

DRAFT NUNAVUT LAND USE PLAN

NUNAVUT PLANNING COMMISSION 4th TECHNICAL MEETING

TRANSCRIPT

Iqaluit, Nunavut

March 7 to 10, 2016

ATTENDEES

NPC: Executive Director	Sharon Ehaloak
NPC: Director of Implementation	Brian Aglukark
NPC: Senior Planner	Jon Savoy
NPC: Senior Planner	Peter Scholz
NPC: Legal Counsel	Alan Blair
NPC: Manager of Translations, Interpreter	Tommy Owljoot
NPC: Inuktitut Interpreter, Regional Planner	Annie Ollie
NPC: GIS Technician	Jared Fraser
NPC: Planner	Alana Vigna
 Moderator:	 David Livingstone
 Aurora Wildlife Research – Biologist	 Kim Poole
Baker Lake HTO	Basil Quinangnaq
Biologist – High Arctic	Liza Ningiuk
BQCMB Chair	Earl Evans
BQCMB	Leslie Wakelyn
Caslys Consulting	Jason Shaw
Elder Advisory Committee - Kitikmeot	Jimmy Haniliak
Elder Advisory Committee	Bartholomew Nirlungayuk
Elder Advisory Committee – Gjoa Haven	David Siksik
Environmental Dynamics	Mike Setterington
GN DoE	Morgan Anderson
GN	Denise Baikie
GN DoE	Mitch Campbell
GN Director Wildlife Management	Drikus Gissing
GN	Lou Kamermans
GN Biologist	Lisa-Marie Leclerc
GN	Clayton Lloyd
GN DoE	Kristi Lowe
GN DoE	Lynda Orman
GN	Steve Pinksen
GN	Amy Robinson
GN	Melanie Wilson
GNWT	Bruno Croft
INAC	Spencer Dewar
INAC	Kim Pawley
INAC	John Price
INAC	Alexander Unaluak
Justice Canada	Ken Landa
Justice Canada	Michelle Zakrison
Kitikmeot Inuit Association	Luigi Torretti
Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	Eva Ayalik
Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	Peter Kapolak

Kivalliq Regional Wildlife Board
Kivalliq Regional Wildlife Board
NTI
NTI
NTI
NTI Vice President
NTI Inuit Learning Development
NTI
NTI
NTI
NWMB
NWMB
Parks Canada
Parks Canada
QIA
QIA
QWB
WWF Canada

Stanley Adjuk
Warren Bernauer
Marie Belleau
Naida Gonzalez (via phone)
Miguel Chenier
James Eetoolook
Jackson Hansen
Paul Irngaut
David Lee
Hannah Uniuqsaraq
Peter Kydd
Karla Letto
Andrew Maher
Micheline Manseau
Rosanne D'Orazio
Steven Lonsdale
Jackie Price
Brandon Laforest

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DAY 1:

Introduction and Opening Remarks	6
Background Information	
NPC: Overview of Caribou Workshop	9
NPC: Review of Drat NLUP Approach to Caribou and Comment On IOL and High Mineral Potential	10
Planning Partner Perspectives	
Chamber of Mines: Proponent Perspectives of Caribou Protection	12
Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. Opening Remarks	14
Kitikmeot Inuit Association Opening Presentation	15
Qikiqtani Inuit Association Opening Presentation	16
Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board Opening Presentation	18
Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board Opening Remarks	19
World Wildlife Fund Opening Remarks	20
Kivalliq Wildlife Board Opening Remarks	21
Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board Opening Perspectives	24
Government of the Northwest Territories Opening Presentation	27
Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment Opening Remarks	33
Government of Canada Opening Presentation	39
The Seasonal Ranges	
GN: Seasonal Ranges and Brief on the Precautionary Principle	46
NWMB: Agreement on Caribou Calving Areas from Nov. 2015 Workshop	63
KivWB: Importance of Freshwater Crossings and use of IQ for Data Collection	66
QWB: Description and Delineation of the Baffin Caribou, IQ Basis	69
The Planning Tools	
BQCMB: The Benefits and Need for Area Protection for Caribou	70
Kim Poole: Assessment of Caribou Protection Measures	82
Chamber of Mines: Proposal of Mobile Protection Measures	93

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DAY 2:	99
Geographic Delineation	104
Mainland Migratory Caribou – Calving and Post-Calving	114
Inuit Owned Lands Discussion	
NTI Presentation: IOL Designations in Caribou Calving Grounds	129
Mineral Potential	
Chamber of Mines: Areas of High Mineral Potential in Caribou Calving Grounds	138
Tundra Wintering Mainland Caribou	151
Tundra Wintering Island Caribou	161
Peary Caribou	165
 DAY 3:	 171
Peary Caribou Discussion Continued	171
Outstanding Questions and Concerns	172
Existing Rights Discussion	184
Concluding Remarks from the Parties	188

DAY 1

March 7, 2016

INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING REMARKS

David: Let's get started. We're pressed for time, and obviously pressed for space. My name is David Livingstone, and I'll be chairing this session over the next three days, hopefully three days. We've got some weather coming in tonight and tomorrow, so we'll see how tomorrow goes. If we can't work tomorrow, we'll do it in two days, and maybe Thursday morning.

A couple of technical things: the headsets. If you open the back of the headset, there is a button on the top right. Just press that. That should find the channel that you're looking for automatically I'm told. Washrooms are outside to the right. There is an exit behind the screen there, and obviously there is the main door there in case of emergencies. I think there is another door...no, I don't think there is, so two doors.

The interpreter, Tommy, is our only interpreter for this morning, and Annie will be in later this morning hopefully, weather permitting. So we'll have only Inuktitut and English. As you can see, the proceedings are going to be videotaped, and CBC, I gather, will be showing up at some point today. I don't know when exactly. The GN will be arriving about 10:30. They're doing a little bit of a briefing this morning to prepare for today and the rest of the week. What else?

Oh, and there will be coffee I'm told sometime soon. I really hope so, and maybe some snacks too. And because Tommy is the only interpreter, we'll be breaking pretty rigorously, about every hour and a half or so. That should work okay. As usual, there will be a transcript of the meeting. Jazz isn't here, but she'll be getting the recordings twice a day, and we'll have a transcript within two to three weeks of the meeting.

Is there anything else that I've forgotten? Okay, what I'll suggest we do is a roundtable of introductions, just names and organizations, and then I'll turn it over to Sharon for opening remarks. And Tommy will do the opening prayer. So Tommy, maybe I can call on you to do that now?

Tommy: *(Opening Prayer)*

David: Alright, thank you, Tommy. Cellphones: please put them on mute. Just a comment again about timing: I'm going to ask people to be really rigorous in respecting the times that we've set out in the agenda. So when it comes to opening remarks, ten minutes per party and a five-minute question-and-answer. As I said, GN will be late, but when they're here, we will get them to make their opening remarks. I'd hoped they would be here first thing in the morning, but they're clearly not. Oh, so now we do have a GN representative. Okay, welcome. And the phone line – is the phone

line working? Okay, we'll get the phone line running as soon as possible, and then people will be able to call in.

Just for the organizations that are here, and I'll repeat it for the people calling in, it's going to be awkward given the nature of the workshop. So I'm going to ask the folks that are calling in to defer to their organizations here if at all possible to ask questions on their behalf. It may not be possible in some circumstances. But we'll do our best. We'll work as long as we can today and if we can tomorrow, and then Wednesday as long as we can again. If things really screw up tomorrow weather-wise, we may work into Thursday morning. We'll see. With that, I'll just ask for a quick roundtable of introductions, and then we'll get to the opening remarks. I'll go with Brian first.

Brian: Qujannamiik, David. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission.

Sharon: (*Greeting*). I'm Sharon Ehaloak. I'm with the Planning Commission. I'm the Executive Director.

(*Pause*)

David: Finally the lawyer can't speak.

(*Laughter*)

Alan: Mike and I are going to leave together. Good morning, it's Alan Blair, Legal Counsel for the Nunavut Planning Commission.

Mike: I'm Mike Settingington, representative for the Northwest Territories-Nunavut Chamber of Mines.

Basil: Basil Quinangnaq, Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers.

Warren: Warren Bernauer, the Kivalliq Wildlife Board.

Miguel: Third time is not a charm. Miguel Chenier with NTI Lands in Cambridge Bay.

Hannah: Ublaahatkut. Hannah Uniuqsaraq, NTI Iqaluit.

Pau I?: (*Greeting stated in his language*) – NTI.

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning. My name is Bruno Croft. I'm a biologist with the Government of Northwest Territories. Looking forward to three days of discussions. Thank you.

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association, Senior Environment Officer.

Earl: Good morning. My name is Earl Evans, Chair of the Caribou Management Board. Thank you.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest with WWF Canada here in Iqaluit.

Jackie: Hello, Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board based out of Iqaluit.

Karla: Good morning. Karla Letto with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board.

Peter Kydd: Good morning, I'm Peter Kydd, the Director of Wildlife Management with the NWMB.

Peter S: Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission.

Jonathan: I'm Jonathan Savoy, Planner with the Nunavut Planning Commission.

Jared: Good morning. Jared Fraser, GIS Technician, Nunavut Planning Commission.

Spencer: Good morning, Spencer Dewar, Indigenous Northern Affairs Canada.

Ken: Ublaahatkut. Ken Landa, Department of Justice (*Remainder not translated*).

Peter Kapolak: Good morning. Peter Kapolak, Co-Chair for Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board.

Steve P: Good morning. Steve Pinksen with the Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment.

Mitch: Good morning, Mitch Campbell, Government of Nunavut based out of Arviat.

Lynda: Good morning. Lynda Orman, Manager of Wildlife Research, Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut.

Lisa Marie: Hi, I'm Lisa Marie-Leclerc. I'm a biologist for the Kitikmeot Region, Government of Nunavut.

Jason: Jason Shaw, Caslys Consulting.

Kristi: Kristy Lowe, Government of Nunavut in the Department of Environment

Steven L: Steven Lonsdale, Qikiqtani Inuit Association.

David Lee: David Lee, NTI Wildlife Department.

Marie: Ublaahatkut, Marie Belleau, NTI (*Remainder not translated*).

Leslie: Hi, Leslie Wakelyn, Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board based in Yellowknife.

Lou: Lou Kamermans, GN.

?Lou?: (*Introduction in his language*)

David S: I'm David Siksik here from Gjoa Haven Elder's Group, Environment.

Jimmy: Jimmy Haniliak, Elder's Advisors Committee, Department of Environment.

Bartholomew: Bartholomew Nirlungayuk, Environment, Elders Group.

Clayton: Clayton Lloyd, Government of Nunavut, Department of Economic Development and Transportation

John: John Price, Indigenous Northern Affairs Canada based in Iqaluit.

Michelle: Ublaahatkut, Michelle Zakrison, Department of Justice Canada

Micheline: Micheline Manseau. I'm a wildlife ecologist with Parks Canada.

Kim: Kim Pawley, Environment and Renewable Resources with Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada in Gatineau.

Eva: Eva Ayalik, Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board.

Morgan: Morgan Anderson, Government of Nunavut, High Arctic Regional Biologist

Melanie: Melanie Wilson, Ecosystems and EA Biologist, Government of Nunavut

David: Okay, thanks. Have we missed anybody?

Denise: Denise Baikie, Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment

Amy: Amy Robinson, Government of Nunavut.

Andrew: Andrew Maher, Parks Canada Agency

Background Information: NPC: Overview of Caribou Workshop

David: Thanks, everybody and apologies for the cramped quarters. We'll see if we can create more space at the break. I'll turn it over now to Sharon for NPC's opening remarks.

Sharon: Good morning, everyone and welcome. It's very good to see so many people and so many people from my home community of Cambridge Bay and Kitikmeot. It's always good to see our region over in this area. So this is the Fourth Technical Session that the Commission is holding for the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. As David said, the workshop agenda is full. We have weather with us, as always, and we're scheduled to finish Wednesday at 5:00 p.m. Right after that workshop, we will be starting the marine portion of the Technical Workshop, and we will be doing evening sessions. We'll be starting the Marine Workshop at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday.

The Commission, first of all, would like to thank you for your submissions for this workshop. Caribou is by far the most emotional topic in Nunavut, and a great deal of input has been provided on the subject. We are here today to discuss your recommendations on caribou - caribou protection – and we have asked for two very specific types of information, which you have already read in the agenda, but we are going to reiterate it.

First, we need to identify with reasonable accuracy, caribou habitat that is relied on during the different seasons. The caribou habitat included in Schedule A of the 2014 Draft of the Nunavut Land

Use Plan uses the boundaries of core calving and post-calving areas for the mainland caribou that were provided by the Government of Nunavut. If your organization wishes to add, change, or delete these areas, we need to know your reasons why, what the alternatives are, and to be clear and simple. This is the opportunity to describe your recommended changes in front of other participants in a transparent consultative forum. Your suggestions will be reviewed, and hopefully consensus will be achieved at this meeting or leading up to the Public Hearing.

Secondly, the NPC needs to know what policies should be included in the Plan, for what type of habitat, and if there is a need to have a different policy for the different herds. The Commission wants to make a few things abundantly clear for this workshop. This forum is a respectful one. It is one that the Commission is here to listen to all parties equally. We need to understand everyone's perspective and the reasons for those perspectives. Our staff, when they ask questions, are genuinely trying to understand your position and the information from a high level. It's comprehensive, and we want to ensure a holistic approach.

To help ensure we capture everything in this session, we are recording it. We have audio, and we have a full transcript, as David said earlier, and the transcripts will be available for you within the next two to three weeks. So when you speak, please say your name and your organization for the record.

I know we say this every single meeting that we have, but I'm going to reiterate it again. This is a first generation Land Use Plan. It's not a forever plan. It's a Plan that is a living document. A Plan amendment can be proposed at any time, and the Plan will be reviewed frequently with a minimum of every five years. We know herds move with time. The Plan can adapt to changing caribou conditions, and in the future as new information becomes available, it will be adopted into the Plan.

Planning can also provide an opportunity to coordinate research. We encourage participants also to think about what kind of universal research program is suitable for the caribou in Nunavut and to inform now and for the future for the Nunavut Land Use Plan. We look forward to hearing everyone over the course of the next couple of days. I look forward to speaking with many of you around the table individually. With that, David, I'll turn it back over to you. Thank you.

Background Information: NPC: Review of Draft NLUP Approach to Caribou & Comment on IOL and High Mineral Potential

David: Okay, thanks Sharon. The next item on the agenda is Review of Draft NLUP Approach to Caribou. Who is taking that one? Peter?

Peter S: Peter Scholz, NPC. I'll cover points 2 and 3 of the agenda and it'll only take a couple of minutes. Point 2 is reviewing with the 2014 Draft – the current Draft – what the approach to caribou is. In essence, the Commission took the polygons that were advised by the Government of Nunavut – and all the advice was for mainland herds; there wasn't any for the island herds – for calving and post-calving areas. What the Commission did is it took those two sets of polygons, merged them, and

then created from there, two new types of polygons: Calving and Post-Calving Habitat, which is shown on the screen up there in green, and a separate type of polygon, Calving and Post-Calving Habitat with High Mineral Potential, which is shown as yellow on the screen there. So collectively, all the polygons you see there are all the calving and post-calving areas for the mainland herds, as defined by the Government of Nunavut. But the boundaries are not between calving and post-calving. The boundaries you see are the boundaries between where there is high mineral potential, which was defined by INAC, and not high mineral potential.

I'll quickly review what the proposed policies are for those two polygon sets you're seeing on the screen. For 47, which is the green, which is core calving...

David: Peter? You need to slow down a little bit. By the way, folks, I do have control over everybody's mike, which is kind of neat actually.

(Laughter)

So I won't hesitate to use it if I need to. Sorry, Peter.

Peter S: Peter NPC. So for the green core calving and post-calving habitat, it is proposed to be a Protected Area with the following prohibited uses: mineral exploration and production, oil and gas exploration and production, quarries, hydro development, all-weather roads, and any related research to any of the above – so quite a high level of protection.

For the 48, which is the yellow, which is again also calving and post-calving areas, they are proposed to be a Special Management Area with the terms as follows: The NPC may refer a project proposal falling within one to NIRB for screening when NPC has concerns respecting the cumulative impact of that project proposal in relation to other development activities in that planning area. The direction is that regulatory authorities need to mitigate impacts on calving and post-calving areas. So essentially the yellow is the same ecological system, but it's a strong flag to the regulatory authorities that these are important areas to caribou, and through the impact assessment process, they need to be considered very carefully. That's point 2.

I'll just jump into point 3, and if there are any questions, we'll take them then. Oh yes, I'm sorry. In Schedule B, we also have the sea ice crossings for the Dolphin and Union herd running between Victoria Island and the mainland, which is again like a flag to regulatory authorities to take into consideration that the herd needs those crossings between Victoria Island and the mainland.

Moving into point 3 of the agenda, Comment on Inuit Owned Lands and High Mineral Potential, those two topics have been moved to the back of this agenda, to Wednesday, so that we can discuss caribou habitat in a comprehensive way and not get pulled aside by economic or other considerations. So the idea is that we can have a comprehensive view of caribou habitat across the territory as a whole, and then we can move into any of these other factors as needed. But we will have that base understanding of caribou habitat that we'll build together over the next two days before we move into those kinds of discussions. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Peter. I'm not going to entertain questions just now. We'll have plenty of time, I hope, for questions later. So we'll just roll into the opening remarks from each of the organizations, and the

first will be the NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines. Mike, do you want to start? And again, I'll ask people to introduce themselves before they speak.

Planning Partner Perspectives: Chamber of Mines: Proponent Perspectives on Caribou Protection

Mike: Ladies and gentlemen, Ublaahatkut. Uvanga Mike Settingington. I'm a Wildlife Biologist and Impact Assessment Specialist with a company called Environmental Dynamics in Whitehorse, Yukon. I've worked as a Wildlife Biologist for the environmental assessment of a number of mining projects in Nunavut and in Northern Western Canada. All of those projects have assessed and managed for potential impacts on caribou. EDI is a member of the Northwest Territories and Nunavut Chamber of Mines. For this workshop, I'm a Technical Representative of the Chamber in Nunavut's mining industry.

The Northwest Territories and Nunavut Chamber of Mines performs the following functions in Nunavut:

- It monitors Nunavut's developments and issues relevant to the mining industry.
- It provides information to industry, Nunavummiut and others on exploration and mining in Nunavut.
- It provides community outreach about exploration and mining matters and opportunities.
- And of relevance to this workshop, it provides input to government on policy and legislation as it relates to exploration and mine development.

The Chamber is at this Fourth Technical Meeting to provide an exploration and mining business perspective on proposed protection measures for caribou in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. Based on discussions from the previous three Technical Meetings, there is a perception that there are organizations that are for and those that are against protection of caribou. This is not true. We are here because we are concerned about caribou and caribou management in Nunavut.

The fact is there are differences in opinions on approaches on how caribou can be protected. The Chamber is one of those organizations providing informed and manageable alternative approaches that will provide for the protection of Nunavut's caribou. Managing caribou is a responsibility of Nunavut's wildlife co-managers. The Chamber expects the policy and Land Use Plan directions created by those organizations will be made on the basis of informed and sound management decisions that are derived from observed evidence, Traditional Knowledge, and reasonable estimates of impacts on caribou populations.

The Chamber expects that reasonable approaches and alternatives will be considered, particularly where those management decisions may affect the progress and opportunities of the exploration in the mining business. The Chamber is aware of the importance of caribou to the local economies, and importance and well being to Inuit and First Nation cultures. Protecting caribou and ensuring continued hunter access, sustainable harvest, and sustainable populations are as important to the Chamber as is protecting and environment of opportunity for discovery, developing profitable projects, and helping to sustain a part of Nunavut's economy.

The Chamber shares the concerns for caribou, supports land use planning, environmental management and assessment, and encourages the use of mitigation actions and protection measures where they make sense. We recognize that mining in Nunavut interacts with caribou, and there is no doubt that caribou can be disturbed by mining activities. Through the land use permit and environmental review process, Industry continuously advances efforts to minimize disturbance to caribou. For active projects, this may mean reducing activities during important time for caribou, including calving and migration, when caribou are present.

Through Nunavut's Impact Review Board process, Industry is leading many efforts in studying and monitoring the effects of exploration and mining disturbances on caribou. Industry is adapting to new information and new approaches to monitoring and reducing those effects.

Peter: Sorry, do you want me to advance the slides?

Mike: No, that's fine. There are three reasons why we should consider alternatives to many aspects of the protection measures proposed for the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan:

1. Nunavut has years of experiences, and analyses repeatedly show that mining disturbances are not the drivers of caribou populations. Excluding industrial activity entirely from seasonal habitats will likely amount to little, if anything, for the recovery of caribou populations.
2. The second reason is that Nunavut has a robust and effective environmental review and monitoring process. Individual projects are subject to intense scrutiny before they are permitted to operate. Additionally, existing protection tools for caribou, in use and improving since 1978, work.
3. The third reason is that the Government of Nunavut's proposal for Protected Areas is not based on sound evidence and seemingly lacks overall strategy to address the root causes of caribou population limitation and regulation.

These statements are supported by the Chamber's technical review of the caribou protection measures proposed for the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The review recommends alternative approaches in areas for potential improvements. The review also suggests reconsideration of the proposed protection measures. That technical review was posted on the Nunavut Planning Commission's website and is available for public viewing.

The technical review provided an overview with references to key literature showing that after more than 50 years of caribou research, there are still no established relationships between industrial disturbance and significant impacts to caribou population health in Nunavut. Regardless, the mining industry continues to study and assess potential impacts, and continues to use best management practices and evolving strategies to reduce disturbance in impact monitoring.

The Government of Nunavut should consider alternative analyses for identifying core calving and key access corridors. The Chamber provided 8 recommendations for revisions, including analyses to better characterize variation in the areas, and to better define what the important habitat features are in the core areas that require specific protection.

In addition to the technical review and recommendations, environmental work for advanced exploration and mining projects continue to analyze and provide the results that characterize potential project and cumulative effects on Nunavut's caribou populations. Assessments have been completed and reviewed that include analysis of the Bathurst, Beverly, Ahlak, (muted)...

David: Mike, are you going to wrap up fairly soon? We've got a lot of stuff to go through.

Mike: Am I over 15 minutes?

David: Yeah. Well, it was 10 minutes plus 5 minute of questions, so there clearly won't be time for questions.

Mike: Okay. Those analyses for the caribou herds are detailed into six peer-reviewed assessments prepared for the public and review boards in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut. Managing impacts on caribou is a key exploration and project development concern. Industry has been working with caribou protection measures that are being applied across Nunavut for many years. On a case-by-case basis, individual caribou protection plans were developed through a regulated and collaborative process with input from Government, Inuit Associations, Hunter and Trapper Associations and communities.

Sound management decisions have to be made on clear evidence, justification of what will work, and a commitment to follow-up effectiveness monitoring. Without a strategy and having those tools in place, it is premature to jump to habitat protection as the tool to protect caribou. Ladies and gentlemen, the Chamber suggests that we keep working with the existing tools and build what has already been working for the protection of caribou in Nunavut. We look forward to productive and focused discussions at this planning workshop. Qujannamiik.

David: Thanks, Mike. As I said, there won't be time for questions at this point at least. I want to remind people that we have a bunch of folks who want to speak, and I don't want to be delaying things because the previous speaker or speakers have exceeded their time allotment. So please, remember that there are other folks waiting to speak. If you can just focus your presentation on 10 minutes on the key items, I think that would be appreciated by everybody. Miguel, are you speaking for NTI?

Miguel: No, David, I think Hannah is. Thanks.

Planning Partner Perspectives NTI Opening Presentation

Hannah: Ublaahatkut. (*Greeting in Inuktitut followed*). My name is Hanna Uniuqsaraq. With me are my colleagues, Paul Irngaut, David Lee, Marie Belleau, and Miguel Chenier, as well as our colleagues from the Regional Inuit Associations. Thank you, NPC, for organizing this meeting and opening up the lines. Much appreciated. NTI recognizes the vital importance of healthy caribou populations

now and in the future. NTI would like to see a Nunavut Land Use Plan that addresses caribou protection adequately, and that also respects Inuit goals for the use of Inuit Owned Lands.

NTI sees this Caribou Technical Meeting as an opportunity to gain better understanding of how caribou populations should be protected, monitored, and managed. We are looking forward to hearing from Inuit who are knowledgeable about caribou, as well as biologists and other technical experts. NTI is looking forward to working with all the other organizations at this important meeting and building a consensus on how to address caribou in the first generation Nunavut Land Use Plan. I'll keep my points brief. Qujannamiik.

David: Thank you very much, Hannah. Any questions? We have a couple of minutes. *(Pause)*. Alright, Kitikmeot Inuit Association, you're next.

Planning Partner Perspectives: Kitikmeot Inuit Association Opening Presentation

Luigi: Ublaahatkut. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you very much for having this Fourth Technical Meeting. This is a difficult meeting especially given the topic and the emotional attachment we all have to caribou here in Nunavut. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association is the regional association representing Inuit, and our mandate is to represent the interests of Kitikmeot Inuit by protecting and promoting our social, cultural, political, environmental, and economic wellbeing.

As you can see, that spans quite a large spectrum, and we need to ensure that we can manage all of these. It is a very difficult chore. As such, we do promote appropriate exploration and mining development in the interests of all Inuit. Projects must balance economic and social development, and they must sustain land, wildlife, and Inuit lifestyles.

The KIA has been involved in the Nunavut Planning Commission process for a very long time. In the last, about two years ago, there was a resolution – NTI resolution – for the Regional Inuit Associations and NTI to work together to try and put forward a common position on the Land Use Plan. I have to tip my hat to my colleagues, because it is my feeling, my opinion, that we know the Plan very well. We understand how it impacts Inuit, and we are trying to do our best to ensure that Inuit interests are represented in that Plan.

With respect to the process, the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, Article 11.2.1B: special attention shall be devoted to protecting and promoting the existing and future wellbeing of Inuit and Inuit Owned Lands. Article 11.2.1C: The planning process shall ensure land use plans reflect the priorities and values of the residents of the planning regions. Article 11.8.2: The land use planning process shall apply to Inuit Owned Lands. Land Use Plans shall take into account Inuit goals and objectives for Inuit Owned Lands.

We understand these very well, and we are trying our best to ensure that caribou as well as economic development are permitted as a result of the Plan. The KIA has made a submission regarding caribou at the First Technical Meeting, and it's on the record so I won't talk about it in detail. But I want to make it very clear, as has been stated by others, that caribou are extremely

important to the RIAs and NTI. We do wish to find the solution. But the solution cannot be unilateral. It has to be respectful of harvesters as well as people – Inuit wanting to work with Industry.

There was a submission that was made to NPC by the Kugluktuk HTO, and I wish to bring that to the forefront. I asked about it. It is on the NPC records. The West Kitikmeot is an area that has experienced a lot of exploration, and there is a certain level of understanding of the impacts. So there isn't a level of unilateral protectionism requested in the West. We need to take that into consideration, especially when unemployment in Nunavut is at 17%. It might be a little bit higher in the Kitikmeot, in fact.

In conclusion, it is a difficult balance, and we're trying to walk that sword's edge. We've always tried to walk that sword's edge. We're not talking about you know, complete and utter development, but we have to be understanding that there are harvesters – there are Inuit harvesters – and there are Inuit who want to participate in the wage economy. Thank you.

David:

Thanks, Luigi. Any questions? Alright, a couple of comments I guess: One is if we could ask people to slow down, it'll help Tommy. At the same time, I do want to get back to being on schedule, and I think we're pretty close. We've got a lot of stuff to do. The second thing – and this came up, well it's come up in every workshop that we've had – there is no doubt that everyone is concerned about caribou. The challenge - and it has been a frustrating exercise from my perspective as an independent Chair of this - is we talk a lot, but we haven't come to any clear consensus on what we need to do. The test of our resolve, I think, to ensure that there are caribou sufficient for harvesting but also to maintain the ecosystem, is going to be in what we do, not what we say.

So I'd really encourage people to start thinking about what they're going to do and not repeat the messages that we've all heard before. No question about the sincerity, but there is a shortfall on action. I think we can all agree on that. I think we're going to defer the Kivalliq Inuit Association presentation. Luis is not here. Hopefully he will get in today or tomorrow, and we'll go there at that point, so I'll call on QIA. Thanks.

Planning Partner Perspective: Qikiqtani Inuit Association Opening Presentation

Steven L:

Steven Lonsdale with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. My director is traveling today, so I will be presenting on behalf of QIA. First of all, thank you for organizing the meetings, and welcome everyone to Iqaluit. My verbal presentation today will speak to a few items:

1. QIA's position on caribou protection
2. The ongoing development of the Land Use Plan as it relates to community consultations
3. And lastly questions and issues identified at the most recent community consultation in Sanikiluaq.

Firstly, the caribou protection: This is already public knowledge and might already have been announced at the last Technical Meeting. In October, at the QIA Board Meeting, NTI Wildlife and the GN Department of Environment gave a briefing on caribou protection measures. At that meeting, a resolution was passed by our Board endorsing protection in caribou calving grounds and mobile protection measures in post-calving grounds.

This is definitely a very complex issue that will be discussed over the next few days by everyone here. Following those discussions, it is safe to say that the Land Use Plan will incorporate information and change, once again. This brings me to the next point of the ongoing development of this Plan and how the community involvement was only at the initial phase during the 2013 consultations. Information was taken from community members, and the Plan was drafted and redrafted into the 2014 version that we see today, something not yet presented back to the originating sources.

Questions, concerns, and discussions around caribou over the next three days will see the Plan change and evolve. QIA has stressed the importance of bringing this Plan back to communities to ensure that the designations align with people's priorities and values, especially when it comes to Inuit Owned Lands. From the time of the original consultations until a final hearing, you're looking at a minimum of three different drafts. The more that this Plan changes without being presented in communities, the further away it will be from the people's priorities and values for the intended use of that land.

QIA had the opportunity to return to one community – Sanikiluaq – for continued consultations for land use planning. We had formally requested that the NPC accompany us, but the NPC was unable to attend. We felt there were too many outstanding issues to be addressed, so we went on our own anyway. We presented to the CLARC – Community Lands and Resources Committee – the HTO, the Hamlet, and the public on facts and information on the Land Use Plan, the consultation process to date, and the various proposed designations and associated prohibited activities.

It was apparent that some of the designations were a surprise in that the community priorities and values were not fully reflected, especially for an IOL hunting area close to town designated as high mineral potential. Several of the different questions and comments included, "Why haven't we seen this map before?" referring to the Land Use Plan designations map. "The high mineral potential designation on IOL does not reflect what the community wants." "Where did this data come from?" "How was the information gathered in 2013 used, and how is it assessed to get the designations?"

We still have many communities to follow-up with to see if the Land Use Plan designations align with community priorities and values for their intended use of their IOL. We anticipate similar questions, concerns, and possible discrepancies from other communities regarding the Land Use Plan, and we continue to stress the importance of community involvement in the ongoing consultations. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Steven. Just to forestall any comments about process, I'm going to remind people that there are discussions underway outside this room regarding process. I'll just leave it there, because otherwise we can get into another fight.

Luigi: Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity. You talked about...(muted).

David: Could you introduce yourself, please?

Luigi: Thank you. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Your question at the end of my presentation was there is very little in terms of substance. The KIA has put forward a position. It is not a Board Directive, but it is a position that we did submit at the First Meeting. So I welcome anybody to take a look at that. It should be on the NPC website. We are in favor of mobile protection measures. It's just we are not in favor of specific lines on a map, because those do not reflect the potential mobile and changes in calving areas of caribou. I just wanted to make that clarification.

David: Yeah, thanks, Luigi. Just so it's clear, it wasn't necessarily a criticism of any one party. It's a frustration, I guess, on my part as an observer to this, that while we continue to talk, we have a wide gulf in positions being presented. We need to narrow that gap, and we're not doing a very good job at it, I'd suggest. This workshop may help narrow that gap, but there is still going to be something of a chasm, I suspect, at the end of it.

I'm going to call a break right now. We're going to try to reorganize the room so there is more space. We're going to try and get the phone line up and running, and we have a few minutes because of the Kivalliq Inuit Association deferring to tomorrow. So let's take 15 minutes and resume.

BREAK

David: Can you grab your seats please? The communication challenges remain. I know it's frustrating for everybody, and it'll be particularly frustrating for those who are trying to call in, but we'll do our best. Let's pick up on the agenda where we left off. Kivalliq Wildlife Board, who is speaking? Warren?

Warren: Thank you, David. Warren for the KWB. Stanley Adjuk, our Chair, should be here in about 10 to 15 minutes. Could you maybe bump us down until he arrives?

David: Yes, we can do that for sure. Kitikmeot Wildlife Board. Jackie? No, sorry. Peter.

Planning Partner Perspectives Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board Opening Presentation

Peter Kapolak: Okay, thank you. Peter Kapolak from KRWB. Our Chair couldn't be here today, so I'm Co-Chair for the Kitikmeot Wildlife Board. In the past couple of years, the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board has been very active in discussing caribou matters with a wide range of co-management partners. We have also met with representatives from our member HTOs. We have consistently heard concerns about mining exploration and mining that may occur on caribou calving grounds and water crossings.

KRWB has heard that explorations that occur on caribou calving grounds in the Kitikmeot will not be supported by the HTOs and local communities. This position has been affirmed in discussions with the Elders. Protection of caribou habitat has never been more important, and we have

appreciated the Government of Nunavut's stance to protect caribou habitat. The covenant is to protect calving grounds and is supported by KRWB. We have participated in various discussions on caribou protection measures with organizations such as NPC, RWOs, HTOs, and Nunavut Wildlife Management Board.

As you are aware, NPC is currently drafting a Land Use Plan in Nunavut, which involves a wide range of organizations, governments, and other interests from Nunavut and NWT. We cannot emphasize enough that caribou calving grounds in our regions need to be protected from exploration and development, especially water crossings. Caribou is the main diet of the Inuit, and its skin is used for clothing. Caribou are a vital part of Inuit culture, and we wish to ensure that Inuit have access to caribou for generations to come. Thank you on behalf of Simon.

David: Thank you, Peter. Any questions? Observations? Alright, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board.

Planning Partner Perspectives: Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board Opening Remarks

Jackie: Hello, Jackie Price with the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I'll be making a couple of remarks on behalf of the organization. Before I begin, I would just like to identify that I am a staff member of the organization. I do not sit on the Board. We were not able to get members of our Board to this meeting. But what I can do is I can pass on the direction I've received from the Board, and this direction has been informed by multiple, multiple conversations with HTOs, be it the manager or the Board themselves.

Just a couple of basic facts: HTOs are organizations recognized under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. Their membership represents an extensive and important demographic of Inuit in Nunavut. Inuit beneficiaries over the age of 16 are HTO members. Conversations at the HTO Board level and therefore the Regional Wildlife Organization level, focuses extensively only wildlife, the environment, questions of protection, and harvesting. So we are well versed in these conversations, and they are at the forefront of everything that we do.

Inuit want caribou protection. They want protected land areas. I'm not extending myself by saying this. At the QWB AGM held in November 2015, the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board passed a resolution affirming their commitment and desire to have caribou grounds protected. The specific grounds included calving, post-calving, migration routes, and access corridors. I hope that is straightforward.

The importance of this stance cannot be underestimated. Inuit have witnessed mining and development. They've witnessed multiple projects across the region, and they've witnessed the life of those projects, and their involvement and engagement with the environment well beyond the life of the project.

In the Qikiqtaaluk, we draw on what we call three main caribou populations: Peary, Baffin Island, and the reindeer in Sanikiluaq. We are aware that various other organizations have created further subpopulations. QWB makes this strong stance on caribou grounds, even though within the GN submission to NPC no calving grounds were identified in the Plan. While not ideal, that doesn't

sway the organization's deep, deep belief that communities know those grounds and want those grounds protected.

In preparation for the Public Hearing on this Draft Land Use Plan, QWB – and we are working with co-management partners – we are working to organize a workshop on caribou grounds in this region. We plan to have areas identified on a map in time for the mid-June deadline for the Public Hearing. This work will be further supported by ongoing communication with the HTOs to prepare them for the Public Hearing in November.

As a staff member and as a witness to the multiple conversations that have occurred on caribou in the last year and prior, I will say that I cannot wait for this Public Hearing. As many of you will have already known, when you have that many community delegates in one place, the tone of the conversation will drastically, drastically change, and in my opinion for the better. So it's QWB's perspective to prepare for the Public Hearing and to provide whatever support the diverse range of community representatives need in order for them to speak as freely as they must at the Public Hearing.

