



ᓄᓐᓂᓂᓂᓂ ᓂᓂᓂᓂᓂᓂ
Nunavunmi Parnaiyit
Nunavut Planning Commission
Commission d'Aménagement du Nunavut

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

BAKER LAKE

January 24, 2020



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. Alternative Energy Sites	5
3. Point Locations Identified by Heritage River Management Plans	6
4. Caribou Calving Areas	7
5. Caribou Post Calving Areas	8
6. Caribou Fresh Water Crossing.....	9
7. Marine Shipping	10
8. Final wrap up Question.....	10
Appendix A: Breakout Group Reference Maps.....	11
Appendix B: Breakout Group Map Revisions.....	14
Map 1: Additional Caribou Fresh Water Crossing 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 Baker Lake 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

Note: Due to weather, all events were rescheduled from January 20th to January 24th.

During the community visit the following events took place:

- **Elected Officials Meeting;** (11:00-12:00) Attended by Hamlet council and HTO members
 - The Commission Chairperson and staff met with the Hamlet Council and Hunters and Trappers Organization members 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 10 people, held 1 breakout group.
 - **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 10 people
 - The evening session was attended by participants from the afternoon session, and after discussions with the Mayor, it was decided not to repeat the same discussion in the evening.

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 areas near Baker Lake: Middle Back River. The 2016 draft of the NLUP recommends a Special Management Area (SMA) designation with conditions that would apply to certain activities, but no prohibited activities. The conditions or setbacks for aerial and terrestrial approach distances area seasonal (meaning they only apply when birds are present). For example, the recommended setback is that users on ground activities must be at least 300 metres away from concentrations of birds; and overflying aircrafts must maintain 1100 m (3500 feet) above birds' concentrations areas and keep 1.5 m kilometers lateral distance from their breeding colonies.

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

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants agreed the Middle Back River area is important habitat for migratory birds and also notes its historical/cultural importance.***

- Group 1 – Participants agreed that this is important bird habitat. Also note that the Back River area is a historical/cultural use area. People went up there from Baker Lake and also from Gjoa Haven/Cambridge Bay by dog team and walking. Inuit used to travel everywhere by foot, dog team – they would go up to that area. There will be tent rings and historic sites along the Back River. There are areas that were used as camps on Back River, Garry Lake and Chantry Inlet – travel route that was used historically – for fishing/camping. Also note that the area should be referred to by an Inuktitut name.

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

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants support the recommended conditions for protecting the Middle Back River bird area.***

- Group 1 – Yes.

2. Alternative Energy Sites

Aleksektok Rapids on the Thelon River could be used for run-of-river power generation. Run-of-river projects basically have an intake above the rapids or falls, and take a portion of the river in an underground pipe to a power facility at the bottom of the falls, where the water is released back into the river. The idea is that this way fish can continue to use the stream by not creating a dam. The 2016 DNLUP would prohibit all uses except hydro development within 100m of the Aleksektok Rapids location to support the potential of the area.

As well, the Quoich River has a site that could be dammed to create a reservoir (a man-made lake) that could feed a hydroelectric generating station. The 2016 DNLUP would prohibit all uses except hydro development within 100m of the area to support the potential of the area.

- a) Do you agree that the hydro-electric potential at Aleksektok Rapids should be protected in the plan by prohibiting other uses?
- b) Do you agree that the potential development of a hydroelectric dam at this location on the Quoich River should be protected in the plan?

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants did not support protecting the sites on the Thelon and Quoich Rivers for hydro-electric potential.***

- Group 1 – Participants did not support protecting these areas for hydro-electric potential. There is a lot of wildlife in these areas and people use them for hunting and fishing. There was concern over who identified the sites and why people weren't consulted. NPC staff noted that there are no current proposals to develop the sites, but they were identified in a study conducted by QEC to look at potential sites for hydro-electric power. One participant noted that they would not like to see this development for at least another 50-60 years. Maybe they should look somewhere else where it does not freeze over, somewhere away from Baker Lake. Inuit know of places where the water does not freeze over that may be ok for generating electricity.

3. Point Locations Identified by Heritage River Management Plans

The Kazan and Thelon Heritage River Management Plans identify locations along the river that are important for people or the environment, or both, and recommend that they be protected. The NLUP, 2016 draft, has incorporated these small locations and placed strong protections on them, preventing most development.

