

# **DRAFT NUNAVUT LAND USE PLAN**

## **NUNAVUT PLANNING COMMISSION TECHNICAL MEETING**

**TRANSCRIPT**

**CADET HALL**

**IQALUIT, NUNAVUT**

**JUNE 23 to JUNE 26, 2015**

## ATTENDEES

NPC: Chair of the Commission	Hunter Tutu
NPC: Executive Director	Sharon Ehloak
NPC: Director of Implementation	Brian Aglukark
NPC: Senior Planner	Jon Savoy
NPC: Senior Planner	Peter Scholz
NPC: Legal Counsel	Alan Blair
NPC: Office Administrator	Jimmy Tordin
NPC: Manager of Translations, Interpreter	Tommy Owljoot
NPC: Inuktutut Interpreter, Regional Planner	Annie Ollie
Moderator:	David Boote
Moderator:	David Livingstone
Interpreter, French	Abednego Shu
Interpreter, French	Emmanuel Griffith
Interpreter, Inuinnaqtun	Henry Ohokannoak
Interpreter, Inuinnaqtun	Tuppittia Qitsualik
Interpreter, Inuktutut	Sutukie Joamie
Transcriptionist	Jasmine Adkins
AANDC	Jessica Bos
AANDC	Paul Budkewitsch
AANDC	Catherine Conrad
AANDC	Karen Costello
AANDC	Spencer Dewar
AANDC	Tamara Fast
AANDC	Laura Harris
AANDC	Tat Ma
AANDC	Erika Marteleira
AANDC	Chris Morton
AANDC	James Neary
AEM/Chamber of Mines	Stephane Robert
Baffinland	Erik Madsen
Baffinland/Env Dynamics Inc.	Mike Setterington
Baffinland	Oliver Curran
Baffinland	Joe Tigullaraq
CanNor	Tineka Simmons
CTA Review Panel	David Cardin
CTA Review Panel	Duncan Dee
NWT/Nunavut Chamber of Mines	Elizabeth Kingston
DFO	Chris Lewis
DND	Dwayne James
DND (phone)	Greg Matthews
Department of Justice	Sina Muscati
DPRA Canada (GN consultant)	Vicki McCulloch
EC	Bruce MacDonald
Eeyou Marine Region Planning Commission	Chantal Otter Tetreault
Executive, Chamber of Mines	Alex Buchan (via phone)
GN	Denise Baikie
GN	Mitch Campbell

GN	D Karadag
GN	Bernie MacIsaac
GN	Gabriel Nirlungayuk
GN	Jennifer Pye
GN	Vicki Sahanatien
GN	Arif Sayani
GN Health	Michelle LeBlanc Havard
GN DoE	Linda Vaillacourt
GN/ED&T	Lou Kamermans
GN/ED&T	David Kunuk
GNWT	Jan Adamczewski
GNWT	Karin Clark
iPolitics.ca	James Munson
Kivalliq Inuit Association	Luis Manzo
Kivalliq Inuit Association	Jeff Hart
Kitikmeot Inuit Association	Luigi Torretti
Kitikmeot Inuit Association	Wynter Kuliktana
Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	Ema QaggutAQ
Kivalliq Wildlife Board	Leah Muckpah
Lawson Lundell	Christine Kowbel
Mayor of Chester	Barney Aggark
Nunatsiaq News	David Murphy
NMRPC	Henry Alayco
NMRPC	Mishal A. Naseer
NRI	Jamal Shirley
NTI	Marie Belleau
NTI	Bert Dean
NTI	Andrew Dunford
NTI	Naida Gonzalez
NTI	Miguel Chenier
NTI	Paul Irngaut
NTI	Robert Karetak
NTI	Hannah Uniqsaraq
NTI	Glenn Williams
NIRB	Tara Arko
NIRB	Sophia Granchinho
NWMB	Jason Akearok
NWMB	Karla Letto
NWMB	Peter Kydd
Parks Canada (Phone)	Alaine Joseph
QIA	Luc Brisebois
QIA	Rosanne D'Orazio
QIA	Steven Lonsdale
QIA	Nigel Qaumariaq
QWB	Jason Mikki
QWB	Jackie Price
Transport Canada	Adam Downing
Transport Canada	Jaideed Johar
Transport Canada	Dale Kirkland
Transport Canada	Jason Rosadiuk
WWF Canada	Brandon Laforest
WWF Canada	Rachel Gosselin

## Introduction

Sharon: Good morning everyone, and thank you for coming to this session. We really appreciate everyone's attendance. My name is Sharon Ehloak, and I am the Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. Before we get into our presentation for this morning, I'd like to do a few housekeeping items and then do a roundtable of introductions, so everyone knows who is participating here today. We have all our registered participants seated around the U-shaped table.

First of all, our session is going to be recorded. We have Rachel [Jasmine] who is our stenographer going to be recording as well. The session is open to the public. The media is welcome to attend. We've asked them not to bring their cameras in, and if they want to interview you, to interview out in the halls so it's not disruptive to any of the participants. So before we get into everything I would ask everyone to mute your cellphones down so it's not interrupting the session. Tommy Owljoot is going start with our opening prayer, so I'll ask Tommy to come up please.

Tommy: *(Opening Prayer)*

Sharon: Thank you, Tommy. So I'd like to introduce the Commission team, and then do an introduction of David and David, our facilitators. And to clarify, David and David – David Boote and David Livingstone – are contracted by the Commission to be independent, to provide objective facilitation for this session. Our legal counsel for the Commission is Mr. Alan Blaire. Brian Aglukark is our Director of Plan Implementation and Policy. Peter Scholz and John Savoy are our Senior Planners. Annie Ollie is one of our planners, translator, interpreter, mapper extraordinaire at the back. Jimmy Tordin is our Office Administrator, so if you have any needs or questions about the session, Jimmy is our point person. He's our team lead for organizing the meeting. I'll ask Tommy to come up, our Manager of Translations and introduce all the translators that we have here today.

Tommy: Thank you, Sharon. In the booths behind me are the interpreters. French interpreting is Emmanuel Griffith, Ottawa; Abednego Shu, Yellowknife; Inuktut interpreter, Sutukie Joamie originally from Iqaluit living in Ottawa; and I think Sharon has introduced our extraordinary Annie. She's over there at the back. I'm Tommy Owljoot, and I was surprised to see Martha at the back helping out. Inuinnaqtun is Henry Ohokannoak and Tuppittia Qitsualik. Thank you.

Sharon: Thank you, Tommy. David, I'll turn it over to you for the introductions and then do the roundtable.

David L: Thanks, Sharon. So my name is David Livingstone, and as Sharon has said the other David and I have been engaged by the Planning Commission to facilitate this meeting. We've both been involved in the Planning Commission work in the last couple of years. To be real clear, we are neutral in the development of this Plan, although we're both very committed to ensuring that a Plan is developed, a good Plan. I think that's the feeling in the room generally. We want to work together to develop the best Plan possible, recognizing that it will never be perfect, and it is 1<sup>st</sup> generation Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan. I've looked through the submissions that have been provided over the last few days, and over the time I've been involved in this land use planning exercise, I've seen a fair bit of evolution, and I was really pleased, really impressed with the submissions that were received by the Commission in the last few days. It demonstrates a great deal of progress, I think, by all parties. I personally think about 80% of the recommendations and comments that were received will be readily addressable.

There's about, I don't know, 10% or 15% that are more difficult, and I hope that we'll get a chance during next few days to discuss those in some detail. Then there's about 5% that are thorny, continue to be thorny, and will take a fair bit of work to resolve. But I'm optimistic that we'll make some real good progress over the next few days and come out better and more informed around the table. So, part of my role will be to be the gatekeeper, the time keeper, and try to keep us all on time. It's an ambitious agenda, and we may have to do some work in the evenings as well, and there's a possibility it will extend into Friday morning. We'll see. We'll do our best to be timely and efficient. The other thing I'll try to do is to avoid blood on the floor. To that end, I've got a little first aid kit here just in case it becomes necessary. I hope not. If things really get out of hand, there's a jet fuselage behind us here that's got two ejector seats, and I'm told that they both work. Hopefully we don't have to test them, but it is a standby. David can introduce himself, but the two of us will be the tag team for the next couple of days.

David B: Thank you, David. Yes, my name is David Boote, and I also have assisted over the last couple years with the Nunavut Planning Commission, and I'm here along with David today, this week, to help move things forward. As everyone in the room knows the development of a Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan has been going on for a while, and I think there clearly is a strong appetite to make some serious progress here. I think the purpose of these days spent together reviewing the Plan and reviewing comments from the various parties are to understand what the issues really are. I know it's a bit of a cliché but I think it's extremely important in this context to get past positions and get to the interests that are at play here so we can actually find a common ground that we're going to need to narrow differences. I think it is also worth repeating what David said that hopefully everyone is going through this process with an understanding that we are looking at a 1<sup>st</sup> generation land use plan for Nunavut. There will be some thorny issues for sure, but for the benefit of Nunavut, there is a need to make some progress, and we're looking forward to assisting in that process over the next few days. Thank you.

David L: Just a couple of additional housekeeping items: For purposes of transcription and for the record, it would be handy that when people introduce themselves or make a comment later, they repeat their name, so Jazz can keep track of the comments, and speak slowly. I'm guilty of speaking too quickly too. But for the interpreters and the transcription, it would be helpful to speak relatively slowly and clearly. We're going to do a quick roundtable starting with Alan on my left here. Just introduce yourselves, please, and indicate which organization you're representing, and then we will then go to Sharon for some opening remarks and move into the agenda at that point. Okay, Alan?

Sharon: David, I already introduced our team, so if we want to just go right to Sina with the federal government...

Sina: Good morning. My name is Sina Muscati and I'm here as legal counsel for the Government of Canada.

Spencer: Sina, we might want to change seats. My name is Spencer Dewar. I'm from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, Canada, but today I'm speaking on behalf of the Government of Canada. We have representation from several departments in the room or via teleconference: Aboriginal Affairs, Government of Canada, Fisheries and Oceans, Transport Canada, Department of National Defense, Parks Canada, and Natural Resources Canada. That's it. Thank you.

Ema: Good morning. My name is Ema Qaggutaq. I'm the Regional Coordinator for the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board.

- Jason: (*Translated*). I am Jason Mikki. I work with Jackie Price. She's stuck in Igloolik due to weather. She will be here with us, probably this afternoon. Thank you.
- Leah: Leah Muckpah. I'm the Regional Coordinator for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board, and I'm representing the seven Kivalliq HTOs as well. Good morning.
- Karla: Ulaakut. Karla Letto. I'm a Wildlife Management Biologist with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board.
- Barney: Good morning. My name is Barney Aggark representing the Hamlet of Chesterfield Inlet, Mayor for the community of Chester. Good morning.
- Brandon: Good morning. My name is Brandon Laforest representing World Wildlife Fund Canada.
- Henry: Good morning. My name is Henry Alayco. I have to say it twice like David said, Henry Alayco. Good morning to all of you. I'm the Chairperson for the Planning Commission of Nunavik Marine Region Planning Commission. Thank you.
- Mishal: Good morning. My name is Mishal Naseer. I'm the regional planner for the Nunavik Marine Region Planning Commission. Thank you.
- Chantal: Good morning. My name is Chantal Otter I am the interim Chairperson for the Eeyou Marine Region Planning Commission.
- Elizabeth: I'm Elizabeth Kingston. I'm the General Manager for Nunavut with the NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines. With me - I'm going to skip a person – is Christine Kowbel, who is our legal counsel this morning.
- Stephane: Stephane Robert from Agnico Eagle, representing Chamber of Mines.
- Oliver: Good morning. Oliver Curran with Baffinland. We also have Eric Madsen, VP of Environment Health and Safety. With Baffinland as well, we have Christine Kowbel as our legal counsel, and this afternoon we'll have Mike Setterington arriving and representing Baffinland as technical advisor.
- Gabriel: Ulaakut. I am Gabriel Nirlungayuk. I represent Nunavut Government. (*Translation was overlaid but not in English*).
- Jennifer: (*First portion cut off from above translation*). ...Departments of Community Government Services, Cultural and Heritage, Economic Development and Transportation, Environment, Executive and Intragovernmental Affairs, Health, Justice and the Nunavut Research Institute. Thank you.
- Karin: Good morning. Karin Clark with Department of Environment and Natural Resources from the Government of the Northwest Territories.
- Jan: Good morning. I'm the second person from the Government of Northwest Territories. I'm also with Environment and Natural Resources in Yellowknife, Ungulate Biologist. Thank you.

- Tara: Good morning. My name is Tara Arko, and I'm Director of Technical Services with the Nunavut Impact Review Board.
- Sophia: Good morning. I'm Sophia Granchinho, Senior Technical Advisor with the Nunavut Impact Review Board.
- Luis: Good morning. My name is Luis Manzo, Director of Lands of Kivalliq Nunavut Association.
- Jeff: Good morning. Jeff Hart. Kivalliq Inuit Association, Lands.
- Wynter: Good morning. Wynter Kuliktana, Senior Lands Officer for the Kitikmeot Inuit Association.
- Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Senior Environment Officer, Kitikmeot Inuit Association.
- Nigel: Ulaakut. Nigel Qaumariaq. Qikiqtani Inuit Association.
- Rosanne: Rosanne D'Orazio. I'm the Director of Lands and Resources with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association here in Iqaluit.
- Naida: Naida Gonzalez, Consultant working with NTI and the RIAs.
- Bert: Good morning, everyone. My name is Bert Dean. I'm with NTI as well, the Wildlife and Environment Department. We also have Miguel Chenier from our Lands Department, Andrew Dunford from our Social and Cultural Department, Hannah Uniufsaraq from our Policy, Director of our Policy Department, and Robert Karetak from our Wildlife and Environment Department, and probably joining us when she's back from holidays will be Marie Belleau from our Legal Department. Thank you.
- David L: Great. Thank you everyone. Was there anybody...is there anybody sitting at the back that hasn't been introduced? Don't be shy. Alright, and Jasmine, is our transcriptionist, as I mentioned earlier. A lot of familiar faces and not-so-familiar faces. Gabe, I don't know if you remember me from that trip to Japan decades ago. We'll have to get caught up, and a number of other folks that I see, so it's kind of interesting.
- Alright, Sharon I'll turn it over to you for opening remarks.
- Sharon: Thank you, David. So, our agenda was at the back. I think we have a pretty aggressive week ahead of us. As David said, it'll be at the discretion of the facilitators whether or not we'll do night sessions, and we'll advise you of that. We are really grateful for the submissions. They were very helpful, and the details will support as we move forward in this process guidance for the Planning Commission. We have a presentation this morning that we're going to get into momentarily. Our presentation will provide you a general overview of the Land Use Plan, discuss how the Land Claims Agreement guides the planning in Nunavut. We're going to review the development of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and its contents, explain how this process will move forward, and how your active participation is essential for the success of this presentation. As we go through the presentation, the Commission staff will be exchanging off on who will be speaking to the various parts of our presentation. After our presentation, we will have plenty time for discussion, and we look forward to that from the Commission. So, up on the screen you see Nunavut from space.

On the right, you can see Baffin Island. At the bottom is Southampton Island where Coral Harbour is, and above that, you can see Melville and Boothia Peninsula. The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement provides many benefits to Inuit of the Nunavut Settlement Area including a unique integrated co-management regulatory system with strong involvement of Nunavummiut in decisions related to resource use and development, and tell me if I'm going too fast.

The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, Article 11, Land Use Planning, which is the primary article that governs the Nunavut Planning Commission to develop land use plans for all parts of the territory that guide and direct the resource use and development in the Nunavut Settlement Area. Land use plans must reflect the values and priorities of residents and provide for their existing and future well-being. Plans can manage or prohibit uses from occurring in areas that are important to Inuit.

The Nunavut Planning Commission is the “gatekeeper” of the regulatory system in the Nunavut Settlement Area. Proponents wishing to carry out activities in the Nunavut Settlement Area must first submit a proposal to the Commission to determine if the activities conform to the requirements of an approved plan. If the proposed land use is supported by the Plan, it may then be considered by other regulatory authorities.

Land use plans prepared by the Commission do not apply to the traditional Inuit land use activities such as hunting, fishing, and camping. Within municipal boundaries, our land use plans only apply to certain activities, such as industrial use, the deposit of waste, or the bulk storage of fuel.

The Draft Land Use Plan, first made public on September 7, 2012, has undergone consultation including engaging over 30 communities in Nunavut, Nunavik, Northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba, numerous Territorial and Federal Government Departments, Inuit organizations, environmental and non-government organizations, and industry. The public consultation phase of the planning process included meetings with elected officials in each community and public workshops where the content of the Draft Plan was reviewed, and the Priorities and Values of the residents were recorded, and I see many faces around the table that participated with us – NTI was with us on every single consultation except for where we were weathered, and we really appreciate support from all the parties. Thousands of areas that are important to Inuit were recorded during the unprecedented consultation. Each area is mapped and available in the individual community reports that are located on the NPC website. And before I turn the presentation over to Jon, Peter, and Brian, all the submissions that the Commission received as late as last night, are posted so all parties can see the submissions that were given to the Commission on the Commission website, Nunavut.ca. With that, I'm going to turn the presentation over to Peter, Jon, and Brian. Thank you.

Peter: Thanks Sharon. It is my pleasure to welcome our planning partners here. Regional planning improves certainty for investors, protects the environment, increases the rate by which impact assessments and other regulatory assessments can be processed, and reduces risk of conflicts over land. This presentation starts by taking us through the why and how of planning, so you can feel the confidence that we do in that statement.

The Nunavut Land Use Plan is planning on an epic scale: two million square kilometers of land and half that again of marine areas; consideration of ecosystems as a whole; planning that does not stop, or start, at the coast; opportunity to consider resource development in a broad context; and a central role for Inuit in the design and implementation of the plan. It is a privilege for all of us to be a part of

this. It is a model of regional planning rooted in local wisdom that the whole world needs, and our success here, your support in making it happen, will have ramifications far beyond our territory.

Not all of us work with regional planning on a regular basis. With your patience and permission, we will spend just a few minutes describing land use planning and regional planning and what they are about.

Land use plans are about the relationship between humanity and nature. We all, as a species, use the land. Our actions are coordinated. One person harvests food, another mines, another fishes, another builds roads, and another programs computers. All these things impact the land, the water, and the air. Since our impact is collective, our coordination must also be collective. Satellite images help relay all this and help show that regions transition into all other regions, and ecosystems know no boundaries.

Humanity has a huge impact on the Earth. For good or ill, we drink the water, gather from the land, and turn energy into electricity to run our devices. Our actions leave a mark on the planet. Decisions have multi-faceted results that last for generations. In this image of Canada in the winter, it almost seems as if people leave no mark. Yet by zooming in many times, the mark of people upon the land becomes very clear.

This image of Meadowbank shows just one of many development projects underway or proposed throughout the territory. By establishing what is important to protect before development occurs, we can both learn about those things, and protect them in a coordinated fashion. This takes most of the uncertainty out of the environmental assessment process. Also, we can consider social, economic and wellness effects in a coordinated fashion from the start, instead of asking proponents to do so in a piecemeal fashion for every project.

So how do we develop responsibly? How do we ensure that the Arctic in a century will be as beautiful as it is in this image? At a deeper level, what is the appropriate relationship between humanity and the Earth, or to dig up an old adage, the relationship between Man and Nature?

The first perspective is highly conservationist. In this perspective, the role of humans is to guard the Earth. It is our sacred trust. We must not harm anything, and to some degree, anything we do will take away from a natural perfection that existed before we came. The opposite perspective is that the Earth is a gift to us as a species, and we may use it however we will to benefit us.

Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit – I’m sorry for pronouncing that wrong - would have us understand something else. It would view humanity as part of a dynamic ecosystem...not only taking but giving, not only using but guarding, not only protecting but preserving. Thinking of humanity as an apex species in an ecosystem, our role is to tie and to bind. Planning is about formalizing and coordinating the stewardship role of our species.

Brian: The Nunavut Planning Commission creates those plans in coordination with all of our planning partners. We are merely the ears and the pen. All of you are the hands, feet, eyes, ears, heart, and soul. Only together can we create a plan that will steward the land effectively for this generation and for all the generations to follow.

The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement provides fundamental guidance on how the Commission must conduct land use planning. Article 11.2.1 reads as follows: “The following principles shall guide the development of planning policies, priorities and objectives:

- A. People are a functional part of a dynamic biophysical environment, and land use cannot be planned and managed without reference to the human community; accordingly, social, cultural and economic endeavors of the human community must be central to land use planning and implementation.
- B. The primary purpose of land use planning in the Nunavut Settlement Area shall be to protect and promote the existing and future wellbeing of those persons ordinarily resident and communities of the Nunavut Settlement Area, taking into account the interests of all Canadians. Special attention shall be devoted to protecting and promoting the existing and future well-being of Inuit and Inuit Owned Lands.
- C. The planning process shall ensure land use plans reflect the priorities and values of the residents of the planning regions.
- D. The public planning process shall provide an opportunity for the active and informed participation and support of Inuit and other residents affected by the land use plans such participation shall be promoted through various means, including ready access to all relevant materials, appropriate and realistic schedules, recruitment and training of local residents to participate in comprehensive land use planning.
- E. Plans shall provide for the conservation, development and utilization of land.
- F. The planning process shall be systematic and integrated with all other planning processes and operations, including the impact review process contained in the Agreement, and finally
- G. An effective land use planning process requires the active participation of both Government and Inuit.”

Peter: Article 10 of the NLCA sets up three levels or “filters” to project assessment.

- A. The land use planning filter is handled by Nunavut Planning Commission. It looks at the broadest perspective. It considers regions, ecosystems, and the territory as a whole. The intention is that regional planning will be guided by IQ, and identify key factors of concern and consideration.
- B. The environmental assessment filter looks at individual projects, and is handled by the Nunavut Impact Review Board with key factors of concerns identified by the NPC Eventually we hope ecological baselines and thresholds are articulated, and the NIRB looks in depth at the impacts of the proposed projects, their mitigation strategies, and recommends terms and conditions.
- C. The water licensing filter is handled by the Nunavut Water Board. The NWB looks in detail at chemical and physical impacts to water in Nunavut, to ensure the quality of water in streams and in lakes. Its work is for the most part based on hard science.

Planning allows the projects that fit into the overall development strategy of Nunavut; environmental assessment ensures those projects have minimal negative impacts, and water licensing looks closely at factors that impact water quality and quantity.

Jon: In 2007, as part of a collaborative effort to develop Broad Planning Policies, Objectives and Goals, the NPC, Federal and Territorial Government Departments, and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated engaged in a series of comprehensive consultations. This process resulted in the identification of 5 broad goals with policies and objectives to support land use planning in the Nunavut Settlement Area:

- Goal 1 Strengthening Partnership and Institutions
- Goal 2 Protecting and Sustaining the Environment
- Goal 3 Encouraging Conservation Planning
- Goal 4 Building Healthy Communities, and
- Goal 5 Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development.

Each of these goals has a corresponding identical chapter number in both the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and the Options & Recommendation document that supports it. These Broad Land Use Planning Policies, Objectives and Goals, along with Article 11 and other relevant articles of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, have directly informed the development of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

Brian: Goal 1, Strengthening Partnership and Institutions, is about governance and transparency, and it has guided the planning process that the NPC has undertaken. The remaining four goals have directly informed the content of the Draft Plan, but before we discuss the relationship between those goals and the current Draft Plan, I will first provide a brief overview of the planning process that has been undertaken in consideration of Goal 1.

The Goal of Strengthening Partnership and Institutions is about coordinating agency functions, promoting IQ, and ensuring the strong involvement of Nunavummiut in the planning process. It has guided the land use planning process that has been undertaken to prepare the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan over the last 7 years.

Over the last 7 years, the NPC has communicated with our planning partners with well over 50 letters, meetings, and sessions, with continuous invitations to provide input to the plan and the related process. We have visited all the communities on multiple occasions, either to collect Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit through land use or Use & Occupancy Mapping, or for a minimum of two visits each for the Nunavut Land Use Plan itself.

It is essential that land use plans prepared by the NPC reflect the priorities and values of residents. Since 2004, the NPC has been conducting Use and Occupancy Mapping that identifies how residents of all Nunavut communities use the land. This compilation of information represents approximately 400 personal interviews that inform land use planning decisions throughout the territory by identifying areas of importance to the communities.

Land use plans must be based on the best available information. In 2008, in addition to ongoing Use and Occupancy Mapping, the NPC began compiling information that would support the broad land use planning Goals that were identified. This included the identification of important wildlife habitat, a

survey of current economic activity and potential, as well as community infrastructure requirements and demographic information.

Throughout 2009, this compilation of information was further refined by working with our planning partners to identify specific Issues and Priorities that should be addressed in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. This list of Issues and Priorities resulted in a series of working draft plans between 2010 and 2011 that focused on subjects where there was sufficient information available to inform land use planning decisions. This work led to the public release of the first Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan in September 2012.

Peter: In 2011, an Options and Recommendations document was prepared to inform the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. This document is the heavy one. It provides the background and rationale for the decisions that are included in the Draft Plan. It identifies the information that was considered for each issue and presents recommendations on how the issues should be managed in the Draft Plan. Although the Options and Recommendations document is not technically part of the Draft Plan, it is the primary resource to understand why the Draft Plan recommends the designations that it does. We will be referring to it throughout this technical meeting.

The document, I believe has started to be handed out. I'm sure you'll all have a copy soon. Subsection numbering has been added to the O&R so that the Nunavut Land Use Plan or NLUP and the numbering in the Options and Recommendation document, which is easier said as the O&R, have the same numbering system. So if you're looking at it, for example, 2.1.1.2 of the Land Use Plan, you can look at 2.1.1.2 of the O&R.

Each chapter, as mentioned, relates to a different goal from the 2008 agreement. The rationale for land use recommendations in the NLUP is primarily in the O&R. The Nunavut Land Use Plan is set up to be a day-to-day working document that people are using on a regular basis. This is the backup, so this is where most of our discussions are going to be, because this thing backs up this thing.

Brian: Between 2012 and 2014, the NPC conducted consultations on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan that included engaging over 30 communities in Nunavut, Nunavik, Northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba, numerous Territorial and Federal Government Departments, Inuit organizations, other Institutions of Public Government, environmental non-government organizations, and industry.

During visits to each community, the NPC met with elected officials, and hosted open house community meetings where the content of the Draft Plan was reviewed and feedback was collected. Thousands of areas that are important to Inuit were recorded during this unprecedented consultation process. This feedback was compiled in reports that were then reviewed with elected officials during a return visit. The content of these reports forms an essential part of the identification of Community Priorities and Values.

The NPC also received written feedback on the Draft Plan from dozens of planning partners. All of the written submissions and community feedback was then considered and used to revise the Options and Recommendations document and Draft Plan. An updated version of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan was released in June 2014. Chapter 1 of the Draft Plan includes an introduction which sets the stage for this process, reviews the broad planning policies, objectives and goals as they were set in 2008, describes the approach to planning, reviews the purposes of the Plan, and the land use designations that are applied.

The plan is a first generation land use plan, it is a dynamic plan, and it is an adopted plan as we will explain in some detail as we work through the document. The Plan uses a variety of planning tools to provide direction on how land should be used.

Jonathan: We wanted to introduce the tools the Plan uses to provide direction. These are:

1. **Prohibited uses**, which identify incompatible land uses that do not conform to the Plan.
2. **Terms**, which identify requirements such as setbacks that land users must follow, as well as areas where there are cumulative impact concerns.
3. **Priorities and Values**, which identify priorities and values of residents that need to be considered in the design, review, and conduct of the activity. Priorities and Values can apply to all Land Use Designations.
4. **Direction to Regulatory Authorities**, which identify issues that regulatory authorities, where appropriate, need to address during the regulatory review of Project Proposals.

Land Use Designations mix the four land use tools I just described in different ways to manage land use. There are three types of land use designations: Protected Areas, Special Management Areas, and Mixed Use:

1. The first type of land use designation is a **Protected Area**, which prohibits certain and particular types of land uses that are incompatible with certain environmental and cultural values, and may identify terms to guide land use and/or direction to regulatory authorities. The intent of Protected Areas is to support environmental protection and cultural priorities.

It is important to note that a Protected Area is not like a park. It is an area that may have prohibited uses, terms, and direction to regulatory authorities that is intended to give strong protection to one or more aspects of considerable value.

For clarity, this can mean that a mine, or a road, or an oil well may be allowed in a Protected Area, but that certain values or ecological resources will have to be carefully protected during the design and assessment. You have to take the proposed regulations for each site designation individually. Protected Areas should not be thought of like parks. For example, the protected area around Sanikiluaq prohibits exploration for oil, protects certain birds through setbacks, but allows for mining.

2. **Special Management Areas** may restrict access to some uses or prohibit incompatible uses. Their purpose is to support the identified values of an area. They are shown as tan on Schedule A of the Plan. They may also identify Terms to guide land use and/or provide direction to regulatory authorities. Compared to Protected Areas, Special Management Areas provide more flexible management of areas of environmental or cultural importance. It is important to note that Special Management Areas also provide management for other values, including areas of economic potential as well as areas with existing land uses. The polygon 167 in the Plan is an example, where 167 prohibits tourism or conservation.

Again, for clarity, this means that a mine, or a road, or an oil well are allowed in a Special Management Areas, but that certain values or ecological resources will have to be protected when

planning the mine. You have to take the proposed regulations for each site designation individually. These areas should not be thought of as conservation or restriction zones.

3. **Mixed Use Areas** allow all uses and may identify direction to regulatory authorities. They are the uncoloured areas on Schedule A.

Brian: In addition to the three types of land use designations, the Draft Plan also includes a separate map, Schedule B, which provides Direction to Regulatory Authorities as well as watershed boundaries. This map identifies issues or values that regulatory authorities need to address during the regulatory review of the Project Proposal. For these issues, there may not have been enough information for the NPC to provide clear direction, but it may be possible for regulatory authorities to address the issues through a regulatory review of a project proposal. Schedule B provides a 'heads-up' of values or resources of importance in certain areas that should be considered in any regulatory or environmental assessment processes.

The most important aspect of this are the Community Priorities and Values that are identified through Use and Occupancy interviews, and during community consultations on the Draft Plan. Providing these Community Priorities and Values to proponents and regulatory authorities will ensure that community concerns are considered at an early stage in the design and regulatory review of proposed activities, as well as in how they are conducted.

Peter: Let's take a closer look at the land use designations in the Draft Plan and discuss how they relate to the four broad land use planning goals. We'll discuss each goal individually as we move through the NSA.

The intent of Goal 2, Protecting and Sustaining the Environment is to support environmental protection and management, and it focuses on the management of important wildlife habitat.

The following areas and issues have been identified to support this Goal:

- Key migratory bird habitat sites
- Caribou habitat
- Polar bear denning areas
- Walrus haul-outs
- Marine areas of importance
- Transboundary Considerations, and
- Climate Change

The Draft Plan proposes various ways to manage each of these issues and areas.

The intent of Goal 3, Encouraging Conservation Planning is also to support environmental protection and management, but it focuses on supporting the establishment and management of parks and conservation areas.

The way to think of it is taking an area that an agency wants to set up a park in and prevent incompatible uses from being done before that park is established. The following areas and issues have been identified to support this Goal:

Parks Awaiting Full Establishment  
Proposed Parks  
Proposed National Marine Conservation Areas  
Thelon Wildlife Life Sanctuary  
Migratory Bird Sanctuaries  
National Wildlife Life Areas  
Historic Sites, and  
Heritage Rivers.

The intent of Goal 4, Building Healthier Communities, is to support community needs and cultural priorities, and it focuses on areas that are important to communities. This includes the following:

Community Areas of Interest, which means that an area where a lot of people in a certain community say is very important, it needs some level of protection.

Community Priorities and Values, which can include value components.  
Community Land Use  
Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy  
Denesuline Areas of Asserted Title Claim  
Transportation infrastructure  
Unincorporated communities  
Alternative energy sources  
Community drinking water supplies  
Land remediation  
Contaminated Sites  
DND Establishments and  
North Warning System sites

As an example of a Community Area of Interest, the Draft Plan identifies Nettilling Lake as Protected Area where industrial activities are prohibited because of its importance to communities. It's near the top middle of Polygon 94 on this map. This area was identified by residents during consultations on the draft plan as an area that should be protected, and there has also been extensive use and occupancy activities recorded during individual interviews with residents.

Brian: The intent of Goal 5, Encouraging Sustainable Development, is to support economic opportunities and needs, and it focuses on the areas that are important to the economy. The following areas and issues have been identified to support this Goal:

Mineral potential  
Oil and gas potential, and  
Commercial fisheries

For example, the Draft Plan includes Special Management Areas for areas of high mineral potential, which prohibits the establishment of tourist facilities, conservations areas, and parks. This type of land use designation can support economic development and increase investor confidence.

That concludes our overview of how the Draft Plan proposes to guide land use in the Nunavut Settlement Area. The implementation of the plan is an important aspect that is covered in the final chapter of the Draft Plan.

The Commission has recently approved internal procedures that outline how the NPC will implement, maintain, monitor, and amend plans under NUPPAA and when the land use plan is accepted.

The Draft Plan has been updated to reflect years of consultation, but the document is still not complete. The final public hearing on the Draft Plan is required before it can be submitted to the Government of Canada and the Government of Nunavut for approval. The public hearing will be an opportunity for everyone to provide oral feedback and written submissions on the Draft Plan in a public setting in accordance with the requirements of the Land Claims Agreement. The Commission intends to fly five participants from each community to Iqaluit for a one comprehensive public hearing.

Before the Public Hearing, this Technical Session, and a Prehearing Session next month, and possibly additional meetings, will set the stage for the Public Hearing. Because of the consultation that has occurred to date, any additional changes to the Draft Plan must occur in a context where representatives from all agencies and communities can discuss them in an open forum, the Public Hearing.

This Technical session is about framing land use questions in an efficient way. The best way to describe how we are going to do this is during this week together as an example.

Peter: Okay so I'm going to go through an example. Consider a piece of land. This box could represent a dozen hectares or half of Bathurst Island. NPC, through a number of iterations, has collected information about this piece of land. We have developed options and recommendations regarding how to manage land use in this area based on the information gathered. The planning tools we have proposed in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan are specifically based on the data at our disposal. This data combines scientific and agency/government sources with IQ. So, the proposed regulations are directly tied into the information at our disposal about that piece of land.

Now your agency may disagree with the recommended land use management decisions. You will have reasons for that disagreement. Your perspectives may be based on source information that is different from ours. If we just talk about the land use management options, the likelihood of locking horns increases. We will be talking about positions, not interests. We need to talk about interests. We have to talk about the information that was considered for the piece of land. If opinions differ as to the appropriate use of a piece of land, one of three things is likely occurring:

1. Different or additional information is being considered than what we have at our disposal.
2. There are errors in one or both datasets. Ergo, we have incorrect information on the land or you have incorrect information on the land, or both.

3. The trade-offs of costs and benefits between two or more courses of action are so close as to warrant additional information. What that means is no land use decision is perfect. You may...an area of very high mineral potential and very high ecological value will require very close analysis to come up with the best possible route forward.

If a disagreement is due to data errors, we hope to resolve the issue during this technical session. We are hoping that any recommendations for revisions to the NLUP can then be brought forward collectively to the Public Hearing for open discussion.

If a disagreement is due to additional information that was not considered or not available, the participant with the additional information may be requested to file that information to be considered at the public hearing, and considered during the revision of the Plan after the public hearing.

If a disagreement is due to need for a closer look through additional trade-off analysis, then this can occur between now and the Public Hearing, including during the prehearing conference in July. No land use decision is perfect. There is always a trade-off. Each option will have different benefits, costs, and forgone opportunities. In some cases, additional analysis, with clear articulation of alternatives, may be required to support decision-making. The results of these trade-off analyses will be presented at the Public Hearing.

Fundamentally, these technical sessions are more about the data that backs up the proposed land use planning tools than the proposed planning tools themselves. We hope to come to common understanding on all data that is available, where uncertainties arise, and how those uncertainties impact policy decisions.

I'm going to talk quickly about the dealing with some pretty technical information. What we ask is that we work to speak plainly and simply, not just for the translators, but also for each other. Our task is about ensuring the best data possible and therefore the best land use plan possible for all Nunavummiut taking into account the interest of all Canadians.

As stated, we have added section numbers to the O&R that are identical to the section numbers in the NLUP. The O&R provides the backup and rationales for the designations in Schedule A of the NLUP. We will be generally using the O&R more than the NLUP during these technical sessions. Have the translators translated? You're good? Okay.

Jonathan: Finally, just quickly for your information, we wanted to update you on a project that's not part of the Land Use Plan we won't be reviewing through our discussion of the document, but we'll just give you a quick overview. The Commission is currently developing a web-based land use plan implementation tool that will help facilitate our day-to-day operations, including how we receive project proposal applications and conduct conformity determinations. This will support the timely and comprehensive review of project proposals against the requirements of the land use plan. The Land Use Plan Implementation Tool will:

- Enable proponents to submit project applications along with all the necessary information and documentation including spatial locations. Proponents will be able track the progress of their project application at any time.
- It will enable NPC to conduct a review and approval process, track progress and notify relevant parties about the current status of the project application. All information will be tracked by the system and relevant spatial and non-spatial information published to a Public Registry.
- It will also provide the public with the ability to search and view details about proposed and approved projects in Nunavut through a search engine and an interactive Geographic Information System map.
- It will also include the spatial priorities and values that were recorded during community visits, which will be used to inform proponents and regulatory authorities of areas important to communities.

The system is being designed in a similar fashion to those being developed by both the Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Water Board, which we hope will result in further consistency and coordination between the different IPGs during the review of project proposals.

Sharon: So in concluding our presentation today, we hope you find it informative, the views of the Commission in our presentation. The Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan lays out the interests of the Nunavummiut, making it straightforward for proponents to know how to align projects to fit within the community needs and wants. The Plan is supported by what we heard from the communities. Every factor has a rationale that can be discussed, and we're open for those discussions. The Land Use Plan will encourage investment and prevent conflict between developers and Inuit.

A recent study done at Harvard qualified, or quantified the true costs of conflict with local populations, to mining companies around the world, and it is very high in that study. This Plan will greatly reduce the likelihood of conflict in Nunavut between proponents and Nunavummiut, and as development activities increase, the benefit of this Plan will become evident.

These technical sessions represent the best opportunity for us to work between professional, as organizations, as partners to review the data and develop recommendations for revisions at our Public Hearing. This technical session will focus on the data that is going into the recommended Land Use Plan. The edits that will occur to the Nunavut Land Use Plan after the Public Hearing will be based strongly on data-founded arguments and discussed in an open context. This meeting is our primary opportunity to ensure data consistency across agencies. Our cooperative work here, again, will greatly increase the speed and effectiveness of the Public Hearing and also ease the task of the ministerial team for the final adoption of the Nunavut Land Use Plan.

We are looking at the territory as a whole. Under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement 11.8.2, the land use planning process shall apply to Inuit Owned Lands. We have to look at the ecosystems, the economies as a whole and think of them as a whole. We have to work together for the overall protection for the whole territory, today and into the future.

Again, I thank you for coming and participating, and this is the Commission's opening for our discussions. I'll turn it back over to David and David. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Sharon. I'm going to propose a change in the agenda. Why not start now? We'll take a 15-minute break now. We have to check on the phones and do a couple of housekeeping items, so if you could back at 10:25, that would be great.

## BREAK

David L: I understand that there have been some challenges with the audio equipment, so we'll have a little bit of a run through on that before we go to the opening remarks from first the approving partners, and then around the table. So if you could take your seats please, that would be great.

With respect to the audiovisual equipment, some of the receivers don't have dials, so it's a little difficult to find the channel that you're looking for. So you have to take the back off, and then there's a button to keep pushing until you hear the language you're looking for. The channels are up on the counters. I think channel 3 – English is channel 3; Inuktitut channel 1; Inuinnaqtun channel 2; and French channel 4. But I guess for those who don't have a channel dial, the best thing you can do is keep hitting that button where the battery – just above the battery compartment until you hear what you're looking for. If there are additional problems, just raise your hand. Tommy can come and help you out.

Alright, Gabe has to leave, so I'm going to turn the mike over to Gabe to make opening remarks on behalf of the Government of Nunavut. Then we'll turn to Bert for NTI, and then to Spencer for the Government of Canada. Then we'll go around the table for the other registered participants. And I'd ask you to keep the comments tight, maybe 5 minutes or so. Hit the high points. We will get into details as we go into each chapter, but for now I think it's important for everybody in the room to hear from the registered participants, the key issues that they've got and that they'll be raising later in the meeting. We have the Hamlet of Baker Lake on the phone, so I'll need to be reminded from time to time that there is a warm body at the end of that phone so I can make sure to inquire if there are any questions or concerns. If anybody else comes on the phone, if you could let us know, and we'll make sure to get back to you. Alright, Gabe, it's all yours.

Gabe: Thanks, David. My name is Gabriel Nirlungayuk. On behalf of the Government of Nunavut, I would like to thank the Nunavut Planning Commission for this opportunity to be here and participate in the technical meeting on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. I'd also like to thank for those, all of you who traveled from afar to participate in this technical meeting. We look forward to hearing different perspectives on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. It can further be developed in a manner consistent with objective set in the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement and to share our perspective on how this may be done. The Government of Nunavut has been an active participant throughout development of the Nunavut Land Use Plan, participating in the Commission's consultation process and various workshop; contributing to the 2012 independent 3rd party review; as well as conducting several internal department reviews of previous versions

of the Draft Plan. In supporting our participation in this Technical Meeting, the Government of Nunavut has provided to the Commission a written submission that includes recommendations to address our primary concerns with the Draft.

The report – there was extensive departmental review and includes input and recommendations from each department that are consistent with goals and priorities outlined in Sivumut Abluqta: Stepping Forward. The Government of Nunavut reviews has identified several key area deficiencies in the Draft Land Use Plan and provides recommendations to address these. In brief summary, deficiencies exist in the following broad themes:

- Encouraging and supporting diverse economic development activities
- Ensuring that sound wildlife management systems are in place by protecting key habitats, particularly in respect to caribou
- Applying regulatory process in accordance with the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement and Nunavut Project Planning and Assessment Act, and
- Ensuring clear process for the Plan development implementation amendment and review.

The Government of Nunavut requests that the following Technical Meeting and Commission – we know that it is being recorded, and I think that's one of the keys – in how they will address their recommendations made by various parties and any commitments made as a result of the discussion.

In addition to this, the Government of Nunavut also requests the Commission present an amended version of the Plan prior to the Public Hearing that responds to the recommendations to the stakeholders. This is an essential step in supporting active and meaningful engagement of Nunavummiut in this very important stage of the public planning process.

In closing, we wish to thank the Commission for providing this opportunity to comment on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and to urge them to consider the recommendations that we've made and those made by the other participants. We have confidence that the Commission will make informed and reasonable decisions based on the information that is given, and look forward to a revised Land Use Plan. Qujannamiik.

David L: Thank you, Gabe. Just an editorial comment from my perspective: I found the GN's review of the Land Use Plan really thorough, really thoughtful, and very helpful, as I did with all the other documents received over the weekend. It's, I think, a really positive sign in the evolution of this land use planning process. So, I know you have to go at some point. I'd invite you back whenever you can make it. Thank you. Bert?

Bert: Thank you David. Yes, Nunavut Tunngavik, I guess we'd just like to acknowledge and thank the Planning Commission for the work done to date to get us to this Technical Meeting. There have been challenges, but NTI has been working with the Regional Inuit Associations to try and provide that feedback. As you'll see in our written submission, there is a number of areas, and we'll be here this week to work with you on them. And we're pleased to be here at this Technical Meeting. We feel it's a step forward. In Brian's comments, you know, that the Planning Commission with the ears and the pen – that's what we need. That's the communication we need to have. I realize there will be some critical comments, but it's to work

toward a positive land use plan that everyone is happy with. So, we are committed to that process and working with you on that.

The comments that NTI are presenting this week will be the result of joint work that we've done with the Regional Inuit Associations, but there are some areas where the Regional Inuit Associations will be commenting on their own. But we got direction back in 2014 from the NTI Board through a Board resolution to work collectively with the RIAs in moving forward with the Land Use Plan. They've, I guess been putting more energy and work on that since the Draft Nunavut Plan came out, but as you'll see from our comments, there is still a lot to do, and I think that's because it's a dynamic plan, as you've indicated, right? It's changing. We also have been assisting at more at arm's length level but to try and make sure the Regional Wildlife Life boards and Hunters and Trappers Associations are more engaged. As everyone knows, capacity is a huge issue, so I'm happy to see that the Regional Wildlife Boards are able to make it here. This will help them prepare work with the communities, with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations to work towards that final Public Hearing

So as mentioned, when the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan came out, it was a lot different than previous version. I think that's reflective of what you've been saying. It is dynamic. There have been lots of changes, but to be honest, it caught a lot of people by surprise, a lot of different changes and how that will work. So, we've been hard to review that and get as many of the concerns documented and work with you on them.

But it's because it's those reasons that we feel more consultation will be needed. Whether it's the Planning Commission or NTI or other organizations, I think we can all appreciate the challenges in doing community consultations and getting that input from communities. There is more work, I think, collectively that we all need to do to and contribute to make sure that the concerns and issues from the communities are well represented in this Plan. And so for this reason, and the impact the Plan will have, that is the big part of our concern: What mechanisms or consultations or involvement can we incorporate to make sure we get that community involvement and that voice well represented in this Plan?

An example, a large one for our department - because I'm in the Wildlife and Environment Department - is with caribou. As mentioned, and I think all parties here have an interest. How will caribou be protected? And one of the clear messages we've heard – I believe it was Luigi from the Kitikmeot Inuit Association summed it up well where we all agree that caribou need some form of protection. It's how do we achieve that? Whether it's through mobile protection measures or other mechanisms, how do we work together to make sure that staple – that caribou are there for people in future generations? I'm not sure, you know, this week will be able, at least discuss it and go through the issues, but it may require more work. So I'm hoping or we are hoping the Planning Commission would be receptive to more discussion on that particular issues to make sure that, again, communities, regions, industry, everybody has an opportunity to work together and find the appropriate tools to make sure that there is that balance. And I think that's the challenge we are all facing is that balance.

We need development, we need jobs, we need that part, but wildlife is such an integral part of our territory that we have to make sure that consultation or that communication is happening with our communities. So that's just a brief summary. We will get into more details as the week goes on, but just a few points we wanted to highlight. Thank you.

David L: Thank you Bert. I think the idea of a workshop focused on caribou is something well worth considering, and we will get to that later in the meeting.

David B: I just wanted to mention that NTI has produced paper copies as well of their comments, which are on the back table if other parties want to pick up a copy.

David L: Thanks David. Spencer for the Government of Canada.

Spencer: Thank you. First I'd like to start off and say that the Government of Canada recognizes the magnitude of the endeavor, task, challenge - whatever you want to call it - to develop the Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan. The Planning Commission is doing important work. They're balancing the competing interests, if not passion, that's going to guide Nunavut in its economy and conservation into the future. Further, we acknowledge that the effort and the dedication by the Commission to get where we are today. This version shows significant improvements over previous versions, and it's anticipated that this Technical Workshop will allow us to take that Plan one step closer to being finalized.

So, a little history on how the Government of Canada has come together to provide its submission. It's a result of collaboration and hard work through the Federal Nunavut Land Use Planning Working Group. We have representation from Aboriginal Affairs, Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans, Transport Canada, National Defense, Parks Canada and Natural Resources Canada, and the Department of Justice. Our efforts have been to consolidate our world view and provide a single voice in an effort to avoid confusion and hopefully assist NPC in the monumental task that they have at hand.

Our submission outlines our primary concerns, which I'll defer to more detailed conversations throughout the week, but I just wanted to highlight that we've taken a slightly different tact in this submission. Rather than just providing a matrix of things that we'd like to see changed, we've added a Concerns and Issues piece so you can sort off....We're trying to share our headspace so you can understand where we're coming from. And this is followed by a recommendation how we think we could be satisfied with our concern. We recognize, you know, that this can lead to further discussion, and you know, we're available here this week - many of the federal partners are with us and some are on the telephone – and even beyond this working. Because, you know, we just want to make sure that we're playing our part to provide the best land use plan possible. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Spencer. And just the phone reminder, I know Baker Lake is on the call. Could anybody else on the phone identify themselves now please?

Baker Lake: (Largely inaudible – Translator also mentioned he “didn't get that”). Can you hear me?

David L: Yep. Thank you. Anybody else? Alright, why don't I ask Baker Lake to just give us a few minutes of your time and outline your key issues and concerns with regard to the Land Use Plan if you are able to at this point?

Baker Lake: (*Garbled & largely inaudible followed by several seconds of dead air on audio*)

David L: Thank you. So I'll just go around the table now clockwise. Kivalliq Wildlife Management Board? Or have I got the Wildlife Management Board wrong? Do we have a spokesperson? Just a reminder too, if you could identify yourself before you speak, that would be great.

Leah: Hi, my name is Leah Muckpah. I'm the Regional Coordinator for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board, not the Kivalliq Wildlife Management Board. There were two main concerns from the Kivalliq Wildlife Board that we submitted in our participant standing request. The first one was the caribou calving and post-calving ground protection for the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou in the Kivalliq region. The other area we wanted raised was the marine shipping route. Those are the two main concerns we wanted addressed in this meeting. Should I...I'll just keep it short and stop there.

David L: Alright, thank you. Short and sweet is good. Next around the table, just the spokesperson for the next organization.

Karla: Hi, I'm Karla Letto with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, and I just wanted to also introduce Jason Akearok, our Executive Director, has joined us since this morning. So he's here as well. The NWMB provided a short written submission to the Technical Meeting, which highlighted two main concerns that we had, mainly with Chapter 2. During our review, we wanted to ensure the Land Use Plan respected the roles and responsibilities of the NWMB. One of them that came up would be the migratory bird setbacks, the marine migratory bird setbacks, non-quota limitation that is in the Land Use Plan that has not been approved by the NWMB. So we touched on that a little bit. And then as well, another concern we have, like some of the other parties around here is with the protection of caribou habitat, and in particular the caribou calving, posts-calving grounds, and key access corridors. So I'll just leave it at that for now.

David L: Great, thank you. Next? I know that some people may pass and pick it up at the end, so if you're not ready, just let me know and we'll come back to you.

Barney: I'm Barney Aggark, Mayor of Chesterfield Inlet, and I'd like to thank the Commission for this opportunity to be able to sit with you guys in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. I'd also like to thank them for the community consultations they did recently. I'm sure that helped them a lot in the direction that they went ahead. I never had the time to put in a letter for the community of Chester, but one of the reasons I came here was to see what steps that I have to take to make the municipal boundary of the Hamlet of Chesterfield Inlet bigger. So, I'll be looking for directions to start taking those steps while I'm here. Thank you again.

David L: Thank you, Barney. So who's next?

Brandon: Hi, my name is Brandon from WWF Canada. We are really grateful for the opportunity to be here and thank the NPC for granting us participant status to observe and participate in this meeting. We just want to quickly say we really applaud the NPC for the hard work and the process, and greatly appreciate some of the changes we saw in the last Draft Plan that incorporated some of our suggestions from previous submissions. I'll be really quick as well. A lot of the concerns that we will address have already come up, such as the conservation of caribou calving grounds and post-calving grounds, marine shipping particularly through the Lancaster Sound area, setbacks for bird habitats and polar bear denning habitats as well. Then one other issue we'd like to learn and address and bring up here is more information on the

process for amendments and updates to the Plan that will happen after the Plan is implemented, and how the Plan will adapt to a changing Arctic, particularly from a wildlife perspective. As calving grounds and denning sites shift, how will the Plan adapt to that? So just a clearer indication of that. Thank you very much.

David L: Great. Thanks, Brandon. Next?

Henry: Yes, thank you. My name is Henry Alayco. I'm down from the Nunavik Planning Commission, and I want to thank the Planning Commission also of Nunavut for letting us participate – Sharon and the rest of the technical staff also. The Regional Planner and I, Mishal, we want to participate in some of the areas that we are concerned about - more of animals of course, because most of the people in Nunavik are still real hunters of their area. And if there can be some protected areas being talked about here, I would be concerned about those also. And a few others items. Thank you for letting us be here. We congratulate you now. I know it's a lot of work to produce a land use plan, and I will participate in some areas. I know we can work this out, because we have at the beginning of our land use plan, the Nunavut Planning Commission taught us a lot on how to go about this and from that we'll participate in some of the items you're going to talk about. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Henry. Next.

Chantal: Hi, Chantal Tetreault from the Eeyou Marine Region Planning Commission. I'm a Cree from Northern Quebec. The Planning Commission was created under offshore agreement that was modeled after the Nunavut Agreement, so we're in the process of doing a land use plan for the James Bay, Hudson Bay, as our northern neighbors of Nunavik, so they're a few years ahead of the Cree right now. So I'm really here just to observe and to really learn from your process and hopefully to get on the same path as you are. Our area is a lot smaller than Nunavut, but still the same process needs to be done for the Eeyou Marine Region. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Chantal. Liz?

Liz: Thank you. The Chambers of Mines is the industry association for mining and exploration in Nunavut, and our role is to educate and advocate on behalf of the industry, and we thank you very much for allowing us to participate in this process. We would like to reinforce the importance of the land use planning process to economic development in Nunavut and the critically benefits that our industry can continue to bring to Nunavut and Nunavummiut.

There's not a lot of economic opportunities right now in Nunavut. The territory is experiencing 14% unemployment, which is about double the rest of the country. Nunavut is experiencing a population growth, and yet there's not a lot of opportunities available in the communities right now. So our industry holds great hope to be able to continue to assuage that problem.

As this first generation plan, it will be strengthened by recognizing that Nunavut's economic advantage lies in non-renewable resource development. The regulatory environment is robust, particularly so now that NUPPAA is the final stages of being invoked. Creating a first stage plan under such condition requires minimal permanent exclusion of land from development, and in fact, should ensure the protection of non-renewable resource potential and access to it. Nunavut's future economic success will very much depend on the outcome of the Land Use

Plan. So we thank you again for allowing us to participate. That concludes my opening comments.

David L: Great. Thank you. Who's next?

Oliver: Thank you. It's Oliver Curran with Baffinland. I'd just like to thank the Planning Commission for giving Baffinland the opportunity to intervene in these very important meetings. I think if there's a recognition around the table on the profound step that this is for Nunavut in its land use planning to cover a geographic area as large as they're doing with one Plan, it's I think probably the largest plan in Canada - in the continent - and probably the largest land use plan that would exist in the world. I think there's recognition around the table the importance of including all of the stakeholder concerns within that Plan and ensuring that once the Plan is developed, it's administered in a way that is practical. It is a massive undertaking, and I certainly appreciate the work that the NPC has done to date and hope that everyone's concerns can be addressed going forward with this Plan.

Specific to Baffinland, our submission highlights three main points with respect to our project, in addition to the Chamber's submission. I think that our first point is to ensure that the regulatory framework within Canada and Nunavut is recognized at the land use planning stage, enabling flexibility for setback areas – for example, for migratory birds - to be addressed by the appropriate regulatory body. The next main point that Baffinland would like to see addressed is specifics on additional research that's required with respect to polynyas and the marine environment. And the last point that we highlighted was further clarification on transportation corridors as they apply to the Mary River Project and approved northern and southern shipping routes. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Oliver. Gabe, you've already said your peace. Actually, I'm waiting for you to leave so I can start telling stories about that trip to Japan. I'm sure my stories will be a little different than your stories. Karin, Government of the NWT?

Karin: Thank you. I'm Karin Clark and I work for the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. I'm really pleased to be here and I thank the Commission for granting us participant status. Our area of interest is caribou, and we've heard that several times already around the table that there is interest in this area. Many of the Northwest Territories barren ground herds are currently in decline or stable at low numbers. We would submit that this then necessitates the requirement to work together in the conservation protection of these herds. As many of you are aware, several barren ground caribou herds in the Northwest Territories have part of their range, and particularly the calving grounds, in Nunavut and therefore require shared approaches to management. The Government of Nunavut has a Cabinet approved formal position supporting no development on mainland caribou calving grounds, and the Government of the Northwest Territories has supported this position in recent environmental assessments – assessment processes in Nunavut.

The GNWT has no authority in Nunavut, and we fully respect the Nunavut agencies around the table and the processes that you represent. We do feel that supporting the Government of Nunavut's position on calving ground protection and the other organizations around the table as well that have that interest, it strengthens collaborative relationships and is consistent with

what we're hearing on our side of the border from several Aboriginal governments and land claim boards in the Northwest Territories. Again, we look forward to being here this week and working together to find some common ground on that issue.

David L: Great. Thanks, Karin. Who's next?

Tara: Tara Arko, Director of Technical Services at the Nunavut Impact Review Board. First of all, I'd like to say thank you very much to the Planning Commission for putting together a meeting like this and acknowledge the amount of work and preparation that does go into starting and succeeding in a meeting like this, so thank you. That's very much acknowledged from our staff to yours.

The NIRB has provided feedback throughout the development of these draft plans and has tried to provide an understanding of the gaps or areas where their decisions could be supported through clarity in the Land Use Plan. Our Board continues to note four specific project proposals where clarity in the Plan could provide assistance to their decisions. It is a very standardized recommendation that they've been making, so not new material necessarily. But where they see specific projects in the specific areas where concern is related through the public comment period, they have been consistently noting where further discussion related to land use planning and development area definitions, or policy of development within certain areas, would be useful to their decisions. And so, their recommendation is to not necessarily have the Planning Commission make a unilateral decision, but work with planning partners to make clear policies in some areas, and these meetings are exactly that. So our Board does appreciate the fact that the Planning Commission has taken the time to bring together all the agencies and make sure they are participating, and provide that feedback clearly to the Plan. So again, very much appreciated. The Nunavut Impact Review Board would fully support this process again to ensure clarity and is willing to provide whatever feedback or clarity that the Planning Commission would seek going forward. We appreciate the ability to be here today as well and throughout the rest of the week for discussions. So thank you very much. Again, we look forward to the meetings of the rest of the week.

