



ᓄᓐᓂᓂᓂᓂᓂᓂ
Nunavunmi Parnaiyiit
Nunavut Planning Commission
Commission d'Aménagement du Nunavut

Summary of Community Meetings on the 2016 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan

KUGAARUK

November 18, 2019



Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1 Context.....	3
1.2 Purpose	3
1.3 Methodology.....	3
1.4 Public Awareness	4
1.5 Follow Up	4
2. Breakout Group Questions and Participant Responses.....	5
1. Key Migratory Bird Habitat	5
2. On-Ice Community Travel Routes	6
3. Kugaaruk Community Drinking Water Supply (PA # 159).....	7
4. Polar Bear Denning	8
5. Caribou Calving Areas	9
6. Caribou Post Calving Areas	10
7. Final wrap up Question.....	12
Appendix A: Breakout Group Reference Maps.....	13
Appendix B: Breakout Group Map Revisions.....	16
Map 1: Additional Migratory Bird Habitat	
Map 2: Additional On Ice Travel Routes	
Map 3: Additional Polar Bear Denning Areas	
Map 4: Additional Caribou Calving Habitat	
Map 5: Additional Caribou Post Calving Habitat	
Map 6: Additional Caribou Fresh Water Crossing & Late Summer Habitat	
Map 7: Additional Community Use Areas	

1. Introduction

1.1 Context

The Nunavut Planning Commission prepared a 2016 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan (2016 DNLUP) for public comment and consideration. Following the release of the 2016 DNLUP, the Commission received a significant amount of written comments and oral feedback during an in-person public hearing in Iqaluit in March 2017 for communities in the Qikiqtani region as well as transboundary Nunavik communities. In August 2019, the Commission received funding to complete consultations on the 2016 DNLUP by holding Information Sessions under rule 17 of the Commission's new Rules for Public Proceedings in the Kivalliq and Kitikmeot regions.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of the Information Sessions was to hear the views of community residents on the 2016 DNLUP. This report summarizes feedback received during the Information Sessions held in Kugaaruk and is prepared under rule 15(5) of the *Rules for Public Proceedings*. The purpose of the report is to inform revisions to the 2016 DNLUP ensuring that the plan reflects the priorities and values of residents.

It is important to note that the information contained in this community report will be considered in conjunction with all other feedback when revising the 2016 DNLUP.

1.3 Methodology

During the community visit the following events took place:

- **Elected Officials Meeting;** (10:00-12:00) Attended by Hamlet council and HTO members
 - The Commission Chairperson and staff met with the Hamlet Council and Hunters and Trappers Organization in Council chambers to provide a brief overview of the NPC's role and responsibility in Nunavut's regulatory system, process history, and preparation for the Information Sessions to be held in the afternoon and evening. An opportunity for questions and answers was provided, but no formal feedback on the 2016 DNLUP was provided or recorded during this meeting.
- **Afternoon Information Session;** (1:30 to 4:30) Attended by approximately 45 people, held 2 separate breakout groups.
 - **Posters;** Multi-lingual posters for each chapter of the Draft Plan were posted in the Community Hall for review.
 - **Presentation;** The Commission chairperson and staff provided an introductory presentation that included a brief overview of some background information, the Commission role and responsibility, role in Nunavut's regulatory system, process history, 2016 DNLUP chapter overview, and preparation for breakout groups including the types of questions that would be asked.
 - **Breakout Groups;** Held breakout group discussions to review community-specific maps (see Appendix A) and ask questions on priority issues (see section 2). Recorded oral feedback and mapped suggested revisions and additions to geographic boundaries (see Appendix B)

- **Evening Information Session;** (6:30 to 9:30) Attended by approximately 50 people, held 2 separate breakout groups.
 - Repeat same format as afternoon session

1.4 Public Awareness

Letters of invitation were sent to the Mayor and Council and HTO in advance of the NPC's visit to request a meeting with elected officials, advise of the public meetings and to encourage participation. Follow up phone calls were also made. Public notice of the meetings was provided in the following ways:

- **Nunatsiaq News;** notice of community meetings was posted in the newspaper in advance of the meetings.
- **Community radio;** notices were read by the hosts.
- **Community bulletin boards;** notices were posted on bulletin boards around the community in advance of the meetings.
- **Facebook;** information was posted on the NPC's Facebook page as well as on local community group pages in advance of the meetings.
- **nunavut.ca;** the schedule of community visits, the Draft Plan, and supporting information was available on the Commission's website.