- a) Is this the right approach?

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants agreed that the identified sites on Heritage Rivers should be protected.***

- Group 1 – Participants agreed that the sites should be protected. These places are like our museum and people go there still to use the land. The historic sites are precious treasures to us. The land, wildlife (caribou, muskox, fish, birds), water are also precious. Some of the stars are caribou crossings which were very important for people and caribou. Cannot separate important places for caribou and people – they come together as one as people would go to the same place. Caribou crossings were marked by people with piles of rocks.

- b) Do you agree with the locations identified?

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants agreed with the identified locations but noted that there are other sites as well.***

- Group 1 – Participants agreed with the identified locations, but there are other important areas and perhaps should protect the entire river. Participants also noted that Baker Lake had requested that Back River be a Heritage River some years ago but the KIA did not support this because they wanted to focus on mining potential. Quoich River is also a very important area for cultural resources. Participants also questioned why heritage

resources identified in the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan have not been carried forward and NPC staff advised that only some areas/issues from previous planning processes have been carried forward where there are specific recommendations to do so.

4. Caribou Calving Areas

There is Caribou Calving habitat near your community (see map). The 2016 NLUP identified Caribou Calving Areas as sensitive habitat and recommends that these areas be zoned Protected Areas with year-round restrictions on mining, oil & gas exploration, roads, hydro-electrical infrastructures, and quarries. *There are parcels of Inuit Owned Land (surface and subsurface) within the areas and overlapping mineral rights.* Note a large deposit west of Baker Lake overlaps with this area.

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

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants did not agree with the caribou calving areas identified in the 2016 DNLUP because they are too small, and recommended using information from the BQCMB and the areas identified in the 1970s for the caribou protection measures.***

- Group 1 – Participants noted that the areas delineated are not accurate, out of date, and do not include all information available. It was discussed that the areas are derived from GN collaring data and do not include information from previous NPC consultations or from the BQCMB or the 1970s areas developed for caribou protection measures. Participants noted that the map does not show all of the Beverly calving area – there is more calving further north. The community has observed changes in the calving areas, now the Qamanirjuaq caribou are moving further north and the delineated areas on the map are too small. Participants also noted that these caribou are shared with other jurisdictions and that we need to be aware of this and also consider the big picture of caribou conservation. To understand what they are doing and do our part as well. We are talking about big herds (migration, calving) a lot but we also need to be aware of the small groups and consider them too. Caribou do not remain in the large concentrated groups all the time. They also move in small groups at different times a year. Caribou will change their range over the longer term but will also come back to the same area over time and then needs to also be considered.

- 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?

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

- Group 1 – yes very important. Activities on the land affect caribou with calves. Very sensitive at this time. Even smells will impact calves. Development would not be good for young calves and it is better if there are no activities. Roads affect where caribou will go. The existing Amaruq mine road blocks the caribou from moving east-west.

- c. Are there other uses or activities that should be restricted?
- ***Baker Lake community participants recommended that activities generating noise should be restricted during calving season.***
 - Group 1 – Noise needs to be prohibited as well in the calving areas – they need silence during that time.
- d. If restrictions on uses or activities occur, should they be year-round or seasonal? If seasonal, what time frame would you recommend?
- ***Baker Lake community participants recommended that restrictions on caribou calving areas should be year-round.***
 - Group 1 – Participants recommended year-round restrictions

5. Caribou Post Calving Areas

There is Caribou Post-Calving habitat near your community (see map...*note the many outliers of this polygon type*). The 2016 DNLUP identified Caribou Post-Calving Areas as sensitive habitat and recommends that these areas be zoned Protected Areas with year-round restrictions on mining, oil & gas exploration, roads, hydro-electrical infrastructures, and quarries. *There are parcels of Inuit Owned Land (surface and subsurface) within the areas and overlapping mineral rights.* Note that the proposed Kiv-Manitoba Road passes through an extensive portion of this area.

- a. Are the Caribou Post-Calving areas mapped correctly? If No ... then ... describe what changes should be made.
- ***Baker Lake community participants did not agree with the caribou post-calving areas identified in the 2016 DNLUP and suggested they be updated to include all available information.***
 - Group 1 – As with calving areas, participants do not support the identified boundaries and suggest maps should be updated to include all available information
- 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?
- ***Baker Lake community participants agreed that activities like mining, oil & gas, roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries should be prohibited in caribou post-calving grounds.***
 - Group 1 – yes, important; all activities should be prohibited
- c. Are there other uses or activities that should be restricted?