And in closing, my last point is that QWB would like to point out that this is a first generation plan. We don't have to have all the answers set in stone. I know concerns have been raised around the table already about – concerns have been raised about the EM, the designation and the importance of having designations figured out right away – this is not possible at this time. So it is QWB's opinion to err on the side of caution. We're not saying it has to stay like this forever. As NPC has repeated numerously at this meeting and at meetings in the past, revisions can happen. Conversations can continue past this first generation plan.

So in fully knowing that ability is constantly there, we would recommend to err on the side of caution until we've developed systems to better engage communities directly in this conversation, because I believe QIA made very important points about the level of engagement at the community level. And constant engagement with the communities should be a central goal of this Plan considering how important it is and how it does center around future development within Nunavut – not just resource development but the development of people, communities, infrastructure, and everything. So thank you very much.

David: Thank you, Jackie. Any questions for Jackie? Alright, we'll move on to World Wildlife Fund. Brandon? And Brandon, just before you speak, people have no doubt noticed that we're ahead of schedule. I'll continue to move forward fairly quickly. I'm worried about tomorrow's weather. So the time we make up today, we may lose tomorrow. Brandon, please?

Planning Partner Perspectives: World Wildlife Fund Opening Remarks

Brandon: Hi, Brandon Laforest with WWF Canada here in Iqaluit. Thank you for having us here. I'd like to start my comments – they're short – by reiterating part of Peter's opening remarks. It is important to first talk about caribou protection independent of Industry, as was the spirit at the NWMB workshop late last year. In that regard, I'm encouraged to see NWMB here at the table and look forward to their contributions.

Of course, the goals of Industry need to enter the conversation, but caribou should be discussed independently first so we agree on the most conservation approach before undertaking a compromise that is necessary that will balance the well-documented needs of the territories to develop its natural resources.

In that regard, it is important that the burden of proof be equal for those advocating for land-based restrictions on development, and those arguing for solely mobile protection measures, as well as conversations on the feasibility of both of these options. Arguments will be put forward demonstrating the need to employ Protected Areas and Special Management Areas in key caribou habitats for disturbance reasons.

Direct evidence also needs to be put forward demonstrating that development of a mine in the middle of a calving ground will have little to no impact on the caribou in that area. These evidences can then be weighed along with considerations of values of Nunavummiut and goals of the territory.

Habitat protection is not the only tool to conserve caribou, but it is definitely one tool among a suite of tools across the range and lifecycle of caribou. I'd like to reiterate that habitat protection and mobile protection measures need not be exclusive of each other. The best measure for caribou in the territory will likely be a mixing of the two.

Sharon spoke about how this is a first generation Land Use Plan, that the Plan can be amended and that exemptions can be applied for. It was mentioned this morning that the Plan will be reviewed at minimum, every 5 years. Given the current status of caribou and the concern expressed by HTOs, we feel, echoing Jackie that a precautionary approach needs to be undertaken.

What's at stake? If a precautionary approach is undertaken in this first generation of the Land Use Plan, new projects in caribou calving grounds will be delayed or potentially not undertaken for now. The minerals will not disappear. The potential to develop those minerals will remain. What is at stake if we do not undertake a precautionary approach, is the potential for irreversible effects on the status and recovery of caribou herds in Nunavut. Our positions are found in our submissions to NPC, so I won't go over them. But we look forward to this discussion, and I again want to thank NPC for our inclusion in the discussion. Thanks very much.

David: Thank you, Brandon. Any questions of Brandon? Then Kivalliq – are you guys ready? Then the floor is yours.

Planning Partner Perspectives: Kivalliq Wildlife Board Opening Perspectives

Stanley A.: Thank you. Ublaahatkut. Good morning all of you. I am Stanley Adjuk, President of Kivalliq Wildlife Board, known as KWB. With me today I have Basil Quinangnaq and Warren Bernauer, and our Regional Coordinator couldn't make it out of Arviat yesterday. I'm expecting her tomorrow – Leah Muckpah. The Kivalliq Wildlife Board appreciates the opportunity to participate

in this workshop. The Kivalliq Wildlife Board is a Regional Wildlife Organization and responsible for supporting and representing the Hunters and Trappers in our region, known as HTOs.

Our mandate outlining the Land Claims Agreement, focuses on wildlife management and harvesting for this region. We work closely with the Hunters and Trappers to fulfill this responsibility. Kivalliq Wildlife Board is made up of myself and the Chairs of the Kivalliq Hunters and Trappers Organizations. Caribou habitat conservation has been a major topic for our Board – the Kivalliq Wildlife Board – for a number of years now. We regularly discuss these issues at our Annual General Meetings and our Board meetings. The Board members bring the unique perspectives of their various communities.

Kivalliq Wildlife Board has submitted recommendations to the Nunavut Planning Commission for the protection of caribou habitat. I'll hand out these comments so everyone has a copy. Kivalliq Wildlife Board recommends core calving grounds, core post-calving grounds, and water crossings on the mainland be designated Protected Areas. These areas should be fully protected from mining and exploration activities.

Kivalliq Wildlife Board recommends caribou on Southampton and Coats Island be given seasonal protection during calving season until more information about calving grounds on these islands are available. Kivalliq Wildlife Board recommends caribou migration routes be designated Special Management Areas. These areas should have seasonal protection during migration season.

Kivalliq Wildlife Board recommends implementing mobile protection measures in addition to the above-listed Protected and Special Management Areas. All explorations and mining companies should cease operations if caribou are nearby during calving, post-calving, rutting, and migration season.

Our Board has been discussing the need for greater protection for calving and post-calving grounds at our meetings for years. We have passed Board resolutions opposing development in these areas at all of our recent Annual General Meetings. These resolutions were based on our knowledge as hunters, recommendations from Elders, recommendations from wildlife biologists, and recommendations from the Kivalliq HTOs who represent their communities.

All of the mainland Hunters and Trappers Boards in the region have supported protecting calving grounds. Once our Regional Coordinator, Leah Muckpah, is in town, if anybody asks questions, she will be able to answer, as she has been dealing with this a lot along with Warren Bernauer.

I want to give you a perspective from my home community of Whale Cove. Whale Cove is a community closest to the Qamanirjuaq calving grounds. It is practically right at our doorstep. The Elders in our community, they always taught us to respect the calving grounds. We are not to travel into calving grounds during calving season. We should stay out of there. We don't hunt females or calves during calving and post-calving seasons. Us hunters – Inuk hunters – we've been taught by our Elders. We go along with our Elders all the time. A lot of us respect our Elders so we listen to Elders. The bulls – that's bull hunting season, so we've always been taught to protect the calving grounds. But it is hard to protect them when we are not in one place together.

When I was the Chair of Whale Cove HTO back in 2013, we tried to get Anconia out of the Qamanirjuaq calving grounds, which helped a bit. The company was drilling right in the middle of

the calving grounds. We placed a resolution saying we wanted them out, and we want the calving and post-calving grounds to be protected. Then the resolutions - we wrote another letter saying we want full protection for calving and post-calving grounds.

So this issue of calving and post-calving is very important to our region in the Kivalliq, and I know also Kitikmeot and Baffin. Caribou is our main staple of diet. Without that, I know a lot of us would be starving. We just want our Qamanirjuaq herd or any herd to be protected. Mining comes and goes. We all know that. They bring money. For how long? We don't know. Caribou have been there forever. We still want it to be there. We'll probably have more to say later on, so thanks for giving us this opportunity. Before we finish, Basil will continue.

Basil: My name is Basil. I'm on the Baker Lake HTO Board, and the Board asked me to come here to give the HTO perspective on caribou habitat. As you all are aware, Baker Lake is inland. I don't really hunt sea mammals there. Caribou is basically all we have, all we really have for country food. I know that in other regions they have restrictions on caribou hunting. All across the North – Labrador, Northern Quebec, Baffin Island, Southampton Island, and Northwest Territories – they put restrictions or even a ban on hunting many of the herds. Quotas or bans on hunting caribou would be a disaster for the people in Baker Lake. I don't know if we will be able to feed ourselves properly. So we have to make sure caribou are properly protected so we don't end up in that situation.

The Baker Lake HTO would like protection for caribou calving grounds and caribou water crossings. We have been trying to protect the most important caribou habitats since the 1970s, since explorations first really ramped up in our area. We asked for land free zone exploration until we had a Land Claim. We thought the Land Claim would help us protect these areas, important caribou habitat and our important hunting grounds. But now we have the Claim, and those areas are still not protected.

This past fall, the HTO held a workshop with hunters and Elders to talk about caribou habitat at the workshop. Caribou calving grounds and water crossings were discussed. Everyone agreed that those should be fully protected. We know that caribou are very sensitive when they give birth. We were always taught not to hunt cows and calves when they were giving birth or nursing. The water crossings – the caribou are very sensitive there as well. The Elders said that the smallest disturbance, the littlest noise and the smallest changes in the land could make caribou change their migration and cross somewhere else. The Elders shared a lot of knowledge of Traditional Rules and rules for respecting water crossings. We were taught never to hunt or camp on the side of the river where the caribou enter the water, for example. And they were taught not to make camp too close to the crossings.

Back in 2012, the Baker Lake HTO worked with other HTOs in the region to try to stop Anconia Resources. Anconia wanted to explore right in the middle of the calving grounds. The HTO Chair at the time – Hugh Ikoe – wrote a lot of letters to NIRB, to KIA and to the company. I'm going to hand out the letter he sent, which Warren has. I hope it gets you to understand where we are coming from.

The companies always tell us that it's only exploration and that there are protection measures, like seasonal restrictions during calving season, or it shuts down when the caribou come close. Sure that might be the case. But what if they find something during the exploration? They will want to

mine it. A whole mine with roads, quarries and a mill and everything – I don't think you could put that in calving grounds and not cause a disturbance.

You should really understand there is really no way the hunters from Baker Lake would ever been comfortable with a mine in the calving grounds. We would never be okay with that, and we're not alone. I know the hunters from where I'm from won't be okay with it either. We work a lot with them when we were fighting against Anconia.

David: Thank you, Basil. Any comments? Questions? Alright, thank you. So, Beverly Qamanirjuaq: Earl are you ready to go?

Planning Partner Perspectives

Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board Opening Presentation

Earl: Yes, good morning, David. We have a split presentation here. Leslie, our biologist, will be speaking first.

Leslie: Thank you. It's Leslie Wakelyn. I work for the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board. Who is the Board, just in case people don't know? The BQCMB is a co-management Board that has been in place since 1978. It's responsible for advising communities and governments on the management of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou herds.

David: Leslie, can I ask you to slow down a little bit?

Leslie: Sure, I'll try. Thank you. These herds use habitats in Nunavut, Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. The Board members represent more than 20 communities in these areas, as well as the two provincial and two territorial governments, and the federal government. The Board has asked NPC and asked all parties involved in this deliberation, to more clearly recognize that many of the caribou herds in Nunavut spend only part of the time in Nunavut, and they provide a shared resource to communities and people across the caribou ranges.

It needs to be clear that caribou harvesters outside Nunavut will be affected by decisions that occur in Nunavut, and the decisions that are made by Nunavut organizations and the people here. So the Board reminds decision-makers that because many caribou herds are a shared resource, many people are watching and hoping that the Nunavut Land Use Plan will clearly show how much Nunavummiut continue to value caribou. It is hoped that Nunavut will act cautiously and do their best to protect caribou for the future. This is particularly relevant in this day of declining caribou herds where many, many people are undergoing hardship, particularly in communities in the Northwest Territories, because of the status of the caribou herds.

The Board, and the many communities it represents, believe it's essential that the most sensitive and most important caribou habitats have effective protection from the negative effects of land use activities and mineral exploration. I stress protection of caribou habitat here. The most sensitive habitats that require protection are found in calving, post-calving areas, and around key water crossings, as the Baker and Kivalliq Wildlife Board reps have just stressed.

The Board believes that the conversation we should be having here about the future of land use planning and the future of Nunavut, should not be a choice between permitting mines or protecting caribou. What it needs to be is about protecting caribou while conducting very careful or cautious economic development. So this is not really radically different from the view that is presented by the Chamber of Mines, for instance, but the critical difference here is that the perspective of the Board and the caribou harvesters it represents, is that mineral exploration and development occur outside of calving and post-calving areas and key water crossings. This is required for the sustainability of the herds over the long-term. This would allow land use activities to occur across most of the vast lands of Nunavut. So the Board and these communities and the caribou harvesters believe this is a perfectly reasonable point of view.

The Board believes that what is required to protect caribou in Nunavut is a combination of area protection and seasonal restrictions on land use activities that reduce disturbance and other effects on caribou. Seasonal restrictions may be implemented to improve mobile caribou protection measures, although we have not yet seen how these new measures will be implemented, if they will be tested, or how they will be proven to actually protect caribou adequately.

It is clear it is not a question of area protection or protection measures. One issue is that there seems to be much confusion about the proposed application of the existing caribou protection measures, mobile protection measures currently in place by Industry, and new mobile protection measures that we have heard a bit about but not seen any explanation of, at least in this forum. People talk about protection measures as though we all know what exactly they are, and that we know they actually have an effect in protecting caribou from disturbance. We have not really seen that yet in this meeting.

One major element of the confusion appears to be that there is not a clear understanding of the intent and limitations of these various versions of protected measures. The key measure for the Board is that these measures are a tool for mitigating effects of land use activities in terms of avoiding or reducing effects on caribou, but they are not a tool for habitat protection. We have submitted various descriptions of the Board's position with quite a lot of detail to the NPC, and it's on the public record, so I won't go through them here today. But I would also like to say that the Board has asked for a precautionary approach. Others have raised that issue here today, and for people to consider the management of risk.

It should also be in the overall context of cumulative effects on caribou, which is particularly of great concern in the situation we're in now where most herds are declining. The Board believes that before any decisions are made to not provide protection through the Land Use Plan for the caribou habitats, such as calving and post-calving areas and key water crossings, those parties who are arguing against protection need to provide convincing evidence that there is no risk of serious long-term effects to the caribou herds that would result from leaving these areas open for their proposed activities.

The Board takes a strong position because there is no undoing the effects of mines, roads, and associated human activities on caribou calving grounds once they are established. We will not be able to go back and reverse changes to habitat or changes in the ability of caribou to access habitats they need on the calving grounds once they are in place. We have an opportunity here now with the first Nunavut Land Use Plan to be cautious and to do our best to take care of caribou habitat,

the habitats that are most crucial. And as has been said before today, we need to remind people that the first Land Use Plan is flexible and temporary and will be reviewed and can be changed when new information becomes available.

One more thing I'd just like to stress is that the Board does not agree that removing areas of high mineral potential from Protected Areas is adequate, because it will create a patchwork of areas that are protected and not protected. Even just from the point of view of Industry it does not seem to be a workable solution, because there will be different prohibitions, different conditions applied in a patchwork of areas. But from a caribou's point of view, there will be disturbance. There will be potential mines in various areas that the herds require to access their calving grounds and post-calving areas. We can discuss that more, later in our other presentation. I'll pass it on to Earl to continue. Thank you.

Earl: Thank you, Leslie. Earl Evans here, Chair of the Caribou Management Board. I'd like to welcome everybody here this morning, ladies and gentleman, and also the Elders in the back that are here present today. Thank you for coming. One of the advantages of speaking last is you don't have much to say because everybody has already said it. I think Leslie covered quite a bit of what we had to say there.

But some of the really main important parts, like I said, protection of the calving grounds is one of our main items for being here. As we know, these herds are a shared resource, so there is not only the people of Nunavut that depend on these caribou, but it's the 20 other communities on the outlying fringes of this area too that depend heavily on caribou. With all the herds in steep decline out of Nunavut, the pressure is even more on the Qamanirjuaq and Beverly herds, because the other people in the communities cannot access caribou.

Right now we have people from Saskatchewan driving 3600 kilometers into Manitoba to get caribou, because caribou have not come through the area. The Qamanirjuaq stayed way east this year. All the Dogrib communities, the people living way out – Lutselk'e and all those far outlying communities - they do not have any caribou this year. Caribou are all up on the coast. They have not come anywhere where there are any roads or any development, and they are very, very hard to get. So the guys are looking at \$20,000.00 to \$30,000.00 worth of planes to go get meat for their community. It's coming your way.

All these herds in the south have been decimated over the years from easy access – hunters coming from all over. So, this is what is going to happen in Nunavut eventually by the looks of things, because these herds are in serious trouble. Right now is bad, bad timing for everybody because of all the caribou in decline. It makes it harder and harder to make decisions for Industry and for the Governments, because of the complex situation here. We don't know exactly how these caribou herds are going to react. How long is it going to take for them to come back? We don't know that.

We have to, like you say, err on the side of caution. I heard this about four times this morning, but I'm saying it again. It's very important. We also have to really look closely at the different areas. Different areas are sensitive to Industry, sensitive to disturbance, main caribou routes. So we really have to be careful. Some areas you can get away with a bit more activity and stuff, and some areas we can't. So every area has to be treated differently, but also with conservation in mind.

Also, I'd like to have a lot of communication with the Elders. I've heard it in Baker Lake. A lot of the Elders say we didn't really even know what was going on here. The message never really got to the people that live on the land. It came to them secondhand. They didn't really even know a lot of this development was happening. So I think it's very important for Industry, Government, HTOs, to make sure that people living on the land get the proper communication so they know what's going to take place, not know about it when the chopper is landing at their camp.

These are some of the things that we really have to look at and really explore closely and take a good look before we make any decisions at all. Like I said, Elders are very important. Elders are the voice of the land. They've been there hundreds of years. They are biologists out there. They know more about the land than anybody, because they live there. We have to take their views into...we have to really listen to them and see what they've seen over the years. They've seen stuff there that people have never ever seen in their life. So they are a book of knowledge. So the more information we can get out and the more we can communicate with the Elders, I think a better Plan can be produced.

With that I'd just like to shut down here before David shuts me down. There are a lot of other things we can talk about, but these are some of the main points we'd like to get out to the people. Thank you.

David: Thank you, Earl. You could tell that my finger was starting to twitch. Alright, Bruno are you ready to go? I know it's a bit early, but are you okay with making a presentation now?

Planning Partner Perspectives: GNWT Opening Presentation

Bruno: Sure, Mr. Chair. Thank you. I was asked to reproduce the speaking notes that my colleagues coming from previous meetings presented to you guys. Some of the information I will present is not new to you, but I think it's important to go over those again. Bruno Croft, GNWT. I'm a biologist with the Department of Environment Natural Resources. I have probably visited calving grounds more than anybody else I can think of through surveys, aerials, and time on the ground, so I think I can share and attest as much – if not more than anybody else – a sensitivity of what could happen there. So Mr. Chair, I'll read and I'll jump in here and there on a few comments. I hate reading this verbatim, but we just had three weeks of public hearings, and I have to go through this quite a bit.

Many of the barren ground caribou herds in Nunavut are shared with the NWT and are a valued subsistence and cultural resource for both territories. Management of these herds should also be shared, particularly as some of these transboundary herds are in decline, or stable but at low numbers. Mr. Chair, I mentioned that we just went through a series of public hearings on the Bluenose East and the Bathurst herd, and you've been at some of those in the past. The reason for those is that those herds are declining quickly, and we have to come up to total allowable harvest for Aboriginal folks down in the NWT. Some won't be able to harvest anymore.

I've heard plenty in the last year and a half of the agony and despair of the people in the NWT on not being able to harvest caribou anymore. So of all the lists of questions have come our way and

concern at the very top of the list is concern about the calving grounds. I heard it all week again last week. Protection of the calving ground – what are you going to do about the calving grounds? I'll try to slow down a bit. So, I can assure you, Mr. Chair, that the majority of Aboriginal groups in the NWT, co-management boards, and all Government, are all on the same page as us, offering full protection of the calving grounds as listed before, and I'll go through those again in a bit.

Caribou are highly vulnerable in the days immediately prior to and during calving and the post-calving period. It just makes sense. You don't have to have been there to know that. The Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan does not, or did not go into enough, or do enough to protect caribou calving or post-calving grounds. Hopefully this will change. I'm not sure where this is going, but we'll make sure we get our voice heard.

Disturbance impacts associated with industrial exploration and development – helicopters, fixed wing flights, vehicular traffic, roads, and most of all permanent infrastructure, mine sites – right in the core or the periphery of the core calving area will disrupt for sure, calving behavior and negatively impact calf production, cow-calf bonding, as well as increased potential for cow mortality. I don't think we need to explain that too much.

The calving grounds, Mr. Chair, are ground zero. There is no room for making a mistake here. We cannot afford to learn the hard way and hope we can go back and correct the mistakes we may have made by rushing too much and doing something that could be detrimental, and there is a very high risk of it as far as impact on the calving ground. So, there is not a whole lot of room there to maneuver. Maintaining the integrity of the calving grounds is absolutely crucial to the survival and recovery of any barren ground caribou herd. Protection of calving grounds is widely supported by communities throughout Nunavut and NWT. I already mentioned that.

Calving ground protection was also one of the highest priorities recommended at the 2007 Caribou Summit held in Inuvik. For those of you who may not know, at the outset of the Bathurst calving ground decline, when we found out that we were losing a lot of cows on the calving grounds of the Bathurst herd, our government decided to have a pan territorial provincial caribou summit in Inuvik. A lot of discussion took place, a lot of concern was expressed, and a lot of recommendations came forward. One of them was to prevent any development of any activities on the calving ground. That recommendation hasn't changed. We have had countless meeting on our side of the border and here – because I've been here a few times.

Again, I'll reiterate what I mentioned earlier. Through all those meetings, consultations and all, the one place we cannot afford to make a mistake is the calving grounds. We need to be really careful how we want to approach development on the calving grounds, because there is not a lot of room there to make mistakes.

The next point, Mr. Chair, has changed a little bit here, but I'll read it and see why it has changed. GNWT supports the Government of Nunavut position, as stated in its submission to the Nunavut Planning Commission that industrial activity of any type - including mineral exploration and production, construction of roads, pipelines, and other infrastructure - should not be permitted on the calving grounds. Now I understand that this has changed as of last week. Mr. Chair, I was at a public meeting last week, a consultation meeting - public hearings about the Bluenose East herd. Someone asked again what we are going to do or what is our position for the protection of the

calving grounds as a government. So we said ours, and I mentioned that we also support the GN's position.

Ironically, an hour later I get this text message, Mr. Chair, that GN has changed its position. So I will have a question, and I can speak on behalf of my entire chain of command, where this is coming from and how it has changed, respectfully of course. Our position has not changed. I had a meeting with the Deputy Minister late Friday. I will speak to our Minister later today. Our position is the same. It has not changed. We support full protection of the calving grounds throughout.

Now, Mr. Chair, I'll add a few more things here that are not on this list. My colleague here mentioned earlier that we should not approach development under a unilateral approach or view or path. I agree. If we look at our department in the last ten years or so, we've been part of countless environmental assessments, and we all understand as biologists working for ENR that the country needs jobs. We need the minerals. We need the oil. We need to be part of a solution moving forward with resource extraction and preservation and conservation of wildlife populations. So we always approach environmental assessment and negotiations with mining folks in the spirit of collaboration. So we ask hard questions. We get asked hard questions, and we came up with some mitigation measures at some point.

Now as we move further north towards the calving grounds, we get nervous. This past fall, we had the Jay-Cardinal Public Hearing as part of an expansion of Ekati Diamond Mine. Their own wildlife advisors came up with their assessment – this is the proponent assessment – that there is no measurable effect of impact of development on the Bathurst herd. That's the first time that we can hear and share numbers other than the natural stressors that can impact caribou. So it's all there, and it's building up.

As we get closer to the calving grounds – and I will say the same thing again – we have no room to make mistakes. We will continue to talk to everybody and listen to people's concerns and do our best to get closer to the solution. There is a line in the sand, from my perspective, and that's the calving grounds. We just cannot jump that one, Mr. Chair, and that's our position. We're not changing it.

There is a whole bunch of other stuff I'd like to share and talk about, and just a quick note on the protection measures we're now starting to hear: As I mentioned earlier, I've been on calving grounds more than probably anyone can think of. I still haven't seen a document about that. Nothing has come on my desk, nothing that would have been peer-reviewed or even explained to me. So what is that about? I'm sure that there are some values to it in areas and post-calving, whatever the methods are, post-calving areas perhaps, and wintering range, fall range. For the life of me, I cannot envision what the method would be through these protected measures document to mitigate any impact on the calving grounds. So wherever the document is, please make it come my way. I'd like to see it. That's pretty much it on that note, Mr. Chair. I'm sure I'll jump in a bit later.

David Thank you, Bruno, and Earl. I forgot to ask if there are any questions of Earl as well as Bruno. Now is the time.

Earl: Thank you. Earl Evans here. I don't know if it's a question to Bruno or what, but just as a note, the last seven or eight years, the herds have been wintering above the tree line. So what that is doing

is putting more pressure on habitat in Nunavut. That seems to be the trend now. The Beverly, Ahlak and some of the other herds are right on the fringe. They are in the Nunavut part of the territory, so that is added pressure on the caribou habitat in Nunavut. So that's something to consider. Because if these herds do come back, like some of them are 400,000 at one time, and if they ever do come back, two or three of those herds in those numbers, it's going to be an extra item on the planning part of this management plan as how you're going to deal with these extra caribou on the range. But that's looking pretty optimistically. But that is there. Like I said, right now we do have the caribou staying up all winter above tree line, so there is added pressure on that resource. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Earl. Any other comments? Observations? Please...

David Lee: Thank you, Mr. Chair or Facilitator, David. So my name is David Lee. I'm the Wildlife Biologist for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. As Jackie mentioned, I don't represent NTI. I'm a staff member. I'm treating this as a Technical Workshop, and I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank Bruno for his comments. I've also worked on most of the caribou calving grounds, and I corroborate all of the statements that he has made.

I think that for most ungulate biologists, there is no question about the critical sensitivity of what we're speaking about with respect to caribou calving grounds for major migratory herds. For those that are not ungulate biologists or don't have that type of experience, I think those reviews and statements also need to be weighed adequately. Thank you.

David: Thank you, David. Are there any other comments, questions? Yeah?

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I have a few questions, and I'm not sure it's most appropriate to ask them now or if it they would be better at a later point in time.

David: Whom are the questions addressed to?

Luigi: To the Government of the GNWT.

David: Well why don't you ask a couple now and then if there are more, we can get to them later.

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. The management of the calving grounds - obviously that's what we're all around here to discuss. I would like to ask a couple of questions, one in terms of Nunavut harvest. How accessible and how easy is it for Nunavummiut to access - you need to keep in mind I'm from the Kitikmeot region - how easy is it for Inuit to actually access these calving grounds, number one?

Number two: what is the level of industrial activity that has happened in the Bluenose East area? So I'll ask those two questions and I may have a follow-up after.

David: Bruno, do you want to answer - and Hannah I guess? But Bruno first.

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bruno Croft, GNWT. Thank you, Luigi for your question. I think you asked a question about harvest in Nunavut, and you asked me to answer this. I think it would probably be better to ask the Kugluktuk biologist. I can tell you what I know. In the case of the Bluenose East

herd, the overall harvest of the herd, we estimate that Kugluktuk probably takes a third of the harvest. If we look at the allocation that we submitted to the various boards lately, moving forward, Kugluktuk would have about a third moving forward, and it's also GN's position. That is based on past harvest reports from officers in your community. So that's probably as best as I can do on this, Mr. Chair. I think it would be better answered by a Nunavut biologist.

I'd like to add to this, if you don't mind Luigi. We have conducted, paid for, all the Bluenose East calving grounds and distribution herds of the Bluenose East and the Bathurst for as far as I can remember. This past summer, the whole bill for the Bathurst and Bluenose East calving ground surveys was about a million dollars and counting, Mr. Chair. So in spite of the fact that a third of the harvest does take place in Nunavut, it's a shared resource. We take that seriously, and we share efforts. Also because now we are getting more and more help from the GN on the Bluenose East. Sorry for the long answer. That's the harvest, a third of it, and your other question was...

Luigi: Industry

Bruno: Okay, Mr. Chair. Bruno Croft, ENR. Luigi, again you probably know more than me about what kind of industry is going on with the Bluenose East. All we know about is the activity of the Tundra Corp – if I'm not mistaken of the name – that took place on the calving grounds in the past two summers. There were drilling sites pretty much right in the core calving area when it first started. We didn't know a thing about it. In the second year, this past summer, we knew and it went to NIRB. Of course, we made a submission, as just about everybody else in the NWT. I think this is the only one I know of on our side of the border, Luigi and Mr. Chair. There are no known developments taking place at this time, certainly nothing comparable to the Bathurst herd.

David: Luigi?

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to follow-up on that. So, the status of the...so just for everyone's clarification, the exploration project that Mr. Croft is speaking to is an exploration project that actually happened last year. It was not two years of exploration. So that's one clarification. The local HTO took some extraordinary measures to work with that corporation – that exploration company, whatever they are – to ensure that they were conducting their activities during a period of time when there were no caribou around. So it has been in the news, and it has been spoken to quite a bit lately, but there is a lot of misinformation that seems to be abounding with that particular project.

The reason I focus on the Bluenose East is that is a herd that, to me, is very indicative of the concerns that my organization have in the sense that the population is decreasing considerably. There is no impact on the calving grounds, but yet it is still decreasing considerably. I don't think that the biologists have a very good idea of why that population is decreasing. What are the specific variables that are affecting that particular population?

Let's imagine if we were to protect that entire calving ground. Would that necessarily result in a population rebound? I would love to see that link.

David: Okay, Bruno, I think I'll address what I suspect you're going to respond to. Luigi, you know as well as anybody that part of the issue is cumulative effects. Part of the issue too, is like I said, flip the question around: What would happen to the caribou if development were allowed on the calving

grounds? I mean that's the concern that people have. There is no clear answer to that, but I think the concern folks are raising is that any development may push the herds in a direction that would be completely unhelpful. Hannah, did you want to get in on this?

Hannah: Qujannamiik. Hanna Uniuqsaraq with NTI. Thank you, Bruno for your presentation. Just from my own understanding, I wanted to get a better understanding of the level of resources that the GNWT puts into caribou management, whether it be monitoring or reporting. Qujannamiik.

Bruno: Mr. Chair, thank you. Bruno Croft, GNWT. Thank you for your question. We have a number of barren ground caribou herds in the NWT, one we call Tuk Peninsula, Cape Bathurst – not to be confused with Bathurst Bluenose West, Bluenose East – these are the ones that we have primary jurisdiction over. Then we assist GN when they ask us with the Beverly, the Ahiak, and the Qamanirjuaq.

Aerial surveys are expensive. We do a number of those on each of those herds on an annual and seasonal basis. I already mentioned the photographic surveys of the Bathurst and the Bluenose East added up to about a million dollars, Mr. Chair, this summer. In years where we don't have photographic surveys, we do distribution surveys, which are a lot less expensive and provide us with really valuable information. So every year we visit the calving grounds. In the fall, in the spring, and in the winter we have other aerial surveys to determine the number of bulls in the herds. Others are to find out the calf recruitment and general distribution of the animals in the winter.

We also have programs involved with health and conditions of the caribou with the communities with a lot of interaction, engagement, and consultation. So if you are asking dollars, I can take that as an undertaking if you want. I can come back with exact numbers, but it is huge. In recent years – up until last year we used to have access to what was called the Caribou Strategy Fund, which added a million dollars a year to monitoring barren ground caribou. We do not have that anymore, Mr. Chair, so now we are scrambling to find other ways to continue the very basic amount of monitoring that should be in place at all times so we don't find ourselves in the situation where we did in the 1990s when we found ourselves complacent and we stopped doing some of those.

The only way we are going to be able to detect all of the above – so any question you might possibly come up with – is if we continue working together with GN and everybody else. This is not only from the dollars but also knowledge – Traditional and scientific – to stay on top of this barren ground caribou situation. It's not looking pretty out there now.

Hannah: Thank you.

David: Thanks, Bruno. Luigi, I noticed that you were heading for the mike there a second ago. Okay, so we'll turn now to the GN, a much-anticipated presentation, I've got to say... but no pressure.

(Laughter)

Planning Partner Perspectives: GN-DoE Opening Presentation

Steve P: Thank you. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. On behalf of the Government of Nunavut, I'd like to thank the Nunavut Planning Commission for the opportunity to be here with our team and participate in the Fourth Technical Meeting on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Government of Nunavut hopes that the technical discussions this week concerning caribou result in a consensus among planning parties in how to best address these important issues through the Nunavut Land Use Plan. We are here to collaborate, share expertise, and find beneficial land use planning solutions for all parties.

On caribou, the Government of Nunavut has provided very detailed land use planning recommendations in the past, but we are cognizant of, and willing to explore, alternative land use tools suggested by other participants.

Substantially, the Government of Nunavut has recently reconsidered its position on protection of calving areas. You will recall that in the spring of 2014, the Government of Nunavut in a submission to the Planning Commission, stated a position that there should be no development in core calving areas and key migration corridors, and seasonal restrictions in post-calving areas. We have very recently reconsidered this position.

The Government of Nunavut is no longer recommending a blanket prohibition on development activities within calving areas under the Land Use Plan, but rather a combination of seasonal restrictions and other measures. We will continue to work with all planning stakeholders on this important issue during the workshop.

In closing, we'd like to thank the Commission for providing the opportunity to continue the discussion on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, and we have confidence that the Commission will make informed and reasonable decisions based on the information they receive. We look forward to responding to a revised Plan. Thank you.

David: Thank you. Yeah, I have a question, and I suspect it will be echoed in one form or another. Can you explain the reasons behind the change in position?

Steve P: I'll do my best, but primarily it was felt that the previous position was overly and unnecessarily restrictive of development. Thank you.

David: And was there a scientific basis for this decision, or was it as you describe, a more general concern?

Steve P: Thank you. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. It was not a scientific evidence-based decision. It was one based on many factors including needs for development and economic development factors. Thank you.

David: Hannah and Bruno and Jackie and Warren....should we just go around the table?

(Laughter)

Okay, Hannah first, then Bruno, Jackie and Warren. We're ahead of schedule, so I think it's fair to say that we can continue the question period at least until noon. The Government of Canada is the last one on, and then I'll ask if anybody else has comments they want to make before we get into the rest of the agenda. So we're good to go for a few questions on this, and maybe a few more after lunch. It's fundamentally important I think, to many people to understand as best they can the change in position. Hannah?

Hannah: Qujannamiik. Hannah, NTI. Thank you, Steven. Just so that I can understand clearly, you mentioned seasonal restrictions and other measures. Can you expand on what other measures mean please? Thank you.

Steve P: Thank you. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. I don't know if I can give you specifics, but I can give you a context. When the Government of Nunavut has other parties participate in environmental assessments of development projects, they look at the potential – we look at the potential – impacts of a given project on water, on caribou, on wildlife in general, socioeconomics. And if there are concerns we feel are going to be problematic - for example disturbance to caribou or interrupting a migration route - those are identified through the assessment process. If we feel that those impacts can be mitigated by whatever the measures, then we would say so, or if we feel that the impacts cannot be mitigated, then we say that the project needs to be changed. So that's the way that we will be participating in environmental assessments, if that's helpful. Thank you.

David: Bruno I think was next. Bruno, just before you go, Steven what I'm hearing is that you're going to look at things on a case-by-case basis, and there won't be a blanket approach in the future.

Steven P: Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. Yes, that's exactly the case. Thank you.

David: Bruno.

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bruno Croft, GNWT. Mr. Pinksen, I think I missed your name there. I don't know if you could explain to me a little bit how you went about consultation on this topic and your change of position. If we were going to turn on a dime within the GNWT and change our position as fundamentally important as the protection of calving grounds without even consulting and visiting all the communities, I don't think we could get away with this.

We've been going to meetings steady for weeks, and we've got two or three legal counsels on our side. There are legal counsels all around the table with various Aboriginal groups making sure that anything that can potentially impact Aboriginal harvest - or to continue their way of life, as they've known it - needs to be scrutinized and a proper case made for it. In this case, I can see the folks on my side of the border wondering why they did not talk to us, let alone talking to your own people. Maybe you have done so, but I haven't heard of it yet, given that this decision was made last Thursday from what I understand. And if it had been decided before that, Mr. Chair, surely we would have heard if they went to the communities to make that case. Has it taken place, and how can you do this? Please somebody tell me if you can actually do this without consulting.

David: Steve?

(Laughter)

Steve P: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. Bruno, it is a Government of Nunavut position that, to my knowledge, was not consulted on. It was a decision made by senior government officials. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Steve. I'm chuckling because when I worked for the federal government years ago, I can remember being in a similarly tough position, so my sympathies. Let's do Jackie, then Warren, then Earl and then back to Bruno.

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I have two questions. The first question is this is a significant shift in argument since the last Technical Meeting. Can you provide any insight into how long the Department has been working to develop this new position?