David L: Great. Thanks, Tara. Next, please.

Luis: Thank you very much, and my name is Luis Manzo. I'm representing Kivalliq Inuit Association, one of the designated Inuit organizations under the Claim, under the NTI umbrella. Like my colleague says, we also have an independent complementary technical report to the Planning Commission. We completed a thorough review, and some of the contexts that we put into a technical submission have concerns of the efficiency of geoscience data in the Plan; fresh water resource designations in terms of the protection of the drinking water; the conflicting marine and conservation areas against development in oil and gas; missing definitions and terms; identification of community (?) priorities; balance in the land use designations; conflicting directions in the Nunavut Land Use Plans for alternative energy. These were the major themes that we put together in our technical report.

We thank the Nunavut Planning Commission to take that opportunity for us to come together and try to build up the Draft Land Use Plan together. You hear about some of the members in terms of the caribou, which for KIA have two components: one is the protection of the wildlife that we very much agree. The other one is the land component to it, which have two partners

as the Federal Government and NKIA holding titles of properties in the Land Use Plan. So, you hear our partner NTI and mentioned the mobile protection measures. We use that in Kivalliq, going by the actual (*Appendix A?*) which has the caribou protection measures. We are actually the region who are implementing very much your plan draft and approve of Nunavut Planning Commission in a good standing. It is necessity of more data. We agree on that. It's necessity of more partnership. We agree on that as well, and the consistence of the information sharing in terms of (*inaudible*).

The opening remarks of the objective of Planning Commission was very well addressed that the difference in data can have a different outcome. We have 10 years working with geoscience data. We need the (*feasibility?*) for the selection of the corridor, communication corridor in Nunavut between Manitoba, Nunavut and the Federal Government. Unfortunately, those don't even make it into the Plan as a designated, even though we follow the Land Use Plan criteria and how we're supposed to (?) this work. It doesn't even make it into the Plan. The (*responsibility?*) to organization also is not well defined as we have it today in our land use plan as a step forward. It's very defined, our land use plan. Effectual enough to combine the table to share the concerns and have an outcome. So comprehensively, our actual land use plan is very good in comparison to what we have today and it's the reason why we are here today. You have all of that in our technical report and the rest of the comments with NTI.

I'm here with Jeff Hart who is also representing Baker Lake. He's practically our right hand in Baker Lake. As you well know, we're doing a community impact in Baker Lake for the last five years. A lot of information is being collected in the last four years. Three documents is being developed to address community effects, and we see very little of that information in the plan. We come here with open mind to make sure those items are taken into consideration into the Plan and when the time comes, I want to share the information we collect over the years. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Who is next? Wynter? No...

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to take the opportunity to – Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Mr. Chair, there are a couple of wildlife boards that actually were not able to speak, the Kitikmeot and the Qikiqtani Wildlife Boards. So I would like them the opportunity to speak before I do if that's okay with you.

David L: Absolutely. Who would be next? Yeah, please.

Jason: Jason Mikki with Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Thanks, Luigi. I was waiting for everybody to speak and then make an announcement that we have three wildlife boards – Kitikmeot, Kivalliq and Qikiqtaaluk. First of all, again, thank you for letting us participate in these meetings and with our submission for Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board, we have provided more comments on the Chapter 2 than any other areas that are being reviewed this week. So once the time comes, we will be providing some more input and questions to everybody when needed. Again, it's Jason with Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board.

David L: Okay, and sorry for bypassing you, Jason.

Ema: Good morning. My name is Ema Qaggutaaq. I represent the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board, and I thank the NPC for allowing us to come to this meeting, to the Technical Meetings. I have three items that my board wants to address at this technical meeting. It's pretty much like the KWB's submission: caribou calving areas in the Kitikmeot, and the other is crossings. We all know that shipping routes will be affected and impacted once the Northwest Passage opens, so that was one of the concerns from the Board. And the third was caribou and muskox congregations in the Boothia Peninsula. That's pretty much what I got so far from them, but we plan to correspond with the NPC more. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Ema and again, apologies for skipping over you too. Luigi.

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association: We would like to thank NPC for all the work that they've done. It has been a long process and I've been on just a fraction of the tours, and it was exhausting just being on the five communities that I've visited. I want to thank all the participants as well, because it obviously shows an engagement and a willingness to improve the Plan. So thank you all for coming. I very much want to thank NTI and the other RIAs – Regional Inuit Associations. We've been working together for a year, and I want to acknowledge the group effort that has been done and the coordination by NTI. It was an excellent process, so thank you to the groups.

I was pleased to hear of the potential willingness for a workshop on caribou. It's obviously going to be one of the difficult topics to deal with. As Bert mentioned, he tried to paraphrase me, but I tried to paraphrase another colleague of mine, so I do not want to take credit for the statement that was made, but we all believe that caribou so need to take...we do need to take some measures to protect caribou. It is...it is...I cannot put into words how important it is for Inuit. I think a workshop on caribou and what measures can be put in place is a valid choice for that specific topic. There are a couple of other items that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association will speak to during the NTI submission or as part of the NTI submission that are a little bit more specific to KIA – KitIA, apologies - but we will deal with those during the submission. So thank you very much for facilitating this work.

David L: Thanks, Luigi. Who is going to speak for QIA?

Rosanne: Thank you. It's Rosanne D'Orazio with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, and just to introduce Steven Lonsdale who is with us. He's the new Environmental and Regulatory Affairs Advisor with the QIA as well. So thank you very much to the Commission for having us here. We're excited, I guess, to participate in this process. And thank you to echo – sorry I talk fast, interpreters. I just don't remember to slow down. Thank you to NTI for all the work that they've put into coordinating our joint submission. We – I personally have really liked working with the RIAs and NTI on this file and hope to continue to do so.

So, QIA has submitted several comments in the joint submission with NTI, and there's a separate comment that we submitted as well. There are two main issues, I guess, that we've brought up, and that comment is how to address community input and the goals and objectives of Inuit into the designations that lie on Inuit Owned Lands, and we will comment further on that throughout this process. The other one is about caribou protection measures. Caribou protection is very important to QIA and to the Inuit in the Qikiqtani region. Through our comments, we are looking to fully protect those calving areas for caribou, and we will express that through our

comments in this process as well. So I want to thank everyone, I guess, for being here and thank the Commission, and look forward to the next couple of days.

David L: Thanks, Rosanne. Just to check on the phone again. Are there any other registered participants on the phone? No? So, I guess we'll move into the real working part of the agenda now.

So you'll notice, if you have a copy of the agenda, a little organizational brief. What we intend to do is introduce each section – NPC will introduce each section that will briefly summarize the intent of the section. And then we've also asked that they present a brief summary of what they've heard. Particularly over the last few days, a huge volume of material arrived on the weekend, and so it's left the NPC staff scrambling a bit. But, I'll ask them to summarize what they've heard more recently. Then, I'll go around the table quickly, basically a show of hands, if anybody else has got any comments that they would like to add above and beyond what they've already submitted. Then we will get into the discussion. At that point, I will try to moderate the discussion but the other David will ask some poignant questions from time to time. We'll see what we can achieve. So, I'll turn it over to the Planning Commission for Section A- the Review of Definitions and Chapter 1.

Sharon: Thank you, David. Jon? Jon will be leading this. Thank you.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Sharon. Let me get the mike positioned. My voice is not the loudest. As has already been said, we greatly appreciate all the submissions. There is a tremendous volume of comments come in the last several days. We have been reviewing them as best we can. We acknowledge the value of all the submissions and are thrilled with the comments that we have received.

The approach we're going to take is, we're going to review each section of the Plan summarizing what it intends to achieve and how we went about making our decision. We might highlight some points that we have noticed, some common threads from different submissions or points where we have questions for participants in regards to their submission. That's not by any means comprehensive. It's something that has caught our attention, and we'd like to discuss further. So we'll go through that. We'll highlight some points, and then we can engage in a facilitated roundtable where all the participants can further expand on their submissions or respond to some of the questions that we had specifically. Again, just because there is such a volume of comments, many of them we find are incredibly helpful, and we don't need to discuss. If there's a comment, a revised definition, and we find it makes sense, we're not going to raise that up and go through line by line of everyone's submission. We just don't have that much time. So if we're silent on an issue, it doesn't mean that we haven't seen it or we have some problem with it. Again, as we go through that, if you would like to articulate a certain point again, feel free to do so if we haven't raised it as we go through.

David L: Jonathan, can I interrupt just for clarification? So if you're silent on an issue that means that you essentially concur with the issue that was raised, or at least the solution that was raised?

Jonathan: It's hard to say with 100% certainty because of the volume that have come in in the last few days. Some submissions we have had time to go through in enough detail to pick out stuff we do have to comment on, but I can't confidently say that we have no questions about the entire volume today.

David L: Okay. Alright, sorry for interrupting.

Jonathan: Alright, so we're going to start with definitions and Chapter 1 all as one discussion. This is a bit different than the other chapters of the Plan. It'll be a bit more straightforward there once we get to actual management approaches for different issues. It will be more of a section-by-section approach. But for the definitions and introduction, I'm not going to go through each section. I'm just going to note a couple of comments that we've received and sort of pose a bit of question or discussion or overview on how we got to that point. And if there's anything anyone wants to specifically talk about further, you can raise those through our facilitator. We don't have any definitions. There have been plenty of clarifications and suggested definitions and noted missing definitions. There are none that we particularly want to make note of at this point, but again, feel free to raise them if you would like to expand on what you've submitted.

David L: Spencer?

Spencer: Hello, it's Spencer. I just want to...Since several parties have made submissions, what if there are conflicting definitions that have been proposed? How would you select which one, and would you inform the, I don't know, the one that was successful? How would you inform the parties on how you chose?

David L: Jonathan, you want to take a shot at that?

Jonathan: Yeah, thanks David. Again, we are not necessarily here today to pick and choose between all of the different definitions. There's an incredible volume of material that has been submitted for the Commission to consider that will all need to be thoroughly analyzed by staff and discussed with the Commissioners themselves before we would make a decision on which definition is most appropriate. Today I don't think we're necessarily going to pick and choose if there are two or three definitions. We aren't going to wordsmith and debate over which. Perhaps if that's what people want to do and it's really important, we certainly can. But today we just look for clarity on issues where we are not fully understanding the points that are being made or if we see a slight issue or something we'd like to discuss with a point that's been made, we would bring it up.

David L: Alright, Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. And just for further clarity, when we speak of the decision makers, the Commissioners are the decision-makers. The staff are here, as Brian said. We are the ears and the pen to put the collective information together to bring forward to the Commissioners. So Spencer, to answer your question, who will make the final decision? That will be presented to the Commissioners. With all the information that is presented, as in the past, the rationale for the decisions coming forward will be in a tracking document, and we in the past have made that available to partners. As such with decision-making, we will continue that transparent process.

David L: Okay, Jonathan, but before you continue, I guess I'm trying to paraphrase what you're saying in a language that I understand. Essentially what you're presenting here are the issues that the Planning Commission staff have flagged as concerns or requiring further elaboration. You're picking the hotspots that you see to date. Okay. And so again, if people are not hearing their

particular hotspot being raised, you're welcome to that and underscore the importance. But I'm...you know, broad-brush. This is the Commission staff reporting on what they've heard and highlighting for you, so far, what they think are the key issues that are emerging. Alright, go ahead Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you, David, and further to that, a significant portion of what we'll be doing as well is briefly articulating what the Plan does and what it intends to do. In some cases, there is some confusion, so just to provide that background to further elaborate on what was intended by the Land Use Plan before we get into the discussion of what has been submitted.

So starting off in Chapter 1, Section 1.1.2, which provides an overview of the Nunavut Settlement Area, one comment or theme we have noted...*(interrupted)*

David B: Jonathan, sorry. Just one second.

Naida: Hi, Naida Gonzalez. We do have a comment that we want to bring forward on the definitions. So it's in part in response to the Government of Canada's submission. So we did submit a question regarding the definition of existing rights. And the reason I bring it up is that some of the issues in this yearlong review that we've undertaken with the RIAs have gone to NTI legal for their opinion.

So in the situation with the definition of existing rights, there is...I would say the position is that it should be in keeping with NUPPAA, with the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act, and I believe the Government of Canada is suggesting a more expansive approach to that definition. I was asked if that was the case, to at least note to NPC that we would be providing essentially a reaction or opinion to the Government of Canada's submission.

David L: Spencer. *(Laughter)*

Spencer: Thank you. In our submission where we do talk about existing rights, we're not looking to be inconsistent with NUPPAA. We want it to be consistent with NUPPAA. So what we're looking for is some more clarification on how existing rights would work under the framework provided by NUPPAA. Thank you.

David L: Naida, do you have a comment on the comment on the comment?

Naida: No.

David L: Sharon can comment.

Sharon: Thank you. So the Commission, as Jon said, is going through the information, and we recognize that a lot volume of information came in as late as last night. And so we are going through information, and we're looking hopefully to have a good dialogue and recognize as Jon said, we will be looking at the majority of the comments, etc. But we are looking to have a dialogue, and you know, we have not had a complete, thorough analysis of everyone's submissions. I think everyone recognizes that around the table, so we're looking to clearly have good dialogue. And as we said before, interests, to get some clarification for us on your positions so we have an in-

depth understanding of where everyone's coming from, if that provides a little clarity on the question. Thank you.

David L: Alright, so let's go back to definitions. We've heard that exchange, and I guess what I gather from it is that there's no desire to change a particular - reinvent a definition, use the NUPPAA definition, but perhaps expand on what it means in the text somewhere or other. Spencer?

Spencer: Sorry. The Government of Canada didn't suggest a definition for existing rights or changes to it, right? But we did request an expansion. So we see NUPPAA setting minimal requirements on existing rights, and we feel the Plan can go further to grandfather or protect existing rights.

David L: Okay. Jonathan?

Jon Just on the subject of existing rights, we plan to have an additional fulsome discussion regarding existing rights in Chapter 7, the Implementation Strategy, which addressed existing rights. So recognizing that it appears in the definition section, we do plan a larger discussion on existing rights and grandfathering closer to the end of the session where it is in the Plan.

David L: Okay, we have a question at the end.

Christine: Christine Kowbel. I was just wanted to make a suggestion. I wonder if having the conversation about definitions at this point in the discussion is maybe premature, and maybe it's a better discussion to have at the end. Because I think a lot of these terms come up when we talk about each chapter, and I wonder if that might be, in terms of ordering, whether it might be appropriate to consider the definitions at the end of the proceedings rather than the beginning? Thank you.

David L: Thanks, and I think Jonathan's hope was that we'd skip over the definition section entirely, but we didn't quite make that. So, Jonathan back to you.

Jonathan: Okay, thank you very much again, David. I guess I've got a quick question as well for perhaps the facilitator: Chapter 1 is a bit different than other chapters in that we will go through decision by decision for each issue. Chapter 1 is more of a scattershot where I'm just skipping sections where we have nothing we'd like to discuss. Would it be preferred to just run through my series of comments on what we've received and then do roundtable on Chapter 1 or go section by section?

David L: Why don't you do just a quick overview of what you've heard and the highlights from the Commission Staff perspective, and then we'll open it up.

Jonathan: Excellent. Sorry for the confusion. The first thing we wanted to touch on was Section 1.2, the Nunavut Settlement Area. It just provides a brief overview of the settlement area and provides the context for what's occurring in Nunavut. There have been comments provided that additional volumes of background information should be incorporated into the introduction to the Plan, discussions on general state of the environment, demographics, the economic situation in the territory, as well as additional information on how decisions were made and things of this nature. I would just like to point out that a conscious decision has been made to try and streamline the content of the Land Use Plan and put background material in supporting

documents such as the Options and Recommendations document. So that underlines the information that's been considered and the decision-making structure that the Plan is using. In addition to that, we did prepare a comprehensive background research in 2008, and those documents are available and have been widely distributed. Again, they were conducted in 2008, so it was a comprehensive demographic and economic sector analysis, wildlife habitat, a general state of the territory. Earlier drafts reproduced much of this information, earlier working drafts, and through discussions a lot of that has been removed. We appreciate that additional information may be beneficial, but we'd request very specific additions that would be helpful, again keeping in mind that there are additional documents out there to support the Land Use Plan itself.

Excuse me. Another key issue we wanted to talk about was in Section 1.4.2, addresses the Consultation Process that was undertaken. And again, it provides a general overview of what was done. There have been concerns raised about how community consultations or the Community Priorities and Values have informed the decision-making in the Land Use Plan. There have been a number of comments to that effect, and I'll just provide a brief overview of how we have used those community consultation results at this point. Again, it will come up throughout the discussion of the Plan, but we thought it was a key point to address briefly at the beginning.

So first of all, the Community Priorities and Values have supported the identification of the issues that are addressed in the Land Use Plan. Since 2009, we have been working to identify Priority Issues for inclusion in the Land Use Plan where we have enough information to make a decision, and that our priority to be addressed. So we've been working with planning partners and communities to do this. A straightforward way in which the Community Priorities and Values have been used is in the decision to address certain topics in the Land Use Plan. So something like walrus haul-outs: the walrus areas that were identified during community consultations have not necessarily been used to define specific areas in the Land Use Plan, but the topics that are addressed have been informed by what communities have said. Communities are concerned about migratory bird habitat and caribou and drinking water supplies. And all of these topics that the Plan addresses have been identified by the communities as important.

So as I said, we have not taken the step of using specific geographic areas to modify additional information that has been submitted, so if we are talking about migratory bird habitat, the identification of migratory bird habitat by communities has not yet been revised for those boundaries, to be clear and confirm that.

In addition, which will be the subject, of course, of further discussion these Priorities and Values are area where communities have identified where they have a significant interest, have been included as a one large direction to regulatory authorities to consider these Priorities and Value, as we've called them. So collectively, they would be available for proponents and regulators to consider during the design, review and conduct of the project. Now, they have been incorporated into the Plan as a series of tables in the back that is simply summarized by category what value appeared in which area. Through the online implementation tool that we are developing, the specifics would be available online in terms of each individual area. So if you were to identify a particular area where your project would be located, you would then get a list of specific comments that communities provided on that area, as well as a list of specific species

that have been identified through our community use and occupancy mapping. Those tables are more of an illustration to include into a hard copy document. But the larger database would be available online and would be part of a conformity determination. I think that summarizes briefly what we did with the Community Priorities and Values.

Section 1.4.3 talks about the decision-making framework that was used. Again, I'd just like to make note that our Options and Recommendation document is the main instrument that captures the decision-making....so what was considered, how decisions were made, and the different options that were available. Again, not wanting to include an excess of detail in the Plan itself, we put in the Plan what's needed to guide land use, and the decision-making rationale is included in a supporting document.

Section 1.5.3, the Application of the Plan: One issue that we noted caused considerable confusion is in regards to municipal boundaries. I'd just like to note that the Plan does apply within municipal boundaries. It's explicit in NUPPAA, but only in certain cases. So to – I guess the definition is probably in here somewhere, but bulk storage of fuel, deposit of waste, industrial uses, those types of things. That being said, the Plan is subject to...the municipal boundaries are subject to their own community plans, which have their own ways to manage land use.

As a solution for potential conflicts and disagreements between community land use plans and what the Nunavut plan might do, all areas within municipal boundaries were designated Mixed Use. And this was an attempt to simplify what is actually occurring within municipal boundaries, leave that entirely in the hands of the municipalities. If there are Priorities and Values that have been identified by communities, those would still be part of a conformity determination, and would be passed on to regulatory authorities and proponents. But it was decided in the previous draft to just designate them Mixed Use and allow all uses to conform to the Plan. Again, there's only a small subset of project proposals that we would actually see. But again, that has caused some confusion over different lists of sites that maybe have not been designated. So drinking water supplies: if the boundary completely encompasses the drinking water supply, it has been designated Mixed Use, and it is not a Special Management Area in the Plan. That has led to some confusion over why Cambridge Bay does not have its community drinking water area designated as Special Management, like Arviat would.

Another topic the application of the Plan that we wanted to acknowledge we received multiple comments regarding the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board's jurisdiction to develop non-quota limitations on harvesting. We recognize that. It came in from numerous submissions, so things like setbacks for migratory bird habitat that include restrictions on fishing gear, that should just be noted up front that they would need to be approved by the Wildlife Management Board in advance. So we thank everyone for their comments on that issue.

In terms of Section 1.5.4, we touched on this in our overview presentation but though it would be helpful to once again just go through the different ways in which the Plan manages land use before we delve into the specifics of each section. The start of Section 1.5.4 identifies prohibited uses as a particular way to manage land use. We would just like to reiterate some comments were received in our review that these prohibited uses need to be clear and easily determined by the Commission. We have received some comments that a prohibited use might be something to the effect of uses that damage this type of habitat – something general like that. It would be difficult for the Commission to make that determination if this use would

damage such a habitat or impact such a species. We do need to focus on clear land uses that are clearly defined in order for the Commission to make clear conformity determinations.

There have also been a number of comments on the use of terms and conditions. And again, we'll discuss these as we go through each section. There were a number of comments regarding the use of cumulative impact referrals as a term. So the Draft Plan identifies specific areas where the Commission may be concerned about cumulative impacts of projects and may refer below-threshold projects to the Impact Review Board for consideration. In Draft Plan, it's set up to be a term, and that's illustrated on Schedule A of the Plan, and a number of parties have identified concerns with that being a term, and perhaps that should be set up as a separate structure and not a term in the Land Use Plan itself. To be clear, there are several categories, which we will discuss, if that cumulative impact referral issue is not a term, many of the issues would effectively come off of Schedule A: for example, polar bear denning, walrus haul-outs, heritage rivers, and community drinking water supplies. Based on the structure of the Plan, that term is what gets them on Schedule A as a noted area. What would be left if we got rid of that cumulative impact referral would be direction to regulatory authorities, which would move it onto Schedule B. That should be noted.

There have also been a number of comments regarding the direction to regulatory authorities. I think there's a general appreciation that in many cases, the Commission does not have enough information to provide clear direction at this stage in regard to many issues. So there needs to be some mechanism with which to communicate that information or keep it around and raise the issue. So the approach that's in the Draft Land Use Plan is direction to regulatory authorities where it identifies the need for a regulatory authority to ensure impacts on a particular value are mitigated. We will have to talk about the specific language. There are a number of concerns - direction to regulatory authorities, that name I know the Government of Canada has proposed calling it information for decision makers and change the wording slightly. The Government of Nunavut has stressed that it's really the proponent's responsibility to develop mitigation measures for regulatory authorities to review that, so that is something that can be discussed further.

The Community Priorities and Values are another aspect of the Plan that I think we've touched on and appreciate there are a number of concerns that people can rise more specifically as we go through.

The end of Section 1.5.4 discusses the three types land use designation that are available, meaning Protected Areas, Special Management Areas, and Mixed Use. We would just like to note that each of these categories has specific types of prohibited uses, terms, conditions that get them into those categories. So I spoke earlier about if cumulative impacts was not identified as a term for polar bear denning, it would no longer be a Special Management Area. So there's a structures that we've established for each of these areas.

For example, there was another submission that suggested changing an area from a Protected Area to a Special Management Area, but keeping the prohibited uses the same. That would not fit with the logic of the designations that has been established. So if there are prohibited uses that are incompatible with an identified environmental value that makes it a Protected Area. There are Special Management Areas for additional issues, so if it's an environmental or cultural value or concern, that would make it a Protected Area. If it's a fishing area or a mining area, or

something of an existing use on the ground area – areas around military establishments – those are Special Management Areas under the Plan. So if we could just keep those in mind - that thinking that was involved in the development of the three designations.

And finally, my final comment on this - apologies for extending this out – is our public registry. This is not included in the Plan, but a number of submissions identified the need for notifying people of project proposals whether that be individual agencies or communities or what have you. There is a mechanism in our public registry for communities or proponents or interested people to sign up for notifications in a variety of different ways. So if they are interested in a particular issue, they could sign up on our website to receive notifications of receipt of project proposals related to Issue X, whatever type of use they're concerned with, or by geographic area. So if you were sitting in Kugluktuk and you were interested in a particular area with which you'd like to receive notifications, you can register that in the public registry and get notifications. Departments, likewise, can do the same thing. So if there are areas around national parks where Parks Canada would like to receive notifications, then that can be set up through the public registry. So every time we receive a project proposal within 50km of a park, then that could be sent off to Parks Canada. So anyone could customize their own set of notifications to receive through our public registry. So I just wanted to note that, because notifications were a common theme through several submissions. Thank you.

David L: Thank you very much Jonathan. That was thorough and clear. It's great. Remind me about lunch. Is that going to be here, or are people on their own? Okay, so we will continue for another 10 minutes or so and break for lunch and come back at 1:15. Any comments from the floor? Naida, and then we'll go down the table.

Naida: We have a number of comments for Chapter 1. I'm not sure if we want to go section by section, however you prefer. I don't think they're necessarily that lengthy but there are a number of them.

David L: Why not go section by section.

Naida: So, 1.2, and I appreciate Jonathan, your comments on trying to streamline the information that exists in the Draft, but it has been streamlined to about a half a page. I think there was not a full realization of the documents that you were relying on. You referred to the 2008 documents, and that those documents discussed the demographics, economic, environmental issues in Nunavut. So, I think it would be helpful if there was at least somewhere where people could realize where those summaries exist to know what the foundation of the baseline information that the Commission is using.

And that being said, we carefully looked at the independent report that was done, and the connection that we made there was that you can't cover all the information, but you need to have enough baseline information to address the key areas in the Land Use Plan where you have planning decisions. I think that's where we're coming from. So in areas where there are designations, where there is direction, that those are the area - that's the need-to-know information that you at least would have to have a summary of, and that's what we're suggesting.

Luis Manzo, who we've been working collectively on this submission, was going to provide a few examples of what information would be useful to include in a Draft Land Use Plan. So, Luis, are you ready to show your slides on that? For 1.2 as to the information that would be good to have in the Land Use Plan.

David L: If you're going to show some slides, can I suggest we do that after lunch and get things set up in the meantime? So if you could just continue.

Naida: Okay. There are two other small areas that we wanted to mention, and it was in the concept of incremental planning. And I think this will touch on what Luis will show. But we're concerned that the Land Use Plan's approach to acquiring information is that it is what planning partners and participants provide to Commission. We would really like to see a more proactive stance in the Land Use Plan that the Planning Commission collects information that's publicly available that's useful in the areas where the designations and direction exists. So, we are looking for sort of a change from what we perceive as a passive approach to the collection of that information to a more proactive approach to acquiring information that's publicly available. And also on incremental planning, we realize that there is a commitment to regional land use planning and there is a small statement in the Draft, but I think all the organizations were eager to know how the regional planning was going to work with the Nunavut-wide plan and how the designations are going to impact the ability to do regional planning. I'll let you respond if you like to those two points.

David L: Jonathan, do you want to take a shot? I mean, I guess I would just say if you want to take it under advisement, there's nothing stopping people from having sidebar conversations and then coming back to the table if it would save everybody else some time.

Jonathan: Yeah, I would just note regarding the final point of the process for incremental planning and additional review and development, I would not like to get into that during the discussion of this document. I consider that more of a discussion for the prehearing conference and process-related issues. I appreciate the comment that you would like to see it reflected in the document, but regarding the specifics of how that would unfold, I'm not sure that this is the appropriate time to consider that.

David L: Any response to any of the other points raised? Okay, Naida.

Naida: The next section we have is on community consultation. We also have slides on that, so I think we'll just hold off on that.

David L: And is that it for your comments on this chapter?

Naida: We do have comments on the issue that was brought forward about notification, and we don't have slides for that one so we could proceed with that one if you like.

David L: Why don't you take 5 minutes and then we'll break for lunch.

Naida: So, in addition to the comments that we provided, we wanted to make very clear that the Plan does address that the communities have expressed that they would like to know what activities are happening in their areas as soon as that's possible. KIA did submit for consideration a

Consultation Guide. It was not reflected in this draft, probably for various reasons. I think one of them, and we wanted to make clear, is that there is no intention that any community consultation or notification would interfere in NPC's conformity decision-making process or further their discretion in that area, but we are concerned that the public registry process is not going to be sufficient in that the issue in that the issue that we would like to have addressed is for communities to be notified before conformity decision is on the table so that proponents would be having those discussions with communities ahead of submitting their project proposal to NPC. And I'll let Rosanne also...do you have anything to add to that?

Rosanne: Thank you. The Guide was submitted to the Planning Commission a while ago at a previous meeting I believe we had in Cambridge Bay. But just to kind of emphasize, I guess, what Naida was saying is that the idea is to have a certain level of notification or consultation with communities from the proponent, not necessarily by the Planning Commission, but on behalf of the proponent, so that there's an awareness of the projects that are happening on Crown Land as well as Inuit Owned Land. Because there's a process in place currently that we consult with our CLARCs on Crown Land, but there are lots of projects that are happening on Crown Land that don't have the same level of awareness in the communities. And we wanted to address that through this requirement for a notification or consultation in the conformity determination process.

David L: Alright, anything else at before we break basically? Ok, Jennifer, you had a point? If you could make it quickly, and then we'll break for lunch.

Jennifer: Thank you, David. The GN had a comment related to the Options and Recommendations document and how this is a separate document from the Land Use Plan itself. As we've stated in our comment, the Land Use Plan is the only legally binding document as per the Land Claims Agreement. However, as the Commission has stated, there is lots of information in the Options and Recommendations document that needs to be considered. Our recommendation is that the Options and Recommendation document be substantively incorporated into the Land Use Plan itself so that users of the Plan may be able to have a full understanding of the information that was considered by the Planning Commission when making their decisions. Has the Planning Commission had a chance to review that comment, or do they have any feedback for us on that?

David L: Sharon? Anything?

Sharon: Thank you. We have no comment at this time. Thank you.

David L: Alright, let's break for lunch. I'll ask people to be back no later than 1:15. We'll try to start right at 1:15. Thanks very much.

#### **LUNCH BREAK**

David L: I've heard some concerns about the relatively quiet mood in the hall, so I'm going to call on people to tell jokes from time to time if need be, put people on the spot. I could tell some stories about Gabe in Japan that probably people don't know about, but maybe I could make something up. Although, I've got to say, it was a good trip. It was in the days when Gabe was a

drum dancer. He was, and probably still is, very good. Alright, so we'll go back to NTI. I guess Luis is going to throw up some slides, or who is going to take it?

Naida: So just to give an introduction: This is in reference to the comment Number 10 that NTI and the RIAs put together. Throughout, there have been comments about more information that is required in Section 1.2 of the Land Use Plan. This one is reference to the natural resource base. Luis is going to provide some samples of the type of information that NTI and the RIAs would like to see included in the Land Use Plan.

Jeff: Hi. Jeff Hart with the Kivalliq Inuit Association. I've just taken an article out of our Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan from Chapter 5 under Mineral Development. DIAND or AANDC currently has the major responsibility for managing mineral exploration and development on Crown Lands subject to the environmental protection responsibilities outlined above. NTI manages the mineral exploration and development on subsurface IOL. NTI is responsible for issuing exploration licenses, concession agreements, and leases on subsurface IOL. KIA is responsible for issuing Inuit land use permits, leases, and other surface instruments as they pertain to this surface estate of IOL. AANDC is responsible for issuing prospecting permits for registering mineral claims and mineral leases on Crown Lands and for granting exploration rights for oil and gas.

Luis: This is the guy that the Lands Department of KIA has been following since 2000 when this plan was approved. It has been very successful, and we will show you the type of information that we didn't see in the Land Use Plan in order to make an analysis of how you will define those areas. And you need to compile a very good information in order to make those discretionary calls in terms of how the areas are being designated.

First of all, I will show you the geophysical structures over the last 10 years have been now finally finalized but (?) with the industry of course. You have in there also the transportation corridor from Manitoba to Baker Lake. Along those trenches are mineral potential you will have in those. I don't know if you can see them. In the top left corner, you have a trench who crossed the Keewatin and Kitikmeot in which those mines, minerals have been developed. Along the same trench, you see the identification of the Kiggavik project. In upper of that trench you have now the new project along the geological information you're holding. It's very impressive how they line up between each other. And if on top of that we put the occurrences, compile it in terms of different metals, you find that all the occurrences also fall in the same trench. So, this is no accident. This is science. In order to make areas or designate areas, we need some sort of balance in the information, which is public information in terms of the sampling, occurrence, and all those geological documents committed to geoscience and go through very good analysis in terms of how you're going to balance the potential against the protection. And this is some the statements that also are in my report. I don't have to go back again in this.

And now I'm going to put what is proposed in the Land Use Plan. The centerline there is the core calving grounds with the protection area. And then you have the proposed calving and post-calving grounds on top of the existing (*faults/folds?*) that we have not yet explored fully because it's very minimum but the potential is there. We know we found deposits. The industry continued finding resources. And the Plan it's not really...it's too protective to the economic development. That's what we're trying to...then I will then merge the existing conservation

areas in the Kivalliq region. Well guess what? We don't have more land in KIA in Kivalliq region to explore, because no one will explore either close to a conservation area. No one will invest there. And this is pure public knowledge, layers and analysis done over the last 10 years. We've been very proactive in protecting caribou and making sure the protection measures are there. We develop mobile protection measures to incorporate in our leases, in our permits. We did the IIBAs to make sure those areas who are subject IIBA according to the Land Use Plan are being completed and followed to those agreements with the Federal Government, with the CWS, with the territorial government. And now we have extra areas of conservation, which does imbalance the richness of the mineral for future generations in the Land Use Plan that need to be addressed. This is a fact. I didn't make this up. Geoscience office have all that information, and Parks Canada has it, GN has it – we have partnership with all of them in order to...since the Land Use Plan was signed was collecting a lot of information in order to make good decisions in the Kivalliq region.

If you notice the calving ground, for instance, we are the only region who have a very healthy herd in those calving grounds over the last 10 years. And if you notice how many permit we access to those calving grounds, there was one permit over the last 10 years. The rest of the permits, they don't have access to calving grounds because there's no insurance for that investment. So by virtue of being in a wildlife area, proponents are not staking those grounds. They may staked them in the past, but they don't do it anymore. But there has to be guidelines of how we're going to administer or designate those areas, especially the transportation corridors. We have (*donors?*), and those maps right now, they allow high mineral potential, but they don't have access. So what do I have – only when I exploring no mine. There's no access corridor identified. This is a very detrimental to all the economic developments for future generations. I mean, we're dealing here with 40, 50 years down the road when we signing this Plan. And our kids today, our kids today, I don't think they're going to be good hunters. They will be transfer of some of that knowledge, but in 40 years, those kids will be administrators. They will be doing our job, and that exchange and adaption will also need to be taken into consideration in the Land Use Plan. I think that covered my technical report and NTI's comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

David L: Thanks, Luis. Any response from the Planning Commission staff?

Sharon: We just thank you for your comments and the information, and no comment at this time. Thank you.

David L: David, you have a question or comment?

David B: I was just going to ask the layers of information, both with respect to mineral potential and the wildlife, the caribou areas. Has that information all being shared with the Nunavut Planning Commission?

Luis: Well, it's public information, all of that information. The Geoscience database – Iqaluit has a geoscience office and NRCAN also have a geomagnetics office and pure mineral development office. You can get those information very quickly, especially NPC who have better agreements than KIA. We were building over time over 10 years those layers as we need it. We also have the till sampling over the whole entire Kivalliq, because we need to make good decisions. We have the whole (?) and 250,000 and 150,000. And that's because we're also dealing with water,

with water compensation for those projects we associated with license. We need to make sure they pay compensation for wildlife. We need to make sure they pay compensation for water, which is a difficult one. But we have those agreements and signed those agreements with proponents to protect the rights of Inuit when we extend those license, and all that information will need to be collected in order to actually sign the agreement of compensation, how much it will be, what kind of...how many wildlife will be actually impacted either by development or by killing. So you need to have, I have the whole harvesting and the whole Traditional Knowledge for (?) and all the atlas incorporated in (?), which is public valuable information. I don't say I collected it overnight, but the sets of GIS that can be provided to NPC for this analysis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

David L: Jon you had a response, and then Bert?

Jonathan: Thanks Luis for the comments. I'd like to note that raw data in that form of geological information, etc., the Commission would greatly appreciate some analysis and specific recommendations on the value of particular areas. We are generalists at the Planning Commission, and we expert collect advice from all the participants around the table. So we're not taking necessarily taking in raw caribou collaring data. And considering that, we are relying on the advice of technical experts who have analyzed the information and are providing specific recommendations to us. So, in the case of mineral potential, the Draft Land Use Plan relies on information that has been analyzed by Aboriginal Affairs, and we can discuss that later when we get to it. But I'd just like to point out if your agency is in a position to provide specific advice through analysis of raw data that would be more helpful in informing the Commission's decisions on how they recommend land use management options.

David L: Thanks Jonathan. Bert?

Bert: Thank you, David. Yeah, just to add onto Jonathan's comments and David's question as well. I think that's what we're doing now is we're providing information to the Planning Commission. I'm not sure if it had been provided before, but Jonathan's comments are helpful as well because we can work with you on that to have that discussion. It does get complicated in that there will be other parties also interested in providing comment on that data or how it should be interpreted. That's, I think, made up a lot of the work the past year that we've been doing with the three RIAs is having the meetings, trying to figure out, you know, what's based on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan what do we need to see in there and get that information. And then we ask the Planning Commission for a technical meeting like this, it's so we can have this kind of open discussion and share the information we've been gathering so that you have it, because based on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, and you've stated you're relying on the information presented by the different departments and then you're putting it in, and I think it needs more refinement or more discussion and stuff like that. So, hopefully that's something that this week we can continue to do and talking with Sharon, you know, in terms of responding to some of the questions and comments we have. If we get some of that initial feedback, we can have sidebar discussions or other meetings as well to try and explain where we're coming from with these different things and see if there's something by the end of the week that we're sort of moving forward on. Thanks.

David L: Thanks, Bert. Stephane's got a question down there.

Stephane: Stephane Robert representing Chamber of Mines: I just want to add on that is we know that Nunavut have a great geological potential and we know it's under explored. And if we knew where to drill, we will go drill. And that is the big things what Luis mentioned is that we know that we have potential, but we don't know the value of this potential. If we knew it, we will be there. Now like Agnico or Amaruq, because we found something one year ago, and we drill there. But if we knew that other place we have, we will go drill. So that is ongoing and things will evolve with time, but we know that the Kivalliq, as an example, have a great potential in the future. But who knows what we have in these faults. Thank you.

David L: Okay, thank you. Just on that, I guess I'd note that everything evolves over time, including the Land Use Plan, and striving for perfection at this stage will prevent any land use plan from ever emerging. There's a....there's an issue of how much can be done and then how much will evolve over time. I appreciate the challenge that the Planning Commission in incorporating all of this, the information, and trying to get it as good as possible. But I guess I would suggest too, that folks were providing information to the Planning Commission can help them out greatly by not only raising issues, but identifying solutions and then exercising some patience as the Plan emerges and working with the Commission to make the Plan better over time. It ain't going to be perfect the first time. That's guaranteed. Any other comments on Chapter 1? I'll go to Government of Canada first and then Sharon.

Spencer: Thank you. It's Spencer. So the Government of Canada's comments, they are detailed in our submission obviously. But I thought we'd at least bring this forward. What the Government of Canada is really looking for is to see a land use plan that supports and predictable decision-making. And we feel that what the Plan really needs to do is outline its conformity requirements. We'd like to see conformity requirements that are explicitly identified. We'd like to see conformity decisions that are determined based on criteria that's as objective as possible. And three, that the criteria can be met with limited information that can be reasonably expected in early exploration or early project phases.

That being said, I just wanted to touch base on some of the comments Jon made earlier regarding the Community Priorities and Values. The Government of Canada is of the position that if Community Priorities and Values are of...if they justify prohibiting or imposing a certain land use or designation, then they should do so. And if they're not, they should not be used in the conformity determination by the Planning Commission, because that causes some uncertainty and it can be vague. So, if they don't justify a special designation, then they should be relegated to basically providing information for the regulators when they're doing their business, whether it be EA or issuing a permit. Thank you.

David L: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. I just wanted to respond or ask for further clarification from NTI, but I'll wait if there are any more comments on Chapter 1 from the parties. Thank you.

David L: And just in the interest of time, if the conversation is kind of bilateral, I'd ask that people take it outside and see if they can't resolve those questions. We really do want to focus on, well on the priority area that people have identified, but also to the extent possible on the areas of common concern around the room. So if some of the discussions are by their nature bilateral, then perhaps you can resolve them bilaterally as well. Any other? Yeah, please.

Naida: Before lunch, we had two other areas that we had slides on that we wanted to touch on Chapter 1.

David L: By all means, go ahead.

Naida: So, the next two are very important to the NTI and the RIAs. Community consultation is something that is throughout the submission that NTI and the RIAs have put together. We thought about what would be helpful in addition to what's in our written submission, and there are a couple of slides. We'd like the Options and Recommendations document up on this computer if that's possible. Before lunch, we discussed whether that was a possibility. Can you...yes the Options and Recommendations document if you can put it...yeah.

So we're looking at page 17. So we're looking at the Rasmussen Protected Area. So if you could just....if you could just take it up a little. We're looking at the additional considerations. Right there, that's perfect. The situation that we're grappling with is that the Nunavut agreement sets a very high standard for community consultation. Active and informed participation and support of Inuit is one of main focuses, and there is no....there is recognition of the community consultation work that has already been happening and has taken place by NPC. Our questions stem more because this Draft is not really a refinement of the previous draft, but it is a new draft in many ways. The designations, in large part, as far as we can see, have not been shown a at the community level or with some of the wildlife organizations in particular.

So here's an example of the protected area for migratory bird site, it's the Rasmussen. So the local community is Gjoa Haven. The outline is in yellow, and the dark yellow includes some Inuit Owned Lands. So we go to the Options and Recommendations document to see what the considerations are, and we see that the considerations are that there's IOL. And then you see the Priorities and Values of residents, and it includes birds, which is good because this is a bird protected area. But we also see that one of the values is that it's a potential economic development area for the community, and there's existing economic development and protection.

So our question is, how do you know that the community values birds over any other use for that area? Because you prohibit every other use, and we don't see that the community input exists that would lend the support for creating this Protected Area. And it's not to say that maybe they wouldn't support it, but the question hasn't been asked at the community level. And that's a huge concern. From our perspective, the threshold that is required for active and informed consultation has not been met.

David: Can I ask for a response from the Commission on that one?

Sharon: Jonathan will be responding. Thank you.

Jonathan: For starters, the specific land use designation as it exists now for Rasmussen lowlands has not been extensively consulted with the communities. The area was identified in the previous draft, with which we used to gather feedback on the Draft Plan, so there have been consultations on this area. Communities were asked if they – I forgot the exact question – but generally do they support these, are they important to them? And they responded by identifying different values

around the area. I also wanted to note that in that list, it's been summarized, but potential economic development - I don't have the exact laundry list of identified values - but in many cases, I'd also just note for reference that could include commercial fisheries as an economic development opportunity, which would be consistent and permitted in the area. I don't know how much I want to get into consultations in general. I'll defer to Sharon on that.

David L: Alright, Naida, anything more?

Naida: I think it's just an area that requires some consideration. Land use planning is not a linear process. This is a new Draft Plan and I think before it can be a final Draft Plan, the conclusion that the RIAs and NTI are coming to is that there needs to be more visible support from the communities and the regional organizations on the wildlife issues, and the balance they would like to see. I mean, you know, this one is close to Gjoa Haven. The Options and Recommendations document, it required a lot of research to figure out which community you're talking about and you know, which regional organizations have been involved or not. More detail on the community consultation process would be helpful. In this example as well, we see that there are prospecting permits. And you know, these highly sensitive areas have been put forward by Environment Canada, but my understanding of the Government of Canada submission is that the prospecting permits within that zone would be grandfathered, if I read their submission correctly. So is that...I don't think we have a final understanding of what even the Government of Canada's position is for that area.

David L: Spencer, do you want to take a shot at that?

Spencer: Without getting too technical, I guess the information provided by CWS – and I guess we can give Bruce the opportunity to explain it further – was provided based on their scientific data collection on what they know about birds and bird habitat. And that was provided by the Commission, and the Commission has made choices to display it the way they have. The Government of Canada's position on existing rights is a way to sort of grandfather - not to isolate – to let tenure that has been issued actualize through the mining life cycle. So it may look like a conflict, but there could be a tradeoff. Maybe in this instance it is too sensitive a habitat that we couldn't allow it to grandfather. I think the position on the existing rights is more of a general rule or statement. That's what we want to see. It may not be absolute, because it may not be justified in some areas. Is that clear?

Naida: I think what we're looking for is some clarity on the specific....what the map is going to look like. That's a general position and that's understood.

Spencer: Yep.

Naida: But what's the impact on all these other designations if that grandfathering of all tenured lands happens?

Spencer: Yep, so we'll certainly have to go out and compile that information and have a broader understanding of what the impacts are as designations get imposed. Right? So, we are compiling that.

David B: And we're not finished speaking about this particular issue. I think in Chapter 7 is when we'll be talking in more detail, because it's a very important one for sure.

Naida: So, we're just going to show one more example. It's very close to this one, so it's the Protected Area, the Kagleoryuk River – Protected Area for migratory birds, so it's page 15 on the Options and Recommendations. So again, we're looking at the additional considerations. So it's a little bit...there we go. So, this area is close to Cambridge Bay. It's....the box line around the bird habitat side is the boundary with the NWT. And again, this is, you know, a substantial area that's close to a community. In the additional considerations – and this happens, the Options and Recommendations document is not complete – we know that the residents prioritize caribou, and I suspect that it's just missing information in the Options and Recommendations document. But we would hope that birds was on the list too. But again, there are mineral claims and mineral leases in that area. There is obviously competing uses. And we understand that Environment Canada provided their information as to the most sensitive sites, and we would expect them to. But what we're not seeing is how that's balanced by the other priorities that the communities have, and what...if the question was asked to the community whether they want that area exclusively used for bird protection to the exclusion of all other uses. I think the consultation process, because there was not the opportunity to show these designations at the community, that's a weakness that needs to be addressed. Another iteration is more than likely needed to be able to get specific direction from communities on whether these are the designations they would like.

David L: Thanks, Naida. Ema, you had a question?

Ema: Thank you, yeah. To the previous slide where Naida pointed out where Gjoa Haven has access to the lands, I wonder if I should point out that all the three communities just outside Gjoa Haven (*named*) all have access certain times of the year, not only birds but muskox and caribou as well. So I was just wondering if I should point that out. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Any response? Yeah, please. Luigi.

Luigi: Luigi Toretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association: Thank you for the slide regarding Rasmussen. I participated in the community engagements in I believe it was 2014, end of 2013 and 2014 for the Kitikmeot. The previous iteration, and I specifically asked the question about Inuit Owned Land in this area – the explanation that I received at that time was that Inuit Owned Land, the choices to do, to access that would be exclusively for Inuit, for the RIAs. This new iteration...there wasn't a specific question as to....I don't recall a specific to the community as to the designation, and if that was the most appropriate designation for the area. And I think that is what we're asking. But I recall the previous iteration and my questions to that effect, and it seemed to provide KIA with more leeway on decisions on IOL, but that is not the sense that I am getting from the designation in the 2014 draft. So just a clarification on that point, on Jonathan's comments to the presentations to the community. That's how I recall it. I don't recall that specific question being asked.

David L: Thanks, Luigi. Any...any other comments...yeah.

Jennifer: Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut: We would like to go back to Chapter 1, and Jonathan touched on a number of comments the GN had, and many of them required no further

discussion. However, we'd like to discuss one comment with respect to related research as a prohibited use in certain land use designations. First of all, we have recommended that related research be defined in the Plan. It's not clear from our perspective. Related research is a prohibited activity. However, in certain areas where it's prohibited, they would presumably require additional research to gain a better understanding of these areas and the measures that are in place to say, protect the values. How has the...or how does the NPC...I guess we're wondering how will additional information provided by stakeholders as part of related research be incorporated into further iterations of the Plan, if it is a prohibited activity in certain land use designations? I think we're seeking some clarification on that point.

David L: Thanks, Jennifer. Comments from the Commission staff? Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thanks, David. I'm a bit confused over your confusion, but related research was intended to apply to the other prohibited uses if that's clear. So if mineral exploration and development is prohibited, the intention was that related research would be associated with mineral exploration and development, or however that's phrased. That wouldn't prohibit all research. So if it's a bird area, you can certainly go count bird eggs in the area.

Jennifer: Thank you, Jonathan. That is actually very helpful. I think the term "related research" is a little vague, so we did have questions if that would relate to the specific prohibited uses that are listed or if it would include all research related to that specific area that's under the land use designation itself. But to clarify, or what I think you're saying is that it would be research related to the actual prohibited uses that are listed? Okay. So, just to reiterate our recommendation, I think it would be helpful to have a very clear definition of that in the Land Use Plan. Thanks.

Jonathan: Agreed. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Jennifer. Other questions. Yeah, Stephane.

Stephane: Stephane Robert. We talked just before that, you know the Plan was evolving. And for that, to evolve, if we say that we prohibit any activities in this area, how can the Plan evolve if we cannot do research? Because if we want to have more information, we need to do research. If we cannot do research, we will never be able to evolve and change this Plan. So that is the point. When we say we cannot do anything research related, it will never change, because we will not have the data to change it. Thank you.

David L: Jonathan, anything? Okay, I think they've accepted the concern, and we will see what happens further. Any other...yeah.

Naida: This is our last issue is on Chapter 1, just for everybody to bear with us. But it's on the Inuit Owned Lands. We also have some slides in this area. I think one of the objections that there is to the current wording in Chapter 1 on Inuit Owned Lands is that there's agreement that Inuit Owned Lands were chosen for a variety of reasons, for renewable resources, for nonrenewable, for cultural heritage. But how those parcels were chosen, that happened through a community process and a regional process, and there are specific reasons why parcels were chosen. So, a general application by NPC that Inuit Owned Lands were chosen for a variety of reasons, so therefore they can generally be intermixed across Nunavut, doesn't reflect Article 17 of the Nunavut Agreement and how IOLs were selected.

We've mentioned now that it was on a NPC initiative that the CLARCs were created. CLARCs are organizations at the community level that the RIAs and NTI rely on when there's an issue that comes forward on a particular parcels of Inuit Owned Land. So, the submission is that the Plan reflect that IOLs were chosen for various reasons, but through a community and regional process, and that needs to be respected. And also on subsurface IOLs in particular, they were predominately chosen for mineral potential. NTI manages those subsurface parcels, and there also is a recommendation that be recognized in the Draft Plan.

Now there are...the number of incursions on Inuit Owned Lands is dramatic. There's about 21 million hectares of IOLs that are impacted, and this is...that's all in the submission in the appendices. Miguel is going to take the group through that. But, again, that's not a refinement from the 2012 Draft Land Use Plan; that's a complete about face. This 2014 Draft Plan takes, you know, a complete different trajectory on how it addresses Inuit Owned Lands. And it was a surprise to NTI and the RIAs that that's what happened. So, a letter has been sent from the President of NTI to NPC that this is a substantive issue that needs to be addressed. Not to say that...there's a recognition that the Land Use Plan applies to Inuit Owned Lands. It's the extent that it does, and without a sense that was what was coming, and more consultations definitely with NTI, Lands, and the RIAs on the IOL issue is necessary. So with that I'll turn it to Miguel.

Miguel: Naida, you've said everything I wanted to say. I don't have to say anything further. It was interesting to hear about this technical session, and I was quite excited. I thought everybody would be in a nice causal intimate setting. We'd get to stand around a big table and point at things that are on a map, but of course everybody showed up in the whole territory. So, anyway, it's not as casual and as informal as I thought it would be.

But Naida did already address most of the things I was going to talk about. But as we can see, when we talk about incursions, we talk about, when we say that, what we mean is where a NPC designation is overlapped with an IOL parcel. So in this case, what I have on the screen are all the various incursions where NPC designations have overlapped with IOL. As a matter of fact, there's 1292 of them. I'm now going to proceed to go through every single one of those 1292, so if you could just bear with me.

(Laughter).

David L: Yeah, I might have something to say about that, Miguel.

Miguel: Maybe I won't do that. Naida also pointed out that, I mean, it's not small, so we have 1292 incursions. These are the numbers of hectares associated, and this is in our submissions. This is the number of hectares that occur on subsurface land, that number that occur on surface-only lands. If you took that coverage all together, it would cover 21 million hectares. So it's not a small amount that we're talking about here.

It might seem a little bit nitpicky that, you know, we're talking about a square meter here, a square meter there to do with the IOL, but this is Inuit Owned Lands. It's private land. It's for the benefit of Inuit, and so therefore every square meter really should count, and consultation needs to happen as a result of that.

So I proceeded also to go through and do a GIS analysis of the smaller fine tooth details of the incursions, and you can also find this is in our submission. It goes through and lists three major things, one which is slivers, one which is chunks (what I call chunks, and these are my own labels), and then the other is misalignments. You know, the 1292, a lot of these small errors account for those. So I thought I would just show some examples.

First I'll just quickly show this one, which is...so this is an example though where we have subsurface land, which is right here, and it has been...designations have been put over the subsurface that very much take it away from the main purpose of that subsurface land. I'm only using this one example. I mean it happens on a number of occasions throughout the Plan where we haven't been specifically consulted on subsurface land and what's occurring on it. Hopefully we can go forward and do that in the future. So that's CO 20. That's in the Kitikmeot.

Now some examples just to show you the slivers that we have going on. So we have, let's see.... This is actually an example of a chunk, what I would call a chunk. So here we have an IOL parcel here. This is a key bird habitat. I don't know how well...unfortunately it doesn't come up very well on the screen. This is a key bird habitat designation, and it just cuts very slightly into the IOL. Again, I'm saying, "Wow, this is really nitpicky." This is like, you know, a couple hundred hectares, which you know, maybe is a lot or not very much. But you know, is it really necessary for this key bird habitat? And especially considering if we look at this and how this buffer was applied, it appears as though – and I know you can't see this – it appears as though the ocean only goes up to here. Really the buffer should have only gone up to here, and it's this kind of an error, it seems to me, we have to address to make sure that the least amount of IOL is affected that we can possibly have.

Now I have talked to Mike Townsend about this well with the NPC, and I think Jon's probably aware of that, so there's a number of these issues. They are all in the submission. They're identified. I'll just give an example, though of a sliver. These are actually...they come out to be very significant if you add them all up. Clearly here – yeah you can't see it. Okay, down on this bottom portion here, we have a key bird habitat site, which is mainly on the ocean. Above here, in this area is land. Clearly, it seems to me the designation was only meant to cover the ocean. It didn't look to me like there was any kind of a coastal setback that was supposed to be applied here. So there's an overlap of the NPC designation on the land, which happens to go over IOL. In this particular case, it would seem to me that probably you would just want to cut it off at the IOL. I mean, this is going to add up. All these little slivers that go through the territory. You're looking at many, many thousands of hectares, so it's definitely something we have to look at.

And the final example that is out of that list is the misalignments. So we're looking at us using different datasets than the NPC, different datasets being available on the government sites that people are using that cause misalignments. Here we can see a Migratory Bird Sanctuary that looks as though it goes up here, but the NPC zone is here, and it's all misaligned. It's caused some confusion, and I think we have to sit down with the NPC and just nail down which are the appropriate datasets to use. I think that's about it for my talk.

David L: Alright, thanks. Peter?

Peter: Thanks, Peter here. The NTI geographic database, is that based on an on-the-ground survey data so you're 100% sure it's accurate in your GIS database?

- Miguel: I rely on my GIS guys to make sure that's there. I presume it is, but you know, we can check again. I think we both have to look at our data though.
- David L: If I could make a suggestion. You both have to look at your data together. And I guess I'd ask the question: What's the plan?
- Miguel: Well, I can't speak for the NPC, but I mean I did begin working with Mike Townsend on some of these issues, and he's aware of them. Mike Townsend, he might want to comment on his position with NPC. I don't know.
- Sharon: Mike is our Land Information Tech and works with the Commission. He is employed by the Commission.
- David L: Alright so....Just a sec... Yeah, I think the Commission knows who Mike is.
- I'd really like to get a better sense of how you're going to move forward. I know you're talking with Mike, but is there a plan to meet with Mike? Is there a plan for your GIS folks to meet with Mike and sort this stuff out, or is it just kind of a wish at this point?
- Miguel: Well I...I kind of hoped actually that we could tackle some of that during the Technical Meeting right now.
- David L: I don't think this is the right place for that.
- Miguel: No, no. I agree.
- David L: Yeah, so what I'd ask I guess is that you get together with the folks in the Planning Commission and set a date. Start this work, because the clock is ticking. Alright, other...yeah.
- Spencer: (*Mike cut off briefly*)...NTI and NPC, because I know the Government of Canada has submitted GIS data, so I'm sure that we'd have to be in there to make sure we're setting it at the same standards. I know the GN is as well.
- Tommy: Speak to the mike please. Thank you.
- Spencer: Sorry. So I think other parties need to be involved in aligning the GIS and getting rid of some of the slivers, etc. etc. I know the feds have provided some information to the Planning Commission. If they used it as is, the probability is that it being the same as the other partners. So I think, maybe a GIS meeting.
- David L: Well, and that sounds like it would be a good thing, so again, I'd.... Just for the benefit of the other folks in room who would have an interest in the resolution of this challenge, I would ask that the Commission, the Government of Canada, NTI and the Government of Nunavut get together during the course of this meeting and let the rest of us know what the plan is to resolve this. Peter?

Peter: Peter with NPC. Nunavut as a jurisdiction has more coastline than any other jurisdiction on planet Earth. A good chunk of the misalignment between the three GIS databases is where is the actual shoreline? I do not see how that can be realistically fixed, so we may have to proceed without fixing the sliver solution.

David L: Well, there's a way to fix the sliver solution. It just may not be the most elegant. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you. So, just for clarity, if the caveat is that we follow the shoreline and that's the agreement with all the parties, that's what we will do. And to be clear, yes we want to work collectively to ensure that the data is being used is a collective data that everyone has an understanding of, of what the reference points are. So the Commission is committed to moving forward collectively on this. If it's a GIS meeting, specific, then we are good to participate in with that. Thank you.