1.5 Follow Up

This summary report will be provided to the Hamlet Council and HTO for review and posted on the NPC's Public Registry for consideration by all participants who may provide comments on it until February 28, 2020. The report and any comments on it will be considered by Commissioners when revising the 2016 DNLUP along with all other feedback that has been received.

2. Breakout Group Questions and Participant Responses

This section summarizes the notes and questions that were used by NPC staff during the breakout groups and well as the participant responses to each question.

1. Key Migratory Bird Habitat

There is one proposed migratory bird habitat area near Kugaaruk: Rasmussen Lowlands (Red knot, Buff-breasted sandpiper, pectoral sandpiper, Sabine's gull, tundra swan, greater white-fronted goose). These areas are used by migratory birds for breeding, nesting, rearing, feeding, moulting, and staging.

Migratory Bird Habitat: Protected Area

The 2016 DNLUP, recommends that the Rasmussen Lowlands be designated as Protected Areas with prohibited activities and seasonal conditions (setbacks) for other activities. Activities prohibited year-round are: mining, oil, and gas exploration and production, quarries, hydroelectric and related infrastructure, and all-weather roads. Conditions or setbacks for aerial, marine and terrestrial approach distances are seasonal (when the birds are present) and specific to the types of birds using the habitat. For example, the recommended terrestrial setback for Rasmussen Lowlands Migratory Bird Habitat is that users must stay 300 meters away from concentrations of birds.

Note for speaker: There are portions of Inuit Owned Land (surface) within Rasmussen Lowlands and no overlapping mineral rights.

a. Do you agree that this is a key migratory bird habitat?

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed that the Rasmussen Lowlands is an important habitat for migratory birds.***

- Group 1 – Participants agreed that the Rasmussen Lowlands is a key habitat and said the area is too small as migratory birds use the area to the east of Kugaaruk as well. No changes to delineated PA.
- Group 2 - Participants did not want to discuss the Rasmussen Lowlands bird habitat. They said it is not pertinent to their community. The participants showed additional bird areas near their community.
- Group 3 - Participants agreed that the Rasmussen Lowlands is a key habitat and said the area is too small as migratory birds use some area at the east of Kugaaruk. An additional area of important bird habitat was added to the map.
- Group 4 – Participants agreed that the Rasmussen Lowlands is an important migratory bird habitat. No changes to the boundary for Rasmussen Lowlands, but other areas closer to the community are also important.

b. Do you support the recommended prohibitions and conditions for protecting these migratory bird habitat areas?

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants supported the recommended prohibitions and conditions in the 2016 DNLUP for the Rasmussen Lowlands key migratory bird habitat.***

- Group 1 – Participants agreed that the prohibitions and conditions are appropriate.
 - Group 2 – Prohibitions explained to participants but they did not want to discuss the Rasmussen bird habitat
 - Group 3 – Participants agreed that the prohibitions and conditions are appropriate and should be applied to the additional delineated area.
 - Group 4 – Participants agreed that uses should be prohibited in this area. Indicated that it would not be wise for mining to occur in this area.
- c. Is there anything else the NPC needs to know for protecting key migratory bird habitat or how it may be used by proponents?

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants identified additional areas that are important for birds that should be protected through prohibitions similar to those used for the Rasmussen Lowlands.***

- Group 1 - The area east of Kugaaruk was identified and the group felt some level of protection would be appropriate
- Group 2 - Participants showed areas near the community toward the east, overlapping partly with the community drinking watershed polygon, as an important bird habitat, but the group did not identify a specific boundary.
- Group 3 - Participants identified 1 additional area that is important for nesting birds that should be protected through prohibitions similar to those used for the Rasmussen Lowlands.
- Group 4 - Participants identified 2 additional areas that are important for nesting birds that should be protected through prohibitions similar to those used for the Rasmussen Lowlands.