Steve P: Thank you. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. This decision was made within the last two weeks, and it is not a Department of Environment decision. It is a Government of Nunavut decision. Thank you.

David: Jackie?

Jackie: Thank you. For my second question, as you know because we work with HTOs, we are very much aware of the arguments made at the local level about the quality and timing and investment in the necessary surveys that are completed to date on various animals, including caribou. Considering this new position by the GN, can you provide any insight into what plan the GN has to reprioritize its resources in order to facilitate the support needed for these other measures? Thank you.

Steve P: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As I noted, this decision is very new, and our resource needs based on this new position are currently being assessed. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Steve. Earl, I'll get to you, but Warren and Stanley are next. Then I'll get to you.

Stanley: Thank you, Chair. We all heard that our government when they announced that, totally ignored our hard work over the last years. But we also know when we give too much information to our own government they always go against it. It has happened more than once, and again, we were disappointed. It's a disappointment with this announcement and the decisions they make when they don't consult with us, when they don't consult with the people they represent.

I don't know what they meant when they decided shared expertise. I think we had very good expertise given to our GN. Our expertise comes from our Elders. We work with them. They live with the caribou. They know the answers. Why does our own government never understand their expertise of our Elders? It's very disappointing when they don't consult you, and you hear it announced. It's hard enough that we try to work this and consult everyone in our region with the hard work with our workers. We went to each community working with them, and then we give all our stuff to GN. Then without consulting, they make their own decision. It's hard when you do a lot of work, and they don't even use it, the work you've done.

Just another question, where did they get their shared expertise from?

Steve P: Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. I'm sorry, Stanley. By shared expertise, do you mean for making this decision or what? If you could clarify the question... Thank you.

Stanley: In the beginning you said the Government made the recommendation from their shared expertise. My question is where were they getting that shared expertise when all we've done was consult with some expertise too. They didn't even consider what we've been working on over the years. Thanks.

Steve P: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. I just went through my notes, and I don't think I referred to shared expertise in my statement or my responses. If I did and have forgotten it already, I apologize. I can tell you that the correspondence received from the Kivalliq Wildlife Board was received by the Government of Nunavut, all of it, in fact. All of our departments were made aware of the positions of the HTOs and the RWOs. That information was available. Thank you.

David: Yeah, Steve, if I can perhaps help out here, I think what Stanley is getting at is the same kind of question I asked earlier. What changed, and why did it change? I appreciate that it's essentially a political decision that considered information presented, and your Government made its call based on that. I don't know if you can add more to it? Yeah, Earl I think was next, then Hannah and David.

Earl: Thank you. Earl Evans from the BQ Board. I know, Steve, you're probably the whipping boy sent here, so you can sign me up for the first 20 lashes.

(Laughter)

I know it's tough coming here and delivering that kind of message, but at the same time, we've got to express our disappointment in this decision too from south of the border. We don't like that at all. I mean we're affected too. We are users of the herd, and like Bruno says, we put a lot of money, a lot of effort into surveys and working in conjunction with Mitch and all the rest of the people here in Nunavut. We have a vested interest, and we want to see what's best for the herd, best for the wildlife, best for the environment, and best for the people. So with that, I'd like to say that we're extremely disappointed in the decision. It doesn't look good for the caribou, let's put it that way. So thank you.

David: Thanks, Earl. Any response?

Steve P: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. I guess the one thing I got out of it was that you are very disappointed with the Government's position, and I suspected as much from many of the participants. Acknowledged. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Steve. Hannah?

Hannah: Thank you. Hannah Uniuqsaraq, NTI. I'll ask my question, and then I'm going to forward it to David for his questions. Steve, in light of this new position, I know that the Government of Nunavut had spent some considerable time drafting a Caribou Management Strategy in the past. If I recall correctly, resources to implement that strategy were not allocated at the time. In light of this new position, does the Government of Nunavut plan to redraft the Caribou Management Strategy? If so, will Inuit organizations and communities be engaged? Qujannamiik.

Steve P: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. It's correct that the Caribou Strategy was not fully implemented, partly due to resource issues. We don't have any plans for our redraft, although full implementation should be done. In the event there was to be a redrafting, we certainly would consult on it, but it is certainly not on the table at this time. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Steve. David?

David Lee: Thank you. Well firstly, I just want to echo Earl's comments. I sympathize for the messenger. I realize that is what you are right now. I don't envy that position. Having said that, I echo Bruno's comments that decisions that may be made, or any actions taken on the basis of this new policy decision could potentially impact the ability of Inuit to exercise their hunting rights, and traditional and current livelihoods, especially under Article 5 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement.

Based on that, what plans does the Government of Nunavut have now to consult Inuit on any decisions they make that may affect Inuit rights? Thank you.

Steve P: Thank you. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. So you're asking, I think, if there is a development project that potentially affects caribou productivity and reduces harvesting opportunities, how the Government is going to deal with that? Is that sort of where you're going?

David Lee: My apologies. I mean this has been a recent development, so I'm having some internal discussion within our organization. Well you've already answered the question about what consultation has taken place, which is limited to none with the affected people. I guess having stated that, then the only place we can go to now is how will your Government consult the people – or Inuit – on this new GN position? This is a general question – if you want to answer it more specifically on a case-by-case basis, that's fine too.

Steve P: Thank you. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. Maybe it's keeping out of context. This is a Government of Nunavut position, submission to the Planning Commission in the context of developing a Land Use Plan. So the Government has stated the policy position. That doesn't create an obligation on the Government of Nunavut to consult on possible impacts of a Plan that has not yet been finished. I don't think we can make those connections yet. If there is an impact on individuals from a project, there is an actual process for people to be provided with compensation for that impact. That's Article 6 I believe. But to suggest at this point there is a Government obligation to consult on its policy position that it's submitting to the Planning Commission, I would disagree with that. Thank you.

David: Okay, Brandon, did you have a question?

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, WWF Canada. I think it was addressed, but I just want to maybe get it explicitly addressed. Was the Department of Environment consulted by the GN in making their decision, or were they not consulted when the GN made their decision? Because you mentioned that it was a GN decision and not a DoE decision. I'm just wondering if the GN consulted with the DoE.

Steve P: I think consulting is the wrong word within an organization. So it's a Government of Nunavut decision, and we're a part of the Government of Nunavut. Thank you.

David: Warren.

Warren: Thank you very much, David. This is Warren Bernauer for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. I'd just like to provide a bit of context for some of what Stanley shared with you just a moment ago. As he said, he's quite disappointed. I've spoken to other members of the KWB Executive and they were both quite disappointed as well.

The HTOs, which have much, much, much less resources and staff than the GN, does really work hard to engage the public and consult with people in the positions we've developed for the Land Use Plan. As Basil mentioned, there were workshops held. Elders and hunters were invited to them. Baker Lake, Arivat, and Chesterfield Inlet – all of those HTO Chairs have held several radio call-in shows with the community about calving grounds and caribou habitat. So if the HTOs can do this, it's rather frustrating if the GN, with much more resources, can't consult with the public, legalistic duties notwithstanding.

I'd just like to say it's difficult to see how the perspective of Kivalliq hunters could have been really considered in this decision. As Stanley said, we have sent volumes of submissions into the GN, and we've written numerous letters. Just as one example, just last week, there were letters written by the Chesterfield Inlet HTO Chair, the Arviat HTO Chair, and the Baker Lake HTO Vice Chair to their MLAs expressing support for the previous GN's position, and I'll hand out some of these. I was going to use them later as examples of IQ documentation, but I think it's probably more relevant now.

I'd also like to say I don't think IQ was considered in this decision. At least from what I've heard so far, it doesn't seem to be reflected. And HTOs have shared a lot of IQ with the GN and the other planning partners through all of this, especially about traditional protection measures Inuit had used to protect caribou habitat and caribou themselves traditionally. I'll speak more to that during our presentation later, but I'd just like to note, I don't see any of this reflected in this new decision. I'll leave it there. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Warren. Mike?

Mike: Mike Settingington with the Nunavut Chamber of Mines. An issue very similar to this was brought up in our technical review, and it was a question that we asked at the First Technical Workshop: is the Nunavut Caribou Strategy considered a policy document? We came into that meeting with the Draft 2010 version, which stated that working with regulatory authorities, co-management partners, and other stakeholders explore options for preserving calving and post-calving habitat.

Then the undated version of a Caribou Strategy, which is present only on the Nunavut Planning Commission's consultation website, had some substantial changes to it. It changed that particular action item from working with co-management partners for opportunities, to look at preserving caribou habitat, to outright protection, which we're talking about now. So we asked the question the first time: When did this policy change come about? And the answer we got was it's always been that. Then it didn't lead to this kind of discussion. So I suggest is that the Government is actually going back to what had already been presented in the Draft Caribou Strategy. So I don't think it's a change in policy. That would be our opinion. Also to further discussion, it no way means that the Government is no longer interested in protecting caribou. Again, it's going along the path of we already have protection tools in place that occur broadly and on a case-by-case basis with intensive review. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Mike. Any response, Steve? Okay. Leslie, last question and then we'll take a break and resume at 1:30.

Leslie: Sorry, I'm kind of in the back row here. I have kind of a technical question. I'm not clear on what exactly has been proposed in the new position because of the other measures that are undefined, but my question would be is this proposal going to provide anything more than the status quo? If not, what is the Nunavut Land Use Plan's value going to be? Is it going to provide any added value for caribou protection? If not, how can that possibly be in a place like Nunavut where caribou is so important to everybody?

Also, do your measures at all address the issue of habitat protection, because to me it sounds like on a case-by-case basis, you could possibly have a mine in the middle of a calving ground? So those are kind of technical questions, but they relate to the purpose of the Land Use Plan for caribou protection and the objectives laid out therein. Thank you.

David: Steve, are you prepared to speak on behalf of the Nunavut Planning Commission?

Steve P: Thank you. So the first part of the question is will the Land Use Plan provide value to caribou? I think that's a little early for me – if I could ever do it – to speak to that question. I'll let the Land Use Planning Commission do that. And for the second half, I don't think I can respond at this time. Thank you.

David: Okay, thanks folks. We'll break until 1:30. I'd ask people to come back a few minutes before 1:30 so we can start promptly at 1:30. Thank you for patience and indulgence.

LUNCH BREAK

Sharon: Sharon Ehloak with the Planning Commission. Warren, thank you for the question. Yes, the video footage will be available. Thank you.

David: Okay, so Government of Canada. Spencer, please.

Planning Partner Perspectives: GoC Opening Presentation

Spencer: Hello, thank you. My name is Spencer Dewar. I'm with INAC, but today I'll be representing the Government of Canada. With me, some of the people are in attendance, and some will be coming in shortly. We have John Price, Kim Pawley and Alexander Unaluak from INAC; Ken Landa and Michelle Zakrison from DoJ; and Micheline Manseau and Andrew Maher from Parks Canada. I just want to thank the Commission for holding this meeting. I know it has been a bit of a logistical nightmare. We're competing with the Arctic Winter Games, so if we have to, we have our hopes and prayers for success for this meeting and for our athletes.

Moving from a caribou workshop to the 4th Technical Meeting, we find these meetings extremely important. It's where we share information and our perspectives. I think overall it helps us build a

common body of knowledge from which we can make better decisions. The Government of Canada has always tried to assist NPC by providing expertise from a technical perspective so that we can develop a Draft Land Use Plan that can provide clarity, which includes alignment with legislation, the NLCA, and policy consistency; a Plan that respects the authorities, roles and responsibilities of each of the implementing bodies; and ultimately a Plan that positively contributes to the environmental regulatory regime in Nunavut.

The lens or the role that the Government of Canada plays in relation to caribou, particularly, Canada recognizes the social, economic, and cultural importance of caribou in Nunavut and sees the significant public concern. Further...(voice amplified from mike)

David: That was a bit of a warning, Spencer.

(Laughter)

Spencer: I feel like Cuba Gooding Jr. at the Oscars.

(Laughter)

David: Could you slow down a little bit though? I know you're excited and all that.

(Laughter)

Spencer: Sorry. Further, we know that these concerns are shared beyond Nunavut's borders across the territory and throughout Canada, while the primary responsibility for caribou is with the public government, the Government of Nunavut, and with co-management systems as outlined in the NLCA. However, there are overlaps with what the Government of Canada does in their responsibilities to support sustainable resource development and the protection of the environment. This includes INAC's responsibilities for land management and various federal wildlife acts and regulations.

Another point that we'd just like to highlight is the Government of Canada does have responsibilities, as does the Government of Nunavut and NTI, for the acceptance of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. So collectively, we need to look for common ground and look for recommendations that provide a reasonable chance of a Draft Land Use Plan being accepted. This will invariably require that we listen and hear everyone's perspectives and try to incorporate them into the Plan. So that being said, we look forward to the discussions, and thank you.

David: Thanks, Spencer. I just want to point out that Bruno mentioned a workshop in Inuvik – was it 7 years or thereabouts? And I remember going to that, and I remember being the only federal person at that 80 plus-person workshop. So from a personal perspective, I welcome the Government of Canada's engagement in this, and I think everybody else does as well. Any questions for Spencer?

Hannah, you wanted to introduce somebody in addition...

Hannah: Thank you. Hannah Uniuqsaraq, NTI. I just wanted to...(new call-in via phone) Hello, Naida.

(Laughter)

I just wanted to take a minute to introduce Jackson Hansen. He is an Inuit Learning Development participant, an 18-month program that is developed by the Government of Canada and Inuit organizations to expose young Inuit to the workforce, the various positions that are available in Nunavut as a way to facilitate their thinking about the types of careers that they might want. So Jackson is posted at NTI within Policy and Planning for the next four months.

Just a quick question, Spencer, and I am just thinking on-the-fly here. I can appreciate your comment that the majority of the wildlife management rests within the Government of Nunavut. But I'm wondering, does the Government of Canada do trends analysis on inspections related to exploration or major projects related to impacts on wildlife or caribou in this matter? Thanks.

Spencer: Yeah, Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada has a field enforcement unit, which does inspect water licenses and authorizations on Crown land and Inuit Owned Land. We do perform a summary to capture what we're looking at and what we're finding in the field, so those are produced. And we do provide copies of inspection reports that get posted, i.e. on the Nunavut Water Board website. I think we're available to provide understandings of what we've seen in the field, if requested. There is not necessarily a trend analysis towards caribou in that regard.

Hannah: Thank you, Spencer. The reason why I asked that, and maybe it was just a little too preliminary, but regardless of the caribou protection measure options that will be proposed or enforced in the Land Use Plan, I'm just trying to get a better idea of the types of resources that the governments are willing to put into whatever measure we choose. And that's why I had asked our colleague from the GNWT earlier about the types of resources their government allocates to these types of things. I'm just trying to better understand the types of resources we're willing to put around this table. Qujannamiik.

Spencer: To steal Bruno's comment, I can take that as an undertaking to find out some more detailed information on the resources that we expend for compliance and enforcement, and other things that might be in relation to say, caribou protection.

David: Earl?

Earl: Thank you. Earl Evans, BQ Board. I had a question for Spencer here. I'm just wondering if you're the right guy to talk to, and I think Hannah kind of touched on it too. Any spare change you have would be greatly appreciated on our side too. Thank you.

(Laughter)

Spencer: We do support the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Management Board. We have a representative as well, Eric Alan as well.

Earl: We need more.

(Laughter)

Spencer: I'll take that on as an undertaking as well.

David: You take that as an undertaking to increase the resources, or as an undertaking to look at increasing the resources?

Spencer: The latter.

David: Are there any other people in the room who would like to make a short presentation? I'm thinking particularly of the Elders on the back row. If you'd like to say a few words, you'd be more than welcome to at this point.

Bartholomew: *(Translated)*: All the discussion this morning, I could understand most of it. It's related to caribou protection. What protection are you talking about? I hear that some appear not to want to protect it, and most are asking about protection issues. Now here is my understanding. Protection measures related to the species are what I understand from this morning. The protection we talk about as Inuit people is especially the calving areas. Is this what you are trying to solve this morning, today? If so, what's there to talk about? It has been there for generations. What else are you talking about in protection? Is it protection for the mining companies, exploration companies? What is it that you're talking about? Who are you trying to protect?

David: Is there anybody else interested in adding to that? Alright, were there any other comments or questions that people had of the GN? I don't want to shortchange that exchange. Warren?

Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our president should be here in just a moment. I believe he has been working with the staff on a statement over the lunch break, and I think he'd like to present that when he returns. Thank you.

David: Yeah, and I'm not sure who to turn to on the question from Bartholomew. Perhaps I can ask the Planning Commission what it expects to get out of the session in addition to the obvious objectives?

Sharon: Thank you, David. I don't know if it's appropriate for us to comment before Bartholomew's question is answered. So, clearly what we're looking – the Commission's role – is to collect the data, have accurate data. And what are the uses, what are the boundaries, and what are the management parameters for core calving grounds, post-calving grounds, and water crossings? How do Inuit, how does Government, how do communities and organizations want to see the management of caribou? We need definitive information. We need accurate information. Both scientific and Traditional are recognized. And the Commission needs clear direction of what it is the parties want to see in this Land Use Plan. When I hear case-by-case, well what does that mean? We need a definition of what is case-by-case management. Is it spatial data? What does that mean? We need answers to these questions. It's very important that we go away understanding what the parties, what the Elders, Government, everyone, is asking the Commission to do. I hope that answered the question, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

David: Yeah, thanks Sharon. And I guess I could add that what we're trying to do here is ensure that we have a healthy economy, healthy caribou herds, and healthy communities. So the direct answer to your question is, yeah we're trying to identify a path forward that will support those three central objectives, which means looking after each one of them in the context of all the others. So are we talking about protection of calving grounds? Yep. Are we talking about supporting a sustainable economy? Yes. Are we talking about ensuring that communities are healthy and the environment is healthy? Yes. So all of those things are being discussed here. The challenge is to come up with an

approach that enables all objectives to be met without compromising any one. It's obviously not an easy task. Go ahead.

?Elder: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Thank you, Chair. I just want to say to clarify this. The animals and the population living up here, we coexist. With the animals, we know that there used to be no fuss. When it comes to animals, we know how to approach. We know how to control ourselves, and at the time there were strict customs in order to achieve our hunting in Inuit land. I'm saying this because caribou appear to be disappearing, and we all agree it's because they are sensitive to noise, to the smell. They are not like us. They can acutely smell. They can hear. The whole territory at times – at certain times – it's very noisy, and this is a big factor. We have known this for generations.

When we hunted in the past, we were quiet. We didn't make any noises, because we knew how sensitive they were, their acute hearing. And they were not easy to catch because of their acuteness of smell and hearing. We decided for many years, we were careful. This has been our life for many years. We wonder why they are disappearing now – because of these noises. There is noise everywhere, and we ask ourselves why caribou are disappearing. If you ask me as an Elder, I would have told you what the problem is. There is machinery. We used to have serenity in hunting in the old days before everything arrived. Today, they appear to disappear. There is aircraft hunting. They go to caribou herds in aircrafts and helicopters, and there is noise it creates. And we wonder why they are disappearing. Thank you for this short notice. I would really love to participate with you to find solutions.

David: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to make a short statement? Okay, Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. Just for Jimmy and everybody that's sitting back there, you are welcome to participate in the comments. So just because you're sitting in the back row...Bartholomew, thank you for commenting. We do want to hear from everybody. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Sharon. So we'll move on now to discussion of seasonal...oh, go ahead.

Stanley: Thanks, Chair. This morning when we asked some questions to Steve, we couldn't get the answers that we were looking for. So, regarding our questions and policy on calving grounds, I would like their Premier Tuptuna to come here this evening and explain himself to us why they have changed their mind. We've drafted this letter before that we want to read out to everyone. It's going to the Government of Nunavut.

RE: Government of Nunavut support for mining on caribou calving grounds. I am writing to you today to express my disappointment in the Government of Nunavut's decision to support mining and mineral exploration in caribou calving grounds. The Kivalliq Wildlife Board has long supported protection for caribou calving grounds and was very happy that GN supported our position before. It was very disappointing to learn that the GN changed its mind and no longer wants to protect calving grounds. The KWB, Kivalliq Wildlife Board, believes that GN has made a very irresponsible decision. Mining in caribou calving grounds could have detrimental impacts on hunters in the Kivalliq region – and I know it's not only in the Kivalliq region. For many communities, especially Baker Lake and Arviat, caribou is the main staple based on information presented by wildlife biologists, Inuit Elders, and Kivalliq Hunters and Trappers Organizations.

The KWB does not believe it is appropriate to allow mining and exploration activities in caribou calving grounds. The Kivalliq Wildlife Board and Kivalliq hunters and trappers have passed many resolutions and written countless letters opposing development in Nunavut's calving ground - so have numerous Dene and Metis communities, the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board, and the World Wildlife Fund of Canada. I am also very disappointed in the way this decision was made. The perspectives of Kivalliq hunters do not seem to have been meaningfully considered. If they had, I do not believe that the GN would have passed a policy that provides no real protection for caribou habitat.

I previously wrote to the Premier and Prime Minister of Environment requesting that they work with the Kivalliq HTOs and the Kivalliq Wildlife Board on the issue of caribou habitat protection. I had hoped that the GN would consider Kivalliq hunters' and trappers' perspectives on land use planning and consult us on any policy changes and decisions. I have yet to receive a response to this letter.

Last week, hunters and trappers from Chesterfield Inlet, Arviat, and Baker Lake wrote to MLAs expressing their views on land use planning. One of these letters was tabled to the legislative assembly by MLA Tom Sammurtok. Mr. Sammurtok said he would be asking detailed questions about the issue later in the sitting. However, a decision was made by Cabinet to support mining in calving grounds before Mr. Sammurtok could ask questions. This is an incredibly important issue and one thoroughly worthy of consultation and public decision. However, the discussion did not take place. We were given no official notice that the GN was considering changing its position on mining in calving grounds. There were no discussions about the issue in the legislative assembly, and there was certainly no engagement with the public on this question.

I hope our regular MLAs will read up on the issue and take a stand. It is not right for a government to make major decisions about wildlife protection without consulting the Inuit who helped most on that wildlife. Please table this letter attached documents to a legislative assembly and discuss this issue for all Nunavummiut to hear. If you guys require any more information about this, the Kivalliq Wildlife Board position on caribou habitat, please do not hesitate to contact us.

This letter we wrote representing the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. I signed the letter, so I hope things will get better from this. Thanks.

David: Thank you, Stanley. I suspect that will get their attention. We'll see what the response is. Any other comments before I close off this part of the agenda? Leslie, the last word perhaps?

Leslie: I just had a technical question again. Our Board will be writing letters of our own. So it would help us to understand how this position was developed, because all we know right now is that it's a GN position. The Department of Environment says it's not just a Department of Environment position, but we don't know what information the Department of Environment provided to the Government and to the Cabinet, and how the decision was actually made, like the process. It would help us to understand that so we could ask the right questions, I guess, when we write our letter. So I was wondering if we could get any information on that. Thank you.

David: Steve, can you address that?

Steve: Thank you. Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. If you're asking for the details of how the Government of Nunavut came to this conclusion, I don't think I could provide that except to say it was a senior decision made with input with the rest of the Government of Nunavut, and it's now an official Government position. I can't really provide a detailed list or description of how that decision was made, except it was an internal decision. Thank you.

David: Warren?

Warren: Thank you. Warren for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. Does the GN have a response to Stanley's request that somebody who can provide that information come here, preferably an elected political representative? Is there any way that's feasible? We're right across the street from the Leg. They're not far.

Steve: Steve Pinksen, Government of Nunavut. If you're asking me to relay to the Premier's office that there is a request for him to come over or for someone to come over, I can certainly do that. I don't control their schedules, of course. If that's a request from this group or the KWB, I can pass it along.

Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Warren for the KWB. Yes, please do. The Premier, Cabinet Minister, somebody that sits in Government, I think, should really come here and explain themselves to us. During the break, the KWB discussed this with some other groups, and we're not the only ones that feel this way. I think if anybody else does, it would be great if they spoke up now. Thank you.

David: Alright. Jackie?

Jackie: Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board supports KWB's request. We also sent our own letter last week to all members of the Legislative Assembly. So we are equally interested in the responses. Thank you.

David: Earl?

Earl: Earl here from the BQ Board. Yeah, we support the request to have a better explanation. Thank you.

David: Alright. Well I think it's fair to say that...oh, sorry.

Peter Kapolak: Yes, Peter Kapolak from KRWB. Yeah, we're in support too. We also sent a letter to the department regarding this matter. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Peter. So I'm going to wrap it up. I think it's fair to say that there is strong interest in hearing more detailed explanation of what transpired. Earl?

Earl: Yeah, could you ask them to bring some donuts too, please?

(Laughter)

David: Yeah, you might have more success on that part.

(Laughter)

Let's go to the seasonal range discussion, and it's the GN who is up to talk about seasonal ranges and brief on the Precautionary Principle. Mitch, it's all yours. Just to remind folks, we've got about 45 minutes scheduled for the presentation followed by 15 minutes of discussion. I'm going to guess that if we could cut the presentation a little bit and add to the discussion that might be helpful. I think many people have already heard the presentation, seen the presentation.

The Seasonal Ranges:

GN Description of the Seasonal Ranges and Brief on Precautionary Principle

Mitch: Okay, thanks very much. So I just want to state as well, before I get into the seasonal ranges, that the biology has not changed. With the issues surrounding all the concerns that are raised around this table, I just want to make that statement before we get into it. I would like to just briefly go over seasonal ranges as the GN has put them together. Again, those haven't changed either.

We are fortunate as well to have one of our GIS specialists here that can help explain any issues that people would like to discuss. I'd also like to mention that we do have...As everyone knows, the last methodology that went out was an abridged version, because the document it came from was a draft document. We've gone ahead and prepared the final version and are close to the final version of this document, which is a map atlas of mainland caribou populations. That's an inter-jurisdictional map atlas that has been worked on between the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Nunavut Government. We have some 40 or 50 peer-reviewed published articles that support the methodologies used by the GN, plus a lot of other analyses that will come in if folks would like to know about it. We've locked that down pretty tight, and the GN strongly stands behind its position and its delineation of the seasonal ranges.

Caribou in Nunavut: There are an estimated 19 populations and/or subpopulations of caribou that are either wholly or partially within the Nunavut Settlement Area. Eight of these populations or subpopulations are mainland migratory caribou. They have also been called taiga wintering caribou. They go down to the trees generally during the winter. The remainder is tundra wintering.

Here is a breakdown of those mainland herds. The Bluenose East is a mainland migratory. The Dolphin & Union is a tundra wintering. The Bathurst is a mainland migratory. The Beverly is a mainland migratory. The Ahiak is a tundra wintering, and the Qamanirjuaq is a mainland migratory. The Lorillard is a tundra wintering, and the Wager Bay is a tundra wintering. There are fundamental differences between these types of populations. There are also a lot of similarities. The annual core calving areas of all of these subpopulations are either entirely or mostly within the Nunavut Settlement Area.

So we've discussed this already, but we need to just go over it quickly in terms of the range. It is a shared range. These ranges, five of the eight subpopulations are shared with other jurisdictions, and there are other people relying on these populations. The Bluenose East is NWT and Nunavut. The Bathurst, Beverly, and Ahiak are Saskatchewan and Nunavut. The Qamanirjuaq is the NWT, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Nunavut.

Caribou management in Nunavut is shared with the Regional Wildlife Boards, which are all represented here, and community HTOs. We consult with those Boards and the HTOs regularly, multiple times a year to make sure that we are trying to coordinate our approach. Nunavut has an obligation to involve other jurisdictions in caribou management.

Some of the caribou ecotypes – I'll just flesh those out a little bit more. Of the mainland herds, there are two main ecotypes, and we've gone over those quickly: mainland migratory and tundra wintering. The characteristics of mainland migratory caribou: They display the most extensive migratory behavior of the two different ecotypes. That's not to say that the tundra wintering caribou are not migratory. It's just that these display an extensive migratory behavior. It exceeds tundra wintering. They are generally sexually segregated throughout the year, except during the rut and fall migratory periods. Calving grounds tend to have cows and calves, yearlings around the periphery, and bulls around the periphery with mostly breeding females and non-breeding females in the center. They migrate across the tundra range in spring returning south to the forested areas early to late fall where the rutting occurs. Their extensive seasonal movements make them less able to adapt to disturbance effects.

One thing that does get discussed a lot that is pretty important to key out here is all of these caribou populations are not all the same. These mainland migratory populations are not hanging around one area in a way that could get used to or acclimated to various noises or various smells, or various sights. They migrate out before they have a chance. So every year, it's a fresh experience. So mainland migratory caribou react a lot differently to potential disturbances on the land than a less migratory caribou herd might.

Calving grounds and spring migratory corridors are the most defined and predictable. They are very small polygons for herds that often can reach hundreds of thousands. The actual areas they go to calve in are very small indeed, and the smallest seasonal range of all the seasonal ranges.

The characteristics of tundra wintering caribou: They display less extensive migratory behavior. They generally display less sexual segregation throughout the year except during the rut and fall migratory periods when the sexes come together. They rarely migrate to tree line, spending the entire year within tundra habitats. It's a key difference between the two. So a couple of things: a little bit less segregation goes on, and they spend their entire year on most years - their entire annual cycle - within tundra habitats. There are less extensive seasonal movements, which may allow for a greater degree of adaptation to disturbance effects. So there can be a little bit of a difference there between those two ecotypes. Calving grounds and spring migratory corridors are less defined and predictable. They tend to be a little bit larger. A lot of the same rules apply, but there are some of these subtle differences between these two.

This is really a quick lay of the land. You can see the mainland migratory populations starting with the gold color with the Qamanirjuaq on the eastern side. To the north are two tundra wintering populations, the Lorillard and the Wager Bay. As we move west, we get into the Beverly herd and the Ahlak herd – Ahlak first and then the Beverly, but there is a lot of overlap on the winter range. Then we get into the Bathurst and Bluenose East, Bluenose West and on outside of Nunavut.

Seasonal range: We base this on collar-derived caribou movement rates. In the earlier periods, biologists did a very good job and would get together and talk to community members to try and

discern when the breaks were for these various seasonal ranges, when they started and when they finished. We've chosen to let the caribou sort of speak to that by looking at their movement rates, and their movement rates do show differences. We combine them into important periods just based on that.

The periods that we did manage to flesh out are calving, post-calving, summer, late summer, fall migration and pre-breeding. It's like a pre-breeding migration. There is rut through the breeding process, fall migration, and post-breeding, so movement off the rutting grounds into the winter habitat. Then winter followed by spring migration back up to calving grounds.

This is an example of what I was meaning in looking at caribou data and letting the caribou talk. This is not heavily modeled data all. These are daily averages that are plotted. This is actually what the caribou are doing. We didn't smooth anything out to make it look better. These are the movement rates of these caribou speaking, like very strongly. It's very similar across the mainland migratory populations. You can see, there are very distinct periods.

So here is the winter period, which is characterized by lower movement rates, trying to conserve energy. There are a lot of different reasons for that, that we'll get into. Spring migration where you see a peak in movement activity on their way up to the calving grounds. Calving, and this calving is not only unique spatially in a very small polygon. Not only do the caribou move 400 to 500 km to actually get there – not only do they move against the growing season, as things green up they are actually moving away - but it's also a period of time when their movement rates are consistently at their lowest. So these animals are looking for a quiet area to have their young, and their movement rates display this. It's a very, very significant period.

Then we have post-calving, which is rearing and the initial part of getting the calves more mobile and able to stick with their mums, and heavy lactation. Then we move through the summer periods, which is characterized mostly by large movement. We'll get into that insect harassment. Then late summer, which is a slowing down. Caribou are packing on the poundage, and fall migration. In fall migration, I've combined in here the two periods: the pre- and the post-rut, but here is where the rut occurs in the middle of the migratory period – right at the peak of that scale.

So, a couple of other things to look at here that comes out of this data, which is pretty incredible. It's not by chance that this migration begins when the wolf pups are born. In fact, this comes from IQ as well. It's a consistent message across science and IQ, peer-reviewed literature, and the experiences gathered around this table of a lot of different biologists who have been working on caribou their whole careers, myself included.

What is happening, we believe, is once the wolves have their pups, they are tied to the dens. The caribou can move off. It makes it a lot more difficult for wolves to follow and bring food back to the pups. This is also discussed by hunters and Elders we have spoken to over the years who indicate the same thing. So the caribou distance themselves from predators and disturbance events related to predation.

Another couple of key periods: These are the periods right after calving where we have the feeding, key feeding. There are not a lot of insects. The forage is of very good quality, and they are able to spend time feeding during these periods. They are the only periods during the summer where

caribou can pack on the food. If those periods are disrupted, that can impact the health and the viability of the caribou populations.

The one period to look at specifically is the post-calving period. If you notice, not only is post-calving important for caribou, but it's a key feeding period. The shoots coming from the vegetation are young. They are full of energy, and they are very palatable. Caribou are packing that on. It happens during the same period when lactation is at its highest for nursing calves.

Then we have high movements due to insect harassment. An interesting spike: We see this spike on most of these populations – pretty much all of them – and we have warble fly and botfly emergence. So you can see the reaction of caribou to these biting insects. This speaks to insect avoidance habitat during these periods. Where can caribou go to get away from this?

So I'm not going to spend too much time here. What I wanted to do was show that this particular method that we're using, every single herd has its own profile. We do not take one herd or join them all together. We look at each herd, and we develop these profiles for them and come out with these movement rates and these seasonal break periods. There isn't a calving start and stop period that is the same for all of these populations. Each population speaks through their movement rates as to where those critical periods are. We use that to generate the seasonal maps.

I'm just going to go quickly through the different seasonal periods, and then we can maybe have some questions. We'll go quickly with some characteristics of these seasonal ranges and sensitivities to the seasonal ranges.

Calving is late May to early June, and that's a rough estimate. Each population varies a tiny bit but that's just a rough guideline. Characteristics are that they are spatially the most concentrated and predictable seasonal range with the lowest daily movement rates. These are both substantial events that happen during that one period. It is predominately occupied by breeding and non-breeding females, and newborn calves. As I was saying earlier, yearlings and bulls are generally to the outskirts. There can be a little bit mixing in, but they are generally segregated.

Spatial extents are exclusively within tundra habitats, offering limited cover to visual or audible disturbance. It's a key thing. A lot of measures that have been used in the past are being applied from taiga sites, and they are being touted as effective measures, but trees absorb sound and block visual stimuli. We don't have that in these areas. These are tundra areas.

They are characterized by low densities of predators and little to no human harvest. It is a time of year where you can't really get a skidoo in. You can't get an ATV in. You can only really fly in. So by the virtue of the time of year, it's really protected from almost every kind of disturbance you can imagine. As Bruno said earlier, David has been there. I have been there. Many people here have been on calving grounds. It is a very quiet place where caribou are not running around. They are nursing their calves and giving birth. There is not a lot of activity. Recent predator studies also show that predator frequencies on calving grounds are very low compared to other parts of their range. They are commonly areas with few foraging opportunities, but they are adjacent to areas that will have foraging opportunities.

Another key feature that is often missed - and you've got to look at all these different components - calving grounds not only have the area to have young, but also they are in the vicinity of areas that

have high-grade vegetation. So it's not just one thing they're going for, but multiple things. There are not a lot of areas, having looked at vegetation data that we've had across our region – the Kivalliq region, the region I work in – there are almost no places that look like that with that combination. So these areas are not necessarily replaceable. Where we can find other areas, oftentimes caribou might be able to move in there. As an example, for Qamanirjuaq, no other area exists on their range that we've identified.

Sensitivities: They are vulnerable to all disturbance effects. This is at the greatest during this period. They are having young. They are trying to keep their young from trouble. They are trying to keep disturbance down, keep predation down. Caribou generally on calving grounds see any kinds of disturbances as predation, and they will move away from it. Calf abandonment is very high during this time of year. It's very, very sensitive of all the seasonal ranges – the most sensitive period.

Energy demands reach a peak throughout this period, while forage opportunities remain low, because remember, we're waiting to get into post-calving for the green-up to start, so that these animals can start feeding. So these caribou have to nurse these young until that happens. There are a lot of energetic demands on cows with calves. Any energetic demands that are on top of what would normally or naturally be there, are going to take away from calf condition and the survivability of that animal. That's been shown in a considerable volume of peer-reviewed literature for ungulates.

Flight responses to any form – visual or sound disturbance are the greatest during this period. We've had on-the-ground experiences with this. Caribou will run. We had several caribou run and keep on running from foot traffic on the calving ground, until the caribou were out of sight with abandonment of the calf in the process.

Susceptibility to disruption of the cow-calf bond is at a peak throughout this period. Until the female has invested a lot of energy into its calf, that bond is very weak, and the female will abandon that calf to save itself. It's an evolutionary adaptation that allows breeding females to survive to the next year to produce calves again.