David L: Okay, so I'll ask again that the four parties and anybody else, I guess, who has got a direct interest in this, can get together during this meeting and set a date for a follow-up session. I mean what I'm hearing is that potentially, there are three different versions of where the shoreline is. You're going to have to pick one and go with that, and then maybe some other simple solutions too. Luis.

Luis: Yeah, I just want to respond to the question about presenting the areas of interest. You've probably seen the map, a lot of geophysical information. What is required, which is in the Keewatin Land Use Plan today is for the Commission and the Federal Government to do a mineral rights assessment, which is called in the Land Use Plan – A mineral and resources assessment of all the areas in which you're going to prohibit any activity just to make sure that the beneficiaries of the claim – in this case, the Inuit – are not making a decision without knowing what's in there. And it's very important, because in order to negotiate those IIBA areas, also Inuit have a right to table the value of those lands if in case those lands became Protected Areas or parks. So it's very important for the federal government and the Commission to really table mineral assessment, like it's assessed in the Keewatin Land Use Plan. It's very important. Having those areas not yet done, and we're talking about conservation areas, prohibited areas, without knowing exactly what will be the future of those areas. We just look in those areas and preventing in future benefit for Inuit. I just...it's in the Keewatin Land Use Plan, is done by the Nunavut Planning Commission – very thorough. That's why I say it's a very good plan. It hasn't failed for me in the last 18 years. It's comprehensive and if we want to do any plan, make sure import all the good things that this Keewatin Land Use Plan has into the new Plan and make sure you do the proper assessment, especially oil and gas and mineral assessment. Because it's a lot of work in Nunavut to look out in an area. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Luis. Rosanne?

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne D'Ozario with Qikiqtani Inuit Association. I just wanted to follow-up on Naida's first point and Miguel who discussed about the incursions of the core designations over Inuit Owned Land, and Miguel addressed it from a subsurface perspective. I wanted to just – it's a comment that we had mentioned in a submission, so I wanted to highlight that it also occurs on surface Inuit Owned Land and that the core designations map that's in the current 2014 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, that version of the map was not brought into communities during consultations. So there's information in these maps where the consultations did not include a

discussion about those overlapping areas between our designation and surface Inuit Owned Land. So, we've...we're of the opinion that further consultations are needed to determine if the designations – the new designations that are in this core map – apply or align with the goals and objectives of the Inuit Owned Land parcels. So, QIA has offered to attend these further consultations with the Planning Commission if they're needed to kind of obtain more input and feedback from the communities. But we do feel that it is important that the designations that are in this new core kind of designations map, are brought back to the communities, so there's an understanding of what designation lies under Inuit Owned Land parcels. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Rosanne. I think that message is loud and clear. Miguel.

Miguel: I don't know if you're going to give me trouble about this, David. I just wanted to very briefly respond to Peter in saying that what we're mainly concerned about is the IOL, so as far as looking at the coastlines for the entirety of Nunavut, that's not necessary. And to just rectify the problems specifically with the IOL using a GIS, you just use a clip and it's gone. Once you acknowledge that it's, for instance, only supposed to be hitting the land mass, then it would be actually a fairly simple thing. So I don't want to take up too much time.

David L: That's helpful. Thank you. Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thanks, Miguel. This is Jonathan. I'd just like to get some clarity of the use of the word "incursions" and the general applicability with which NTI is using it. So you're referring to all incursions of designations that are not Mixed Use in a broad sense across all designations. And I guess you can start to begin to infer that there's a general dissatisfaction with any incursion on any IOL from any Special Management or Protected Area. Is that the case or can NTI be more specific in incursions that are a problem.

Miguel: Yeah, "incursions" is a word I did choose. It does sound a little bit combative, I must admit. It's like we're going to war. It's an incursion, but it was something that seemed to fit where the designations overlap. So I don't mean it to be a derogatory label in any way particular. I'm not saying that we agree with all incursions, or I wouldn't say that we disagree with all of these incursions, but I think that we're hoping that there can be more consultation with regard to the designations on the IOL. That's what we're looking for.

David L: Jonathan.

Jon: So at this time, NTI is not prepared to provide recommendations on the appropriateness of the Special Management and Protected Areas on IOLs until additional consultations take place.

Naida: What's being said is that every specific designation that impacts IOLs should be examined on its own merit, that NTI and the RIAs will likely have – will have a position on each one of those. But the IOL selection process involves the communities, and they also have a say. So it has to be done collectively, and there needs to be a process to get that done.

David L: Alright, I'm hearing two stages in that. One is rectifying the databases that you know, sorting out which system you're going to use and which geo-reference is going to be the standard. Then once you've addressed the incidental incursions – the artifact incursions - there will probably be some overlap of interests, and that needs to be sorted out further. There are some

artifacts just because of the geo-referencing, and then there are some real issues. So again, I'd like to close on this part of the discussion. I think the messages are pretty clear. I would really like the four most directly affected parties to get together over the next day or two and let the rest of us know what your plan is for moving forward to solving this problem. That okay with everyone? Looks like I've got nods around the table. Alright, anything other than what we've been discussing to date on Chapter 1? Anybody else got any issues, concerns? Just to let you know, what we're going to do is, David will wrap up the discussion when we're close enough to the clock. If there are more issues to be raised, then let's do that. Liz, you had a...

Christine: Yeah, Christine Kowbel. So, just a postscript to the discussion that was just had. I just want to ask that any of the results of those discussions be made public because they do have potential to impact various members of the Chamber with projects on Inuit on Lands.

David L: It shall be so, I would hope. Alright, are we done with Chapter 1 for now? Notwithstanding that there are a bunch of other comments that were raised, but are we done with the discussion around the table here for the time being at least? Alright, I'll turn it to David to try to wrap this up and then we'll take a short break and get into Chapter 2.

David B: Thank you, David. As I think Jonathan mentioned when he started the summary of Chapter 1, this is – I think as we saw from the discussions, it's not quite a straightforward chapter as perhaps some of the other ones will be. So, in terms of the discussion maybe starting with the fact that it appeared there was a fair bit of agreement on some of the comments that Jonathan and his summary responding to comments made by the various parties with respect to things like the definitions. Some of the definitions, I think it sounds like there will be some homework done and some brushing up on some of those. The discussion about, comments raised about why certain municipal...some of the communities had various designations, the explanation of the Mixed Use designation within boundaries because of the general planning powers of the local communities. Water sources are sometimes are inside, sometimes outside the community boundaries, and therefore they don't all look harmonious in terms they are being designated in the Plan.

In reference to the comments about restrictions on wildlife harvesting, there was some agreement that some wording changes are required there. The clarity of language around prohibited uses as well – the actual terminology – there's probably some homework needed on tightening up consistent definitions....references, sorry, to uses. And I think there was good discussion and indication of what's coming up on the public registry that the Planning Commission is preparing to implement, and that will help with some of the concerns with respect to knowing what's going on.

I think the one comment from the Government of Canada about predictable conformity requirement and decision-making, the point about the Community Priorities and Values featuring as a conformity requirement itself is something that I think is important to...I heard being important to clarify as to...and that would go some direction into helping out with the concerns from the Government of Canada about having predictability in the process. I think the larger...maybe the larger issues about consultation certainly needs to be more discussion and consideration on many of the points that NTI and the RIAs have brought up. I think that the, perhaps one of the earlier points from NTI was the issue about how much information is appropriate to be in the Land Use Plan itself, and I think that's an age-old discussion. Anytime a

land use plan is done, how much of the information is appropriate inside and how much is appropriate outside in other documents referenced within the Plan. That's something that again, perhaps will be given some more thought.

And certainly the...I think NTI was raising a number of...I guess you'd call them...well you could call them process related issues with respect to consultation and with respect to moving forward on any amended plan or how that will all look. We need to...we will be talking about that whole theme about process related, or process versus technical issues probably throughout the meeting. And I think Sharon mentioned that in some of the earlier comments that process related issues would be something that need to be sorted out in the Prehearing Conference or meetings that have been scheduled as well, but not to take away from the importance of the issues being raised for sure. And I will, yeah I'll shut up now and just end on Miguel's interesting and extensive mapping issues that do need to be resolved. But I think as Jonathan pointed out, while a lot of them hopefully would be quite straightforward, more are....some of them are definitely more substantive and related to policy and choices, and will involve all the major parties. Anyways, I'll wrap it up there. Thank you.

David L: Okay, thanks David. We'll take a 15-minute break and resume at 2:45 please.

## BREAK

David L: Okay, everyone. I'm going to ask Jonathan to introduce Chapter 2 and follow the same format that we did for Chapter 1. It should be interesting, this particular chapter. It should catch a few people's attention. So Jonathan, I'll turn it over to you.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. So, Chapter 2 covers Protecting and Sustaining the Environment. There are a number of areas we'll go through one at a time, so key bird habitat sites, caribou, polar bear, walrus, marine areas, transboundary considerations, and climate change. So we'll do these one at a time and discuss the issues to a particular, or the comments to a particular issue and then move on to the next one. So, as with the Chapter 1 overview, I'll start by overviewing what the Plan does for an area; some of the comments we've heard; some potential questions; and then we'll go into a roundtable discussion on the topic.

Regarding Key Migratory Bird Habitat Sites, the Commission has relied on the identification by the Canadian Wildlife Service of *highly risk intolerant sites* and *moderately risk intolerant sites*. So they conducted a thorough analysis of migratory bird habitat in the territory and assigned different – sorry – assigned different values to these areas and prepared specific recommendations for each site. They included a variety of setbacks that we will discuss shortly, as well as some prohibitive uses that have been developed over the years.

I'd just like to clarify again that the Community Priorities and Values have not been used to modify the boundaries in this Draft Plan. We are using the boundaries that were provided by Environment Canada. In general, the Plan assigns Protected Area designations to those sites that were classified as highly risk intolerant. For terrestrial sites, there's a few different categories. Terrestrial highly risk intolerant sites were all assigned a Protected Area designation that has a list of prohibitive uses that includes industrial uses - essentially mining, oil and gas, roads,

quarries, that type of thing - as well as the setbacks that have been identified for different species of bird depending on the site itself.

The marine highly risk intolerant sites only prohibit oil and gas exploration and production and related research. That should be taken into consideration when reviewing all of the bird habitat sites together, as well again as the recommended setbacks for each site. All of the moderately risk intolerant sites have been assigned a Special Management Area designation that includes the recommended setbacks and cumulative impact referrals as a term. As we noted previously – I'll just mention it again - some of setbacks do apply to commercial fishing, and those would need to be approved by the Wildlife Management Board before they would be able to be included in the Land Use Plan.

There is an issue with the setbacks and the way they have been prepared and recommended, and how we are able to implement them in the Land Use Plan. The majority of the setbacks are from sites such as concentrations of birds. The Commission would have difficulty conducting a conformity determination on a setback that is from a concentration of birds within a larger migratory bird habitat site. To work in that scenario, we've used direction to regulatory authorities. Since we don't feel, would be unable to make a clear conformity determination on these setbacks, we are passing them on to regulatory authorities and proponents to consider in the further review of the project.

I know there are a number of comments that have been received, and we can elaborate on those. I hesitate to summarize what everyone has said. Maybe I'll stop there and ask people to provide their comments, and we can sort of discuss how, in particular those setbacks, are to be implemented.

David L: Thanks, Jonathan. Any comments that people would like to raise in addition to what they've documented already or would like to reemphasize? Yeah, Naida.

Naida: On the migratory birds, we do have – Rosanne is going to present a few slides to set the context as why that is happening. The new 30 Protected Area sites do overlap with about 1.5 million hectares of IOL, and about 1.3 million hectares of that IOL is found on Baffin Island and on the coast. So QIA obviously is the manager of those surface IOLs is impacted much more than any other Inuit organization. Again, just to reiterate the exercise that we did showing everyone what's in the Options and Recommendations document, we did go through the 30 sites and have the same concern. In some cases, the communities did not identify birds as an issue. Most cases they did, but also identified other values. We are looking for a sense from the communities whether the one priority for those sites is the key migratory birds or whether there are other issues that they want addressed simultaneously for those, for those sites.

Before Rosanne gives her presentation, so that I don't have to interject on this issue, we just wanted to refer to Environment Canada's submission. They did do an excellent job in putting together their material and identified 43 sites that were highly risk intolerant. So there was 43 sites that they put forward. Thirteen of them are already Migratory Bird Sanctuaries or national wildlife areas, whereas the 30 that we see in the Protected Area designation are new ones. We understand that what's being forward for these 30 sites are not new migratory bird sanctuaries or national wildlife areas, but functionally, we don't see a difference. On the ground, what we're dealing with are migratory bird populations that seem to be vulnerable. We think the

Impact Benefit Agreement for Migratory Bird Sanctuaries and National Wildlife Areas is there for instructive as to the level of consultation that's required. And certainly, since this is a wildlife issue, there is a sense that the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, RWOs and Hunters and Trappers Organizations should be involved in the decision-making. And with that, I'll leave it to Rosanne.

David L: Thank you. Rosanne?

Rosanne: Thank you. Roseanne D'Orazio with QIA. As Miguel is pulling up the – I was going to use one example from western Cumberland Sound archipelago to identify or to kind of give an example of the overlap of key bird habitat site with surface Inuit Owned Land. I guess just to highlight before I start, Naida discussed it briefly, but there's two main concerns that we have with the incursions or overlapping areas of key bird habitat designations – or Protected Area designations for key bird habitat sites and surface Inuit Owned Land.

The first is that... it's in a way as if non-legislated key bird habitat sites have been created through this protection in the Land Use Plan. So we do believe that it should go through the appropriate process, including kind of the IIBA process that is established for these areas. And maybe now that the map is up, I'll just go through. So the light pink area is the surface Inuit Owned Land, and what you see in orange are the overlapping areas of the key bird habitat sites, the Protected Area designation and surface Inuit Owned Land. So there's a large area of overlap around Cumberland Sound. When it comes to what the intent or purposes of those parcels were in that area, as Naida mentioned, I believe that further consultation has to happen to understand if the communities truly – or Inuit – really want that entire area to be under a Protected Area designation. So in addition to the fact that it hasn't go through the actual legislated process to become a key bird habitat site, it also could have potential other uses that are prohibited within the designation. So there could be potential for hydro development in that area. There could be potential for exploration or mining that would want to use road access in that area. So those questions were not addressed and need to be asked if those prohibitions are within that Protected Area designation.

So, I guess as Miguel is doing his fancy GIS work, you can see...I don't believe there's any subsurface, so it's all surface IOL in this area that you can see in pink. And then everything in yellow is the overlapping or incursions of that designation on the Inuit Owned Land. Thank you.

So in our submission there is actually a list of 13 about areas where there are incursions from bird habitat sites on Inuit Owned Land, so we've identified them all. I don't think I need to go through all of them, but they are in our submission so that at least we have a point to start a discussion on. And I think the discussion needs to happen between QIA and the Planning Commission, but once again, we really want to emphasize that discussion should be brought back to the communities, and further consultation would be needed to determine how that designation fits with goals and objectives of IOL.

David L: Thanks, Rosanne. I want to ask CWS a question. Who can speak for CWS today? Bruce. Yeah Bruce, so the question I have for you – it picks up on NTI's concern, QIA's concern that this Protected Area designation would be equivalent to a Migratory Bird Sanctuary in effect. Is that how you see it?

Bruce: Thanks. Do I call you Mr. Chair?

David L: You can call me anything you want, Bruce. Nothing's changed.

Bruce: Thanks, Mr. Chair. It's Bruce MacDonald, Canadian Wildlife Service. I would not agree that it's the same as a Migratory Bird Sanctuary. One way to show this would be a Migratory Bird Sanctuary. Migratory Bird Sanctuary does not expire unless there's an order in Council that basically disestablishes it, or as a Land Use Plan that's reviewed every 5 years. Equally, these areas are not established legislation that Environment Canada has. So we have the Canada Wildlife Act as well as the Migratory Bird Convention Act and the associated regulations, which we used to establish our protected areas. So this is not being used as any...they're not...these "Protected Areas" as they are called, are not being established under our legislation. And equally, and finally to answer the question, the comment was made this morning by the Planning Commission themselves that Protected Areas are not meant to be parks. I think that was the term that was used, or similar to parks. So again, in my view, that's another difference.

David L: Okay, but before you go, what I'm hearing from NTI and QIA is the concern that, in effect, the prohibitions that apply within these areas are equivalent to the prohibitions that would apply in a Migratory Bird Sanctuary, notwithstanding that they're not being established pursuant to legislation. So the question that I have – and I'm just asking it for clarification - are the prohibitions equivalent?

Bruce: Again, it depends on the legislation. A National Wildlife area has quite different prohibitions versus Migratory Bird Sanctuary. For example, most of the prohibitions in a Migratory Bird Sanctuary are only valid when the migratory birds are there, whereas in a National Wildlife Area, they would be valid year-round. So does that help with some of your question, or am I missing some of it?

David L: Well, I guess it's going to come in some cases to site-specific prohibitions. As folks have said, each site is different or potentially different. I guess what I'm trying to get at is the concern that's been raised that this is a, kind of a slight-of-hand approach - that the equivalent level of protection that would be given through Migratory Bird Sanctuary is being given through the Land Use Plan, and that's been done without the same level of consultation that would be expected if it were being created under legislation.

Bruce: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bruce MacDonald. I wouldn't agree that it's a slight of hand. Environment Canada was asked, I believe as most other folks around this table were asked, to provide their information on what values that they're responsible for exist within Nunavut, which is exactly what we did. The Planning Commission took Environment Canada's submission, and they came up with - based on our data – and they came up with those, I'll call them zones. So Environment Canada didn't come in to this with any preconceived notions that we were going to be using any sort of slight-of-hand or otherwise to create new Protected Areas. As I said, that's not the business we're in. But we provided to our experts the important bird areas that we know are out there. There could be others that we're just not aware, because we haven't been there. But at this point, those are the important and key bird areas within Nunavut that we're aware of.

David L: Okay, and just to be clear, for everybody, slight-of-hand is my choice of terms, not anybody else's.

*(Laughter)*

But I'm still not...I'm still not perfectly clear, and perhaps now is not the time. But the level of protection for these areas, is that equivalent or is it a case of one-site-at-a-time analysis? Is that the equivalent level of protection that would be expected if it were a Migratory Bird Sanctuary, just in terms of prohibiting activities?

Bruce: If the activity was going to have a negative impact on a migratory bird while it was there, the activity would most likely not be permitted.

David L: Okay. Alright so I'm hearing that it's kind of, sort of, almost the same.

Bruce: And I mean, just for another point of clarification. It's Bruce MacDonald again. It's the Minister's authority to issue those permits. So that's why I say it most likely would not be issued. It's the Minister's authority. So we would review the permit as part of the established Nunavut process, and the permit may or may not be issued.

David L: Yeah, but we all know that the Minister always does what you guys recommend, right? You don't need to answer that. Alright, any....yeah, Luigi.

Luigi: I have a couple of questions - Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association – to Environment Canada and CWS. In some instances, the designations, the protected conditions are actually over and above the legislation that Environment Canada and CWS are actually departments too. These are applied on 30 areas that are actually not legislated right now, correct?

Bruce: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Bruce MacDonald. I'm sorry, I'm not sure I quite got the question there. Can you rephrase it again please?

Luigi: Some of the protections that those additional 30 areas over and above the 13 that are legislated...some of the protections that are laid onto those designations are actually over and above the legislation that mandates the migratory bird sanctuaries and the Wildlife...the Wildlife, the whatever, National Wildlife Areas. Is that correct?

Bruce: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Bruce MacDonald. And again, I'll have to say it depends. With a National Wildlife Area, no; with a Migratory Bird Sanctuary, yes. Again, with a National Wildlife Area, all activities are prohibited without a permit. That could mean anything from literally walking, canoeing, etc. with the exception of beneficiaries of course. Whereas a Migratory Bird Sanctuary, the activity has to have a negative impact on the migratory birds and their habitat while the birds are there to be prohibited.

Luigi: So the protection is greater in the Plan than it is under the legislation. Second question that I want to address is regarding some of the colonies that the...the intent is to protect. How old are some of those colonies? What is your data in terms of the years of use of those colonies?

Bruce: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's Bruce MacDonald with the Wildlife Service. It depends on the area. I mean, some areas we've been to as recently as – we've got folks going in this year to do surveys. Other areas we have not been there for a while. When it comes to ivory gulls, we've had

surveys within the past 5 or 10 years. So again, it depends. It's our expert advice on best available information that those sites are, are important to the birds, which is why that key habitat site document was produced in the first place, was to make folks aware that from Environment Canada's perspective, those are the key habitat sites.

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. So as of...what I'm trying to get to is that Environment Canada and CWS are stating that these areas are not fixed. They can change with the Plan. I guess the question I'm asking is to your best information, how long will these colonies be established on these sites? Within my lifetimes? Is the expected use within my lifetime? Is it 5 years? Is it, you know, infinity? How long a time are we thinking about? And if it is infinity, it is effectively legislated.

Bruce: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Bruce MacDonald with the Wildlife Service. Are you asking how long will the birds use the area, or how long will they be protected. If I knew how long the birds were going to use it, I'd be wealthy person, because I'd be able to go to the Planning Commission and tell them exactly, what I'm assuming what they'd like to know. But there are so many different variables. For example, if there's a bad spring, the birds may not have any nesting success, and they may abandon the area early. It depends. But what is important is there is there's historical information that shows those birds do come back to those areas most years. Is climate change going to affect that? Is development going to affect that? We don't know. That's why we go back there and continue to look at those areas to see if the birds are still there.

David L: Alright, any other comments? Naida?

Naida: Since we have Bruce up there, I wanted, we wanted to ask. You supply the information to NPC... it's now in this Land Use Plan. What's your expectation on the community consultation process going into this? Is this... is Environment Canada or CWS planning on having community consultation related proposed Protected Areas?

Bruce: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. It's Bruce MacDonald, Canadian Wildlife Service. Again, I would say from our perspective they're not Protected Areas from a legislation perspective. We were invited to present our information to the Planning Commission, which is exactly what we did. It's our expert information based on our biologist's professional assessment of migratory bird habitat in Nunavut. So in our view, it stands on its own from our experts.

David L: Rosanne and then maybe we'll move on to a different topic. I think you guys have made your point.

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne with QIA. I just wanted to clarify if they're not protected areas under the CWS legislation at the moment and they become Protected Areas – or Protected Area designation or Protected Areas under the Land Use Plan - is there an intent to make those into protected – what's the term - legislative protected areas, I guess, after? Because the prohibitions would already be there. The restrictions would already be there to allow it to become. And I think what we're trying, I think what we've repeated several times is that it hasn't gone through that process, and for us, it hasn't gone through the IIBA process according to that. And that's....That's where the issue is and that's where it goes, I think, beyond what the Plan should be allowed to do at this point.

Bruce: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bruce MacDonald with Canadian Wildlife Service. I would agree 100% that if any of these areas were of interest to Environment Canada for permanent protection under our legislation, we would definitely follow the Land Claim and the IIBA process. We're signatories to the IIBA, and we follow it. And, again, at this point, we have not heard any requests from a community or otherwise that says they would like these areas permanently protected. So at this point in time, we're not moving down that road.

David L: Alright, anybody else? Luis?

Luis: The Land Use Plan during one of the wildlife presented by CWS a long time ago in Coral Harbour, from that community consultation, the people of Coral Harbour didn't want the wildlife sanctuaries to become a conservation area. One of the biggest wildlife sanctuaries that was proposed, actually nationally, marine areas. The people of Coral Harbour deny that did not want it to become a wildlife area. That letter was sent to KIA, and then it was sent to NPC for a mainland (?) Keewatin Land Use Plan to release the oil and gas exploration to make sure everybody at Coral Harbour knows what kind of oil and gas resources is in the island. And the letter was very specific that they don't want no conservation areas in the island until that research has been done. And that also went to NRCAN those letters. Until now, nothing actually happened because we was waiting for the Plan. Unfortunately, you can see on the map on the left all the areas that are being designated. Those great circles there are the original oil and gas produced by Encana economic development. They are public information. A lot of it was analyzed when those designations was actually granted. Then again go back into the Keewatin Land Use Plan that if anything of these island became conservation areas, they need to do oil and gas and mineral assessment before it became. And it's an obligation now under the organization for those areas now. There's a national park conservation area to actually take place before the designation is granted. And that's for us in the Keewatin Land Use Plan. And so, I chose, I put forward those layers, and this is public information if, I don't know, the federal government actually did any research or going to be doing any research in oil and gas and mineral assessment in those areas before those areas became designated as protected somehow, to make sure Inuit know what's the value of those lands are, and how to get IIBA later. Thank you, Chairman.

David L: Thanks, Luis. Any comment? Okay.

Naida: Just a quick huddle here between NTI and the RIAs. I think the question to let Bruce off the hook is to NPC in that the sites have now been proposed as migratory bird protected areas. And there are concerns about the level of consultation with the communities on the specific designations and impacts on each community. Is there going to be more consultation on the designations, and how is this issue going to be addressed?

David L: Maybe I'll answer that. It's been answered before. This is a process issue that I don't think the Commission staff are not in any position to answer. So the issue of further consultation will be determined by the Commission itself, and I think that's going to be the answer you're going to get each time you raise this particular type of concern. Commission staff are free to contradict me on that, but that's what I'm hearing. So just give them a little bit of slack on this one. Any other comments – technical comments – on the prohibitions that may or may not apply to these

areas that have been identified as important to migratory birds? Alright we will leave...Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thanks. This is Jonathan. I just would like to potentially further expand on the idea of the setbacks in the Land Use Plan and how they are associated with direction to regulatory authorities. The Government of Canada has recommended they be included as conditions with the type of wording that the project proposal must comply with the setbacks in Table 2 in order for it to proceed. And I had sort of mentioned in my overview that we would have difficulty conducting a conformity determination against those conditions, and we're just wondering if anyone had any recommendations on how we could address that issue?

Spencer: Thank you. This is Spencer Dewar. When it comes to direction to regulators, I think the Government of Canada sees it as two separate things. I think what you're referring to is the setbacks in Table 2. We think calling them conditions – I think it's conditions for conformity. So you're conformity determination is conditional on the setbacks outlined in Table 2. So we see them as conditions. So that's what we're trying to pitch there. Does that make sense?

*(Laughter)*

Jonathan: Sorry, just to follow-up. This is Jonathan again. Are you saying that the Commission would not be responsible for conducting an assessment of whether those setbacks were achieved? Like I mentioned, some of them are, you know all land uses must be 1 km from a particular concentration of birds or remains such-and-such a marine distance from them. And those areas are unknown to the Commission within these larger bird habitat sites. So the recommendations, as they've been recommended, are within this larger area. Uses should be set back in different distances or heights from particular locations, which are undefined. So, our conundrum was we would be unable to clearly assess conformity with a given project, because we don't know the specific locations of the birds, the colonies within that site, which is why we used it as direction to regulatory authorities so that could be incorporated into the actual licensing and authorizations.

Spencer: I think we were looking at it where you could grant a conformity determination but you'd have a condition that would follow setbacks. I recognize that information, if it's not in the hands of the Commission, would come through EA, right? So if you were to say must stay 1km away from the nesting birds, you conform as long as conditionally you do that, right? So then as it goes through EA, the regulators would be able to inform, so that your conformity determination would not be compromised. It would be abided to. It would just be a condition. That was sort of how we saw it.

Jonathan: Thank you. So just to clarify, we would be unable to determine if a project did not conform to those setbacks? It would be....

Spencer: Well, you're making the conformity conditional upon abiding by the setbacks, right?

David L: Okay, I'm going to suggest that you carry this conversation outside further if you need to. We can revisit it later, but I think we need to, in the interest of time, to canvas the group one last time on this particular part of chapter 2, and if there aren't any other concerns, then we...please.

Brandon: Hi, it's Brandon from WWF Canada. One thing we wanted to raise, as far as I could see, shipping is only listed as a prohibited action in two of the Protected Areas - 92 and 93, I believe. But it's identified as a threat for almost all of the migratory bird base based protected areas, and if NPC could comment on their jurisdiction and restricting shipping and why it's only in two of the Protected Areas and not in any of the others. For example, #11, Lambert Channel just as an example as a predicted shipping route that...where shipping is identified as a threat to the eider in the area that have garnered the protective status but is not addressed from the establishment of the Protected Area.

David L: Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you, David. The recommended prohibited use on shipping in the two specific locations – those are, that should be noted that they are not migratory bird habitat sites. They are Community Areas of Interest where the communities identified a specific concern with shipping and cruise ships. During our community consultations, explicit reference was made to concern in particular bays regarding shipping and cruise ships, and it was intended to be used for Traditional activities and wildlife. So that's why it was in those two, because it was specifically noted by communities. In the migratory bird sites themselves, it has not been included as a prohibited use. However, there are setbacks for shipping. So if it's in a marine area, there are marine setbacks from which ships would need to remain away from particular coastal areas where birds may be nesting, for example.

David L: Okay, any other questions, comments? Alright, and I'd really encourage people to continue the conversations as you see fit outside the room or during the breaks and so on. I don't want to seem to be cutting conversation off, but I am cognizant that we've got three days to go through a lot of stuff, and you know, if we can avoid meeting in the evenings, I'd like to do that too. So Bruce, thank you very much, and Jonathan do you want to go on to the next section?

Jonathan: Great. Thank you very much, David. We'll now we'll move on to caribou calving and post-calving areas, so this is Section 2.1.2.1, the specific issue. There is further caribou habitat identified, but for the moment we'll stick to calving and post-calving areas in. To summarize, numerous organizations recommended the protection of caribou calving and post-calving areas to the Commission through our consultations. Through the previous consultations over a year ago, the GN provided information for mainland herds that included a variety of different habitats for consideration for different levels of protection and management. We will...I think the GN is going provide an overview of these different types of habitat.

I will note that the submissions we received were not, of course, entirely consistent. In some cases there was recommendation for prohibitions on certain activities within calving grounds and post-calving grounds. In other cases, it was calving grounds and key migratory...key access corridors. There were variations among different in what we had received. The GN, in particular, recommended core calving areas and these key access corridors to have prohibitions.

What the Commission did is looking at the variety of submissions that were received in regards to caribou combined, which was a file the GN provided as well – a combined core calving area and post-calving area, which reflected submissions from the Wildlife Board, the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board, other organizations. And we considered the

combination of those two types of habitat to include at least the vast majority of key access corridors that the GN had identified for prohibitions. That's the first thing I just wanted to mention that the process that was gone through.

The other is that we received information from Aboriginal Affairs, again, on areas of significant or high mineral potential. And what has been done in the Draft Land Use Plan, which we can certainly discuss is areas of high mineral potential were effectively removed from the Protected Area designation of the previous amalgamation of caribou data and changed to a Special Management Area where direction to regulatory authorities was provide a noted a potential concern for cumulative impacts.

So, again recognizing there was feedback from a variety of different parties on this issue, that's an overview of what we did based on the information we had at that time. There are, of course, a lot of issues to talk about, and I won't pretend to summarize all the agency's feedback on that at this time. But we'll note there is certainly overlap with IOL in these areas and a lot of interests in the mainland in general. Sorry Peter, did you have anything to note?

Peter: Hi, Peter with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Just the map I have on the left screen. The polygons marked 47 are core caribou and post-calving areas. The polygons marked 48 are also core caribou calving and post-calving areas with high mineral potential. They are scattered across the territory. I'll just zoom out to the key here for the different types of caribou, and this is data from the GN. So pink is the migration corridors. Red is the calving area, and the yellow is calving and post-calving. So, the NPC did rely pretty heavily on GN data on deciding where the 47 and the 48 went, and my computer is frozen again. Thank you.

David L: Alright, I have a feeling there might be a comment or two on caribou calving and post-calving. Yeah, shall I start with you, Bert?

*(Laughter)*

Bert: Yeah, thank you David. As noted in our earlier comments, it's a very complex issue, and it's one we've been working with Regional Inuit Associations and with the Regional Wildlife Organizations and local Hunters and Trappers. When Inuit signed the Land Claim Agreement, they got land and they also got management responsibilities with wildlife, and we have those competing priorities. I think from the NTI perspective, it's similar to what the Planning Commission and even the Government of Nunavut would be going through with the different departments. It's trying to find balance with those competing interests. Clearly when the GN submission or when the Draft Land Use Plan came out, it had the GN information and that protection for not just the core calving grounds, but the post-calving and migration...or corridor routes. It caught a lot of people's attention. Industry as well would be very interested in what was going on and how will the Planning Commission deal with this.

As mentioned, and it's on the record, there are Hunters and Trappers organizations and wildlife boards that have concerns and want protection for the core calving grounds, and there seems to be more flexibility for post-calving or corridors with mobile protection measures. As we've heard earlier from some of the Regional Inuit Associations, this is an area we've left with each RIA to be able to comment on, because the dynamics of caribou are different in each region. And also mentioned – I think it was Karin or Jan mentioned when they were doing their

introduction, there are a number of herds that are in a downward cycle, and they are shared populations that are crossing different boundaries.

NTI does not have an official position at this time. It's something we continue to work on. We respect the concerns from the communities for how important caribou are, as do the RIAs, so it's a challenge for all of our organizations. We'll be continuing to work on this. I guess it was one of the reasons earlier, we were trying to gauge if there was interest to do a roundtable, as the Planning Commission had mentioned before at earlier meetings. Some of these issues will be a bit more intensive or complex and require more discussion, not just at the regional or NTI level or government level, but at the community level. And we've learned over the last few years just some of those impacts.

David L: Thank you, Bert. This is definitely one of the thorny issues I referred to earlier. Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you David, and thank you Bert. First of all I think we would like to commend the Commission for the work they've done so far in the Plan. As we all recognize, this is a very sensitive issue, and the data that the GN provided to the NPC that has been reflected in the Plan represents the best available information that we have at this time for caribou requirements, protection requirements. With that said, I think it would be useful to go...or outline the GN's primary concerns with the approach that the NPC has taken in the Plan so the NPC has a good understanding of our recommendation. Of primary concern to the GN is the application of land use designation to core calving areas and key access corridors, according to the overlap with areas as of high mineral potential. And the GN also has concerns with missing information with respect to other lifecycles, stages of the caribou specifically: rutting areas, migration corridors, and seasonal ranges.

To help me explain this a little bit better, we have a short presentation that we can go through that will provide some visual representation. Peter is going to help me out with the controls. So I'll get you to go to the....bear with us here. So for the sake of time, we will just be focusing on the Qamanirjuaq herd, and if there's further questions, we have our caribou biologist on hand here, Mitch Campbell, to answer any further questions. Here we go. Next slide please.

So as I said, we've got information on three mainland migratory herds, but we will be working with Qamanirjuaq just for the time being. Next slide please. So this map represents the full range of the Qamanirjuaq herd. As you can see, it extends into multiple jurisdictions. However, through the use of telemetry collaring data, we've been able to narrow down the core calving areas to the specific places where they exist.

So core calving areas, to get a little bit into the details, represent an area with a 95% utilization distribution. What that means is that these are areas where breeding females consistently congregate to have their young. They're chosen to favor calf survival, which means they have low numbers of predators, and they are free from sources of disturbance. This is very important because calving is the time when caribou are the most sensitive to any kind of disturbance. And like I said, Mitch can get into more details on this point. So next slide please.

So now what we've done is overlaid the spring migration routes onto the map. Spring migration routes are the corridors that caribou use to access the calving grounds. The methodology used to delineate these areas is much the same as what was used for core calving areas. Next slide

please. So it might be a little bit....so you can see we've added an outline to the core calving area. It's brown, and that represents the extent of post-calving. After the calving season has ended and once calves are strong and more mobile, the herd starts to spread out into post-calving areas. These areas are geographically larger and offer good forage. Additionally, because the calves are more mobile, they are able to avoid disturbance at this time.

Key access corridors – and there's an important distinction between key access corridors and spring migration corridors – hopefully I can explain right now. Key access corridors, to determine the key access corridors, the GN looked for overlap between three important life cycle stages, being the spring migration routes, the core calving areas, and the post-calving areas. Where these three areas overlap, there is a very high concentration of usage by caribou and represent areas of critical importance to conservation for the species. So if you go to the next slide.

This slide here, the purple outline represents the GN recommendation for the core calving area. As you can see, we've combined core calving with key access corridors for their collective importance for herd health and productivity. We must...or it must be stated that impacts from industrial development at this time cannot be mitigated due to the hypersensitivity of caribou during the calving period. Next slide.

So what we've done in this slide here is just overlaid the areas of high mineral potential from the Land Use Plan. It's our understanding that these areas are based on a number of factors, but they represent areas of high potential for mineral resources. Where these overlap, of course, as everyone knows with calving grounds, they have been designated as Special Management Areas where development activities can occur. And the GN has major concerns with the approach. If an area of high mineral potential overlaps with a calving ground, it essentially trumps the protection requirements of the calving ground and undermines the potential protection measures put in place by the plan by fragmenting the core calving areas and key access corridors and separating them from the migration routes used to reach the calving ground itself.

To explain this better, we have actually put together an animation that uses telemetry data from a 20-year period. So, the bright green is the spring migration coming through the spring corridor, and now we have dark green, which represents calving, which is within the calving area. Yellow is post-calving, and now we're going into the late summer. So we'll let that just loop through one more time so that folks can get a feel for it. Essentially it's showing the movement of caribou as they come up through the spring migration corridor and into the calving areas. You can see they congregate in very high concentrations in these areas. And then in the post-calving they're able to spread out a little bit more, and then onwards into the rest of the seasons.

So I'll just get you to go to...So now just quickly we have Qamanirjuaq herd, Bathurst herd, and Beverly. We've been able to put all the animations together onto one slide, which will give everyone a little bit more of a visual representation of the importance of these calving areas. So this is coming into the calving period. And now we're post-calving and out into the summer months.

So hopefully that explains the GN's recommendations to the NPC a little bit better, and if anyone has any questions, we'd like to open up the floor to discussion. Like I said, Mitch Campbell is here to answer any questions of a technical nature. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Jennifer. Why don't I just kind of go around the table. Government of Canada, any comments on the caribou issue?

Spencer: No comments.

David L: Alright, any of the wildlife boards? Go ahead.

Jackie: Hi there. Jackie Price with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I joined this meeting late, so I'm sorry I missed the first half of today. Although we have written this within our submission and in appreciating that this is a highly sensitive and important topic for communities, we would just like to reiterate that from QWB's perspective, we believe that calving and post-calving grounds should be protected regardless of high mineral potential. We make these statements based on our daily interactions with HTOs of this region and in considering the vital importance of caribou as a food source. And as mentioned by Bert earlier, our active involvement in the management of caribou including the recent public hearing on Baffin Island caribou hosted NWMB. And also in respect to the fact that our communities of Resolute and Grise Fjord are highly, highly active in the management of Perry caribou. But I guess some of you probably guessed that, so we just wanted to reiterate it. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Wildlife Management Board? Any comments?

Leah: Thank you, David L. Leah Muckpah, Regional Coordinator for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. In KWB's AGM October the Kivalliq Wildlife Board unanimously passed to protect the core calving and post-calving ground for Beverly and Qamanirjuaq, and this was reaffirmed in the February 2013... Oh actually the first resolution was in February 2013, reaffirmed at KWB's AGM October 2013. A third was sent out April of last year reaffirming that KWB stance to protect the calving and post calving grounds. Before the Kiggavik hearing in February, Kivalliq Wildlife Board passed another resolution not opposing Kiggavik but with a lack of start date and lack of protection of calving and post-calving grounds for the Qamanirjuaq herd opposed to support Kiggavik. The stance for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board comes from the seven communities that make my regional board, so that's where we stand.

David L: Okay, thank you. Just going around the table, any comments? Yes, please. Henry.

Henry: Henry from Nunavik Planning Commission. Now this information that I saw is really good. How did you collect the data? Did you radio collar all the caribou?

Jennifer: Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for your question. I defer to Mitch on this point respecting how we gathered the data for caribou.

Mitch: Yeah thanks. So there are a number of different data sources were used, both IQ-based and scientific based. It was more than just caribou collars that were used to determine the importance of these areas. To define these core calving areas, collar data was used over multiyear period to ensure we captured the entire areas. That's what these are based on that we're looking at here in these animations. But there is a lot of survey data that was used as well, surveying during calving. There is a fair amount of on-the-ground work in the calving grounds that has been done over the years that has been utilized for this position as well. IQ

shared and discussed at the Regional Wildlife Organization meetings and at HTO meetings across the Kivalliq region, and also we had a caribou strategy consultation process that traveled right across Nunavut and spoke with every HTO and all three Regional Wildlife Organizations. During each one of these, information was collected from hunters, what they had seen, Elders what they knew about calving and effects of disturbance on calving grounds. In every single case, communities and our WOs came out strongly wanting complete protection within calving and post-calving areas for caribou, and in some instances on migratory corridors as well. So that's the overall information base that was used for that. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Mitch. Henry?

Henry: Yes, thank you. Because I am a hunter myself. Did you know that there were lots of caribou from Baffin Island – Peary caribou coming down from Cape Dorset area to my area, Akulivik where's I'm from. They migrated through the ice somehow and they landed in my community a few years ago, maybe 8 or maybe 9 years ago. I just wanted to say this information, because they migrate somehow through the ice where there's a lot of open water. Just for your information. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Mitch?

Mitch: No, I really appreciate that information, and this is the kind of information that really helps to understand more. Because really when we talk about collective experience...I've been working on barren caribou for 30 years now, exclusively pretty much, but you guys have been working on barren ground caribou your whole lives. So we really need to add a huge level of importance to what the communities and the hunters are telling us. It's these guys that grew up on the land, always with the caribou, living off the caribou. I mean there may not be a very organized way or structure to collect the information, but I'm telling you right now that the information is absolutely of the highest quality. And then when we've done our science, all its done has just verified what we've been told all those years. This kind of information – I know a lot of people around this table may not be used to utilizing this kind of information, but I hope you believe me having worked on caribou for 35 years, it's of a higher quality. And it really needs to be considered by all organizations when you're moving forward with land use and the protection of caribou for sure.

David L: Well speaking personally, it's no surprise to me that the communities know more about caribou than the researchers do. No offense. Having been through that experience in the NWT time and time again. Speaking of which, does the GNWT have anything to add to what they've already indicated?

Karen: Thanks, David. The GNWT – it's Karin Clark, sorry. Jan's telling me to speak up. The GNWT did not make a formal written submission, so if it's ok, I'd like to just read. We've got about five or six points that summarize our position.

David L: Yeah, I mean this is, as I said earlier, one of these really important issues, and I'd like to canvas the group and then figure out where we're going to go with it. So yeah, by all means.

Karen: Okay, thank you. Caribou are highly vulnerable to disturbance in the days immediately prior to and during calving and during the post-calving periods. Studies of the Porcupine caribou herds

calving grounds suggests that displacement from preferred calving areas may result in reduced early calf survival. Disturbance impacts associated with industrial exploration and development may disrupt caribou calving behavior and negatively impact calf productivity and cow-calf bonding.

Maintaining the integrity of the calving grounds is absolutely crucial to the survival and recovery of any barren ground caribou herd, and the protection of calving grounds is widely supported by communities throughout the Northwest Territories. Calving ground protection was one of the highest priority recommendations of the 2007 Caribou Summit held in Inuvik. Calving grounds are not only used during the calving period. They may be used from migration in May through the summer and into early fall, as we saw in those animations, which were really helpful. Development on calving grounds may thus affect the herd through a substantial portion of the year, and not just during calving.

GNWT supports the Government of Nunavut's position as stated in its submissions, to the Nunavut Planning Commission that industrial activity of any type, including mineral exploration and production, construction of roads, pipelines and infrastructure, should not be permitted in any calving areas or key access corridors at any time of the year.

In post-calving areas, the GNWT supports GN in recommending the use of seasonal restrictions, with only winter road access being allowed. And lastly, GNWT supports the use of seasonal restrictions on development activities when and where caribou are present in rutting areas. I think Jan wanted to make just a couple of points.

Jan: Just one more point to add. We don't have – this is Jan Adamczewski with NWT as well – we don't have a nice animation for the Bluenose East herd, but if you go west of the Bathurst, that's the next calving ground, and that herd is familiar I think, particularly to hunters from Kugluktuk. That calving ground is just west of the community, and we have the same kind of collar and Traditional Knowledge information for that herd. The Bluenose East and the Bathurst, particularly, the trends are downward. The numbers are at low levels. So the level of concern in our communities and out Aboriginal groups is extremely high. Harvest restrictions have come down for the Bathurst. The harvest has almost been closed in the NWT, and we're now looking at restrictions on the Bluenose East harvest. So I can say – I can't speak for the Tłı̨cho Government, but there are many Aboriginal communities in the NWT, and they are very concerned about anything that might impede possibility of stabilization and recovery of these caribou herds. Thanks.

David L: Thanks, Jan. Just coming up the table here, any additional comments? Miguel?

Miguel: Miguel Chenier with NTI. This is a question to the GN, a general question: Is this a published report and has it been peer reviewed? Is it possible for us to be able to see the methodologies that were used in developing the areas that you've defined? And along those lines more specifically just to ask, were the areas defined as a result of an average from year to year from the data that was gathered, or is it cumulative? So along those lines. That's what we're looking for. Thank you.

David L: Go ahead, Mitch.

Mitch: Yeah, thanks for the question, and just...it may not have trickled down to you, but that has been supplied to NTI. The methodology has all been sent over to the Wildlife Division so that's there, but I can go over it very quickly.

It's a cumulative look at collaring from 1993 to 2010 is what that represents. It represents actual caribou locations. So there isn't any averaging going on other than the.....kernels...the size, the buffer size of the collars. We have to buffer all the collars to actually create the actual areas that we do. It's an 11km buffer that we put on to theses, so it's not substantial. So what you're looking at essentially, although any kind of GIS spatial polygon that's put on there has some modeling involved in it. What you're looking at with those collar locations that you're looking at is actual locations of caribou. So it's the real McCoy. We're not smoothing lines out or anything. That is where the caribou – exactly where they were and where they've been between 1993 and present. So it's a phenomenal thing. It never ceases to amaze me to see caribou really that predictable during that time of the year, and it really is. It's what it looks like.

And just too, a point of clarification: I don't think folks around the table know we have some preliminary data for Qamanirjuaq caribou. Since 2008, the Qamanirjuaq caribou is now in a statistically significant decline of a substantial nature. We are going to be reporting to communities before we report numbers back, but just so people know that the Qamanirjuaq between 2008 and present has begun a decline that, like I say, statistically significant. All the main herds now are now in substantial declines. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Mitch. Miguel?

Miguel: Thank you, Mitch. No, I hadn't heard about it being cumulative. That was one of the questions I had, so we haven't heard that yet. Just as far as accessibility goes though, I was still wondering about the report being accessible so that we could see the methodologies? Was that also passed on to NTI?

Mitch: Yes, the methods were sent along. We can send them along to you guys again. Somebody's got them there, but we can forward them again. The methods are also in an in-prep publication that's going out between the NWT and the Nunavut Government that's sort of a state-of-the-art of spatial analysis and of caribou annual and seasonal ranges. All the polygons and the methods have been described and have been out to various organizations, partnered organizations that we're working with. I can make sure that you guys get all of that. We expect that within the next...probably by November, the publication will be out and available publically.

Miguel: Thank you and very impressive, by the way.

David L: Thanks Mitch. Thanks Miguel. Jason, you had a question?

Jason: Qujannamiik, David. (*Jason spoke in his language. The following is translated:*) Beginning in 2008, the community members – the caribou were declining. When we heard that, beginning in 2008 there was a moratorium. We have given support to protect our caribou herds. Therefore, it effects our community very seriously, and it affects because it's a part of the main diet. It's a very serious matter that hinders Inuit. Therefore, the QWB supports the protection of the caribou, and we are going through the non-hunting of caribou. Thank you.

- David L: Thank you, Jason. Liz.
- Stephane: Stephane Robert for Chamber of Mines. So the Chamber support caribou conservation, and we have been supporting caribou, history in Nunavut's three regions on a number of herds. Caribou continue to be the focal species of assessment in mitigation planning on a project-by-project basis. A number of parties believe in protection of calving areas and other parts of the seasonal range. Protection measures and other mitigation measures such as the caribou protection measures, already exists and was developed with Inuit organizations and with Government of Nunavut and are used to protect caribou and caribou habitat.
- Before absolute protection measures, as recommended by GN are imposed, we will expect first to have a clear definition of what core habitat is. The question we ask with some answer that we get today: clear method and justification of boundaries; peer review; associated research, because are we protecting for the correct reason; and an example of development in the core calving area that causes discernable decline in a caribou herd. Because what is really important is if we sterilize an area because we cannot do any research after that, this can be sterilized for a really long time. So it's really important to understand this. As we say, Chamber of Mine is not against, but we want to make sure that we will protect the good things, and we believe in caribou protection measures. Thank you.
- David L: Thanks, Stephane. I guess just a word of caution. Sterilization is a strong term. You might find a more sensitive one. Sharon and then Mr. Mayor.
- Sharon: Thank you, David. Sharon with the Nunavut Planning Commission. We'd like to thank the GN for the presentation, and Mitch, the participation on the consultation. We recognize that's been very valuable. This information – you said you provided it to NTI, but the Commission does not have that information. We have the maps, but we don't have the science. So we would like to have that information as well. It would be appreciated. Thank you.
- David L: Thanks Sharon. Barney?
- Barney: Thank you, David. I can't stress enough how important the caribou herds are to the culture of Inuit, because it's one of last parts of the culture that we're trying to hold on to. We can't say enough of how important it is to protect the calving and post calving grounds. I would like to thank the wildlife boards and Mitch Campbell and Bert for all the hard work they've been doing. I've been with the Wildlife Board for a few years, and I've seen the process that they've done in the years, and I just want to give them a pat on back for all the hard work they did. Because realistically employment in one mining industry compared to one hunter - there's really no comparison. One hunter will provide for a community, and caribou being one of the main diets in our culture, there really is no comparison. So, I would really like to raise my concern for the protection of caribou calving grounds. Thank you.
- David L: Thank you, Barney. And I've been remiss in not asking the registered participants who might be on the phone if they have any comments. And I'm not hearing any...Yeah, go ahead please.
- Baker Lake: (*Via phone. This portion is not on audio*): Question for GN: Post calving grounds for protective status – is there a biological reason for this?

Jennifer: Hi, Jennifer Pye. Thank you for the question. There is no doubt that post-calving areas are obviously very important to herd health as well, but the GN has a mandate that we must stick within, and it was a GN approved position that all-out protection be assigned for core calving areas and key access corridors and that seasonal restrictions in post-calving areas would be an effective way to mitigate the impacts from development at this time.

Baker Lake: (*Via phone. This portion is not on audio*) Is post calving decision rooted in science?

Jennifer: Sorry, to clarify your question, you're wondering if the post-calving area decision was rooted in science. The GN...the departments submitted to our decision-makers a number of options for post-calving areas and core-calving areas. These were explained in an Options document, and the decision to assign seasonal restrictions to post-calving areas was directed from our decision makers. Thank you.

Baker Lake: (*Via Telephone. Not on audio – question about water crossings and seasonal restrictions*)

Mitch: Yeah, hi. This is Mitch Campbell with GN. So the water crossings are captured within the migratory corridors in the seasonal range, and the recommended sort of actions for those particular seasonal designations. So that was all captured under there. And as just a real quick answer to the initial spot, all the biological information was put towards the submission within the Government of Nunavut, and a decision was made at higher levels. And so, you know, there are many other components to the decision-making other than biological that we're taking into consideration when that decision was made. So that was kind of above my head, but just to more fully answer your initial question. Thanks.

David L: Thanks, Mitch. Any other questions from Baker Lake? Okay, thank you. Peter.

Peter: Hi, Peter from Nunavut Planning Commission. I have about a half dozen questions for a few of the parties. The first batch are for GN. It sounds from what I heard today that you're not too happy with the designation 48, which is core caribou calving and post-calving areas with high mineral potential, which is an SMA not a PA. Now, is that with all 48s that you're not too happy about, or is that some 48s.

For example, I'll swing over to the Qamanirjuaq herd here. It sounds like this 48 where my cursor is moving, which seems to cut through the migration corridors, would be something you'd be very not happy about. But other 48s like the one at the top, you might not be as concerned about. Am I, is my thinking along the right lines?

Mitch: Okay so...What this kernel represents in the analysis in the analysis that was done, was it was a very uncomfortable process. So where this ended up coming to, and there are many organizations that were not happy with that kernel that was developed. It's quite small compared to what some of the presented kernels for low risk protection of the calving grounds were. So to answer your question, it's all....

Peter: Sorry, when you say 'kernel' what are you referring to?

Mitch: The polygon of the core calving area and key access corridor. The overall polygon. So the answer is that is really – it's already scraped down to a bare minimum in terms of what we believe the

herd needs in this particular case, and in all the cases. So we'd be – what we're looking for is for caribou, core caribou calving areas and key access corridors to trump high mineral potential in all cases. And that's what we're asking.

Peter: So to be clear, you would like to see Designation 48 scraped and all 48s being moved into 47, and 47 is the Protected Area for core caribou calving and post calving areas?

Mitch: Correct.

Peter: Okay, thank you. My second question is it sounds like there is five types of caribou habitat, and it sounds like there's priority on those types of habitats. I want to be sure I'm clear that I have the 5 in the correct order, so in descending priority, the most important is calving areas. Second is migration routes. Third is post-calving, fourth is rutting, and fifth is water crossing. Is that correct?

Jennifer Thank you for your question. I think it's perhaps not the best way to rank them in order of importance. I would say of course, core calving areas and key access corridors are of the primary importance, yes in that way. But post-calving, rutting areas, and migration corridors – they're all of equal importance to the overall productivity of the herd throughout the various seasons throughout the year. So, yes, we have recommended a number of measures for each of these seasons that reflect importance to the overall productivity of the herd. I don't know if Mitch has anything to add to that, perhaps.

Mitch: No, I don't think prioritizing is the way to go with that particular issue. I think just taking it on a case-to-case basis is the best way to go, because really you're asking a caribou biologist what's the most important spot, and I would say the whole annual range is the most important spot. So the caribou generally – I don't know if this will help but it might add some background – in an environment where the growing season is very restricted and where vegetative productivity is very low, the species that survive in those areas require extensive, massive areas to survive. Migration, in this particular case, is one of the strategies to maximize abundance and productivity of these herds and long-term viability. So, it's just the nature of it, you know obviously we can't protect whole area. But the whole area is still important and the caribou need to access it. I would look at different tactics, different strategies for each of the seasonal ranges, but each is as important as the next is the way I would...I don't know if that helps. But obviously, core calving and key access corridors are number 1. Thanks.

Peter: Just two more questions: If everyone looks on the map on the left, you see the large polygon 47, which is Protected Area north of Kugluktuk. Now the GN's submission had a caribou map in it, and the portion of 47, which only has the horizontal yellow lines on it, is included as important caribou habitat, if I interpreted that map correctly. So it sort of cut 47 in half. Am I confirming that you want to keep this 47 as it is?

Jennifer: Sorry just to clarify, whereabouts in the Settlement Area is this?

Peter: This is Kugluktuk, so it's northwest of Kugluktuk. It is post-calving...

Jennifer: Sorry, could you repeat the question?

Peter: On the map, the portion of this polygon 47 that is just the yellow horizontal lines, which just means post-calving. It wasn't colored, so I'm just confirming that the GN is still saying that the whole of the 47 needs to say as 47, which is protected caribou habitat.

Jennifer: To clarify, the map that we sent to the NPC with our submission only shows core calving areas and key access corridors to draw particular attention to those areas. Post-calving data can be discussed in more detail, unless Mitch has something to add to that. Maybe I didn't fully understand the question.

Mitch: So just quickly, for the post-calving, yes. That's the way it should lay out for post-calving. So, yes, it should be included.

Peter: Great. Thank you. This really is only two more questions. So we're looking at Adelaide Peninsula here. We see a large red polygon here, which is most of Adelaide Peninsula overlying, which is the core calving, and then a lot of the yellow, which is post-calving. And then what I noticed just now is that over here is the core calving polygon, which relates to your presentation, but your data from the presentation isn't showing the same extent of the calving area up into Adelaide Peninsula if you look over at the screen on the right. So if you're looking at the screen on the right – I'll try to get my cursor over here. This area isn't showing as core calving from the presentations. So does that mean that – let me get my cursor back over to the left screen again – that this red polygon is out of date or what does that mean?

Mitch: Okay, that's...good capture. It's not out of date. To do this presentation, we didn't want to encumber the process with a lengthy presentation, so we didn't do all the herds. There's the Ahiak herd that is neighboring the other herds there, and that's left out of this, so that's what you didn't see. So it's as you have it - that's correct.

Peter: Thank you. My last question is for the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. In your submission, you suggested the mobile regulations for caribou. Are you able to go into some explanation of how those would work on an administrative jurisdictional level and flush that out a bit for us?

Luigi: Thank you for the question. Luigi Toretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. The mobile protection measures would require...it would be difficult administratively to incorporate those in a zoning. It would be similar to the discussion that Jonathan had with the birds and CWS. So it would be fairly difficult. The point that we would like to make – that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association would like to make - is that we all want some strong measures to protect caribou, and I would suggest that a specific workshop – a facilitated workshop - be seriously considered. Because I think all of our organizations – all the people around the table – are really looking to protect caribou. How we go about protecting them is the big question.

You know, we can...a lot of these....some of these are position statements, and right now I have to speak to the position given to me by my Board, which is the mobile protection measures. And part of that comes from the fact that the feedback that I'm getting in my area is that the caribou calving grounds - the core calving grounds - are not as is displayed here. They are in the cumulative sense. So if one looks at a compilation of data from 1993 through 2013, that compilation will result in those core areas. Year to year there is going to be variation in those calving grounds.