2. On-Ice Community Travel Routes

Sea ice travel routes have not been identified by Kugaaruk. Other communities in the Kitikmeot have identified sea ice travel routes and the 2016 DNLUP recommends that the routes be zoned Special Management Area. The travel routes would be protected seasonally from Ukiaq to Upingaaq (October 15 – August 14). During that time most ice-breaking across the routes would be prohibited unless an ice bridging plan is in place to ensure community members are able to travel safely.

- a. Are there on-ice travel routes that your community would like to identify?

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants identified on-ice travel routes used by residents.***

- Group 1 - Participants identified 3 on-ice travel routes. All are important and used regularly. Additional routes used for hunting seals were described but not mapped.
- Group 2 - Participants identified major on-ice travel routes used by them to travel to other neighboring communities, and some others used for hunting
- Group 3 - Participants identified 5 on-ice travel routes and 1 on-ice travel area. All are important and used regularly.
- Group 4 - Participants identified a number of important on-ice travel routes as well as one occasionally used route.

- b. Is the correct time frame identified for protecting the sea ice routes in your region?
- Group 1 – No specific months were identified but routes used when ice is good in winter through to breakup.
 - Group 2 – Participants agreed with the proposed time frame. They explained that some routes are only mainly used during June and July for Narwhals hunting.
 - Group 3 – No comments
 - Group 4 – Participants noted that the on-ice travel routes are somewhat used starting in December and are most heavily used between April and June.
- c. Is there anything else NPC should consider for protecting the on-ice routes in your region?
- Group 1 – No comments
 - Group 2 – Participants have concerns with shipping and cruise ships coming into the bay. Mentioned that the hamlet council has decided that only emergency and community resupply ships will be coming. Anyway, they do not have concerns with community resupply ships because the Coast guards always accompany them.
 - Group 3 – No comments
 - Group 4 – No comments

3. Kugaaruk Community Drinking Water Supply (PA # 159)

The 2016 DNLUP identifies the Kugaaruk Community Drinking Water watershed as an important area to be protected and recommends it be zoned a Protected Area. As a protected area the following activities would be prohibited year-round: mineral exploration and production, oil and gas exploration and production, and hydroelectric and related infrastructure.

Note for participants: There are portions of Inuit Owned Land (surface) within the Community Drinking Water Supply area and some overlapping mineral rights.

- a. Do you think the land use plan should prohibit activities in this area?
- ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed that proposed prohibitions in the 2016 DNLUP for the community drinking water supply are appropriate.***
 - Group 1 – Participants agreed that the prohibitions are appropriate.
 - Group 2 – Participants agreed with the prohibitions in this area
 - Group 3 – Participants agreed that the prohibitions are appropriate.
 - Group 4 – Participants agreed that uses should be prohibited in this area.
- b. Is there anything else NPC needs to know about how the Drinking Water Supply area can be protected or used by project proponents?
- ***Kugaaruk community participants noted that the identified boundary for the drinking water supply seemed too small.***
 - Group 1 - Some participants thought that area delineated was too small but did not want to change the boundary

- Group 2 - Participants wanted to know if it is possible to expand the area. After further discussion, they clarified that they would like the area expanded to have prohibitions on a larger area for some other values such as important fishing rivers and lakes.
- Group 3 - No additional comments
- Group 4 - Participants noted that the identified watershed boundary seemed too small and there were areas outside of the boundary that also drained into the same river system.

4. Polar Bear Denning

Polar bear denning areas have been identified near your community and the 2016 DNLUP identifies them as Valued Components, where there are no prohibited uses or conditions because the areas are broadly defined and the Commission did not have enough information to propose specific management for these areas.

- a. Do you think it is appropriate to identify these areas as Valued Components so proponents and other regulatory authorities will be aware that polar bears may be denning in the area?

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed that it was appropriate to identify polar bear denning areas as Valued Components.***

- Group 1 - Participants agreed that it was appropriate to identify these areas as Valued Components.
- Group 2 - Participants agreed that polar bear dens being identified as VCs is appropriate. The group Identified additional polar bear denning areas.
- Group 3 - Participants agreed that it was appropriate to identify these areas as Valued Components.
- Group 4 - Participants agreed that it was appropriate to identify these areas as Valued Components.