The high densities of cows and calves within a small geographic area warn of the high potential for disturbance-related spatial and population level impacts during this period. Densities are of their highest during this period, sometimes exceeding 400 and 500 caribou per km squared – huge numbers in very tight spaces, and year after year.

This is a calving ground, and we can put this up. These are the polygons that have been generated for calving seasonal range, all the way up to the 100% utilization distribution. As you get darker, those are the higher density areas.

Post-calving is summer, late June to mid-August. Characteristics and sensitivities: It's a time of year when energy demands on cows nursing calves are extremely high. Calf survival depends on intact cow-calf bonds and continuous milk production. Continuous milk production requires continuous feeding. Generally it occurs within and directly adjacent to calving grounds. Primarily cow, calf, and yearling groups move together in search of high quality forage to sustain milk production and build fat reserves. They are more extensive than calving grounds but similarly used in a time-wise and spatially predictive manner. Biting insect emergence begins and increases throughout the latter

half of this period. The most extensive daily movement rates occur during the latter half of this period as insects start to harass more and more animals.

Sensitivities: Biting insects can significantly increase energy expenditures, impacting forage intake and milk production. There are high energetic costs associated with the displacement of caribou from insect avoidance habitat. Displacement of cow-calf pairs into marginal habitats will reduce energy intake and, in turn, milk production. This is a very real thing that has been documented. These aren't things we're just dreaming up. This is all based in science and observation.

There is susceptibility to calf abandonment throughout the period. Environmental stressors are generally low early in this period, allowing for extensive foraging. That's in the early stages. Remember that circle of the high-energy forage intake. Mechanized transport, aircraft, roads and their effects on increasing disturbance and human harvesting are of the greatest concern within these areas, because they disrupt caribou from feeding and from taking care of their calves. And you disrupt feeding then you disrupt milk production. General disruption of foraging behavior of cow-calf groups will negatively affect cow health and cow survival. Again, this is grounded in peer-review literature. This is not something we're pulling out of the air. This is factual.

Here we have just a general look at the post-calving area. Again, there are smaller polygons but quite a bit bigger than the calving areas that we were showing earlier. Then actually, we're including summer so early summer there as well. You can see how it is starting – these areas are starting to expand. So late summer, which is mid-August to mid-September, biting insects steadily decline during this period. Forage intake is maximized during this period, while forage quality declines. So you remember that other circle on the downside of that high insect harassment. The only problem with that time of year is we're getting towards fall, and the vegetation is losing some of its quality. Still good, but they again need to maximize forage intake. It's a time of year when environmental stressors are low, allowing caribou to focus on forage intake and the storage of excess energy as fat.

It is geographically extensive, though foraging caribou are often selecting for small patches of higher quality forage. It's not just this huge vast area they can take advantage of. They literally need to go out there and search for those high quality patches. A lot of the activity we see in late summer is movement between patches. If a caribou is disturbed in those areas, they will move off and try and relocate another area, because they need to keep feeding.

Uninterrupted foraging during this period is critical to reproductive success, including the rutting process as well as the later calving past the rutting process. It is also critical to over-winter survival. This is the last chance for these animals to get good fat reserves. Movement rates are generally low during this period.

Sensitivities: There is high sensitivity to forage disruption with the potential to strongly impact energy uptake and fat production. Low movement rates make caribou on their late summer range particularly susceptible to roads and are characteristic of increasing hunting pressures and general disturbance. When disturbed, forage patches can take considerable time and energy to relocate. Cumulative effects, particularly centered on roads, aerial disturbance, harvesting pressure, and predation are of the greatest concern during this period. You can see how these areas are starting to expand even more. So we do have larger areas.

Fall Migration and Rut is the time of year when breeding occurs. All ages and sexes come together. It generally occurs in the vicinity of the tree line for mainland migratory herds. Primarily cow-calf groups migrate from the tundra environment into the forested environment for the mainland migratory, or into the more southerly extents of their annual range for the tundra wintering. Cow-calf groups join up with mature and young bulls, generally in the vicinity of the tree line for mainland migratory. Even though geographically extensive, caribou generally utilize these areas in a predictable manner. If you look at the sport hunting industry across the North, they have lodges in specific places, and they get rutting caribou coming back into that area, or at the beginning of the ruts, and many of those areas over and over again. So there is predictability to it.

Sensitivities: Migration and breeding are energetically demanding, primarily to mature bulls. So this is a hard time of year for a mature bull, because they're just about to go into the winter, and they're putting out a lot of energy to breed. Disruption of the breeding process will increase energy demands and impact breeding success. It occurs just prior to the winter season when the amount of stored energy will directly affect overwinter survival and overall productivity. And these ranges are generally extensive. Obstruction and/or diversion of pre-rut migrating caribou can substantially disrupt the breeding process with animals not arriving onto their rutting grounds. Cumulative effects as they apply to the disruption of migrating caribou and the breeding process are of the greatest concerns within these seasonal ranges. Here's an example of pre-rut. Here are the rutting areas. Again, the darker colors are the concentrated areas, and these are the post-rutting where caribou are going onto their winter range. Just two more here and then we're through.

Winter Range is mid-December to mid-April. Characteristics: It's the time of year when energetic stressors are at their greatest. Forage quality, quantity and accessibility can be highly variable from year to year, but is generally low. It generally occurs within the tree line for mainland migratory herds. Movement is generally low, though it can vary with levels of predation, harvesting, and snow conditions. Spatial use of winter range is highly dependent on fire history, weather, roads, and harvesting pressure. It's the most geographically extensive range of all the seasonal ranges.

Sensitivities: Caribou are particularly susceptible to roads and associated harvesting pressure. It is harder to locate and maintain feeding areas during the winter season. There is more space out there, but it's hard to get them. Roads bringing in any kind of...they are pathways for predation for predators to move down. This makes those populations more susceptible to harvesting. All these things will cause those animals to abandon those sites. In the wintertime, that is a huge energetic cost, and they may not be able to relocate to another good site again, and that's going to impact them throughout the rest of the year.

Snow thickness, icing, forest fires, and harvesting pressure can heavily impact caribou condition and survival. Severe winters can push caribou past stored energy thresholds, reducing their overall survival or their productivity. One of these things can be what they term a reproductive pause, which caribou will skip one year of breeding. This can heavily impact the population demographically. Late winter yarding behavior can concentrate caribou into small areas. Disturbances within these areas can reduce survival. Generally, they are in those areas because movement outside of them is difficult, sun crust formation and things like that.

Cumulative effects are particularly centered around roads and associated harvesting pressure and disturbance, which are of the greatest concerns, again because of the size of the areas. So here is the winter range. It covers a pretty big swath of ground. So you can see that cumulative effects

need to be considered to know how much of the winter range is being removed from the caribou's ability to access.

Spring migratory is the final one, and then we can have some questions. The spring migratory period is mid-April to late May. It begins following the wolf denning and pupping, restricting a pack's ability to follow migrating caribou. It is a time of year characterized by declining energy reserves and increasing energetic demands for pregnant cows. Forage quality and accessibility along migratory corridors is generally very low. Primarily cow and calf and yearling groups migrate from the wintering grounds to the calving grounds. Migratory corridors are generally linear and used annually in a spatially predictable manner. Daily movement rates are high during this period, often covering hundreds of kilometers – 400 to 600 kilometers generally.

Sensitivities: Disruption and/or diversion of migrating caribou can have serious energetic consequences. There is high susceptibility to predation during this period. Diversion of the spring migrating caribou could delay arrival times onto calving grounds, leading to calving outside of these areas and corresponding increases in predation and reduced calving success. This, again, is a well-documented phenomenon in the literature.

Disturbance of migrating caribou can modify spring migratory corridors and calving extents. Linear features, obstructions or disturbance during migration can disrupt and/or divert caribou. Again, a lot of this stuff we've seen. Now recent work that has come out shows the effects of roads on migration – fairly serious effects. We also have a lot of good IQ, talking about how if leaders in a migratory group are disrupted or turned, it will lead almost the entire group onto a different area. So these are all really well founded. You can see, too, that these corridors, if you look at those corridors, you can see that they are very distinct. Spring migratory corridors are some of the most predictable of all the migratory corridors.

We've got an animation, too, that we can just put up there in a second when we get the computer back up and running. I guess we could field some questions right now while we're getting these things running.

David: Miguel?

Miguel: Thank you, David. Miguel with NTI. Mitch, thanks for the presentation. It was great. I always like to see the correlations between events in the wild and the movements of caribou. The warble fly thing is really interesting. I wonder - You made the distinction between the tundra wintering and the mainland migratory. Would it make sense to have at least two management approaches to address each of the types of herds? I mean, if not for each herd separately? I know it's an early Plan, and maybe we can't get everything in there. But I'm just wondering, would it make sense to do so? And if you were just to separate it into the two different herds – the tundra wintering and the migratory or mainland migratory – can you suggest some differences that could be made in those approaches, if you would agree to that? Thank you.

Mitch: I think that we would have to...It is certainly something that's documented that we're seeing stronger evidence of. It would be something that I think would be worthwhile talking about further, absolutely. There are some pretty substantial differences between the two groups, although general behaviors and sensitivities remain fairly consistent.

Notably, calving grounds for tundra wintering caribou herds tend to be quite a bit larger. Although predictable, they are not the same as the mainland migratory. I think that is something that looking at how those differences might play out in the Plan, is something that we certainly could look at and would be willing, obviously, to look at with all the other colleagues here. It could be a worthwhile exercise. I don't know if that answers your question.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Do you want to describe the video?

Mitch: Okay, so the main idea behind this video or this animation is to try and talk about...When we used to talk about key access corridors – it's hard to get my head in the game on this and keep everything straight, because we're so used to a different approach. I want people just to look at – we're looking at telemetry dates September, October, November, December, January, February, and March. Now we're starting to come into spring migration shortly. You can see how the animals and watch them come up into that calving ground. This is multi-years of data, and it's absolutely predictable beyond what you could possibly imagine, because there are only certain corridors these caribou can use.

The point of looking at this is to understand that these are not static polygons that we've got here. Caribou flow onto and off of these polygons. So if the caribou are utilizing – and case in point – the north end of their core calving point, there is a lot of real estate between where they've got to go from and where they've got to go to before they get there. So it's not just looking at spatial prints. It's looking at also the movement of animals across that and making sure that movement is not disrupted, so that the caribou can make full use of these core calving areas.

That's what we're really trying to show here, because oftentimes we see maps, and it's not fluid, but what is really going on out there is very dynamic and much more complex than a lot of people that may not be dealing with caribou all the time necessarily understand. So that's what this animation is trying to show folks.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Earl?

Earl: Thank you. Earl Evans, BQ Board. I have a couple of questions for Mitch. One of them is regarding the vegetation atlas that Nunavut has been working on for several years and when it's complete. I heard you say that this high-quality forage is only found in the core calving areas. That's why the caribou go there. Is that correct?

Mitch: It's found in association with and some on the core, and some around the core. But it's close by. So if you look at – here's calving right now. If you look at calving coming out into post-calving, you see it's in the vicinity of the calving areas. If you look, we are running resource selection function models. We're kind of in the middle of working on that right now, which looks at caribou use and the habitats from that same map system. We have just bits and quips of things that we've seen that there is a lot of really high-quality habitat in the vicinity of the calving ground that doesn't appear to be in the same combination anywhere else on the annual range of the Qamanirjuaq herd.

On some of these other populations, there have been multiple areas. This is all the very beginning of looking at this. So I would say that there are good feeding areas in the calving grounds, but most of those areas are just in the vicinity just outside. It's very rocky in the center of the calving ground, and then it gets to a lot of wetlands as you move a little ways outside of the core calving area. It's a bit of a mix of both.

Earl: I've seen that atlas, and a lot of work went into that. It looks very detailed. So I was wondering if you were to overlay, go to that page in the atlas and look at the vegetation on that, it would tell you what's on the ground. You guys have checked that out, right - what's there? Is that correct?

Mitch: Yeah, that's correct, and that's exactly what we're doing right now. We just haven't gotten to the endpoint of doing the analysis, but that's exactly what we're doing. We're in the middle of working with that with John Boulanger and actually Caslys, a firm we've been working with for the GIS. So it's ongoing right now.

Earl: One second quick question: The Beverly herd this year for some reason - I think it's the first time I've ever seen it - they wintered up on the coast this winter. In your estimation, do you think that the energetic costs of not coming down for migration and having to migrate back in the spring with no hunting pressure up in the coast, do you think you can expect an increase in the number in that herd this year?

Mitch: It's really hard to say, because it's going to depend on what the food was like where they were. If they had a hard time finding food, and there were other reasons such as burns why they couldn't penetrate into the taiga, we'd have to figure that out. I haven't really looked into that aspect. I don't think we have a lot of information that would help us do that at this point in time. But we will probably find out, because we're scheduled to go in to the Beverly herd this year and run a reconnaissance, so we'll be looking at calf production and relative densities across the Beverly calving grounds. So we'll be able to better report back as to whether that had an effect or not.

Earl: Thank you, Mitch. I was just talking to some of the trappers that were up on that north end, and they said this winter there was a lot of overflow and a lot of real bad ice up in the area. They figured that's why the caribou didn't come down below the tree line there, because the conditions weren't very good.

Mitch: That's a really interesting observation, because that's happened a few times, reported by Lac Brochet and Tadoule Lake residents. With caribou in years that they didn't come down, they said the rivers were very undependable and very dangerous to travel. They figured that had something to do with the caribou not penetrating further into the taiga.

David: Thanks, Mitch. At the back?

?Elder: (*Translated*): The people I'm here with are my co-Board. Mitch, I have no questions for you. You are talking about caribou herds before you were born that I have knowledge of. But just a short statement: We only have three days on the caribou workshop and various items here talking about caribou. The Government has given us some tasks to attend this meeting for the IQ and the calving grounds disturbance, according to our knowledge. After all that work, the Government has completely destroyed our work in reverse of the policies we heard a few days ago. But here, I just want to say it appears that for those involved in wildlife, you appear to have something against exploration and mining.

My first career, I worked up in Alert in 1967, and up there during my stay towards the end of 1967, I moved over to Panarctic in Queens Islands. The person I went to Grise Fjord, Mary, she had intimate knowledge in caribou and musk ox movement when Panarctic was in the hay day. She

worked in my district. I live in Iqaluit. I know I will be buried in Nunavut. I've been up here for 68 years. I'm not originally from Iqaluit. I'm from Arctic Bay. The knowledge and what I have seen, what I have heard, we were voiceless at times, but while we are here we should be aware that exploration and mining companies - government have spent a great deal of fighting these two industries. They spend quite a bit of money. I think that's dangerous in our knowledge.

Polar bears and caribou – for example - our wildlife, it's hard to predict what's going on now with wildlife, even hearing government restrict polar bears. Many have come out separating like some people have. Some polar bears are not good for food anymore. They are all marked by government establishments and studies. According to Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, your research is really undesirable to look at. You show it on TV and tell us that this is rational study. It really hurts my heart. You don't tell us how you chase the caribou in order to study it. You don't tell us how many you have killed or how many killed in the course of studies. When there is too much stress on caribou, they die. So you tell me something, Mitch, a rational study where they are and where they are going. That's very rational. It's ideal. Baker Lake caribou, where have they gone? It's from the noise. You say it's from helicopters. It's from the noise. You say they vanish because of these noises.

I worked everywhere in industry. I could tell you a lot of stories. But animals...animals are not only research – there is too much of that. Sometimes they don't go back to their original habitations. For instance, polar bears- when I was younger, we stayed very far away. And from here, we stalk. We plan. How do we get that polar bear? Today, as our hunting system, we only go after them now when we see them from our eyes so close, and we just shoot them. So the animal behavior of the 1940s and 1960s has changed drastically. They are not what they were before. Today, our wildlife has changed now due to something. They come in now to the communities scrounging for food.

I just want to say to the Government of Nunavut and mining companies, Government has spent a great deal on research. They're no worse than mining companies, exploration companies...everybody is the same across the board. So if Government can't comply to what people need, then it is probably Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, if you believe in the land and come into the HTOs, the population of Nunavut should share. I just wanted to let you know that.

David: Thank you.

Luigi: Luigi Toretti. *(Inaudible one sentence)*

(Laughter)

David: We'll take a break. Let's take 15 minutes. Before I forget, could people make sure they've signed in? If you haven't, please do. Thank you.

BREAK

David: Any more questions for Mitch? Mitch is here. Luigi?

Luigi: Luigi Torretti. Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you, Mitch, for your presentation. This is not necessarily a question. I have three questions, not necessarily questions for Mitch, although he may be able to answer this, but questions for the GN.

Firstly, a technical question: there were polygons submitted by the Government of Nunavut to the NPC. If I understood correctly, the NPC merged those polygons together, and then placed them on the map. There were some factors that went into the decision-making on the polygons and how they were applied to the map. So the question to the GN: Is the representation of those calving and post-calving polygons on the land use map the representations that the GN wishes to see on the Land Use Plan? I've got two others to follow-up.

Mitch: No. No, they weren't. They were separate from the original GN submission, but the individual polygons were accurate. They were just merged into a different polygon.

Luigi: Okay. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. For clarification, can you provide information on how the GN would have liked the polygons represented on the land use map?

Mitch: Well, before or after?

(Laughter)

It's confusing for me actually right now. I'll just say in the previous submission, which has been changed now, but in the previous old GN submission, the intent was to look for protection on only the calving ground polygon and not on the post-calving polygon. That was meant to be post, like seasonal protection in there. Of course, as Steve had indicated this morning, that GN position has changed. But that was the old position that we had submitted. Does that clarify it?

Luigi: Thank you, Mitch. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Yes, that does clarify. Yeah, I appreciate the difficult position that you're in trying to...walking through the weeds. So that was a question before that was kind of developed before this meeting, and obviously there was a clarification on the GN position. The Department of Environment...I'm going to ask the question, but I suspect you haven't had the time to address it.

One of the things that I'd really like to see moving forward is are we able to get to a point or position where if some level of mobile protection measures was the choice to go with, has the GN considered what specific measures would be acceptable to them? I think that's the can of worms that we need to open up and work our way through. So again, just to clarify, what recommendations would the GN make to improve mobile protection measures?

David: Just an interjection: There is more than one can of worms in that one.

(Laughter)

I want to go back to your answer, Mitch, but answer this one first.

Mitch: We...we can't answer that at all actually. I'm unable to answer that question. I'm sorry.

David: Okay, and Luigi, just let me revisit the first question you asked and Mitch answered. So we heard that the change in policy direction was not science based. We've also heard that the science-based evidence you've put on the table - the policy about how to apply that aside - stands. So the polygons

that you've developed for the ranges, including the calving grounds, stand. Alright. Despite the policy, the map stays the same. The application of the map is the question.

Luigi: I guess I would pose the question once again then in terms of...If I understood the answer, is it true that it is strictly the calving grounds that were put forward as areas that the GN would like to see restrictions on? Or is it both the calving and post-calving? And sorry, I've got another question, but I'd just like clarification on that point.

Mitch: Okay, so again I just want to make the differentiation that in the old submission, the last submission that was sent into NPC - the older one - the GN position at that time was to only have area protection for the calving polygons, not for the post-calving polygons. In the post-calving polygons, the old submission was to look for seasonal protections in there. So there is only one area protection that was put forward in the old position. That was only for that smaller calving polygon.

David: I want to go back to this again, because I want it real clear what I'm driving at. The maps that GN has put forward with regard to caribou use of the range are still scientifically valid from the GN's perspective. What has changed, at least with respect to the calving grounds, is that the GN's current position is that those calving grounds would not be protected. However, the area of the calving grounds is not being challenged internally within the Government of Nunavut. That science stands. The decision that was made to change policy on how to approach protection of caribou has changed, but not the map that shows the ranges. And there are other organizations that still advocate protection of those mapped calving grounds, aside from the GN's position. Is that correct, Mitch? Could you put that on the record please?

Mitch: Yes, Mitch Campbell, Government of Nunavut. So, the polygons that were originally developed and submitted to NPC are still the same. How the polygons are going to be treated is what has changed in the GN policy.

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Okay, I guess the question ends up to the NPC. In light of the clarification from the GN that the post-calving does not necessarily have restriction, but has some form of mobile protection measures – will the NPC separate those polygons? Will they be considered different polygons, protection on the calving polygons or restrictions on the calving polygons, and some type of special management on the post-calving?

Brian: Qujannamiik. Brian Aglukark, Planning Commission, Arviat. The NPC at this moment is not in a position to respond to that question. We will be deciding on what type of approach we want to take over the next few months. That's a decision that only the Commissioners can make. I apologize, Luigi. I can't answer your question. Qujannamiik.

Luigi: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, for taking up so much time. I do have one last question. Kind of following in Miguel's footsteps about different approaches for the mainland migratory and the tundra wintering caribou, is the GN considering the potential for regional approaches as well? The reason I bring up the question is that from a scientific basis, I think everybody is quite clear that the Bathurst caribou have changed their calving ground range. I'm not sure if everybody around the table is aware that IQ points out two changes in that caribou calving ground.

The caribou calving grounds right now are where it was historically, and I believe Mr. Kapolak would be able to speak to that if he wishes to. So the reason I bring it up is because of the shifting nature

of that calving ground. One of the big concerns for the KIA is if we create a polygon that is protectionist, if there is a shift once again, that polygon may stay on that map and ineffective at protecting a different area. So, is a regional approach something that the GN would be considering?

Mitch: So, the GN is trying to tackle with its jurisdictional partners, a method of looking at timelines of collar data to be used to define certain seasonal ranges, understanding in some certain situations, although they usually take a very long period of time for these sorts of shifts, these shifts can occur. I want to just clarify that this is over a very long term. These are not things that just sort of flip back and forth. These are over decades, if not longer, from what we've seen with most of these populations. So, we are in the process of trying to determine how that might work so that areas that no longer are being used by caribou and are considered by the communities and other co-management partners – biologists, etc. – as being unimportant, that at that point in time could be adjusted within the Land Use Plan. But that is a work in progress right now, but we're looking into it.

So the short answer is, yes we're looking into that kind of thing. We're open into looking into that. Just so that this group is aware, the original polygons that were developed - and I believe Bruno, we're reevaluating everything next year with all the new collar data. So we'll be revisiting a lot of these things and a lot of people will be involved in looking at them. But right now the polygons, we're sort of holding them for five years, and we'll reevaluate and add new collar data to reassess those polygons. So it is something that we're open to looking at, and it's something that we're actively looking at right now, trying to establish a process that will offer the maximum amount of protection for these animals by identifying the key areas, the important areas, but also understand the biology of these areas and the temporal nature of these areas. I don't know if that helps, but generally we're open to looking into those sorts of things. Thanks.

David: Last one, Luigi.

Luigi: So, Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. So sunset clauses are something that the GN would be willing to consider?

Mitch: I'm sorry, Luigi. Could you repeat that question?

Luigi: I apologize. Sunset clauses: So a clause that indicates for "X" period of time, this polygon is accepted within the Land Use Plan, but after that sun sets, after that period lapses, then either it needs to be renegotiated and all the parties need to come to the table and accepted that yes, the status quo is applicable, or nay, it has changed and there has been a change in data. Therefore, something else needs to be implemented. Again, in terms of sunset clauses, would that be something that the GN would be interested in?

Mitch: I think... You're making me think here, Luigi.

(Laughter)

I would like to hear from some of the other people around the table. Certainly it would be something I think that would be reasonable to consider, to revisit, because we are always consulting. Things are potentially changing. So on the surface, it sounds like a reasonable way forward. We would want to make sure that would be well consulted amongst our communities and

our RWOs, and also consulted with our jurisdictional partners. But I think on the surface, it sounds like a reasonable way forward. Yes.

David: I would add that you're going to have to consult with your financial management board, because that's going to require a lot of monitoring. What was your name again...(laughter)....Luis?

Miguel: Oh, come on. I've hardly even said anything.

(Laughter)

Miguel with NTI. Actually I'm a bit concerned. I have two things now, because you said something that concerned me. But you represented the GN as saying they are no longer advocating for any protection in calving areas. I believe that's what you said anyway, but the GN didn't object to that. I was a little surprised because I'm pretty sure...my understanding is that the GN is simply saying they're not asking for prohibitions on development in calving areas. I just want to make sure that's clear. Like if I'm misunderstanding...they're still advocating for protection, just not prohibitions.

David: I don't know to be honest. My understanding was that the GN – and I haven't seen anything in writing – the GN's current position is that while it was advocating for protection, the caribou calving area would be conservation zones in the Land Use Plan. They've withdrawn from that position and have said they'll consider on a case-by-case basis the best approach to caribou protection throughout Nunavut. So I interpret that personally to say that the position that caribou calving grounds be effectively designated as conservation areas is no longer valid. But that's just my opinion.

Miguel: Miguel with NTI. Yeah, perhaps they should speak to it.

David: I'll ask GN to speak to that.

Mitch: I'll let Denise answer this, because I'm getting a little bit confused here what we're actually talking about. I'd appreciate that if you could.

David Lee: I hope this helps. David Lee with NTI Wildlife. I would like to know what the GN policy statement or position is, please. Thank you.

Denise: Denise Baikie with Government of Nunavut. Just to make things less clear and more muddy, here's my attempt. So we're not necessarily advocating for habitat protection anymore, as it being designated as a Protected Area polygon. Now understand our position has to be fully fleshed out, as this is a recent development. As Steve stated earlier, we would support development in calving grounds and key access corridors on a case-by-case basis, with associated seasonal restrictions, mitigation plans, etc. The exact details of what we're going to implement have not been worked out yet, so I apologize if that made it worse.

David: Miguel.

Miguel: Miguel with NTI. Now to my real question -that was just a concern from what you'd said. It's to Mitch. Mitch, in the last Technical Meeting we were at, you gave a presentation called "Finding the Balance." In that presentation – and correct me if I misread what you had on there – at one point

you'd said if there were enough funding available, then mobile protection measures could be a feasible way of protecting the caribou. I would ask, did you have that in your presentation, and could you clarify what you meant by it? Thank you.

Mitch: Sure.

(Laughter)

Okay, so my problem is we're zipping back and forth from old policy to new policy here. So if we go to the old one, which is no longer supported by the GN, in that policy, we did not say that mobile protection measures could replace area protection for calving. I just want to add this caveat, because I'm a biologist, and I need to add this caveat into this whole thing to get out of the policy thing. So we all know the GN policy. We're all aware of it. From the biological standpoint, I think it needs to be understood by everyone around this table. I'm just going to give a little backdrop. This is going to help me feel sort of less confused, and people can respond to this as they like.

I have been working on caribou for 30 years now. I've been on the calving grounds almost every year of that. I've worked on woodland caribou, and I've worked on Peary caribou. Mostly, I've worked on barren ground caribou. A lot of the Elders and the RWO reps around this table have been on caribou habitat a heck of a lot longer than I have, and they have a massive amount of knowledge as well on all of these. I've spoken to many, and we've listened to many who have provided the feedback back to us.

Additionally, we've been very thoroughly through the literature. We probably haven't seen everything that's out there, but there are dozens of papers that very clearly delineate potential impacts to caribou etcetera. So we've gone through that and justifying important caribou habitats and that sort of thing. From a biological standpoint, positions aside here, there is a reality to where we're going here. The reality is development on a calving ground will impact caribou. We know that. That's not something we're guessing about. There is some question as what the magnitude of that effect will be, but it will impact caribou.

I just want to make sure we're very clear, and this is from a synthesis of my personal experience of my experience working with colleagues around the table, and speaking with Elders and hunters. I feel I have to say that, because that's who I am. I'm a biologist. I want people to understand what is going to potentially happen, that there will be some sacrifices that will have to be made when we go into a calving ground and develop in a calving ground.

I'm not speaking to any positions. I'm just trying to lay out the biology and say that biology has not changed. That has stayed the same. In fact, the biology with new research that is being done is becoming clearer. So, that being said, just because I was getting confused, I thought it was good to put it out there on the table. I think I'm speaking for my colleagues here as well who have looked into these issues as well. But that doesn't change the current policy framework that we have to work within now. Clear as mud.

David: Okay, any other...Miguel one more?

Miguel: Yep. Miguel from NTI. Yep, this is a Technical Session, so positions aside, we all have to be aware of them, but we're just talking here and trying to figure things out. Thank you.

David: Yeah, and I guess I'd reiterate while the policy has changed, the science has not. So, I guess I'd characterize the GN's current policy as less risk averse than the previous one. Hannah, did you have a question?

Hannah: Thank you. Hannah from NTI. I can appreciate the awkward situation you guys must be in, but Denise, you mentioned that the new policy has yet to be fully fleshed out. Will the policy be submitted to NPC, because I don't think that decision was made publically or released publically? I'm just trying to understand where the GN is going with this. Will we see something in the near future? Thank you.

Denise: Denise Baikie, Government of Nunavut. I assume this will be something that will be forthcoming in an NPC submission on future land use planning submissions.

David: Yeah, go ahead.

Dirkus: Dirkus Gissing, Director of Wildlife Management, Government of Nunavut. There will be a media release later today from the Government of Nunavut on the decision on caribou that will clarify what the Government position is at this time. I just want to make another comment. Our previous position was that calving grounds were protected from development. There was our position to NPC to consider in the development of a Land Use Plan. Now what we're saying is each proposal will be considered on a case-by-case basis. That is purely a recommendation again, to NPC. Nothing prevents NPC from making a position to say calving grounds are protected. There are a lot of people around the table that provide input into this, not just the Government of Nunavut. While we are a major player, I expect that you will consider inputs from everybody around the table in making a decision in developing a Land Use Plan.

David: Great. That's helpful. Warren.

Warren: Thank you. Warren with the KWB. I'd just like to say, you know, talking with my Executive, with the other staff that has been around KWB a lot longer than me, they really appreciated the GN showing up at their AGMs year after year and consulting really heavily with the KWB on their previous submission. It didn't reflect everything the hunters wanted, but calving grounds was a big priority. As the Chair has noted a few times, the policy may have changed, but the science hasn't. I do hope the NPC staff will consider the science that has been presented here and the other science when they are coming out with their final recommendations. Thank you.

David: Alright, any other questions before we move on? So next on the agenda is a brief update by the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board on the workshop they held back in November. A number of folks weren't able to attend that workshop, so we've asked the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board to summarize the results.

The Seasonal Ranges:

NWMB: Agreement on Caribou Calving Areas from November 2015 Workshop

Karla: Thank you. This is Karla Letto with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. I apologize in advance if I get a coughing fit. I've been battling a cold. If I do, Peter will take over for me. So thank you for giving the NWMB an opportunity to speak at this Technical Meeting. I'm going to address the caribou workshop but also give a little overview about the NWMB and our position. So for those of you who do not know, the NWMB is a quasi-judicial tribunal with decision-making responsibility, acting as the main instrument of wildlife management and the main regulator of access to wildlife in the Nunavut Settlement Area. There are a number of provisions...

David: Could you slow down a little bit? Thank you.

Karla: There are a number of provisions in the NLCA that give the NWMB authority to play an active role in the management and protection of Nunavut's wildlife habitat. These include:

- The provision of advice on mitigation measures to be required from developers who damage wildlife habitat, which is Section 5.2.34
- The approval of the establishment, disestablishment, and changes to boundaries of conservation areas related to management and protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat, which is Section 5.2.34A
- The approval of plans for management and protection of particular wildlife habitats, 5.2.34C
- And the identification of wildlife management zones in areas of high biological productivity and the provision of recommendations to the Nunavut Planning Commission with respect to planning in those areas, which is Section 5.2.34B.

In May 2014, the NWMB passed a resolution recommending the full protection of caribou calving and post-calving areas, which included a prohibition of mining exploration and development. That NWMB position has not changed. This position was forwarded to the Planning Commission in our May 2014 and June 2015 submissions.

So as most of you are aware, the NWMB hosted a workshop in early November 2015 called "Protecting Caribou and their Habitat." The purpose of the workshop was to bring together Inuit hunters and organizations, community members, wildlife scientists, and wildlife managers, to share and discuss current scientific and Traditional Knowledge on the effects of disturbance caused by human land use activities on caribou and caribou calving habitat, and suggested recommendations on how to effectively manage and/or protect caribou and caribou habitat in Nunavut for the long-term sustainability of the species.

The workshop was not intended to lead to one or more specific NWMB decisions or recommendations for the protection of caribou or caribou habitat, and it was not a forum for promoting or advancing a formal party or departmental political position. However, the NWMB

may use the information heard at the workshop to assist the Board in performing its functions related to the management and protection of caribou habitat, as per Article 5 of the NLCA.

Prior to that workshop, the NWMB issued a contract to a legal firm to conduct a review of legal jurisdiction on caribou habitat protection, mainly with respect to mineral exploration and development. As well, the NWMB issued a contract for a literature review on the impacts of human activities on barren ground caribou with a focus on IQ, scientific information, and caribou protection measures. The literature review was based on information post-2010...

David: Yeah we're going to need to...if you could say a sentence or two and then pause, that would be great.

Karla: The literature review was based on material post-2010. Sections of that literature review are currently being reviewed and edited, and will be made publically available once complete. The NWMB also provided funding to the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization to conduct an IQ literature and workshop in their community. Presentations on the initial findings on the legal review, literature review, and Baker Lake IQ Workshop were presented at the NWMB's Caribou Workshop in November. A report on the NWMB's workshop is still under development. We hoped to have it complete before this Technical Meeting, but unfortunately we are not able to do so. However, that report should soon be circulated to workshop participants for feedback and will be submitted to the Planning Commission along with the literature review for their June Hearing submission deadline.

Today I can present the 11 Points of Agreement that were drafted by our NWMB Legal Counsel at the conclusion of the workshop. These points of agreement have been circulated to participants and are available on our website. I've also got some handouts here that I'll send around. So just reading from the Draft Points of Agreement:

1. Both Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and science provide useful information and guidance regarding caribou and caribou habitat protection issues.
2. It is necessary to include IQ information on maps addressing caribou and caribou habitat protection.
3. IQ and science are essentially in agreement, based on the reliable and persuasive evidence with respect to caribou and caribou habitat protection issues, particularly regarding the vital importance of caribou calving areas, post-calving areas, water crossings, and access corridors.
4. Currently, there appears to be no reasonable legal or policy balance between development and protection in core caribou habitat.
5. Establishing Protected Areas is generally a more effective conservation action for the protection of core caribou habitat and vulnerable caribou populations than simply establishing protection measures.
6. Particularly considering the presently low caribou population numbers in Nunavut, the high economic, social, and cultural value of caribou and caribou habitat to Inuit and ongoing exploration and development activities throughout the territory, it is urgent that prompt and

effective steps be taken by management authorities to ensure the protection of this irreplaceable natural resource.

7. The establishment under Nunavut's Wildlife Act of Special Management Areas and accompanying regulatory safeguards appears to be an effective and appropriate legal action for the protection of caribou and caribou habitat.
8. A caribou zone of influence is a useful concept to apply in considering overall caribou and caribou habitat protection.
9. Mobile caribou conservation measures deserve careful examination and consideration, for example, within buffer zones in the vicinity of a Protected Area.
10. Caribou and caribou habitat Protected Areas and protection measures, once decided upon, must be clearly expressed and conveyed to all those affected.
11. To ensure effective caribou and caribou habitat protection, adequate funding is required for communications, implementation, monitoring, and enforcement.

In conclusion, the NWMB would like to echo other parties that we heard from today in saying that we need to take a precautionary approach when considering the protection of caribou and sensitive caribou habitat. To quote the federal judge that ruled in the 1978 case between the federal government and the community of Baker Lake regarding mineral exploration and development in the region at that time, "The minerals, if there, will remain. The caribou presently there, may not." We think this is important advice that the NPC should keep in mind when revising the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. So now if Peter has anything to add... Thank you.

David: Thank you. Any questions for the Wildlife Management Board? Seems pretty clear. Yeah, Spencer.

Spencer: Hi, Spencer Dewar from INAC. I just wondered what is meant by 'zone of influence' as a concept.

Karla: So the 'zone of influence' was a presentation that was delivered at the workshop by Kim Poole. It is based on a paper that he was a coauthor with John Boulanger. Mitch might want to chime in there as well. He might know more about it, but it's basically looking at how far outside you can see from where an activity is taking place, where you can still see the impacts of that activity. Looking at a case for the Bathurst caribou, it measures a certain distance out where the effects of disturbance could be measured, and it was linked as well with dust accumulation on lichen. So there's a possibility that the dust created from roads is going out so far that it could be affecting the vegetation and forage for caribou and thus, affecting how far they come to the disturbance.

David: Yeah, and Kim will be on the phone this evening, so if there are question of him about the zone of influence concept, they can be raised then. Any other comments? Leslie.