I want to point the Commission to a paper by Côté and Festa-Bianchet. It was published recently, and I believe it was 2013. They specifically looked at Quebec - Northern Quebec - where they actually have they have a legislated polygon, a protected polygon for caribou calving grounds. The research looked at how annual distribution of caribou calving was actually protected by that delineated polygon. Effectively it was a very poor protection year to year. The management recommendation was typical of biologists in the sense that what they recommended was the legislative protection of a larger area protection. But people can look at that and make a different recommendation, and focusing more on mobile protection measures for protection. So I would strongly recommend that a caribou meeting be facilitated, because I think we're going to develop some more pointed discussions, and more pointed data, because that is something from the GN. What really are the annual areas that are used by caribou? I don't know if I actually responded to your question. I hope I gave a little bit more clarity.

David L: Thanks, Luigi. Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you, David. Sharon from the Nunavut Planning Commission, just two comments. The Commission looked the number of submissions with the mobile measure recommendations, and we do need to flush that out. So the option of another specific workshop, I think, is something that we should be look at. When the four parties get together, we can further have those discussions. For the GN, I am wondering if you can provide the Commission with the Option and Recommendations documents that went forward on the decision-making, so we could we see your methodology and what was explored? And if you can advise or provide the Commission with how much input the community had into those Options and Recommendations, we'd appreciate that for our consultation record as well. Thank you.

David L: Yeah, go ahead, Mitch.

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. It's also, just as a note, in the metadata on the files that were sent to NPC, there is a description of the methodology that was used to develop it, so that should be readily accessible with the files you currently have. I can provide you with a text document that comes from the draft map atlas that is coming out that will give you a more user-friendly version of the methodology. So I'll take care of that.

Also, just for point of clarification, the GN is not supporting mobile protection measures within core calving areas and key access corridors. The GN believes they have a very large amount of information and IQ, and we have some of it here, if in a sidebar people would like to see it. I can show it to them. Otherwise, it's going to take a lot of time. I brought a lot of the papers with me that say that mobile protection measures, though effective - I would agree with the other groups – effective during some of the seasonal times of year or post-calving and migration and those sorts of things. We think there definitely could be a workable model put forward on that. But during calving, the sensitivities are simply too high. The result of the research that has been conducted and the experiences that we've gone through, and local hunters have gone through at the community level, clearly show that caribou are way too sensitive - even for visual cues - on a calving ground.

So I just wanted to make that one...I understand, and I'm totally willing to enter in – myself. I have to ask my government – but I am personally totally willing to enter into discussions. I think they're long overdue for a number of reasons on both sides with our colleagues down the table

here, the Regional Inuit Associations, and get into further discussions so that we can try and see a way forward here.

But, I would like to make just one really quick statement before I leave off here. I've been working on caribou for about 35 years, as I said earlier, and I've spoken to many colleagues that have been working on caribou longer. Then I've spoken with a number of the hunters and trapper, and just beneficiaries that have been on the land for a period of time. I've been doing this in Nunavut for quite some time now and before I even came to Nunavut. And all my experience and all the information I've collected, and the literature I've collected so far supports all of this, and there is literature to support it – not as much as I'd like, but it exists. It all tells me that if we do not – if we fail to protect our caribou herds on their core calving areas and key access corridors, the future will fundamental change for harvesters and for caribou. Everything I know, everything I've learned, and everything I've talked to people about say the same thing. I can't stress enough how important this is. It's not a contest. It's not any of these things. It's factual, based on what I've seen and what people have relayed to me. It is a real critical turning point here, and I don't want to heap the pressure onto NPC, but NPC really have a lot of...have more on their plate than they should have. You already have too much on your plate as it is, but this is a key thing for the future of caribou in Nunavut.

David L: Okay, Mitch. I think we've got it. Liz.

Liz: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's Elizabeth Kingston with the Chamber of Mines. So, based on this new position provided by the GN over the weekend, the Chamber would like the opportunity to canvas our members and provide a further response to the NPC with respect to this particular area. We also know that all areas of high mineral potential have not been captured in terms of data, so we would like this data to be provided to the NPC for consideration as well. With respect to the upcoming or prospective hearing on caribou, we would like to be considered and invited as a core party member to that discussion, so we would like to be involved. And I believe, Mr. Chair, if you'll indulge us, I heard Alex Buchan call in on the phone. He is a member of our Executive of the Chamber of Mines, and I just would like, with your indulgence to invite him if he has any further comments that he can add to the Chamber's area on this. Thank you.

David L: Yeah, by all means. Alex, if you're still on the phone, you're welcome to make a comment.

Alex: (*Not on audio. The following is approximation*). To the GN, in terms of the experience and literature and research that has been conducted on the core calving areas, can examples be provided where development had a negative effect on caribou calving grounds on the herd?

David L: Go ahead, Mitch.

Mitch: How much time do we have?

David L: You don't have to provide it now.

Mitch: We can provide it. Absolutely. And I believe the NWT has number of examples as well, and we could provide that easily.

- David L: Alright, can you maybe give Alex a date by which you would commit to provide this?
- Mitch: It won't be until – I'm off on holidays shortly – so it won't be till August sometime that I could probably get that. I've got some information. I might be able to....if he can contact me, I might be able to get him some stuff before I leave, just fax him some papers.
- David L: Okay, will that work for you, Alex?
- Alex: (*Not on audio. The following is an approximation*): With regard to calving grounds, is it not possible that these areas only need to be protected from disturbance specific periods of the year?
- David L: Mitch, go ahead.
- Mitch: That's a question in the mobile protection measures. Much of the component of what affects caribou on the calving grounds we're trying to flush out. So as I said earlier, there's not as much information there as we'd like. But some of the Traditional practices of Inuit using inukshuks to funnel caribou are evidence of visual abilities to cause caribou movements and displacement. So we know that caribou do react visually.
- Again, I've got a couple of examples of what happened to us, and I've got actually, I believe, a couple of people here that were with me on this particular study that can verify this, but it would take a while to bring it out. Just showing what walking across the tundra can do to cause calf abandonment and caribou to leave the area. Having an infrastructure always requires something going on, some sort of generator running, staff keeping the place up, aircraft potentially coming in periodically for anything – medical reasons or just to resupply a company. All these things, plus the visual, plus the dust that's created by all these different effects that occur in a large site – a large mine site – are all the reasons why these mobile measures can't deal with that.
- The other thing to consider with mobile measures – and I can speak to anyone off to the side here or go on to it further if we have time later – is by the time mobile protection measures detect a problem, it's too late. The caribou have already been impacted. So if you're using mobile protection measures on an animal that's already avoiding an area, it's like a dog chasing its tail. How effective is that? So there's nothing...the caribou leave, so there's nothing to worry about, so there's nothing to protect from. So, aircraft surveys affect that. Height of land surveys having human beings during calving up on the height of land can affect where caribou come and how they approach an area. And then there's some research like Belanger et al. that showed a 14 to 26 kilometer avoidance area around mine sites that were not even in calving areas in less sensitive times of the year.
- So all of these things come together to suggest that infrastructure on a calving ground is not mitigatable and it will cause fundamental distributional shifts in how caribou come onto, go off of, and utilize their calving area, which in turn affects their overall distribution and their productivity. Thanks.
- David L: Okay, thanks Mitch. I'm going to draw it to a close at this point. Maybe I'm not going to be able to. First thought, before we go down the table, I want to ask Sharon from the NPC perspective,

the notion of a workshop specific to the caribou issue and the requests of the Chamber sound reasonable?

Sharon: Thank you, David. Should we reach consensus that – and it sounds like there is the desire for the workshop – we would welcome anyone that wanted to participate, same as registered participants here. We wouldn't close that to interested parties so that we would have a good objective baseline from the workshop of information. And any information that is out there - if the Commission doesn't have it currently – the datasets – we would appreciate receiving them.

David L: Alright, thanks. So, boy...where to start. Okay I'll start in that corner, and then we'll just move our way around. Peter, I'm going to ask you to hold until we hear from the others.

Karla: Thank you. Karla Letto with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. I didn't speak up earlier in the roundtable, so I just wanted to briefly say that the NWMB is supportive of the position that the RWOs and the GN and GNWT have all put forward about the importance of protecting caribou calving, post-calving grounds, and key access corridors.

I don't have the 35 years' experience that Mitch had, but in my two years here in Nunavut, I have heard from many Inuit the importance of this. I think that it is something that is supported by both science and IQ. In 2013, the NWMB held priority workshops with the three Regional Wildlife Organizations that had representatives from every HTO. I'd like to say that at all of those workshops, the importance of protecting caribou calving grounds was brought up as a major concern and as a major research priority. So I think it's something that is felt by all the communities.

In terms of the workshop that has been coming up here a few times, I wanted to point out or just let everyone know that the NWMB has recently decided to hold a caribou workshop, so we may have something we can talk to the NPC about further and talk to other people here about who would be interested to be invited. But the goal of our workshop is to talk about updating the caribou protection measures and reach kind of a consensus that most parties agree on. So maybe we can talk a little bit more about that with the NPC.

David L: I'd certainly encourage that. Thank you. Henry I think you were next.

Henry: Thank you again. I know caribou in Nunavik declined very much one time, but we still go out caribou hunting. This one thing that I would like to say, we can do a lot of things with caribou management. Becoming an Elder myself, I know that when caribou are pregnant and they're calving, we try to tell the younger people not to catch caribou when they're calving, when the newborns are coming out at this time. We try to tell the younger people not to disturb the caribou that are pregnant too much just before the newborns are around. It seems to work sometimes, very much, even though there will be some caribou being killed, one but not more than that. Now I see today, when caribou were coming up to calve in our area, there was hardly any caribou hunting if we haven't seen caribou for a long time. This season when they are calving, instead of protecting the area, protect the caribou that are calving. Don't protect the area; protect the caribou that are calving. Tell your children not to kill caribou when they're calving. That's what we try to tell our children. That's mature hunters in our area, even if there are laws or bylaws or whatever kind of legislation. Tell your people when they're calving, don't

shoot them. It's only just a matter of time, that short time, one to two months that you will be able to catch them again. I just wanted to say that. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Henry. So who was next...Rosanne?

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne from the QIA. I just wanted to elaborate a bit on our position that we put in our submission, and I had a question for the Planning Commission. The Qikiqtani Inuit Association is in a bit of a unique position, because there is no caribou data in the Land Use Plan in this region. There is caribou data in this region, but it's not in the...the baseline data is not sufficient to be in the Plan. So, first I guess I would just like to look to NPC to comment on how the information would be included in the Plan when and if it became available. If the protection measures that are determined through this process – whatever they may be – if those would be applied automatically, or how that process would go through when it is available? And if you've, I guess, thought of how that data could be collected or – and I guess this might a question for the GN in a sense too, and this might be a process question, but I think there could be a bit of a quicker answer here too as to how we would take into account the lack of data in this region.

Taking that into the consideration that caribou is of great importance in the Qikiqtani region, the moratorium that was placed here on hunting caribou in January, I think, just shows how important it is to protect kind of a vulnerable species at the point. The position that we have is to protect, to have full protection within those calving areas, and that includes the areas of high mineral potential for several of the reasons that I think the GN has already pointed out. We did propose the mobile protection measures in post-calving areas. I think from my conversations that Luis might be the best one to kind of go into more in-depth explanation about mobile caribou protection measures. But we believe that it's important to have a certain level of protection at all times when caribou are present, and that's the criteria or the guts, I guess, of a mobile caribou protection measure that we thought was important to apply in the post-calving areas.

The one thing that I did want to bring up is that in order for mobile caribou protection measures to be efficient, there does need to be a pretty robust and high level of monitoring that comes in place with that. The one concern we have is that perhaps there isn't adequate capacity or resources at this point to implement the measures that would need to come from that monitoring. So mobile caribou protection measures were put in place in the post-calving areas. We would want to see that there are steps in place for that monitoring to happen and for it to exist. So I guess I look to see if the NPC has any comments on my original question about the lack of baseline data in this region and monitoring.

David L: Okay. NPC – Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. I'll answer the first part, and then Peter and Jon will answer the second part. With regards to when new datasets become available, the Plan is a living document. So as new data becomes available, especially in very priority issues such as caribou management, we would add and amend the Plan. We don't have to wait for the every 3 to 5 year cycle for amendments. Amendments can be asked in any time in the review. So it would be added as soon as that information was provided. And in regards to the protection measures, I would ask Jon or Peter, one of them, if they can comment on that. Thank you, David.

Peter: Thanks, Rosanne. You actually led into a question that I was going to ask, which is, I interviewed Dr. Côté at the University of Lavelle who Mr. Torretti cited about a half-hour ago. In Quebec he estimated that the budget needed to monitor the caribou herds there to a level adequate for mobile regulations was around 1.3 to 1.5 million annually, and he estimated that for Nunavut you'd need triple that. I don't know what the Government of Nunavut budget is, but I don't think it's anywhere near that amount. So, something to take into consideration.

David L: Okay, thanks Peter. Luigi, you had a comment?

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Luigi Torretti. Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I want to...one comment and then a question. I want to thank Henry for essentially trying to....for stating what I have been unable to thus far. The area is important because caribou are there. That is the message I got in my region as well, and that's why I find it important to look at it annually. Certainly, there are characteristics in calving grounds that caribou go back to. There are characteristics there, but it is the caribou that we need to protect. That's one of the reasons why the KitIA has been a little bit more focused on the mobile measures rather a polygon delineation. So, the area is important because caribou are there.

The second is I want to follow-up, kind of the flip side of coin, the question that Mr. Buchan asked, and specifically to the Bluenose East. If I understand correctly, the Bluenose East, the population has been declining steadily. That's the information that I've understood. Can the GN or the GNWT speak to the calving ground productivity for that herd and can you speak to the impacts in terms of developments or nearby developments that could impact that herd?

David L: Alright, do we have a volunteer? Jan.

Jan: Jan Adamczewski with GNWT. I'll try and answer the question. First just a comment on the mobile protection measures, because it's kind of a seductive idea that you just protect the caribou when they're there. But particularly with the Bluenose East herd – because I've been on multiple surveys and, you know, looked at the collar data – the main calving area is in the Rae and Richardson valleys just west of Kugluktuk. But we've also found that the collared females, cows with calves, can be in there in the middle of July. They may be in there for a good part of the summer. So if you sort of say, "Well, we'll just stay away when they're on the calving ground," but if you build the infrastructure, you still affect them through a good part of the summer. In terms of the herd's population trend, we just did calving photo surveys – Bathurst and Bluenose East. Mitch was part of the crew, quite a large contingent. We won't have those numbers until sometime in the fall, but yes, the trend is downward based on reconnaissance surveys. The calf recruitment numbers have not been super bad but consistent with the declining population. So that's the basic trend we're seeing with that herd.

David L: Luigi, and I don't want to prolong the debate, so...

Luigi: No, no, just and I specifically asked about development in that, so I just wanted to point out.

David L: Jan, any follow-up?

Jan: My apologies, Mr. Torretti. Jan Adamczewski again. I don't think at this point that we see development as having had that much influence on the Bluenose East herd. There is a proposal

by Tundra Copper for the calving ground, and a number of people have been involved in that. We believe a lot of the decline has been natural causes, and harvest has probably contributed to that, particularly as the herd has reached lower numbers. Thank you.

David L: Okay, Barney you had a comment.

Barney: Thank you, David. I just wanted to comment on KIA and Henry's comments there. Our generations were also taught in the seasonal hunts of the caribou, and we do follow what our Elders say. There are certain times we catch the bulls and certain times we catch the females. That's probably one of the reason the Qamanirjuaq herd has been thriving throughout these decades throughout our culture. It's not just that we have to protect the caribou. It's the fact that we have to protect the land they are living on too. What they eat is going to affect the herd, and the air pollution. Those are all the aspects that we have to look at and keep it as pure as we could. We do understand that we have to protect the caribou, and in one of the ways we will do that is protecting the land also. Just wanted to make that comment. Thanks.

David L: Thank you. Okay, I'm going....We will follow-up in more detail unless it's really significant....alright, short and sweet and that'll be the last comment on caribou. I'm saving David Boote's and my recommendations.

Mitch: First, our recommendation was from 2014, so it's not a new thing. The second – I'm doing it as quick as I can – I just wanted to follow-up on Barney that protecting just the caribou is the problem. We need to protect the caribou and the habitat the caribou is on. And that's the key. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. So here's the thing. It's now 5 to 5:00. We're going to break at 5:00. I hate to say it, but I think we're going to have to get back together at 7:00 tonight. We're not done with Chapter 2 – we're not even close I suspect, so let's resume this at 7:00, and we'll carry on with the next section in the chapter. I think what is the key next step is a workshop. I mean, frankly there's a predominance of opinion in the room that the calving grounds need to be protected, but it's not a consensus. If a workshop would help move that discussion forward, I think it would be time well invested. Certainly the mobile protection measures need to be reviewed and amended. I have had some experience with those as well, and they are far from perfect. I think we are all struggling with how to protect caribou when they're not on the land that is so sensitive, and then protect the land that really is crucial. So, I'm going to suggest that the Wildlife Management Board, NPC and whomever else - NTI, Government of Canada, and GN - and GNWT too if you like - get together and decide on when and what a workshop would look like. Hopefully you can report back to us later in the week as to what recommendations you would have. I think I overlooked the Government of Canada maybe once or twice. Did you have anything to add in this?

Spencer: I guess it was just your final comment. It's Spencer from the Government of Canada. Do you want the workshop to occur and we'll report back recommendations by the end of the week?

David L: No, no. Ideally sure. No.

Spencer: Because we're already busy.

*(Laughter)*

David L: I want a plan for the workshop and some dates if you can manage that. So I'll turn to David Boote, and I'll ask people to return here by 7:00 tonight.

DB: Okay, well I'll be quick. Maybe we can take stock of the whole chapter, perhaps, once we are through the discussions. But as David said, there needs to be follow-up amongst the parties about when and how further discussions on caribou should occur, and maybe keeping in mind the need for the sharing of further information and data that some the points that were raised in the discussion this afternoon in advance of any gathering.

I think before we got to the caribou, I think there was some clarification by the Planning Commission on areas for bird protection, the various legislated ones and the ones that are put out in the Plan – proposed in the Plan - based very clearly on the information provided Environment Canada, and I think the data and the...using Environment Canada's high and moderate classifications for impact on bird habitat, you know, is quite....it's quite a good example, I think, in the Plan of the using data to translate it into the designations - different designations and different prohibitions on uses in both of those designations.

As NTI was following up on a number of questions about the differences between the wildlife bird sanctuaries and the areas designated in the Plan, I think it's good to have that discussion and an understanding of the differences. Those differences were stressed by Environment Canada. I think the other point that is, I think, quite important again for a workable Land Use Plan is the point raised by the Government of Canada about how setbacks feature into conformity determination. I think it was agreed that the Planning Commission and the Government of Canada can get together and have a follow-up discussion on how that can actually work. Because, again it's in the theme of making this Plan work without...by trying to avoid uncertainty and both with respect to the staff having to apply measures suggested by other parties and also, of course by proponents. I mean, it's very important. I would suggest to sort that out, and I think it can be from the quick discussion we had. And then the last point of clarification of restrictions on shipping, I think it was important to point out in response to the question about the WWF about how communities...community consultations informed the restrictions in certain areas as opposed to other marine areas in Nunavut. So I think that was my sense from the subjects not associated with caribou.

David L: Alright, thank you David and thank you everyone for your patience. Unfortunately for your indulgence later on tonight, see you at 7:00 to those of you who can return.

### **Break**

David L: I'm looking at Chapter 2. We've done Key Migratory Bird Habitat. We've done Caribou Habitat to the extent we could. So there is Polar Bear Denning Areas, Walrus Haul-Outs, Marine Areas of Importance, Atlantic Cod Lakes, Transboundary Considerations, and then Climate Change. I'm hoping that we can be done maybe by 8:30. But as I say, we'll wrap up by 9:00 no matter how far we are along. Jonathan, please?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. I'd just like to confirm that we completed caribou calving and post-calving areas, but we didn't discuss caribou sea ice crossings, which was a separate issue.

David L: Yeah, I think we can include that in the workshop planning. I don't know that we need to go back into caribou now.

Jonathan: Okay. The next issue then is Section 2.1.3, Polar Bear Denning Areas. As an overview in the previous round of comments, the World Wildlife Fund recommends seasonal restrictions for polar bear denning areas. We did not have any dates at that time with which seasonal strictures would apply or what they may be. The North Baffin and Keewatin Regional Land Use Plans identify that the activities should be restricted near polar bear denning areas. The current Draft Plan has relied on polar bear denning data provided by the Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment. The designation that's applied is a Special Management Area that includes direction to regulatory authorities to mitigate impacts on polar bear denning areas and identifies the area where cumulative impact concerns may be noted.

For reference, there was one known issue. I just wanted to mention. The polar bear denning line from the North Baffin and Keewatin Land Use Plan has not been identified in the Options and Recommendations document. That's an error. They're mentioned in concert with walrus haul-outs, and the reference only made it into the walrus haul-out section.

In terms of comments, we didn't receive a wide variety in terms of polar bear denning areas. The Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board did identify that polar bear denning areas are very important and perhaps should be considered as Protected Areas in this Draft Land Use Plan, but there were no specific requirements as to what a Protected Area might entail. So that's a quick summary of what the Plan attempts to do for polar bear denning area, and we'd invite further comments.

David L: So, any additional comments, concerns? Bert? Luis and then Bert.

Luis: Luis Manzo, Director of Lands, Kivalliq Inuit Association. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to emphasize in the same section. Such a designation in Keewatin Land Use Plan, page 45, such a designation is actually to have some sort of restriction. The land use plan called for no (?) Coral Harbour. So it's written there. It's how it is being used in the land use plan. And this is some of the things to put in your land use plan. We hope to see it there from the Keewatin Land Use Plan to the new Land Use Plan. Thanks.

Jon: Thank you, Luis. I'm not clear on what aspect of the Keewatin Land Use Plan you were referring to.

Luis: In regards to designation of wildlife, the areas support wildlife area, in the Coats Island and Coral Harbour. So, if they became designated there should be effective management according to the Keewatin Act or Keewatin Land Use Plan and should be negotiated with the Coral Harbour people. Thank you.

David L: Okay, I guess the comment is noted. Bert.

Bert: Thank you, David. I'll sort of pass this to the Regional Wildlife Boards too in case they want to elaborate a bit. But in our written submission, we asked if the RWOs or the NWMB or the HTOs if they had provided additional information that could be incorporated. Because I know for the GN – and maybe the GN wants to comment – but a lot of their research is focused on

population. So they're out either getting biopsies or doing work like that. There hasn't been denning surveys that I'm aware of in quite a number of years. There may be some areas, but it would be dated information, so we would really relying on input from the communities if there are feedback on that information that's there. So again, this is another area we've identified that hopefully we can work together to incorporate that information from the communities. Because polar bears were listed under the Species At Risk Act, they are developing a Polar Bear Management Plans, so there is work being done by the government with the communities on developing that management plan. But, again, in terms of denning surveys or that kind of information – and perhaps others can help me out here or correct me - but I'm not aware of any recent information or recent work that's been done that would say we were really confident with that information we have. So it's just a point I wanted to make. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Bert. Jennifer, any comment on that?

Jennifer: Thanks for the comment, Bert. This is Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. That's correct. The information or data that we provided to the NPC was the, or is the best available data that we have at this time. I don't have a technical expert with me with respect to polar bear denning or polar bear areas of significance. However, I can say there is ongoing work that is happening at this time. Once we have new data, we will supplying the NPC, of course, with that information once we have it. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Any – Rosanne, just because I noticed you came in late, a little bit late. Yours – QIA's was about the only comment of substance that NPC received on polar bear issues.

Jonathan: Sorry David.

David L: No, is that incorrect?

Jonathan: It was the Wildlife Board.

David L: Sorry, the Wildlife Board. So I guess my question wasn't relevant after all. Yes, please.

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I'll start off, and my colleague may want to add just a couple of points. Just to clarify, yes, QWB did recommend that polar bear dens be uplifted to Option 1. We cited the importance of polar bear for multiple reasons at the community level, not only for the hunt, the food, and the clothing, but also to recognize that for some of our communities through the HTO, sport hunts do occur, and this is an important source of income. Polar bears are a specific case in wildlife management because of the huge international interest in the wellbeing of polar bears, although we all worry about how the polar bears are doing. Sometimes our strategies are different than our international counterparts.

So in response to that, we felt it was important to highlight that, you know a high level of vigilance should be provided for polar bears and their denning sites. Just to respond directly to Bert's comments, it's true there is not a lot of current research on denning sites, but I just wanted to mention that we have had an expression of interest from the community of Clyde River to partake in some kind of a community based project for denning sites. It hasn't yet developed itself yet. It hasn't gone into action, as the community is looking for funding and kind of an accurate and effective methodology. But I just raised this point to mention that there are

communities that are interested in this work. I believe that if the space was provided, communities would respond quickly.

I guess this is a good time for me to just mention, I know there has been a lot discussion earlier about questions to NPC specifically about ongoing consultation. My question is not to that but just to highlight to NPC that our role as Regional Wildlife Organizations require – our job is to interact with the HTOs and the HTOs represent within the communities. So I guess I just point that out to say that there is opportunity for NPC to work more closely with the RWOs to get that kind of important information, because for our communities and the organizations we worked with, wildlife and land can't be separated. So in order to help develop, you know, the best 1<sup>st</sup> generation Land Use Plan that we could have in Nunavut, us as RWOs we're here to work with you and to facilitate and to figure out how best to do it. So I went on. I think that's everything from us right now. Thank you.

David L: Thank you.

Brandon: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Brandon, from WWF Canada. I wanted to thank Jonathan for clarifying something that was lacking in our last submission – some more specifics, and that's taken into account. We are going to recommend at least some denning areas be moved to protected, and that will be reflected in the next submission. But I just want to make it clear that the goal of WWF's conservation measures for polar bears, we're 100% supporting of sport hunts, of traditional hunts. The reason we are pushing for polar bear conservation is to they're there for communities to use. I know I was at a recent polar bear forum last week in the States, and there was some misinformation that WWF – especially WWF Canada - is not supporting of harvesting or sport hunting. I just wanted to make it clear that our mandate and our official position is pro-sport hunt, and that's why we do push for conservation measures. Thanks.

David L: Thank you, Brandon. Ema?

Ema: Thank you. Pretty much echoing what Bert said. Not very aware or concerned about denning areas, as they are to my understanding already protected under management plans. Since I became working for the RWO I never really heard any concerns about denning areas, because they're already being protected in the plans. So, thank you. I don't know what else to add.

David L: Great, thank you. Any other comments? Yes, Henry?

Henry: Qujannamiik. I'll wait for people to put their left or right earphones on. (Henry began to speak in his language).

David L: Henry, can I get you to stop for a sec? We're not getting any English interpretation.

Henry: (*The following was translated*): For us Inuit, we know that with the baby polar bears, we do not look for the denning areas specifically. We do not look for those specific areas. We know of the general area, and the steep sides of the hills. We know the general area, but we do not, we never look for the specific denning area per se. In the past, when we had dog teams those people who wanted to hunt polar bears would never hunt bears with cubs, although we hunt the polar bears on the field, not in the dens. We never hunted...we don't' hunt for polar bears

with cubs. We just know that where they are in general. We do not specifically look for the denning area.

Once in a while, just by chance, if the dogs sniffed it out, they would know where a den is. We cannot specifically say that we know where the dens are. I don't think there's anyone who could say for specific where den is unless they have a dog. It is a difficult thing to study. We know find out exactly when they come out. It's difficult to put a study even though we know the general area, because they come from their dens down to the sea area one, two or three cubs. Once we see their prints on the snow. I think it's like that in most communities. But if somebody wants to study, you have to have a dog for the polar bear. Because there's areas where there's deep snow. We cannot say that they're become extinct, because there are polar bears. We know the path they take from the land down to the sea. They go through the same passageway.

David L: Thank you, Henry. Any final observations on this topic? I guess we'll leave it at that. The Commission has the information it has and will welcome new information as it comes in. Jonathan do you want to move on to walrus, please?

Jonathan: Thank you, David. Walrus haul-outs, while obviously a different issue, is in many ways similar to the polar bear denning areas we just discussed. Again, the habitat requirements for walrus are very specific. There are only certain locations where they can haul out of the water during open water season. Again, the North Baffin and Keewatin Regional Land Use Plans identify walrus haul-out as important areas where development should be restricted. In this case, again, there is information lacking. But the information that is in the Plan was digitalized by the Planning Commission from Department of Fisheries and Ocean study on the Foxe Basin only. That should be noted. But that is the information we have at the moment. Again, Special Management Area designation was assigned, which includes direction to regulatory authorities to mitigate impacts on these areas, and again identifies cumulative impacts concerns.

And again, similar to polar bear, one comment that we had noted was from the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board identifying that it should be an Option 1 protected area, the same as polar bear. So I'll stop there and see if there are any further comments.

David L: Thank you, Jonathan. Any follow-up from Qikiqtaaluk?

Jackie: Sorry, I'm sitting over here working on my tan.

*(Laughter)*

I'll take a break from that and I'll share some thoughts on walrus. Thank you, Mr. Chair. From the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board perspective, we felt it was important to request that walrus haul-outs be uplifted. As we mentioned in our submission for the last number of years – five to seven, communities of the Qikiqtaaluk region have been working with DFO on developing a new Walrus Management Plan. A large part of this plan has included inviting representatives from the 7 communities to discuss management options, to discuss IQ, and a variety of other matters. In the course of this discussion, communities often mention that haul-out sites specifically are very, very vulnerable to any environmental changes. Especially concerns were raised for the walrus sites within the Foxe Basin, as that's probably the largest area in this region to hunt walrus.

The importance of walrus – especially for Foxe Basin – cannot be underestimated, not only for cultural reasons, but also economically and an important food source for the region and the territory as a whole. Again, this is based on community concerns, concerns raised by the HTOs, and it is something that communities are working closely with DFO on this matter. We are aware that DFO has conducted a number of surveys over the last couple of years. We could talk another time about some of the concerns communities had about that, but again, just to emphasize that walrus haul-out sites are very important for those communities. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Yeah, Henry.

Henry: Okay, I'm going to save you some time without putting the microphone on. (*Audio switched off.* *The following is an approximation*) I do a lot of walrus hunting in fall time – four and five communities sometimes. When you're thinking about making some changes in this area, it would be very helpful for us to be notified of what you're going to do because we've been going there for so many years, even before you were born, all of you inside this building. It is important to keep walrus hunting open. If there has to be something done to this area, it would help let us know what you want us to do.

David L: Okay, thank you, Henry. Anybody else? Yeah, Rosanne.

Rosanne: Thank you. Just really quickly to respond to Henry's comment: QIA, NTI, and Makivik have had kind of brief conversations before this meeting, and we said that we would follow-up between now and kind of the next, on those areas of joint occupancy. And I believe that Makivik also submitted a comment to the Commission during this phase of the review. So I just wanted to mention that we will be discussing with them further about those areas of joint occupancy. Thanks.

David L: Thank you. Any other points of interest regarding walrus and walrus haul-out areas? Ok Jonathan. Whoops, sorry go ahead.

Leah: Thank you, David L. Leah Muckpah, Regional Coordinator for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. Speaking about walrus. I have one issue that was tabled by one of my HTOs. Coral Harbour – and this is in my written submission but I'll just read it out – Coral Harbour has raised concerns with the proximity of shipping routes to their main walrus hunting grounds despite the NPC's proposed designation of Walrus Island as a protected area. This is in the Q&R Options and Recommendations, page 66. This came from several hunters, and it came up quite often. They have a hunting area south of Coral Harbour where they go out walrus hunting, but they've addressed shipping as a major concern, disturbing walrus south of Coral Harbour, but it's still in the Foxe Basin subpopulation area. I thought should put that out there. Thanks.

David L: Thanks, Leah. And do they have any recommendations about that traffic? Setback, anything like that?

Leah: Can you repeat that?

David L: Well, you said that the hunters have expressed concern. I'm just wondering if they've had any specific recommendations. I haven't read your submission, so it may be in there. I'm not sure.

- Leah: They wanted protection even though it's in Draft Land Use Plan. They wanted to emphasize protection of the walrus hunt area.
- David L: So they're proposing it as a Protected Area?
- Leah: Yes.
- David L: Okay. Jonathan, do you have any comment, question?
- Jonathan: Yeah, I'll just clarify that the area was identified through community consultations with Coral Harbour as an area of importance. And the island itself is designated a Protected Area where industrial activities generally are prohibited. And I believe the concern from the HTOs in the Kivalliq region is in regards to shipping around the island, which hasn't been incorporated in the Plan.
- David L: And can I be so bold as to suggest or ask what might you do with that recommendation that something be done to address the potential effects of shipping? Is it...I mean, how would you propose to respond to that, that concern?
- Jonathan: It is certainly noted, and will be considered whenever revisions are proposed. The issue of restrictions on shipping, as I think there are additional comments that aren't springing to mind but other people have raised concerns about other community areas of interests and restrictions on shipping and cruise ships, and Moffet Inlet and somewhere else in Foxe Basin. So, hearing that the concern is similar in regards to shipping, it would make sense to treat them in a consistent fashion.
- David L: Alright, thank you Jonathan. Sorry for putting you on the spot there, but it was kind of just left hanging. Any other comments? Concerns? Luigi.
- Luigi: Mr. Chair, if I can ask for a couple of minutes just to discuss a topic with NTI and the other RIAs. Is that okay?
- David L: Yeah, sure.
- Luigi: Before we leave the subject in other words.
- (Pause)
- David L: So, Luigi, having caucused, do you have anything you want to put on the record? Please go ahead.
- Naida: To summarize our discussions, and listening to Leah's submission and your question, I think the issue comes up again to consultation. Obviously, the DFO data was a good start. They have provided the data that you have around Walrus Island. It seems to us that you went back to Coral Harbour with the data the DFO provided in that designation, that more than likely they'd have adjustments to that boundary based on how they use the area and issues with the marine

portion of it. So we want it noted that it's good that that's coming out at this meeting. But to further refine that boundary really, communications with Coral Harbour are necessary.

David L: Thank you. Last call on walrus. Jonathan.

Jonathan: Sorry, just a quick follow-up to note that in the specific example we were just talking about in regards to Walrus Island that was identified through community consultations. It's identified as a Protected Area, not as Special Management Area, which the DFO areas were identified as. So it's a separate issue that we segued into on the discussion of walrus.

David L: Okay. Good enough for now at least? Alright, where are we here? Marine Areas of Importance. Jonathan, please.

Jonathan: Thank you, David. Section 2.1.5, Marine Areas of Importance: There are two subsections in here, the first of which is ecologically and biologically significant areas. These are broad general areas that have been identified by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans as being important, ecologically and biologically, but there was no policy guidance on the management of these areas. They are broad, generally important area that DFO wished to see identified in the Land Use Plan. With that being said, we have designated them Mixed Use, so they do not appear on Schedule A. They do appear on Schedule B with direction to regulatory authorities to consider the importance of the areas. I guess there have been some comments in regards to these EBSAs, but I did not have any questions in regards to them.

David L: Any comments from anybody in the group? Oh, please.

Mishal: Hi, good evening. My name is Mishal Naseer. I'm with the Nunavik Marine Region Planning Commission. I have a question for the NPC. In determination of these EBSAs, we ourselves – the NMRPC – is also launching a Marine Protected Areas Project in conjunction with our wildlife board, and we are wondering if there is a way to kind of combine that process. I mean, we don't know what it would look like in your Land Use Plan at this point, because as you said, it's not fully defined. But would there be some kind of collaboration effort that could be undertaken on this matter? It's just a question I wanted to bring up. Thank you.

David L: Jon? Jonathan?

Jonathan: Yeah, I guess it's a process question that I guess I'm not prepared to answer in terms of what collaboration we would pursue. We have no current plans to further refine and investigate these EBSAs. Fisheries and Oceans has advised us that there are areas where additional research is required to identify more specific management in those areas. We have not had any discussions with DFO or anyone else about pursuing research in these EBSAs. That being said, if you are pursuing that type of research, we do share a significant boundary, so you could imagine collaboration being productive.

David L: Thanks, Jonathan. Anything else? Yeah, please.

Jackie: Thank you again. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. In our submission to NPC, we raised just a number of points for consideration, but for just for our conversation right now, I just wanted to – or QWB would just like to highlight that areas of marine importance, a lot of that

would overlap with community areas of interest. Just as this Plan develops, it'll be interesting and important to maintain a consistency between those two areas, where I feel at least if we look at the Foxe Basin area, which is an area that Igluligaarjuk raise as an area of community importance. I think that qualification would fall naturally in the area of marine importance. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Jackie. Any other comments? Alright, we'll call it on that and move to Atlantic Cod Lake....oh, Polynyas. I've got a different...okay, polynyas then. Sorry.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. So the next area of Marine Areas of Importance deals with polynyas in particular. In the previous....*(audio switched to translation temporarily)*...are included in other designated areas, key migratory bird habitat in particular, an area in Foxe Basin that was of community interest. That being said, a Mixed Use designation was applied generally to polynyas, similar to the EBSAs previously, which provides direction to consider impacts on these important areas. I, again, didn't have any comments that I had noted that we required clarification on, but open for comments.

David L: Any comments? Anybody? Alright, oh sorry. Go ahead please.

Mike: Mike Setterington with Environmental Dynamics. I'm here on behalf of Baffinland and the work that we've done in the marine environment for the project. So, polynyas are one thing we considered both for shipping and then specifically for effects on marine birds and the environmental affects assessment for the first project. I'll refer to that as the FEIS. So, Baffinland doesn't at all question the probable ecological importance of polynyas to marine mammals, marine animals. Polynyas, I think, were first identified for their ecological importance in the Canadian Arctic by Ian Sterling in the early 1980s. And in his publication on polynyas, he identified the need for further research to determine what in polynyas are at risk.

Canadian Wildlife Service in 2004 published their key marine habitat sites for marine birds. And in that publication, they had a map of known polynyas in the Eastern Arctic and Nunavut in particular. There were further citations to work for polynya identification, and then as part of Baffinland's work, up to 2012 looking at the shipping route through Foxe Basin and Hudson Strait, Baffinland conducted an analysis of polynya-like features in Foxe Basin. Similar to how the level of detail of information used for caribou areas, data for polynyas was gathered from 1991 to 2011. Then I believe as a part of the submission from the World Wildlife Fund to the Nunavut Planning Commission, that's what I tracked the database to. There was a spatial database of polynyas provided to the Nunavut Planning Commission that's part of maps.

Well my observations show that those polynyas actually don't match any of those above data sources. And in particular, there are polynyas identified in the Hudson Strait. The entire northern part of Hudson Strait is identified as a polynya. So maybe we need some clarification on the data. Even though they're not identified as Option 1 protection areas, it would seem to be a waste of effort to focus a lot of our mitigation and analysis efforts that either don't exist or perhaps focus on interactions that may not have any effect. So this is a case where we have to make sure that we're using the right data to identify the right areas. And as far as we can tell right now, they aren't the right areas.

David L: Thanks, Mike. Jonathan? Sharon?

- Sharon: Do you know where the right areas are?
- Mike: The best information that Baffinland has, again is the Canadian Ice Service data from 1991 to 2011 that was published in an appendix to the FEIS, which is on the NIRB website. So from a Baffinland perspective, that would be the data. But again, I question where the data comes from for the Nunavut Planning Commission, because it doesn't match any of the other sources that I mentioned.
- David: Jonathan, any response?
- Jonathan: Sorry, if I understand, the data provided by WWF is inconsistent with the sources that they reference in their submission?
- Mike: I didn't go into detail on that. I did look at several of their references. But by way of example, I could show a figure showing Environment Canada's data on polynyas versus what the Nunavut Planning Commission is using. I have a map figure of that on my computer. I could show that as a quick example of why I question the areas that the Nunavut Planning Commission is using.
- Jon: Yeah, we appreciate that there are different maps of polynyas out there. We used as information – as far as the Plan says – information that was provided by WWF provided in 2014. And I am unaware of exactly what went into that dataset.
- Brandon: The last thing we would want to do is put forth misinformation, so I'm really happy to work with you to rectify that. I don't know off the top of my head. I wasn't around when that was submitted, I'm but happy to follow-up with you about that and make sure it's rectified if there was an error.
- David L: Sharon?
- Sharon: Thank you. Mike, if you can share the data with the Commission, we would be...we would take that and review it. We would appreciate if you can give it to us.
- Mike: I'm Mike Setterington on behalf of Baffinland. Yeah, we can submit the appendices that were submitted as part of the FEIS and, and then I can provide the Mallory and Fontaine 2004 publication from Environment Canada. There are several other references as well too that World Wildlife Fund made, but perhaps we can work together as a three-way party on that.
- David L: Thank you Mike. Just, Government of Canada, do you have anybody from Transport Canada available to you, or the Ice Service folks?
- Spencer: Yep. We do have representation for Transport Canada.
- David L: Okay, well it might be wise to include somebody with a direct access to the actual remote sensing data and get them engaged in this discussion.
- Spencer: Okay, we'll see what they have. I mean, the Government of Canada, in our submission, we also...we're interested in the how the designation around polynyas was collected. We were

interested to hear what NPC had and where they received it from so that we could make more informed feedback on it. So, that's part of our submission.

David L: Okay, well I guess what I'll do then is leave it in NPC's hands to follow up with the various parties, but clearly it is important to get the most accurate mapping possible, and it sounds to me like there is some question about which maps you should be using. I'll leave it to you guys to pull it together and come up with something that is as accurate as possible. Any other comments?

Henry: Qujannamiik. Thank you. On polynyas, I've been living up North and thankful for quite a long time. And when I was a boy, these polynyas used to be open all the time. Now when I got a little bit older, these polynyas, as I know, sometimes they close. I don't know for how many years. So what kind of data do you have, questions you have about polynyas. I don't know. Maybe because the currents are weaker, I don't know, or the weather is colder, I don't know. But sometimes they're open. Sometimes they're closed. I don't know for how long. I haven't seen some polynyas that are open for a long time. Just wanted to say that. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Henry. Any other comments? Okay, so according to the Table of Contents – I'm using the Land Use Plan - the Atlantic Cod Lakes is next. I don't know if that lines up with your plan. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Apologies. I'll turn the mike on. Atlantic Cod lakes in general were identified in previous versions of the Draft Plan, but have now been removed from the Land Use Plan. They appear in the Options and Recommendations document as a record of the decision. But my recollection is that they were under consideration through the Species At Risk Act, and DFO advised us that was no longer proceeding and they were not an issue that was raised prominently by communities. There was seemingly little priority given to that issue. So we have designated them Mixed Use in the Land Use Plan, and they don't appear in document itself.

David L: Alright. Thank you, Jonathan. Any comments? Concerns? Observations about the disappearing cod lakes? Alright, then Transboundary would be next.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. The Land Use Plan deals with transboundary issues in two different ways, one for impacts in the Settlement Areas impacting lands on the other side of the boundary; and the opposite of that, of land use occurring on the other side of the boundary impacting the Settlement Area.

In regards to the first example, the Great Bear Lake watershed has been identified in the Sahtu region of the Northwest Territory as an important area in their land use planning that assigns protection measures to that watershed for its importance. A small portion of the watershed lies in the Nunavut Settlement Area, in the Kitikmeot region. So in consideration of these potential transboundary impacts on an identified important area on the other side of the border, the Land Use Plan assigns a Mixed Use designation, so all uses would be permitted. But again it assigns direction to regulatory authorities to consider the impacts on the adjacent area.

One comment that was received from the Government of Nunavut was that that concept should be extended to all watersheds along the Settlement Area boundary. I'd just like to note in response to that, the Land Use Plan has been developed since 2009 to focus on priority issues.

So recognizing that impacts can go across the boundary both ways, both examples here do focus on priorities that have been identified. So the specific Great Bear Lake watershed that's on the other side in the Sahtu region has been given consideration, but not every watershed that shares the border has been assigned such a direction to regulatory authorities.

Now, for the opposite example of activities occurring in neighboring jurisdictions impacting the Settlement Area, we have again assigned direction to regulatory authorities or to government I guess in this case, to requesting that the Impact Review Board screen and review projects in adjacent areas. Those – sorry I think I was reading a GN quote there. The direction to regulatory authorities applies to hydro development and oil and gas activities, which are two land uses that the Commission has been notified of being concerned – the hydro development in the Hudson Bay area impacting polynyas etc. in the Sanikiluaq area, and oil and gas occurring, for example, in the Davis Strait. Again there was a GN comment to generalize that to all land uses, and the intent of the Plan was to focus on priority issues that had been identified rather than a generic notification that this could be done for all projects.

David L: Thanks Jonathan. Any comment from GN on Jonathan's overview?

Jennifer: Thank you, Jonathan. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. With respect to the transboundary resources for watersheds, the GN's comment comes from a place – and the Plan mentions itself - the concept of watershed planning and considering these large areas for their importance to many different factors. So our recommendation is just that all of these important transboundary watersheds should be included for their importance to potentially impact within Nunavut or vice versa in other jurisdictions. With respect to....sorry...transboundary considerations....sorry. The GN's comments simply asks that the Plan remain consistent with the legislation, the direction that's provided within legislation, so we had asked that – you know, there is potential for additional projects in addition to oil and gas potential and hydro development to potentially impact on the Settlement Area. As such, the statement in Plan should be expanded to include the language that's seen in NUPPAA. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Jennifer. Any response? Okay. Not that it makes any difference to the transboundary discussion, but Jonathan you should know that - and the Planning Commission I suppose should know that - with respect to the Great Bear Lake watershed within the Déljne district, that has been nominated as an international biosphere reserve through the UNESCO process. It doesn't change anything in terms of the regulatory context or the land claims agreements or anything else. It's a designation that recognizes a sustainable development approach that's exemplary. So in terms of the transboundary linkage between Nunavut – well, Nunavut's share of that watershed – it does add a little...it underscores a little bit the importance of watersheds and in particular this one. Alright is that it for trans...please.

Mishal: Hi. Michelle Naseer from the NMRPC. I just need a clarification from both GN and NPC what Jonathan just stated. So you stated that there should be greater oversight undertaken by Impact Review Board in terms of projects or activities with might have transboundary impacts within the Hudson Bay area? And you were quoting GN, but GN is saying that's not what they meant. I just want to get a clarification. What was the actual...what was the recommendation by GN?

Jonathan: Thank you, this is Jonathan. I guess government has the ability – I'm a bit shaky on this - to request the Impact Review Board to review the impacts of projects that are occurring outside

the Settlement Area for impacts on the Settlement Area. The direction in the Land Use Plan is to encourage government in these specific instances where we've been notified of concerns to encourage them to engage with the Impact Review Board in those instances that we've been notified that are of concern. The comment from Government of Nunavut was that the ability or option exists for all categories of project proposals, and the language in the Plan could be revised to reflect that.

David L: Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you, Jonathan. That is....That is correct. That is our recommendation that the language in the Plan be generalized to include all projects that may have an impact. Thank you.

David L: A comment from NIRB?

Tara: Thank you, and I apologize for the quality of the statement. So the Government and the Regional Inuit Associations would be able to make those referrals to the Nunavut Impact Review Board, but the NIRB would also encourage that the language be clearer as to what the transboundary concern was. So is it a referral based on watershed, wildlife issue, fish, marine habitat issue?

Second of all to, you know, maybe be clear or keeping in mind while we're finishing and polishing this Plan off that not only identifying the Hudson area that has been talked about here, but the major areas that could be referred to the NIRB for most transboundaries would be helpful. And then finally again, with the blue box noting, referred to the NIRB for screening and to review, I'd suggest keeping the language open, because part of the NIRB's expectation in providing a screening decision is to determine whether or not a review is required, so it wouldn't always be referred to review necessarily. It depends on the screening process, so just keep the language open there. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Tara. Yeah, thank you.

Jonathan: Yeah, thank you very much, Tara, for the clarification comments. Appreciated.

David L: Alright. Any other comments, observations on the transboundary stuff? If not, over to you again, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. Section 2.3, the final section of Chapter 2 is in regard to Climate Change. Now this issue has been recognized and acknowledged by numerous participants as being important. However, at this time, the Planning Commission has no agreed upon terms or condition or direction with which we can incorporate into the Land Use Plan. So there is currently a direction to regulatory authorities, again to consider the Commission's objectives, I believe, on climate change. There have been some comments from the Chamber to clarify that we appreciate. There have been some comments from the Government of Canada, again providing clarification on this, and I don't have any questions in regards to those comments.

David L: Anybody have any observations? Please.

Andrew: Hi. Can you hear me? Andrew Dunford, NTI. I guess...we didn't raise it in the submission, but it was in our initial letter indicating that there was a lack any type of action towards climate change in the Plan's initial draft or in the follow up or in any of the previous iterations. The Commission's objective it says in Climate Change here in 2.3 is to 'control and minimize greenhouse gas emissions, monitor climate change impact, encourage the development and adoption of adaptation strategies, and consider issues relating to the changes in landscapes due to climate change, such as the loss of glaciers,' and I guess permafrost and the like. In the Plan, in the Options and Recommendations – again like you said, it says defer to regulatory authorities, but nowhere in the Plan does it address the Commission's requirement to meet that objective.

There was really no forum for many of these, I guess, decisions that need to be made, to be presented to the Commission for any of the bodies. Like my question kind of relates to all that, and how does the Commission plan to incorporate just like basic existing climate information about monthly averages, max-minimum temperatures, you know average conditions in the area. A number of extreme weather days...you know the average wind, you know sun exposure, stuff like that that would be absolutely useful for long-term planning?

And the other consideration is like how will the Commission use projected changes into the Plan, like there is a lot of data out there that indicates a change will occur in a specific pattern or a certain trend. Things that will happen are like areas that are sensitive to change like permafrost areas changing, you know infrastructure would be at risk, and then changing water tables, and like lakes disappearing. I don't see any of this addressed in the Plan, and I'd like to ensure that all potential development has this readily available with their considerations. How does the Commission plan on addressing these deficiencies?

David L: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. Well, we, the Commission really appreciates the detailed engagement now. And I guess for the record, our consultation record is public. The Commission has over the years engaged NTI 47 times of which we've received 18 responses. So, we are looking the information from you, and your ideas and your solutions. We want to move forward and have active engagement. So, there has been a number of questions for information that have gone out there, and we still want to work collectively to move forward with that. We do have a call in to the Vatican by the way.

(Laughter)

Just kidding...on climate change. But you know, these are outstanding issues that we definitely need to have some resolution and some direction and some guidance from our partners. Thank you.

David L: Jason.

Jason: (*The following is translated*): I will speak in Inuktitut. When we are discussing this, we have submitted from QWB to be consulted with. The members have always hunted on the land and that was the animals – they're the ones with the expertise on day-to-day contact with land and

the animals. Therefore, even though...they say should be consulted as to how the wildlife has been affected by climate change. Thank you.

David L: Andrew.

Andrew: Just an observation is that there seems to be a lack of a venue, which this Technical Meeting I thought was going to be, where the bodies would get together and discuss all the ideas. Hash out the best-case scenario and presented it to the Commission. I know for climate change, it's been going on and on and on, and everybody's been working together, but nothing specific for this. And same with the GIS issues and other issues. And perhaps the Commission could come up with a way to, I guess, direct or collect you know. Like it's....if the broad issue was like, "Oh we're making a Nunavut Land Use Plan. Give us information." It needs to be a little more directed. I'd be more than happy to work with the Commission on identifying issues that we can work collectively with. There's lots of information available. It would be interesting to undertake I guess, for all the different sections of the Land Use Plan that haven't been discussed as a group.

David L: Alright, I'm going to call a halt to that conversation, at least in this room. If NTI and NPC can get together and work out a common agenda to address the issues of concern in a way that's productive and move the Plan forward then that would certainly be welcome by all parties. But I've heard enough about the consultation or lack thereof, the communication or lack thereof. I'd just...I would ask that we get back on track and talk about the technical details that we need to sort out. If you do have some communication challenges or information needs mutually, then I'd ask you to get together bilaterally and sort that out. Any other comments on the climate change issue, technical comments? Go ahead, Mishal.

Mishal: Mishal Naseer, NMRPC. As part of...I also I wear two hats. I'm also the Executive Director of the Nunavik Marine Region Impact Review Board, so I deal with the impact assessment of different projects that comes to Nunavik or may have an impact on the Nunavik marine region. I'm wondering, what kind of communication is there between the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the NPC with regard to projects, for example like Baffinland, where part of the project certificate requires some climate change modeling and other datasets that could be utilized within the Land Use Plan context? Thank you.

David L: Sharon, Tara? Either one of you want to take a shot at that?

Sharon: We're not going to comment right now. We'll ask Tara if she wants to. Thank you.

David L: Alright. Please Tara. Thanks.

Tara: Tara Arko, Nunavut Impact Review Board. At least you know I'll be brief. The NIRB's monitoring program long-term is meant to be an adaptive management plan where each year the Board goes through a monitoring cycle. So not only is the Nunavut Impact Review Board participating in some cases in some of these monitoring groups, or at least observing, but the Board provides a direct set of recommendations to the proponent and possibly other authorizing agencies or responsible authorities. And then responses are received or updates received to try and coordinate better or report better to what the Board had envisioned as a mitigation to an impact identified through the review process.

So all of that every year is made available, and the Planning Commission is very much a participating party on our distribution lists to keep up to date on the latest reports from the proponent, the recommendations made by the Board, and any other comments, submissions or discussions from a regulatory authority. Because again, it is not just the proponent that has responsibility under the NIRB's project certificate, but also certain regulatory authorities as well. So it's very much something part of public distribution every year to keep all parties updated, and all concerns entered onto the record and brought in front of the Board at least once a year. And from that, the Board will make a set of recommendations specific to the project and the activities that have gone on through the year.

David L: Thanks, Tara. Mishal?

Mishal: Thank you for that. Actually, my question was more specific to, I mean Baffinland has – I'm just using them as an example because they're here. They've been in operation for a bit. There must be datasets out there that they've collected, or when they were issued their project certificate they were asked to model certain aspects of, you know, for climate change or you know. Just within the specific requirements of their environmental impact statements, they were asked to complete a set of tasks, for example. Is this...and you said that this is communicated to other parties. But when you look at the – when I look at the Plan, it mentions that there's a limitation of data in the planning process under Section 1.4.5. I'm just going back to that, because it says that the NPC wants to set aside some funding to cover that. Wouldn't that also feed into it? Wouldn't that help maybe, like the gentleman from QIA said that there was datasets that were available or more readily accessible, that it would further kind of make this 2.3 more specific in terms of options that it recommends? So thank you.

Tara: Thank you for that clarification. The Nunavut Impact Review Board does focus the concerns of impact and monitoring on project-specific impacts. So in most cases, the data produced by proponents is a result of monitoring identified from specific concerns that come up through the review process. So most of that tends to be focused on monitoring for, say emissions related to shipping activities, that kind of thing.

However, the Nunavut Impact Review Board does also respect that there are other research projects ongoing that are intended to capture a broader picture, and in fact, some of our staff members do undertake specific after hour and separate projects as part of their education and learning, and they can work on committees to try and address some of those concerns. Again, where that is not infringing on the ability of the Board to monitor specific projects. So the Nunavut Impact Review Board is aware of some of that and can participate at certain levels, but the focus of the Nunavut Impact Review Board is really to identify project specific impacts and help ensure that the mitigation proposed in the review process is actually effective once the project is on the ground. Thank you.

David L: Any further follow-up on that by anybody? Any additional comments on climate change from a technical perspective? Alright then we're done for tonight. We'll start at 9:00 sharp tomorrow morning with chapter 3. So thank you very much for returning. I'm impressed with the turnout. And it's been a long day, so thank you for patience and indulgence as well.

**DAY 2:**  
**JUNE 24, 2015**

Sharon: Thanks for coming back. I know it was a long day but a very productive day yesterday. And today we're going to resume, and we're looking forward to another productive day. David and David, again this evening will advise us if we're on track for our evening sessions. This morning we have our Chair of the Commission with us to say opening remarks so I'm going to turn it over to our Chair, Mr. Hunter Tutu.

Hunter: Thanks Sharon and welcome everybody. Sorry I wasn't able to attend meet and greet or do opening comments yesterday, but my two kids are up and I just got back on Monday evening from Yellowknife. They came in on the Ottawa flight, so I had to rush to meet them. Hope you can...*(audio cut off briefly)*... through the participation and engagement from people like you at the table, and I'm very pleased to see that. I hope over yesterday and today and tomorrow that you guys have some very productive, respectful meetings. You know I made the commitment that we all need to work together. We're all together in this and we need to work together to move forward. I hope you guys have very productive, cooperative meetings over the next couple of days. I look forward to seeing the outcomes of this, and hopefully it will be just another huge step forward for the planning process, for the Draft Land Use Plan. Next steps we can try and get this done. But I appreciate everyone for showing up and taking the time to be here and for the input that we need in order to help make this Plan a reality. I appreciate that.

Sharon: Thank you, Hunter, and we'll turn it back over to the Davids and to Tommy for the opening prayer as well. Thank you.

Tommy: *(Opening Prayer)*

David L: Good morning everyone and thanks for coming back so promptly. We've had a few glitches with the audio system, so if it goes down again, you will notice and everything will go silent. It seems we had too many coffee pots plugged in to one circuit. So we'll try to get the coffee ready as soon as possible, and soon as I can I've got a little slide to show in that context. Well, let me just catch up to where we were yesterday. So we did complete yesterday's agenda almost on time, in fact a little bit ahead of time. Today I'm hoping we will be able to avoid working through the evening. We need to break a quarter to 5:00. The Planning Commission has meeting at 5:00. So, we'll see how far we get. I suspect we might be able to make some good progress today. So, I'll turn it over to David to briefly summarize last night's meeting, and then we'll move in to the review of Chapter 3.

