

ATAC Resources

Date: July 20, 2021

Location: phone

Attendees:

- DRPC: Tim Sellars
- ATAC: Andrew Carne

Notes

Comments and questions from ATAC

- Based on the Draft plan, we are concerned we may not be able to develop our existing claims, despite them being highly prospective and located within an ISA 1/2 classification, which expressly allows exploration and development.
- Who will track cumulative effects indicators during implementation? An online dashboard showing the indicator levels would be useful.
- We need certainty as to where we can and cannot explore, and have the confidence that anything found could be developed. The plan as drafted is vague around what is allowed in ISAs, and the boundaries used to differentiate the LMUs appear to be arbitrary. To attract investment, it is critical to know that an area is open for exploration and development, or not, and that needs to be very clearly defined.
- Very little public information on caribou in the RAR and other publications. Suggest public release and review of the newest Fortymile Caribou report, if that is being used as part of the planning process.
- The Fortymile Caribou migration is only a couple of weeks each year, so timing windows makes more sense than year-round mitigations or overall prohibitions/restrictions. Also, the routes change, so no particular ridge line is used every year.
- Critical to balance and allow for co-existence of mining and exploration with other values
- ATAC is primarily interested in LMU 23:
 - There are some contradictions in the plan. The plan states that there should be no development on “specified ridgetops important for caribou migration” (p. 173) in LMU 23, but the designation is set at ISA 1 on all ridge lines in the LMU.
 - Recommended Management Practices for Caribou (p.78) includes “High concentrations of small-scale disturbance and any large quartz exploration projects (Class 4) or quartz mines should be avoided within key migration routes”, despite many of these migration routes crossing ISAs.
 - Other more specific mitigations should be considered rather than blanket prohibitions against exploration and development.
 - The plan references “specified ridgetops”. If it is not all ridgelines, then the plan needs to be clearer on which ridgetops.

Rarely does mineral exploration lead to development, as only few mineral deposits are ever deemed viable. The exploration industry needs a lot of land open for exploration to be able to find the very few

Dawson Draft Plan Engagement

deposits that may be economic. Modern exploration activities can be conducted with very minimal impacts to the environment. It is critical that areas open for exploration could also allow eventual development, or else there is no reason to explore.