Leslie: Hi, Leslie Wakelyn, BQCMB. I just had a quick question on one of them, and I didn't get the handout so I'm not sure which number it is... Number 7. I was wondering if there had been any progress on trying to figure out if the GN's legislation would be useful to establish Special Management Areas under the Wildlife Act. Thanks.

David: GN?

Dirkus: Dirkus, Government of Nunavut. They are already in the Wildlife Act, but we don't have regulations in place yet. That's something we are considering.

David: Yes?

Karla: I am just going to add to Dirkus' comment there. The NWMB is still interested in pursuing that option and has sent out a letter to co-management partners to request a meeting looking at that, looking at wildlife regs in particular as an option forward.

David: Thank you, and I would guess that we will be influenced by the GN's recent policy decision about protection of caribou habitat. Any other comments, questions? Alright, let's move on then to the Kivalliq Wildlife Board and a presentation regarding freshwater crossings. We touched on that earlier today, but Warren, are you the lead?

The Seasonal Ranges:

KivWB: Importance of Freshwater Crossings and Use of IQ for Data Collection

Warren: Thank you very much, David. This is Warren for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. Leah Muckpah, our Regional Coordinator was going to co-present with me. She's not available today, so I'll do my best. I'm going to talk a bit about not just the importance of water crossings, but the approach that KWB is taking to IQ. When Leah gets here, she'll talk a bit more about the engagement that we went through with Elders, with the public, and with the HTO Boards to arrive at these conclusions.

So the approach that we've taken towards trying to inform our positions with IQ, I guess is twofold. The first was documenting the traditional roles that Inuit have for protecting caribou habitat, because there are quite extensive rules around how hunters should treat habitat areas. It's so extensive that I think Inuit would have their own traditional land use plan before the Canadian government and scientists and policymakers.

The second is documenting Inuit values around caribou habitat. The definition of IQ that commonly gets circulated or emphasized is that it's not just information and observations. It also deals in the realm of values and cultural values, so we try to focus on that as well. In terms of the traditional rules, as Karla mentioned, the NWMB funded some research for us. We did a literature review of the traditional caribou habitat protection methods looking at anthropology, archeology, oral history, Traditional Knowledge studies, and on and on. There is quite an extensive literature on this actually. We also held workshops with each HTO in the Kivalliq region on this topic.

The reports on this work are recorded in all of the HTO submissions to the Planning Commission, which have been on the Planning Commission's website for quite some time now. I would especially recommend the reports that were appended to the Baker Lake HTO submission. So first I'd like to talk about the traditional rules about water crossings that we documented. I think these help explain the reason why the HTOs and the KWB have been pushing so hard to protect these areas.

So according to the workshop that we held and a really extensive list of academic literature, there are a lot of rules that Inuit followed traditionally around how to treat a water crossing when you're hunting or camping near it. For example, the Elders teach not to hunt or camp on the side of the river where the caribou enter the water, because any change to the landscape there can really affect their migrations and make them cross somewhere else.

They also teach not to camp too close to the crossing, or build cabins too close to the crossing. The Elders said they were also taught to not leave carcasses too close to the crossing and to make sure they leave those areas especially clean. They also said they were taught to be extremely quiet, especially close to a crossing and not to disturb the first caribou in the herd, or the first group of caribou that migrate through, because if you disturb those, you'll mess up the whole migration.

Now I should say that historically for inland Inuit, the water crossings were one of the most important hunting sites. The fall caribou hunt at the water crossings is where most of the inland groups that live in Baker Lake and Arviat today, got almost all of their food and clothing for the winter. As a result, there are a lot of archeological resources around these areas, and a lot of Elders have emphasized to us during these workshops that they don't want these artifacts removed or moved around.

I think it's worth pointing out that archeologists have even found that the archeological record reflects these traditional rules. There are a number of papers that have been written on this that you don't find many artifacts on the side of the river where the caribou enter the water. Most of the artifacts are found over a hill, out of sight of the water crossing. There aren't a lot of bones or other fragments nearby. The archeological record testifies that Inuit followed these rules very closely historically.

Water crossings, especially to Baker Lake and Arviat, remain extremely important to hunting today, especially along the Magoose River for Arviat, the Thelon and Kazan Rivers for Baker Lake, and the east end of Baker Lake and the north and south channels into Chesterfield Inlet or Baker Lake and Chester. They are still very heavily used. So that's water crossings.

In terms of calving grounds, we also heard some traditional rules that Elders were taught and continue to teach in terms of managing the hunt to protect calving ground habitat. First of all was the traditional hunting season. All of the HTOs told me that the calving and post-calving season is bull hunting season. They were told to leave cows and calves alone during the calving and post-calving season. The Elders in Whale Cove told me that they were taught to stay out of the calving grounds entirely during the calving season and to stay closer to the coast and leave the caribou alone in their calving grounds while they are having babies.

The Elders in Arviat told me that they emphasized to younger hunters that they shouldn't be building cabins in the calving grounds, because these permanent structures will disturb them. In Chesterfield Inlet, an Elder told me, "We will never stop trying to protect the calving grounds. It is a part of our culture." So, with regards to both calving grounds and water crossings, the Elders said that their traditional rules are inconsistent with mining. Like how can you have an open pit right next to a water crossing if you can't even leave a caribou bone lying around?

So I'd like to just say a couple of things about the value that Inuit in the Kivalliq place around protecting these areas. I think this is reflected in the long history of trying to protect these areas, which Basil touched on a bit this morning when he gave opening remarks. A lot of this activity was focused on Baker Lake. The community made numerous land freeze proposals during the 1970s, asking the federal government to stop issuing permits for exploration until a land claim is settled. And according to my discussions with Joan Scottie, who was the research assistant for the consultant study that was done in 1976, one of the big focuses with this land freeze is they wanted to have especially water crossings, but also migration routes and calving areas protected.

Then the government proposed special measures, which eventually became the caribou protection measures to deal with this issue. The community responded that these seasonal measures aren't enough, and that's what turned in to the Baker Lake court case. In Baker Lake, the Kiggavik Mine has been proposed twice now, once in the late 1980s and once just recently. In both situations, a major concern that the community had was that Kiggavik would induce further development, that once you build the road out to Kiggavik, it's a uranium rich area. So you're going to start seeing more roads, more mines, and more open pits. Both times, there was a concern that this development could spill over into calving grounds.

The first time around it was because UG, the company at the time, was actively exploring in the Beverly calving grounds, and that was according to some people that I've talked to including Joan who was very active in this. That was detrimental to their relationship with the community. In this time around with Kiggavik, both the Baker HTO, the Chester HTO, the Arviat HTO, and the Kivalliq Wildlife Board, all said that they wouldn't support Kiggavik until there was a proper land use plan in place with firm protection for critical caribou habitat, so this induced development would not spill out into the calving grounds. The KWB passed a resolution to this end, which I'll hand out after I'm done talking to maybe provide a bit more background and context. Then since then, there have been struggles over Uravan wanting to drill in the Beverly calving grounds and Anconia trying to get into the Qamanirjuaq calving grounds – and they are in there.

So there is a long history of this, of hunters standing up and speaking their mind about this. I think this shows some clear local values around protecting this critical habitat and not wanting mining there. As Basil said this morning, hunters in Baker Lake would not accept mining in calving grounds. There is a line in the sand, and for them that crosses that line. Based on the HTO's public engagement in other communities – radio call-in shows, consultation with Elders – I really don't think Baker Lake is alone on this.

So I think we should really question why the Government of Nunavut is promoting development in calving grounds at this point, when at least with the communities I've dealt with, I don't think a mine in the calving grounds could ever get a social license. I don't know...I can't imagine there would be any mitigation measures that would truly make hunters comfortable with a mine right in the middle of the calving grounds, and I've heard the same comments from HTO Chairs and from numerous communities in the Kivalliq. I think I'll just leave it at that for now. Thank you.

David: Thank you, Warren. Any comments? Questions? Strong presentation. Jackie, do you want to update us on the next item here?

The Seasonal Ranges:

QWB: Description and Delineation of the Baffin Caribou, IQ Basis

- Jackie: Thank you, Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. If you look at your agenda, you'll see there are two times QWB was allocated a space to discuss some of the IQ they have collected. QWB did have a proposal to hold a workshop prior to this meeting, but due to a variety of external factors including accommodation, QWB made the decision to postpone that workshop. This was not an easy decision, but one that we just had to make. So officially, QWB doesn't have anything to add under the seasonal range or the planning tools. But again, I do want to reiterate that QWB is planning to still hold a workshop, and this workshop will be held in preparation to meet NPC's June deadline for submissions for the Public Hearing. So please stay tuned. Thank you.
- David: Thanks, Jackie. Any comments or observations? Alright, I think I'm going to call it for the afternoon. We're at 4:30 or close to it in any case, and on schedule. I think the forecast for tomorrow is somewhat grim, so I think it will be wise to have the evening session as scheduled and see how much we can get done then. Then we'll see what the weather brings tomorrow morning, but right now the winds are forecasted to be like 70 to 90 kilometers, so it may be a little difficult to travel. Okay, so we'll see you back here at 6:30. Miguel?
- Miguel: Miguel, thank you. I was just going to ask David, is there some sort of a plan notification system for the blizzard tomorrow so we don't venture down the hill, so to speak?
- David: Yeah, I think it's going to be up to the city to make the call about whether it recommends people travel, but I think we could send out a note as well.
- Miguel: Okay. Thank you.
- David: Alright, so we'll get back together at 6:30. We can update on the weather forecast again too at that point. Thanks very much everyone.

BREAK

- David: What we're going to try to do tonight is try to get to 9:00 if we can and get as much done tonight as possible. The weather forecast is the same as it was this afternoon, which is not good – up to 90-kilometer winds overnight and into the morning. Spencer, when he gets here, has a number that people can call. He'll give us that, but the Planning Commission will also send out a note sometime around 8:00 tomorrow morning just to confirm officially whether the day is on or not. Then we'll update that periodically during the day. I'm hoping that if we can't meet during the day, we can at least meet tomorrow night. Then we've got Wednesday as well. So we'll get as much done tonight as we can.

The downside – well, there are several downsides about tonight – the fact that we're working tonight is one. There aren't any refreshments either I gather. So we'll just have to...we'll order from the bar, how's that? On the Planning Commission's tab.

(Laughter)

That ought to help the mood, right Brian?

Brian: Sure, why not.

(Laughter)

David: That's on the record, too. So we'll get onto it. Earl, are you ready? Jackie has done her update, so it's to the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Board on the agenda. And just for folks, we're on Item #11. Is Kim Poole, do we call him? Is he going to call in? What's the story there?

Peter: Kim Poole has been asked to call in at 6:30. He was asked at 4:30, and he did confirm.

David: Alright, telephone? Telephones are online apparently, so let's go. Earl and Leslie.

The Planning Tools: BQCMB: The Benefits and Need for Area Protection for Caribou

Leslie: Hi, Leslie Wakelyn with the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board. I was asked to do a presentation by NPC, and I've been trying to revise it continuously as conversations change things a little bit, so we'll see if I get the main information people would like.

First of all, why are we doing this presentation? As we have heard multiple times, some parties believe that it's not necessary to protect calving grounds through protection that excludes specific land use activities from geographic areas, also known as area protection. Some believe that as long as the environmental assessment process makes recommendations about actions that should be taken, including perhaps, caribou protection measures to reduce or mitigate damage to habitat and disturbance to caribou, that is all that is needed. The BQCMB strongly disagrees with this view, as we have heard multiple times.

So just to be clear, I'll just review what the Board's position is on area protection, so we all know where this comes from. The Board believes that protection of traditional calving areas delineated using all available Traditional Knowledge including IQ, telemetry, and survey data since the 1950s, would actually be the ideal way to protect caribou herds' calving grounds over the long term. This is because herd sizes change through time, and over the long-term population cycle, herds that may be in decline now might actually increase in size again and need larger areas and more space for calving than they do now. So that would be the ideal situation from the Board's point of view. As I have said before, the Board's position is also that development activities should be prohibited from post-calving areas and around key water crossings as well.

So why do we think that mobile caribou protection measures, or some form of caribou protection measures alone would not be good enough to protect caribou? There are limitations associated with various versions of protection measures. They are a tool intended to mitigate effects of land use activities on caribou, so individual caribou and groups of caribou – they provide no habitat protection. So these measures alone will not provide meaningful protection against changes to

habitat that could lead to fragmentation of ranges and reduced habitat quality, quantity, and effectiveness. So this is why we need both protection measures that reduce effects on caribou from land use activities such as disturbance on some seasonal ranges, but we need area protection to prohibit activities in specific geographic areas...(muted)

David: Could you slow down a little bit?

Leslie: Sorry. That's pretty effective. So we need area protection to prohibit activities in specific geographic areas for the most sensitive and important habitats. Recommendations made to NPC by various parties for protecting caribou calving grounds are intended to safeguard caribou and habitat from the negative effects of disturbance and other aspects of land use activities through avoidance of direct negative effects on those sensitive animals and habitats. So area protection is not mitigation; it is protection of habitat.

I thought that Mitch did a pretty good job of going through the key characteristics of calving and post-calving areas that provide benefits to caribou today, so I won't repeat them. But I will repeat a few key points. One of the things is that determining what is necessary to protect caribou habitat relates not only to the geographic area or the physical space, but also should consider the following:

First, caribou must have access to habitat, including for instance, use of key water crossings and not being diverted from those crossings, just as an example. Essential habitat components including vegetation of course, but other things included in the habitat, must be available for caribou to use and to gain nutrition from in the case of forage. So therefore, they cannot be covered in dust or contaminated materials. When caribou occupy a habitat, they must be able to utilize forage, for instance, fully in order to meet their requirements. So, therefore, they can't be subjected to frequent disturbance.

The negative effects of land use activities include not only obvious direct and immediate effects, such as mortalities resulting from impacts from vehicles, but also more subtle and longer-term effects, such as reduced productivity and survival resulting from repeated interruptions to foraging. So we've heard these things before, but I think quite often, people just keep thinking of disturbance – disturbance on individual caribou, disturbance on groups of caribou – and we maintain that it's not just that which is the issue here. And it's certainly not just that driving caribou cycles entirely, but they do need habitat, and calving habitat is the key habitat that they do need absolutely to return to, to gain all those benefits that Mitch outlined today.

So I have a few more general comments on area protection, too, to put this in context. It has been mentioned, but proposals to provide area protection for caribou core calving grounds, calving grounds in Nunavut, are intended to avoid the direct negative effects on sensitive animals and habitats. But the broader goal is to support continued sustainable caribou harvesting by Inuit and by other indigenous groups outside Nunavut who also depend on these species.

Maintenance of the traditional caribou using economy for present and future generations will have positive implications – socially, economically and culturally – for the territory and for preservation of cultures and food security across the caribou ranges, both inside and outside Nunavut. Restriction to land use activities applied to specific geographic areas is a well-established conservation tool. It has been used globally for more than a century. We are not inventing something new here for the Nunavut Land Use Plan.

Selective geographic areas have been protected and managed primarily to support the conservation of biodiversity, to protect crucial habitats for specific species, to protect important cultural heritage, and to safeguard special physical features. Area protection can be established through permanent legislated protected areas such as national parks and conservation areas, or through flexible, frequently reviewed and updated land use plans. All three approaches have been used to support caribou conservation in Northern Canada.

So just as an example of how we're not being revolutionary here by talking about area protection for calving grounds, there is currently legislated protection for parts of caribou ranges across the North, including the following legislated protected areas, which exclude industrial development from...(muted).

Sorry. I'm going to give you a nice, slow list of legislated protected areas, which exclude industrial development from portions of caribou calving grounds and post-calving areas already. So this includes:

- Tuktut Nogait National Park in the Northwest Territories, which protects the Bluenose West calving ground.
- Ukkusiksalik National Park in Nunavut, which protects the Lorillard calving ground. Again, these are portions in some cases.
- The Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut, which protected the traditional Beverly calving ground.
- The Queen Maud Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary in Nunavut, which now protects both the Beverly and Ahlak calving grounds.
- And then there is a well-known example in Alaska of the Porcupine calving ground, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Also in land use planning specifically, there is a precedent just next door in the Sahtu region of the Northwest Territories where the Sahtu Land Use Plan protects a portion – not in this case of calving grounds – but of the summer and fall range of the Bluenose East caribou herd in the Edailla or Caribou Point conservation zone. Land uses prohibited from this zone are bulk water removal, mining exploration and development, oil and gas exploration and development, power development, forestry, and quarrying. So they have taken the bold move to make this conservation zone in the Sahtu region to protect the summer and fall range, or a portion of it, of the Bluenose East caribou herd.

So protection of calving habitat in the Nunavut Land Use Plan would also, in addition to addressing territorial conservation needs, would also address federal and international conservation needs. I won't go into detail on this, but just so people are aware, there is a global strategic plan for biodiversity. Canada has signed on to it and has established targets – conservation targets – to fall under the requirements of that agreement. That includes protection for at least 17% of the terrestrial areas of the country. So again, this isn't a radical idea to provide area protection.

To get back to actually the sensitivity of calving grounds and the need for protection of calving habitat, there have been numerous examples of people that have made these recommendations. So in the early 1990s, the Porcupine Caribou Technical Committee identified the calving and immediate post-calving periods for Porcupine caribou as the most sensitive period for cows and calves, and they classified calving and post-calving areas as being the most sensitive seasonal habitats. As many people may know, the Porcupine Caribou Management Board has been lobbying both the Canadian and US governments for decades to keep protection for their calving ground in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

The Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board rated sensitivity of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou to land use activities based on a number of ecological factors, with caribou sensitivity rated most highly of all the periods during the calving period and with a rating of high sensitivity during post-calving. They also rated sensitivity of seasonal ranges to land use activity based on five factors. Calving grounds were rated as high sensitivity to land use activities, and post-calving areas were rated as being highly sensitive. More recently, the Bathurst Caribou Range Plan Working Group rated caribou sensitivity during calving and immediate post-calving for the Bathurst herd as very high, and they have rated habitat in calving grounds and post-calving areas as having very high sensitivity to disturbance.

In terms of the caribou stakeholders, caribou harvesters, and various other organizations representing those harvesters, as was mentioned earlier today, there was a Caribou Summit held in Inuvik, Northwest Territories in 2007 where 180 representatives from across every NWT region, Aboriginal governments, caribou management boards, renewable resource and co-management boards, outfitters, environmental organizations, and oil, gas and mining industries were all present. There were 63 issues identified by the delegates. Only three of them got relative consensus of over 100 votes each. The first priority was protecting the calving grounds in the NWT and Nunavut. The first priority for immediate action was to meet with Nunavut to begin discussions about protection of calving grounds. This was in 2007.

The BQ Caribou Management Board held a Caribou Workshop in February 2010 with participation from more than 75 Elders and hunters from across the caribou ranges as well as government, staff, scientists and others from three territories and five provinces. Input from the participants led to recommended actions for a number of specific factors involved in caribou declines, and six general recommendations.

The first general recommendation was that governments and others should protect areas that are very important to caribou, starting with the calving grounds. The BQCMB's comments to the Nunavut Planning Commission in February 24 were accompanied by letters and resolutions calling for protection of calving and sometimes post-calving areas, from many organizations representing caribou harvesters from across the caribou ranges. I won't list the groups here. Others have mentioned them, but they were from all across both caribou ranges including in Nunavut, Northwest Territories, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

Based on this, when the BQ Caribou Board developed a new management plan, they included the following recommendations:

Calving grounds should be protected from exploration and development activities. No new exploration or development activities should be allowed on calving and post-calving areas. Also,

no mineral tenures, federal land use permits, or Inuit land use licenses should be issued on calving and post-calving areas.

So, there are more lists of papers – peer-reviewed papers – in the literature that we could go through as well, but that would take a lot longer than the time we have. But if anyone is interested, I could give them a list. But it's notable to note, as Karla mentioned earlier, there was a literature review done for NWMB prior to their Caribou Workshop, and it included peer-reviewed literature on IQ and other Traditional Knowledge reports. Based on over 150 references, their conclusion was that the need for designating Protected Areas to preserve critical or sensitive habitat for caribou is well acknowledged across the range of the species. So that's the most recent report that compiles information from various sources.

So rather than go through a long compilation and summary of what people have said, because Mitch and others have talked about this previously, what I would say is that a basic summary – two sentences – would be that while on the calving grounds, caribou cows are especially vulnerable to disturbance, and all the cows of any one herd are gathered together in one place. Therefore, anything that affects the cows on their calving grounds, affects the future productivity of the herd.

Given the status of most of the herds today, it's generally felt that cumulative effects are a major, major issue for all the caribou in Northern Canada and that any additional stresses that can be managed, should be managed. There has been a great effort in various places to manage other factors as well, but what we're talking about today is area protection. So I'll just leave it at that.

In conclusion, the BQ Caribou Management Board believes that protection of habitat for caribou in the Land Use Plan needs to focus on managing risks of major negative effects of caribou over the long-term, based on actions that can be taken now and adjusted over time if necessary as new information becomes available. So what are the risks? One example would be what is the risk of being more precautionary than is absolutely necessary to protect caribou? For instance, what if parties agree, based on evidence, that mineral exploration and development have been prohibited from a larger area than necessary to protect the calving ground for a caribou herd. Adjustments to the Land Use Plan can be made. We've heard this over and over.

In the meantime, a few exploration projects may theoretically have occurred without restriction on land. Use may not occur in an area for a few years, perhaps. Because we can't predict, we don't know what companies might be interested and which areas might have sufficient investment backing for exploration to occur. It's all pretty hypothetical. But the majority of lands in Nunavut will still have been open for exploration and development, and the minerals will still be there and available. So if it is decided sometime in the future that some area needs to be reduced or changed in terms of a Protected Area in the Land Use Plan, that can be done. Then the options for exploration and development can be pursued at that time.

So what is the other risk? What is the risk of not being precautionary enough to protect caribou? For instance, what if we allow significant habitat loss and/or availability of crucial habitat to occur on calving grounds through damage that we allow from roads and mines? Then we will have reduced the ability of caribou to access key areas for calving and caring for their newborn calves, and we will have reduced the amount and availability of habitat crucial for calving, not just for the term of a Land Use Plan or the first Land Use Plan – but forever.

Even with mobile protection in place, this may have detrimental results for both caribou herds and habitat. So this is something to be avoided even for healthy herds. But given the status of both herds now, it would be yet another pressure affecting caribou in combination with all the other factors when they are very vulnerable. So the responsible thing to do – our Board believes – is to be precautionary in favor of protecting caribou and protecting caribou habitat, the most sensitive habitat being caribou calving grounds, post-calving areas, and areas around key water crossings - but specifically starting with calving grounds. So I guess I'll leave it at that, if anybody has any questions. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Leslie. Any questions? Any observations from folks? Yeah?

Luigi: Mr. Chair, I feel like a constant troublemaker here.

David: I agree.

Luigi: I figured that.

(Laughter)

Luigi Torretti. I've got a target. I'm surprised there are no lasers pointing at me yet. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you, Leslie for your presentation. It is very informative and also points to the number of areas that are already protected in Nunavut and that have some protective influence on caribou and caribou calving grounds.

One example of a legislated area that seemed to me might not have been brought up in your presentation was in Quebec. If I understand the Taillon paper well, Quebec has legislated the protection of caribou calving grounds, and there were a few iterations of polygons that the government imposed protections on. In a study, the Taillon study basically looked at the areas and compared the legislated protected areas to where caribou were actually calving year by year. I don't recall – maybe somebody else is familiar with the paper – but I don't recall exactly what level of protection it was, but it was not substantial. The number of 30 or lower percent was actually protected. Can you speak to that, if you're familiar with that?

And for myself, coming from the Kitikmeot, this has some implications, because you know there have been documented switches by a few herds. So again, as an organization that is responsible for land management, putting polygons on a map and saying these areas are stopped and that there is no development, then I have to say my Board is quite concerned with that. So can you speak to the Quebec scenario?

Leslie: Leslie Wakelyn for the BQCMB. I'm somewhat familiar with that paper, but not extremely. Somebody else here would probably be able to talk to it specifically in more detail. But what I would say about it is that is why we're saying that the opportunity of working with the Land Use Plan is a good one, because we recognize that things change. And because land use planning is a flexible tool, new information can be used in the future to change an area that is protected, if it is seen to be not adequate. There is a flip side to that too, of course, in that if you don't protect an area and then it's used later, it might not be the best habitat any longer for a herd.

We're working with a difficult species. Caribou are complicated. We're not talking about a peregrine falcon nest where they'll come back to the same nest for sure for decades. It's a difficult problem and we're all trying to do our best to come up with the best solution for sure. So there are complications. As I said, when our Board started talking about protecting calving grounds 30 years ago, what people wanted was legislated permanent protection, because that's what they thought was the best way to go. So now it looks like the best way to go is through the Land Use Plan. But not protecting anything is not at all going to solve any problems from the conservation point of view, from the caribou point of view, and from caribou harvesters' point of view. So somebody else here might be able to talk about that paper in particular if you want.

David: Leslie, Peter's got a question and then I think Earl wanted to say something, but can you describe what you mean by protection - like what form that protection would take?

Leslie: So basically we're talking about prohibition of incompatible land uses, as the term is often used. So, for instance, it would be prohibition of mining and exploration activities, and not only mining and exploration, but those would be at the top of the Board's list in terms of what is going on in the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq calving grounds.

David: So, effectively withdrawing surface and subsurface rights, the potential for disposition of those rights, including prohibiting land use permitted activities?

Leslie: Yeah, I guess I mean that would be subject to discussion a little bit about the full extent of it. Would it be the same in every area? I don't know. But for the two herds that this particular Board has been involved in, yes.

David: We'll explore this a little bit more over the next day or two, but it seems to me that a temporary renewable moratorium on the issuance of mineral rights might be part of that, obviously grandfathering existing rights. But a moratorium on the issuance of new rights subject to decisions further down the road may be, at least, a big part of what you're talking about in terms of this general term 'protection.' It might also include if there's an all-weather road being proposed through a calving ground, then you might want to reroute that road. You may not want to prevent that road from happening at all.

But it's something that I want people to start thinking about. Protection means a whole bunch of different things to different people, just as conservation does. Some people think of conservation as complete withdrawal or prevention of any activities. Other people see conservation in a different light. So I'm going to start asking people to define what they mean by protection and the timeframe within which, and the process by which that protection would be reviewed and renewed or not. Peter?

Peter S: Peter Scholz, NPC. Not a question but a comment: I actually interviewed Dr. Côté at the University of Laval in Quebec City 10 months ago, and he talked about that very factor that Luigi mentioned. So, my understanding was the caribou in Quebec move around quite a bit more than here in terms of their calving areas, but he would be the one that would have the full answer to Mr. Torretti's question.

David: Earl?

Earl: Earl Evans, BQ Board. I've got an answer for you, Pete. Those caribou move around down there lots because they are bilingual.

(Laughter)

Also, Luigi wanted verification that he's a troublemaker. I agree, he is.

(Laughter)

But getting back to the more serious side of things, Leslie and the Board and all the people on the range, we put a lot of thought into the presentation that we gave. Everybody has their own view of how caribou should be protected and what protection means to different people. Everyone in this room has a different agenda, and they see things in a different light. But we're looking at it from a harvester's view – people on the ground, people that are living there and living life on the land. Living with caribou is a totally different thing if you're working for a wage economy. It's a different thing.

But the two have to work in harmony here, because Nunavut's a young territory. There are unlimited resources here, and everybody wants to extract them. But they don't have to be extracted all at once. You can do it in smaller scale over a longer period of time. As long as the people in the community of Nunavut – if they want jobs, then jobs should be at their fingertips. Training could be provided for people, because they always say they need specialized people, so they bring people in from outside. But training should be available for any person – any young person – in this community that wants work. Work is available in the mines. They should have access to it with no strings attached. Training should be right at their fingertips. Train them up and let these people have the money to provide their families so they can live the dual lifestyle, work when they have to – work a few months a year. Some of them only want to work two or three months. Others want to be employed full-time. Give them that option.

Like Luigi said, it's a dual-edged sword. We need wage economy. We need some mines and some development, but not on a big, huge scale. Have it so, like I said, everybody can work together without harming the wildlife and the environment in doing so. So like I said, Leslie put a lot of thought into that. Myself, I sat on two or three different caribou boards and stuff, but it seems like the planning is all too late. I mean, those three herds – the Beverly, the Bluenose East, the Bathurst – all those herds are totally decimated. There are only 2 or 3 percent of them left. So we must have done a pretty shitty job planning. It seems like all the planning is after the herds are in steep decline, and there's not much you can do about it.

There are so many different factors that add to the decline of the caribou. I mean it's not Industry. Everybody points a finger at Industry. It's not Industry. It's everything altogether that has combined. You throw in the natural cycles there, and then all of a sudden you've got a steep decline and you can't do nothing about it. So like I said, with this Plan here, the herd is still half-ass healthy. So let's try to plan around this so we don't see the demise of this herd as we've seen in the rest of the herds. Down south where I come from, we're the first ones we couldn't hunt, because the caribou moved away. There was not enough around. Then it moved up to Yellowknife, and then all the surrounding communities of Yellowknife – Lutselk'e. None of those people can hunt...*(muted)*.

Okay, I'm slowing down. But I'm just trying to say, we have to really look at everything and take a really good look and see what we can do to make this Plan work, not plan after all the caribou are gone. We need to be proactive about it and try to get this off the ground. Some parties are going to have to compromise. There is no doubt about it. Everybody is going to have to bend a little bit. Some might have to bend right over, who knows. But this is the way it has got to be. These are the cold hard facts. Three caribou herds have just about been wiped off the face of the earth, and we're still talking about planning here! So let's not let that happen with this herd for the sake of all the people of Nunavut here. Thank you.

David: Luigi, before you speak, I just have to make an observation. I've been in meetings with both you and Earl, and I've got to say in terms of troublemaking potential, Earl wins.

(Laughter)

Luigi: Luigi, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Actually, I was going to say I'm the troublemaker. He's the one that makes sense. I want to support what Earl has said. I am trying to ask some really tough questions, because the truth of the matter is they are going to be hard answers. Everybody is going to have to bend a little. So the reason I'm asking the hard questions is to make people understand that as land managers, we are in a very difficult position as well. But let's try to get past some of the superficial talk, and let's try to look at what are the potential actions that we can take. That's why I'm trying to ask the hard questions. So point those lasers.

(Laughter)

David: Well I've got a cartoon for you tomorrow. Leslie?

Leslie: Thanks. I just wanted to pick up on the bending bit a little bit. I just wanted to point out – not Earl's reference...

(Laughter)

I know better. But I think there has already been a lot of bending. There has been a lot of compromising on the conservation side. As I said with our Board, ideally what people would like to see protected is the total traditional calving grounds known to have been used, documented since the 1950s when they started surveys – since before then if there is Traditional Knowledge before then. So they would have a great big area on your map that they would like to see protected in terms of excluding industrial development, because they think that when the caribou cycles change, the caribou might need that area again. So that's what they would really like.

And most people here know that generally at least – but people tend to forget – that the Nunavut Planning Commission really listened to people when they combined the calving and post-calving polygons together and put them in their Plan, because at that point, the Government of Nunavut was talking about just recommending protection of calving and core calving. So they've tried to bend, and they probably got flack for it. People are saying, "Why did you do that?" But the GN has also compromised. They've looked at just core calving areas, and they tried to reduce it as much as they could. They stopped saying they want protection of post-calving areas. Forget today, but...

(Laughter)

But people have been compromising as much as they can but still trying to maintain what would be meaningful for caribou. So I'd just like to remind people of that I guess. Thanks.

David: Luigi, did you have a follow-up, and then David, I'll go to you afterwards.

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I would be extremely concerned with - speaking for the Kitikmeot Inuit Association - that level of protection. If we were to look at the map right now, there is a considerable amount of area there that is covered by caribou calving grounds. If Inuit have selected some of those areas for potential development purposes, then essentially we're eliminating the choices that Inuit can make on those areas. That needs to be considered with a large degree of...it needs to be seriously considered.

If Inuit cannot make choices in terms of development and all they have is caribou, well the ultimate choice ends up being that the Inuit need to go back to the traditional lifestyles if you want to take it to the full extent. That's what's going to need to happen. I know in my community and in several areas of the Kitikmeot, going back to the old ways, it's romantic, but the reality is that days have changed. We have to be very, very careful of that. We need to ensure that Inuit can harvest caribou, and we also need to ensure that they are able to live as other Canadians do as well.

David: Yeah, and I don't think anybody disagrees with you, Luigi. It's a question of how do we achieve that. I think sometimes there is an assumption that if an area is temporarily set aside from development, that's a permanent decision. From what I can hear anyhow, that's not the intention. The intention is to review these regularly with sufficient evidence gathered in the meantime to make a renewed judgment as to whether it's effective or not. But that's what we need to work through over the next two days.

How we ensure that, as we talked about earlier today, we have three legs of the stool of equal length: healthy environment, healthy caribou, and healthy communities? That's the challenge. Nobody is saying - from what I can tell anyhow - that we have to sacrifice one leg of the stool or even make it significantly shorter than the other two. It's how do we get this right? For the time being, how do we set in place a mechanism to review it to ensure that it's still right in the future? David?

David Lee: Thank you, David. David Lee with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. I just wanted to clarify and respond to one of Luigi's initial comments on the Taillon shifting caribou calving ground paper. So I've revisited it. It had been a while since I read it. I think it's very important to clarify that although it is identifying some of the issues of a calving ground that is shifting, it is not questioning the importance of the caribou calving grounds for their demographic importance as well as their critical habitat importance. Instead of me stating that, I think it's more important for me to just quote the actual paper:

"We suggest that constraints on human activities within the wildlife habitat, in this case, should be permanent to prevent degradation of calving range."

It provides all of the references mentioned before about the impacts of industrial activities in calving grounds for which there is quite a bit, and for which there should be a rebuttal to the Chamber of Mines review. The last statement is the protection of calving grounds should be

regularly updated to confront possible novel threats and ongoing environmental change. So, this doesn't negate anything that Leslie, the BQCMB and many of the other proponents including Inuit, have stated about the importance of protecting caribou calving grounds and its highly sensitive nature. Thanks.

David: Thanks, David. Jackie?

Jackie: Hello. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I don't have a question. I just have a comment. I'm afraid I do have to respond to Luigi's earlier statements where he states not allowing development leaves Inuit no other choice than to return to a traditional lifestyle. I find that statement hugely offensive, and I feel that in an attempt to – how do I say this? – in an attempt to move beyond an either/or, he has just reaffirmed it.

I find it very important to just state and to also highlight that in the conversations I've had with many Inuit across ages, across regions, my understanding is that everyone is searching for new, creative ways to move beyond this way or that way. I don't feel that statement has provided any space for that kind of forward thinking that Inuit are bringing forward beyond the structures of management and business that we have right now. So I just had to say that. I don't think it's fair, and I don't think it's hugely accurate. I would question Inuit in their own region if they feel it's as black or white as that. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jackie. And maybe I'll take it back. Maybe you are the bigger troublemaker, Luigi.

Luigi: First of all, I wish to apologize for my statement. The statement...I made the statement because of my understanding, potentially incorrectly. We're looking at a lot of protected areas right now, okay? The statement that I understood, that I heard, and that resulted in that response, was that we're going to expand those areas even more so than what is presented on the map. So, I misunderstood. I misunderstood you, Leslie, and I take that back. If that is not what is being proposed in terms of expanded far beyond what is here, then I made a statement in error, and I do take that completely back.

So I apologize, Jackie. Again, in the context that I understood it... Nunavut is an extremely important area. It has the calving grounds for many, many different caribou herds. Essentially, if we look at Nunavut exclusively as a calving ground and we impose limitations on the entire extent of Nunavut, then that is the potential problem that I see. So I apologize. The statement was made in an emotional concern that I had that everything was going to end up being protected.

David: Yeah, and Luigi, I think everybody understands where you're coming from, and in a good way – not critical. I think you did misunderstand what Leslie was getting at, but I understand the reaction too. Leslie and then Mitch.

Leslie: Sure, I'd just like to clarify. I was just trying to give an indication of how thinking is trying to be creative and is trying to be inclusive of other factors, and showing that if we came at it from an entirely conservation point of view, the ideal situation would be much larger areas to be protected. But we're in a land use planning situation where everybody is trying to work together and come up with the best solution. That's why there have been compromises made already, because people I thought were forgetting that.

I'd just like to include for the record, too, this statement since I hadn't said it before. We keep repeating this over and over in the BQ Board submissions. The Board isn't against mining or other forms of economic development. We acknowledge that Nunavut has valuable mineral resources, and the mineral exploration and development industry will be important to the future, to the economy and people of Nunavut. But the Board believes that it is essential that the most sensitive and important caribou habitats are effectively protected from industrial land use activities.