David B: Thank you David and good morning. I thought before I did the summary of our discussions last night, I would make somewhat of an attempt for a little humor. I think David was saying if possible, and we were talking on Monday night about whether there are any planning jokes. It's not what you would think of first with planning, but what the heck. A lot of people are familiar with the NIMBY in the planning world: Not in My Back Yard, as a response to various development proposals. I saw another version of that, which was intriguing, and it was BANANA. BANANA refers to the response from some people perhaps in some situations: Build Absolutely Nothing Anytime Near Anything. So that's the BANANA syndrome. Hopefully that's not what

we're about here. Anyways, so that's my poor attempt at, come on...planning jokes, yeah? Keep looking.

*(Laughter)*

Anyways, just to summarize the last discussion we had yesterday evening, I just briefly...I just wanted to note a couple of things with respect to the conversation starting with polar bears. The denning areas – the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in particular was suggesting that the areas have a Protected Area designation as opposed to the current Special Management provision. There was discussion about the data, the currency of data available for polar bear denning. Both the GN and World Wildlife Fund noted there will be some further data provided as available and further comments, I believe, as well on the part of the WWF.

With respect to the walrus haul-outs areas, again the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board spoke about needing Protected Area designations or argued in favor of such. There was discussion about the impact of marine routes on walrus haul-out areas as well. With respect to polynyas under the general topic of the Ecological and Biological Significant Areas, there was agreement for a meeting of the minds and the data between the World Wildlife Fund and Baffinland with involving the Planning Commission staff, to sort out what the issues are with respect to the differing results and the use of differing datasets on polynyas.

With respect to the transboundary discussion, the Government of Nunavut was suggesting a wider application than the current language in the Plan with respect to potential impacts, both within the Settlement Area and outside. There was a suggestion by the Impact Review Board that the language and direction in the Plan be edited somewhat to clarify difference between screening and review to avoid confusion on that front. Finally, on the discussion with respect to climate change, I think the Planning Commission made it clear that they are open to engagement and discussion on concerns and how to potentially add substance to this important area of concern within the Settlement Area. So that's what I've got of the discussion.

David L: Thanks, David. So we'll turn it over to Jonathan again to go through the same sequence of briefing that we did yesterday: just a summary of what's in the section, a summary of comments received, and then we'll open it up for discussion around the table. So Jonathan go ahead, please.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. So we're starting off today in Section 3.1.1.1 – Parks Awaiting Full Establishment. We'll start off by noting, of course, that the Land Use Plan does not apply within established parks. So the current Draft Plan identifies Ukkusiksaliq National Park and Ward Hunt Island as areas that are awaiting full establishment as national parks. As well, the Plan identifies 4 territorial parks, again outside of municipal boundaries that are awaiting full establishment and assigns a Protected Area designation to those areas, which prohibits the common list of uses throughout the Plan.

The first thing to note is that Ukkusiksaliq has since been fully established, so that will need to be revised in the Land Use Plan to reflect it as an area where the Plan no longer applies. In addition, the GN has provided an updated list of territorial parks. Again, as we noted earlier, there was some confusion over the numbers and locations of these areas, and that was based

on the municipal boundary being Mixed Use. We can discuss that further. I think that's all I'd like to note on this topic at the time.

David L: Okay, thanks Jonathan. Any comments, concerns, observations on this one? Sure go ahead.

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Question regarding the Bluenose Lake area: I guess I'll start off with a pointed question. Is there a land withdrawal on Crown land for this specific park, or proposed park? Proposed?

David L: Jonathan?

Jon: Sorry, we can have this discussion, but I'd just like to note you've jumped ahead a section. We're on Parks Awaiting Full Establishment, and that's a proposed park. Can we finish this topic first?

Luigi: Sorry. I stand out.

David: Any comments on the section that we're dealing with right now? Yeah, Rosanne.

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne from the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. So there was an image that we were going to use along with this. It's question 29 in NTI's submission. It's about the parcels – the subsurface Inuit Owned Land parcels in Katannilik Park. Maybe I'll just explain the issue. We were going to have an image – sorry – on the screen here, but I think the projector went down.

David L: Let me...let me buy you a few seconds. I've got an image I'd like to put up. It's one of these I remind myself every morning about – where is it? There you go. As we're waiting for coffee, I apologize for any absent mindedness or short temper on my part. I ain't quite human just yet. (*Showed slide: "Instant Human, Just Add Coffee"*).

(Laughter)

So you can return control to NTI if you wouldn't mind, Peter. Thanks. That's my attempt at humor without coffee. Sorry Rosanne, go ahead.

Rosanne: No problem. I'll try and keep your attention without the coffee. So I'll just explain the situation I guess, because we do need to make slight change probably to our comment. So it's Comment #29 that was in NTI's submission. It was about Parks Awaiting Full Establishment for the Katannilik Territorial Park. This is why I wanted to show the map, because we dug a bit deeper into where the boundaries actually were, and there's an overlap between the proposed - or awaiting establishment, I guess - Katannilik Park and the Soper River Heritage Area. It's actually the Soper...the polygon for the Soper River Heritage Area that overlays with a subsurface Inuit Owned Land parcel. And I guess once we show you the map, the question I guess for the Planning Commission is if it purposefully went over that subsurface Inuit Owned Land parcel, which is that little square in the bottom there. So it's actually the Soper River Heritage River Management Area that overlays with that subsurface IOL, and that was destined for future kind

of development. So we would not want it within the Protected Area designation. So we just wanted to see if that was on purpose or if it just happened to overlay.

David L: Jonathan.

Jonathan: I guess it was done on purpose in that the designation for the Soper Heritage River was meant to apply to the watershed. We thank you for the comment regarding that IOL subsurface parcel, and that can be considered for revisions.

Rosanne: Just to add to that: that parcel is actually excluded from the territorial park, so it would, I guess, make sense if it was excluded from the Protected Area designation as well.

Jonathan: Thank you for the comment.

David L: Yeah...Jennifer?

Jennifer: Good morning. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. Our technical expert from Nunavut Parks would just like to add to that.

Vicki S: Good morning. My name is Vicki Sahanatien. I work with the Parks Department. Yeah, I didn't realize there was that sort of mapping overlap. I think that's something Parks should discuss with both QIA and also NPC, and I guess revise the boundaries perhaps of the heritage river or discuss whether, you know we need to...Heritage rivers do not preclude mining activity and that kind of thing, so to me it's sort of a mapping area issue as opposed to maybe a substantive issue.

David L: Alright, so I'll leave it to the three parties - or four parties perhaps - to sort out. It's pretty clear what the issue is. Sharon?

Sharon: We have a question on the IOL parcels that were selected. Do you have a consultation record with the...from the input of the communities? We have - maybe Brian can explain it a little more for me - but we have communities telling us different information, so we would like to have a complete record. If you do have the consultation record of how those parcels were selected and the community input, we would appreciate that. Brian, do you want to add anything further?

Brian: I'll attempt to make sense to what she's saying, requesting. You mentioned that certain parcels have been selected or set aside for mineral development. Is there any possible way we get records of those consultations you had with the communities that selected those parcels? We'd like to know how the RIAs and NTI have identified those to be set aside for mineral development.

David L: Just, just for clarification on my part, are you talking about all selected lands? Well at a first step, I would suggest that anything that was subsurface was intended for development, but I'll let NTI address that.

Naida: So yeah, it says in the submission that NTI and the RIAs have put forward that 4 subsurface parcels – and I believe this is a subsurface parcel that Rosanne has brought forward. Predominantly they were selected predominately for mineral development. There are a few exceptions, but as a rule, they were selected for mineral development. There are a few

exceptions, but as a rule, the subsurface parcels were collected – or chosen – for mineral developments. I believe Miguel Chenier can provide more information for that. On subsurface parcels, there is various processes that are happening within in the RIAs. Each RIA would have to have discussions with NPC on those. I think the focus would probably be on the parcels where there's designations and overlap, as opposed to trying to provide a whole report on IOL selection, if that makes sense.

David L: Can I suggest that work be done in concert with the working group that we talked about yesterday to address the incursions, and that as you go through those overlap issues, you clarify what the intent was for each parcel?

Bert: Thank you, David. Yeah, we had just a short discussion with some of the Planning Commission staff this morning, similar to the caribou - the idea or concept of having like a roundtable or some kind of session on the caribou protections measures. This is another possible one that now there are some details, and I know even with the Planning Commission's rules, we want to make sure we are doing everything in a transparent way. That was one of the things Jonathan and I were talking about. But that's something we can follow up on, to see if we can...those areas that have been identified can expedite the process by having that some type of roundtable or some type of process. The timing and logistics of that is another challenge, etc. but we will have further discussions on that and see what we can do.

David L: Okay, thanks Bert.

Bert: Rosanne wanted to add one more thing.

David L: Sure.

Rosanne: Sorry, I'll just add a bit based on what we've been doing on the surface IOL parcels. So there's kind of the original intent as to why the parcels were chosen at the beginning. But the documentation that we have is not black and white in the sense that we could kind of just hand it over so that this parcel equals this. That's kind of what we're trying to do now is as a long-term initiative, go back to the communities and restate what the purpose of those IOL parcels are. But that's kind a reason why QIA has offered to come with the Planning Commission if additional, kind of meetings or consultations are needed – is to clarify those purposes. And as Naida said, it would be easier to kind of identify the designation that needs to be addressed at this point, as opposed to I think identifying every IOL parcel in the region. So we were going at it from a kind of a land use planning vision in a sense: let's just identify where those problematic areas are and then kind of address those.

David L: Anything from the Planning Commission on this? Well, I guess from the perspective of moving ahead as quickly as possible, I think the group would appreciate some sense of when you guys can you get together and start working on this. By end of the meeting, if you would report back and lay out your timetable - that would be helpful.

Sharon: Thank you. We met this morning. Bert has to go back to his team, and I have to check our schedule, but we are looking for as quickly as possible, considering lots of our staff are off over the summer. So we're targeting hopefully the end of August. We just need to check with our

prospective groups, but there's a commitment that we will meet as quickly as we can to resolve these issues.

David L: Okay, any other comments? Vicki, did you have a comment?

Spencer: Sorry, was that...was that meeting Sharon that you just spoke about, was that the GIS meeting? Because I think.... No? Okay, thanks.

Vicki: Vicki here. Yeah, just a small comment. The Soper River Heritage Designation predates the Land Claim and even the territory, so that's why some of that map is out of date. So we will reconcile that with you.

David L: I need a little clarification and I think maybe Spencer does too on this - the GIS versus this most recent discussion. I was hoping that that could be all combined in one discussion.

Sharon: Thank you, David. So the Commission is committed to working collectively with the larger group on the GIS. The caribou workshop, I think there was consensus on that last night as well. And that's coming together. And then there are issues specific with NTI and the Commission that NTI and the Commission are going to sit down and seek resolution on.

David L: Can you share those issues with the rest of us?

Sharon: It's the issues that we've been discussing over the course of yesterday and getting some definitive direction from NTI on their submission and some clarification, what isn't sought here in this workshop.

David L: Bert, can you elaborate a little bit from the NTI perspective. I'd just, I'd really like everybody to understand what NTI and the Planning Commission are planning.

Bert: Thanks, David. As everyone can appreciate, a lot of these issues, there's a lot of history especially in a format like this. Sometimes there can be misunderstandings going back and forth on some of the issues. One of our big points, I guess what we've been stressing, is how to incorporate that consultation with the communities. We also recognize the challenges that are faced in doing that.

With the incursions or overlap on different things that NTI has recently done with their analysis, the Planning Commission has asked for, I guess more information or details or solutions, like how can these be fixed? So we're looking for solutions. How can we do this? We're not just here to complain and say, "This is wrong. This is wrong. This is wrong." We're coming to the table as much as possible to see how this can be addressed and what are areas...or potential solutions to it. The reason I mentioned in terms of process is we want to make sure there is that transparency, and everybody's aware of it. It's just unless we're planning to sit down for 10 days and evening sessions and go line by line, which happens with other processes and there is the ability to do sidebars and try to have the different parties resolve some of these things and then report back to the larger group so there is that transparency.

We're still trying to figure out that process from all the RIAs and NTI. Hopefully I'm okay in saying that we need to get that communication happening. But if we don't get into the details in

this larger group, we need some mechanism to do that. And that's why we've been asking about process and what's the appropriate way to do it, because we're not trying to circumvent any of the rules or procedures? We are trying to find solutions, but again based on the NTI resolution, we were given the task to work with the RIAs and address those, or identify those issues and concerns. So, we're not going to be doing our job if we're not meticulously going through point by point. No If is technical issues – and that as one of the reasons NTI asked for a Technical Meeting - we'd like to resolve those in this forum in a Technical Meeting as opposed to a public hearing where we have five delegates from each community; we have another 135 people in the room, and we're going through a long list of things.

So our goal is how can we work with the Planning Commission and other parties that may have interests in those different areas to identify our concerns? If there are things that can be resolved before the public hearing – and again, that's one of the reasons NTI has been asking for what would the report look like after this technical meeting. Or would there be...what would we be reviewing at the public hearing I guess? So anyways, we're sort of learning as we go a bit, as we work with the Planning Commission to go through this. Because this is first time everyone's going through this for a land use plan. And we're also sensitive that as we repeat some of the concerns, it can get a bit hard to take. I sense there was a bit of frustration at the end of the day yesterday, and we've had discussions about that, how to try to keep the process moving in a positive manner. But we do have to get our points out there on the table, so we're trying to do that as respectfully as possible.

And if there is opportunities to meet with the different groups – and I haven't had a chance to talk to the Government of Canada or to any of the other groups - a workshop on caribou was an approach that seemed to work. I think there's in a few other areas that possibility to try and resolve a number of the issues so that we are prepared for a final hearing. And it's something that the communities can comment on and be prepared for, and it's not NTI or the government departments or other agencies doing all the talking and the community members just sitting there. It's more of a chance or a process for them to participate in. So hopefully that explains the goal we're trying to reach.

David L: Yeah, and I appreciate that. I guess I'll echo what Sharon said yesterday morning. Ideally this is a plan that's everyone's plan. It's not the Planning Commission's plan. It is everyone in this room ideally would own this plan and support it fully at the end of the day. The only way you're going to get there, in my view, is by working together openly, transparently, constructively, and in a friendly and respectful fashion. But that means that everybody has to be engaged in that. When I – and this is just me sitting as the independent Chair – when I hear two parties saying, "We're going to go off and have a bilateral about process, the Government of Canada and GN among others, are kind of left wondering what's going on. That's not necessarily helpful. So I appreciate your clarification, and I'll look forward to whatever details you can provide later in the week. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you. And just to be clear, when we met in March with all the parties, the Commission offered to workshop individually with each of the parties so there is common understanding with their issues. So it's not a bilateral. We've offered the same for Canada, for NTI, for the GN, and we've come in and done presentations for some of the senior management in GN as well. So, we're being open and transparent. Our message is clear. We want to work collectively, and we want to resolve the issues. The ITPR was very clear about active engagement on all parties,

and recognizing that's where we're headed, and that's what the Commission's message is. We want to engage. We want to work collectively. We need active partnership to give us active feedback and constructive feedback, and definitive areas where we can make solutions and resolutions with that pertains to management areas in the Plan. So I hope that gives you clarity, so there is transparency in all our processes.

David L: Yep, works for me. Any comments on this process issue? Okay, let's get back to the technical. Any comments on the section we were dealing with? I think we're good. Okay, Jonathan, you want to move into the next section then?

Jonathan: Sorry, David, if I could just bring it back to the previous one for a discussion on the municipal boundaries being Mixed Use? It's not explicitly identified in the Plan. It has caused confusion, and I was wondering if I could just touch on that now in the context of all the discussions that are going to come. So we have designated areas within municipal boundaries Mixed Use. Again, that's not an explicit discussion that's in the document that people have provided feedback on. But I'm just wondering if there are any comments around the table with regards to that decision, in particular with territorial parks awaiting full establishment. Thinking about it, I can see the logic of identifying those within municipal boundaries, because the Land Use Plan will no longer apply once they are fully established. So there's logical benefit to identify them in the Land Use Plan. That's not what's done. I was just wondering if the GN, in particular, had any feedback on that.

Vicki: Thank you. Vicki with Parks speaking. Yes, there is great value, and we requested that in one of our comments: Comment 3-010 that all parks awaiting establishment would be zoned as Protected Areas. Some of the parks within the municipal boundaries are quite small, and there are campgrounds within the towns. But others are not so small, and they are for particular values that the communities have identified, cultural and also natural values.

In particular...well, an example is the park near Cambridge Bay, Ovayok, is quite large in size and has a lot of values. So it is important to use that designation of Protected Area. When it comes revising or creating the management plans for those parks, that's when we work with the communities to see what kinds of uses will be allowed in the different sectors of the park areas. It's important that we're able to go through that process with the communities and make those decisions. Thank you.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. Spencer was just asking a question to me if this was an appropriate time to bring something up. I had said 'no,' but perhaps it is.

Spencer: Yeah, I hope this is the right time, because it does touch on several of the Government of Canada's departments and concerns. So, it's in regards to notification zones. Specifically, Parks Canada is requesting a 50km buffer of a notification zone if things should occur, and then 25km around historic national sites. DND would like some notification. So I was just wondering what NPC's headspace is on how they would achieve that? Would they achieve that through...would it be hard written in the plan? Would it be some other process? I was just wondering what you were thinking.

David L: What ARE you thinking Jonathan?

*(Laughter)*

Jonathan: The thinking regarding notifications, especially in an explicitly geographically defined area is that it's sort of an administrative requirement that we would implement through the public registry that we'd mentioned yesterday. So in this case Parks could go into our public registry and identify the exact areas where they would like to receive notifications. They could specify the types of project proposals that they would like to receive notifications on. And as soon as the Commission received the applications and posted notice of a receipt, Parks Canada would get an email notifying them of the project proposal. And likewise anyone could do that.

Spencer: Thank you.

David L: Okay. Moving on.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David.

Jennifer: David? Hi. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. We would just like to request that in addition to National Parks and Parks Canada, that the Territorial Parks be notified, or make a verbal comment that Territorial Parks also be notified of development activities that are occurring within a zone close to those areas, in the same way that you described through the public registry process.

Jonathan: Sorry I might be a bit confused. Our intention was not to identify all of these different notification requirements that departments or members of the public would have. It's that we would encourage those types of notifications to be established by the organizations themselves. So if Parks, GN, Territorial Parks Division want to receive notifications 25km from a territorial park, they can set that up themselves through our public registry.

Jennifer: Thank you for clarifying.

David L: Okay, are we good. Peter?

Peter: Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission. In the GN submission comments 3-001, it's in about a half-dozen of the comments, I got the impression that NPC does not have the most recent geographic data on park boundaries or established parks in Nunavut data. Just a general comment that when park boundaries are changed or when proposed park boundaries are changed or if parks are established or anything, the geographic data should be sent to us so we can update our files.

Vicki: Yes, okay. We'll do that, but we have been doing that. We are not sure how the list was created, but we're keeping things up to date as much as possible.

David L: Alright. Good to go?

Jonathan: Thank you very much. Moving on to the Proposed Parks section, just a quick overview of what's in the Plan. It does identify the proposed park on Bathurst Island, Qausuittiq as a park proposal. I'll just note now that that is another area that there have been recent announcements where that is going to be an established park shortly. So, that would be anticipated to change to an

area where the Land Use Plan no longer applies. In support of that area, the Land Use Plan also identifies the adjacent area to the east as an important area for the survival of Peary caribou. Based on some recommendations it has included a Protected Area designation for that adjacent area as well.

The Plan also identifies the area in Bluenose Lake, which Luigi was mentioning earlier, as a proposed new national park, but the withdrawal has lapsed. That was our understanding when the Plan was drafted. We can certainly get some follow-up on that, but again, a Protected Area designation is assigned. The GN has identified last spring a park proposal near Clyde River that covers a significant area and identified that it had community and RIA support but is not yet finalized. There are still ongoing discussions. So again, the Plan assigns a Protected Area designation to manage the area in the interim.

Some of the comments - just quickly to overview – there is the issue of regarding Bluenose Lake that Luigi is seeking clarification on. The GN has identified additional territorial parks, and perhaps that in particular we do not have shape files for those as follow-up to Peter's. Those in particular we do not have. And I think that's all that I had to comment on now.

David L: Okay, thanks Jonathan. Luigi, did you want to follow-up on your earlier comment?

Luigi: Thank you. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you for the clarification about the land withdrawal no longer being in effect. This question was actually directed to the Government of Canada. If the land withdrawal – and my apologies, I must have had too much coffee this morning. It must have been the espresso. I'm not sure. So the...if there is no longer a land withdrawal, does that not indicate that Parks Canada...the concept of a proposed park is no longer valid for the Government of Canada, Parks Canada specifically? Question.

David L: Spencer?

Spencer: Thank you. Spencer Dewar. That's not necessarily true. I would have to consult with Parks to see what their intentions are. A land withdrawal expiring could simply be an administrative error or that there could be some issues or further things that need to be done before the Government of Canada feels that a further land withdrawal is warranted. I just texted the land manager to see what the status is on the land withdrawal. You know, paperwork might be in the process. I defer to the phone if Alaine Joseph from Parks Canada has called in, if he might have more insight on Parks intentions.

Alaine: *(On phone).* Good morning. *(Not on audio. The following is an approximation):* We will follow up on the land withdrawal on that area. Right now I have no information in front of me.

David L: Okay, thanks Alaine. And while the phone has my attention, is there anybody else on the phone now? I guess not. Thanks. Luigi.

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At times I feel like – Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I think this is my version of Groundhog's Day. Just for a little bit of history on this proposed park, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association was not opposed to it initially. Parks Canada approached KIA and asked for a 5-year period to study the proposed park, and we accepted. The study was to be concluded in that 5-year period. That 5-year period lapsed without any report to KIA. They came back - Parks Canada came back to KIA - and requested a 3-year extension. They did not

have the time to do it in those 5 years and asked for a 3-year extension. KIA kind of hem-hawed, and we accepted another 3-year extension.

Once those 3 years lapsed, Parks Canada came back to us a couple years ago asking for another 3-year extension. Well, if it is not a priority to undertake a study in an 8-year period, then KitIA cannot support the proposed project, and we withdrew our support. And to my understanding and all the phone calls that I've made to the Government of Canada, that land withdrawal has lapsed. It was in the Gazette, and it has lapsed, indicating that there is no intent to continue with that proposed park.

We stand firm that we would like to have that delineation - that designation - removed from the Land Use Plan. I don't know if there's any clearer message I can deliver. It was...this is something that my Board and president have messaged, they've asked me to pass on. As an aside - and it'll come up later - but this is an area that will not produce any kind of significant benefit to Kitikmeot Inuit, or as we see it. But there is the Qausuittuq River area. So I would encourage Parks Canada to enter into discussions with KIA, because that is an area of community interest where Inuit would like to see some kind of conservation area being established. Whether it ends up being a national park, I'm not sure. But please engage us in those discussions and please drop the Bluenose proposal.

David L: Any comment, Spencer?

Spencer: I think it's best Parks sees what their intentions are and listens to what the Kitikmeot Inuit Association has said. So, we'll respond in due course.

David L: And you'll advise the NPC of the outcome of those discussions?

Spencer: Yes.

David L: Okay. Luis?

Luis: Luis Manzo, Kivalliq Inuit Association. The actual Keewatin Land Use Plan is called for oil and gas and mineral assessment in any proposed future park in the Kivalliq. Ask NPC was to inquire to GN to provide a land use of the park. Does NPC have the mineral assessment in those parks that will be established? Because it's required, a minimum assessment before the park be established in order to assess the value of what we need to negotiate in the IIBA. We need to know what kind of value is that. And it's just fair for Inuit to know what the value is to establish some sort of IIBA statements. Thanks.

David L: Thanks Luis. I think GN wants to take a shot at that.

Jennifer: Our specialist from Nunavut Parks, Linda will be responding to that. Thank you.

David L: Linda, go ahead.

Linda: Thank you. Good morning. The process to establish a new park, a new territorial park, before we bring it to the GN, there is a preliminary mineral assessment that's done. It's mainly desktop

assessment. And for all the new parks, we have that process. We can provide the information for all the new parks.

Luis: Thank you. Appreciate if you could give us a digital copy.

David L: And does the NPC want to see the same information or is it irrelevant to your process? Brian?

Brian: Thank you, David. Brian Aglukark, Planning Commission. The current Plan does have a process in place with specific processes to ensure there's a proper consultation process within the region. In terms of the issue covered under this Plan, I think Jonathan can speak better to that. Thank you.

David L: Just to be clear, all I'm asking is whether you want to see the same information that Parks is going to provide or GN Parks is going to provide to Luis. Do you want to see it or no? That's all I'm asking

Jonathan: Yes.

David L: Alright, so GN if you can also provide that information to NPC, they would appreciate that. Any other comments? Yes, Rosanne.

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne from QIA: I have three shortish comments on this section. The first is with respect to the Peary caribou habitat adjacent to the Qausuittuq National Park, which I should announce I guess. As of yesterday at noon, it got royal assent, so we do have a new national park in Canada, which is the Qausuittuq located on Bathurst Island, north of Resolute. But in the Plan, #59 I believe, is also a protected area designation, which overlays with...on the far right that dashed area is Inuit Owned Land. Between the park and IOL is a Special Management Area for Peary caribou. We were going to pull up, but I think this image has all the information you need. So the area of concern for us is the Prohibited Area designation over the IOL parcel.

As I mentioned, there are some parcels that have records of why they were chosen. There were two reasons why this was chosen: for protection and potential development - cultural reasons and development. So what we said in our comment is that we would have to...there's no reflection in the Plan as to what the community intent for that parcel was, and if they wanted it under a full protection designation. So this is one of the areas where that we are recommending further kind of consultation with the community be done to determine the true kind of interests or objectives for that IOL parcel, and whether it should be included in the full Protected Area designation or not. I guess the Government of Canada also commented on this in that it should only be a Special Management Area, so it's another just comment to take into consideration I guess for that area. I have two other comments.

Spencer: Yeah, this is the Government of Canada's position that we....yeah, we don't want to see it as a Protected Area but a Special Management Area subject to further studies.

Jonathan: I raised this in the Chapter 1 discussion. I think this is the example where Canada has recommended that it be a Special Management Area, but the list of prohibited uses remain the same. I attempted to articulate during Chapter 1 that doesn't fit with the logic that the land use designations have been set up. So if it prohibits uses for the benefit of the environment and

cultural values, the Land Use Plan has called those Protected Areas. So we would just be changing the name of it, but the direction would remain the same.

David L: Thanks, Jonathan. Spencer, I guess Rosanne and then Jennifer. But are they on the same topic, or are you moving on? Jennifer was it on this? Yeah, go ahead then please.

Jennifer: Thank you, David. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. We would just like to comment on section or #59: It has been identified as an area that is important for Peary caribou. While there is a lack of data that identifies clearly where calving areas are, we do know that this is an important area for Peary caribou. And as more data becomes available, our recommendation that no industrial development on calving grounds would apply in this area. So, we would like to see it maintained as a Protected Area to reflect the important ecological value that it does have for Peary caribou. Thank you.

David L: Well, Jonathan, what's your thinking on this one?

Jonathan: I have no profound thoughts, except to encourage QIA and NTI to identify any specific values or concerns in regards to that parcel. When the Plan was revised, it was based on the recommendation I believe from Canada and possibly GN – I don't have the list of recommendations from last spring – but that there was some agreement established when the area was removed from the park to continue protecting the area until some future discussions took place. Again, I don't have the information in front of me, but if there is different direction or values that NTI and QIA have identified, we would welcome and consider those.

David L: Okay I would just suggest that maybe the parties that have expressed interest in various forms of designation for this area maybe get together and see if you can't sort it out and then advise the NPC accordingly. Peter?

Peter: Peter, Nunavut Planning Commission. In your O&R document, it is map 73, and we can use that as the start of our discussions. Thanks.

David L: Alright, so you ok to go to the next one, or do you want to revisit this one?

Rosanne: I just have one last comment, and then I can go on to the next. I agree that I'm willing to sit down with NTI and the Planning Commission to work on this. I think the point that we kind of keep trying to make is that the communities need to be involved in that discussion as well, and that there needs to be some form of discussion at that level as to what the intent of the IOL parcel is as well. So we are happy to sit down, but there might be an additional step that needs to happen as well.

David L: Okay, and I think that's probably part of what Bert was talking about earlier. Okay, so the next...sorry, Jonathan?

Jonathan: Sorry, just for clarification, I was trying to paraphrase something that was in my mind. It is actually written in the Options document, the recommendation. We had in the 2014 Options document it says Parks Canada Agency has advised that "the area east of the proposed Qausuittuq National Park boundary currently covered by a land withdrawal, should be protected from development as decided by the Senior MERA Committee in 2002 moratorium on mineral

exploration and development until the Peary caribou recover and/or their fate is otherwise determined." Sorry, there's a reference to a 2002 agreement, and we did not differentiate between the Crown land and IOL parcels but would welcome additional input.

David L: Okay. You okay with that? I'd just add from my own perspective – and I've been involved with the Senior MERA group for some time - that's a mineral and energy resource assessment. They can make recommendations but they're not necessarily binding on anybody, including in one particular case I remember in the Sahtu, on the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs himself. So, Rosanne, do you want to carry on?

Rosanne: Thank you. The next topic is Question 31 in NTI's submission, and it's about, Aggutinni the proposed territorial park. I just had a quick question or a quick comment: I guess that QIA is currently in consultations with Clyde River with respect to this park. We're working with the Government of Nunavut as well. The ongoing discussions are whether the Inuit Owned Land parcels would remain within the park boundaries or not. So, those conversations are ongoing. I can't guarantee or give you data as to when they would be completed, so the only thing I guess, is a way for the Plan to reflect whatever comes out within these negotiations or discussions with the Government of Nunavut, and if there would be a mechanism to incorporate into the Plan somehow.

I guess I'll just go on to the next one, because it's a very similar comment as well. Question #32 that we had in our submission – NTI's submission - was about the proposed national marine conservation area in Lancaster Sound. Conversations or discussions are ongoing amongst the steering committee, which is QIA, Parks Canada, and the Government of Nunavut with respect of the boundaries of the proposed area as well. And the question, I guess to the Planning Commission is whether the Plan would need to be amended if the boundary changes as is what is proposed currently, or if there is another mechanism to update the Plan based on kind of the final boundary that is determined after the feasibility study is completed? Once again, I can't...I don't know if the feasibility study would be completed before or after the Land Use Plan is. So I just wanted to get your feedback, I guess on a mechanism for that

David L.: Jonathan?

Jonathan: So if these boundaries are revised and agreed upon before the Plan is submitted for approval, we would receive that information and make changes to the document before it was submitted. If the Plan gets approved with the boundaries as currently drafted and they were later revised and agreed upon, I'd note that the Land Use Plan would no longer apply within the territorial park or the National Marine Conservation Area, so that would require a Plan amendment to remove those areas from the jurisdiction of the Plan. It would be a relatively straightforward amendment. The Plan would no longer apply, and we would update our Plan to show that.

David L: Thanks Jonathan. I suspect that you have a little bit of time to play with there.

Rosanne: Thank you. Sorry, I was...just to confirm, the Plan doesn't apply in territorial parks either in addition to national parks?

Jonathan: When fully established.

- Rosanne: Thank you.
- David L: Alright any comments? Anybody else? Luis.
- Luis: Luis Manzo. Just clarification for Proposed Establishment of Territorial Parks and uses of this of mineral assessment. The Keewatin Land Use Plan has called for full mineral assessment. It's no choice that they stopped. The assessment and probably (?) can give you those guidelines to the full mineral assessment in those areas. Because that's in the actual land use plan, that's why I was asking. Because when you're talking about the future exploration going to the park, you need to know which has potential that you could expect and with the flexibility of the zones. Because you are close to IOL in the Arviat area, and it's just the river could divide in between. And when you talk about zoning for future and you being advised in it, we need to have that mineral assessment those based on the actual Keewatin Land Use Plan. Thank you. Just for clarification with the assessment. Thanks.
- David L: Thanks, Luis. GN, do you want to respond to that? Yeah, go ahead.
- Linda: Linda Vaillacourt with Nunavut Parks: When I talked about the desktop assessment, it is in the feasibility study. And whatever the process that we're in, we're always consulting with the communities. We provide the desktop assessment in the preliminary...in the feasibility study. If the community agrees to – and the GN and the Regional Inuit Association – if they agree to move ahead to next step in the planning, then we go through the complete mineral assessment, and we always provide information to all the parties. Decisions are based on all the consultations.
- David L: Okay, Luis.
- Luis: Thank you very much for the information. Yes, who would require that, just to have a solid basis? We know this agreeing with park. We just try to make sure that the zoning is reasonably flexible enough. And it's not because I chose what is called by the Keewatin Land Use Plan but that you need to have those assessments than before the plan proposal is being established. Thank you.
- David L: Thanks, Luis. Anybody else have comments on this? GN?
- Linda: Just to clarify, these assessments are not done by the Department of Environment. They are done in consultation with the departments or specialists like the CNGO and ED&T, but it is part of the process of establishing a park.
- David L: Okay, thank you. Nobody else raising their hand? Okay, why don't we go on to the next section and then we'll break at 10:30 depending on how far we've gone.
- Jonathan: Alright. Thank you very much, David. The next section is Proposed National Marine Conservation Areas. As Rosanne was just mentioning, there is a project underway to establish a conservation area in the Lancaster Sound. The Draft Plan has incorporated the current proposed boundary for the study area, and we appreciate that discussions are ongoing regarding that boundary. It does designate the area as a Protected Area with some prohibited uses. I will note that I think this a particular example where there's a lot of the shoreline mapping slivers and

overlaps with different designations, given that it's a marine area in a lot of these mapping issues. Again, although it's called a Marine Conservation Area, I would note that once established, the Land Use Plan would no longer apply. But typically with all other conservation areas, the Plan does apply when they are established, such as Migratory Bird Sanctuaries etc. Thanks.

David L: Alright. Any comments from anyone? Going once, going twice. Alright, next section.

Jonathan: Moving along to 3.1.2 Conservation Areas: The first item is Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary, which was established to protect muskox in the '20s. The lands are withdrawn, and we've assigned a Protected Area designation that prohibits a number of uses. And I don't have notes of any questions in regards to this.

David L: And I see no indication of anybody adding to that. Alright, Jonathan you ready to move to the next one?

Jonathan: Thank you. The next section is Migratory Bird Sanctuaries. There are currently 8 established in Nunavut. The Draft Plan assigns a Protected Area designation to those areas, which prohibits incompatible uses and also implements setbacks in the same way that was done for the Key Migratory Bird Habitat that we discussed in Chapter 2. So they're the same discussions around those setbacks would apply here. I do have a note here just to clarify that the Chamber of Mines raised the issue that the Queen Maud Migratory Bird Sanctuary boundary is under review. They were questioning the status of that, and if we were aware of it. And we were just wondering if there is follow-up information around the table?

David L: Bruce, would you have anything to add there?

Bruce: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Bruce MacDonald with Canadian Wildlife Service. I guess I would look for more information on the questioning, because I'm unaware of the boundary being under review.

David L: Liz, do you have anything that you can add to that?

Liz: Good morning. Elizabeth Kingston, Chamber of Mines. I can repeat what's in our submission as the question if that would be helpful. Essentially, it's our understanding that the boundary - being the largest conservation area in Nunavut - is under review. There's a couple of web links that we've referred to in our submission. In our view, it has been made increasingly clear that a significant portion of the Queen Maud Sanctuary is actually not critical bird habitat, but there are areas of significant mineral potential in and around that area that could be investigated if the land was available to such activity. So we understood that Environment Canada was conducting this review, and we wanted to alert this or notify this to the NPC to get a better understanding of where the process was in terms of this review for their information.

David L: Okay, thanks Liz. So can I leave that to Government of Canada and Bruce to follow-up on and see what you can uncover?

Bruce: Yeah, I'll certainly follow up, Mr. Chairman. But like I said, from my perspective at this point, there is no boundary review that I'm aware of. But I will definitely double check and get back to the Commission. Thank you.

David L: Great. Thank you. That would be appreciated. Luigi?

Luigi: The Kitikmeot Inuit Association would like information on that. We have been questioning the extent of that bird sanctuary as well. It's quite a huge piece of land, so if you follow-up with the Chamber, can you also follow up with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association please?

Bruce: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, the information will be made available to whoever wants it.

David L: Yeah, I would if you send it to the NPC, they'll put it on the website and others can access it. That'd be helpful. Any other? Yeah, Naida.

Naida: Naida Gonzalz, NTI. We wanted to mention that we appreciate the Government of Canada's submission in this area where they acknowledge the IIBA for the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries, and that there were negotiations that took place over a long period of time that allowed Inuit access to parcels within the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries. The Government of Canada suggested a way to deal with that so the land use designation does not interfere with that.

NTI has a different proposal for a solution to that, and it's to take the approach that you find in the Sahtu Land Use Plan. Where there are legislated conservation areas that the existing legislation and regulations is what applies, and that you don't overlay another set of conditions with the Land Use Plan that would sometimes be conflicting. So we like the approach in the Sahtu Land Use Plan where the existing legislation and regulations is what applies, which I think makes it much clearer and less confusing.

David L: Yeah, Jonathan?

Jonathan: My first thought is that there has been some effort to buy the Government of Canada to translate the existing legislation – legislative Protected Areas – into language that the Commission can implement through its Land Use Plan. We are required to do a conformity determination on project proposals in those areas, and we would not have the ability to implement as written, that legislation. Just in terms of us reviewing the projects, if that was the case, we would not have much of a role there, I guess, just in terms of the way land use plans are implemented in the Nunavut Settlement Area compared to other jurisdictions.

David L: Well, in the case of the Sahtu – and again I've had some experience there – it's the dual designation issue that you're talking about. Yeah, and so just for simplicity and clarity, the decision was made that if a conservation area was identified in the Plan, then the rules that were in place to – if there were rules in place - for that conservation area were maintained, and that the Plan didn't add another layer of designation to it. It's just simplicity. Clarity. Any other comment on that?

Naida: Yeah, I would say that, just to respond to the translation that was provided. If the intention was to mirror the Migratory Bird Sanctuary prohibitions in the Land Use Plan, we don't believe that's

accurately reflected, that they are over and above what's in the legislation by far. And that's a concern.

David L: Okay, well we'll leave it with NPC and the others to sort out. Spencer, did you have a comment there?

Spencer: So – it's Spencer from the Government of Canada. So, NTI, you're proposing that you just leave it under the normal CWS, or whatever the prohibitions are, and NPC's providing some value added? I guess the Government of Canada is stuck in the middle. We just want to make sure that any IIBA is not affected by any additional measures that NPC proposes.

Naida: We're concerned that the value added is interfering with what's been negotiated in the IIBAs, and we'd like to see that resolved.

David L: Alright, so I guess we'll leave it at that. I'm sure we're not going to solve it today. But I think it warrants some follow-up discussion. Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you, David. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. We would just like to make a note or a comment for the record that in addition to the importance of this area as a Migratory Bird Sanctuary, there is also important calving grounds that exist for the Beverly and Ahiak herds within the Queen Maud Gulf Sanctuary. Thank you.

David L: Alright, is that it for this section? Any other comments? Alright, I'm going to declare a break. I need some coffee, and we'll get back at 25 to. Thanks very much.

## BREAK

David L: Okay, Jonathan if you wanted to get started.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. The next subject is National Wildlife Areas, very similar in the treatment to the Migratory Bird Sanctuaries in the Draft Plan. They are again established under the Canada Wildlife Act, and there are 5 of them within the Nunavut Settlement Area. And all five have been assigned Protected Area designation that prohibits incompatible uses and also establishes setbacks that was done in the same manner that was done for Migratory Bird Sanctuaries and Key Bird Habitat Sites. So those same themes apply, and I'll just open it up for comments.

David L: Any comments, concerns, observations? NTI?

Naida: Just spilled my tea everywhere, but...I'll just repeat the same concern as Migratory Bird Sanctuaries, and I won't repeat it again, and it is about the dual designations. So where there are dual designations, we are of the position that whatever exists in the legislation regulations is what should apply in those areas.

David L: Okay, NPC has that message. Any other comments, concerns regarding this particular section, subsection? Okay, Jonathan you want to go to the next, please?

Jonathan: The next topic is Historic Sites. I'll start by noting that land use plans prepared by the Commission do not apply within National Historic Sites that are administered by Parks Canada. At the time of the drafting of this Plan there were 12 National Historic Sites in the Settlement Area, none of which were administered by Parks Canada. Additionally, there were 4 territorial Historic Sites within the Settlement Area. All of these areas outside...sorry, those areas outside municipal boundaries – it's the same issue again – have been assigned Protected Area designation that prohibits incompatible uses.

Just note, Canada was concerned about which historic sites had been designated, and again to confirm, that was a municipal boundary being Mixed Use. I guess we'd be curious for specific feedback that they would be appropriate to designate within municipal boundaries. Also, as a note, the Erebus, which was recently found is in the process. It may already be done. Maybe Parks can update. But that's going to be or already is a National Historic Site that is administered by Parks Canada, so the Land Use Plan would not apply to that area. We would just await receipt of that information.

David L: Okay, thank you Jonathan. Spencer, did you have anything to add to what Jonathan has referred to in his comments?

Spencer: I think – Spencer Dewar, Government of Canada. I think we've seen that just 8 of the 12 historic sites were captured. We just want to have information on where to base the determination level of the level of protection given to the 12 sites. That's it.

David L: Alright, any other comments? Concerns? Okay, so we'll move into chapter 4 then I think. Is there more to do here?

Jonathan: Heritage Rivers is the final section of Chapter 3. There are currently 3 designated Canadian Heritage Rivers within the Settlement Area, and it's important to note that each of those areas has its own management plan. For the Thelon and the Kazan Heritage Rivers, the management plan focuses on a corridor extending 1 km from the riverbank. The management plan for the Soper River considers the entire watershed. There's a significant portion of that watershed, as we were noting earlier, is within the territorial park. In addition, that management plan has stronger language in regards to protecting the ecosystem and biophysical and cultural elements of the watershed as a whole.

Based on those different management plans, the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan assigns a Special Management Area to the Thelon and Kazan River corridors where direction is provided to regulatory authorities and cumulative impacts possibilities are identified, whereas with the Soper River watershed, it was assigned a Protected Area, which prohibits incompatible uses. And we have noted previously the concern with the IOL subsurface within the park but that has been captured by this watershed designation.

David L: Thanks Jonathan...Go ahead.

Jonathan: I'll just note as well that the GN has identified that the Coppermine Heritage River has been nominated, and it has been going through a process. It has encouraged the identification of the Coppermine River in the Plan as a Special Management Area. It wasn't, I guess clear exactly

what the Special Management would be and we were just looking for a bit of confirmation as to perhaps what that would look like.

We had a question from the Chamber of Mines confirming that mineral exploration development is permitted within Heritage Rivers. Sorry, do we have the table schedule, Table 1? To confirm, it's not...apologies. Mineral exploration and development is permitted in the Thelon and Kazan River corridors. And I was just asking if we could pull up the list of prohibited uses for the Soper Heritage River.

David L: Okay, in the meantime, Naida did you have a question?

Naida: Yeah, Naida Gonzalez. On the Thelon and Kazan, NTI and RIAs are in the middle of negotiations for an IIBA for Canadian Heritage Rivers. One of the issues with respect to the Thelon and the Kazan is how IOL's are going to be addressed within the IIBA. The negotiations have hit an impasse. It's the request of the Kivalliq Inuit Association that until those issues are resolved that the Special Management Area not be designated for the Thelon and the Kazan.

David L: Okay, and GN, were you going to respond to Jonathan's request there?

Jennifer: Yes, thank you David. Vicki will be responding to Jonathan's request about the Copper Mine Heritage River.

Vicki S: Thank you. Vicki Sahanatien, Nunavut Parks. So, again, it's a bit complicated because of what Naida just mentioned NTI. The IIBA negotiations are at an impasse. But we are starting to have discussions again about moving ahead with work, but we don't know the timeframe on that at all. In regards to the Coppermine and the designation there, the nomination document went to the committee that accepts those. It's a federal, provincial territorial committee. The nomination document was accepted. We proceeded to create a management plan. Actually, the work was done by Kugluktuk itself with the Inuit organizations and also with territorial and federal assistance. So there is a management plan, but at this point it's still a draft, again until the IIBA is concluded. I guess it's important to note that the designation for that other Coppermine was a community brought forth the idea to the territorial government and the federal government. So most heritage rivers are community driven, pretty well all of them. It's an important piece of work for Kugluktuk, but again, we're sort of sitting in stasis until that IIBA is completed. The important thing about heritage rivers is that there are values to be protected, and those values are enunciated through the management plans. For the most part, they would warrant at least Special Management Area protection. I guess what we can do is provide that draft plan to NPC. I, I guess I'm new with GN as well, so I'm not sure what documents were provided to you in the past. But we can provide that, and there's information there that would back up that kind of designation. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Vicki. Jonathan, anything?

Jonathan: Yeah, that would be appreciated. I'd just like to note that if there is any specific direction that the GN feels would be appropriate to incorporate into Land Use Plan, if that could be identified. That would be appreciated.

Vicki: Vicki, Nunavut Parks. Yes, we can do that. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Vicki. Luigi.

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. The comment that Naida stated that no Special Management Area be designated until such time as an IIBA is negotiated – is finalized – stands for the Kitikmeot Inuit Association as well. This is a plan that was led by Kugluktuk, and KIA certainly participated in it, but it does, it has a potential to impact IOL, and we do need to make sure that an IIBA is considered – is finalized – before we would consider it a management area or some kind of designation to be assessed. So at the present time, we do not wish to see a Special Management Area designated until IIBAs are done.

David L: Okay, that's pretty clear. Any other comments? Concerns? Yeah, Vicki.

Vicki: Thank you. Vicki Sahanatien, Parks. I understand the NTI and also the Kitikmeot Inuit Association's concerns on that having the rivers designated. I guess, it's unfortunate I suppose, because they are great values, and they are nationally recognized as well as within the territory, and not just for natural but for cultural values. I'm hoping there is some way if the designation does, I guess is removed, that there's some way to recognize those values in another fashion. The reason being is because the rivers that are nominated, if values are, I guess eroded, I guess it's possible for them to be delisted. So there are ramifications within that federal program. It's important somehow to recognize the national value of those heritage rivers within the Plan. I'm not sure, I guess, how we can, given the state of the IIBA lack of negotiations and also the positions that have been enunciated, which we were not aware of actually. So it's a bit of a surprise in terms of responding and thinking of alternates at this point. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Vicki. I guess the only recommendation I could make is you guys are here today. You might want to talk and see what you can do. Any other comments or concerns? I'm not sure I'm going to acknowledge that but yes, sure. Jonathan go ahead, and then Luis.

Jonathan: Sorry, I just wanted to follow-up. I was perhaps a bit inarticulate earlier when trying to address the question that the Chamber had posed to the Commission about confirming where mineral exploration and development was permitted or prohibited under the Draft Plan. We just wanted to reference Table 1 in the Plan where it's clear that for the Soper, a heritage river, it's proposed that there would be prohibited uses including mineral exploration and production. But for the Thelon and Kazan areas, there is just direction to the Water Board, in particular, to mitigate impacts on those heritage rivers for some specific activities. So within areas 88 and 89, the Thelon and Kazan Heritage Rivers, those uses would conform to the Draft Plan.

David L: Luis.

Luis: I just have a question for NPC. We know there is lack of negotiation with the rivers, but when at that point it's going to be passed soon – one year or two - what's the process to then incorporate some sort of a designation in those rivers? It's not clear to me in the future plan how will you incorporate it? There has to be an amendment in the Land Use Plan afterwards when we finish to negotiate with the GN or to incorporate designations or rivers or not?

Jonathan: Sorry, I'm a bit confused on the question. You're referring to if agreements are later reached regarding Canadian Heritage Rivers and there was at that time agreement to put some direction in the Nunavut Land Use Plan regarding those areas, what would be the process?

Luis: Correct.

Jonathan: Yes, so as we discussed with other issues throughout the meeting, if we receive additional information in advance of a plan being submitted for approval, we would consider it at that time. Following an eventual approval of the Plan, the Commission would consider a Plan amendment as requested or as well during a periodic review. And we'll discuss those types of functions during the discussion on Chapter 7.

David L: Thanks Jonathan. Yeah, Vicki.

Vicki: Vicki Sahanatien, Nunavut Parks. Just a very quick comment, just for the record and to clarify, I guess, responsibilities. For the negotiation of the IIBA for Heritage Rivers, the federal government is leading that negotiation, because it's a federal program. The GN is a party to that negotiation with NTI and the RIAs, I think. So, we're waiting. We're not trying to hold things up. Just to clarify that.

David L: Okay, thank you. I guess the same comment that I made earlier would hold though. The parties are here today. Maybe you can get together and see if you can accelerate something. Okay, I think we're done with Chapter 3. Are we? Great. Do you want to start Chapter 4 then, Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much. The first section of Chapter 4 deals with Community Areas of Interest through our consultations with communities on the Draft Plan. There was a great deal of areas identified for various importance. Those have been included in the Plan as a separate issue as Community Priorities and Values that we'll discuss next. But in some instances there was a good deal of consensus to the identification of an area repeatedly and vocally for some areas where there were no other designations in the Land Use Plan. So there are 6 areas that have been identified through community consultations. Again, they are outside of other areas that have been identified in the Plan, which have been assigned Protected Area designations that prohibit specific uses based on the feedback we received from the communities.

There have been some questions regarding those lists of prohibited uses, and in particular cruise ships and shipping noted as being prohibited in two particular areas and where that came from. And I think I mentioned yesterday that those specific uses were identified through community consultations as having concerns with those activities in these areas. With that, I'll open it up.

David L: Comments? Luigi.

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association speaking to the Hiukitak River. The Hiukitak River is an area that our Board – I believe it was 2007 - passed a resolution to explore potential conservation options for that area. It is the KIA that submitted that polygon. The polygon is a little bit larger than what may end up being the conservation area, but we're trying to estimate what the original intent was. We did make that submission. When the

submission was made, the KIA did not specify prohibitions and the prohibitions that Jonathan mentioned - the commercial shipping and the cruise ships. We don't quite see those being in line with the original intent of the submission. So from a KIA perspective, we would like for the Hiukitak River Area to have those removed as a prohibited use. Anyway, that's from our perspective. And just a follow-up on the Bluenose discussion, again, I would encourage the Government of Canada to withdraw its idea for a Bluenose... an extension to the Tuktut Nogait and rather focus on engaging the Kitikmeot Inuit Association on the Hiukitak River instead. So, Jonathan, I believe, does that answer your question in that specific regard, the prohibitions?

David L: Jonathan?

Jon: Thank you, Luigi. I just would like to note, it is important distinction that as you can see in Table 1, the Hiukitak does not have shipping and cruise ships listed as prohibited uses. Those were specific to Moffet Inlet and an area in Foxe Basin where that was the concern. With the Hiukitak River, we did not receive that feedback. So, the list of uses is consistent with other Protected Areas. We didn't receive specific direction, but we understood from KIA that, you know, mineral interests were not being granted in the area, and this would be consistent with that and would also apply to Crown land. It was viewed as supportive of the Kitikmeot Inuit Association direction.

David L: Luigi.

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My apologies for misinterpreting that table. When I originally assessed the protected...or looked at the prohibited uses, I thought that shipping was listed in there. So if mis...if that's a mistake on my part, I apologize.

David L: Okay, any other comments, concerns? Alright. Want to go on to the next one. Oh sorry, Jason.

Jason: Qujannamiik. Thank you Mr. Chairman. With the Foxe Basin Marine Area of Interest in Igloolik, is that the idea where Igloolik and Hall Beach were trying to develop a Marine Protected Area in working with DFO, or is that a whole different topic in the Draft? Can you clarify? Thank you.

David L: Jonathan, can you...

Jonathan: Thank you very much. My understanding, and I could be incorrect here, but I believe the shape file that's used for the Community Area of Interest in the Foxe Basin is a shape file that resulted from the DFO consultations on areas of concern. We heard those concerns repeated during our consultations. That area, I believe, has been used to define the area, so it does in part build on the consultations that took place with DFO.

David L: Jason, you okay?

Jason: Thank you. Thanks for the clarification, because in our submission, under this Igloolik along with Hall Beach were trying to establish a Marine Protected Area that was scrapped a few years back. When it was scrapped, Igloolik in 2008, agreed there would be ban in sport hunting and tourism of concerns with the walruses in the area. So they stopped for 2-year ban that...the decision was made locally to see if marine mammals would come back or return. So, that was locally. So

needed clarification if it was from that or the Marine Protected Area that was being proposed. Thank you.

David L: Jonathan.

Jonathan: Yeah, I'd just like to confirm that I've checked Table 6 in the Draft Land Use Plan, which identifies data sources. I'm not sure if everyone's aware of that, but it does reference the information we have used in terms of a geographic base. And that does reference that we have used the Marine Protected Area boundary that was being discussed with DFO that was supported by the community at the time. And a 1 km extension to that has been applied, again reflecting the general discussion that we had with communities about the importance of the area that DFO heard and we did as well.

David L: Alright, thank you. Any other comments before we move on to the next? Yeah, please.

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I'm just going to follow-up slightly on the question Jason just asked. Thank you for that clarification, Jonathan. I guess this chapter is interesting, because from the QWB perspective, this area has a lot of potential of growth, and a lot of potential for future generations of this Plan to really, to really benefit from community experience.

I guess I just want the official record to be said that in this region and no doubt for all the territory, each community has Community Areas of Interest that would fit the guidelines and the rationale for the list you have right now. So, maybe we will discuss this in the next section of the Plan, but it'll be interesting to see how this section gets developed, because all communities have areas in which they probably want to protect in similar manners as the ones highlighted in this Plan right now. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Spencer.

Spencer: Spencer Dewar from the Government of Canada. I just wanted to highlight that the Government of Canada's submission, it doesn't support prohibition on shipping in Moffet Inlet or Foxe Basin. We would like to discuss it further and see if maybe there is less a restrictive approach that can be investigated and applied?

David L: Okay, I invite you to discuss if further. Just to be clear, though that discussion would be a broad circle. Any other comments, concerns? Alright, so we'll move on from Community Areas of Interest to the next section then.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. So as we've already discussed, during community consultations, a large number of areas were identified for their importance to various goals, identified by communities. We've used those Community Priorities and Values throughout the Plan, as we've previously discussed. But this is the section of the Plan where we bundle up all the areas that were identified by communities. They've been, again, summarized in tables in the back of the Plan. We've provided direction to regulatory authorities to mitigate impacts on these Priorities and Values.

Again, I'd just like to note that a more helpful and informative version of that is envisioned to be implemented through an online system where a specific list of the exact comments that were provided for these areas would be provided for proponents and regulators. So the tables in the back are, again, just an attempt to summarize that volume of information. The Government of Canada wished to clarify that these do not form part of the conformity requirements of the Plan, and we do confirm that in the Draft Plan. It's direction to regulatory authorities, or information for decision makers. Canada has also suggested the GN has provided clarification that we'll need to consider all of those comments carefully. But it is correct that the Commission would not use these Priorities and Values to assess conformity for a given project proposal. Thank you.

David L: Thanks Jonathan. Any comments? Naida.

Naida: We'd like to commend NPC for collecting this information and see that it would be very valuable. We have concerns and understand the Government of Canada's position that it should not be an informed part of the conformity decision. We're not suggesting that it should. But there's concern that this information isn't going to be used as extensively as it could be. Possibly whether there's a way to ensure that proponents do use this information some way to require them to show that they have looked at it and reflected on the community Priorities, we're looking for something with more meat to how this is going to be implemented in the Land Use Plan.

David L: Jonathan, can you elaborate?

Jonathan: Yeah, I guess of course we would welcome suggestions as to how it could have more meat or effect or value in the Land Use Plan. That is, I guess part of a larger discussion on how the Plan functions with this direction to regulatory authorities concept. You've mentioned the idea of somehow requiring proponents to demonstrate consideration of these Priorities and Values. That's a common thread as well that we would welcome feedback on. It's not coming back to me exactly what other sections similar comments have been provided. But there is that theme of, "Is the Commission able to require information to be submitted that demonstrates consideration of any concern?" That's worthy of larger discussion and what the Commission's role in that would be. And we clearly would not be assessing whether or not the consideration is appropriate. It would almost be an information requirement under that concept that you've raised here. And I know throughout the document we received similar comments from different organizations. So, yeah, we appreciate any information that could be provided

David L: Yeah, Sharon.

Sharon: So just to be clear, we are looking at it. It's a complex issue. There's a number issues around it with the conformity process of imposing a 3<sup>rd</sup> party requirement on a proponent. So we are looking at it. We do need to have further discussions on it, and we don't want to make the process any more cumbersome, but we also hear what you're saying and concerns regarding the use of the information. So we are looking, and we will be looking for solutions to incorporate if it's possible. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. NIRB, do you have anything to add to this discussion?

Sophia: This is Sophia with the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Not at this time.

David L: Okay, I don't think there's anybody here from the Nunavut Water Board is there? No. Alright, well, it would be useful to get some engagement with the regulatory authorities on this particular question. I'm sure you've had some discussions already, but as folks have said, it keeps coming up and sooner or later it's going to have to be addressed in a way that works for everyone. Okay, any other comments? Yeah, please Jackie.

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Again to kind of follow-up on my previous comment, we at QWB see this section as again something that has a lot of potential for future growth. Regional Wildlife Organizations hold annual general meetings once a year, and within those meetings there's an opportunity for all our members – all the HTOs - to highlight concerns within community regarding wildlife and habitat. As you can appreciate, the issues that get raised can be really wide-ranging and impact all of our organizations in this room. So just based on that experience I can imagine someone like QWB being able to input into this Community Priorities and Values table or database or whatever it is yearly and formally. It will be interesting to see as that develops and as we develop our systems in which we can communicate more effectively, how it gets acted upon within the regulatory processes that we have. So that's I guess just a comment. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Jackie. Henry.

