness. I think you're doing the right thing by having meetings like this and getting together and talking about things, and I just want to congratulate you on the approach, and I hope you continue it. Thank you.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thanks, Mary. Anyone else?



FRED PRIVETT: I just want to say that I think Lyn and Lindsay and Rob did a really good job of pulling this conference together and all the other people behind the scenes that were putting a lot of work in. So, I'd like everybody to give them a clap.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thanks very much, Fred.

LYN HARTLEY: Can I just add to that, because you don't know all the folks who were so busy. We were maybe very visible, but there were so many folks who were pulling their weight behind the scenes. The editorial team of the publication we produced today, so Carenn Kormos, who has been just doing everything in the background; Diane Gunter, Shane Andre and Rachel Pugh were all in the background. You didn't see them, but they've just been flying around here. So, thank you very much to those folks.

VALERIE WHELAN: Hi. I haven't said much out loud these last three days. I'm very, very new. I've never worked in the area of environmental assessment or socio-economic assessment. It's been a pretty incredible experience, a very mind-boggling experience. I guess the one point that I'm thinking about a lot is in the assessment, the whole question of balance. We've talked a lot about impacts on people and how important it is to consider the health and welfare of people. I think one thing I would take with me is the balance. You don't want to stop total development opportunities, but you want good projects. I think that was just something I wanted to say, that that need for balance really has to be there, and I think the way to achieve it is what we're talking about with open dialogue, that communication aspect. That's all I have to say.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thank you for that. That's good. Thank you.

SPEAKER: I, too, haven't been here for the whole conference. I popped in yesterday, and this afternoon, I was able to share with a working group; and I found that very stimulating. I just wanted to share -- I know I haven't been here for three days, and I explained that; but just being here the brief time I was, I think that what matters most is the networks that were established here, the sharing of knowledge, the validation of the importance of socio-economic impacts and assessment and new and different methods to look at assessments and impacts. I think that's what I found really good about this conference.

SPEAKER: I would like to, first of all, really thank the organizers of the conference, as well. I think they did an incredible job, three days packed with information and data and work for us, which was good.

One thing that struck me, I've attended a lot of these kinds of conferences before, attended by practitioners, in New Zealand, Vancouver, Whitehorse; and it

occurred to me a while ago, but it really hit me this time that we tend to be preaching to the converted, I think. I was quite amazed at how everyone is so agreeable and everyone seems to kind of think the same way. Perhaps that's the problem is we need to have these events for practitioners, to build up the practice and improve it; but we also need to package, I think, the essence and the value of socio-economic impact assessment as an important tool in decision-making, we need to package that for the decision-makers, the movers and shakers, if we're going to try to change our governance structures in the way decisions are made. I think you need to have something for the politicians, for the policy makers, for the development sector, which the corporate practitioners are aware of a lot of this; but you have to get it up there where the big decisions are taking place. That's just a reflection I had.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thank you for that. Anyone else?

(No audible response)

LINDSAY STAPLES: With that, just before I offer the closing of the day up to Rob and to Chuck Hume, who has kindly agreed to do the closing prayer, Ian, I think you had a small housekeeping matter.

## **27.0 International Polar Year - Ian Church**

IAN CHURCH: A lot of you know about the International Polar Year, a lot of you don't. I'm going to spin this this time in terms of socio-economics. International Polar Year that's coming up is the fourth in history. They occur, in the past, every 25 or 50 years. The first one was actually in the 1880's. It dealt with both polar regions, including the boreal regions, and it was a major explosion of scientific effort in the polar areas. This time around for the first time, they've recognized that by god, people live in the polar regions or in the northern regions and the southern regions; they should be involved in setting up the priorities for the program. They should be involved as researchers, and they're also consumers of the information.

The other thing is unlike in the past when people were looking at weather or biology or physics, they've said, "There's this whole political structure. There are people. There are health issues. There are things like decision-making processes going on, what we've been talking about here, and we should be looking at what people have termed, and you guys have termed it 'the human dimension'." So, this time, in fact, one of the major themes, along with taking a snapshot in time of where the polar regions are and the processes that are going on, this time they have also included all those things that have a human spin to it.

Some of you have already submitted proposals. It's international in scope. To date there are internationally well over 2,000 research proposals submitted. In the Yukon I would say Yukoners have to date submitted about 100 or have been

part of about 100. In Canada we have something like over 250. But some of the questions that people asked in the last couple of days, I heard a few people say, "Well, we need information on thresholds" or "We don't know enough about this" or "Maybe what we're doing here is kind of unique, and maybe other areas can learn from this." Maybe we can learn from what other people are doing." Those are the kinds of themes that are out there and are very valid for International Polar Year. So, if anyone is interested, I sit on the Canadian Steering Committee for this. There are about 100 countries involved, and for the board, it's going to be a major influx of projects you're probably going to have to do assessments on by the way, you probably haven't even thought about it, from all over the world; and a lot of them are looking at doing work in Canada. I think it is an opportunity if people are looking for "pushing the science", the kind of thing we've been talking about for the last three days, and want to get into pushing that science of impact assessment and saying, "Maybe we can push that and take advantage of this international effort, and there may be some financial support to do that kind of thing," which is the end of my message.

LINDSAY STAPLES: Thanks, Ian, very much. Just a quick footnote on that, by way of example, Ian mentioned that this group is looking for project proposals. Just to give you an illustration, Ian talked about science, and traditional science, of course, is a part of this. As some of you know, I do a lot of work up in the North Slope of the Yukon with the Inuvialuit, and we've actually worked with them to develop a proposal to basically look at sod house construction and ice cellars and how they're affected by climate change; and it's going to involve the community basically building a sod house and looking at ice cellars in the context of how these structures are affected by warming in the Arctic. So, there are lots of ways to imagine what a project might look like. So, thanks for that, Ian. It's a great opportunity for many of you here.

For my part, thanks very much. I've really enjoyed myself. You've been a great group to work with. I've learned a lot. I really enjoy this subject area. It's an area that's near and dear to my heart. There are lots of other ways to do this, and I don't doubt that there will be people here in the room meeting in different configurations and smaller groups. I just wish you well in those discussions. Thanks very much, and Rob, will you do the close.

## **28.0 Closing Comments**

ROB WALKER: Thank you very much. I don't really know how to close something like this. It's been quite an experience for myself and everybody. I would like very much to thank the presenters who were here, who came and spoke to us and took their time and energy and shared their thoughts and understandings. First of all, I think I think we should all give them a great hand for those that are still remaining.

I think at times through this workshop, I have felt overwhelmed and overawed. I think the thing that has really got to me the most is just the intensity and your willingness to just dive into this, to just be so open about it and to share. You've just done a fantastic job. So, I really want to thank all of the participants here. It's been fantastic!

I think pretty well everyone has been thanked, but I would like to thank Lyn very much. She's been fantastic at organizing this workshop; and of course, to Lindsay, as well.

I'll just pass the microphone over to Chuck for a final prayer. Since we started with all these languages, I will say Gunałchîsh, Máhsin cho, thank you.

CHUCK HUME: Yes, when I spoke the first day, I spoke in two traditional languages that were taught. I'll speak to you in my third language that was taught, and this would be English.

## **29.0 End of Workshop & Closing Prayer - Chuck Hume**

Closing prayer by Chuck Hume.

(Workshop Concluded at 3:40 p.m.)