So as we said before, the choice shouldn't be about talking of mines or caribou. We're trying to figure out how to do both. Like you said, there will have to be bending in both directions for sure, but there have been compromises made already, and we are trying to work together. No one is trying to say that there should be no mineral development or exploration in Nunavut. I've never heard anyone say that no matter how emotional in any caribou meeting. So I hope that clarifies things.

David: Thanks, Leslie. Mitch?

Mitch: Yeah, Mitch Campbell, GN. I just wanted to just point out for perspective that what we're talking about in terms of calving grounds, at least as the GN has delineated calving grounds, is approximately 6% of the Nunavut Settlement Area. So we are talking about a very small amount compared to the Nunavut Settlement Area. So I think that perspective needs to be understood. The other component is it's never all going to be developed all at the same time. So spread out over time, proportionately, you're looking at even smaller areas. We need to keep that in perspective that calving grounds are not...if other groups are looking at calving areas for protection, that is not removing a significant amount of landscape from the industry. So I don't see how there would be those conflicts. I just wanted to add that we had those figures here. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Bruno? We're going to have to get to Kim. I'm sure that he's got other things to do tonight, so Bruno go ahead, and then we'll go to Kim. Then we'll come back if need be.

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Real quick: Just one part of Luigi's question earlier that kind of got lost when we talked about the Taillon report, and I think it was related to exchange rate or switches between herds. I just wanted to point out that we have addressed this in the case of the Bathurst and the Bluenose East. That information is all available either on the Wek'èezhii Renewable Resources site or the Sahtu Renewable Resources site. Those are the two public registries.

For your information, if you look at the past five years, the rate of exchange between the Bathurst and the Beverly to the East and Bluenose East to the west is in the order of 2% - so 98% calving ground fidelity. It's exactly the same for the Bluenose East if you compare switches to the Bluenose West to the west and the Bathurst to the east. That is consistent with the previous Public Hearing that we had where we had done this analysis - always in the range of 2% to 5% switches, consistent throughout. Mr. Chair, that was all I wanted to point out.

David: Thank you, Bruno. Kim, are you ready to go?

Kim: Can you hear me? (*Barely audible*)

David: Kim, are you there?

(Pause)

- David: We're going to try a third time. Kim, are you there?
- Kim: Yeah, I can hear you. Can you hear me?
- David: Yeah we can. Boy, it's staticy though. Maybe we can ask the folks here to see if they can fine-tune the speaker.
- Kim: I can hear you guys very well – Leslie and Bruno and everybody else. You come across well. You can't hear me as well?
- David: Yeah, it's really difficult to understand what you're saying. I'm going to ask our technical folks to see if they can tweak this thing, so just standby for a couple minutes.
- Kim: Sure thing.
- David: Alright, we're going to ask you to keep talking. Maybe you can sing us a song. We could use some entertainment.
- Kim: You don't want me to sing you a song. Can you guys hear me yet? Is it any better? Any worse?
- David: Yeah, it's getting better. Why don't you try the presentation and I may have to interrupt it to fine-tune things again. Peter, you wanted to say something?
- Peter S: Peter at NPC. Kim, I have an 8-slide presentation emailed to me from Luis. I'm hoping that's the right presentation. Just say next slide and I'll move appropriately.

The Planning Tools:

Kim Poole: Assessment of Caribou Protection Measures

- Kim: Yep, thank you. I will. Just a couple of things from my end. Do I assume there is translation going on?
- David: Yeah, there is so you'll have to speak slowly, and boy you've got to speak clearly, because at this end, it's difficult to understand.
- Kim: Okay I apologize for that, but I can't help it. I will try and speak as clearly as I can. I've been listening to the last hour, with Leslie's presentation and the discussion. I appreciate that I have not been there today to get all the context of what has happened so far. The one little nugget I want to throw out is that people should also keep in mind that the Bathurst herd has declined roughly 96% or 97%. The Bluenose East herd has declined 80% or 90%, and all that has occurred to my knowledge with absolutely no development of any sort on the calving grounds. So, I'm hoping that people are

keeping in mind that there many other factors involved with what is happening with the caribou herds in the North beyond simply area or restrictions or disturbance protection on calving grounds. I just thought I'd throw that in there after listening to the various comments and discussion.

To get to my presentation, what I am going to present is a fairly brief overview on the position that the Kivalliq Inuit Association has come up with for caribou to the Nunavut Planning Commission. There are two documents that go behind this presentation. One is a February-of-this-year document that is essentially detailed background to this presentation. And the other is a November of 2015 document that outlines in more detail how the proposed Kivalliq mobile caribou conservation measures would work out. So people can refer to those two documents for further information, or I can take questions at the end. Can I have slide number 2 please?

So, hello? Am I coming across okay, David?

David: Yeah, it's fine right now. Thank you.

Kim: Okay. So we are suggesting that from an area designation perspective that management of caribou must be based on both IQ and western science as it relates to caribou ecology and their assumed or suspected or known vulnerability to disturbance. Of course, and as was evidenced in the last hour that I've been listening, there is a balance between caribou protection and economic development. We do not suggest that it is necessarily always either-or. We suggest there are some compromises that can be made that consider both.

We are suggesting that seasonal designations and dates, such as the ones that have been proposed in other documents related to this issue, should be decided through a collaborative exercise, not just radio collars or satellite collars, but also IQ, aerial survey data etcetera. These seasonal designations and dates should be considered with the practicality of managing in mind. In other words, it won't help things if we come up with 8 or 9 or 10 different seasons with various scenarios of management for those. It gets far too complicated. The comments that we are presenting here pertain to both mainland migratory and tundra wintering herds, and less to the island herds.

Slide number 3 please. What we have done, and this is presented in greater detail in our Mobile Conservation Measures document, is assess the risk categories for caribou at different times of the year based on presence of newborn calves, based on how concentrated and congregated the animals are, and other factors like that - based on movement rates. We are suggesting, as most people would agree, that the crucial time is when a species is most susceptible to disturbance, and we are focusing on those periods where the mitigation and monitoring for development and assignments of Protected Area designation should be considered. For this exercise, we are suggesting six seasons as shown in this table, and some of these are amalgamations of seasons that have been suggested by others including the GN.

Slide 4 please. We are suggesting that the core calving areas should be designated using the areas used by core calving and the immediate post-calving caribou. And we are proposing that this include what we call the extent of calving. The extent of calving essentially runs from the peak of calving to about three weeks of age, and those three weeks are important, because that is when the calves are totally dependent on the female for nutrition, for suckling, and before they start to consume any of their own food.

So with this kind of designation, we are suggesting that it is encompassing both the calving period itself and the next three weeks. We are suggesting that this area, with the caveat I will get into in a minute, be provided a Protected Area status where mineral exploration and development would not occur. This area is fairly consistent. Now we're aware there have been many different mapping exercises, primarily conducted by GN, because GN has been the one that has been doing most of this. Our proposed core calving areas are likely consistent with the mapping that was proposed by GN in their June 2015 submission to the Nunavut Planning Commission.

As noted, the Kivalliq Inuit Association supports the identification of these core calving areas using both IQ – or using IQ, scientific survey, and the collar data. We suggested that these be done keeping temporal trends in mind using the most recent 10 years of collar data. For that discussion of movement of caribou calving ground, I would agree very much so that the Quebec herd – the Quebec Labrador herd – moves calving grounds to a far greater extent than what is seen in the NWT and Nunavut. Given changes in herd size and changes over time, there have been shifts in the extent and distribution of calving grounds. So we think it is most appropriate that this be assessed using the most recent 10 years of collar data, and that it be reviewed on an approximately 5- or maybe 8-year program. In other words, the mapping for these core calving and other seasonal ranges could be reviewed every 5 years.

Next slide please. With core calving areas, as we've defined them with that overlap the various high mineral potential, we are suggesting that these be given Special Management Area status, within which the proposed Kivalliq Mobile Caribou Conservation Measures would be applied. We are also suggesting that within a 25-kilometer buffer around the mapped core calving areas, mobile measures would be applied as per the Mobile Caribou Conservation Measures document. So in other words, even if mapping has designated a specific area as a core calving area and in the middle of a review period or over the course of years there are changes to where the caribou are calving, that essentially the buffer would be able to identify areas that could be monitored and mitigated for development around the core calving area where heightened mitigation could be applied on a mobile basis. In other words, the protection would be traveling with the caribou and not necessarily always variant based.

Next slide please, which should be the water crossing. We are suggesting as well, as Leslie pointed out, that the water crossings are significant areas. We are suggesting that the immediate area around the identified water crossing should be a year-round Protected Area status where no development or exploration would be allowed. The size of the area we're talking about is not necessarily huge. It's perhaps 1, 2, 3 kilometers in radius, and that would be parallel to traditional caribou approach characteristics that could be based on IQ. However, around these Protected Areas, there would be what we suggest a 10-kilometer radius zone around these crossings within which mobile protection measures would be applied. We are also suggesting that the "designated" or identified water-crossing database that was developed for the DIAND Caribou Protection Measures, that database has to be updated. There are far more water crossings out there than the ones that are designated or identified. Many of these have been identified in environmental assessments that have been done and could be also supplemented through IQ. So we are suggesting that list should be updated.

Next slide please. For other seasonal ranges beyond the core calving, we have designated as I mentioned, five other seasons. With the data used, we are suggesting to apply mobile protection

measures with different criteria and timing for the different seasons. In other words...this is in far greater detail in our Mobile Caribou Protection Measures document from November.

The final slide please, slide number 8. Where there are major transportation corridors, only the structure proposed. An example of this is the Nunavut-Manitoba Road or the Kivalliq-Manitoba Road or whatever the term is used to describe it. We are suggesting that these should be routed to avoid core calving areas where possible, but should be granted Special Management Area status with appropriate and required stringent mobile measures applied to them. So what we are trying to say is that no one - as I said at the start of my talk here - no one is arguing the importance of caribou calving and the calving areas themselves, and the timing of it. There is a lack of really strong empirical data that suggests or indicates that caribou at that time are susceptible to disturbance, but intuitively we would all agree to that. And with the precautionary principle, it would make a lot of sense from everybody's perspective to give these areas the highest protection possible.

We are confident that even within core calving areas, for instance within portions of the Special Management Areas because of high mineral potential, in order to deal with these transportation corridors and infrastructure, we are suggesting that mobile measures could be effective. We are suggesting that the onus of...you know, it's easier, cheaper, well just easier to give a Protective Areas designation to a chunk of land and walk away knowing that nothing can touch it. Even with mobile measures, there is going to be more work involved, but the onus we are suggesting, should be on the proponent. If somebody wants to go into a Special Management Area, they have to ensure that they provide the funding so that the regulators can conduct sufficient monitoring and mitigation to ensure that the disturbance is minimized or eliminated. The regulator, even within these Special Management Areas as we envision them, the regulators can still say, "We want a small footprint." "We want you to be aware that depending on where the caribou are you may be removed. All personnel may be removed and all activity ceased for up to 2 months a year." At least the company, the proponents go into it knowing full well the importance of the area and the implications to any exploration and potential development going forward.

So we think this is a strong enough basis to manage these areas. Do not shut them out fully, the economic development, but ensure caribou conservation is foremost in everybody's mind. Again, more details are provided in our February document that I believe that Luis from the Kivalliq Inuit Association has distributed, and information on the mobile measures from our November document that was presented at the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board Caribou Workshop in November. I would be pleased to take any questions if there are any.

David: Thank you, Kim. While people think about your presentation and formulate their questions, I wonder if you could – and I appreciate you weren't given a heads-up on this - but could you talk a little bit about this zone of influence finding that you were a part of, just to give people a bit of an overview of where the science stand on the zone of influence discussions?

Kim: Sure, I would be pleased to. There are two large diamond mines in the Northwest Territories in the summer-fall range of the Bathurst herd – the Diavik and Ekati Mines. Up until the late 2000s, they conducted aerial surveys that looked at the distribution of caribou in relation to the mines. We analyzed both data and determined that there was an approximate 14- or 15-kilometer area around the mine footprint that is including the processing plant, the pit, and the main roads that are in that area. There is an area of about 15 kilometers within which caribou are less abundant than they would be based on the habitat alone if the development wasn't there.

We are not saying it is a 14-kilometer exclusion zone, that there are no caribou there. We have shown that there is an area within which caribou are less abundant, sometimes a fair bit less abundant, than would be expected if the development were not there. As most of you are probably aware, in the last few weeks the Tl̓ich̓ô government released a Traditional Knowledge study from Wek'èezhìi that basically agrees very closely with – they have another term for it, which I can't remember off the top of my head – but basically, they are suggesting that the diamond mine has created changes in caribou movement and migration that is essentially creating a zone of influence. The terms they use translate roughly into areas where the caribou don't go anymore. Both western science and Traditional Knowledge are there. The one thing I must say about zone of influence is that there have been different studies on it with caribou and other wildlife. There has been very little work in the North. We have come up with one way to look at it, one analysis, but it is based on kind of a single area – over a number of years, granted, but a single area. So it's a concept that needs examination at a better scale.

David: Okay, thank you very much for that. There are a number of questions around the table, but just so I'm clear about what you're proposing, the calving grounds and the immediate post-calving grounds would be protected from mineral development and mineral exploration, except where there are areas of high mineral potential. And in those areas, the mobile protection measures would apply to activities.

Kim: Yes.

David: That plus the zone of influence discussions suggest to me that maybe that's a little problematic. In addition, linear infrastructure, if it can't be rerouted around a core calving ground, you would –or KIA would – suggest that mobile protection measures would apply to that fixed infrastructure as well. It's a little challenging, I think, but it's certainly a good basis for further discussion. So I'll open it up for folks, Earl and then Bruno to start.

Earl: Earl Evans here, BQ Board. Good evening, Kim. I think you and I had this discussion before on the zone of influence and how it affects caribou. I know you're talking about the zone of influence around the mine. Well, that zone of influence is there because the mine is static. It's in one place. But the zone of influence for the caribou actually starts when the trucks leave Yellowknife and do that 500 kilometers on the ice road. That whole trip the truck takes is negatively impacting caribou because that was all caribou country at one time. I think the last time I've seen caribou right close to Yellowknife was around 2002 or something like that. But that whole road at one time...(muted).

Okay, David. That whole road at one time was caribou country. So by having that road there, it is negatively affecting the caribou. So the road is a zone of influence in itself. People use a road, and like I said, as soon as that road opens, I'm like everybody else. I want to go hunt caribou, and that's the easiest way to get caribou is you load up your skidoo. You drive down the road, and 90% of the community hunts are done along that winter road, and if that winter road wasn't there, those community hunts wouldn't be done. Every community hunt usually takes around 100 caribou, and not counting the 20 or 40 trucks that come out of Yellowknife every Saturday, and during the week there are several too.

So that whole road has a negative effect on the caribou, so it is a zone of influence. I don't know. The mine itself, you said was one, but I take this road as another one. So I don't know if you can

categorize it one or two, but it is negatively affecting the caribou one way or the other. That's just my opinion on it. I think Bruno and the rest of the people have similar thoughts. Thank you, Kim.

David: I'll just remind everybody to slow down a little bit for the interpreters. Bruno?

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Kim. Good to hear you. I'm not sure if you had a comment on Earl here, but if not, I'll ask you a question. I'm just wondering, Kim, if you could, please clarify for me your description of this Kivalliq Mobile Caribou Conservation Measure or approach that you shared with us. I'll say what I think I heard, and please correct me if I'm wrong.

So I'm assuming of course, that it's applying to the Qamanirjuaq herds, that we would have the core calving area of some size as defined by surveys, collars, Local Knowledge, that would be determined and established. Then beyond that, an additional buffer of 20-25 kilometers would occur where mobile protection measures would apply, which I don't really know what that is. But is that how you describe this, Kim?

Kim: Yep, yep. That's essentially it.

Bruno: Okay.

Kim: Do you want me to explain how mobile measures would work though, since you're not actually following that, Bruno?

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Kim. We may not have to dive into that whole thing of mobile measures at this stage. I'm sure other people want to ask questions. I think you've answered what I wanted to hear though, Kim, and that's good. Essentially what you're saying here, based on your presentation, is that once we go beyond the core calving area, we would fall into what you described earlier, the post-calving area. So in this case, the mobile measures would be applicable in the post-calving area, just based on my experience. This is what it would look like. Anyway, I think I've got my answer on this one.

There's just one thing I'd like to point out, Mr. Chair, real quick. I don't want to drive this too, too long but Kim quite correctly shared with us earlier at the beginning that the Bathurst and the Bluenose East have dropped quite a bit in recent years, and that happened with no development on the calving ground. Just a thought, but what would it be if we had in the calving grounds development at that time? So, we want to be careful about how we bring those arguments together, Kim, I think. On that note, I'm happy with what I heard here. Thank you.

Kim: Actually, could I ask for clarification of your last comment, Bruno? You broke up a little bit, and I didn't quite catch it. Are you saying there was mineral development on the Bathurst calving grounds during the decline?

Bruno: That's right. You had mentioned at the beginning that those two herds had declined quite a bit, and there was no development on the calving grounds of those two herds. I think this is what you had said earlier, Kim, suggesting that there were other drivers that pushed the decline down. We all agree with that, but my point was, Kim, that what if we had major development on many of those calving grounds in addition to what the environmental conditions or factors are doing right now? We've got to be careful with approaching the core calving areas.

Kim: No, if I understand you correctly, I agree. If there had been a mega-development on the core calving grounds of the Bathurst herd, we might be down at 99% decline, as opposed to only 97%. There is no question about that. Keep in mind too, it's not just environmental factors that have been driving the decline of the Bathurst herd. There are other anthropomorphic factors called harvesting. It's not just natural in that sense. But you know that far better than I do, I'm sure.

David: Okay, thanks Kim. I'll just take a moment to introduce to folks who may not know James Eetoolook, the first Vice President of NTI is here. He has been popping in and out. James, I want to take the opportunity to remind you that you still owe me a musk ox hunt. Of course, I owe him a sheep hunt in return. Maybe we're equally guilty for not following-up on stuff.

(Laughter)

Any other questions for Kim? Yeah, there is a bunch. Warren and then Earl.

Earl: Earl Evans, BQ Board. So Kim, you still never answered my question. Do you think the road is a zone of influence from where it leaves Yellowknife, the ice road to supply the diamond mines?

Kim: Yeah, I'm sorry, Earl. I didn't catch that as a question. I think that the Tibbitt to Contwoyto Road definitely has a zone of influence around it. I think that the road itself has been very, very poorly monitored from that perspective. The joint venture seems to not have had any responsibilities for looking at the potential zone of influence, and I'm not just talking from a harvesting perspective. I'm talking more from an animal distribution perspective, although I've argued and as I've seen over the years that I've lived in Yellowknife, there is no question that from an animal harvesting perspective that has huge implications.

So yes, I believe it does have a zone of influence from an abundance perspective, similar to what we have looked at with the diamond mine. But keep in mind that it is during the winter season, and caribou movement and distribution and susceptibility to disturbance would be different at that time than what we saw in the summer-fall range when the caribou are fairly sedentary as well. There's no question there is something around that which never been quantified. Even the satellite collar data that ENR has possibly could be used to examine that question. Granted, the caribou don't always overlap the road these days, but they have in the past since the power has been out in 1996.

Earl: Thank you, Kim. I'm glad you're going to appear in court for us and state that. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Kim. Warren?

Kim: You broke up on that one, but I didn't catch it.

Earl: You did a good job. Thank you.

(Laughter)

Kim: Okay.

Warren: Thank you, David. It's Warren from the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. Hi, Kim. I first have one comment to make about the KIA position, and then I have one question for you. First, I'll just reiterate the position that the KWB has come to, which is they don't want to see development within the core calving grounds, and based on our engagement, we really don't think a mine could get a social license in that area. Mobile mitigation measures notwithstanding, we don't think people would support it regardless of what mitigation measures are introduced.

There also seems to be a serious logical issue with protecting the core calving areas that don't have high mineral potential. You're essentially saying we'll protect the calving grounds from mining except for where there is likely to be to mining. The logic behind it is rather difficult. Anyway, regardless, I'll get on to my question.

At the last meeting that we were at, the...

Kim: I'd like to comment on that.

Warren: Sorry, what now?

Kim: Are you going to let me respond to your comment? I think I'd like to make a response if I may, Mr. Chair.

David: Yeah, let me think about it. Yeah, okay.

(Laughter)

Kim: Thanks. For one, the mobile measures pertain primarily to exploration. If anything large is being proposed, that's a development. It is going to go through the NIRB process, which essentially almost takes it...well, it doesn't take it out of the hands of the NPC under Nunavut Land Use Plan, but it puts it to another level where social license and other factors are considered far more expensively than simple exploration. What we are proposing at least makes it clear to the proponent – potential proponent – that if they go down this route, at the exploration stage, they may be subject to the following restrictions in this area. And there could be footprint restrictions on how big the development would be. There would be timing restrictions on exploration etcetera. But anything that goes beyond that would be in the NIRB process. So you paint is as though we're hoping for lots of mines in areas of high mineral potential, but that's a bit of an exaggeration. It still has to be a measured development, and the regulators, including the Kivalliq Inuit Association, would be the ones that would be controlling the process.

Warren: Thanks, Kim. I wasn't trying to paint it like you wanted lots of mines in the calving grounds. Just, it seemed somewhat inconsistent to protect the areas from mining where we already know there isn't going to be any mines, because there isn't the high mineral potential.

You kind of answered the question that I was getting at, that I was leading up to, which you mentioned before that these mobile measures are just for exploration and not for actual mining. Do you think, like do you have a proposal for how the impacts of a mine could be mitigated in the middle of the calving grounds? Because if these effects can't be mitigated, and if these companies can't get a social license in that area, I don't understand why the industry really wants to get into there, sink a bunch of money into a place that they're not going to be able to recoup, because the

communities aren't going to want them there. They're going to fight tooth and nail to keep them out. They might get rejected in the NIRB, or probably even likely to get rejected in the NIRB process anyway. Just the logic of it is beyond me.

Kim: Yeah, I don't disagree with you in the sense that you wonder why a proponent would want to go into it knowing that he might not get the social license and approval through NIRB. But keep in mind that there are a number of types of development, some that we understand – diamond mines, gold mining, etcetera – some that are scaled that could be large or they could be quite small. You know, if there was a seasonal operation that was primarily in the fall and winter, for instance, that was occupying a very small footprint with minimal disturbance inside one of these Special Management Areas, to pull out – I don't know – some rare earth mineral or whatever. That's not the same as putting in Ekati Diamond Mine with a 30-square kilometer footprint in the middle of a calving ground. There are degrees of scale here that you have to keep in mind.

Protected Area status is fine, but it eliminates everything. Special Management Status has the option of eliminating almost everything if it wants, because the regulators including the Kivalliq Inuit Association and the GN can say, "Here are your restrictions. If you don't like it, don't go in there." But it doesn't eliminate the options for everything.

So I think we're not far off the same page. It's just how we go about it. At least suggest that the mobile measure approach could work inside those areas when needed. But again, it's not as simple as a Protected Area status where you put a circle around the area and walk away and throw away the key. So we think it's doable. It leads to options for economic development, and it leaves the proponent and potential companies knowing what the rules are going in. We think that's important, because these kinds of companies generally like to know the rules even if they don't like them.

David: Okay, thanks Kim. Mitch has a question or two, and then we're going to take a break. I've got to think about the interpreter behind me here. But Kim, after we take the break, we're going to get Mike Setterington to speak. Would you be available if there are questions over the next day or two? Could we call you and pull you back into this?

Kim: I'm afraid, David, for the next day or two I'm available only in the evenings your time.

David: Yeah, that may not be a problem here given how much discussion we have to go through. Anyhow, we'll follow-up with you if need be, but I'll turn it over to Mitch right now.

Kim: Okay.

Mitch: Okay, yeah, thanks very much for the presentation, Kim. There are a lot of interesting ideas you've presented, and I have some more or less quick comments. I'll do a pause in case you want to respond to any one of them. They're not so much questions most of them. Some concerns: Overall, I think that mobile protection measures have a lot of potential and a lot of applications. But at the moment, at least from my perspective and my understanding – which might be in error, but it's where I'm at right now – they're untested. They are conceptual at this point, so we can't be certain of their effectiveness overall. So that's just one concern. Before you would apply something like that in a calving area, you'd want to be darn sure what the result was going to be and not use it in an experimental fashion.

A couple of really quick comments on the three-week dependency: I'm just a little bit concerned that maybe there is some room to maybe talk about that a little bit, because it can vary depending on the melt, how quickly the females can get into vegetation, and how well they are nursing. It can be extended several years. It's just a concern. I think it could use some more discussion.

The 10-year period you were speaking of too, I think is another thing that would require a lot of discussion across the different jurisdictions and communities to find out what a reasonable period might be. I would suggest it might be longer than that, quite a bit. But I'm sure there are other people who might have different ideas. But I think that needs to be discussed further amongst various stakeholders.

One concern – there are two other concerns and then I'll leave it there, and again, I'm really trying to be as constructive as I can here. I can't help but to think that with the amount of mobile protection measures that may be required, we're looking at a pretty massive expense. We will need to get our heads around the conceptual components into the financial realities to see if it's actually financially doable.

The other issue I know in speaking with the communities and the RWO in my region is that this potentially – and there may be other ways of dealing with this, but it needs to be discussed. But potentially accelerated aerial surveys and collaring programs are something I know that communities have been very strong in having us, as the GN, try and come up with ways of getting away from so much aircraft survey for wildlife, because of the disturbance effects it can cause. I know there are some ways that you can look into that, but these are some of the concerns that I've seen through this, and I appreciate to them. I appreciate your presentation. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Kim, did you want to respond to that before I go to Leslie for the last question before we break?

Kim: Yes, David, just short: Thank you, Mitch, for your comments. They are all good and thoughtful as usual. A couple of things: As I did mention, it is far cheaper and easier to put a line on a map than block it off, walk away, and throw away the key. There is an expense involved, but again, we're suggesting that most of this is driven by mineral exploration or development. That's where most of the expense should be shouldered. If no one wants to go into a particular area, then there is less need to do any expensive monitoring to ensure they are able to trigger – you know, have enough knowledge to trigger mitigation etcetera.

The radio collars, the occasional annual surveys that you do, that should be sufficient. We are not suggesting that most proponents would be involved or want more collaring for their area of interest. That's not maybe on their books, unless they wanted to chip in to the GN program to ensure some collars are available on that particular herd or in that area. We are suggesting, though, that surveys can be done.

We know that there is a problem of extensive surveys where there are collars or aerial surveys, and people on the land that do land surveys or whatever can look at the shorter distance. We appreciate that there are sort of mid-distance issues. Surveys can be conducted – the way we proposed our mobile measures, surveys can be conducted at higher elevation where you're not necessarily seeing everything, but you're seeing enough to be able to make a call. The other thing - enhanced mitigation should occur. Ten years from now, yours and my kids are probably going to be playing

around with drones that can do everything that the planes are doing – the helicopters are doing – now. So there is development, but we do recognize that there are issues for sure. And I'll let it go at that.

David: Thanks, Kim. Leslie?

Leslie: Hi, Kim. It's Leslie Wakelyn, BQ Management Board. Thanks for the presentation, and I look forward to more improvements to mobile protection measures. I'm glad you're doing some creative thinking. However, I have a big issue with the fact that you seem to think that you can have protection for parts of calving grounds, but if they're identified as having high mineral potential, the same level of protection isn't needed. And in fact, it would only be a Special Management Area with mobile protection measures, meaning exploration would be there and potentially go to development because you're going to have a lot of activity right on the core calving ground. You have defined the calving area much more narrowly than the GN did in their mapping, so the maps that people are familiar with are quite different than what your area would be. You have considered it a crucial risk category, so the highest level of risk, but parceled the calving ground out into areas that are somehow less crucial because of another value. So, I think your conclusion was that this proposal you put forward will not compromise caribou, but biologically from that perspective, I'm not sure I understand that point.

Also, although I won't belabor this point, I'm not really sure how practically it would work either with the buffer zones and everything. But I'd like your thoughts on the first question today. Thank you.

Kim: Thank you, Leslie. When you talk about activity on the calving ground... But of course, mobile measures in most cases, would mean if there was a potential exploration site of any sort within a Special Management Area within a core calving area, there would be no physical activity. There would be no planes. There would be no aircraft. There would be no people active during the two months where – and you can even extend it into the post-calving period or the early summer period – wherein caribou might be present. If caribou are present – calving, post-calving, immediate post-calving and beyond – then activity is shut down. So, you are not dealing with the disturbance of activity of aircraft, trucks and people. There is no question you have an infrastructure there, whether it be a camp or a drill site or whatever. But there is no activity. So, I think because of the way the mobile measures work...it's not perfect. The perfect world would be to block the whole thing off, walk away, and throw away the key. But we suggest that given the available evidence, and I have not reviewed that document from the NWMB that went through all of the disturbance literature – I haven't seen a hard copy of it. I was there for the presentation but that's all. We suggest that this would have minimal impact on a calving ground. Again, everything is context specific. It's the size of the footprint. It's the type of development and the area within the calving ground. But there would be no activity at that time. Does that clarify things a little bit?

Leslie: Yeah, I'm sorry. What I was meaning was there is activity that potentially will lead to a mine. I understood your response to Warren, but still you had explained it as though maybe there will be a small mine and maybe there will be a small footprint, and NIRB will deal with it, etcetera. But the fact of the matter is if you're not going to create a Protected Area that prohibits mineral development, there could be development on the calving ground. That's the bottom line. That's why this seems inconsistent to me and makes no sense biologically.

Kim: It is inconsistent with the values that you are proposing to essentially protect every square inch of habitat. Yes, it is inconsistent with that. We are not suggesting, though, in every case that it is absolutely necessary.

David: Okay, thanks Kim. I think I'm going to call it. We're going to have to take a break. Our interpreter is working overtime. We'll get back in 15 minutes, but if we decide to call on you, we'll give you a shout and see if you're available. So thanks again very much for the time and the presentation.

Kim: You are most welcome. Yeah, best thing is to send me an email with as much warning as possible.

David: Will do. Thanks again.

Kim: Okay, thanks. Bye-bye.

David: Okay, we're going to take as short a break as possible, and Mike will do his presentation. Then we'll break for the evening. I'm going to skip over the NPC spot just temporarily at least. We'll get back to it. We'll go to Mike in a moment.

BREAK

David: I just want to update on the weather situation. It seems that it is worse than initially forecast, at least from what I've heard. I haven't actually seen it myself. There are 90-kilometer winds for a good part of tomorrow and a storm cell sitting on top of Iqaluit. It's kind of looking like we won't be meeting tomorrow morning at least. However, Spencer has a number that people can call, and we will also get the Planning Commission to send out a global email to folks at 8:00 tomorrow morning, so we'll cover it twice if we can. I'm hoping that we'll be able to meet tomorrow night, if not tomorrow afternoon, but we'll get the Commission to update folks at noon as well, or maybe just before noon about potentially meeting in the afternoon. If that doesn't work, we'll try to meet in the evening. If that doesn't work, we'll cram two days into one on Wednesday. It's about the best we can do I think. Spencer do you have that number?

Spencer: Yep. So, just a little bit of a disclaimer: This is the number we use at INAC to close our building, so usually we do it based on what the City of Iqaluit does when they take things off the road. But in the event that we closed it for some other reason, we'd be subject to INAC making the decision. 975-4535. It is 975-4535.

The Planning Tools: Chamber of Mines: Proposal on Mobile Protection Measures & How They Could Be Logistically Incorporated into NUPPAA Legislated Regulatory Procedures

David: Okay, I'll turn it over to Mike then, and this will be the last presentation for the evening.

Mike: Thank you. Good evening, ladies and gentleman. Mike Setterington representing the Nunavut Chamber of Mines. We were slotted in to talk about mobile protection measures and how they

would be logistically incorporated into NUPPAA legislated regulatory procedures. We sent some feedback on that topic, but the Chamber doesn't have the expertise, nor is it our mandate to incorporate things into federal legislation. That would be something we would look to Spencer to do. So we're not going to talk about that specifically, but I am going to build on top of what Kim Poole just presented for the mobile caribou protection measures.

I'm going to reiterate a few things that I started saying this morning about how industry has adapted to caribou protection measures on different projects for exploration, for advanced exploration, and for mining projects in Nunavut. So I've heard about a half-dozen times today the mention of the caribou protection measures, first implemented in 1978 when the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization brought the Federal Government to court. Those measures have been in use for 38 years, and that has included recognition of protected areas for caribou – protected as in seasonal restrictions for industrial activity and getting into some of the aspects of mobile protecting measures, protecting caribou when they are present.

The Nunavut planning process is only part of some of the environmental issues that industry faces. It's the first pass. The second pass is another thing that Kim Poole brought up - the Nunavut Impact Review Board process. So we have exploration projects, which generally follow best management practices, general guidelines. In most areas, exploration projects have to follow a best management practice and other guidelines presented to them by the Government, Government of Nunavut being the caribou regulators, and the Nunavut Impact Review Board guidelines.

In sensitive areas, should industry be made aware of and choose to operate, the industry will consider seasonal restrictions and exploration-specific mitigation plans. An example of this, specific mitigation plan and seasonal restrictions is what Tundra Copper implemented for their exploration program in the Bluenose East calving grounds this summer. So they didn't enter the area until after the caribou were gone, and they had specific mitigation plans to deal with caribou when they were present. They didn't have to implement any of those practices, because caribou weren't present for the duration of the program.

Advanced projects enter another realm of scrutiny, and as Leslie mentioned earlier, that's where we begin to address the burden of proof. So industry, for advanced projects through the Nunavut Impact Review Board process, continues to analyze, present and review and defend and revise environmental impact assessment, cumulative effects assessments, and project-specific caribou protection plans. That effects assessment and wildlife protection plans are developed in collaboration with regulators and community to do what's right for the wildlife.

Currently in this review process, there is TMAC with the Boston and Doris North gold projects in the Kitikmeot. They are currently going through their review and had technical meetings with the Government. They are currently revising their assessment and management plans. The Kiggavik project went through the process with one of the more elaborate cumulative effects assessments of the Qamanirjuaq caribou herd. And that cumulative effects assessment was developed following a two-day technical meeting specifically with the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board to specifically address their concerns and come up with the best way to approach a cumulative effects assessment.

That cumulative effects assessment considers the energetics of caribou and implemented zones of influences for a number of disturbances, including mine projects, zones of influence on roads, zones

of influence on communities, zones of influence on outfitting camps, zones of influence on other disturbing features on the landscapes – and incorporate those considerations into the overall effects on the productivity of caribou. That cumulative effects assessment further went down the road to develop scenarios of what would happen with and without development in the traditional range of the Qamanirjuaq caribou with population projections of the caribou up to 50 years with and without development, and with and without harvest.

The findings of that...the conclusion was that we could not determine the effect on the caribou as a result of the Kiggavik project, because it was masked by natural variability. So many people are familiar with that analysis, and those results are similar to what Bruno suggested earlier, results for the cumulative effects analysis, which uses a similar approach for the Jay Project for the Bathurst caribou.

So as I mentioned in the presentation this morning, Industry commissions cumulative effects assessments on a regular basis. Industry is the ones producing those cumulative effects analyses. We're looking for the impacts. We refer to the best available information. We refer to the literature. We use that information. We project scenarios. We predict impacts into the future. Those are presented and reviewed.

Earl, you mentioned earlier about getting Kim to present something in court, and that's basically what we do through the Nunavut Impact Review Board process, which is a semi-judicial process. The evidence is sworn in, so we're very careful about what we say and very careful about providing the best available information, and as we see it, the truth. No one can predict the exact truth of what's going to happen 50 years down the road. But using the best tools available to us, we are not seeing a magnitude of effect that would be significant effects on caribou.

Those cumulative effects and the effects assessments of individual projects that are occurring in Nunavut in caribou range, are scrutinized and reviewed by groups such as this sitting around the table through the Nunavut Impact Review Board process, first in technical meetings, written feedback, responses to information request, and then in a final Public Hearing.

So I'm just trying to emphasize the fact that not only do we just refer to the literature supporting whatever argument may be available, we're actually quantifying the effects because we need to. The burden of proof is on the project proponents to show that they will not have a significant impact on caribou.

Further to the assessments, we developed wildlife mitigation or monitoring plans, again in collaboration with the wildlife management partners, Hunter and Trapper Organizations, the Government of Nunavut, Environment Canada, or Inuit Associations. The longest standing wildlife mitigation and monitoring plan in Nunavut for a project now is Agnico Eagle's Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for the Meadowbank Project, which is reviewed annually by regulators in the Government of Nunavut. An example of another way of doing things is the Baffinland Project Wildlife Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, which also incorporates feedback from a terrestrial environmental working group, which includes the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, the Government of Nunavut, Environment Canada, and other members that are interested to provide feedback twice a year on the effectiveness of the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, which is revised on a regular basis and is currently on Version 4, three years into project effects monitoring. Part of that plan includes

collaboration on larger scale regional level monitoring conducted by the Government of Nunavut, so we have a broader picture of what's going on with caribou populations.