Henry: A mixed up person to see if he wants to speak in English or Inuktitut. Again, maybe I'll say it in Inuktitut instead. (*The following is translated*): All of us from the communities are...this is important to us, whether it's land or the sea. Those, the people, the local people use bodies, whether it's government. The people – the local people – has to be considered. I'm glad that you are discussing this matter. They have to be put into full consideration, the local people of what they find value. And for us the walrus hunting area or the one near Sanikiluaq, we go harvesting there. They are important to us communities. For example where I was born, my mother, she...it was a good place to live even though there was no trading place. Culturally, it was a great place to live at. My father used to reside down there on that island for 12 years. It is important for example. Those proponents if they are to disturb the wildlife, the wildlife will move on somewhere else. This has to be put into consideration what the local people value. They want it to be protected. I just wanted to repeat that. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Henry. Other comments, observations? Alright Jonathan, you want to proceed please?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. Just one final note that occurred to me as Henry was speaking: Just to note that these Community Priorities and Values are identified by community in this digital database, and it includes areas that were identified by people in Nunavik as well as incorporated information from the Denesuline in Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

The next section, 4.1.3, is Community Land Use. Now this is included as a separate section but it's similar to the previous one, except it relates to the use and occupancy information that the Commission has been collecting for a number of years. So this documents actual individual sites that have been used by Nunavummiut. The Draft Plan again assigns a Mixed Use designation as it were to all of these areas, but compiles all the information and would provide a direction to regulatory authorities, again to consider these recorded areas of use.

David L: Comments? Concerns? Okay, next.

Jonathan: 4.1.4 is Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy. There are I believe two separate areas in the Settlement Area, which are identified in the Land Claims Agreement as areas of equal use and occupancy between the Inuit of Nunavut and Nunavik. Within these areas there are jointly owned Inuit Owned Lands. During our community consultations, these areas were identified by residents of multiple communities in both Nunavut and Nunavik as important for a variety of cultural and environmental reasons. For this reason, the areas were assigned a Protected Area land use designation, which prohibits incompatible uses. I will note we received a submission from Makivik who is not here in the room. I'm not sure they've dialed in or not. They stated that they are concerned about this, and it may limit certain activities in the area. They are going to get back to us, and QIA has mentioned that there are ongoing discussions regarding those areas.

David L: Thanks, Jonathan. Is there anybody from Makivik on the phone? Henry?

Henry: (*The following is translated*): Yes I did. In Makivik – I'm not a delegate from Makivik, but on behalf of them, we go walrus hunting in the fall season in August, end of August. It is written that Nunavummiut and Nunavik equal use, because how we...how it be planned to use some of us, some hunters go harvesting walrus there. The communities...the locals go up to walrus hunting there, and they go to Sanikiluaq area to Sleeper Island. We appreciate this that there is a dual purpose. Walrus meat, to us, we use year-round as a staple diet. I just wanted to say, if there are any activities in these areas, we have to be know, we have to be informed of each other in the documents, how they have to be protected. Take into consideration that we do not want the animals to move from that area. They have to be protected in those areas. We appreciate that. I just wanted to say that.

David L: Thanks, Henry. Yeah, please Rosanne.

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne from QIA. I just wanted to add that I had a quick discussion with Makivik right before these meetings started, and we are going to look to continue to actually meet to perhaps submit a joint submission to the Planning Commission on those areas of joint occupancy. So, we will work with them and NTI to try and bring something forward on behalf of all the parties involved.

David L: Thank you. Yeah, Brian.

Brian: Thank you. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. Just for the record, Henry is here on behalf of the Makivik Regional Planning Commission, not for the Makivik Government itself, for clarity. Thank you.

David L: Thanks. Anybody else on this one? Okay, Jonathan, next section please.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. Section 4.1.5 – Denesuline Areas of Asserted Title Claim: There are currently areas of asserted title claim within the Nunavut Settlement Area, and negotiations are ongoing. In the Draft Plan it identifies certain areas that have been withdrawn from disposition and assigns those areas a Protected Area designation that prohibits a number of uses. The Denesuline have been in communication with us over the last six months or so and have identified significant concern that this designation impacts their negotiation processes.

In consideration of that, the Commission has issued a notation on February 5, 2015 regarding the area, and I think I'll just read the notation so everyone is aware. The notation reads: "The area of land withdrawn under order in council etc. will be considered and presented during the public hearing on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan as an area of Mixed Use. The area will be reevaluated in light of any representations that may be made during the public hearing. Following the public hearing, the Commission will revise the Draft Plan to reflect the most appropriate land use designation to manage the areas."

So there has been some commitment to consider the area as Mixed Use to give them some certainty in their ongoing negotiations. But of course, the Commission will continue to consider any other interests or values in the area that are identified in the remainder of the process. Thank you.

David L: Thanks. There's no one from the Denesuline in the audience here. Is there anybody on the phone representing Denesuline? No, I guess not. Oh, sorry Bert.

Bert: Thank you, David. Yeah, if I could just maybe give a brief update? I'm actually involved with part of the negotiating team that meet with the Dene, along with AANDC and the province of Manitoba. We were in Arviat last week to do a consultation with community. We met with the Hunters and Trappers Organization to give them an update, and we also held a public meeting. I had a chance to briefly speak with Brian at the Planning Commission office in Arviat and give a brief update.

There's still a confidentiality agreement around the negotiations, but in broad general terms, and just as an update – because this file has been going on for 15 years and people wonder is it ever going to end - they are very close. There's actually...it's within the federal system. So, as identified, there has been a land withdrawal. There's identification of what will be Manitoba Lands that are within Nunavut. I won't go into too much detail, but clearly that's why the letter from them, similar to what Inuit have with their Land Claim Agreement and trying to sort out how Inuit Owned Land would be managed. The Manitoba Dene will be going through a similar process.

Connected with those negotiations are South of 60 negotiations. Inuit are negotiating with the province of Manitoba for a land claim in Manitoba. It's mostly along the coastline, and again, those discussions are ongoing. One of the components not in the claim, but something the Manitoba government is looking at is a resource management board that would be in Manitoba. So it would be good to have coordination between that Board and Manitoba with the Planning Commission. I know that AANDC has approached the IPGs trying to figure out a date when they can provide an update to all of the IPGs, because in that area in the South Kivalliq, if it affects the Dene, it's envisioned that they would have a role or be involved with the IPGs - so not just the Planning Commission, but Water Board, Impact Review Board, Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. It's probably still a year or two, or perhaps more away, but there have been consultations with the communities, and it is coming close. So hopefully the Planning Commission will hear more official sort of updates. And again, this is just a broad general update that there has been significant progress, and things are coming close to an agreement.

David L: Thanks, Bert. That's helpful. Comments from anybody? Yeah.

Spencer: Spencer Dewar from the GoC. We support the Denesuline. We think it could be Mixed Use. We don't feel that prohibition is necessary. Thanks.

David L: Alright. Okay, Jonathan? And then the next section.

Jonathan: Thank you David. Yes, we had noted the Government of Canada's comment, and we appreciate the clarity of the submission. We also had a quick follow-up with the Government of Nunavut that suggested that we revise Schedule A to include...to reflect the full extent of the areas of interest. We'd just like to confirm – you made reference to colored dashed lines from Figure 1 in the Land Use Plan. Are you proposing that we simply illustrate that boundary on Schedule A for reference as it were?

Jennifer: Thank you Jonathan. And also thank you for providing clarification earlier on the notification that the NPC posted. I think that is not reflected in our comment, but yes, our department – one of our departments – had noticed a discrepancy in what their understanding was of the withdrawn lands and what was in the Plan. And so we're asking that it be updated to reflect, I guess the accurate boundary.

However, with respect to, I guess delisting the asserted title area to Mixed Use, the GN would just like to note that the Dene areas are also...they also overlap with important rutting areas for the Qamanirjuaq herd, and the GN would like to be consulted with respect to any change in the land use designation for this region.

David L: Thanks, Jennifer. Any comment?

Jonathan: Yeah, thank you. And I'd just like to clarify again, in the notation, it noted that, you know, the Commission will consider it Mixed Use for the purposes of that area, for those boundaries, but again would still consider any other values that are identified in the area, and consider those up until a public hearing.

David L: Alright, I sense a certain ebbing of energy in the room. We'll do one more section and then we'll break. And then we'll get back at 1:15, so hopefully a slightly longer lunch break than yesterday. Jonathan??

Jonathan: Thank you David. This might be a bit of a complex issue to knock off before lunch, but the first section of Territorial and Community Infrastructure relates to transportation infrastructure. The Draft Plan identifies I think two existing roads in the territory. We have received comments identifying additional existing roads, including Meliadine and Nanisivik. The Plan also identifies a number of proposed transportation corridors in the Settlement Area. In the Options document, there is a Mixed Use land use designation assigned to these areas, so there are no terms specifically attached to them. There are some acknowledged issues with this in that some of the proposed roads or corridors overlap with Protected Area where all-weather roads are prohibited. This is in conflict, which has been noted by several participants. There have been some suggestions to exempt the list...the areas that have been identified from the prohibition on all-weather roads. And I guess there have been a number of requests for clarification, and I'll guess I'll just hesitate from summarizing all of those and would allow the participants themselves to summarize.

David L: Alright. Luis.

Luis: Yeah, the post-corridors are before. Those corridors are before the designations have been granted by the NPC. There was consultation between government, especially the Government of Nunavut, Federal Government, Dene KIA. GN with understanding this will continue to be the corridor for the purpose of access for hydro generation and also transportation corridors. The map that you actually showed as the strategic planning for roads for GN is being also assessed by KIA in the feasibility study that we did for four years is being identified, is being consulted. Agreements have been reached at different tables for these to be the corridors at this point. That's calling an alignment corridor over post-corridor being selected. According to the Land Use Plan, we consult NPC on that. It's in the document, and we want it to continue to be a Mixed Use for the purpose of this Plan. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Luis. Naida?

Naida: I would...I would just add to what Luis had to say that particularly with the corridor from the Manitoba-to-Kivalliq, a lot of the work has stemmed from what exists in the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan. So there is a request to have some continuity between the land use plans and some consideration for that corridor, considering the work that has been done as a result of the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan.

David L: Okay. Jonathan...Spencer.

Spencer: I just wanted to touch on the marine shipping component of this section, and just say that the Government of Canada supports a land use plan – an approach to a land use plan that both respects Canada's international obligations and builds on Canada's domestic regime. If there's more questions on that, we have expertise from Transport Canada that can kind of explain what the role in what these obligations are. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Spencer. Anybody else for now? Yeah, please.

Oliver: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's Oliver Curran with Baffinland. I'd just like to clarify with the NPC with regards to the approved southern shipping route for year-round transport of iron ore to Hudson strait and Fox Basin. I just want to confirm that that will be adopted within this plan.

David L: Who...Sharon you want to take that?

Sharon: I think right now I'm going to defer the comment on it, Oliver. The Commission's not going to comment on that right now. Thank you.

David L: Alright, Oliver please.

Oliver: Thanks, Sharon. I guess I'm just following up from a previous meeting that we had at the Mining Symposium, I guess back in 2014 where you had indicated that this Land Use Plan would in fact adopt the southern shipping route through the Hudson Straight and Fox Basin, as approved by the NIRB. So, is there a change in thought there?

David L: Maybe I can, I can anticipate to some degree. I don't know what happened at Mining Symposium, but I do know that it's the Planning Commission that makes the final call on the Plan before it goes out for approval. Staff will advise the Commission. I don't think the staff here are in any position to say something will be in the plan. They'll hear from the folks and pass the messages along, but in the end it'll be the Commission that makes the decision. I think you might just want to have to accept that for now.

Oliver: Thank you, David.

David L: Henry, and then we'll take a break.

Henry: Okay, thank you. I know I can speak with Baffinland on the side, but for the record, we met with Baffinland before on this shipping route before for the agency going through Hudson Strait a couple years back. I thought that they had rerouted their shipping route through Northern Baffin. We never heard from you again or NPC on their shipping route, because we're concerned with the wildlife in Nottingham and Salisbury. These are our prime hunting areas for walrus. Not only that, but I know that when the beluga are wintering, they are right along the shipping route that Baffinland wanted to use, so maybe someone can get back with us on this - because wildlife is still our priority as Inuit people. Thank you.

David L: Okay, thanks Henry. And with that, I'll call a break. We will resume at 1:15, and if the Planning Commission has any response to your request, Henry, we will get to it then. Thank you.

## **LUNCH BREAK**

David L: Okay, we had a request from the Government of Nunavut – well Canada too, but the Government of Nunavut before we broke - to make a couple of points, and then the Government of Canada has offered to bring forward its Transport Canada experts to talk about shipping issues and so on if people have questions of them. So we'll kind of conclude the little bit of discussion that we left over just before lunch, and then we'll go to Transport Canada. Then people can feel to ask whatever questions they like, and then we'll get back to the more structured part of the agenda. So, Jennifer?

Jennifer: Thank you David. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. Yes, with respect to transportation infrastructure, the GN would just like to note for the record that, for instance in the case of the Nunavut –Manitoba transportation corridor that is proposed – and it is our understanding that there are other proposed routes, that the route may change with additional technical study and what have you. So just to state for the record that what's in the Plan could potentially change following, you know, further technical review with the agencies and bodies involved. That's all that we have to say on that point. Thanks.

But we would also like to perhaps raise to the group, discussions over lunch with other agencies and parties with respect to the caribou workshop. We would like to propose that perhaps at the end of the formal agenda, an additional item be added where we can have additional discussion regarding many of these sidebar workshops, particularly the caribou one, from our discussion of the group, to perhaps discuss expectations and outcomes that could come from this meeting. I

think it would be very helpful for those around the table to discuss that in more detail. Thank you.

David L: Sounds like a really good idea. Okay, Spencer do you want to introduce your guys?

Spencer: Transport Canada, please report to the main table.

*(Laughter)*

David L: Alright, before we do that, I forgot. Henry, we left the question unanswered.

Henry: Okay, thank you, Mr. Daniel L. That's what I think...Chair.

David L: You can call me whatever you like, Henry. I'll answer.

Henry: My friend, my buddy. Thank you. That question I asked was the shipping route. Because if I didn't ask it, and it's there, I would not feel good after a few years if I see walrus running away from the ships and the beluga running away from those ships with me having haven't said anything. I'm worried about that. Can somebody please say something to help me on this? Thank you.

David L: Thanks Henry. Well, we do have some help in that regard sitting now with the Government of Canada. Oliver?

Oliver: Thanks David. Oliver Curran with Baffinland. And thanks for those comments, Henry. So I'd just like to respond to Henry's comments, and I guess remind everyone here that the shipping route through Hudson Strait & Foxe Basin was part of a 4-year review period with a lot of consultation through the Nunavut Impact Review Board. The project has now been approved in our project certificate, and that shipping corridor is approved for transport of iron ore.

But, Henry, in response to your concerns, you may not know that as of the process, the NIRB directed our company to set up a marine environment working group, which includes all stakeholders, including Environment Canada. It includes Makivik, and the World Wildlife Fund, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the Government of Nunavut, among others. So as part of that Marine Environment Working Group, we have participation from Gregor Gilbert of Makivik who represents that agency. And so, he's a part of reviewing our environmental effects monitoring program for the project. In the even that shipping corridor at Hudson Strait is used, any of the environmental effects monitoring that's done as per our project certificate would involve review by Makivik. So I just wanted to put that on the record. Thank you.

David L: Alright, thanks. Henry, do you want to follow-up?

Henry: The reason why I ask was because nobody ever spoke to me about any kind of meetings on this. I'm sorry. Makivik never came to us to talk about this, and if they have come for you to talk about this, then maybe my question may not have been there. But if I don't know, if nobody has talked to me about this, I want to find some answers and maybe Mishal can help me as well. No? Okay, thank you. Just to let you know, as a person representing Nunavik Inuit, our concerns are much of wildlife mostly and the land, so if I don't ask questions like this, I would

not feel good. Let me know – let us know – the Nunavik Marine Region Planning Commission what you’re doing. If something happened, if one of your ships came over and spilled whatever, walrus or beluga area, what would happen? What would they do if something happens like this, I think some kind of spill or contaminant or whatever. That’s my concern. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Henry. I guess that just underscores the need for open inclusive communication and no assumptions, you know. You can assume that Makivik has contacted folks but that may not be the case. So I think what Henry is saying in this case is that maybe the two of you need to talk directly and maintain that conversation. Go ahead.

Oliver: Thanks David. Oliver Curran with Baffinland. So to be clear, obviously there are no shipping activities occurring right now along that corridor. I think that’s clear, and I think it’s clear there is open dialogue occurring in the Marine Environment Working Group where Makivik sits. And Makivik was also represented in the Nunavut Impact Review Board hearings on the southern shipping route. So all the concerns that Henry brings up are valid concerns, and they were talked to at length over a 4-year process. So I appreciate those concerns, and they are representing in the Marine Environment Working Group, should that project be developed. Thank you.

David L: Okay, Henry.

Henry: Thank you. There are some ships going along that route also halfway for Raglan Mines. Sometimes we have some things going on with them, but it’s the Impact Review Board who looks after these things. For me, it’s just if I don’t say these things, it’s not right for me as the Chairperson for Nunavik Marine Region to raise these questions, concerns. Thank you.

David L: Okay, thanks Henry. I think I’ll turn it over Transport Canada at the moment and we’ll see where that conversation leads us and then, as I said, get back to the agenda later. So could you guys introduce yourselves, and we’ll go from there? Thanks.

Dale Kirkland: Sure. Thanks David and thanks to NPC staff for giving us a few minutes to speak. My name is Dale Kirkland. I’m the Acting Regional Director for Programs for Transport Canada, and I’m based out of Edmonton. We thought following lunch, we would just take a few brief moments just to circle back to some of the points that were made on shipping. And following that, open up any questions or comments to perhaps my colleague and I on that issue.

So before doing so, briefly, as Transport Canada provided comments within the GoC submission related to marine shipping, and essentially those comments focus on input or marker down that there is a very robust domestic regime in place for marine shipping. And as well, we have a number of international obligations with respect to navigation and marine shipping. As well, Transport Canada has previously provided the NPC with information on the legal regime that governs shipping back in 2013 and 2014 for other processes.

This morning Spencer made a comment with respect to Foxe Basin and Moffett Inlet, and this arises from Transport Canada’s comments to the NPC that speak to prohibitions – proposed prohibitions - on shipping in Moffett Inlet and parts of Foxe Basin, which require further discussion. In response this morning, we heard that conversation needs to occur. We’re not quite sure where that conversation – or when – but nonetheless, we thought we’d sit here

today and maybe start to have that conversation here today if possible. So with that in mind – I appreciate the time - I'll pass the mike to my colleague to introduce himself and then David, I'm in your hands from there. Thanks. (Whispers): It doesn't reach very far, JD. I'm sorry. It goes the other way JD.

JD: Good afternoon. My name is Jaideep Johar. I'm Manager with the Marine Safety and Security, Transport Canada Office based out of Winnipeg. Further to the comments provided by Dale, and I would again like to emphasize the international and the domestic regulations that are in place for marine shipping occurring in the Arctic. In particular, in the Arctic, there are three main acts, which look after the operation requirements. One is the Canada Shipping Act. Second is the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, and states zero discharge is allowed in Arctic waters. The third is the Marine Liability Act.

The Canada Shipping Act governs all the marine activities. On top of it, we have Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, which clearly defines that there is zero discharge allowed in the Arctic waters. That means any vessel operating in the Arctic is not allowed to discharge anything with regards to oil and other domestic generated waste. This is a very important concept when we regulate and monitor the Act. We have a binding agreement with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea – UNCLOS - where the vessels have the right of innocent passage. However, these vessels are required to meet domestic requirements when they are entering our waters and they are navigating through our waters from east to west or wherever the destinations are.

I will just give you an overview of our activities to clarify what our role is and how we monitor these vessels. Any vessel that enters the Arctic zone is required to report to us their sail plan, their destination, and some of the requirements with regard to having insurance in place for navigating in Arctic waters. We review these plans, and if we find there is noncompliance, we direct the vessel, and sometimes we've taken action for vessels to go back and get the required documentation or required insurance policies for navigating in the Arctic.

Also to note that we monitor and look at the vessels operating in the Arctic by carrying out inspections and through our surveillance planes, which fly over the Arctic to find out if...in regards to pollution. There are regulatory requirements for vessels to navigate in the Arctic. Just for the information, the Arctic is divided into 16 shipping control zones. Zone 1 is the zone, which has the most difficult ice conditions, and the Zone 16 is the zone, which has, which doesn't have as severe ice conditions as the other zones. These zones are basically based on ice conditions. Vessels are required to be structurally built to go into these ice zones and into these areas. If you find that a vessel navigating in the zone is not complying with the regulatory requirement for construction, we prohibit the vessel, we give direction to the vessel either to take assistance from icebreaker, or wait for the ice conditions to improve, or take another route. In short, we would be pleased to continue to work with the NPC to support its Plan development. Additionally, we recommend that the Commission also engage us with other federal regulators and shipping industry to develop planning practices that are safe and ultimately responsible and practical. I would like to take any questions in this regard. As Dale also mentioned with our comments about restricting shipping in Foxe Basin and Moffet, we would really like to clarify why those restrictions are in place. Because prohibiting outright vessels may impact huge on communities, all the vessels that are in that region. Thank you.

David L: Thanks. I have a question right off the top. What's your oil spill response capacity, capability in the Foxe Basin? What oil response equipment have you readily available? Where would you draw it from in the unlikely event of a spill or an accident?

JD: Just for the record, oil spill response is the responsibility of the Canadian Coastguard. While I can't speak on behalf of them, but I can still provide you with information what's required from the regulatory part. Any vessel that's operating in Arctic is required to have a shipboard oil prevention plan. In case of the spill, they have to activate that plan, report the activities – those activities – to all to the federal agencies including Coastguard. The Coastguard become the on-scene commander and looks at the conditions and monitor the spill clean from the vessel. Canadian Coastguard will take the lead for the oil response if the proponent is unknown or unable to carry out the operations. But it is for the ship to make sure they have a shipboard oil pollution prevention plan, especially navigating in Arctic where the resources are scarce. So this is our recommendation, and this is our regulatory requirement to any proponent operating in the area, in the Arctic, to have a shipboard oil pollution prevention plan, which is approved by Transport Canada, which addresses the spills.

Also we have been working with some proponents where they demonstrated the extra step and they have gone to take some assistance from response organizations, like the one from UK or the one from South of 60. So, just to mention that we have this robust regulatory regime, and we monitor what plans the vessels have before they enter the Arctic. But with regards to how the spill response will be conducted, that's for the Coastguard to be able to answer that question.

David L: Okay, just a little bit of context for that question. I was the head of delegation for the Emergency Preparedness, Prevention and Response Working Group of for the Arctic Council and I worked a lot with the Coastguard folks. And I guess I can say that at that time, the resources available to Coastguard in the Arctic were limited. Reliance on the ship to be kind of a self-contained operation is kind of the default position, but I hope that Coastguard – and I'm sure they are - is looking at this and trying to beef up their response capability. Peter, you had a question?

Peter: Thanks. Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission. So I have a question about an interpretation, a WWF interpretation of the current regulatory structure in Northern Canada. The focus that I'm getting at is when Nunavut Planning Commission processes indicate that an area should not be accessed by ships, or certain ships or at certain times, is that enforceable under planning legislation or is that enforceable through other marine legislation? I'll now go into the source, and I'm hoping that our WWF member will be able to comment on that.

So the understanding that I have right now is that United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea established to be a framework for more detailed regional marine regulations. And I have a quote from WWF from Dr. Saxena who is a professional marine lawyer, from 2009, which says, I quote: "All enclosed or semi-enclosed ocean waters are governed by regional governance agreements developed under UNCLOS. WWF believes that such rules should be developed for the Arctic ocean - and in this case specifically the Arctic archipelago and related areas, Nunavut Settlement Area – re-propose combining key elements of the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment for the Northeast Atlantic, which is OSPAR, the Convention for Conservation for Marine Living Atlantic Resources (CCMLAR), and Regional Fisheries

Management Organization (RFMO), and International Maritime Organization (IMO) regulations and a binding enforceable structure."

Okay, this could get really legal really quickly, but really I'm focusing on when the communities say, "Please don't send cruise ships into within a 5km or 10km – or whatever range on Walrus Island – and the Plan says the cruise ship is prohibited, is that binding under the Plan or would we have to look at amending marine regulations or some other system? Thank you.

David L: Brandon, do you want to fill in some of the gaps as these guys caucus?

Brandon: Brandon from WWF Canada. I'm a little caught off guard with that comment in terms of ability to respond right now. I know it is one thing that we came here to learn more about in terms of the enforceability of the Plan in marine regions when it comes to shipping. I'd have to review our previous submission to comment fully, and I can follow up with that later. But it was a question I was about to ask the Transport Canada guys in terms of if the Plan came out, there are two small areas now where shipping is drafted to be prohibited. Would that have a legal basis under international laws? So I'm sorry I can't answer that, but it's something that we're trying to figure out too.

David L: Okay, thanks Brandon. Dale, JD?

JD: First of all, I would like to comment on what you have provided. Recently there were reviews of tanker safety in the Report North of 60 where there are recommendations North of 60 with regard to spills also. I believe the Government of Canada is working on those recommendations, which include spill response.

With regards to your question of Walrus Island, I just want to find out that when we look at the submission here we have for DNLUP Land Use Plan, there are some setbacks for marine shipping. We're talking about migratory birds. So what I would conclude is that there is a process. There are setbacks. My only caution is that if there is something that is required to be put for ships to be so many miles away from any island or any place, we need to be concerned with communities also, with industry also, to make sure that the alternate route is viable and it is safe. We have to look at a broader perspective. We don't want to also take the ship away from the normal route and have the ship go to the areas, which are unchartered. So, subject to safe navigation considerations, this can be worked with. Thank you.

David L: Okay, thanks J.D. Just as kind of a follow-up on that: Is that the Notice to Mariners approach? So it's not...I mean the captain always has the final say, right, in terms of safety of the ship and so on? So it's serious advice, but it's not a regulatory binding requirement? Okay. Other questions, comments? Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. I'd like to thank Transport Canada for sharing the regulatory regime in which they work. And I'm wondering if you can provide the Commission with any information or links to reports that would identify a contingency plan for oil spill cleanups under ice or in ice-condition water, if you could provide us with any insight or any linkage to information or reports. Thank you.

David L: JD?

JD: Transport Canada, JD here. I will surely look into some publications, which have come to our knowledge, and also the study that was taken by...undertaken by Tanker Safety experts, where they have specified some publications with regards to that. Also I will ask my Canadian Coastguard colleagues, because they are the organization responsible for looking at the spills, and I will get back to you on that.

David L: Thanks, JD. Barney?

Barney: Thank you, David. Barney Aagark, Mayor of Chesterfield Inlet. Coming from Chesterfield, we have a really busy shipping route right by Chester throughout the summer, right from ice breakup until ice freeze-up. During NPC's community consultation, I'm pretty sure this was brought up to the NPC about the shipping going by Chester almost daily. One of our main concerns was a bit of a follow-up of what David asked in the beginning about the emergency response. Our community's main concern is the inlet between Chester and Baker Lake. There are some very narrow gaps there. We've heard of some ships touching bottom, and we've heard of ships beaching. With that being said, an emergency response is something that we really want in Chester. Because our hunters are going to be more than willing to help voluntarily if something happens, because that's how much they care about our sea mammals around our area. I've been raising this concern for a number of years now, and I will continue to raise this concern until we see something happen. Because I don't think anytime soon the shipping will stop going by Chester, heading up to Baker Lake. That's all I wanted to say for now. Thanks David.

David L: Thanks, Barney. Yeah sure, David.

David B: I was just going to ask if you could clarify for the group. You referenced the international agreements for shipping. You mentioned the term the Right of Innocent Passage, I think. Could you maybe explain what that means?

JD: Basically what it means is that if a foreign vessel is coming to, let's say Canadian waters, or a Canadian vessel is going to some other waters, they have a Right of Innocent Passage. That means, we will not ask the vessel to stop or to come to our area if they meet the regulatory requirements. So basically that's what it means and entails.

David L: Alright, other questions, comments from anyone? Oh, there's one at the back. And Liz. If you could introduce yourself, that would be helpful.

Deborah: I'm Deborah (?). I live in Iqaluit. I have one question. Is there any legal...does Nunavut Government have any legal responsibility if there is an oil spill to clean up? And who has the legal responsibility to clean up oil spills anywhere in Nunavut? As you well know, Inuit are against contamination. We have already been contaminated by the Armed Forces. We don't need other countries doing that too. So what are...anybody here, can anybody here answer that?

David L: Thanks. JD or Dale, do you want to take that on? Then I'll turn to the GN.

JD: As I had mentioned earlier, it is the responsibility for the vessel to carry out the clean up operations. We make sure that the vessel is complying with all the regulatory requirements that are in place, including having plans on board and cleanup equipment on board. Also, when the vessels are discharging at a terminal, let's say, at an oil handling facility in Baker Lake, there is a regional requirement for the facilities to have oil and pollution emergency plans where they work with the vessel to make sure the spill is cleaned up. And also under the Under Marine Liability Act, there are provisions in place to compensate community if there is a spill from the vessel.

David L: Ok, so JD, in partial answer to the question, it's a federal responsibility effectively, and the GN has little or no direct responsibility for cleanup?

JD: Yes. If the spill is not land based then it's our responsibility.

David L: Okay, thanks.

Deborah: If the spill is land based, who is responsible?

JD: That would be the territorial and provincial governments and Environment Canada, depending on the spill.

Deborah: And to whoever is responsible- the Environmental Minister or whoever is responsible, who would notify...How would the process be, if say like God forbid, in Iqaluit there is an oil spill. Who would respond right now, because we have a very sensitive area, our fish, our seals, everything that we eat. They cannot survive an oil spill. It is very important for me as a Nunavummiut to know who responds and how it's cleaned up and how fast.

JD: I would like to add that there are regulatory requirements for any shipmaster or the oil handling facility to report to the Marine Safety and Security and inform the concerned parties if there is any spill. The Coastguard is the response...they are monitoring the response when there's a spill on board. I can't speak on behalf of spills from the land. Maybe I would ask our GN colleagues to speak on that.

Deborah: Thank you.

David L: Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you for your question. Unfortunately, we don't have the technical expert to use here to give a precise answer. However, what we can say is that there is a 24-hour spill response line. We also have spill response officers who would be the people responding to any kind of spill. However, if you would like more information, we can work with you later and get your contact information to provide a more precise answer with more information once when we've followed up with our department.

Deborah: Thank you very much for both of you partially answering it. But this 1-800 number, this is the first time I've heard of it. Have you broadcasted it or announced it publically, the number itself, to the HTA? The hunters know right away before any ship, so they would help you if you inform

them of the 1-800 number. I have confidence in all the community hunters and families. We have families here.

Jennifer: Thank you for your concern. Again, there's no technical expert here to answer that question. But it is my understanding that the information is available and has been posted publicly – the spill response line. But again, that is a good concern and thank you for sharing it. It's something we can take back and you know...to ensure that this number and this information is widely known throughout town and throughout the territory itself.

Deborah: Thank you for answering the question about the 1-800 number but I would like whoever's chairing or whoever is writing to say...make a recommendation or whatever a motion that the 1-800 has to be publicized. The more people Inuit know of this from their own community, they will call it. They're the first response team. They're on the ground. They're in the sea. So I would like that recommendation -that motion -to whoever is doing this. Thank you for your time and your patience, and thank you Chair for allowing me to question this.

David L: Thank you for raising your concerns. And we'll follow-up, GN will follow-up with you directly. This isn't a place for making motions and passing resolutions, but we've heard clearly your concerns. And I would suggest that they are shared widely. So thank you.

Deborah: Thank you, but I expect a response for that 1-800 number being made a motion – here, anywhere, whoever makes the motion.

David L: Well as I said, this is not a hearing or a council meeting to make motions. I think you'll find...excuse me. I think you'll find that if you go to the HTA, you'll find the 1-800 number posted on the bulletin board. And you'll find it on any website, and I think you'll find it in the telephone book as well under Emergency Response. There's an emergency spill line, as people have said, a 24-hour spill line. The information is available. The network is in place, and I would expect that the HTAs are part of that network.

Deborah: Thank you. I didn't know that all that information was available. Well that's what I was questioning. And, also I would like the manpower for whoever has to take it. There's lots of people here. There's lots of brains. You know, what's going to happen if there's a spill? Who's going to respond? I don't care who is responsible for paying it. We know the Federal Government eventually will, whoever spills the oil will. But somebody has to respond to an oil spill immediately.

DAVID L: I think we all agree on that too. And I thank you for your comments and your concerns. We'll have to move on now.

Deborah: Thank you.

David L: Are there any other questions of Transport Canada? Yeah, Liz?

Liz: Yes, thank you. My question is whether you could please clarify that Transport Canada does not support any prohibitions on shipping in the Land Use Plan, including seasonal restrictions? Thank you.

- David L: Thanks, Liz. Yeah, Spencer?
- Spencer: Sorry, since we're on the record – Spencer with the Government of Canada. I just wanted to clarify a few things. Responsibility for a spill rests with the proponent or whoever did the spill, right? So in the event someone does spill, we do have a 1-800 contingency line that's called up, and then that gets sent out to parities that are responsible for monitoring spills. On land – Crown land - Aboriginal Affairs is responsible. So, we enforce and monitor that the person who did the spill does the cleanup. We just wanted to make the clarification. I know that's how it's mostly handled. And further, the spill line number, which I texted to get it from the office – I don't know it off the top of my head; I don't spill much fuel - is in every permit that is issued to go on to Crown land. So anyone who is taking fuel into the territory or using it should know that this 1-800 number exists. Sorry. Thank you.
- David L: That's good. Thanks Spencer. Just to add to that, in the event that the individual organization that caused the spill is unable to clean up the spill, then government steps in and usually - well always – tries to recover those costs. But government is the backup in the case of the proponent being unable to clean up properly. Any other comments, concerns from folks? Questions? Liz?
- Liz: Yes, thank you. Elizabeth Kingston, Chamber of Mines. Would you like me to repeat my question? Thank you.
- JD: No, I'm fine. We do not support any outright prohibitions for shipping.
- David L: Okay, sorry I missed the absence of the response. Any other comments, questions? Alright, one of the dangling issues, I suppose, is the follow-up meeting that you're looking for. I think the best thing to do is simply to talk to the folks that you would like to include in the meeting and try to find an agreeable time. It probably won't happen around this table at this point, but during the coffee breaks or after the meeting, I'm sure you can find people and sort something out. Dale?
- Dale: Thanks, David. Dale Kirkland. JD and I will be here for the next few days, and during coffee breaks we would be more than willing to have conversations with folks. But I just want to get on the record that Transport Canada will not be creating some sort of working groups or a committee to discuss shipping issues. Thanks.
- David L: Alright, thank you. Shall we get back to where you left off, Jonathan? Alright.
- Jonathan: Thank you very much David. We left off on Section 4.2.2, Unincorporated Communities. The Draft Plan identifies two unique unincorporated communities of Bathurst Inlet and Umingmaktok that are not recognized by the government as municipalities, but are also not outpost camp. Recognizing the unique position that they're in, the Land Use Plan identifies a 2km buffer around the communities themselves and assigns a Protected Area designation that prohibits certain uses. I'll just note that the 2km buffer was taken from the Land Claims Agreement as the extent with which certain rights are available around outpost camps. We acknowledge they are not outpost camps, but that was the source of the 2km buffer that has been used. And I don't think there were any comments on these areas.
- David L: Any comments now? Luigi.

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. The 2km radius is acceptable to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. We did provide support for those communities to be listed in the Land Use Plan. It's a sensitive matter, and longstanding or longstanding denial of services to those communities, and that's something that the KIA and the GN and other agencies would probably have to get involved in with discussions, but we do appreciate those communities being listed in the Draft Land Use Plan.

David L: Thanks Luigi. Any other comments? Alright, Jonathan, next please.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. Moving on to Section 4.3, Alternative Energy Sources. The Plan identifies three sites for their hydroelectric generation opportunities. Two of these are in the Kivalliq region along the Thelon and Quoich Rivers. A third is identified here in Iqaluit near Jaynes Inlet. They're all are Special Management Area land use designations that prohibit other uses. I would note that in particular, the site along the Thelon River is not identified for its potential to be dammed or blocked. The area is unique in that it identifies a particular bend in the river where it would be suitable to use – I believe the phrase may be “run of the river” power generation to send a certain amount of water over a hill through a turbine and then deposit it back in the river on this unique site. So it identifies a 100m buffer around the area. The other two sites in the Plan there would be reservoirs, and the Plan identifies the footprint of what the reservoir would be.

I'd also like to note that there are some basically scale issues with Schedule A. That's been pointed out by some participants in that they're not visible. It's an oversight on our part by not labeling them as specific points with labels on them. They're there, and you see them in the digital data. It's just not visible on the scale, and they didn't get a label. But they are there, and we would revise the Plan to more clearly illustrate them.

David: Okay. Any comments, concerns? Yeah, Joanne. Rosanne. I need some more coffee.

*(Laughter)*

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne from the QIA. So I wanted to comment on the one site that is within our region- Jaynes Inlet. It's not....so this site was included in the previous review that NIRB did the screening and I guess the beginning of the review of this project. It's not clear to us at this moment if there's continued support from the community for that location at Jaynes Inlet. I also wanted to comment because I had a chance to flip through the Government of Canada's submission. They've suggested that Armshow also be included in that section. Based on the comments that QIA submitted to NIRB through that review, it was very clear that we did not support the Armshow location. And I can confirm that we continue not to support that location for hydroelectric potential. So I would....from our...I guess I don't know if it's a recommendation but to confirm the continued support on the Jaynes Inlet, and we support the fact that Armshow is not currently included in the Plan.

David L: Okay. Any other comments? Observations? Yeah, Luis.

Luis: Yes thank you, Mr. Chairman. Luis Manzo for Kivalliq Inuit Association. The recommendations or the provisions for 100m buffer in the Thelon. Without an existing IIBA, I don't know how you

can reference to 100m buffer as any specific activity use for it or you use the Thelon Management Plan to reference the 100mg buffer for each side of the river for the hydro-generation, so no activity.

Jon: Sorry, I'm not 100% sure on the question. But I'll just try and clarify that it's a 100m buffer from the specific location where the infrastructure would be located. It's a unique point along the river where there's a particular bend and a fall, perhaps or something. So it's a very localized site where the infrastructure could be located. So the Plan is attempting to manage the area in light of that very unique value and very confined location, which the turbine would need to be located.

Luis: Thanks for the clarification. I just wanted to make sure. Thanks.

David L: Thanks. Yeah, Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you David. Just going back to the Armshow South site that was mentioned by QIA, the GN did include a comment in our submission with respect to this site. While we do respect obviously the views of the QIA on this matter, we are seeking clarification in this particular example for Armshow South. It's a unique circumstance, in that it is located within a territorial park awaiting full establishment. However, the Armshow South site is in the process of being reviewed, which under the Plan, it's our understanding would qualify it for having existing rights. So I guess we're just seeking clarification from the NPC on how this be considered in the future...in the Plan? Thank you.

David L: Jonathan?

Jon: I guess to clarify, the intent of identifying these area is to manage them for that future use. So if they are on the ground, it's in review, and the project has been proposed and has proceeded along, then it would have existing rights, and there would not necessarily be a great benefit from the Land Use Plan as identifying it as a Special Management Area in order to ensure that value remains in place. If it's on the ground it would have existing rights, and there might be reduced value in including it in the Land Use Plan itself, regardless of the other considerations that it's a territorial park or QIA does not support it.

Jennifer: Thank you for your response. No further comments at this time on this. Thank you.

David L: Thanks Jennifer. Any other comments at this point? Okay, Jonathan. Next please.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. The next subject, 4.4.1 Community Drinking Water Supplies: The Draft Plan splits this into two distinctions sections: 4.4.1.1, which deals with drinking water supplies that are completely contained within municipal boundaries. Municipal boundaries in Nunavut are fairly large, and a number of communities draw their drinking water from small lakes that are entirely contained within the boundary of the municipality and are subject to municipal land use plans. So in the spirit of discussions that have previously taken place, those areas were assigned a Mixed Use designation and would be subject to the conditions of the community land use plan that applied for drinking water supplies.

David L: Comments? Yeah.

Naida: Naida Gonzalez. This is an area where NTI and the RIAs contracted a water quality expert to assist in developing the comments. The comments that we got back was that they had a concern that all the inputs in the watersheds hadn't been taken into consideration for the four that are not included as Special Management Areas. So those would be Gjoa Haven, Igloolik, Clyde River, and Iqaluit. And is it possible to get more information on how those watershed boundaries were delineated? I looked at Table 6, but it doesn't provide enough information to assist the contractor in this case to be able to do more of analysis.

Jon: Thank you, David. In terms of the criteria by which they were designated Special Management Area or not was done exclusively on the basis of the municipal boundary. So I don't have an access to the count of which ones fell in which category, but that is my understanding of how each were designated. We can look at that in more detail, if we'd like to look that up.

Regarding the specific issue of how they were delineated, that is an interesting story. We recognized early on in this development process that community drinking water supplies were an important aspect of land management in the territory. And we attempted to locate these areas, specific shape files, with which we could delineate them. We were unable to locate them from any organization. The Nunavut Water Board did not have delineations of the community drinking water supplies. Natural Resources Canada did not have them. Community and Government Services did not have them. We were not able to acquire them back in 2008, 2009.

At that time, our staff used – I can't reference the scale of mapping – but the best contour mapping and elevation models that we had, and digitized them in-house based on the contours and some truthing such as it was with Google Earth. We recognize the limitations of that, and if anyone has more precise information, it would be greatly appreciated. I know there are certain instances where there may be better mapping available, in particular within municipal boundaries. The current Draft identifies those as Mixed Use. But that is the source of generally all of the community drinking water supply watersheds, and I'll note that they were taken from the intake point. So if it was drawn from a particular river, the watershed is defined from where the intake point is along that river. If it's a lake, it's from the watershed of that particular lake. So again, that's what we're using, and if someone has more precise information, it would be welcomed.

David L: Thanks, Jonathan. Any follow-up?

Naida: I have a follow-up question. So just to understand, within municipal boundaries then, is it safe to say there is more confidence in the delineation of the community water source? Was there more information within municipal boundaries than in areas where the water source is outside the municipal boundary? I'm just trying to clarify where NPC most needs information. So I mean, we've looked at those four communities and have concerns that the watershed areas fall outside municipal boundaries, which is not indicated right now. But, generally, a review of all the watershed information would be useful.

David L: Jonathan?

Jonathan: In general I mentioned there would be benefit of reviewing the information that's being used. Sorry, I'd just like to clarify, you've identified four watersheds that fall outside municipal boundaries that have not been designated Special Management?

Naida: Yes, to be clear, that's what the technical reviewer on issue identified that the knowledge that they had that the watershed boundaries were larger than municipal boundaries and should have Special Management Area designations.

Jonathan: Sorry, I assume this is in the submission, but can you just mention the four communities if you have it in front of you?

Naida: It's Gjoa Haven, Iqaluit, Igloolik, and Clyde River.

Jonathan: Okay, I'll just note that Igloolik, their water supply is on an island, which is entirely a municipal boundary, so that one in particular. Yeah, our information is saying Gjoa Haven as well is within the municipal boundary so.... Sorry, Peter has just confirmed that according to what we have in the Land Use Plan, those drinking water supplies are entirely within the municipal boundary. So if the consultant you're speaking with has different versions of these drinking water supplies, that's obviously of great interest to us and all the participants.

Naida: We'll go back to them and....bring back to you whatever we have.

David L: That's great. Thank you. Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you David. Sharon from NPC. If NTI has any specific recommendations to improve the protection of the community water drinking sources, the Commission would also like to hear NTI's recommendations on that. Thank you.

David L: Okay. Thanks, Sharon. Any other comments? Yeah, Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you David. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. The GN included in our submission, a comment respecting community drinking water sources outside of municipal boundaries. We would like to note that these areas are extremely important for public health and for ensuring safe drinking water. We need to protect the sources. The Commission designates them as a Special Management Area. However, our recommendation is that perhaps – and I'm not sure if this is process question – perhaps it could be beefed up a little bit, so that, you know any proposal that is proposed a community drinking water source watershed would you know, be able to identify in their proposal....like just identify those facts in their proposal, their location within the watershed, potential impacts, mitigations measures, just that kind of thing to beef up that recommendation for community water sources outside municipal boundaries. Thank you.

David L: Jonathan?

Jon: Yeah, thank you, Jennifer. This is an example that was popping in my mind in previous discussions about this idea of can the Commission require or encourage or do something to encourage proponents to submit information in advance of a conformity determination. So it came up with community consultations, I think in a similar vein with the QIA's proposal to have certain events take place and be submitted. It is a bit of a procedural nature. There are other

ones that I'm again forgetting, but that type of management in the Plan is something that we have questions about our authority to do so -like if we are able to, you know request a proponent to identify mitigation measures or whatever the language would be to address impacts on community drinking water supplies. We would be unable to be in a position to the validity of those measures. But I think the point is being raised that there could be some requirement to submit them, and we have questions about our ability and value of doing that.

And also, sorry, we've segued into second part of this section on drinking water supplies. And Peter has just reminded me to reiterate what the Plan does recommend in this section. So we do apply direction to regulatory authorities to the Nunavut Water Board to mitigate impacts on the drinking water supply, and also identify the area as concern in regards to cumulative impacts. We consider this to be a strong example of a geographic area that there could be cumulative impacts concerns where below-threshold projects could be referred to the Impact Review Board for consideration as well, that being framed in the context of the recommendation that the GN is proposing that there could be almost an informational requirement that the proponent would submit – almost a description of making explicit reference to what they're doing in consideration of the value of the area.

David L: Okay, Jennifer?

Jennifer: Thank you, Jonathan. I'll just follow-up. Thank you for that. I understand, of course, this is something that you – the NPC will need to discuss further and determine, yeah, what your authority might be in this particular circumstance. As with the other examples that were raised by other parties, we appreciate that and look forward to the NPC's recommendation. Thank you.

David L: Thanks Jennifer. Any other questions, concerns, observations here? Okay next section.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. We now start into a bunch of sections that have a lot to do with-sorry, apologies. We're now on Land Remediation, Section 4.4.2. This section identifies several DEW line sites that are in various stages of remediation and assigns a Special Management Area that prohibits a large number of uses. I don't have any specific notes in this particular case. But I'll just stop and see if there's something that anyone wanted to flag.

David L: Anything? Apparently not. Jonathan, carry on.

Jon: Thank you very much, David. Section 4.4.3 segues into Contaminated Sites. Now in this case, Aboriginal Affairs maintains a list of Northern contaminated sites programs, sites that have – maybe I shouldn't paraphrase what the list is and who is responsible for what. But in any event, Aboriginal Affairs has identified 14 sites within that list that they administer where they are a concern for public health and safety. The list is extensive, but 14 sites have been identified. And a Special Management Area has been assigned that prohibits additional uses.

Canada did provide some comments on this, identifying that as sites are remediated, they would be open to future uses, and there would only be a certain subset of uses that would...that should remain restricted. I was just a bit confused as to how that subset of uses could possibly be incorporated into the Land Use Plan given the timing of where these sites are in their remediation plan.

David L: Spencer?

Spencer: Thank you. This is Spencer on behalf of the Government of Canada. Our Contaminated Sites Program has an open use of land. So I think at the heart, what we're trying to do, as remediated sites become remediated, we want to open up as much land as possible for future use. So, arguably we just wanted to delineate maybe smaller pockets where landfills may exist, where they shouldn't be used. So I think that's our intention. So as sites become remediated, we'd have to work with the Commission to let them know, so they could change the Schedules at the back to you know, reflect the situation on the ground.

Jon: I'm sorry, just to further clarify: The sites that have been identified – those 14 - are not at such a stage where the smaller subset of uses, like drilling over a landfill site for example – they're not at a sufficient stage where the smaller subset of prohibited use is appropriate. These 14 still require more general prohibitions, but sometime in the future, as they are remediated, those prohibitions could be relaxed

Spencer: That's my understanding. Although, where's the 14? I just don't have it. It's probably not appropriate to go through them one by one right now, but I do believe what we're pitching right now....right...yeah, so those would stay as is for future open land uses, remediation concludes.

David L: Okay. Jonathan then Peter or Peter then Jonathan. Peter then Jonathan.

Peter: Thanks, Spencer. Can you summarize the prioritization system that the Government of Canada uses for deciding what order to spend to clean up the contaminated sites?

Spencer: We certainly have a program, and you know, there's federal money to fix that program, that is dedicated to it. So there's a....I do believe it's a national program, if not northern, pan-northern program, and it does have priorities. I can share this information on how they're prioritized. I think that would be best than speak to it. It's quite a complex undertaking, but very thorough.

David L: Jonathan, did you have a follow-up there?

Jonathan: No, that's clarified the point for me. I was just thanking Spencer.

David L: I could use a point of clarification, and it probably shows how long I've been out of the picture on this, but what about the DND sites?

Spencer: Yeah, when the DEW line sites closed down, AANDC or INAC took some responsibility for some, and DND retained responsibility for others. To speak specifically to the DND ones, it would probably be best to call on Dwayne James maybe to talk about them?

David L: Come on up, Dwayne.

Jonathan: While Mr. James is coming up, I'd just like to note that this list of 14 includes several former DEW line sites, and the other sites are addressed in other areas.

David L: Okay, it wasn't real clear to me. It looked like it was all AANDC sites. Dwayne? Thanks.

Dwayne: Thanks, David. Dwayne James with the Department of National Defense. So the Department of National Defense shares the responsibility of the DEW line clean up. Half the projects, or half the sites are with AANDC and half with the Department of National Defense. Those sites are currently in the environmental remediation phases and monitoring phases. And I guess similarly to AANDC's point, we would be looking to have restricted access as well because of the sites that are being remediated or cleaned up and monitored.

David L: Okay, and so is that...I guess what I'm really looking for is I don't see any reference to the DND sites in this particular section. I wonder if I'm missing something.

Dwayne: Yeah, Dwayne James, Department of National Defense. I believe our sites are covered off in the next section under 4.5. It goes through the various DEW line and North Warning System sites.

David L: Okay, thanks very much. Just another historical note: I was involved in the remediation of Resolution Island, which was quite a project. I haven't been back there since, but I think it's relatively clean now. I was also, way back when, involved in offshore research, and one of our ships sank in the harbor at Resolution Island, the MV Minna. I suspect it's still there in one form or another.

Dwayne: And I do believe Resolution Island was the first part 5 review under NIRB as well - another historical milestone.

David L: And I had the pleasure of being the Government of Canada's lead on that NIRB review and the water board part of it too.

Dwayne: We had cake when it was remediated.

*(Laughter)*

David L: Alright, enough history. Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. We'll now move on to Section 4.5. The first subsection in here deals with Department of National Defense Establishments. In this case, these are not the DEW line or the North Warning System sites. These are additional areas like Alert, Eureka, Nanisivik, a number of high Arctic data communication system microwave repeaters, basically a number of different National Defense sites. The Draft Plan proposes they be designated Special Management Area and prohibits other uses. There is a point of clarification. National Defense has written a letter stating that these access restrictions may not be appropriate. This is a change from previous draft and previous correspondence. They have reiterated an earlier concern regarding notifications and that type of requirement. I guess staff are just looking for a bit of clarification or elaboration on what exactly is being proposed at this time for these establishments.

David L: Dwayne?

Dwayne: Yeah, thank you, David. Dwayne James, Department of National Defense. I believe we also have Greg Matthews from Department of National Defense who is likely on the phone right now. So, Greg you can chime in if there's anything here that you need clarified as well. So the intent, I know from the definitions of the Special Management Area –it was a bit concerning for the Department of National Defense.

We have some areas where obviously there are some restrictions that are required. There are some restrictions related to various developments. The letter that was written by the Department of National Defense to the NPC intended to clarify some of those setback requirements, specifically for random setbacks, establishing a zone to minimize the impact of electromagnetic interference on its facilities. Setback around the radar towers has been set at a distance of 8km. Also within that, there were some aerodrome safety zones established around DND airfields and landing pads to ensure continued safe operation of aircraft. And the rate I have, been set at 4km, 2.5km, and 1km intervals, applicable to the runway, helipads and refueling points, respectively. So DND, I guess is in agreement to redefine those lands currently termed SMAs in order to displace some of those restrictions. However, what we do require is that the above zones remain in effect and remain part of the Land Use Plan. Thank you.

David L: Jonathan?

Jonathan: Alright, thank you very much. I guess we'd just like to confirm: those values that you've spoken about with electromagnetic interference on particular infrastructure had previously been identified, and the result of years of discussions were the Special Management Area designations as proposed, which outright prohibited generally all other uses within these areas. We appreciate that the concern in these cases in regards to aerodrome safety and electromagnetic interference. If we are to remove the prohibitions that are in the Plan, are there specific...thank you yeah. So the Plan does prohibit all uses except Government of Canada activities. Recognizing that the concern is perhaps more specific, and this may have been an overgeneralization, is there...is National Defense particular uses that should be setback from these areas or are all uses required to be setback from these locations? If that's so, would that effectively be the designations as they are?

Dwayne: Thank you, David. Dwayne, Department of National Defense. I guess the intent was to ensure development in the area does not negatively affect the function of the radar insulations and the movement of aircraft traffic to and from the sites. There's no intent to restrict Inuit access to the area for hunting and harvesting. Again, the intent was to ensure that ongoing operations are not impacted, and access remains unimpeded to the sites. Thank you.

David L: Great. Thanks, Dwayne. Anything, Jonathan?

Jonathan: Yeah, I guess we can carry on the conversation, perhaps. This is maybe not the best forum to do it here, but yeah, I'm still not entirely clear as to what the Plan would be revised to include to address the concerns that have been identified. But that might be best addressed in a side conversation.

One other comment that I just wanted to note in the submission, I believe the same letter. It references concerns over a seismic research facility in Cambridge Bay, and its absence from the Draft Land Use Plan. Again, like a broken record, that is a result of these municipal boundaries

being designated Mixed Use across the board. So the seismic research facility is in – or primarily within - the Cambridge Bay Municipal Boundary, so it's not identified.

David L: Okay. Comments from anyone else? Yeah?

Naida: So we had a few questions related to this. Just to follow-up on the last comment: It wasn't clear to us in the letter whether that seismic facility – the 1968 agreement - whether it all falls within municipal boundaries, or can we expect that there's going to be a new additional site in the Land Use Plan based on that comment by DND in the letter? I'm not sure. DND suggests that there is something absent from the Plan. You're saying that it's all within municipal boundaries. I'm just trying to clarify – is it all within municipal boundaries, or does some of it fall outside?

Jonathan: We'll just bring up the area on the map here for reference. But I know there's a large polygon submitted in the area around Cambridge Bay. I guess I won't wait on memory. We'll just bring this up here. Yes, that large rectangular area. That has been clipped to the Cambridge Bay Municipal Boundary. I'm not 100% clear on if that very large footprint represents the extent of seismic activity monitoring or if it is within the Settlement...the municipal boundary. Does DND have any clarification on that?

David L: Dwayne?

Dwayne. Yeah, hi. Dwayne James, Department of National Defense. I'm not exactly certain whether or not that's the full extent. What I do know from the information I have: The area is 400 square miles. And I'd have to go back to some of the records in order to really validate the polygon that's in front of us and whether or not that's the full area. Thank you.

David L: Well I guess that's the request for clarification. Yeah go ahead.

Matthews: (*Phone. Audio was turned off. The following is an approximation*): It is the full extent for the 1968 agreement. There are numerous overlaps to be recognized.

David L: Okay, thank you. So we'll get some clarification on the extent of the seismic array inside and outside the municipal boundaries. Miguel?

Miguel: I guess I'm just a little bit confused. I mean that hexagonal shape that we're talking about is the municipal boundary, but the big square area is the seismic array.

Matthews: (*Audio marginally audible. The following are bits and pieces*): Again that is the facility....it's a smaller facility...in Cambridge Bay... three parcels controlled by the Department of National Defense. That operation, the seismic array is actually...beyond that...

David L: Okay, bottom line is we need a good map. Sharon?

Sharon: Well we need clarity around it too, so it's definitive.

David L: Alright, so that'll be the DND and Planning Commission getting together and sorting this out. Okay. And that, of course, will be posted on the website.

Naida: And for the rest of the DND sites, I think starting 130, we have a question related to the list of prohibited uses. We understand from the submission that DND has said that the Special Management Area that exists is too restrictive, and there's suggestion that activities related to Government of Canada activities and Government of Nunavut – and you've added the Government of Nunavut activities as being plausible within that Special Management Area. There were discussions – preliminary discussions - that the Special Management Area could be lifted and notification system placed there instead of Special Management Area. I'm wondering if other type of activities like mineral exploration, are the type of activities that could occur within that zone or not?

David L: Dwayne, you want to take that?

Dwayne: Hi, Dwayne James, Department of National Defense. Greg, do you have any insight into that question?

Greg: *(Audio cut off)*

David L: Okay, thanks Greg. Naida?

Naida: Just to clarify that there is a considerable amount of Inuit Owned Lands involved with these sites, so there is an interest in resolving the issue and what the list of prohibited uses – if any - are required in and around those sites.

David L: Okay. So I'll...I think we can...I think we've got the essence of it. DND, NTI and the Planning Commission will have some work to do to clarify the situation and then bring some certainty to the maps that are going to be posted. Okay. Jonathan, do you have anything else?

Jonathan: No thank you. I'll just mention that the conversation has just naturally flowed into Section 4.5.2, which cover the North Warning System sites, which are treated in a similar manner to the DND establishments we previously reviewed. And all of these areas are in different categories but the same discussions need to take place regarding the clarity around what the Land Use Plan will include.

David L: Okay, anything? Naida, anything else on that? Okay. Anything from anyone else? Alright, final section in this chapter, and then we'll break. Do you want to take that now, Jonathan, or do you anticipate a longer discussion?