- b. Are there smaller more specific locations within the areas that have been identified where you think the plan should provide more detailed management? If so, what type of management do you think should be included in the plan?

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants identified additional polar bear denning areas that should be identified as VECs as well as 2 particularly important areas where more restrictive management would be appropriate.***

- Group 1 – Participants felt the polar bear denning area near Kugaaruk needed revision: that it be extended inland more. This extension was added to the map.
- Group 2 - Participants did not identify specific areas for a more restrictive designation.
- Group 3 - Participants felt the polar bear denning area near Kugaaruk needed revision: that it be extended inland more. This extension was added to the map.
- Group 4 - Participants identified 2 smaller areas within the larger area where more restrictive management would be appropriate.

5. Caribou Calving Areas

There is Caribou Calving habitat near your community used by the Ahiak caribou herd (see map). The 2016 DNLUP identified Caribou Calving Areas sensitive habitats and recommends that these areas be zoned Protected Areas with year-round restrictions on mining, oil & gas exploration, roads, hydro-electrical infrastructures, and quarries.

Note for participants: There are parcels of Inuit Owned Land (surface and subsurface) within the areas and overlapping mineral rights.

- a. Are the Caribou Calving areas mapped correctly? If No ... then... describe what changes should be made.

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed with the caribou calving areas identified in the 2016 DNLUP but noted several additional areas that should also be included.***

- Group 1 - Participants agreed the mapped area included calving habitat but needed to be expanded to include the peninsula east of Kugaaruk. The group agreed on a revised boundary.
- Group 2 - Participants agreed with the mapped boundaries, but stated the boundaries are incomplete and identified additional caribou calving areas.
- Group 3 - Participants agreed with the mapped boundaries, but stated they are incomplete and identified additional caribou calving area.
- Group 4 - Participants agreed that the identified areas are important caribou calving areas, but also identified three additional areas that should be treated the same way.

- b. Do you agree it is necessary to restrict certain uses and activities like mining, oil & gas, roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries in Caribou Calving areas?

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed that activities like mining, oil & gas, roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries should be prohibited in caribou calving grounds.***

- Group 1 - Participants agreed that the prohibitions are appropriate.
- Group 2 - Participants agreed with the prohibitions.
- Group 3 - Participants agreed with the proposed prohibited uses. Want the prohibitions all year round.
- Group 4 - Participants agreed that activities like mining, oil & gas, roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries should be prohibited.

- c. Are there other uses or activities that should be restricted?

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants did not identify additional specific uses that should be restricted in caribou calving grounds.***

- Group 1 – No comments
- Group 2 - Participants want the areas protected from all kinds of development, but did not add any particular new use to be restricted

- Group 3 - No comments
 - Group 4 – No comments
- d. If restrictions on uses or activities occur, should they be year-round or seasonal? If seasonal, what time frame would you recommend?
- ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed that restrictions on caribou calving areas should be year-round, rather than seasonal.***
- Group 1 – Participants agreed that restrictions should be year-round.
 - Group 2 – Participants want the prohibitions all year round.
 - Group 3 – Participants want the prohibitions all year round.
 - Group 4 - Participants agreed that restrictions should be year-round.
- e. Is there anything else NPC needs to know for protecting the Caribou Calving habitat or how it may be used by project proponents?
- Group 1 - No comments
 - Group 2 - No comments
 - Group 3 - No comments
 - Group 4 - No comments

6. Caribou Post Calving Areas

There is Caribou Post-Calving habitat near your community used by the Ahiak caribou herd (see map). The 2016 DNLUP identified Caribou Post-Calving Areas as sensitive habitats and recommends that these areas be zoned Protected Areas with year-round restrictions on mining, oil & gas exploration, roads, hydro-electrical infrastructures, and quarries.

Note for participants: There are parcels of Inuit Owned Land (surface and subsurface) within the areas and overlapping mineral rights.