So Industry is using the same information as everyone else to interpret existing effects and potential future effects. So here in this meeting – and we provided that analysis, Industry wrote it. We seem to be the most familiar with it. Unfortunately, a lot of the information results seem to be disregarded or ignored. As a scientist that does this work for the mining industry, I can't ignore our own work and the evidence in front of us.

So again I turn to the fact that protection measures that we find are effective have been the ones we have been using, such as mobile caribou protection measures. But again, I'd also like to reiterate what I said at the presentation this morning that the Nunavut Chamber of Mines is not the decision-maker. We're here to provide the business perspective on exploration and mining. We look to reasonable decisions. We look to the regulators to provide sound advice and transparency in their decision-making and their advice to the Nunavut Planning Commission. So again, we continue to look forward to the discussions. They have been very interesting, and we will continue to try and provide our perspective on what makes sense. Ladies and Gentleman, thank you.

David: Okay, thank you, Mike. Mitch?

Mitch: Thank you very much, and thanks for your presentation, Mike. Just a couple of points, and one thing I wanted to read here that came out of the Environmental Management journal in 2006. I just want to read it into the record. It's just a quote from one of the articles:

"Cumulative effects assessments in Canada are in dire straits. Despite a huge amount of talk and flurry of development activity associated with cumulative effects assessment concepts, it has not lived up to its glowing promise of helping to achieve sustainability of diverse valued ecosystem components. The six problem areas include:

1. Application of the CEA in project-level environmental impact assessments
2. An EIA focus on project approval instead of environmental sustainability
3. A general lack of understanding of ecologic impact thresholds
4. Separation of cumulative effects from project-specific impacts
5. Weak interpretations of cumulative effects by practitioners and analysts
6. Inappropriate handling of potential future developments"

That came from peer-reviewed literature. Another couple of points I'd like to raise and then I'll leave it to someone else. A 50-year projection is...I don't know anyone in my field that has ever looked to a 50-year projection on caribou. With all the chaotic events that can occur in the lifecycle of a caribou population, to think that you can even come close to 50 years shows that you're not really considering all the factors.

There is no truth in a model, because a model predicts, but it doesn't predict exactly what's going to happen. So we can't say there is truth in it, especially when you're predicting 50 years down the line. The other component is a model is only as good as the inputs that go into it. So if someone is going to rely on a model, we all need to know what those inputs are, how old they are, how they were developed, and how they are implemented in the model to come up with such a projection. I would have – and I've seen these models before – I would have absolutely no confidence in

someone that told me they could predict what caribou were going to do 50 years from now. I would say the same thing if they said they could predict what caribou was going to do 10 years from now.

The other component is that for Qamanirjuaq, Kiggavik is not a very good example for a cumulative effects model. It is right on the edge of its annual range and most of the time Qamanirjuaq caribou don't venture into that area. So I would expect that even without a model, you wouldn't see it as having major impacts on that particular herd. That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

David: Any response, Mike?

Mike: No response. There wasn't a specific question there. But again, that cumulative effects model was reviewed by all regulators, and we did not get that kind of feedback until right now. Now everything that Mitch said, yes, that's true. With cumulative effects assessment, there are outstanding issues. We're all familiar with those journals, the practitioners and the environmental assessment practitioners. That's a challenge, but we have no better tools available to us.

David: Warren?

Warren: Thank you, David. Warren for the KWB. Mike, I'd really like to thank you for your presentation. I'd like to acknowledge both Mike and Kim's work on discussing mobile protection measures, because we do think they do have some applicability here, just not on the calving grounds. Now there is one thing in particular that I want to address here, and it's that both yourself and others have suggested that the NPC is only one part of the regulatory process, that basically NIRB can deal with the concerns that are being expressed here, that the hunters have been sharing with the HTOs and the HTOs have been sharing with the KWB and I've been bringing forward.

With all due respect, I really have to disagree for a number of reasons. First, planning is intended to screen out projects that would be unacceptable. By the time you get something to the NIRB, it's implied that there is some support, in principle, for this project if the impacts can be mitigated. And I think as I made clear earlier today, the feedback we've been getting is that hunters do support mining in principle, just not in the calving grounds. They do not support mining in principle in the calving grounds, at least in the communities I've worked with through the feedback we've gotten.

Second, the NIRB mandate is I think a bit more narrow than you're implying. It's a technical process, and it really isn't based on public acceptability to the same degree that a planning process can be.

And third – and I think this is most important – the NIRB process is really onerous and really stressful, and really difficult for communities, especially with a contentious project. I can tell you right now, the Kiggavik review was hellish for a lot of people in Baker Lake. You know while it was going on, I was joking with the NIRB staff that we need an impact assessment for this impact assessment, specifically the social impacts. You know, it drained a lot of resources and time from the HTO that they could have spent really focusing on managing the local hunt or dealing with other issues that are affecting caribou. It was extremely psychologically difficult for some people. The representative from the Hamlet of Baker Lake actually made a really impassioned and poignant speech to that end during the NIRB review. He said, "I hope you see what you're doing to the community here just by coming here." It was hell for them.

I really don't see why you would want to subject communities to this sort of thing for a project, in an area where we've already been getting feedback, where they are saying stay out. I really think this is something to consider. You know, Industry might have money to throw at these things, and sure, it might cut into their profit margins, but the social impacts of having to go through these NIRB processes are actually fairly substantial. So there are some comments there, and then I also have a question, which is how did you consider IQ in your position on calving grounds and your response to the GN's policy? Thanks very much, Mike, and thanks again for your presentation.

David: Mike, anything?

Mike: Thank you for your questions, but I do need clarification on your question. You were asking how we considered IQ in calving ground identification?

Warren: Thank you very much. Not in the identification of the areas, but in the identification of appropriate land uses within calving grounds.

Mike: Consideration of IQ for the Chamber's position as we are moving forward now on caribou protection measures – more mobile caribou protection measures – I would say that's based on the experience of the Industry proponents across Nunavut. The Chamber itself wouldn't have considered IQ specifically for the position statement. That would have come from the mining proponents in our experience on various projects that incorporated IQ, from Baffinland to the Doris North project, Meadowbank, Kiggavik...

David: Leslie?

Leslie: Hi, thanks Mike. Some of the points I was going to make have already been made quite well. But I would like to add to the idea that environmental assessment processes are for mitigating impacts and identifying how to mitigate impacts. It is acknowledged that there will be impacts. The land use planning process is supposed to provide a way to avoid impacts in areas where they are not acceptable. It is supposed to incorporate values, and to the point that Warren made, presumably will have periodic reviews to the Land Use Plan that communities will be involved in. But there are endless EA processes, and it's not just communities. It is governments and review boards, and everyone is spending an awful lot of time on environmental assessments, including for projects in calving grounds. It's taking up a lot of resources and energy, as Warren said, by communities. So the land use planning process is supposed to be a broader scope, a first level. Decisions are made based on the values of the people. So to say basically that you don't need that because you have an environmental assessment, I don't think is appropriate.

Then the second point was about Kiggavik, and in particular, as you know, our Board was involved in reviewing your cumulative effects assessment. We came up with a very different conclusion. Rather than your conclusion that the project will have no significant project cumulative or transboundary effects, the BQ Board concluded based on your EIS and cumulative impact assessment that the project's cumulative effects on caribou would be significant. Residual cumulative effects would likely reduce sustainability of one or more of the caribou herds in the area, and it would have negative effects on caribou harvesters across the caribou range. I've been told previously that the GN's review concluded there was just way too much uncertainty in the effects assessment, and they didn't have confidence in the proponent's ability to monitor and mitigate impacts on caribou.

Back to the BQ Board's assessment, one of the major flaws in the assessment, was this assumed stable trend for the Qamanirjuaq herd when in fact, the herd is declining. So that was a major issue for the Board. So I guess those aren't questions. They are just statements, but yeah. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Leslie. Mike, any statement in response to the statements?

Mike: No statement.

David: Alright, anybody else? Any comments? Questions? Alright, I'm going to take that as we're done here for the evening. So the Planning Commission will let you know what the plan is for tomorrow, but I suspect it's fairly safe to say that you can probably sleep in. At this point in the game, it doesn't look pretty. Stay tuned.

?Female: David, where's your optimism?

David: I'm optimistically looking forward to sleeping in.

(Laughter)

We'll see you all sometime tomorrow I hope - if not, then Wednesday. I really hope – I'm optimistic – we'll meet on Wednesday. It would be 9:00 if we are going to meet tomorrow. Tommy, do you want to do a closing prayer? Thanks, so we'll have Tommy do a closing prayer for us.

Tommy: *(Closing Prayer)*

MEETING ADJOURNED FOR THE DAY

DAY 2 March 9, 2016

David: I figured this cartoon was kind of appropriate, Luigi.

(Laughter)

Luigi: Thank you. Yeah, that's quite appropriate. I'm actually familiar with the original of that, but it's a good change.

One of the things that I do want to start this morning off with is a little bit of a statement regarding what I said on Monday. You know, I've been living in Kugluktuk for 10 years, and I've been lucky enough to have hunted with many Inuit there. Some of the Elders have taken me under their wing, and I've learned a lot from them.

As I mentioned earlier, the KIA is in the position where we have to walk a sword's edge. We have to look at economic development, and we also have to look at conservation. By no means is the KIA against conservation. The KIA is one of the only Inuit groups that have actually put forward a community area of interest, the Hiukitak River. It is on the NPC maps, so we are one of the few Inuit organizations that have put an Inuit area of interest for conservation. Likewise, we've also closed several parcels to exploration. So we are not against conservation.

There are also regional differences, so I'll slow down a little bit. Apologies to the translators. There are also regional differences, and those regional differences are economic and conservation as well. So, in terms of economic, we don't have a Baffinland, nor do we have a Meadowbank. Cambridge Bay is the one community that has an economic thrust. Our other four communities do not. So, the projects in the Kitikmeot are still uncertain. Hope Bay is uncertain. Sabina is still going through the processes. There is a lot of uncertainty. Sure there are deposits there, but nothing is moving ahead in any manner.

I was looking trying to find some economic data, and all I could find was that in Nunavut, the unemployment rate is 17%. In the Kitikmeot, it must be a lot higher than that, and it has been like that for a number of years. So we do have to balance the two options. When I hear comments about the protection of additional historic calving grounds, I have to say that if I bring that back to my Board, the Board makes the ultimate decision, but I will let you know that it's going to be a very, very tough pill to swallow, especially given the levels of prohibitions that are currently on IOLs in the Kitikmeot.

So that was the reaction that you saw from me. There is a lot of frustration on my Board about the levels of prohibitions. So I apologize for poorly representing the KIA and Inuit. That was not my intent, but the message is what I wish everybody hears clearly now. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Luigi, and I think people understood and understand. It's a difficult situation to be in. I'm just going to check with the communication folks and see if the buzz has gone. It will be sad if it has. I apologize for the delay.

I'll ask Tommy to do an opening prayer, and then we'll get into the meeting.

Tommy: (*Opening Prayer*)

David: A couple of quick housekeeping items: in terms of the caribou workshop itself, probably most people are aware that we will work through today and this evening, but we can also work tomorrow morning until about noon on caribou. The Marine Workshop has been postponed. So we've got more time, and I think we can get through the agenda fairly easily in that time. We can tighten things up here and there. Sharon, did you have any housekeeping items?

Okay, some people have to leave, Miguel being one of them. Bruno has some time constraints as well, so we'll adjust today to make sure those who are leaving can provide their concluding remarks to the crowd before they go. So, I've got some suggestions, some ideas I want people to think about as we go forward in this.

A couple of principles: The first is this is a first generation Land Use Plan, as people have continually referenced, and we need to accept and embrace I think, the imperfections that will be in that Land Use Plan. We need also to recognize the three to four years before there is a complete review of this first generation Land Use Plan, that work will need to be done to address those imperfections. But if we continue to strive for perfection in the first Plan, then we'll never get the first Plan. So I'd ask people to get past this notion of trying to get it absolutely right. I know people have said that, but there is still a tendency to try and get it perfect, as perfect as possible, and it's just not going to happen.

The second thing is that calving grounds and the immediate post-calving grounds are of fundamental importance to caribou. I mean I don't think anybody is going to disagree with that. We need to do something. We need to provide some protection for caribou on those ranges, and arguably on the critical water crossings and perhaps some other critical migratory corridors. I'm going to suggest that we think of those protections as temporary. There is a real reluctance to – in some corners – to embrace permanent protection, even though other folks would love to see permanent protection.

In this first generation Plan, I want people to start thinking about the measures as temporary. I guess I'd propose that those measures need to be as explicit as possible in the Land Use Plan, but they will sunset in four to five years unless they are renewed through a Plan amendment process. Now that should provide enough assurance to folks who are concerned about setting aside too much land or protecting too much land. It's a temporary measure, not a permanent measure. It will sunset unless it's renewed through a Plan amendment. It won't automatically rollover. I think that should provide enough assurance for those who are, as Luigi has emphasized, concerned about not locking up too much land and losing economic opportunity, and at the same time providing enough assurance for those folks who want to see protection of caribou on calving grounds and other critical areas.

In the meantime, in the ensuing three to four whatever years, the GNWT, the GN, and all the other parties, but particularly the mining industry, have got to get together to address some of the uncertainties that currently exist and are currently of real concern to people. The definition of mobile protection measures, and the effectiveness needs to be tested. Mobile protection measures need to be better defined, and they need to be tested. There is not enough definition now, and there is certainly not enough experience now to suggest that mobile protection measures would be adequate on calving grounds. I think most people would agree with that. We're going to have to compromise, all of us, in this process if we're going to get to where we need to be. We're going to have to give a little to get little.

The research and monitoring program in the three to four years would also include better definition of the calving grounds, better definition of caribou movements, better understanding of the pressures that are affecting caribou numbers. That's going to require the Governments and Industry and Regional Organizations, and communities to really put a lot of effort into understanding what's happening. Because if we don't have a better understanding, then it's going to be harder and harder to do what we need to do, which is be better stewards of caribou. We've talked an awful lot about the need for action. Well, let's compel ourselves to act and do that by establishing temporary measures that will need an active engagement and a full Plan amendment to extend. If the work isn't done in the next three to four years, then it's going to be pretty hard to argue that those measures should be extended.

So I put that on the table. Think about it during the course of today and tomorrow. Nobody is here to make absolute decisions, but if you can take that back to your parent organizations and talk to them about that kind of concept, that kind of approach, then we may just have a much smoother Public Hearing in the end with respect to caribou at least. There is a question or comment in the back? Jimmy?

Jimmy: Thank you. Jimmy Haniliak, Elder Advisor...for the GN. Now I'm going to be Elder Advisor to the world again.

(Laughter)

We have been talking about protecting the caribou calving grounds from mining and anything else that they place in our land. One thing I haven't heard is that we have never talked about the predators – the wolves and the grizzly bears. They are the number one killers of caribou. We need to think about this and put something in place.

I have been trying to work on this for a lot of years and...*(pause of emotionality)*...Sorry about that. I get emotional when I'm talking about the animals that I survived on for over 60 years. I came from a nomadic family, and you know it's really tough surviving on the animals that are out there. And we need to do something. You know I've been talking about predation for many years, and when I talk about this, I want to protect any calving ground, any caribou in Nunavut or NWT. Wolves, grizzly bears are the number one killers of our caribou, especially when they are calving.

These predators, even from a very, very long ways, they can smell. They have really good smell. Come calving time, you know they use their smell to look for these newborn calves. That's why in my region in the Kitikmeot on Victoria Island, our wolf population and our grizzly population have drastically increased by really big numbers. And I think from past experience, I think now we're well over the – I'm going to say the 500 mark, but that's not the number. I'm just using that. If we are going to protect the calving grounds, we have to put something in place for the predators that are out there.

I'm going to give you one example a couple of years ago – two or three years ago. I was on a hunting trip about 60 miles west of Cambridge on Victoria Island, and that's when the migration of the herd was heading to the east from the west. In a one-mile radius – not radius but along the coast – I ran into at least 7 or 8 caribou that were put down by wolves, and they were only half eaten. That's why for so many years I've been talking about predation. I want to protect the caribou herd.

I, myself, I can't eat wolf, and I can't eat grizzly bear. Very few are in the same boat as me, and we need to include – if you want to protect the calving ground – we need to include these predators. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I have a lot more to say, but I'm going to stop here for now. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jimmy. I've been asked to remind people or suggest to people that when they speak, they speak a little bit further back from the mike. I guess there is some more buzz. We've got some time constraints again. What I'm going to suggest is that we move into the agenda, and if people have comments about each part of the agenda, great. If they have more general comments, then let's park it. You want to make the comments short, because we do have limited time. Bartholomew?

Bartholomew: (*Translated*) Qujannamiik. I'd like to take this opportunity to say what I have in mind. Although I have many things I could talk to you about, I will keep it short. There is one thing I notice here - a lack of working relationships amongst many groups. Although we have the same idea, we're talking about the same subject of caribou calving sites, our areas do not have many large herds, although they come to our region.

The caribou coming up to our area, south migration, east, west, come in from the Baffin Island area and come to our region crossing winter icings. The caribou herd migrate the southern way, and on their way up, there are a lot of female caribou coming into calving grounds. Lately we have been noticing that the calves that were born last year and should be traveling with the herd, are no longer to be seen at the same time. Although you know, as uses of the caribou, we like tender meat sometimes, yearlings, but they are not appearing. Although female calves are coming up migrating north able to feed their young, there are no yearlings coming up.

They are very vulnerable at a tender age, just being born during the year, and they are very good targets, easy species to catch. Wolverines, foxes, and wolves – the predators know where to catch, even for young seal pups in the spring. So there are predators, and their favorite catch in any species are the younger species of any kind. We have done our part in many areas to keep the land clean, not leaving debris behind in the field that would interrupt any kind of animal species. This has been our practice for many years.

As an Elder, we have been taught for many years how to conduct ourselves, not only for cleanliness but for protection of animals as well. As Inuit hunters, it's partly our fault too that we are leaving debris behind. Too many times we blame Industry, explorations and the mines. They appear to be our targets. When it's about water, about environment, garbage, we blame this. For me at my age, I was taught how to cut and preserve what I have cut. If we didn't keep that practice long ago, it would be bad for us. If we don't practice what we are taught, it leads to starvation and poor hunting lifestyle. And that thing that was taught to us is coming in today where younger hunters are being careless.

We do this. We care about this species, because we still need it for food. Many people not working cannot afford to buy from the store, the cans. If people aren't working and are careful and listen to the practices, they can feed themselves. They can have food. Exploration will not stop. Earlier I mentioned working relationships. Even today the new companies coming up here appear to be very careless at times. Why is this so? They create noise. They create smoke. They create many things that would disturb migrating caribou, but if we work together... It's really the noise, too that we're aware of. There is too much activity. Not only are they being disturbed by other species, their problem is compounded by noise, the smell, and it's really hard now for Elders to reach the ranges at times.

For instance, we go out hunting sometimes, especially in warmer months. I'm ready to shoot. I'm ready to harvest my food. Next thing I know, I have some mechanized noise coming into my region and smell coming in. I tell you, calving grounds are very important, especially the springtime when they are giving birth. This is short, but thank you for listening to me.

GEOGRAPHIC DELINEATION

- David: Thank you. So let's get on with the agenda. We left off at Item 16, so let's pick it up there. I know some of the GN folks have time constraints. They have to be out of here at noon. I'll open it up for discussion. There has been some debate about the definition – geographic definition of calving grounds, post-calving grounds. I'd remind people that it doesn't have to be perfect this time around, but it needs to be good. And I'd suggest the best information we have right now is the GN mapped polygons. So I'll open it up for questions of the GN with respect to the methods that they've used and confidence that they have in the zones that have been defined – calving, post-calving and others if need be. Warren.
- Warren: Thank you, David. Warren from the KWB. I'll be brief. I gave my IQ presentation the other day, and the delineation was not the focus of the IQ that we collected. It was discussed a bit in the workshops that we held with the HTOs. And at least in terms of the Qamanirjuaq calving ground, the Rankin and Whale Cove HTOs kind of basically said those are some of the main calving grounds, especially around Whale Cove and Rankin. So there is some corroboration for IQ for that. Their areas are a bit larger, but they basically came to the conclusion that yeah, this would work for the HTOs as a minimum area that they want to see protected. Thank you.
- David: Thanks, Warren. As a minimum area and as an interim measure. Okay. Other comments? Mike?
- Mike: Mike Settingerton with the Chamber of Mines. I agree with David's comment that it's probably the best information that we have available. However, that said, there was a recommendation made last Monday night in the Kivalliq Inuit Association's presentation suggesting that perhaps it could be better to find if it were restricted to the previous 10 years of data. In addition to that, the Chamber provided a technical review to the GN raising issues, but also importantly raising recommendations. So we had 6 issues with the analysis – sorry 8 issues with the analysis and 8 recommendations. Our interest in presenting those issues and recommendations is because it's important to land users – not only the mining industry – but it's important to the land users to be clear on what these areas are and what's going to be occurring.
- So that's why we have the 8 issues and 8 recommendations, plus the additional recommendation that the Kivalliq Inuit Association presented. So my question to the GN is are they able to address those issues and recommendations in what I heard to be a final analysis of these areas coming some time in the near future?
- David: GN? Mitch? Tommy is reminding us to slow down.
- Mitch: Okay, yeah. This is Mitch Campbell of the GN. We have looked at the Chamber of Mines issues, and we are not in agreement that those are issues with our analysis. We stand beside our analysis being quantitatively sound and supported in the literature. I can turn over specific questions. Perhaps that might be easier to our GIS analyst that has come down to try and flesh out those ideas a bit more, because I think there is some misunderstanding on the side of the Chamber of Mines of what the GN position is.

Another issue I would like to present, which probably feeds to this misunderstanding is that the work that this was based on is still just coming out. So we have been working on that in terms of developing the methods section and putting the publication out that supports this. That has been a work in progress with all the other issues that have been going on. We have been delayed in releasing that. So I think that all the information perhaps, wasn't available to everybody to look at, which has caused some of the problems obviously.

These positions have been consulted with Inuit generally and certainly within the Kivalliq region. There has been general agreement, but as the KWB just indicated, the main criticism of the GN polygons from not just Wildlife Boards but also other groups such as the BQCMB and other groups, is that our polygons are far too small for calving, and they need to be expanded considerably.

A couple of things before I turn it over to Jason: We have had since the development of these polygons, which was done in collaboration with the GNWT with their ungulate biologists, as well as the BQCMB. We are more restrictive in our analysis than the BQCMB would have liked, so we consulted everyone but came up with our own position. When this happened, we had a commitment of returning every five years, so this is not new. I know people have recommended it, but this has always been our intent since the 2012 data was released. Because all these polygons are based on data current to 2012, and the next revision will be in 2017, we'll be using all the data up to 2017, and we'll also be examining the methods that we used to draft the polygons and looking for alternative ways. Our consultant here – our subject matter expert on GIS here – can also speak a little bit that the process has already begun, and we've been looking at alternative methods. However, I want to be very clear that so far, the general consensus is that the methods we have currently used are the best. So far with what we've examined, it looks like we chose a very effective method to develop our position.

And then regarding the 10-year consideration of data that was brought forward by a speaker for the Kivalliq Inuit Association, people need to understand that is conceptual at the moment. It has just been thrown out there without any background to support it. It doesn't mean that idea is not being explored. It is. And as I had mentioned in my questions back to the presenter, we believe that 10 years is far too short a period, and it sounded like the presenter and also our colleagues from other jurisdictions are willing to look at that, discuss it, and develop it further so it is well reviewed.

We are trying to be very careful to stay away from conceptual ideas that are not grounded in science of some form, of testing, of understanding the effectiveness of these methods. From that perspective, we do not want to use the potential long-term implications on caribou that could be negative or likely will have negative effects. We do not want to experiment there. When measures go into these populations, they had better be vetted extremely well. We better know that they are going to be effective, not guess, so that everybody knows what they are getting when that comes into play. Right now that doesn't exist. So these are all some of the things that we're trying to make sure that we do our homework here.

The GN position is an information-driven position: information from IQ, from peer-reviewed science, from our experience, and our own investigations. We've been trying to maintain that position all the way through, and we're going to continue to do that. So, I'd like to turn it over to Jason and then make a request to the Chamber of Mines that they could maybe break down the questions. Jason Shaw and I can help them along as well to try and answer the questions that they had. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Before you pick up the mike, Jason, I guess that's exactly the kind of cooperative and collaborative process that we need to engage in, not just around this table and not just in the immediate following days, but in the years to come. The best information available now is not going to be the best information available in five years' time. Our knowledge evolves. Caribou populations are dynamic, and the opposing views need to be reconciled to the extent possible immediately and in the longer term. It gets back to what Bartholomew was saying that sometimes we seem to be working in silos instead of working together. So the better understanding that you and the Chamber have about the questions that the Chamber has and about your methodologies, the better for everybody. So I'd really encourage that.

We're not going to get into all the details today, but your offer of working together with the Chamber outside this room is welcome. I suspect the Chamber feels the same way. So let's just keep that momentum going. Again, I want to remind people that we're not in a quest for perfection. We're in a quest for "good enough for now" with work to be done over the ensuing months and years. So let's not shoot ourselves in the foot by looking for the tenth decimal place when we haven't gotten the integer right. Jason, you want to pick it up? Miguel?

Miguel: Miguel with NTI. Just while it is still on the table with regard to the 10-year period, before we move on to something else. Just a really quick comment with regard to the 10-year period: I'm no expert in the field, but Mitch, two days ago you said that 10 years - you cannot predict what caribou are going to do in 10 years. So therefore, to me it just makes sense that we would look at a 10-year period. It's just a comment, and I don't necessarily need a response. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Miguel. Mitch, would you like to respond?

(Laughter)

Mitch: Yeah, Mitch Campbell, Department of Environment. I think that was in a different context, if I remember correctly. What we're talking about, I believe, in the context of...there are two different things here: modeling versus looking at an information chunk of time. We need to make sure that it's well defended in the biology of the species we're dealing with from a scientific perspective.

So what we're talking about is what time series of data do you use that has a biological significance to the species you're dealing with? It's very clear from the data that regardless of the literature and experience that generally speaking, though we know caribou calving grounds do shift, it's over an extremely large or long period of time. And this is particularly true for mainland migratory populations. We are talking...it varies some. It could be 60, 70, 80 years, 100 years for the Qamanirjuaq herd. They have never shifted their calving ground in recorded history, so certainly over a 100-year period.

So using a 10-year window can be problematic. But having said that, I'm raising it as a concern that needs to be very carefully researched and looked at. It needs to include IQ and other types of Traditional Knowledge to try and capture what a significant period would be. I think so we have to just make in this forum here, because we have subject matter experts in a lot of different areas, we just want to let folks know that sometimes these kinds of things get mentioned, but they have no validation behind them. So we have to make sure that we don't look at these as potential ways

forward right now. These conceptual ideas need work to know if they are going to be effective or not.

It's like everything else, that's going to take time. We don't want to put these ideas in play right now to solve the problem quickly, when they could end up causing huge problems down the line. That is not the way we want to approach that, certainly from the GN standpoint. We want to make sure that when we go into the communities with a potential way forward, we're giving them high quality defensible positions and methods to move forward with what we have confidence in, and that also includes the Inuit knowledge as part of that process. I don't know if that helps clarify that. Thank you.

Miguel: Thank you, Mitch. That was a great response.

David: I'm going to let Jason do his thing, and then we'll get back to questions if there are questions. I know David has questions, and Luigi. But Jason go ahead, please.

Jason: Thank you. Jason Shaw, Caslys Consulting. Thanks for having me here today. In response to the Chamber of Mines issues and recommendations, instead of addressing them one by one, I'll give a little bit of a background that will hopefully clear up some of the questions. Then if there is further clarification needed, I can do that.

So we are working with the GN and GNWT in an inter-jurisdictional approach for a data-driven methodology for finding the seasonal ranges. Because there is quite a difference in movement between the seasons, there are two steps or two types of analyses that we ran. The low movement seasons used the individual point locations, whereas the high movement migrations used the walk lines or the paths. Each subpopulation was run independently, and then compiled into the larger territory.

Now with this analysis, there are many different ways of defining home ranges, and they have been developed over a number of years to best fit available information – so telemetry, very high frequency, collars, to GPS collars that have more accuracy.

Three main analyses are minimum convex polygons, kernel density estimators, and then some higher end Kriging and more mathematical models. MCPs or minimum convex polygons tend to overestimate ranges, as they take the maximum area of the data. Kernel density estimators model the locations based off of density functions and is the most commonly accepted method of range delineation. With the advancement of location data, more advanced models are being developed, for instance Kriging, but it's still in works and needs more normally distributed data not typically seen in telemetry data.

For this analysis, we chose the most commonly used method, which is the kernel density. The main variables in this analysis are your cell size of what the data is being summarized as, and the search radius. In some of the Chamber of Mine's comments, the search radius, or the buffering distance, was a concern or brought up as a potential area for improvement.

There are many different ways of looking at this search radius, and it's often the issue or the area where comments or concerns can be brought into. One common way of looking at the data, or finding the search radius, is called the least cross square validation, but it often underestimates the

area. It's usually good for individual animals, for instance bears. For the data, we did run a test, and it's about 2 kilometers for the search radius.

The other size is a reference to search radius selection, and it is often overestimating the ranges. Accepted practice is to take 0.7, or 70% of that value, which is about 14 kilometers. For this analysis, we use the 11-kilometer search radius, which is lower than the 14 kilometers. It is based on avoidance behavior from the John Boulanger paper. It is also minimum distance that produces a fairly continuous range, representing the seasonal use of the herd animals.

So once this analysis is run, you get the density surface, which is then put into bins for the utilization distribution. For the low movement seasons, the 95th density value contour was used, and it was modified to move outliers, as well as to connect any small island polygons that were close to the main grouping. Again, this was a data-driven approach so that any polygons removed had to have a higher density within it.

For migration corridors, there was a different approach taken where the data was examined to find the individual start and stop times for every collar for every year. Then yearly density values for these walk lines were produced and combined into full dataset surface. For the migration corridors, the 80% contour value was used, and it was not modified.

So one of the issues or recommendations that the Chamber of Mines has identified are the smaller polygons – I believe they identified 30 polygons – that don't fit the herd's major core area. Since this is a data-driven approach, if there was a higher density involved, they were left and remained in the dataset. Most of these islands or smaller polygons are associated with the tundra wintering caribou herds and not the migratory.

One of the other issues or recommendations was the confusion or un-clarity of what was based on the Nagy analysis from 2011-2012. Our approach built upon this analysis and used the herd affiliations for the collars, as well as the fleshed out seasonal date ranges that was worked on by John Nagy and the Department of Environment of the GN.

I hope my explanation wasn't too technical. If there are any questions that I can clarify, I will be happy to answer. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jason. It was too technical for me, and I may not be the only one in the audience. But if the subject matter experts are communicating and resolving their differences, great. Mike, do you have any follow-up?

Mike: Mike Settington of the Chamber of Mines. So I'm going to start off by rephrasing Mitch Campbell's answer - did you consider any of our recommendations? I would say yes, you have considered some of our recommendations, because you just did provide clarity on some of the methods. So again, I understand that you're providing a final document and methodology on what's been done, so if you can incorporate some of that discussion that you just had, that would be useful and help us out.

We still do have a few concerns, but honestly it's not worth going through it now. It's more about the acceptance of the areas than whether it's a decimal place difference or not. It doesn't really matter. It's the groups around here and whether they accept the areas or not. If Bruno Croft from the GNWT has basic agreement that's the calving ground of the Bathurst caribou, then it's not an

issue for us. It's just we need clarity on the methods, because as a consultant of the mining industry, they come to me and ask what do these areas mean? I need the clear methods of how they are defined, as opposed to just saying that's what the Government says of the calving areas. I need the methods behind that. The mining industry has become a lot more sophisticated in the past 20 years than it has been in the past where we just took the areas for granted. We're just as interested in knowing how those areas are defined as anyone else. So that's why I had those recommendations. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Mike, although I've got to say, I don't understand your distrust of government.

(Laughter)

What I want to encourage is that you guys continue to talk and continue to work together, because when it comes time for the public hearing, nothing would please the Commission more than to have both organizations come forward and say yeah, it's good enough for now. We're going to work together to make it better. What I hear GN saying is that the calving grounds, post-calving grounds are conservative in estimation. I hear some of the communities saying that they're not nearly big enough, and the BQ Board saying that. That's something that will be a work in progress as the methodologies get better defined, as the tracking research and monitoring programs kick in. But what I'm striving for now is good enough, not perfect. So David, Luigi, and Jackie.

David Lee: Thank you, David. David Lee with Nunavut Tunngavik. I just wanted to respond to one of the queries that were put forward to the GN. I know Mitch was being as open as possible, and I appreciate that. With respect to the examination of the 10-year period for the spatial telemetry data, I appreciate that Mitch and the GN is open to looking at that.

As a subject matter expert, my response would be that the analysis that the GN has done with their current period, even though they have not provided a strict biological rationale, is satisfactory. The reason I'd like to mention that is because if we are looking at the spatial distribution of at least two generations of caribou, then we would be looking at least 20 years, depending what the generation time is for the specific herd. I realize there are different generation times. For those that are not familiar with generation times, I'll just give a basic definition, which is the average age of the cohort for caribou for that particular subpopulation that we're dealing with – the average age.

So when doing status assessments for other species, typically we will look at least two and up to three generations. So if we were seriously examining what the spatial distribution of caribou are in the area, I think looking at 10 years as a minimum is understandable. I understand why there is that desire, but two generations – 20 years – is not unreasonable and does have biological justification. Thank you.

David: Thanks, David. Luigi?

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Just a comment: Please look at the data also regionally, because there are differences. This is just a comment. I'm not asking for anything in addition to that. It's not question.

David: Mitch, I can see a body reaction there.

Mitch: No. Thank you, it's Mitch Campbell, GN. Yeah, we will be, of course, looking at that. These herds are not all identical. They have a lot of mainland migratory caribou – the behaviors are very consistent between them, but landscapes tend to change distribution, things like that. Point well taken. I just wanted Luigi to know we will be looking into that. Thanks.

David: Thank you. Earl and then Jackie.

Earl: Thank you. Earl Evans, BQ Board. Just a question for Jason there: When those movements were running there, I see you had the telemetry dates at the top, but you didn't have the years on them. Is that over a period of years, or is that just one year over and over?

Jason: Thank you. Jason Shaw. That was all the data – the telemetry data – compiled together. So it's regardless of the year. So when you're looking at the date, it's April 26th to May 6th for any year.

David: And just to remind people, how many years total?

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. Mitch Campbell, GN. There is about 25 years of data being projected there, which just as an additive thing, looking at the patterns, the fact that those patterns obviously have repeated themselves for 25 years is a very significant thing. This is one of the reasons we wanted to put together that animation. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Jackie?

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Thank you for the information shared this morning. My comment is a follow-up to what Luigi had just mentioned. The Qikiqtaaluk region is a region not well represented within the GN's submission, and we understand that's for a variety of reasons. Therefore, I just wanted to place it on the record that QWB and other organizations within this region will be working to develop our own recommendations for areas of protection. We just remind and ask all members around the table to be aware that our approach will be more focused on IQ and community experience. We will be drawing on scientific information done within our region, and we have received information from various sources to assist us in that. But again, I just wanted to affirm, at least from the QWB perspective, we'll be bringing forward our own recommendations of areas based on knowledge of our community members and informed by the research done, and that we will be wholly unapologetic in doing that. Just so you guys know. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jackie. That was pretty clear. Mitch?

Mitch: Yes, thank you very much and thanks, Jackie. It's Mitch Campbell, GN, and not that I need to add this, but I feel obliged to add this. The lack of polygons developed for the Baffin area is clearly an issue that has not been dealt with from the GN, but it does not mean they are not significant areas. Obviously they are. There are a lot of significant issues. What I can say is that from the GN perspective, we will commit to helping out in any way we possibly can and moving forward and trying to collect information of moving forward in a way that respects community direction and how they want to see this progress. We'll make that commitment at this point, because we understand there are data deficiencies there, and we need to make that up. Thanks very much.

David: Thank you, Mitch. Bruno?