Jonathan: Sorry, David. That was the last section of the Plan itself, but Peter has noted that the Options document also includes a discussion on aerodromes. This is similar to Cod Lakes where previously versions of the Land Use Plan had addressed municipal community aerodromes in a particular way. That was based on previous discussions with Transport Canada and others regarding the establishment of aerodrome regulations. Since then they've all been established and are in place. And the aerodromes no longer occur, or appear in the Land Use Plan itself. So they no longer occur in the Land Use Plan itself.

David L: Okay, so we'll take a break and come back about 5 after 3:00. Just to let people know again, we'll break for the day at quarter to 5:00, and we will not have an evening session. So break at quarter to 5:00 and then come back at 9:00 tomorrow morning. Alright, thanks.

## BREAK

David L: Jonathan, you want to start Chapter 5?

David B: I lost my agenda. How far are we supposed to get today? How many chapters?

David L: We're ahead of time.

David B: Okay.

Jonathan: Thank you David. Chapter 5 addresses the 5<sup>th</sup> goal of Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development. The first section of Chapter 5 deals with Mineral Potential. These areas have been discussed in passing throughout the meeting. But I'll just summarize again that areas of high mineral potential were based on a number of factors that the Government of Canada, I guess, provided an analysis that identified areas of high mineral potential based on mineral occurrences, tenure, favorable geological units, this type of thing. I don't have an exact description of what went into that.

They did provide a number of qualifications on that material when it was submitted in 2014, in that it was approximate and preliminary, and it was illustrative in a sense. So that needs to be acknowledged. The Land Use Plan has taken those areas and identified them as Special Management Areas where incompatible uses are prohibited, which include parks and conservations areas and tourism activities. This area has led to some comments for sure. I again, I will refer the participants to summarize them themselves. I know the GN in particular has identified concerns with all of the proposed prohibited uses that are in the Plan. So I guess I've got nothing further to add - apologies for rambling.

David L: Yeah, just don't let it happen again, Jonathan. Questions, comments? Observations? Yes, Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you, David. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. I think we'd first like to begin by...yes, we are acknowledging we do have a number of comments on high mineral potential. Perhaps it would be useful, you mentioned the Government of Canada was the agency that provided the majority of information for high mineral areas, for high mineral potential. And we would just like to better understand the research that was used for these areas and you know basically how they were delineated and provided to the NPC.

David L: Spencer?

Spencer: Spencer Dewar for the Government of Canada. Well, we have a geological department and a geologist on staff. We are the repository for geological collection of information, right, through our Mining Recorders Office. So I think it was our district geologist that actually compiled the data and made the maps. I do believe they probably also had assistance through the CNGO – the Canada Nunavut Geoscience Office - and possibly the Government of Nunavut. Karin Costello – I don't know if she is still here; she's been here all day. She might have just stepped out. I think she was instrumental in pulling it all together, her and her team. Yeah, if she's out there, it might be worth having her in. Hi Karen.

(Laughter)

We're just talking about the high geological potential. So I was trying to explain how we sort of came to it. I explained that we have district geologists that collected the information, and as the Mining Recorders Office being the public registry of all geological information that's collected in the territory. So I'll let you just finish from there.

Karen: Thank you. Karen Costello with Aboriginal Affairs. Internally, our staff looked at the known geology. We looked at historical and active mineral tenure. And on that basis, we identified areas of high known mineral potential. It has well been documented by various people that the level of geoscience knowledge within the territory varies from well-known information to not-as-well-known. So I think it's important to recognize that the mineral potential map – mineral potential information – that is presented is based on the level of knowledge and the level of activity, both historical and current.

Spencer: I also mentioned maybe the CNGO was involved and possibly the Government of Nunavut...

Karen: Through the work with input from Natural Resources Canada and Canada Nunavut Geoscience Office, which is the defacto Nunavut Geological Survey, jointly funded by Natural Resources Canada, the Government of Nunavut and Aboriginal Affairs. There was also input provided with regard to mineral potential.

Jennifer: Thank you, Karen. That's a good point, a good point of clarification that these areas represent known areas of mineral potential. That's kind of the second part to the GN's comment on this matter is that the Plan be...the wording of the Plan be revised to state that these are areas of high "known" mineral potential as opposed to just simply "areas of high mineral potential." Thank you.

Karen: Yeah, I think we would...there would be no disagreement from us with that, because as I said, the level of geoscience knowledge varies across the territory. Certain statements as far as potential is just based exactly that –on the level of information that is available. Thank you.

David L: Peter?

Peter: Hi, Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission. Just for everyone's reference, the map on the right on the screen in front of you is showing three SMAs. 167 are the terrestrial yellow polygons. Those are AANDCs high mineral, or high known mineral potential polygons with the essential caribou habitat taken away. Then the polygons on the water are the high fisheries potential, and there's a few offshore point polygons, which are oil and gas potential. The polygons terrestrially are cumulatively 8.6% of the land area of Nunavut. I do have a question for Kivalliq Inuit Association in that your submission talked a lot about geoscience, inferred resources...the NPC doesn't not have in-house geological capacity. Has your data, is the data your talking about, has it been shared with AANDC in preparation of these polygons, or are you recommending changes to these polygons? Thank you.

David L: Luis?

Luis:

Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the question. Luis Manzo from the Kivalliq Inuit Association. This is information that we have been collected along industry and Geoscience Office. Now you can see we collect probably more – we did more research in terms of historical data and also was knew that other is being provided for by industry, which of course, would ?line out polygons or those occurrences that occurring was mentioned, which was different in the potential they mentioned, because we have a little bit of more information. But we can create a polygon and what the occurrences are and say to you the potential mineral.

Which...my point was to make sure those are being assessed in the areas, because it's a conflict. We have been managed and implement for our 10 years, the actual Keewatin Land Use Plan, which encouraged economic development and sustainability. Over those years, in this case industry has been investing millions of dollars in IOLs and Crown land to develop those lands of high potential. When we saw these new polygons presented in the Plan being more cartographically other than geoscience assessments, then we went and collected all our database and start pulling all our information together for the last 18 years I have been with KIA.

We sent it then for further analysis with a company, with a geological company to demonstrate the conflicts that we have in terms of those designations. Now, we didn't present our position until the concerns with the – I don't know the (?) information. This perhaps needs to have another discussion with NRCAN. We'll be very simple, because it existing rights. Papers submitted to treasury boards by proponents would make those assignments of the high potential in those areas. Investments have been made, licenses have been granted.

Somehow I'm very uncomfortable to continue speaking with those rights, which are existing rights in some of the cases. And that is what Karen was speak about in terms of the permitting that has been, over the last year in Kivalliq has been actually been candid to proponents for exploration. And now in the Plan we see provisions that prohibit those rights to exercise their rights in the future. Somehow we need to get more clarity in those areas. And that's the reason I didn't present polygons, because all the papers and documents and dots they present, represent, the areas of trench in which all the occurrences happen over the last 18 years, which highlight the potential different metals over the years, which now is a research area. But Karen will be probably with me in that supporting the Federal Government position in the potential, but also I would like a little more consideration and take the new data that we presented as validated from geologist that have been doing work in the area as well. Thank you.

David L:

Please.

Karen:

Karen Costello for Aboriginal Affairs on behalf of Government of Canada. Thanks for those comments, Luis. One of the things I'd like to mention is that we are not the only ones who are in receipt of information on mineral potential. We are...we deal with Crown Land, and NTI has rights to a lot of....a lot of land has been identified for its high mineral potential. So there are many sources of information in addition to the information that we have based information on, as Luis mentioned. And I think it would be important that as much of that information come into the Plan as possible, because Nunavut is a vast territory. Since 1999, over 3 billion dollars has been spent on mineral exploration and mine development. Not all of that is infrastructure, so a lot of is the gathering of geoscience information. It has been spread across Nunavut in various locales. Thank you.

- David L: Thanks, Karen. Miguel.
- Miguel: Miguel Chenier with NTI. Jon I realize you...I don't know if you've had a chance to review through our whole submission. But with regard to our Comment #47 with regard to subsurface IOL, we'd asked about your consideration for putting that in as high mineral potential. Did you want to comment on that?
- Jonathan: No, I don't think I've got particular comments - just clarification that NTI would consider all subsurface parcels to have high mineral potential.
- Miguel: We have one or two exceptions that we can provide to you.
- Jonathan: Excellent. Yeah, it would be fantastic if those exceptions could be explicitly noted.
- Miguel: Will do.
- David L: Karen, can I ask you a question? I've always been challenged – and I've got a background in geology - but I've always been challenged by this notion of potential. I understand risk assessment and the kind of quantitative approach that risk assessments take. Is the development of mineral potential analogous to a risk assessment approach or is it more qualitative?
- I'm trying to get at the real meaning of, well, high known potential...there's a bunch of qualifiers right there. Potential means it might be there. There's a good chance of something being there. Known potential means that you know something about the geology that increases the likelihood that there might be something there. And then you compare that to the rest of Nunavut where there's a huge absence of reliable data. So I'm just trying to wrap my head around what these high potential maps really mean in terms of likelihood.
- You know, I mean I get the notion that the best place to find a new mine is near an old mine, because the geology is favorable, and it's what happened in Hemlo and Northern Ontario for example, right beside, right under the Transcanada. Suddenly somebody takes a second look or a third look or a fourth look and finds a huge gold deposit. And that area would be rated high potential simply because there's a mine there already.
- We don't have that much experience and knowledge in Nunavut, and yet the maps show high known potential. So I wonder if you couldn't just explain to folks the relationship between a high known potential and likelihood if that's possible? And I know that with every geologist including myself when I was in that field, would say, "You never know where the next mine is going to be. You've got to look everywhere and you've got to look several times." But the flip side is the tradeoff between identifying these areas as high potential and then potentially the...well for example, caribou calving grounds – that conflict that then arises; the tradeoff of values or the overlay of values. It's important in the caribou calving ground context, but it's important in other contexts too. So, is there some way of simply explaining how likelihood and high potential line up?
- Karin: Karen Costello for Aboriginal Affairs. Daunting question, but I'll do my best. In trying to identify areas with or coming up with high known mineral potential, we start by looking at the geological

terrain. Is it the type of geology that lends itself to having a variety of different types of deposits? So we start with that. Then we look at....and that requires us to have a basic understanding of the geology of the area. Then we look to see if there have been any documented mineral occurrences – gold, copper, zinc, iron, whatever the commodity is. Then we'll look at historical activity and based on that, we know that periodically from the level of activity that when we're on...when commodity prices are at a certain level, there is renewed interest. So we get a sense that when certain occurrences are identified or when certain deposits are identified, they may not necessarily be developed now, because the economic conditions are not great, but we know that there's potential for them to be there. So say that there's a likelihood that they could be economic resources or exploitable resources at some point in time.

The term likelihood....if you're in an area that's a giant granite mass of....granite pluton, the likelihood of you finding certain types of mineralization and economic mineralization in that would be limited. But the likelihood of you finding perhaps another Meadowbank, another Back River in certain terrains, in certain geological environments - greenstone belts - the likelihood would be higher. So when we came up with these areas we identified for the high potential, it's based on known information, historical activity.

Some of CNGO and the Geological Survey of Canada that's still ongoing is that they're doing – they're still doing what's called baseline geological mapping. When they complete that work, they often identify, find new occurrences. A recent example of that was when they worked on the Melville Project on the Melville Peninsula. This was a large area of mapping. One of the areas they found was a nickel occurrence, and that led to an increase – a bit of a surge - in mineral exploration activity. Now since then, there has been some work done. It didn't meet the thresholds for companies to maintain their interest, but it still represents an area with some high known mineral potential. The geology is right. We have an occurrence, and we know there is something there. So I don't know if that helps or hinders.

David L: Well, it all helps. I just...in that latter example, the potential remains, but the likelihood has diminished somewhat based on the work that has been done Is that fair? I mean it's still possible that there is something, but the more you look and the less you find, the lower the likelihood, correct?

Karen: I think it needs statistics on that.

*(Laughter)*

David L: Okay, well maybe we can have a sidebar conversation at some point. Stephane.

Stephane: Stephane Robert. So for us the definition of high mineral potential, I will give an example of what we call our Amaruq exploration site. We still don't know if we have a mine, but we knew that with all the information that on surface with survey and all that, that we have high mineral potential. To know if it will be something, we need to go drilling. After that you can find something but maybe it's not economical. So it's two things to have high mineral potential and after that to have a mine. To be mine, we need, everyone needs to make money. So you need to be economical. So it's two things, but it's still there and maybe in 20 years and 30 years it will be economical. So on Amaruq, we drill. We drill a lot, but still don't know if it's economical. We

will know in the next year probably if it's economical. But we drill, and if it happens that it's not economical, the high mineral potential is still there. So that it is what I think say what is high mineral potential. And maybe in 20 years, the price of gold will be at 5000 bucks, and now it will be economical. But that, it will depends. But the high mineral potential is still there.

David L: Yeah, and that's very helpful. I guess I don't want to prolong this but so the more work you do and the more promising the results, the likelier it is. The more work you do and the less you find, the less likely it is. And in the absence of detailed geological knowledge, we're kind of dealing with the first thing, just the potential, based on the geology that's there and examples elsewhere – it's potential. It has got little or nothing to do with likelihood at that stage.

Karen: Karen Costello for Aboriginal Affairs. And just to touch on a point that Stephane mentioned, there are other things that impact on the likelihood of there being mine. And those are economic drivers, and they're beyond our control. They're beyond an operator's control. That is why it is important to not exclude these areas, because the potential does exist under the certain economic conditions where an identified historical resource could become a future, a future mine.

David L: Thanks Karen. Luis?

Luis: I would like to...in two slides I have I'll be able to explain what we did. Karen and KIA have an obligation under the Keewatin Land Use Plan to promote economic development. In that sense, we need to provide information to sell to the proponent. If we look....I hope everybody can hear me. If we look at historical data, all the trenches....

*(Luis was away from the mike, barely audible. The following is an approximation):* This is where the occurrences are. Then compile all the data. Here you'll see the geoscience data. What is happening in the trenches....It's really to attract the investment in the territory, because the money is in the exploration. That's where the money is. The money is not to find a mine. When you find a mine, everybody is going to win. But really the majority of the investment is done by all the industries together and the exploration dollars they put in the ground and reaching then in value then for parcels. And that's why NTI also has very good mineral agreements in existence today, especially in the Amaruq. You can see right there in the trenches you have Kiggavik you have Meadowbank, and right off of that you have Amaruq just 50 clicks from the trench. But we are providing the data and they've been collecting more data to verify it.

Now with the new technology you have better geomagnetic data that you can actually do (?) in the stop applications that the industry has. But really if we lock those areas then we don't have no economic drivers in the territory because the vocation of the land with minerals. We don't have. I'm coming from the natural resources experience and the degree I have. So the vocation of the land in Nunavut has pure mineral vocation. There's no forestry. You have water resources. There are renewable resources. You have oil and gas and minerals that are not renewable but is the biggest economic driver that you have in the territory. So when you classify soil science, they will give you those vocations by virtue of the land itself. It's something that...we would like to see something like that based in soil science. We are far away from it, but that will determine your resources and the use of those resources, and at equal balance of formal processes into the regulations. But if we lock all those big potentials, then of course, investment is going to go away. There's going to be...it's high enough already to produce one

ounce of gold in the territory. It's about \$900.00 for an ounce when you're in an operating mine. But then again, we have a lot of jobs from the mine. But if you ask me how much Amaruq being invested so far, it's about \$40 million dollars in two years. It's just an exploration. So that means no to the stores, all the hotels....it's how it spins the economy. Everybody probably has a sense of all that, but when you put that in perspective, we can avoid devocation of the territory as minerals. And it's how we should start, defining what is a vocation of the land and spin from that end. Thank, you.

David L: Thanks Luis. Okay, sorry for the diversion. Jonathan, you want to get back to the technical unless there are any other comments? Luigi.

Luigi: About resources and trenches...no, kidding, kidding.

*(Laughter)*

Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. This is a comment related to the mineral potential but not necessarily the discussion that we've just had. According to the current prohibitions currently listed under mineral potential, one of those prohibitions is tourism facilities. The Kitikmeot Intuit Association has a little bit of difficulty trying to understand why tourism facilities would be considered a prohibitive activity under that designation. Certainly we see a lot of benefits.

Right now in terms of...in certain areas, there's one particular lodge that is covered by a designation that is a high mineral potential, or so-called. So in terms of established lodges, I guess the existing rights would be applicable to that site. But in terms of the potential, Nunavut is in such dire need of infrastructure. Any kind of road network – in our area, for example, if Izok, the Izok corridor were to open up, that would provide access to inland areas that are impossible at the present time unless you have air support. So I guess the question is, what is the reasoning for restricting or prohibiting tourism facilities in those types of sites under that designation?

David L: Jonathan, do you want to take that?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Luigi, for the comments. They are greatly appreciated I believe the reasoning or rationale behind prohibiting tourism facilities in high mineral potential, is that they were considered to be possibly incompatible with industrial activities. That being said, there has been a great deal of feedback to the contrary, so that will all be taken into consideration.

David L: Okay, thanks Jonathan. Any other comments? Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you, David. We would just – the Government of Nunavut would just like to add to that comment. We also had a similar comment with respect to prohibition of tourism facilities within high areas of high mineral potential. Just to add to that, we believe that in addition to mineral exploration, there are other economic sectors that are developing within Nunavut. And we believe that tourism facilities can, or are not necessarily an incompatible use with mineral production and should be allowed to proceed within those areas.

Furthermore, we also have a comment about the same thing with respect to conservation areas as a prohibited use within areas of high mineral potential. And for much the same reasons...sorry. Territorial parks or conservation areas do offer opportunities for tourism and other economic spinoffs that could come from those...the establishment of those areas. Also as was discussed earlier today as part of the feasibility study of conservation areas and parks, they do you know, conduct their own geological surveys. So that's something to consider, that they could perhaps work together and are not necessarily an incompatible use with areas of high mineral potential. Thank you.

David L: Alright, yeah.

Elizabeth: Elizabeth Kingston with the Chamber of Mines. Just to follow-up with the GN's comment that industry – the mining industry agrees that tourism facilities are not incompatible with areas for mineral potential. Thank you.

David L: Wow, we have a consensus, in this room of course.

Spencer: Does the Government of Canada have to say that?

*(Laughter)*

David L: Oh sorry.

Spencer: We agree.

*(Laughter)*

David L: We could take silence as consent too. Anything else? Yeah.

Brandon: Brandon from WWF. I would just note that this is the only polygon with prohibited uses that doesn't include the last caveat of related research. And I just wanted confirmation that there is still potential for conservation-based research in these polygons even if parks remain prohibited use, which we would agree with GN that isn't necessarily given the regulatory framework to establish a park anyways. But as related research is not there, just confirmation there could be environmental base research for conservation purposes in these areas.

David L: Yeah, the potential is there but is the likelihood? Jonathan.

*(Laughter)*

Jon: Thanks for the question. Yeah, just to confirm, research associated with conservation objectives would be permitted under the Draft Plan as it's currently written. I'd just also like to note I'm appreciative of the very specific feedback in regards to this designation in terms of the list of prohibited uses being inappropriate. That's very helpful for the Commission to consider. Also I'd like to note if there are any prohibited uses or terms or conditions or any direction at all that would be recommended to be included in such a designation? That would be helpful to be identified as well, because at the current time, this designation includes those two lists of prohibited uses, and we're hearing lots of discussion around the table that they may not be

appropriate to prohibit if that was the direction the Commission takes. That would effectively make the areas Mixed Use, and there would no longer be a high mineral area potential designation in the Land Use Plan. I'm not say that's what is going to occur, but in that scenario, that would be the result. So if there is any ideas or recommendations of what a high mineral area potential designation could achieve, that feedback would be appreciated.

David L: Okay, any further discussion on this item? Jennifer, don't be shy.

Jennifer: I just – sorry, I saw Peter had his hand up first. Sorry Jonathan, just to clarify, I think what the GN would be on board with is, yeah, if these areas of high mineral potential, they would be better classified, perhaps as a Mixed Use if you were to take these recommendations into consideration that they would have no prohibited uses. So within the logic, I guess, that you have used for the Land Use Plan, it would fit naturally under the Mixed Use designation. That's how I understand it. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Jennifer. Peter.

Peter: Thanks. Peter, Nunavut Planning Commission, and thanks for that Jen. GN comment 5-00e it says existing tourism operations and high mineral potential areas. My question is does GN have a high tourist potential map of some kind?

Jennifer: Thank you for that question. Not at this time. We do not have a map of high potential areas for tourism. However, I do have a technical person from the Department of Economic Development and Transportation. Lou Kamerman is here who could perhaps add a little bit more information to that for the group today.

Lou: Lou Kamerman, Government of Nunavut. I can confirm that our department issues outfitter licenses, so we do have an idea of coordinates, locations of where current outfitter camps exist that are associated with outfitters based within the communities. So there are areas we know people are, and I assume there is because there is high tourism potential and they enjoy the area. But as for putting forward coordinates or trying to delineate zones that are good for mineral potential – or tourism potential - there could be some inherent difficulties, just given that it could be subjective in how you establish where these areas are. This is something we would be definitely be interested in exploring and possibly discussing with other planning partners. I guess if we could see if there is interest from anyone else, we could discuss this further and see where that leads us.

David L: Jonathan?

Jonathan: Sorry, I just thought I'd mention on the theme of tourism, the Community Priorities and Values that the Land Use Plan identifies in the very specific comments that would accompany the digital files, which are available on our website currently, communities identified areas of tourism potential as well. That came out naturally through the discussions, and particularly scenic areas or areas that are important for sports hunts and things of that nature as well during our discussion on the encouraging sustainable economic development. So that's in our files collectively.

David L: Yeah.

Naida: Naida Gonzalez. We just wanted to raise that we have some concerns with the GN's proposal that conservation areas and parks would be allowed in the high mineral potential areas. That may set up a potential land use conflict. We haven't made a final determination on that, and we'll get back to you. But we want the opportunity to discuss it as a team and provide more comments on that.

David L: Thanks, Naida. Please.

Rochelle: Rochelle from WWF. So as an alternative option, we were thinking there could be still the Special Management Area designation for high potential mineral areas, to keep that in mind. And it could be followed through like other SMAs just with directions to authority agencies when other types of uses can be planned or foreseen on those areas. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Go ahead.

Liz: Thank you. Elizabeth Kingston, Chamber of Mines. Just a request: A claimholder would like to be advised of any proposed additional use in the area, including tourism facilities. Thank you.

David L: Okay, thanks. I think we're probably good to go on to the next section. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jon: Thank you very much, David. The next section is Oil and Gas Potential. This section is treated slightly different. And I'd just note that there are three types of licenses that can be issued: Significant Discovery Licenses are one category. The others are Exploration Licenses and Production Licenses. At this time, only Significant Discovery Licenses have been issued in Nunavut. They tend to be fairly small, and the Land Use Plan assigns a Special Management Area designation to them and prohibits, again the similar list of incompatible uses. So it's a similar theme but purely based on Significant Discovery Licenses rather than potential itself.

One comment I had noted was that the GN identified a missing Discovery License on Cameron Island. That's another scale issue like the alternative energy sites where it did not get labeled as a point, and the label didn't appear. So, that can be addressed. Thanks.

David L: Thanks, Jonathan. Comments from anyone? No. Alright, then let's go on to the next section.

Jonathan: Thank you. I'll take the similar theme of the comments on the previous discussion regarding the list of prohibited uses. The final section of Chapter 5 deals with Commercial Fisheries. The first subject is that Cumberland Sound near Pangnirtung has been identified as a particularly important turbot fishing area for the community. It has a management area status through, I guess the GN that they may want to elaborate on. But that area of Cumberland Sound has been assigned a Special Management Area designation that prohibits incompatible uses, I believe just oil and gas exploration and development.

The other issue that has been explored under this section is char and turbot areas of abundance, which have been identified. So the Commission received information on general areas of abundance for char and turbot, which are of course fish commercially in the Settlement Area. Those areas were assigned a Mixed Use designation with direction to regulatory authority to consider the impacts on those fisheries.

There was one comment I had noted on fisheries regarding the identification of important subsistence fishing and other harvesting areas in the Settlement Area in the Plan. I just wanted to note that that has been extensively documented in the Community Priority and Values where subsistence commercial – or subsistence fisheries and marine mammal harvesting areas have been documented. Thank you.

David L: Okay thanks Jonathan. Comments from anyone? Jennifer.

Jennifer: Hi. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. I just wanted to note, and perhaps the NPC has already seen our comments with respect to commercial fisheries, but just to draw attention to the few comments that we did have. They're very editorial in nature. But we had recommended that in addition to the commercial fisheries listed, that shrimp as well be listed as a fishery operating within the territory. Furthermore, we just ask that there be a change to the wording in how Cumberland Sound is written in the Plan just to accurately reflect its correct name, which is the Cumberland Sound Turbot Management Area.

David L: Okay, thanks. Any other comments, questions on this one? Alright. I may be wrong, but I think that takes us to the end of Chapter 5. Good. Alright, do you want to start Chapter 6?

Jonathan: Thank you, David. Chapter 6 deals with Areas of Mixed Use. So in these areas, which are the uncoloured or base map areas on Schedule A, all uses would conform to the requirements of the Land Use Plan as drafted. The areas would be subject to direction to regulatory authorities as illustrated on Schedule B as well as the expansive Communities and Value that might be identified. But again, just to confirm, all uses would conform, and that would purely be direction. Thank you.

David L: Comments? Observations? You guys really want to get out of here don't you? Alright, we'll just keep going. I'm not seeing any...Bert? Oh sorry, Naida.

Naida: We have some...we would rather not start Chapter 7 today. We have some discussions that we'd like to have before reviewing that chapter, so I'm not sure if an early end to the session is possible?

David L: Oh, it's very possible. Unless anybody has any violent objections, I think if NTI needs to caucus, we should allow that. Peter?

Peter: Hi. Our Plan was at the beginning of Chapter 7 to hand out or new procedures. If we hand them out now, then people can take our one extra hour to read them if they want to, and then there will be more prep for tomorrow morning.

David L: And there will be a test? Okay, well let's call it a day then, and we'll get back. Sorry, Jennifer.

Jennifer: Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. I just earlier in the day, after lunch, the Government of Nunavut had requested that an additional agenda item be added at the end of our sessions here today, and I didn't seek any kind of official – or I didn't receive any sort of official clarification from you David on that.

David L: Yeah, I nodded. My read of the audience was that, yeah, people were good with that, and discussions afterward supported that as well. Yeah go ahead.

Mike: Mike Setterington with EDI for Baffinland: I was just going to question that additional agenda item, if we could perhaps have an evening meeting or a meeting right now? I don't know if it has to be an additional agenda item to go over those objectives and outcomes. It could be a fairly short brief meeting with interested parties.

David L: I don't think NPC is available in that brief time. They've got other commitments. That's why we're going to break earlier today. And then I know they've got some later commitments. If people want to meet though bilaterally or in small groups, by all means. But I'd like to have the entire group here for that discussion. It's significant enough. Yeah I know. Okay, we will tack that on to the end of the agenda, and now I'll turn it back to the Planning Commission to introduce this document.

Peter: Thank you. I might ask if one or two people would volunteer to help spread these documents around, and I'll start working through it. Just the background: these are 7 procedures, which were accepted by our commissioners back in March and basically make the Nunavut Planning Commission NUPPAA ready. The 7 procedures relate to the methods that the NPC will follow for 7 different types of tasks:

The first one is Conformity Determination. That's the biggest one and that includes cumulative effects. The second one is how we would deal with minor variances. Just a quick definition for those who might not know it: a minor variance is when a proposal does not fit within the specific technical details of Plan requirements but is felt to fit within the fundamental values and priorities of the Plan. And the relaxation would be minor to allow for the project. So there's a specific process for a minor variance. The third procedure are amendments to Land Use Plan, and these cover basically what are the two types of amendments, which are either amendments initiated by a proponent. And that's where a project does not fit a plan as written and the proponent is interested in changing the Plan so their project would fit, or it could be self-initiated by the Nunavut Planning Commission as part of a review, a periodic review of the Plan, and factors indicate that the Plan should go through a revision.

The fourth procedure is information management. That one is our shortest one, and that's basically dealing with how the NPC would deal with information that comes in, particularly confidential information, information from one-on-one interviews, and under what circumstances it would be released for public availability or not. The fifth procedure is monitoring approved projects. What that is if the NPC issues certain terms and conditions on a project approval, as part of the conformity determination, the NPC would have to follow-up periodically to check up on those. And that's how we would set them and do them.

The sixth procedure – and by the way, these were really exciting to write – is monitoring land use plan implementation. That is basically the NPC annually will look at every land use plan – in this case Nunavut Land Use Plan – and will carry out and will look at information. How many conformities? How many positive? How many negative? Were there any amendments? Were there requests for variances? etc. And that will give us an indication that will be made available publically whether a Plan amendment or a Plan reiteration will be needed down the road or the following year.

And then finally is the periodic review process, which is the detailed – what NPC will look at a Plan ever 3 years in detail to help determine whether the Plan needs minor revisions, a full scale overhaul, or something like that. Should I go through these in more detail or do people...?

David L: I think give people a chance to look at it, and then we can pick it up tomorrow. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. Just for the group's insight: So in preparation to be NUPPAA ready, the Commission is informing you these policies were approved by the Commission in March. And this is an insight into how we are doing our business, transparency. These procedures are already posted on our website, so they're there in the e-version for you, and we're simply providing you with a hard copy so you have it. And if you have any questions or any suggestions, the Commission is always open to hear your feedback. We always strive to do business in the best way, and as such, that is the intent to these procedures. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Sharon. And we'll set aside some time tomorrow to go through it and questions. Liz?

Liz: Yes, thank you. Elizabeth Kingston, Chamber of Mines. Just a question I guess, Sharon: If I understood correctly, you said that the procedures were approved by the Commission in March. The documents are being distributed now. Should we assume that you're looking for feedback or comments on the document? If it's already been approved, then does it leave it open for discussion I guess? Thank you.

Sharon: Thank you, David. Feedback....Thank you for your question, Liz. Feedback is always welcome, but they are the policies of the Commission and the commissioners have approved these policies. It doesn't mean that they are not open for change in the future, but these are the policies that we're following currently.

David L: And I guess I'll just add that it's an opportunity to read them and get some questions answered if you have any questions of the Commission staff tomorrow regarding these procedures. Anything else for now?

Peter: A quick comment: we have translated these. We haven't massed produced them though. If any of your colleagues want an Inuktitut version, we can photocopy them for you.

David L: Alright, so we are adjourned. Is closing prayer something that we should do? No? Alright folks, see you tomorrow morning, 9:00. Have a good evening.

## **DAY 3: JUNE 25, 2015**

David L: Tommy if you can do the opening prayer for us? That would be good. Henry? Okay. Thanks.

Henry: Thank you. Good morning everyone. I hope you had a nice sleep during the night, and we'll pray to our Lord to get with them again for today. I'll do it in my language.

*(Opening prayer)*

David L: Thank you, Henry. I've just noticed that the coffee has arrived, so maybe for those of us who need coffee, we could take a couple of minutes, grab a cup and then sit back down again. And then we'll get going. I'll be the first in line.

### **Short Break**

David L: I'll give people a couple of more minutes to grab their coffee, but in the meantime I have a public service announcement. It appears one of our members in the room is a year older today - so Happy Birthday, Spencer.

*(Clapping from participants)*

Henry: Maybe we clap only after we sing Happy Birthday.

*(Laughter followed by joyous early-morning singing to Spencer)*

David L: Alright. We should probably get started. We're going to start with Chapter 7. I think the approach that we're going to take is that NPC will just overview the Internal Procedures document that was distributed late yesterday, and then we will go through the chapter in the Draft Land Use Plan. But it appears that going through the document first might actually help the discussion with respect to the chapter and the Plan itself. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you. And just if you're looking for it on our web page, the Internal Procedures, it's under the "About Commission" box. You can find it in there. Thank you.

David L: Okay, so who's leading? Jonathan or Peter? Peter, take us through it please.

Peter: Alright, thanks everyone. Okay, so I'll go through procedures in the order in which they are in your binders. I hope everyone brought the binders they got last night. I'm going to direct everyone to this page, which is the last page of Conformity Determination procedure immediately before Tab 2. This is just an overview of the Conformity Determination procedure. I will try to go this quickly, and I will try to make it exciting and interesting.

So starting at the top blue box, and I'll scroll down here so it's on the screen as well. This one's a bit...this is the biggest one, so it'll be a little longer than two minutes. So the top box is the submission comes in. The second box down, the NPC posts notification of receipt. Third box down, the first one in green, the NPC reviews the project proposal to see that it's consistent with terms, conditions of the land use plan. If it is, we move over to the left – the green box on the left. And that box is the NPC determines whether the project is exempt from screening. If yes, which is the box on the right there, the green one, NPC determines if there are concerns related to cumulative impacts. If there are concerns, it will go to NIRB. If there are no concerns, it will

go to the regulatory authorities identified by the proponent. Going back up to whether the project is exempt from screening, if it is not, the project proposal will be sent to NIRB.

So going back up to this box here, the third box down, the question whether the project proposal is consistent with the terms and conditions of the Plan, if it is not – ergo it's a negative conformity, the NPC determines if a minor variance might be applicable. If a minor variance is applicable, which is this box, the minor variance process is initiated to determine if conditions for a minor variance are met. If they are, a minor variance is approved and we flow over back over to here, which we talked about already, whether the project is exempt from screening. Going back to his orange box, the determination whether a minor variance process, what it says, if it is not consistent with minor variance, a minor variance will not be approved. So we'll move back up to the first orange box, which was the question, "Can a minor variance be applied?" If it cannot be applied, the proponent may apply for ministerial exemption, which is this box. If an exemption is granted, then we go back over here to the NIRB process. If a ministerial exemption is not granted, the proponent may revise the project proposal and resubmit or go to a plan amendment.

Now let's go back to the lead document. I just want to highlight key timelines here. I'm not going to read...I will actually read the document word for word slowly and monotonously. Happy birthday, Spencer.

(Laughter)

Okay so the timeline statements in here are 4.1. "Within seven days of the receipt of the project proposal, NPC shall review and determine if the required materials have been described have been submitted, ergo is the application complete." On 4.2 there's a 45-day timeline, and this is the period of review by the NPC. So I'll just...on your time...I'm not going to...I'll get you guys to read on your own and you can come to me with any questions if you have later, or if you have any questions now that's fine too.

The 4s and the 5s are where timelines are located. These timelines are consistent with what's in NUPPA. The remaining sections, 6 and 7 deal with basically what I talked about in the chart. And then there are some definitions in here, and Appendix B talks about the cumulative impacts concerns and how that works under Schedule 12-1, NLCA.

But the four key questions that NPC will be looking at to determine whether cumulative effects warrant it going to NIRB are:

- Does the project proposal occur in the same general location as the previous project or where there's an existing project or whether there is a proposed project?
- Does the project proposal use the same resources as past projects or as current project or as a proposed project?
- Does the project occur where there's a sensitive ecosystem? Or
- Does the project have the potential to induce activity, ergo by allowing this project to be fairly certain that something else is going to be coming along in short order.

Are there any questions on conformity determination, because that's my overview? And as I said, we can talk about this later if people want more time to read, or we can do it one-on-one.

David L: Thanks, Peter. Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you, David. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut. I was just hoping the NPC could clarify: Will we discussing conformity determination during the agenda part of the meeting, or is this kind of the time when we're going to be talking about conformity determinations?

Peter: Peter, NPC. If you have comments on the process, it's probably better done as part of the chapter discussion. Why we're going through this now is that you can see what we have hard written. So if your questions or comments are covered, then we're good, but if you want to discuss it more, have comments, then we can do that later.

David L: Yeah, just to be clear about that, this is just going to be a very brief summary of the document, and then we'll get back to the chapter itself. So Peter, if you can roll through that, that'd be great. Sharon?

Sharon: As part of the Chapter 7, the Implementation of the Document, we just wanted to give you a very high level of internal policies so you see how the Commission is operating under the policies. We're not going to read them. We're not going to walk...if you have questions, you know, we're just giving you the introduction and then we will finish going through the chapter. Everybody can read, so I don't think we need to go word by word. Thank you.

David L: Okay, Peter?

Peter: Thanks. The second one is the minor variance procedure, which is the other bigger one. And I'm going to go to Appendix B, which is on page 9 of it, and that is also a flow chart. We only did flow charts for the two or three biggest ones. So the top of the flow chart, the submission comes in. On the left side, the ED determines if conditions in the Land Use Plan are met. And the next one down is public notice and invitation to provide written comments from interested persons. So this basically...sorry, I'll keep on going.

If no comments are received on the proposed minor variance, and the minor variance is considered to be consistent with the Plan, and what the Plan says about minor variances, it will be granted. If comments are received about the proposed minor variance, the Commission may hold a public review if Section 7.1 conditions are met, and I'll go in here and talk about Section 7.1 shortly. The Commissioners, at that stage, consider if the comments may or may not decide to grant the minor variance. Going back up, on the right side, if the executive director determines that the conditions for minor variance in the land use plan are not met and/or if the Commissioners or the Committee of Commissioners say that a minor variance cannot be permitted due to comments, the minor variance will not be granted. At that stage, the proponent may apply for exemption. The proponent may amend their proposal. The proponent may apply for a plan amendment, or the proponent can reevaluate their project.

So I'll go back up to the actual written portion, and I'll just highlight timeline statements in here and Section 7.1. The timelines are listed in sections 3 and 4 of the minor variance, which are on page 3 of it. And again, those are consistent with the NUPPA timelines. And there's also a timeline statement on 5.1D. The section 7.1 says the Commission may conduct a public review of a proposed minor variance only if the Commission receives written comments from any

interested persons that, in the opinion of the Executive Director, address the criteria in 5.1D of this procedure.

So basically, a minor variance comes in. It seems like it's appropriate with the Plan. We issue a call for comments. If comments come in that come from people that are actually affected by the proposed minor variance or that is significant information that can waive the decision on whether or not to allow the minor variance, but typically a minor variance will be handled through the minor variance criteria, which will be listed in the Plan. Are there any comments or questions on that one?

David L: Liz?

Liz: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's Elizabeth Kingston with the Chamber of Mines. I'd actually just like to go back a little bit to Appendix B, Item C – just the previous section you were reviewing. I apologize. We weren't quick enough to get our question in.

Sharon: Sorry, Liz, did you say Appendix B?

Liz: Appendix B, Item C.

Sharon: Thank you.

Liz: Cumulative Impact Concerns, that section. I apologize. I have to put my glasses on, because I can't see that and look at this at the same time, so I'm trusting that's what you have up on the screen? You okay, Peter?

Peter: My computer chose this particular moment to freeze.

(Laughter)

David: Well I'm sure that diagram and the words are emblazoned on your memory, so Liz, why don't you ask the question?

Liz: Okay, I'll go ahead. So, industry considers all areas in the Nunavut to be sensitive areas, and we've adapted our projects accordingly with appropriate actions and mitigation measures. When we read this section, we ask whether or not this article would mean that every project would be referred to the NIRB.

David L: Who's....Jonathan?

Jonathan: Hi, this is Jonathan from the Planning Commission. Thanks for the question. These questions are intended to be a guide, which would be used to consider whether there were cumulative impact concerns. So these questions would serve as a guide in the evaluation of whether there were concerns. And regarding sensitive environmental system, that phase that's worded in there, the Land Use Plan – and there are concerns that have been voiced about the Land Use Plan identifying areas where cumulative impacts may be of a concern – but that language would imply areas like community drinking water supplies. The Plan identifies the cumulative impacts

concerned maybe present there. So those areas would be incorporated into the evaluation of these guideline questions.

David L: Any follow-up?

Liz: Not at this time, but we may revisit. Thank you.

David L: Thanks. Peter you want to roll through the rest of this document?

Peter: Thank you. Peter, Nunavut Planning Commission. We are moving on to Procedure 3, which is Amendments to Land Use Plans. I am again going to the last page, which is a flow chart, which is the page immediately before Tab 4, and it looks like this. So starting at the top, the proposal comes in and it will be posted on the public registry. NPC will consider the proposed amendment and determine if there is a need for a public review. If there is no need for a public review – I'll back up a little bit and say there will be a call for comments on the Plan amendment, and that will help inform whether there's a need for a public review. The NPC will recommend to the Minister and DIO the accepted or rejected, in whole or in part. The Minister may or may not accept the NPC recommendation to do that Plan amendment. If the Minister rejects the NPC recommendation for a Plan amendment in whole or in part, the NPC will revise the proposed amendment and will resubmit, which will either be accepted or rejected by the Minister. If the Minister rejects a 2<sup>nd</sup> time, that will in most cases end the amendment process, and the Plan will remain as it was before.

Now moving to Section 2, which is back up in the Plan amendment. Again, this is compatible with NUPPAA. It's not a long procedure. It's only a page and a half. It goes over the process of discussions before, during and after with the proponent and with various parties. The timeline statements are on 3.2 and 4.4. And I think I will leave that one there in case there are any questions on how Plan amendments will be handled.

David L: Any questions right now? Remember that we'll get into the chapter, and these things may be raised again in the chapter. Peter, why don't you continue, please?

Peter: Thank you. Information Management, which is in Tab 4 is the shortest of the procedures. As I said yesterday, this one has to do with... In most cases, information given to the Commission will be publicly available, but in some cases it needs to be kept confidential. This procedure goes over how those two are differentiated and how confidential information is treated. Are there any comments on that procedure?

David L: I don't see any, so Peter, why don't you continue.

Peter: Sure. Jon just asked me to state that he NPC does not distribute GIS information that is provided to us by parties. We simply use it. If people ask for GIS information, we will refer them to the original source.

So Procedure 5, Monitoring Approved Projects: This is a very short procedure. Basically, if there are terms and conditions associated with a conformity - a positive conformity determination - the NPC will have in that determination whether we need to check up on it, and we will do so. And in most cases, we will try to coordinate those kinds of activities with the other IPGs or with

other regulatory agencies either by sharing flights or asking someone else to have a look or something. Any questions on that one? Okay.

Monitoring Land Use Plan Implementation, Procedure 6: This will be done annually. If you go to section 1, which is on page 2 of this procedure, and again I'm under Tab 6, I'm going to go through the list A to H. Because these are the factors that NPC will be looking at annually on every plan or on the Nunavut Land Use Plan, because there have been quite a few questions about when and how our Plan amendments are initiated, or Plan reviews. So A to H is:

- A. Annually, the number and nature of applications for project conformity
- B. The number and nature of project proposals found not to conform with the Plan
- C. The number and nature of Land Use Plan amendments that have been accepted or rejected
- D. The number and nature of minor variances that have been granted or refused
- E. The number and nature of project proposals that have been referred to NIRB for screening because of concerns regarding cumulative impacts
- F. Project proposals that have been granted or refused a Ministerial exemption
- G. Project proposals that have been found to not be operating in conformity with the applicable requirements of a plan and enforcement activities have been required, and
- H. The time taken for NPC to process applications

This annual report will be given to the Commission as part of our annual reporting process. Are there any questions on that procedure? Okay.

Now the final procedure – and I hope I haven't been too painful in going through all 7 – the Periodic Review: In essence, NPC will take those annual reports and do a report every 3 years on whether a Plan needs to be revised. The gist of it is, if everything is running smoothly, there haven't been any comments or complaints, it doesn't look like there needs to be tweaking, no new parks have been established, and everyone is pretty happy with what's going on, then the Plan amendment is a significant undertaking, why do it. If factors indicate that there do needs to be some changes or a major overhaul, in most cases there will need to be some tweaking that this report would be the back up to the rationale of what those changes need to be and how they are going to be undertaken. There is additional considerations that were made every 3 years over the ones I just listed, and those are listed in section 2, and I'll just go through them very quickly, and then I will be done.

Okay, 2.1F, the extent to which policies, objectives and goals of the plan are being achieved through implementation of the Land Use Plan; G, the emergence of new concerns in the Nunavut Settlement Area; H, the emergence of policy initiatives at the Commission and/or the emergence of relevant policy initiatives from a planning partner; I, any feedback and/or recommendations included in the Commissions' annual report on the implementation of plans prepared under the previous procedure; J, the availability of new data, including updated statistical information, wildlife data, emerging economic opportunities or trends and the Nunavut General Monitoring Plan; and K, whether there is funding available for a review of the plan.

And the final decision on whether a plan will go through a review procedure will be made by the Commissioners. Are there any type of questions or comments on the 7<sup>th</sup> procedure?

- David L: Naida?
- Naida: Naida Gonzalez. I do have a question, because I understand in 2.1, every 3 years there will be an assessment, whether there should be a periodic review. However, 1.1 does not specify how often periodic reviews would take place. Under this system it would be possible not to have a review for an indefinite period of time, because you could keep having assessments of whether you are going to have a periodic review and not have one. So is there a possibility in 1.1 to say at a minimum, a review will take place every five years?
- David L: Go ahead, Peter.
- Peter: 1.1 is intended to mean that if a periodic review is needed more than every three years, the Commission has the ability to do that. Under 2.1, it says every three years following approval of a land use plan, the Executive Director will assess factors. Thank you.
- David L: Yeah, Stephane.
- Stephane: Stephane Robert. On the Monitoring Land Use Plan Implementation on Section 1.2, it's mentioned that NPC will review each license permit or authorization sent to the NPC by the regulators. So what it means really? Does it mean that the permit will not be enforced before the NPC will review it? What it means really, and what is the timeline on that? Thank you.
- David L: Peter, Jonathan, and then Sharon has something to add.
- Jonathan: This review is solely for the Commission's benefit to assess whether or not the conditions of the Land Use Plan are being implemented. That has no bearing on the actual licensing and involvement of that agency with the proponent. It's just the regulatory authorities may send the licenses to the Commission, and we will review them as part of our monitoring to evaluate the means by which they're being incorporated by licenses and authorizations.
- Stefan: So what will happen if NPC thinks it's not in line with the Land Use Plan?
- Jonathan: Then that would become an enforcement issue if the NPC feels that the license does not or permit does not appropriately implement the requirements of its Land Use Plan. I don't know the process that would be followed regarding that, but it would be a discussion between the NPC and the authorizing agency, as they are required to incorporate those terms and conditions. If the Commission did not feel they were appropriately incorporated, then that, I guess would become a conversation between NPC and the authorizing agency.
- David L: Okay, if I can interject. That's clearly an area that you're going to have to be more precise about. I mean, obviously the concern is that once a license is issued, it's issued. If the NPC then determines the license doesn't meet its requirements, it's a concern for the proponent big-time. So, there's probably a lot of clarity required between NPC and the regulatory authorities as this moves forward. Sharon.
- Sharon: It's Sharon from the Commission, and I thank you for the questions. Just to clarify: I don't know Naida that we answered your question concisely. The Commission is always self-reviewing. If in the two plans we see – the two current plans we have – we always are looking at those. Under

these internal procedures, the Commission self-imposes a minimum of every 3 years, but this procedure gives the Commission the ability to review as required. If an amendment or an addendum to the Plan is required, we can do that at any time. That's basically what this policy is saying, but the measure is every 3 years at a very minimum and in the interim as required.

Naida: Our concern is that we appreciate there will be an internal review, but we're looking for at a minimum when there will be a full public review of land use plans. One of the premises for the designations is that they will be reviewed, and they can be adapted, and they're not permanent. So for that to really...really resonate and have an impact, I think internal reviews are very necessary. But there also needs to be periodic public review, and we were under the impression that usually that happens every 5 years.

David L: Yeah, so the concern is that there be an automatic 5-year review whether or not your internal audit suggests that it's needed. I mean, the concern appears to be that internally you can decide that there's no need for the 5-year review, and that's not reassuring to some parties.

Sharon: So we thank you for the comments. These are new procedures, and we'll take your comments under notice. There are procedures that the Commission can review and change, and we'll take your comments as noticed. So I thank you for your feedback.

David L: Okay, well start with the chapter. Oh sorry, Stephane.

Liz: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's Elizabeth Kingston with the Chamber of Mines. Just a general comment on the Procedures document: So generally speaking, we have not had many comments or questions this morning to offer, because we've had so little time to review the document frankly. We would like to have the opportunity to provide a written submission on these documents once we have an opportunity to canvas our members and gather feedback. So we would appreciate if the Commission would consider our comments, even though it's been stated that these documents were already approved in March. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Liz. Sharon?

Sharon: Absolutely. All feedback is welcome, and these are first-time policies. We're trying them out, and any constructive feedback is welcome by the Commission. And again, it would go back to the Commissioners to change or amend the policies as they see fit, but your feedback is more than welcome. Thank you.

David L: Liz, when do you think you could have that?

Liz: Thank you. Elizabeth with the Chamber. I would have to....I would have to discuss with our executive and membership and have enough time to actually review the document before we could provide a complete response.

David L: Okay, I'm just trying to think of a date, a target date, not just for the Chamber but for others to provide comment to rather things trickling in periodically. Would mid-late September be okay?

Liz: Thank you for the question. It's Elizabeth. While we can't speak for the other parties, I would suggest that September would be a reasonable timeline or deadline for comments to come back. Thank you.

David L: Okay, I'll just throw on the table that September 30<sup>th</sup>, those who have comments provide them to the Commission by that date, and then the Commission would have a package, presumably of comments to consider, rather than one after the other trickling in at random times. Does that work for the Commission? Okay, alright so let's get back to the chapter section by section. Jonathan you leading that? Elizabeth.

Liz: Thank you. It's Elizabeth with the Chamber. One final question on these Procedures documents: You've stated a deadline of September 30<sup>th</sup> for comments back from the Chamber, and our question is whether or not these Procedures will be enforced before then or will you wait until we've had an opportunity to provide feedback and to properly review these documents before they come into effect?

David L: Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you. The policies are approved now. There is a requirement as well under NUPPAA. And NUPPAA we understand, or we've been told is effective...in effect on July 11<sup>th</sup>. Spencer, you can correct me if that's wrong. Thank you.

Spencer: I do believe the target date is July 9<sup>th</sup>.

Sharon: So, NUPPAA imposes deadlines or timelines on us, and these policies address those timelines. Thank you.

David L: So I guess that means the sooner you get your comments in, the better, if you have significant concerns. Alright, shall we try again?

Jonathan: Thank you, David. This is Jonathan from the Planning Commission. In regards to Chapter 7, it deals, of course, with the implementation of the Land Use Plan. There have been number of general comments received. Again, we are reviewing those and have done our best to get through them in the last few days. Many of them have general applicability to the entire chapter. We hope some of those concerns are addressed with further clarification in the Internal Procedures. There has been a lot of discussion about quoting or referencing or paraphrasing of NUPPAA, and again, we hope things are clearly laid out in the Procedures. So I won't go through every section and address all of the comments that have been provided. I do have a couple of comments noted that I'm seeking clarification on. I'd of course encourage anyone to reiterate any concerns they may have in light of the procedures that were just distributed and to raise any concerns as we go through.

So just starting at the beginning, Responsibilities for Plan Implementation: I don't have anything noted requiring clarification. I guess just please stop me at any point if you do, if you would like to emphasize a particular point that you provided in your written submission.

7.2 just provides a brief overview of the public registry, which we hope to have available soon. I don't have a date for that precisely, but again NUPPAA is coming shortly, and we're required to have it. So that is anticipated to be available shortly.

Spencer: So now we know that NUPPAA we do have an effective date and when it's going to be enforced. There's talk in Chapter 7 that the verbatim references to NUPPAA would be extracted. So is there going to be a new version of the implementation of Chapter 7 that we're going to see?

David L: Thanks, Spencer. Jonathan?

Jon: Thank you, Spencer. I can't speak to exactly when a revised Chapter 7 would be available, and when that will occur. That's a discussion I'm not going to speak to. But yes, the intention is to revise whether there are verbatim references or quotes or paraphrasing, the intention would be to rely more heavily on the procedures that we have prepared, which we believe are consistent with NUPPAA, and that's their intention. They've been carefully considered. So as we go through sections here that identify minor variances or periodic reviews, they may need to be reconsidered in maybe a more general summary without the explicit references to NUPPAA.

David L: Thanks Jonathan. I'd just point out that the second...the last sentence in the second paragraph says the final version of the Plan will not contain verbatim references. Obviously, you're going to have to meet that requirement too.

Jonathan: Yes.

David L: Okay, do you want to continue?

Jonathan: Absolutely. Thank you. Section 7.3 is regarding the Proposal Application. There have been some comments provided to that effect. I don't have any clarifications required that again would eventually be available through the public registry where proponents would be able to apply online. I would note that. Section 7.4, Land Use Designations and Terms, I....

David L: Jonathan, sorry. We have a question. Naida?

Naida: There is a comment in NTI, RIA submission that on the project proposal application in regards to the identification of Inuit place names, the way that's written in the Draft is that it would greatly assist. NTI and RIAs, we would like to see something more like a requirement that proponents use Inuit place names, and we're looking for comments back as to whether a more definitive statement can be made.

David L: Jonathan?

Jonathan: I'm not prepared to make any commitments at this time. I thank you for the comment.

David L: Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you. It's Sharon from the Commission. The Commission doesn't have a complete set of the names, so if NTI or the RIAs have any further information or datasets, we would gladly accept them. Thank you.

David L: I suspect that stronger wording will emerge, but as we've said before, the Commission staff don't have the authority to make an absolute commitment to that. But I think they hear and are sympathetic to your suggestion.

Naida: We would just mention that Inuit Heritage Trust would have the majority of that information, and we will facilitate that discussion between the parties.

David L: Great. Thank you. Okay, anything else? Okay, Jonathan why don't you pick up where you left off.

Jonathan: Thank you very much David. Regarding 7.4, Land Use Designation and Terms: I would appreciate if there are any further comments from any of the participants regarding some of the issues that have been discussed throughout the meeting this week in terms of concerns regarding direction to regulatory authorities, cumulative impact referrals. There have been a number statements made regarding consultation requirement, both with communities and with individual departments within government. There have also been comments regarding subjects like demonstration of consideration in regards to mitigating impacts on drinking water supplies, these sorts of processes that would take place before a submission to the Commission. I guess I would just appreciate if anyone has any further thoughts on that to share to provide any more clarity to what has been submitted?

Yeah, just to clarify, on any aspect of land use designations and terms, again we've talked about these throughout the week. I realize we have written submissions, and we're going to back to those and consider them carefully. I'd just appreciate that it's a significant component of the Plan. They have general applicability across all land use designations. Just if there's anything that anyone wanted to emphasize about how the Land Use Plan works in terms of prohibited uses – we understand they need to be clear and easily interpreted. We've heard that. That one's clear. Direction to regulatory authorities, there have been comments that it should be information to decision-makers, or the onus should be placed more on the proponent. We just received 300 pages of comments and we are considering them. I just would encourage anyone to provide any clarity that might help us as we interpret this but completely respect that we have received the written submissions, and we will consider them.

David L: Why don't you continue on, Jonathan. If people have comments as they're taking another look at things, I'm sure we can get back to them.

Jonathan: Okay, one issue I had noted in particular on this section, it outlines – although I'm not seeing the exact quote here on the page – but I had noted that the Government of Nunavut had identified concerns regarding overlapping land use designations. So there are areas in the Plan, for example where a Protected Area and a Special Management Area overlap. And the Plan attempts to articulate that the requirements of both designations would apply in the area where they overlap. The Government of Nunavut has pointed out that could be viewed to be conflicting or two land use designations, and those should be addressed and taken into consideration.

We appreciate that point, and I just wanted to note that the thinking behind that was where the conditions or terms of a Special Management Area and Protected Area, in some cases they can

work together to support an area. So in the Lancaster Sound National Marine Conservation Area proposal, for example, there is a certain list of prohibited uses. Within some Special Management Areas around the Lancaster Sound proposal, there would be setback requirements that were identified by Environment Canada for migratory bird habitat. Those setback requirements are not in the Lancaster Sound proposal, so the intent was to try and apply both requirements in some situations. So I just wanted to provide a bit of clarity on the rationale as to why that was done.

David L: Jennifer?

Jennifer: Thank you, David and thank you, Jonathan for your clarification. I think that raises another question for me. My understanding was that overlapping land use designations would be, one area would have two designations applied to it? But from what I think you're saying is that you could have one land use designation and then it's abutting and adjacent land use designations would have supporting prohibited uses or terms? Is that correct?

Jonathan: Sorry, I didn't quite follow. Perhaps I can just attempt to rephrase. Where there is an overlap, we saw value in maintaining both conditions or both designations. You could argue that well, if both are required in this area, make a new designation and put a new number on it and combine the terms, and that would be Area 230 as opposed to 229 or 231. But there's an attempt to address that by just having the requirements of both designations apply. And if they were in conflict, a decision was made, and one was removed from the other. But where we saw them as being compatible, so the example of the prohibition on oil and gas in the Lancaster Sound area and the setbacks for migratory bird habitat, we saw no reason to remove one or either of those two requirements of the Plan. So we effectively tried to articulate how they could be combined and both would apply.

David L: Yeah, we've had some discussion about this over the last couple of days. I'm not a land use planner, but I've had experience with land use plans. I find it confusing too. I think what the GN is saying is that – and I'll try to paraphrase – if there is an area that has some status pursuant to regulations – it's created as a Marine Protected Area for example – the Land Use Plan need not add to that. The decision has been made to protect an area under legislation. That should be good enough. I think that's essentially the point. No? Alright. I'm corrected. Vicki has corrected me.

Jennifer: Thank you. I think our confusion lies...I guess the question is, is it necessary to have two distinct land use designations applied to one area, or could.... I think it might be confusing to users, so perhaps just having one land use designation that would incorporate all the values that are addressed in the two separate ones. And obviously this would be the Commission's decision, but I think it would become confusing to have more than one land use designation applied to a certain area or a certain geographic spot. That's our interpretation of that part of the Plan. And I think that's where our concern is. It's just we find it confusing. Thank you.

David L: Okay. Any response, Jonathan other than you'll try to sort it out?

Jonathan: Yeah, thank you. We noted the confusion, and yeah, I just thought it might be beneficial to try and articulate the rationale behind what we were doing. We appreciate that it is not entirely clear.