- a. Are the Caribou Post-Calving areas mapped correctly? If No ... then... describe what changes should be made.
- ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed with the caribou post-calving areas identified in the 2016 DNLUP and identified an additional area that should also be included.***
- Group 1 - Participants agreed that the delineated areas are important post-calving habitats and said that additional areas should be added. The group mapped the additional area that should be included as post-calving habitat
 - Group 2 - Participants agreed that the identified areas are important caribou post-calving areas
 - Group 3 - Participants agreed with the boundaries. Added that they don't consider there to be a difference between calving and post-calving.
 - Group 4 - Participants agreed that the identified areas are important caribou post-calving areas

- b. Do you agree it is necessary to restrict certain uses and activities like mining, oil & gas, roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries in Caribou Post-Calving areas?
- ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed that activities like mining, oil & gas, all-weather roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries should be prohibited in caribou post-calving grounds.***
- Group 1 - Participants agreed that the prohibitions/restrictions are appropriate. Noted that a winter road might be okay but definitely not summer or all-season road.
 - Group 2 - Participants agreed with the PA designation and restrictions as well
 - Group 2 - Participants agreed with the PA designation and restrictions as well
 - Group 4 - Participants agreed that and activities like mining, oil & gas, roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries should be prohibited.
- c. Are there other uses or activities that should be restricted?
- ***Kugaaruk community participants did not identify additional specific uses that should be restricted in caribou post-calving grounds.***
- Group 1 - No comments
 - Group 2 - No comments
 - Group 3 - No comments
 - Group 4 - No comments
- d. If restrictions on uses or activities occur, should they be year-round or seasonal? If seasonal, what time frame would you recommend?
- ***Kugaaruk community participants agreed that restrictions on caribou post-calving areas should be year-round, rather than seasonal.***
- Group 1 - Participants agreed that restrictions should be year-round.
 - Group 2 - Participants agreed that restrictions should be year-round.
 - Group 3 - Participants agreed that restrictions should be year-round.
 - Group 4 - Participants agreed that restrictions should be year-round.
- e. Is there anything else NPC needs to know for protecting the Caribou Post-Calving habitat or how it may be used by project proponents?
- Group 1 - No comments
 - Group 2 - No comments
 - Group 3 - No comments
 - Group 4 - No comments

7. Final wrap up Question

- a. Are there other areas so important to your community that the land use plan should tell others how they should be used? Identify the area, the importance of the area, how the plan should manage the area.

➤ ***Kugaaruk community participants identified a number of fishing rivers that should be protected year-round.***

- Group 1 - Participants identified a caribou freshwater crossing southeast of Kugaaruk. This was mapped. Agreed that restrictions applied in other regions appropriate for this water crossing too. Also noted that the marine area – Kugaaruk Bay is very important for the community and wildlife (seals, narwhal and) and needs to be protected for the future. Bay is filled with narwhal in the summer. Also a number of camps and cultural areas identified along the coast. Some discussion about a potential community Area of Interest.
- Group 2 - Participants identified fishing rivers and larger surrounding areas as important areas for the community where uses such as mining, oil and gas, hydro infrastructure ... should be prohibited
- Group 3 - Participants mentioned fishing areas as well but did not map any boundaries. Identified also Muskox area north of Kugaaruk (area overlaps with caribou calving areas PA) and stated that Muskox are lately moving toward Southeast. Did not propose any desire protection for the Muskox.
- Group 4 - Participants identified 5 rivers that are important community fishing areas that should be protected in the plan, where uses should be prohibited that could contaminate the water (similar uses to other Protected Areas discussed). Restrictions should be year-round. Noted concerns with garbage from dump and town in general blowing into the water.

➤ ***Some Kugaaruk community participants identified an additional caribou late summer area that should be protected year-round.***

- Group 2 - Participants identified a caribou late summer area in the northerly part of Kugaaruk and recommended the same protected area designation as caribou calving and post calving area.



Appendix A: Breakout Group Reference Maps

Appendix B: Breakout Group Map Revisions

Map 1: Additional Migratory Bird Habitat

Map 2: Additional On Ice Travel Routes

Map 3: Additional Polar Bear Denning Areas

Map 4: Additional Caribou Calving Habitat

Map 5: Additional Caribou Post Calving Habitat

Map 6: Additional Caribou Fresh Water Crossing & Late Summer Habitat

Map 7: Additional Community Use Areas