- Group 1 – none added
- d. If restrictions on uses or activities occur, should they be year-round or seasonal? If seasonal, what time frame would you recommend?

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants recommended that restrictions on caribou post-calving areas should be year-round.***

- Group 1 – Participants recommended year-round restrictions

6. Caribou Fresh Water Crossing

There are Caribou Fresh Water Crossings near your community (see map). The 2016 DNLUP recommends that the fresh water crossings be zoned Protected Areas with year-round restrictions on mining, oil & gas exploration, roads, hydro-electrical infrastructures, and quarries. *Note: There are parcels of Inuit Owned Land (surface and subsurface) within the areas and overlapping mineral rights.*

- a. Are the Caribou Fresh Water Crossing areas mapped correctly? Is the 10km buffer zone appropriate? If No ... then ... describe what changes should be made.

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants agreed with the identified caribou freshwater crossing locations and identified additional areas.***

- Group 1 – Participants agreed with the identified crossings but identified some important ones that are missing. Caribou will cross Baker Lake too, they can cross large bodies of water. New area marked on map at the east end of Baker Lake. And along Chesterfield Inlet (waterway).

- 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 Fresh Water Crossing areas?

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants agreed that activities like mining, oil & gas, all-weather roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries should be prohibited in caribou fresh water crossing areas.***

- Group 1 – yes it is important.

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

- Group 1 – discussion regarding shipping and potential impacts (displacement) of caribou from shoreline of Chesterfield Inlet and parts of Baker Lake.

- d. If restrictions on uses or activities occur, should they be year-round or seasonal? If seasonal, what time frame would you recommend?

➤ ***Some Baker Lake community participants recommended year round restrictions for caribou fresh water crossings and some suggested seasonal restrictions would be appropriate.***

- Group 1 – some participants recommended year round restrictions and some participants suggested or seasonal restrictions.

7. Marine Shipping

There are no proposed limitations or restrictions on marine shipping in Chesterfield Inlet.

- a) Are there any recommendations or policies for marine shipping in Chesterfield Inlet that should be considered for the next draft of the NLUP?

➤ ***Baker Lake community participants noted concerns with the impacts of shipping on wildlife in Chesterfield Inlet.***

- Group 1 – Participants noted concern over 30+ barges moving up inlet and lake bringing supplies. This is a large increase from before the mine. Caribou are not so observable anymore – they use to be seen along the shores all the time but not since the ship traffic has increased. Harder to see marine wildlife now, it seems to be less. Maybe the noise from the ships has displaced the fish, seals, whales. Notes the Chesterfield Inlet is narrow and not a lot of room for both ships and wildlife. This includes the Quoich River area. now There can be as many as 4-5 ship anchored at Cross Bay. And there seems to be fewer marine mammals (seals) and caribou. Used to be able to harvest seals at the east end of Baker Lake but that does not happen anymore. The caribou are still present but they are further inland now – away from the shore – then they used to be. It seems the ships are displacing them.

8. Final wrap up Question

Are there other areas important to your community that the Nunavut land use plan should identify and designate for use? Identify the area, the values and sensitivity? Importance of area, and what types of activities should be restricted and when the restrictions should be in place.

- Group 1 – Additional Discussion: Participants were concerned with the identification of the Kivalliq to Manitoba corridor on the maps even though there is no current proposal for it. Suggestion that perhaps NPC should not put the road on the map in the land use plan. When things are on the map it gives the wrong idea about what has been agreed to or approved or exists and this is not the case. Additional comments/concerns regarding the mapped route - lack of discussion, and consultation with the community.
- Group 1 – Participants also expressed concern over the NPC uranium information sessions in 2007 and the amendment of Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan – the process that was followed to allow uranium mining took resident’s voices away. Refers to the lack of a plebiscite vote on allowing uranium mining and instead relying on 7 council motions when there wasn’t consultation. Process is questioned on how community voice is heard. 2016 draft plan has included uranium exploration and mining as an activity that can occur, which is not appropriate.

Appendix A: Breakout Group Reference Maps

Appendix B: Breakout Group Map Revisions

Map 1: Additional Caribou Fresh Water Crossing Areas