- David L: Okay, Stephane you had a question?
- Stephane: Yes, Stephane Robert. I'm a little bit confused, and I will take an example. So we have between Rankin and Baker Lake, we have a transportation corridor. And this transportation corridor passes through different areas. So we have the Protected Area. We have a Special Management Area and some Mixed Use. So in this case, if a road is built, what will be...what will be the designation of this road, because it passes through a lot of different areas – Protected, Special Management Area, and Mixed Use? So that is really confusing for me and confusing for any people that want to do development. So I understand more a little bit about that. Thank you.
- David L: Thanks, Stephane. Jonathan? Can you clear up the confusion?
- Jonathan: I think I'm confused as well.
- David L: More coffee please. Well, so am I, and I guess I'm....I was just talking to David about some of the terms. And I know this Plan has been in development for some time. But even the term 'Protected Area' confuses me. It has a different meaning in other contexts. These areas are areas where there are prohibited uses. So terminology is a bit of a challenge, and I think that is being reflected in some of the discussions. Yeah, sure.
- Jonathan: Sorry David. I'd like to just give the opportunity for Stephane to reiterate his concern and confusion. In part I was a bit confused about the specific question. If you could just reiterate please?
- Stephane: Yes. Stephane Robert. So on the screen here, we saw what I was talking about, about Rankin Inlet and Baker Lake. We have a transportation corridor. So if we, you know, build the road as an example, and this passes through different Protected Areas, Special Management, Mixed Use. So what will be the designation of this road? Is the transportation corridor will be prioritized over the different area?
- David L: Stephane, maybe I can help a little. The analogy used, and it's not – because the term 'Protected Area' has different meaning – but think of Hwy 1 through Banff National Park. So within Banff National Park, certain restrictions apply to the highway, to the use of the highway. Outside the park, different considerations apply. It's still a transportation corridor, but depending on the geographic area it is crossing and the layers of regulation in that area, different rules apply. So one corridor passing through several different zones is not unusual in Southern Canada.
- Christine: Yeah, Christine Kowbel. I think what the Chamber is trying to articulate is it's just a flag to the NPC, the challenge posed by any linear project – whether it's a road or a transmission line, any utility corridors – and how, sort of the unique features of that kind of project that might be presented by the approach in the Land Use Plan. Thank you.
- David L: Peter?
- Peter: Thanks. Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission. I'm going to try to summarize what the Plan currently does and how it's structured, and hopefully help clarify what's going on here. So I think take this Rankin to Baker corridor, for example. What the Plan says is over on the right

screen. It says there are several proposed corridors, including this list, which includes the Rankin-to-Baker. Now if you look at the regulations for polygon 47, included in the list of prohibited uses is all weather roads. So my reading of this, when I understood it, was that the Plan recognizes that a road between Rankin and Baker is envisioned for some point in the future, more or less in this location. However, because of the importance of polygons 47, my interpretation is that the drafters of the Plan felt that a Plan amendment process should be undertaken to take this corridor – to take a strip out of 47 or to revise protection measures in 47 before the road is actually, before the corridor is designated as a strip of land, which would allow for the road to be built. So basically is a way of ensuring that when the road is thought out, caribou are given very high level of protection. And there's a lot of community consultation before the final routing is chosen. Because at this stage, the best map we have is basically a broad brush pen. And on the scale of maps we're using, the width of the pen mark is kilometers wide. We don't...by the time we actually get to the point where a road is being built, that may change. So, the Plan is trying to recognize the long-term vision of the territory while protecting the current resources.

David L: Stephane.

Stephane: Liz will come after me, so if I understood, we have a transportation corridor but we cannot build the road there?

David L: Peter.

Peter: No, it's listed in the text as a proposed transportation corridor. It's not listed as a transportation corridor in the Plan.

Stephane: Just a second please.

David: Peter, if I can try to sum up, and I'll be corrected no doubt, if I'm wrong here. You've recognized the interest that has been expressed for a transportation corridor in this area. For the time being, that corridor is not a permitted use. It's...a road in that area is prohibited, but in time when a proposal comes forward, an amendment would be contemplated recognizing that there is a longstanding interest in that. Did I get that right?

Peter: Yes you did. That is correct.

David L: That's a relief. Alright, Luigi.

Luigi: I guess...Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I guess the question for me ends up being, how long is an amendment going to take in order for a plan like this to be undertaken? As we all know, Nunavut is in serious need of infrastructure, and it takes many years for any kind of project to take life. Once the capital is available, how long is the amendment process going to take?

David L: Peter.

Peter: Peter Scholz. Thanks for your question, Luigi. This is the way my interpretation would be of how this would play out. So, let's say funding becomes available for building this road. The way I

think it would work out on the ground is that the people planning this road would look at this map and go like...and go, "Okay, we understand that people have talked about a Baker-to-Rankin road for a very long time. We know the concept is approved by the people of Nunavut, because Nunavut Land Use Plan has been approved, and it has been in operation for a number of years." They'll look at this map. They'll look at the regulations for 47, and they'll see the road is not permitted. Then they'll say, "Okay, we have two options. We can either go through 47, or we can go around 47." If you look at the map up on the screen, if they go 40 or 50 km out of their way to the North – and I have no idea whether that's technical feasible or not – I'm just saying, if they zig the road to the north, they can avoid 47 completely. This may be 5 years. It could be 25. It could be 50 years before this road is actually being built.

At that future date, the 47 polygon may not be applicable as it is now. The 47 polygon may have moved, because maybe the caribou calving areas may have moved, and information has come in, and the 47 polygon has been amended based on the information. Then there's going to be amendments every 3, 5, 10 years, whatever is appropriate, as we agree to. So if 47 is still as it exists, and they have to put the road through 47, they'll then apply for a Plan amendment.

So NPC will look at that and say, "Yes a road corridor has been envisioned there. This will have to go to community insight. We're going to need detail information on mitigations and that sort of thing." The communities, specifically Baker and Rankin at that point – the people will have a great deal of say of how they feel about that road going through. The Plan amendment process doesn't....can take a longer period of time, but for projects of this magnitude and with the kind of long-lasting impacts that would be derived, I would argue that taking the time and figuring out the proper mitigations and management of the road to protect the caribou would be appropriate, and it's worth that extra 6, 8, or 10 months to figure those things out in detail, to allow the Plan to be amended appropriately.

David L: Thanks, Peter. Stephane. Luis? Sorry, Luigi.

Luigi: Sorry, I wanted to thank you Stephane for allowing me a follow-up, or at least a follow-up comment anyway. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I appreciate your comment about switching the area and avoiding, potentially avoiding the designation by altering the road. Thinking from my area, in the Kitikmeot and the proposed roads there, that becomes a much more significant challenge to avoid a Protected Area. So it becomes much less flexible.

The other comment that I would like to make is that unfortunately – talk about a thorn in my side – unfortunately, in terms of infrastructures like this, it has not been government....the governments have not been the lead authorities in proposing or developing. I apologize. I'm not speaking for the Kivalliq region. But in my region, in the Kitikmeot, the governments have not been the lead authority speaking to roads. For a community, for a territory to grow, infrastructure is needed. If it is project proponents that put these forward, the project proponents are going to have some serious challenges logically and from a capital standpoint to bring these projects forward. Government has time. They've got a lot of time. But project proponents, time is money. And it becomes - that window of opportunity really shrinks. So, again, I guess the question ends up being, is there a sped-up process for proposed infrastructure that is already recognized in the Plan? Because if it's recognized, maybe it could be sped up. What about projects not yet recognized? That becomes a whole other layer of complexity. So that's the end of my comment.

David L: Thanks, Luigi. I just – before I go back to Stephane – I'll point out that this is not a new issue. The Gwich'in dealt with it with Mackenzie Valley Pipeline. The plan was set up so that while there was a fairly broad corridor known for the pipeline route, the precise corridor was not known. So the planners built into the approved land use plan, a corridor – general - and then allowed for the variance once the precise coordinates of that corridor were established. That's one way of doing it. There are other ways of doing it, but it's not a horrendous challenge, and I think it can be managed efficiently.

Luigi: Thank you for pointing out the variance. I wasn't thinking that route. The amendment would probably apply for projects that are not there, but hopefully a variance would result in a quicker response in this scenario. Thank you.

David L: I mean, it was different with the Gwich'in because there was more definition with respect to the pipeline corridor, but you know, again, it's just an example of elsewhere that did work. Stephane. Sorry Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon: Just to clarify, there are a number of options, right? Peter spoke to a couple of them. Through the amendment process with the consultation and the review, it may be decided and acceptable that the path stay straight or that it be variance, or it would be amended. So there are many options, or it could go for an exemption. But those are all part of options.

The other thing, the amendment process doesn't necessarily need to take long. We processed one for a proponent, and it took less than 6 months, and that was the whole process. You know, it's depending whether we have the resources, like the funding to undertake all of these things, and that's an issue that the Commission is actively working on resolving so that we are very timely with responses and being able to process the amendment requests as they come through. So, you know, it doesn't necessarily mean that it's going to take a long time. It can take as little as six months, and that's the one that we did process. That's what the timeline was. And the Commission wants to be responsive and be efficient and ensure that we're not holding up projects. Thank you.

David L: Okay, Spencer. Is the check in the mail?

*(Laughter)*

Spencer: Spencer Dewar, Government of Canada. I guess our review – I think we might have misunderstood. When we saw a proposed transportation corridor, we thought it was proposed because eventually someone would be building an all-weather road. But the way I'm understanding it is NPC is saying that it's a proposed transportation corridor, so you're not quite sure whether transportation should be allowed there. I think the Plan, whatever the decision of the NPC or the Commission is, has to be clear. So it has to be a transportation corridor and allow for all-weather roads, or it's not a transportation corridor, right? So thank you.

David L: Okay. Yeah, Sharon.

Sharon: So for clarity, it's not recognized as a transportation corridor. It is proposed, and it's future. It's an identification that that's been identified to the Commission. Thank you.

Spencer: But it doesn't make....there's no special conveyance by saying it's a proposed transportation corridor, right? So the Plan should articulate where transportation corridors are agreed to and exist. So if it's a proposed....I would just like to see like transportation corridors clearer and allow for a reasonable expectation that, you know, they would conform to the Land Use Plan. Right? Recognizing that just because a road is being pitched, there's still a robust regulatory environment, environmental assessment and regulatory that would look at some of the impacts, right? So I think the Plan just needs to be bold and say, "There are the areas where we envision transportation, and transportation conforms to this Land Use Plan in these areas." Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Spencer. I guess I'd point out that I would...just looking at map and without much familiarity, those are pretty straight lines. I'd call them conceptual at best, and there is going to be a considerable amount of work before it becomes a proposed corridor. Then once it becomes a proposed corridor, there's going to be more work to define the actual route. So in the end, it may look entirely different. As Peter has said, the circumstances will change in the meantime anyhow. I'd caution people about getting too worked about this at this point when we're dealing with concepts and wish lists at best. Stephane.

Stephane: So the Government of Canada has identified infrastructure deficit, a big constraining factor in Nunavut. So what is the rationale behind land use amendment when the NIRB process conducts a complete review of any potential effect done to enter a job project?

As an example, an environmental impact assessment is around four years. We will spend 5 million of dollars and more, only to do the environmental impact assessment, plus the engineering fees of all that. So now what we put...so every infrastructure, because don't have infrastructure in Nunavut. The longest road in Nunavut is a road that was constructed by a private company. Agnico Eagle is 110km. It's a private road on federal land, commissioner land, IOL land. But it's a private road. Now every time that we will have to build infrastructure, we'll have another step in the permitting process to amend the Land Use Plan. So thank you.

David L: Thanks, Stephane. Any other comments? Yeah, Luis and then we'll take a break.

Luis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Luis Manzo from the Kivalliq Inuit Association. NPC is well aware of the research done in the transportation corridor based in the Keewatin Land Use Plan they did propose 12 years ago. It's explicit there, within the understanding of governments, which established to select that corridor. KIA took initiative to select the alignment. The alignment is practically what you have in the map, and it's exactly 50km wide. There's a reason why it's 50km wide. It's specifically economics. It was an assumption made that the corridor can actually be moved in one specific area in order to make it happen, but economically it's impossible. We map all the materials. We map all the materials and all the alignment that can be used to build that road to do an economic assessment in that corridor in order to put numbers to each km to be built in that assessment. And that assessment is being built according to the Keewatin Land Use Plan recommendations. We'd like to see that corridor remain as a corridor of alignment, which is what we call existing alignment in the Keewatin region, that's now a formal. Where in those 50km it's going to be will depend on who build the road and some engineering decision. But that's based...any road is based on two things in Nunavut: One is your water crossings and two is the materials to minimize the cost of your road. There's not going to be (?) With those 50km. The documents are valuable, and economic development and transportation has it. Federal

Government provides us the funding to do that, and it's being agreed....I don't think we are off in here, but we want to make sure that designation – this is a corridor, in those areas. You can't invest money and then tell me there's not going to be a corridor. I have an existing approved legislated land use plan that would base all that research on. We will recommend the Commission to consider very seriously, because it's an access. It's not – 60 engineers coming with alignment. That's all the information that our consultation across Manitoba and Nunavut is being carried out. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Luis. Jennifer is it quick, or is it going to result in more ongoing discussion, because we can do it before the break or after.

Jennifer: Thank you. We would like to be able to make our point. However, I realize that more discussion can happen after the break. I'd like to thank Peter for providing a good explanation of the process that could potentially arise in a situation like the one that we're talking about with proposed corridors going through multiple land use designations.

The GN would like to say that we rely on the processes that are outlined by the Nunavut Planning Commission, because they do allow for consideration of the current environment that is within these places. It allows for proper consultation with the affected communities, and also for the specific prohibited uses that may be stated within the land use designations, for example within core calving areas and key access corridors. So the GN does have concerns that if there were a corridor designated as was suggested by the Government of Canada, that it may reduce the opportunity for implementing the terms that are stated in a specific land use designation, like the Protected Areas or Special Management Areas. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Jennifer. That's helpful. Okay, let's take a 15 minute break and then pick up the discussion as need be.

## BREAK

David L: Okay, folks. We're going to get going again. But I just wanted to throw up a slide on the screen. It kind of illustrates where land use planning can take us or not take us. I don't know if you can read it, but basically the couple is in the middle of nowhere looking at a map, at a plan. And the caption is "This is just going from bad to worse." I don't think that applies in this particular case, but that does say something about land use planning. Alright please grab your seats, and we'll get on with the discussion. Stephane and company, did you have any follow-up comments to make? I don't know if Stephane is here any longer. Alright well, I'm....Elizabeth, do you guys have any follow-up comments? Alright, well you contemplate, Naida you do have some comments to make?

Naida: Yes, I was just going to follow-up on the Luis' comments from the Kivalliq Inuit Association and the submission – the NTI and RIA submission – we did emphasize the Kivalliq-Manitoba corridor. One comment is that not all the corridors are as well developed as others. In the case of the Manitoba-Kivalliq one, there is a formal delineation that arguably could have its own designation. In discussions, I think what would be easiest is a Special Management Area that would then deal with terms and conditions for whatever the NPC thought was necessary,

whether that be caribou or community consultation. But for corridors that are further along, there needs to be, I think, some planning for it beyond plan amendments.

David L: Okay, thanks Naida. My sense of it – and I guess I'm in agreement in that the nature of these proposals, some are better defined than others. Some look to me like somebody just took a ruler and drew a line from one community to another on a map, and there's no real alignment. It's conceptual at best. Until there's more detail provided, it's pretty difficult to set aside a corridor. It may be entirely the wrong corridor, and then another amendment is required. Yeah, Sharon.

Sharon: For clarity, we're not proposing a corridor. These are anticipated. We have...what we have, I just asked our staff. We have a map, no further data than a proposed map with no definitive routing from Kivalliq. We have no information from other parties of definitive corridors. So when we say "anticipated," it's the Commission's best guess. We hear what everyone is saying. So we'll go back and give it further consideration, but if any of the parties have definitive information that they want to provide to the Commission, the Commission is very open to taking that information. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Sharon. Stephane?

Christine: Christine Kowbel. I just wanted to clarify that I think Baffinland has provided shape files for the approved southern shipping route. That's an actual corridor rather than a proposed corridor, and so we'll provide a follow-up written submission after the hearing so that the NPC has that information. Thank you.

David L: Jennifer, do you have any comments at this point?

Jennifer: Thank you, David. This is something that the GN would like to have more discussions internally about, so we have no further comments at this time. Thank you.

David L: Great. Thanks. Alright, Spencer.

Spencer: Hi. Spencer from Government of Canada. I just want to restate our position. As we see it, the proposed transportation corridors now, we don't see that conveying any special status. We think it may lead to confusion where people think this is where roads can be built. So we'd ask that NPC, you know with the parties, come up with transportation corridors where roads could be built, or where they would be preferable, where they would conform to the Plan, right? Thank you.

David L: Okay, why don't we leave this topic now? I'll ask Jonathan to move on. I'm hoping that we can wrap this chapter up by noon, but we'll see.

Jonathan: Okay, thank you very much David. That will wrap up Section 7.4 on Land Use Designations and Terms. As we've noted, we have received a number of comments, and they will be given full consideration.

Section 7.5 includes Generally Permitted Uses. The first and third, I'm not aware of any comments on Remediation and Reclamation, and the Establishment of National Historic Sites.

There was a bit of a clarification from the Government of Canada on administration by Parks Canada, and I think that was clear. The middle one, though, Accessory Uses, caused a deal of confusion and we have received comments with some proposed clarifications. I just wanted to make a comment that may help the participants. The concept, as far as I understand it, of Accessory Uses stemmed from the concept of a use being allowed in an area where perhaps there was infrastructure existing – for example, there might be an airstrip or runway in an area where certain activities would be prohibited. But it may be beneficial to use that airstrip to access adjacent areas. So that was the example that was discussed. An Accessory Use was an attempt to allow that type of activity. So if an airstrip occurred in a Protected Area, for example, and there would be benefit to utilize that airstrip to access an adjacent Mixed Use or Special Management Area where the use would be permitted, that was sort of the incentive for trying to incorporate Accessory Uses. And we appreciate that the definition may require some clarity, and that could benefit from some additional consideration and discussion.

David L: Stephane.

Stephane: Stephane Robert. So, can you clarify when we talk about Accessory Use, what criteria are you going to use to define customarily, because in the definition, you have both accidental and customarily. So can you define what criteria will you use to define that? Thank you.

David L: Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you, Stephane. I'm not prepared today to clarify a definition and further expand upon that. We appreciated the concern has been noted, and I know there have been suggestions among the various submissions that will be considered. If we have not commented on that, additional suggestions would be appreciated, but I guess I don't have a response today. Thanks.

David L: Okay. Any other comments? Yeah, Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you, David. The GN would like to note that we have a similar comment to the one that was just made regarding Accessory Uses and the criteria used to determine them. We also had a comment regarding the conformity determination process that may be used for an Accessory Use. Perhaps the Commission could provide additional clarification on how that would unfold? Thank you.

David L: Jonathan?

Jonathan: I think the issue as we've noted requires further clarification on how those uses would be more explicitly defined, and if that is developed, it would roll into the Conformity Determination process the same way, determining if a use is a prohibited use or not. If those are clearly articulated, it would be part of the Conformity Determination process in the same way, appreciating that's not clear in the current Draft.

David L: Okay. Any other comments? Jonathan you want to go on?

Jonathan: Section 7.6 deals with Existing Rights. Again there have been several comments on this issue. It references some NUPPAA sections. I won't particularly try and paraphrase people's comments. We have noted them. The Government of Canada, in particular though, did identify a suggestion

to expand upon the existing rights as they are identified in NUPPAA. These were minimum standards that the Land Use Plan could expand upon. It concluded with a line that when 10 years expire, the prohibitions would then become applicable – the prohibitions in the Land Use Plan. It wasn't quite clear to me – and again, this is another issue that requires additional discussion - if there would be an opportunity in there for terms and conditions to apply in these cases. NUPPAA does discuss different variations of what existing rights would be preserved under different scenarios of work stoppages and rebuilding. And it does differentiate between prohibitions and terms and conditions, and their applicability depending on when a plan was approved or amended. And the language in the Canada submission, I think it didn't differentiate between those two, and we were wondering if you had any thoughts on that.

David L: Thoughts welcome. Stephane.

Stephane: Stephane Robert. On the existing rights, I want to clarify something, because the mining industry, the first thing that they do is exploration. So if we have a site that does exploration, so that is an existing right. So is the existing right will be good to do mining or if...what really? Because a mine starts by exploration and go to a mining. But if you do drilling, but you are in a zone that's prohibited, but you can do exploration because it was existing right, but you cannot do a mine...so that will lose all the investment that we will put. So I want to have clarity on that on the existing use. Thank you.

David L: Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you, Stephane for your question. The answer is subject to ongoing discussions that we're currently having. So we can't give a definitive answer today. Thank you. Oh, and it was Sharon from NPC.

David L: Spencer?

Spencer: Thank you. Spencer Dewar, Government of Canada. The federal position on existing rights is we'd like to see that mineral rights have the ability to advance to other stages of the life cycle. Where you'd originally start with a prospecting permit, someone could think that the switch to a mineral lease would be, you know, a change in use. So as you're doing early exploration, and then all of a sudden you start to do exploratory drilling, and then eventually a mine. We think if there's an expectation that a company or a proponent that has started the process should be able to go to the final stages. Right?

So we're just saying from a conformity perspective, we think that they should be grandfathered, not need conformity to go to the next stage. That's not to say that they'd be exempt from EA, right? We'd still have all those processes that would take care of the impacts, etc. What we're trying to avoid is a wet blanket being thrown over the economy, changing everyone's sort of tenure as they understand it, recognizing that no one does mineral exploration for the sake of mineral exploration. They are all trying to take it to the next level of a mine, right? So we need to have the transitional clauses to give the existing rights a chance to mature and actualize.

David L: Okay, just an editorial comment I guess: In the case of prospecting permits, those cover huge areas and could kind of override a number of other interests in that area if there was a blanket

acknowledge that those are preexisting rights that kind of supersede anything else. It's just a comment.

Spencer: But a prospecting permit is in place for a finite amount of time, right? And it would eventually expire, right? So it would be incumbent upon the proponent to advance the prospecting permit to you know, a mineral claim, which would probably be a smaller footprint. And then from a mineral claim, they would move to a mineral lease, which would probably be even a smaller, you know. So what we're trying to do is protect that causal link from Point A to Point B, right? But as the proponents give up their tenure, then all of a sudden the designation would then apply for any future uses, right?

David L: Okay, thanks. Naida.

Naida: I did have the opportunity to communicate with NTI legal services on this point, as we discussed the first day. They have expressed some uncertainty whether NUPPA, in fact...the provisions are just a minimum of what can be exempted. So they've asked whether there can be more communication with the Government of Canada on the details of the legal opinion on NUPPA, as well with NPC. The main point being is that the right interpretation that everybody agrees on needs to be established. Because the consequence is that, you know, someone could contest the Land Use Plan based on the existing rights issue not being properly dealt with. So I would just ask Spencer whether we can have some communication as to how to get our respective colleagues in contact.

Spencer: Spencer Dewar, Government of Canada. Yeah, of course. We built NUPPA as a collective, so we certainly want to implement as a collective as well. So we can have those discussions for sure. Thank you.

David L: Sorry, Luis?

Luis: Yes, Luis Manzo, Kivalliq Inuit Association. I just want to make a comment to the Federal Government position, which is the same question that we raised in terms of the grandfather part. In the Land Claim, there is existing easements to certain properties. But I want to put an example of one conflicting property, which is in calving ground, which in this case will be Ferguson Lake, which is a donut in the center of the calving ground without access. How do we have access to that right? We don't have adjacent access? And then on top of that we have a new designation, which prohibit any...that kind of use. So that's just something that needs to be clarified. But the Claim clarifies some of those projects – Kiggavik, Cumberland, Meliadine – but not for the existing new leases the Federal Government has. I will ask probably the industry to provide those easements. They should be actually put forward. There was an exercise in the Claim in order to make sure the right was being exercised. Otherwise, you've been entering in a conflict of designation clashes. You know what happened, we had a long process before investment is getting into those properties. So I just wanted to have the certainty of the Claim that the lease adjustment is being actually provided if that's possible, because it could be different ways you can...but I'm sure it's existing land adjustment in those properties, especially the leases. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Luis. Stephane.

Liz: Thank you. It's Elizabeth with the Chamber. With respect to NTIs previous comment regarding more communications with the Government of Canada with respect to existing rights, industry, we would like to be part of those discussions due to our existing claims. Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Elizabeth. I can anticipate that the GN would like to be party to those too? And so would a number of others. Well, there you go, another working group. Any other comments on this particular section? Okay, Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, David. The majority of the rest of the chapter deals with sections that are also addressed in the Internal Procedures. As we have stated, we have received a number of comments on this document that applied generally in terms of the way we are referencing NUPPAA and the way the section's outline or the requirements. I'm not going to go through those or note any particular concerns. But as we proceed through Conformity Determinations, Minor Variance, Exemptions, Plan Amendments, Periodic Reviews, there's a section on Additional Research, and a final note on Enforcement. The Plan identifies how these will occur, and we have already established that will need some reconsideration. If anyone has any comments, they'd be welcome.

David L: Yes, please.

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I was wondering if the Commission staff could just provide a little bit of an overview on how the section on additional research and studies was formulated, and what kind of boundaries or... just essentially, how did they come up with what they have presented here? Thank you.

David L: Thanks, Jackie. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much for the question. This section on Additional Research and Studies was pulled together based on our experience developing the Land Use Plan of areas where we could benefit from additional information to further refine the Plan, as well through our discussions with communities. In some cases, concerns were noted where the Land Use Plan might not fully address those concerns. It was identified as potential priorities for future research. We'd also note that we sit on the secretariat – oh, sorry the steering committee for the Nunavut General Monitoring Plan where there are some research projects that are funded. We identify projects that support land use planning and allow us to develop land use plans. So these types of priorities would also be pursued through that organization as well.

David L: Any...Stephane...Chamber I should say.

Stephane: Stephane Robert. On Section 7.10 on Plan Amendment, on Point D, the review we say one of the bullet is 'have an adverse impact on wildlife, wildlife habitat and community use.' So what authority is under the NLCA and NPC would carry out its own impact assessment? Thank you.

David L: Jonathan? Sharon?

Sharon: Could...Stephane, could you rephrase your question, please? We're not sure what you're asking us. Thank you.

Stephane: So on Section 7.10 D, the third bullet, it says...to say if, whether or not the proposal amendment would have an adverse impact on wildlife, wildlife habitat and community land use. We talk about impact. So the question is what authorities under the NLCA, NPC would carry out its impact assessment?

David L: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you. I don't have my Land Claims in front of me right now. We will look it up, and we will get back to you and give you the group announcer.

David L: Stephane, if I can just add. I don't think they're talking about full-blown impact assessment here. It's...based on the information they proceed, whether or not the Commission thinks that there could be a significant impact. I don't think we're talking about duplicating a NIRB process, for example, if that's what you're concerned about.

Stephane: Because really, that to clarify (?) this view, you have an impact, you need to do a full impact assessment. That is part of Nunavut Impact Review Board. So that was my question. Thank you.

David L: Yeah, and I understand the concern. As you've heard, the Commission will try to clarify that. Any other comments? Yes, Naida.

Naida: Naida Gonzalez. I just wanted to comment on 7.12, Periodic Review and Monitoring: It was the assurance I was looking for earlier in the day that a periodic review would happen every five years, appears to be in the Land Use Plan. It says a periodic review should occur every five years. I'm sure we would prefer "will," but I would suggest that the Procedures this morning are not in line with what's in the Draft, and we prefer what's in the Draft.

David L: Okay. I think that's registered. Any other comments, concerns? Yeah, Spencer.

Spencer: Hello. Spencer Dewar, Government of Canada. So these comments were proposed before we saw the Internal Procedures, and they're around cumulative impacts. So we noticed that the Plan has the Commission's ability to forward things to NIRB for screening when there are concerns over cumulative impacts, referenced as a term in the back tables. We see that ability exists everywhere, because it comes from the NLCA. So we thought it would be best to maybe not have it as a term, but maybe change in the term to say that you know, this is an area that could have cumulative impact concerns. But then in this section, in between 7.8 and 7.9, we'd add a new section, which talked about how cumulative impacts would be assessed. It's almost like extracting what's in the internal procedures into the document so you can read them and see them there clearly.

David L: Any comment from the NPC staff?

Jonathan: Sorry, just to clarify: The proposal or the suggestion is to incorporate the criteria or guideline questions from the Procedure into the Land Use Plan itself and maintain in the Land Use Plan potentially identifying particular areas that may be of concern, but not including them as a term under the Land Use Plan.

Spencer: Yeah, the term as written now comes from the NLCA, so we think it's a blanket of NPC to do it any time. So when we see it specifically referenced in terms of specific sites, it almost diminishes the ability of NPC. But I do think how the terms are outlined, you know, highlighting that this is an area that NPC sees a potential for cumulative impacts, is probably good guidance to proponents. But I think maintaining and being clear about the right to send things to NIRB when there's cumulative impacts is across the territory. And we have offered some wording that could be in there, and I think we've highlighted that you should discuss with NIRB to get something finalized. But we're just trying to provide some guidance on how we think it would be more accurate to the Claim.

David L: Okay. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Spencer. The Commission accepts that, and we will further consider it and look at it. Thank you.

David L: Any other comments from anyone? Alright, well, we're apparently at end of the Draft Land Use Plan. One outstanding bit of business is the caribou workshop, proposed caribou workshop. GN had asked that we have some discussion about that, so I'll ask Jennifer.

Jennifer: Sorry, David. We were having discussions. But yes, thank you. We would like to hear a little bit more from the table – from around the table - with respect to the caribou workshop; perhaps a little bit more about what parties' expectations might be for such a workshop and what the outcomes of a workshop would be. Perhaps NPC could share that with the group so that we could have a better understanding of how this workshop would facilitate the planning process. As we get closer to the public hearing, I think that would be useful for everybody so that we may be better able to plan our meaningful participation in a workshop such as this one that has been proposed.

David L: Okay, just to remind folks: The notion of a caribou workshop came up early in this meeting, given that issue of caribou conservation and calving ground protection and mobile protection measures, and conflicting land uses and so on, is one of those thorny issues and central, I think, to the interest of folks in Nunavut and elsewhere – folks across the border in the NWT. And it was clear we're not going to resolve that problem in this forum, so the suggestion was that a separate meeting – a technical meeting be set up with the intent of at the end of that couple days – probably - session, that there would be some recommendation that the Nunavut Planning Commission could consider in developing the Plan. So that was kind of the impetus of it. The Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, perhaps not coincidentally, was planning a caribou workshop anyhow, so the idea started to gel that perhaps we could accelerate that timing. In addition to the caribou protection measures, I think that Nunavut Wildlife Management Board was initially focusing on broadening the scope. So I'll just turn it to the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board perhaps to explain what their thinking was about the caribou workshop you were proposing, and then we can try to figure out where we go from there.

Karla: Thank you, David. This is Karla Letto with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. Yes, the NWMB was considering having a caribou workshop. The intention of the workshop that we had in mind was to bring in experts, both scientific and Traditional Knowledge holders to discuss the most current research in the field with caribou and disturbance studies. So that was our intention. We wanted to have a bit more of an educational day followed by a day when

workshop participants can kind of draw on the information that we heard from these experts, and try to come up with either new...or update the caribou protection measures or discuss other options that we can do to protect caribou. When we started conversations around the table on Day 1 about how NPC could have a caribou workshop as well, we thought there could be potential there, that we could combine both of our workshops.

We would still like to have our as an information sharing session part of it but are open to partnering with other organizations. Maybe it could be a 3- or 4-day workshop where we have Day 1 and 2 could be the technical part of it. We are getting the information and using that information then to draw on different strategies. We can discuss the pros and cons of mobile protection measures, what other jurisdictions are doing, what area closures or seasonal restrictions, and being able to pull on the experts in the room for their knowledge. And then that could lead to maybe Day 3 and 4, a bit more of what the Planning Commission, I think needs, and actually finding out how what was discussed in those first two days could then go into the Land Use Plan. When NWMB started it, we were thinking more of a smaller workshop here in Iqaluit, but now that there is interest from a lot of organizations, we would like to maybe draw on partners to help with that if it's going to be a larger workshop.

David L: Bert?

Bert: Thank you, David. Yeah, just to maybe update to how this discussion started. We identified it on the first day that NTI does not have a position yet on caribou protection measures or how that perspective or that view could be put into the Land Use Plan. We have had meetings with the Regional Inuit Associations, and there have also been consultations or workshops with local Hunters and Trappers Organizations and Regional Wildlife Boards. And there is various views on it, so it's a politically sensitive issue for the NTI Board with those competing priorities – with land management and Inuit Owned Land, as well as caribou and protecting caribou, how to go about doing that.

Again, as mentioned on Day 1, I think it's a similar situation with the Government of Nunavut. And although they have a cabinet direction and they've submitted their information into the Land Use Plan, we knew coming into this Technical Meeting that it's not like all the parties are ready to give some clear direction to the Planning Commission of "This is what works." So that's where the idea of a workshop came about, and to have that discussion with the different parties, and that's when we became aware of the NWMB's plan to hold one as well.

Over two years ago, at the Mining Symposium, they actually brought the three Regional Inuit Associations into a meeting at the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board to see how we could get some discussion on caribou protection measures, and how we could go about doing it. So we've been advocating it. We've been promoting it. We're willing to help facilitate and organize and work with all the different parties, including the Planning Commission. I realize capacity demands, all of that is part of it, but I'm optimistic. We'll have to follow-up with the Government of Canada as well as others in terms of how we can plan a productive session that would include all the different parties. If there is different components to it, as Karla has mentioned, I think that's helpful.

The location, I think originally we talked about Arviat. In September, the dates didn't work for people. It sort of got moved into October and possibly Rankin, just because there is more hotel

space and accommodations for people. So, the goals and how it will come about still need to be flushed out a bit, but I think we're all on similar grounds. We may have different priorities that we want to focus on, but we'll have to get that organized. And I know industry has also indicated that they have a stake in this. And again, as identified on Day 1, we want to make sure that whatever we're doing is done in a transparent way and feeds into the Land Use Plan. We need to be more aware and get ourselves more familiar with the policies and procedures and how do we hold a workshop and get all the views together.

The challenge will be just getting all the partners together at that time, but I'm hoping that there will be support to do that. We're definitely willing to work with the Planning Commission on that. Thank you.

David L: Any others? I assume the Government of Canada would be engaged in that workshop as well?

Spencer: Yeah, that would be our intention.

David L: Planning Commission?

Sharon: Thank you, David, and I thank everyone for their comments. It's Sharon from the Commission. We see this as a good opportunity and very supportive of the workshop, and we would like to participate of course. For us, clear direction and mitigated measures that are identified to the Commission would be the goal of what the Commission is. I think Karla's summary of what the workshop might look like is a good outline. I think that is the goal of what we've heard from the group here around the table, the many concerns. And I think flushing out some of like the mobile measures, what does that really mean? What does that look like? What are the expectations?

I think as you all can empathize, we for example... we received 300 - over 300 pages - of submissions late on Monday, so we still have to analyze and look at what all of that means. So once we have that ability to look through those, we can have some more tangible questions and issues to be clarified. We think that this is an excellent opportunity. We've been waiting for this kind of information for a long time. It's a good step forward. I'm not sure if there's consensus for the date, but I've heard the week of October 7<sup>th</sup> in Rankin Inlet. We would look to co-partner with the group, not specifically be the lead on the workshop, but absolutely the outcomes of the workshop would be the direction of what the Commission is looking for. Thank you.

David L: Thank you, Sharon. Wildlife Management Board?

Karla: Thank you, Sharon. Karla with the Wildlife Management Board. After talking with staff in our office, that week October 7<sup>th</sup> we don't think is going to work for the NWMB. We have, some of our staff are already going to be on duty travel, and we did have some other timelines in mind for what we wanted to do preceding the workshop. For example, we wanted to hire, or put out a request for proposals to come in, for someone to do a full literature review for us and to look into what other jurisdictions are doing, as more information to go into the workshop. So we were thinking the end of October or early November might be a more realistic timeline for us. Thank you.

David L: Okay. I don't know that we can do much more now than confirm the interest. And I guess what I'd ask people to do is if we can now, obviously we need a small working group, planning group. I'm assuming that the Planning Commission could put somebody on that; Nunavut Wildlife Management Board obviously; NTI; GN...Maybe the four organizations can delegate a person each to start the planning for this thing in a little more detail and resolve the date question and start flushing out a terms of reference or an agenda. Is that something that people can agree to now, that they will nominate somebody? This would just be, just to plan the workshop, to assist the Planning Commission, the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board in logistics planning, basically, and the agenda development. Jennifer?

Jennifer: Thank you, David. Yes, that is something the Government of Nunavut can do. We can work together with the partners and NPC to flush out what this workshop might look like in more detail. However, perhaps more discussion could happen after this after the roundtable session. Because I think there are some questions that could be answered today amongst the parties and the NPC that would help to give a clearer direction to the workshop itself. Yeah, I think that's our suggestion. Thank you.

David L: Well, I mean, we've got the people here. We could address some of those issues now if you'd like, but it might be wise to put those issues on the table and let people think about them a little bit. I'm trying to avoid having to come back this afternoon if people have other plans, but we do have the afternoon to work on this. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. Sharon from the Commission. I'll just ask the group to remember that the Commission did have the date in November for the Public Hearing and the anticipation of being ready for that Public Hearing. So the quicker these types of sessions happen, the better prepared and informed the participants will be going into the Public Hearing. Thank you.

David L: Agreed. Yeah, there's a point there and then I'll get back.

Mike: Mike Setterington with Environmental Dynamics, and I'm speaking more on behalf of industry than Baffinland in particular right now. The Government of Nunavut was particularly interested in outcomes and objectives of the workshop. Our concerns around environmental impacts and being an assessment biologist, is that we recognize the amount of data and information, the amount of work that the Government of Nunavut and other parties have put into caribou research over 30 years in Nunavut. And we see a lot of protection measures coming out of that work, a lot of data being derived, particularly for the mainland caribou. We appreciate the work that in particular, my colleague Mitch Campbell has conducted as well too, well respected.

But what we are looking for specifically and what has been missing is really the supporting evidence and methods of defining these specific boundaries of Protected Areas when we're talking about exclusion of activities. We're going to have to be very specific on how these boundaries are being defined. The first that we heard of these methods were a few bullet points provided at the presentation. And I'm sure that the Government of Nunavut has more evidence to present on how they came up with these boundaries, but this is something that we particularly need to see, probably before this meeting and then have discussion about it at the meeting. So supporting evidence for the boundary and the methods used to define them.

The next thing that we'd like to see in particular – and I think the NWMB was talking about this, and this is particularly important for I suppose the Western or scientific experts and the Traditional Knowledge holders and community users and hunters – is clarification of the interactions that really do affect caribou populations in calving grounds, looking at the disturbance and what is it that is affecting caribou? What is it that we're trying to protect? And right now it's easy to say "Exclude everything so we can allow the caribou to recover," but we don't really know what it is that we absolutely need to exclude. So I think that could be a good discussion at this workshop as well. So those are the two key things that we'd like to see as industry. Thank you.

David L: Alright, thank you. In the corner?

Peter: Thank you. This is Peter Kidd with the NWMB. When we had initially discussed having this caribou protection measures workshop, the goal was to bring the main caribou scientists and harvesters around the table to discuss some of those issues. But we weren't prepared to bring in the industry aspect of it. We know the industry has a lot riding on these as well. But being the NWMB, our main concern was the protection of caribou. That to us, is what is most important. And we also want to recognize that mining has a lot at stake here as well.

But before we get to Phase 2 of this workshop, we really wanted to nail down what the impacts are on caribou, how we do mitigate them. Then phase 2 would be the NPC side of things where we bring everybody around the table to hash out how we implement these measures and what goes into the Land Use Plan and what doesn't.

But our focus is primarily on the protection of caribou so that we can continue to see caribou for generations down the road. So that is really what we want to see in the first phase of the workshop. We understand the timeline that the NPC is working with too, but we don't, we don't want to rush this, because we know how important it is. Everybody has a stake in caribou in Nunavut. And being so valuable and important, I don't think we need to rush. We understand the importance, and we are going to do. And we're going to do it soon. But I don't think we want to cut corners on this one. Thank you.

David L: Okay, thank you. Yeah, Mitch.

Christine: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Christine Kowbel. Not to speak for my client, but I think absolutely the importance and concern about protecting caribou is absolutely shared across the industry. You referred to the goal of the meeting was to bring together wildlife experts. I don't need to take probably time in this meeting, but I'm happy to, I think Mr. Setterington would be happy to speak to his background. But Mike Setterington is one of those experts in this field, if not the leading expert in the Arctic on some of these issues. Thank you.

David L: Thank you. Mitch, did you want to add something?

Mitch: Yeah, thanks very much. So, all these examples provided by Mike are easily shown, and we'll bring that to the table. But what would be extremely helpful as well, on the other side is – and as just indicated, Mike's experience working with industry - if we can have examples on the other side too. It seems to always be kind of a one-way street of us showing facts. It would be good to see in the mining sector, any evidence of no effects based on what they've seen. So that

would be very helpful to have, because we've never actually seen that any of that kind of information. Just trying to...it would be good to have both sides of the coin going, instead of the reliance always being on, you know, the one side. Thank you.

David L: Thanks Mitch. Other comments? There's clearly a fair bit of convergence of interest, but there is also a lot of detail to be worked out in planning this thing. Once again, in the search for perfection, we sometimes delay getting to the pragmatic. The absence of complete knowledge and full knowledge is not necessarily an impediment to taking conservative actions quickly. And I've got to...we've got to agree that all the cards need to be on the table. If we're looking for full information and full disclosure, and the best possible solution, then let's get at it. Caribou are just too important to delay the needed discussions. It's not just the Land Use Plan. It's caribou in some crisis at this point. Jennifer.

Jennifer: Thank you, David. Just to follow-up on that: I think...and I realize we're getting to the end of the session and it's almost lunchtime. So perhaps we could propose that after lunch, maybe the four parties meet to discuss this and the Wildlife Management Board – Nunavut Wildlife Management Board – to discuss this in a little bit more detail outside of this venue? Because everybody is here at the table today, so it would be useful I think. Thank you.

David L: Yeah, I'd go a little further, I guess. Make sure that the four parties are able to do that, but also if others want to sit in on and listen to the discussion, they would be able to do that. Bert, are you good with that? Okay. Planning Commission? Okay. Nunavut Wildlife Management Board? Okay. And obviously the GN is. The Chamber.

Spencer: Us too.

*(Laughter)*

David L: You know, how could I overlook the Government of Canada? Elizabeth and then Henry.

Henry: Thank you. Nothing serious, I just wanted to say that there was one person who said about caribou one time, if you really want to manage caribou, you have to put fences around them. Just to make you laugh. Thank you.

*(Laughter)*

David L: Yeah, Wildlife management is often a misnomer, often a misnomer I think. Elizabeth.

Liz: Thank you. Elizabeth from the Chamber. Obviously, there is still a lot of discussion, and there doesn't seem to be a clear plan yet for how to provide proper management and protection of caribou. So it is our position that a Public Hearing not take place until such time as these issues have been properly discussed, and that an appropriate management strategy is being put forward. Thank you.

David L: Alright, thank you. Any other comments on this? Well, it's a quarter to 12. I think we can wrap things up with respect to this Technical Meeting now. I haven't had a chance to talk to the Commission about kind of next steps. But perhaps I'll turn it over to Sharon to outline that. I think what we can commit to as facilitators is getting out quickly – like within the next week or

so – the key (and it'll be a short list), the key decisions or key issues that were discussed and some direction on that. The fuller report of the meeting will be available at some point, and the Commission will be in charge of that. We will have a transcript available, a rough transcript pretty quickly, and a more detailed one in a week or two, a more complete one.

I guess I...before I hand it over to Sharon, I just want to say that I've been involved in this Nunavut Land use Planning exercise since about 1980, actually probably a bit earlier than that in one form or another – Lancaster Sound, Kitikmeot, Kivalliq, Keewatin as it was once known. And it kind of goes in cycles, right? Progress is made early, and then things have slowed down, and that's typical of land use planning everywhere. In this particular case, the planning process has been difficult, very difficult at times. The independent third party review pointed out the difficulties and made a number of recommendations about how to move forward. I just want to say that I've seen a huge change in attitude and engagement and major progress, evidenced in part by the meeting here, but notably in the submissions that were received by the Commission over the weekend. A real, I think a real shift in commitment and professional engagement, and I just want to congratulate everybody on that. So Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. You kind of took my words.

*(Laughter)*

Yes, I was going to acknowledge that, and staff have identified how appreciative they are of detail of the submissions. Of course, we have more analysis to do with them, but the initial review, it's a lot of tangible information that we've been looking for, for a long time. The active engagement that we do see, we're very appreciative and respectful that this momentum keeps going forward. The turnout at this meeting - I believe I can fairly say on behalf of the Commission - demonstrates the willingness and the attitude that this is a priority and getting a good Land Use Plan in place. As we said at the beginning of the meeting, we are the gatherers of the information and the holder of the pen, and the Plan is only as good as the information and the participation we have to move it forward.

In terms of next steps, we've heard a lot of information this week, and we've had discussion with various partners around the table about our agenda for our Prehearing Conference, which will go ahead the week of July 14<sup>th</sup>. However we're looking at some of the process issues that we do have on the agenda and amending the agenda to ensure that intent of that workshop addresses some of the outstanding concerns. We've heard from some of parties that they may not be ready with some of their information. We see that as that's fine. We're looking at changing the agenda. We want to meet the needs and very seriously make the commitment to all parties that we've heard what you've said this week. We'll be moving forward.

In regards to the various workshops with polynyas, the GIS and the caribou, we will have the Commission team...we don't have our GIS technical staff here, so we'll have them follow-up with the groups so we can establish. I think these are not so complex that we can't get these resolved working collectively and getting an email out of when we can, if it takes a day in person or if we can resolve it on a teleconference. I think there are technical issues that we just need to ensure that the datasets that we're using, we have agreement on. The same with polynyas. I don't see that as a major issue.

So the caribou – Brian will be the lead from the Commission. Bert, I believe you're the lead for NTI. Spencer...

Spencer: Good first point of contact. It may change.

Sharon: Liz, I believe you'll be the contact for the Chamber, correct? And Jen?

Jennifer: Same as Spencer – good first point of contact. We can decide from there.

Sharon: Okay, thank you. And then for NWMB, Karla? And NIRB, Sophia? I don't see Tara here today. I hope she's feeling okay.

Sophia: Yeah, I can be the lead for that for now.

Sharon: We'll make sure that all parties are included.

Christine: Sorry, Sharon. Just for Baffinland, Baffinland has requested that Mike Setterington be their lead.

Sharon: Okay, thank you. And if industry wants to send more people, you know, we want the best information at that workshop. So as I said, we will co-work the group. I don't know what the proper terminology is, but to ensure that the timeline is met. With regard to some of the research, we'll have to look at what's applicable. What we need for the Land use Plan may be not as in depth as the in depth research that the NWMB is looking at. So the timing for that, if we can try and get it for the October timeline, and we'll work with parties to come up with a common date and make sure everybody – well I don't know if everybody's going to like the date – but that we can live with it.

On behalf of the Commission team, we really appreciate the constructive input. We would like you to continue to provide it to us. Our staff is always available. We upset our website, Nunavut.ca pretty much daily. So, if there is any information, we've had some calls that they can't find information. Once our public registry is up, I can assure you it's going to be a lot more user friendly than the website we're currently using in our FTP site. When Jon said "soon" for our registry, as July 9<sup>th</sup> is the implementation date, we're actually doing a trial run on it tomorrow, our training for our staff. So we will have it up and running before the implementation, official implementation of NUPPAA. With that, I'll just ask Brian if he has any other comments on behalf of the Commission team. Thank you. And I'd like to thank David and David and the interpreters, because sometimes we do speak very fast, and they haven't thrown anything at any of us. And David and David for their objectivity and all the party's inputs.

David L: Thanks, Sharon. We'll go to Brian, and I think what I'd like to do is just go quickly around the table for any concluding comments from anybody, and then we'll close with a prayer. Thanks. Brian?

Brian: Qujannamiik, Sharon, David. Just a really short, quick comment just to remind everybody that this work that we're doing doesn't belong to us. We don't own it. We're doing the work for the residents of Nunavut, in particular the Inuit, their culture, their lifestyle. We should keep that in mind and remove the thinking of position and what department you're working for. Again, I

want to echo what Sharon said. We appreciate the participation and the time that you took for this session. It's greatly appreciated. Qujannamiik.

David L: Spencer?

Spencer: Thank you. Yeah, we feel this has been a very productive meeting. We've been able to put our concerns with the Draft Land Use Plan on the table. We feel we've been listened to. I just wanted to extend that we have to keep conversations going, recognizing there's going to be subsequent questions. I have the list of action items that I'm going to try to figure out to satisfy several parties around the table. But we're always here. And I hate to say this: I'm with the Federal Government and I'm here to help. But in this case, we may actually be there to do that. So thank you.

David L: Can we just go down the table? Anybody who wants to speak, feel free.

Jackie: Hi, Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. This is the first time QWB has attended a meeting like this, and we just wanted to say thank you for providing us the space. It was a good learning process. Our job moving forward will be to ensure that the concerns and experience of HTOs continue to play a part in these discussions. That will be our responsibility, and we look forward to it. Thank you.

Karla: Karla with the NWMB. I'd like to thank the Planning Commission for the meeting. It was very interesting conversations. We look forward to continuing to work with everyone here on putting off this caribou workshop. Thanks, Sharon, for going around and pointing out the contacts for that workshop. I also just want to put in there that correspondence about it should also include the three Regional Wildlife Boards here. They are the links to the communities, and we would really like to have a strong community presence at this workshop as well. So if anybody is going to start some communication on that, it would be great to include Ema, Jackie, Jason, and Leah in those conversations. Thank you.

Brandon: Brandon from WWF: I just want to acknowledge that we fully appreciate that you don't have to let us come to these meetings. We appreciate you giving us a space. It was a really good learning experience for us, and we're going to continue to be involved, as we have the last five years in giving our input. But I'm just putting it out there that we know and are appreciative of the space that we're given. So thank you very much.

Henry: As for myself, I give my appreciation to the Technical Meeting. I think I'm the oldest person in this room.

David L: Don't bet on it, Henry.

*(Laughter)*

Henry: You're right behind me. I don't look it, but I'm an Elder now. I know NPC ever since they started, and I want to thank all of you for participating with them. It's very good to be like one mind in your land, in your territory. If you work well together like this, I know good things will come out of this. So I thank NPC for heading this Nunavut Land Use Plan, and I hope all of you will work together like this. We will keep in touch with you. We thank you for initially giving us a

few first steps in our department, Nunavik Marine Region Planning Commission, and we'll keep on working with you. Thank you.

Chantal: Hi. Chantal, Eeyou Marine Region Planning Commission. Same as Henry, we're in the same boat right now. We're in the process of beginning our land use plan, so this was a great learning experience for me. Ears were open and taking a lot of notes. I met a lot of great people, who will be receiving some emails from me on how to get this process going for us. So thank you.

Liz: Thank you. It's Elizabeth from the Chamber. Thank you to the Commission and staff for allowing our industry to participate in these meetings. As you can tell, the Land Use Plan is obviously a very important issue for our industry, and I think we've exhibited that through a number of the questions and comments that we've raised throughout the week. So, our request – I guess a final request – is that we could have responses. I know in fairness to staff, they haven't had an opportunity this week to provide direct responses to a number of our questions. We would ask that those responses be provided to us at least 7 days before the Public or the Prehearing Conference so that we have time to confer with our members and be better prepared for the Prehearing Conference.

Jennifer: Thank you. Jennifer Pye, Government of Nunavut for the last time. Yes, echoing what the others have said around the table, I'd like to thank the Planning Commission very much for this opportunity to provide comment on the Draft Land Use Plan. It has been a learning experience for everybody around the table, including ourselves, and we look forward to participating in future events such as this that the NPC might hold, so that we can continue to work together on this Plan and see it through. We have a number of action items that we will be following-up on and would like to see what the NPC produces from this meeting to guide our own future involvement in this process. Thank you.

Sophia: Sophia with the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Just echoing what everyone else has said, and thank you very much to the Nunavut Planning Commission for allowing us to be here and to be involved. It was very informative. We look forward to working with everyone as the process develops. Thank you.

Luis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Luis Manzo, Kivalliq Inuit Association. I would just like to thank everybody around the table, especially the Nunavut Planning Commission for being so patient and diligent and responding to our, sometime overdue questions or repetitive questions. I also wanted to thank Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated to be able to come with us in one front. The Kivalliq region, we have a good plan right now. We implemented that plan. We're proud of it, and we've been doing it for the length of time that I've been working for KIA.

We are hoping to cooperate for the information that you may require from us. We have a lot of tasks to complete before the Prehearing Conference. We hope the Commission can consider those dates in order to have a very good information to avoid the clashes and conflicts that we have today at the table. Professionally speaking, I think everybody is on the same page, but a decision needs to be made, and it has to be sustainable. Like Brian says, we're working for the Inuit, and don't forget that. It's their right. It's their Claim. It's a mandate in an organization to protect those rights. Thank you again, and I wish everybody safety home. And I will be sending the pertaining information you request from me at any given time. Thank you.

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I will defer to NTI. I think they're going to sum up some of the specific concerns that KIA has at this point. But I do want to extend a heart-full thanks to everybody around the table, NPC for the organization that was involved, your facilitation, and everybody's involvement in terms of the specific issues or concerns, whatever, that you've brought to try to help improve the Plan. Thank you very much for your participation.

Rosanne: Rosanne from the QIA. I will also, I defer to NTI for the closing, I guess, comments from QIA, but personally I just want to thank the Planning Commission and all the other participants. We do look forward to participating in the other meetings and workshops that we've discussed here. Hopefully we can do that and provide some responses or better information, I guess, that will go into this Plan in the end. So thank you.

Bert: I'm just going to tag-team with Miguel here.

Miguel: Bert, of course, gets the last word, but thank you as everybody else has said. But I think perhaps the NPC doesn't often get enough thanks, but thank you very much for the food and the coffee that you provided.

*(Laughter)*

Bert: It's a tough crowd this week. Yeah, if I can find my notes here. I have been asked to summarize just the closing comments for the three Regional Inuit Associations and NTI. We've had ongoing discussions, I think, with everybody in an effort to move forward on this file and to work towards developing a quality Land Use Plan, 1<sup>st</sup> generation Land Use Plan admittedly. But we do need to get a Land Use Plan in place and get that process going. NTI and the RIAs are committed to that process. Hopefully that's recognized, as mentioned, through the submissions and the efforts everybody's made here this week.

We want to keep the momentum going. We've had those discussions. We are interested in that, but we are concerned that for a Prehearing Conference so soon, as mentioned, we're not ready for all the components that are in the current agenda for a Prehearing Conference. We've heard there will be an adjustment to the agenda, so we'll wait to see that revised agenda. But we would ask if there is going to be a meeting in a few weeks, that we not call it a Prehearing Conference? Call it some kind of meeting, whatever you want to call it, but there's going to be more work to be done before that final hearing. I think to get buy-in from everybody around the table, we need to recognize that all the partners have sort of stated at one point or another during this week that a Prehearing Conference in two weeks, we're not quite there. We look forward to seeing the report and the transcript, and all the work that's going in, and summarizing the points that have been made this week. But again, just as all organizations have staff going on holidays or limited capacity in the summer, it is going to be a challenge to realistically have a productive meeting in a couple weeks to get through the current agenda. Again, we just needed to make that point.

Having said that, I mean NTI and the RIAs are committed and ready to work with the Planning Commission and the government departments and different organizations and industry, and the communities especially. That's the big thing. I think all of us can recognize that. We need to have awareness and discussions at the community level, an update if this Public Hearing is going to be

productive. If we're going to bring five delegates from each community in Nunavut and we're going to have 200+ people, we need people that have already talked about this at their community. They're not coming here sorting of wondering what the meeting is about or why they're here for a week. Ideally they'd have done some work and homework in their communities and be coming here to provide that input that the Planning Commission will need.

So that's what we committed, whether it's roundtable or workshops or follow-up technical sessions. Regarding the migratory bird proposals, I think there's a lot of information we need to get from the communities on that; as well as clarity on the Department of National Defense site; the GIS related issues that Sharon mentioned; as well as the workshop on caribou; and as was just brought up today, the existing rights. All those prospecting claims – I'm not sure on all the numbers. We haven't necessarily done the analysis. But we've talked to Miguel. If all those existing rights mount up to 1/3 of the land, how does that affect the Land Use Plan, like if those things are grandfathered? So there's big implications on that factor alone. So these are things there has to be more discussion on and that means a lot of work still to do. So we have to be realistic in terms of dates and when we can achieve this.

As mentioned – and I don't want to belabor it – whatever that meeting is July 13 or 16, how can we work so that it, yes, it helps keep the momentum going, but I don't know if it's necessarily a Prehearing Conference yet. I'm not sure if we're there. And I guess we're still trying to figure out – and I realize there's information that will have to go back to the Planning Commission for consideration – but how are you incorporating all these comments that you've heard. Will we see something that has track changes? I realize it's a big endeavor, but again, for us to back to our organizations and report on how the progress is being made, we need some feedback from the Commission as well. Son on that note, I'd just like again to thank the Planning Commission and everybody that traveled and was able to attend the meetings the last three days. I think there was a lot of apprehension just how it would all go, just because of some of the history with this file, to be honest and as David has indicated. I think everybody came here prepared to work and see what we could do to advance it. Hopefully we're on the track. I'd just like to say thanks.

David L: Thanks Bert. Anybody in the back rows, so to speak, want to add anything? Jasmine, working your fingers to the bone back there? Want to thank Jasmine too. I mean it's a task trying to keep up with you guys. Alright, Tommy, are you ready for a closing prayer, or is somebody... Henry again? Alright, thanks again, everybody and safe travels.

Henry: (*Closing Prayer*)

## MEETING ADJOURNED