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Real quick just to follow-up on Mike's comment here a bit earlier: We worked with data for quite some time now – mid 1990s, and it has never failed to find more caribou where you have lots of collars, less when you have less collars, and very few when there are no collars. When you get to the calving ground, there is an additional layer of information that we could easily look at – nothing to do with collars – and that's the results of the systematic reconnaissance surveys, photographic surveys, visual surveys, and composition surveys done on the calving areas of the Bathurst herds since the mid-1990s, and Bluenose East since the mid-2000s.

These surveys clearly show you regardless of where the collars are – although they perfectly match with each other - high density of breeding animals, medium density of breeding animals, and lower densities of breeding animals. This information is available on our website. We are always under a lot of pressure to release this as soon as possible after surveys so everybody can see them. You can access that. We can provide them to you. Just for my own sake, if you look at the Bathurst and the Bluenose East – I don't know if there is a map here of a core calving area, Mr. Chair. If you overlay the results of our surveys over the years on top of those kernels, they perfectly match. If anything, in the case of the Bathurst, they are a little bit smaller than what our surveys have shown over the time where those breeding concentrations are located. If you don't need the collars to define calving areas, we can help you out with other things. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

David: Thanks, Bruno. Peter.

Peter S: Thanks. Peter Scholz, NPC. I have two technical questions. The first question is regarding how key access corridors were defined. The reason I'm asking the question is I've been looking at the animation. For the Bathurst and the Qamanirjuaq, what's marked as key access corridors are small gray blobs that you can see that sort of match the red that the GN provided. Could you move a little bit more so we can see? So it's the same area. But for the Beverly herd, there is a very large gray blob marked on this map as a key access corridor, but on that map, the red is quite small. I'm just wondering a little bit about that.

And a point of clarification for myself: I've heard three terms, and I don't know if they are synonymous or not. I heard the term 'immediate post-calving.' I've heard the term 'three week post-calving,' and I've heard the term 'post-calving.' I'm confused as to whether these are the same words or not and whether they have planning implications. Thank you.

David: Mitch?

Mitch: Thank you. Mitch Campbell, GN. I'll speak to the post-calving terminology and then I'll turn over the key access corridor description to Jason. I can also speak to that as well if necessary. For the post-calving, the post-calving as defined by the GN is a period that was drawn from movement data showing when calving caribou start to become mobile to a point in time when calves become more free-ranging. There are a lot of different ways of delineating that. I believe that what you heard are different names for different people's ways of delineating post-calving.

One of the problems I think that has been raised here that question brings up, is that obviously people are not getting together on how to define these areas. So we need to get together and come up with a standard term and move forward with this. The GN would like to – because we've done an enormous amount of work in developing these seasonal ranges and because we're going to have

these seasonal ranges and methods etcetera that will be published soon – we would like to hear from people and try and standardize this so everybody is talking apples.

That's going to help this process quite a bit, because the differences between those definitions are very negligible, very small. I'll turn the next portion over to Jason. Thank you.

David: Just before you do, can you think of a process that would engage the folks around the table to talk about this over the next few hours and offer up some kind of plan to move forward with these discussions? I mean I appreciate the commitment, but I'd like to see the plan.

Mitch: Yeah, so as we said, the GN is not going to vary from its position of the definition of the seasonal ranges. We believe these are all justifiable. We have developed a method that we believe is extremely good to define these, and a method that communities we have consulted so far also agree with. It's a good representation of their sets. There are some differences there, but there is general agreement.

So I think what we need to do – and I'm not trying to move around what you're saying, David – what we need to do is get that publication out and use that as a starting point. But for this group's understanding, these methods have been developed with the jurisdictional subject matter experts, including inter-jurisdictional boards as well as through a consultative process that is not completed yet but is ongoing. So there is a lot of agreement on this way forward. I think what we need to do, having seen the Chamber of Mine's review and some other comments, is that we need to make those positions much clearer – define them and get them out in a publication so that people can have a chance to discuss it at that level. We are committed to trying to do that with the GNWT hopefully in the next couple of months. We're really going to try to push that thing out the door. Thanks.

David: Okay, but I would also like to see a working group, to be blunt, struck by yourselves. Include the Chamber and include other parties, and I suspect Luigi would like to be included in that discussion so that you can work together in a structured way to move this thing forward. So when it comes to the Public Hearing, the differences are minimal. I find it frustrating to leave a discussion with commitments but not a plan. I'd like to see a plan. Mike?

Mike: Mike Settington with the Chamber. I'd just like to support what Mitch Campbell was saying moving forward in an evidence-based approach. That's fine. All we're asking for is clarity and transparency on the methods, and that is what Mitch is suggesting will be provided. That doesn't take a working group approach, from our perspective right now. When it comes to Traditional Knowledge and you have to include that, then that wouldn't be something the Chamber would be involved in, but we put our recommendations forward. We need methods that we can actually replicate ourselves, so that's the kind of clarity that we're asking for. That doesn't take a workgroup. That just takes a good writing and a peer-reviewed process, and that's what we're asking for.

David: Okay, great. Thanks. Luigi.

Luigi: Mr. Chair, Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I support your stance on a timetable. Having been involved in the publication process, those processes can take a very, very long time, and we don't have a lot of time. So I know there is concern about data and how the data is going to be

handled, but the information needs to be available and assessed, possibly before a publication comes out. So I support your position on it, Mr. Chair.

David: Alright, I'm buying the beer tonight.

(Laughter)

Following up on this, there was a working group established to develop this agenda. Perhaps that working group can move forward in coordinating the various elements of further discussion. I don't know. You guys need to sort that out. That's all I'm going to say about it. Leslie.

Leslie: Just for general purposes for those not in the know, which is most of us in this room I think, about the intricacies of this analysis that we're talking about, there are lots of definitions of calving and post-calving grounds in the literature, and I've reviewed them for the Board. Part of it is because the dates are actually different for different herds, and the GN has been dealing with that. But I think a great deal of it is in evolution in our knowledge and the techniques available. So things that Peter mentioned and that we deal with, it's a function of looking at older literature and older summaries, and people setting dates and times based on the information they had available at that time.

So as an example, the Porcupine Caribou Management Board dates are different than the BQ Management Board dates, partly because they're looking at different herds, and partly because they looked at things differently – but also because of the different information they used. So now we're in a new era. We have new techniques, and we're way, way ahead of the game really compared to the past. But still when people look at the literature, there will be this confusion, because people are using different dates, and they are using terms differently too. The term 'post-calving' is most problematic, because people use it to mean different things. So even in the most recent paper that was provided over the phone the other day, they actually include post-calving in their calving season definition.

So just so people know, a lot of the confusion is not caused by disagreements so much as different methods, times, and evolving knowledge. So I think going to what we know now and the methods that are available now, it'll be able to be sorted out, so I don't think people need to be really anxious about huge disagreements. There are great methods now, and people need to just it down and agree on the best way to use the information that is available. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Leslie. Jason.

Jason: Thank you. Jason Shaw. The main differences between the migration corridors that you see on the two screens are on the animations. The hatching is the full spring migration corridor. Part of the submission and what you see on the opposite side here are the key access corridors, which are the spring migration corridors within the post-calving range and outside of the calving range. Thank you.

David: Okay. Any other comments, questions? Okay, what I'm going to suggest is that we have a moderate consensus, I think, on accepting the polygons as proposed by the GN for calving and post-calving, however you want to define it. I guess there will be a clearer definition of that, but it's probably close enough for our purposes now. So what we're going to do is take a short break, and then we're

going to talk about what it is that we do or don't do in the key ranges. I'd suggest that rather than the 9 seasonal ranges that are set out in the agenda, we focus really on two: calving and post-calving. The three to four week period following calving would be, as a rule of thumb, the post-calving range – and then the key corridors. This would include important freshwater crossings, important sea ice crossings, and other important key corridors that caribou use consistently over the years.

So we're not going to look at nine. We're going to look at two basically. What I want people to do is start thinking about what activities they would like to see permitted, what activities they'd like to see prohibited, and how they would suggest those would be addressed in the Land Use Plan as explicitly as possible. We also need to talk about the mobile protection measures, what that entails, and how we can move forward on better definition and better application of those concepts. So let's take a 15-minute break and move away from the spatial and into the actions

BREAK

Mainland Migratory Caribou - Calving and Post-Calving

David: I've been asked to remind people again to sit back from the mikes. These ones are apparently super sensitive, and I'll have to remind myself periodically too. So, now that we've had some discussion and some level of comfort about the geographic delineation of calving and post-calving grounds, we need to start talking about what kind of protection would be required to ensure that the caribou aren't disturbed in those critical areas.

I'm also asked to remind folks that we're not starting from a blank slate here. There are already activities that are permitted occurring in some calving grounds. Some rights have been issued in some calving grounds, so that needs to be considered in the discussion, particularly the grandfathering of those rights and the extent to which those rights are grandfathered down the road. We've had some discussion in previous workshops about mineral rights being grandfathered from mineral claim through to reclamation and restoration. I don't think there was a huge level of comfort with that approach, but we need to talk about it some more in the context of what sorts of activities would be permitted in calving grounds, and what sorts of activities would not be, and then what research and monitoring is required in the interim period to better understand mobile protection measures and other means of protecting caribou while they're in those areas.

I also suggested that we break the ranges into two categories: calving and post-calving being one, and then key corridors, key crossings being another. In the latter case, seasonal restrictions might be appropriate for some activities, but physical infrastructure is clearly a problem. So I'm going to open it up for discussion, but I did ask Ken Landa to talk a little bit about the degree of precision that would be desirable in the Land Use Plan. So Ken, if you could touch on that please.

Ken: Sure. Thank you, David. Ken Landa with Justice Canada. One of the challenges of this process, not just on caribou but throughout the Plan development, will be to take the concepts of what should and shouldn't happen, or what should happen but the conditions that should be applied, and translate those into the specific text of the Land Use Plan. And the Land Use Plan has to be applied and implemented and used. So that has to support people to do project design and project

description so they can write a project description that allows the Planning Commission to look at it in a very short turnaround – I think it's 45 days to do a conformity determination – not gather new evidence, but take objectively descriptive characteristics of a project, compare that to the text of the Land Use Plan and say, "This conforms," or "It doesn't conform but a variance would be appropriate," or "This doesn't conform and no variance is appropriate." To do that, it's necessary that we move away from subjective criteria like "must not unduly disturb caribou." How do you figure out how much disturbance is due and how much is undue? You need to be able to translate these things into very specific activities that can or can't be done.

I'll use an example from fish – That won't deal with caribou, but if you are talking about blasting, you would talk about a sound pressure level that can't be exceeded. It's objective. You know exactly what can and can't be done in a certain area. That's important to make that conformity determination. It's important – I'll go back and do it in a better sequence – it's important from project design, project description, conformity determination, and then the Government regulators for both Governments to ensure that their authorizations pick up these terms and conditions from the Land Use Plan and incorporate them into their authorizations. So, in order for that to work, you need fairly precise and objectively discernable, objectively testable conformity requirements throughout.

So I'll go back to where I started. That presents a considerable challenge in moving from concepts, like we'll have caribou protection measures. And that has to be translated into, well okay, what does that mean? What are you allowed to do? What are you not allowed to do? What are you required to do specifically, and what are the triggers for having to do those things? Can those things all be described at that early stage of project description at a relatively low level of investment, because the project hasn't been approved yet? This is all at the earliest stage when proponents are not able to, or willing to, invest. And we're not just talking about Industry. We may be talking about researchers etcetera, who have got to figure out exactly how do I design my project in a way that meets all the requirements of the claim, describe my project so people can read how it meets all the requirements of the claim, and then the Commission applying the claim can go from one document to the next and say, "Yes, I understand how this project meets the requirements of the Plan." I think I said 'claim' a number of times. What I meant to say was 'Plan.' Since I'm having trouble staying slow, I'll just stop.

(Laughter)

David: Yeah, I haven't used the mute button today. To pick up on Ken's comments, there are blunt instruments that we can use, and there are sharper instruments we can use. So, a blunt instrument, for example, would be prohibition on the issuance of new mineral rights. Prohibition on registering new mineral claims – that's a blunt instrument. That stops those activities. There are other sharper instruments that could be used, and that's what we need to talk about now.

Let's start with calving and post-calving. What activities, what prohibitions would people support, and what activities, if any, would people support on the calving and post-calving grounds? I've heard, well we heard from Kivalliq Inuit Association the day before yesterday about an approach on calving grounds where there is high mineral potential then activities could continue, but where there was low mineral potential, there would be a prohibition. That's neither here nor there, I suspect, in terms of an easy approach. So I'll open it up for people to put their thoughts on the table about what activities. Let's start with prohibitions: Mining is an area people are clearly

uncomfortable with on calving grounds. What about mineral exploration? Is that an activity that people would want to see happen? Somebody put something on the table. Bartholomew?

Bartholomew: Qujannamiik. (*Translated*). I think more protection of the species is in question, and there is no doubt there needs to be protection. Surveyors, the mining industry and Inuit - the main users – I have not seen a cooperation yet. We appear to be a long way. Inuit and Government governing the species have not really worked together yet in terms of protection of the species. There appears to be some particular Boards here concerned about the species. Even though they are Boards that Industry and regulators share together, there appears to be a far difference in opinion. I keep referring to Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit, the users and people affected by caribou declining. The mining industry, the boards, the government, regulators, why can't you just sit together and come up with something instead of power playing what needs to be really corrected? I think by starting to cooperate rather than working independently you could accomplish a lot more. Thank you for this short information.

David: Thank you. I think that's what we're trying to do here. Yes, please. If you could introduce yourself for the record.

David S: (*Translated*): David Sisik, Gjoa Haven. Just a short comment: I am hearing your discussion. Every time caribou is the topic, we are becoming worried that a quota system will be introduced. Lack of information is giving us this that you're going to start coaching. So there seems to be a consensus to try and resolve the problem with the caribou herds. But with the mining industry, it's a big concern for us in Nunavut. Sometimes what you want to do is consult the communities with what your goals are in achieving what a good mine should be, but it appears to lack consultation to Inuit who are unilingual. The information is never really passed on. That appears to be the big problem with you as Industry. When you come to Inuit, people who depend most of the time on the land for caribou food, when I hear people meeting on caribou, you have detailed discussions. I'll echo what was said to work together, resolve something, and something will happen. Thank you.

David: Thank you. Before we go to the next speaker, I'll bring people's attention to what's on the screen. Currently in the Land Use Plan, those are the prohibited uses. Leslie, there is somebody beside you who wants to speak? Tommy, can you read out what's on the screen right there?

Tommy: (*Translated screen*)

?Elder: (*Translated*): Thank you, Moderator. I'm with Environment Canada as an Elder representative. I grew up strictly in the land. I started at age 5, I've been hunting and living off the land since. This is how I grew up. Hunting is what I grew up on. I have intimate knowledge of what needs to be done with every level of game. Now here is my question. I have not heard about this for many years. Research, research – how is it working? What are you looking for? Numbers? What do the numbers tell me? Everything I hear is numbers. Before that, to understand I never needed numbers, but at the same time, although it was difficult, it was very strict rules to follow to hunt. Everything we did at the time was a matter of survival.

Dogs and caribou could hear each other miles away. Today we all know that calving sites are completely surrounded by exploration companies and mining companies, and you as researchers, don't you know that you should be aware of that now? Even whaling, we depended on whales. Even then, it's not safe to be on the shore when whales are migrating. It transmits sound. They have

acute hearing for sound in the water. Even helicopters transmit echoes, as if there were sonars. I have never heard these people that have knowledge. Don't researchers know that they hear? I'm concerned.

David: Mitch, do you want to take that on?

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. Mitch Campbell, GN. We are aware that a lot of these activities cause disturbance to caribou. We're aware of that, and to other wildlife. One of the things – and we hear this from our HTO meetings during consultation, and the RWOs as well – a couple of ways we've been trying to deal with this is first by trying to reduce the amount of activity for any kind of research or monitoring, especially with aircraft, to reduce that kind of disturbance. So we are aware that it occurs.

One of the other things we're trying to do is ensure that when we do these kinds of activities, that we have local representatives from HTOs with us that have input into when they believe these activities could be causing serious problems. So we're aware of that, and it's one of the issues that we're concerned about with many protection measures, which are part of monitoring and research. We have to be very careful that we're not actually impacting these animals while we're trying to help them, and that's a very real danger in moving forward that we have to be very careful with.

I don't know if that helps, but this is why these issues that we're speaking about here – about how to deal with disturbance – are so difficult, because sometimes the very methods that you're using to try and help sustain caribou populations are actually adding to the destruction of them. We're trying to strike that balance by assessing where these activities have greater and lesser impacts on caribou. We have an awful long way to go. We're definitely not there yet. We also need to do a better job of involving Inuit Elders, hunters, and Inuit organizations in the discussions around those kinds of activities and how they should proceed. I mean we definitely have a commitment from the Department of Environment. We know we're not perfect, but we're really trying to engage communities and make this work. But we do have a long way to go. I'm hoping that helps a little bit. Thanks.

David: Earl and then Leslie.

Earl: Earl Evans, BQ Board. I have a question for Mitch. Would ecotourism and photography and stuff like that fall under this category? Because I know this last summer, as a matter of fact, that requests have come in to do photography on the calving grounds. So that means aircraft, people on the ground – that is a form of disturbance. So would that fall under related research? And also I know out of Yellowknife with the ecotourism, there were a lot of planes landing beside the herds when they were migrating and moving to the calving grounds and taking pictures and causing the herds to scatter. So would that all fall under related research in that category, or would that be a separate category?

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. Mitch Campbell, GN. Thanks, Earl. That's an extremely good question. My understanding, and I'll let Amy speak to this and maybe the NPC could speak to this as well, is that those kinds of activities during the calving season, that's the key. There are two different ways of looking at this before I turn it over, just for clarity in the group here. One is activities that don't require any infrastructure development, so activities that will go onto a calving ground area, let's say, but they don't put any infrastructure up. If those activities were outside of the calving period,

obviously there are no issues there. Then there are issues of putting permanent infrastructure onto calving grounds. As an example for calving grounds or anywhere, the impacts are then there through the calving season as well – or there would be impacts through the calving season.

There are two different ways of looking at it. Just one more clarification speaking to this point: I was going to speak on it before, but I hadn't. I don't think that anyone has problems with exploration activities per se, as long as there is no permanent infrastructure, and they are not conducting them while the caribou are there. The problem is exploration activities would imply existing rights. So you don't expect that an organization would go into an area – calving ground or otherwise – spend money and time, and then be told later, "Jeez thanks for coming in and spending your money, but you can't come here because it's a calving ground." That's not a reasonable approach. It's not fair to that organization to do that. So that's the disconnect is that although exploration can easily be mitigated, that's not the issue. It's where the exploration can lead to through existing rights. That's where things can start to go off the rails. Maybe Amy can pull it back to your original question. Thanks.

Amy: Hi, Amy Robinson, GN. As Mitch mentioned, this is language from the 2014 Land Use Plan, so we'll let NPC clarify what they meant with regard to related research. I believe in our prior GN submission, we did ask for clarity on this point. Also, just to be clear, the GN's land use recommendations moving forward for these areas will be forthcoming in a subsequent submission to NPC. Mitch and our other wildlife biologists are here to provide their professional opinions on these matters, however.

Melanie: Melanie Wilson, Government of Nunavut. I just wanted to add one more comment, just elaborating on what Mitch had said regarding the different approaches to mitigation, and just to put a statement out there that there are many different types of mitigation that we can do on calving grounds. The first and most important mitigation is avoidance. There are two different ways to achieve avoidance. We can avoid spatially areas of importance, and we can avoid temporally areas of stages of life history that are important. I think we kind of need to think about those two ways of mitigation and how we can incorporate those into what we want to protect. Thanks.

David: Okay, thank you. Jonathan or Peter?

Peter S: Thanks, Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission. The related research in this list refers to research that relates to the items above it, not to anything else besides.

David: Alright, Leslie?

Leslie: Thanks. Leslie Wakelyn, BQCMB. I'm going to address David's question directly. The items that are prohibited uses as listed in the current Draft Land Use Plan, which are displayed here, would be supported as being prohibited uses by the BQCMB with the addition of winter roads as well. Also to more explicitly talk about the related research, for a Protected Area for a calving and post-calving ground where we are trying to protect the habitat, we would also say that geological surveys in terms of aerial surveys to investigate the potential – mineral potential – of the calving and post-calving areas should also be prohibited, because although they won't involve infrastructure on the ground, to Mitch's point, the point of it is to identify areas that could be developed for mining. If we were going to protect the habitat, then we don't see why that use would be allowed. So just for that point specifically. I guess that's it for now. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Leslie. Other comments? Jimmy?

Jimmy: Jimmy Haniliak, Elder Advisor. Maybe I'm lost. I don't know, but you can correct me. Prohibited uses – I see a list there. I come from the Kitikmeot, and we live on Victoria Island. We do have calving grounds on Victoria Island, and if the cows make it to the area where they migrate, if they make it that far... You know, I'd like to see shipping included, because we have a lot of drowned caribou. I'm going to take an example that took place in beginning of December. Without the knowledge of the community, there were a couple of ships that went through our Northwest Passage, and the ocean was already frozen. We had hunters already at the mainland. They knew nothing about the ships that went through. It's open water – the shipping route. What would happen if the guys were out on the mainland, and they were trying to get back home and they go through?

I always mention this over and over again about shipping. When our oceans freeze, there should be no shipping. I mentioned this over and over again. Sometimes, you know, I talk about shipping. I talk about predation. Sometimes I wonder. Who am I? Nobody is listening. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jimmy, and we will talk about the shipping aspect in the next section of this discussion. For now we're going to focus on caribou calving and post-calving grounds. Then we'll move into the other key areas. Sharon you had a comment?

Sharon: Just for clarification, following up on Leslie's comment – oh, sorry, Sharon Ehloak from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Earl, you asked about ecotourism and photography. An activity is an activity. If I was a caribou walking along - just from a caribou perspective - and I see a plane, I don't know if it's for a mine or if they are there for a photo-op. All I know is as a caribou, there is a plane. There is a person. There is an activity. So for us when we talk about these things for the Commission, we've said it many times. We need clear distinction, and if you're defining an activity on a calving ground, an activity is an activity. It doesn't matter if it's ecotourism or if it's photography or if it's mining. Clear direction needs to be given to that, and we need to remember that as the Commission, we're here to compile the data and the information and bring that forward for the Public Hearing for Commissioners to make informed decisions. So, remember from a caribou's perspective, a plane is a plane is a plane. They're there. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Sharon. I guess I'd reiterate Ken's comments earlier: The clearer the Plan is, the easier the conformity determination will be. The precision is of the essence here. The other thing I'd like to remind people about, at least from a perspective I suggest people think about, is that these are temporary prohibitions. They would be reviewed when the public review of the first Plan comes up and would only be extended through a Plan amendment. Leslie?

Leslie: Thanks for the question, Sharon. So to clarify, just to be specific, what we would say is that tourism activities that don't involve landing on the calving ground during calving and don't involve flying over the calving ground during calving and post-calving in this case, might be considered. But the list up here with the additions I made are talking about year-round prohibitions. So there would be two different types, whether they are year-round or not. That would differ depending on the actual activity. Does that make more sense? And then taking into account what Mitch said also about whether there is infrastructure involved or not – so it would be year-round prohibition on infrastructure. It would be year-round prohibition on mineral exploration for instance, because the

point of mineral exploration is to build a mine, which would be prohibited from the calving and post-calving area, but tourism activities or other activities that wouldn't involve landing on the calving ground at other times of the year might be permissible. Does that make more sense?

David: Yeah, that's clear and helpful. Warren?

Sharon: And just to be clear about David's comments for amendments, this is a first generation Plan. It is a living document. It doesn't have a sunset clause. I don't want anyone to think that these terms and conditions have a time-limited clause. They are in place until the Plan is reviewed, and new terms and conditions are put in place for an amendment process. So, if it is deemed that the existing terms and conditions were to carry forward into the next version of the Plan after consultation, then that is how it would be. There is no sunset clause on these, but it is a living document, and it will be reviewed at a minimum every five years. If someone asks for an amendment – there's new data – then the Commission would entertain that. That is what is outlined in the Land Claims Agreement. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Sharon. Just to be clear from my perspective, the Plan could include a specific component that says these prohibitions will sunset at a given date unless there is a Plan amendment to continue them. I think you need certainty, and we've talked about in other working sessions about the need to be clearer on the engagement process that would be followed by the Planning Commission in reviewing the first generation Plan and making potential amendments to it. So that's another element - the reassurance that's necessary for other parties to engage in this process comfortably and confidently. Warren, you had a comment?

Warren: Thank you very much, David. This is Warren for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. I have two comments actually. First, in reference to the sunset clause, I'm going to be talking to some other parties here to see if we can maybe propose some wording for, if not a sunset clause, a need for a specific review of aerial protection and to see if maybe we can get some buy-in and move past this conflict. I think that's in everybody's interest, so I'll have more on that later.

But for now I just want to comment on the tourism issue. I haven't discussed this extensively with the KWB Board. However, based on the IQ data I collected during these workshops held with each Kivalliq HTO with invited Elders and hunters and radio call-in shows in some cases, I think there wouldn't be a major concern with tourism provided that A.) It doesn't take place during the calving and post-calving season, because as I stated the other day, there are strict rules against entering the calving grounds from Elders in Whale Cove; and B.) That it doesn't include infrastructure of any kind, because the Elders in Arviat had instructed hunters not to build cabins in that area, not to leave tent frames lying around, or leave any garbage in the area. So provided that those Traditional Rules could be respected, I think the Board would be amenable to tourism in the area, but I would have to clarify with the Board before I could be sure of that. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Warren. There was a question from the back?

Bartholomew: (*Translated*): Thank you. Thank you, Moderator. This Technical Meeting, hearing the discussions is pretty exciting. It appears that it will be a good Public Hearing with this discussion going on. I see here it's pretty much lopsided. It appears to be all technical people. What are you going to present, just technical findings in a final product? There is some government here. I don't even know and have never heard of some organizations present here.

What about Government of Nunavut? Are you able to truly speak for your department executives so Inuit in Nunavut can understand where we stand with you as our government? I think it's also wrong that only the Government of Nunavut, especially your department head, could dictate and decide what's good for Nunavut in terms of this species. Mitch, you were asked a question by Liza about the collaring. Have you ever checked caribou heads? What other parts of caribou species are you able to research? Liza was asking questions to scientists surveying caribou herds. I think some people are concerned about caribou hearing and ears.

The mining industry – I know it's inconvenient and bothersome. People don't like that. One thing you have not mentioned to the mining industry, I have worked in that part, Nanisivik and Mary River. You don't mention this too much to Hunter's Organizations and conservationists who are totally against this industry. I know there is more that we could expand on like diamond mines. It's 180 miles from here. It's going to be a huge production, maybe a long-term production. For sure 180 miles, probably a 180-mile all-winter road will emerge because I haven't heard it being shipped by ships – Baker Lake, Meadowbank. They are finding more gold, and more expansion of winter roads are being discussed. They will want to have a road.

Once it's open, people who live up there, we will be able to utilize these roads. It's going to help us to use in terms of getting out there a long ways. It will help us to hunt in Baker Lake. You're not talking about any benefits of roads being emerged. It's all negative. Meadowbank, for instance, there was a proposal. I lived in Pond Inlet for five years. It's a good hunting ground, and they are going to build winter roads from Mary River towards Igloolik. It was a good idea, and people have utilized and benefited from the all-winter road. More facilities could have emerged, and especially in that rocky terrain, people have been able to travel further. You have to also talk about benefits of winter roads. I'm also a heavy equipment operator. It's good. I like what I was trained on. I have poor hearing now, because I worked for a long time in the industry. The benefits emerging are not being discussed.

The Government of Nunavut and mining industry representatives seem to be having a speaking contest to see who would be assisted most. Think about Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit being left out while these two organizations are battling it out to see who is right. You are leaving Inuit behind. You are leaving them out in the cold. They are not having much say in terms of animals, industry – all of us should be able to co-manage whatever the industry or conservation is being struck. You appear to be spending a lot of money on these kinds of meetings. What solutions have we seen? We are supposed to be working with this guy here, that guy there, and me. What solutions are we finding to make productive of this meeting. If you let me talk, it would be all day.

(Laughter)

David: Thanks, Bartholomew. I think you made your point. If you could introduce yourself, that would be great.

?Elder: *(Translated)*: I'm from Pond Inlet. We have active industry up there near us. The winter road wasn't there previously. Today it's there, but we don't have access to it as hunters. There was a plan to go near the Igloolik area. People are seeing heavy industry machines near Pond Inlet now. For those of us who are hunters, we are considerably restricted in use of these access roads. I'm aware that today Mary River has a lot of people working there. Since it started near Clyde River, they have

moved away from us south towards Cambridge Bay. So we are seeing depletion of caribou from our region. It's because of the all-weather road and the noise. There are a lot of people and a lot of activity in that area.

I have not seen caribou tracks in that area for a while now. This is another topic I was told to bring up today: caribou quotas. For those of us living up there, there are very poor conditions. We buy from caribou and they are not to our taste. We are more used to Baffin Island caribou, and this is what we're used to. We don't like the quota that's imposed on us, and having to buy caribou from elsewhere is also not good. We have other country food, and a lot of them appear to be quota now – polar bear, fishing that you're allowed to catch – it's all quota now. Caribou is on quota now. Another topic - once I get that, I'll tell you what I'm told to say again to this group.

David: Thank you. Yes, Rosanne.

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne D'Orazio with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. I just wanted to go back quickly to the - sorry I'll slow down already - comment that you made earlier about the review period and the sunset clause, just because I think it will help us better explain when we're in the communities what exactly these prohibitions could entail. So if I understand, the Planning Commission is committed to do a five-year review period. Do you want to jump in?

David: Just to be clear, I'm not speaking for the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission can answer those questions. What I was proposing is...well that a proposal be considered by the parties here, and I guess indirectly the Planning Commission. But I'm not speaking on behalf of the Planning Commission. Any proposal that comes from me is just as the independent Chair trying to develop a consensus and a level of comfort among the differing views, differing parties.

Rosanne: Thank you, and I do think that is important, because I have heard you commit to it. But I did hear Sharon commit to the 5-year review period as well, which is why I just want to confirm or have it here that at the end of five years, would the review be of the Plan as a whole? Would it be helpful if we identified certain sections of the Plan that we would for sure want a review after five years or however many years that would be? After that 5-year review period, would those changes then require an amendment to the Plan, i.e. would some party have to request an amendment during that 5-year review?

And if we put forward a sunset clause on certain conditions, then my understanding is that the sunset clause – that prohibition would end unless an amendment was put forward to allow it to continue. That's the understanding I have at the moment, and I just wanted to clarify with the Commission, because I think this will help us as we go into communities for them to better understand if this is a prohibition that would be a long-term prohibition and what mechanisms exist for them to be able to participate in any reviews further on. Thank you. Sorry, this applies to the caribou, but it could potentially also apply to other prohibitions in the Plan, so I'm bringing it up now. But it is relevant for other key bird habitat or other Protected Areas as well.

David: Yeah, and I'll turn it over to Sharon to respond on behalf of the Commission, but the idea that I was putting on the table was essentially a sunset clause. For example, in the core calving and post-calving areas, these prohibited uses would expire at a certain date, and whether it states in the Plan or not, to continue that prohibition would require an amendment to the Plan to address the sunset. Now how that works out mechanically and the legalisms that are necessary to make that happen, I

don't know. Because what I'm hearing is that people are uncomfortable with indeterminate prohibitions. So let's address that issue somehow in the Plan itself and create a mechanism for a comprehensive review in the case that people either want to sunset it as the Plan would say, or to renew it for another period.

Rosanne: Thank you. I guess my question was whether it is required to put something in as a sunset clause in order for there to be a potential to change it. Is that the trigger, yes it needs to happen? Or is the 5-year review – from what I understand Sharon said, the 5-year review doesn't mean the Plan starts all over again. You would then need to put forward an amendment to make any changes at that 5-year review period. So I'm just trying to understand. If we want something to be from a limited time period, we need to put it in as a sunset clause.

David: And I'll get Sharon to address that.

Sharon: Thank you, Rosanne and David. Sharon Ehloak from the Planning Commission. So I said at a minimum, 5 years, and I will explain the process. The process for the Commission to review and amend a Plan is outlined in the NUPPAA legislation and the Land Claims Agreement. So the review with NUPPAA, the Commission now has the power to request amendment on the Plan once it's approved on itself. We never had that authority before. The Plan is the Plan is the Plan. It's in place until it's amended. At a minimum, every five years the Plan is reviewed, but it doesn't mean that we wait for the five years. Anyone, including the Commission, can ask for an amendment. If there is new data, new information that is available, that can come in front of the Commission to be included and the Plan amended. The process is laid out for a Plan amendment.

Your question of would it be specific to regional or sub-regional components of the Plan – the Plan is reviewed as a collective at a minimal. It's an overall Plan that is reviewed. If in the interim there was regional or sub-regional data that became available, it doesn't mean that we cannot in the process, look at those specific areas to include in the Plan. So our understanding of a sunset clause, it's time limited. That is not a position the Commission is putting forward. That is a position that David is saying for conversation, just to be clear on that. Rosanne, I have a question for you for QIA. When you're going into the communities, are you consulting on behalf of the Commission, or what is the scope of what you're consulting on so we're clear on that as well so we can work with you? Thank you.

David: Thanks, Sharon. And just to be clear, it's not a position I'm putting forward. It's a suggestion for consideration by all the parties, including the Planning Commission. Rosanne.

Rosanne: Thank you for that, Sharon. Rosanne D'Orazio for the QIA. So I think that it clarifies for the review, amendments would still be required in order for changes to happen during that review period. And it's helpful to clarify that the sunset clause is a suggestion at this point. If that's something that we want to pursue, then we can bring that forward.

So with respect to the consultations that QIA is doing in the communities, we've completed one so far in Sanikiluaq a couple of weeks ago. QIA put forward a request for the Planning Commission co-facilitate or attend those consultations with us...(muted)

David: Rosanne, we went through this discussion on Monday, the first day of the meeting. The spokesperson at that time laid out the process that you followed in Sanikiluaq. I don't want to get

into this discussion about who is representing whom and all of that stuff. We're talking about caribou, and with all due respect to Sharon, maybe you two can have that conversation outside the room. Let's get back to the caribou conservation stewardship issues that are on the table please, because I don't want to go down this road again. I really don't. Fair enough?

Rosanne: Sure, out of respect for the question Sharon asked me, no we did not represent the Planning Commission while we were in communities. We represented QIA, and we collected lots of questions, and we'll bring those forward in a summary of what was said in the communities. We can share that with the Planning Commission.

David: Thanks, Rosanne. Brian.

Brian: I get to play with that button now as well?

(Laughter)

David: No, only I get to play with it.

Brian: I just want to clarify a comment made by you. Regardless of whether there are agreements or no agreements, in this room, the NPC will still consider that information. There is nothing concrete. We're not taking or making any positions until the information is put forward to the Commissioners. So whether there are agreements or no agreements, we have no position. Qujannamiik.

David: Perfect. Oh Sharon please.

Sharon: I want to be fair to everybody. Bartholomew asked, and I don't think his question was answered. He referred to technical findings and being lopsided. The process for the Public Hearing, I think it's very important that everyone understand that everyone has an opportunity to present – the communities, the HTOs, government – will all be heard equally...everyone's voice. The Commission will work very hard so that the information being presented is in a way that our Elders and our communities are all included, and that it's understandable at a level that...In translations we lose a lot of technical terms. I think that's the easiest way to explain it. And we have to remember that the Commission is here to listen to everyone equally, and the Elders and communities will all have a voice at the table, as much as government, the HTOs, NTI, the Inuit Organizations, the Regional Wildlife Boards. Everyone will be there.

We are respectful of everyone's voice, and that's the information that comes forward that the Commissioners will consider when they are making the decisions. As Brian said, we don't have a position, but we have a stake in ensuring that when the parties come forward, if you have consensus between parties, it makes it easier for the Commissioners to look at the information and see where the collective wills of the parties are, and it will help them make their decisions. I hope that clears up that part of the process for the Public Hearing as well. Thank you.

David: Okay, thanks Sharon. Warren, Brandon, Luigi – please make your comments pertain to the caribou calving and post-calving areas, and not process.

Warren: Thank you, David. My comments right now have to do with the idea of a sunset clause or something like that. Is that alright?

David: That's fine.

Warren: Thank you very much. I'll try and be brief. First, I just want to acknowledge that the concerns of Mr. Torretti from the KIA has been raising are I think quite valid in terms of the need for economic development and the need for access to IOLs in the event that there is a change in values and priorities for them. The KWB has acknowledged that in correspondence with NTI and the federal government.

I'm not sure a total sunset clause would be the best solution for this from our perspective, insofar as it would just remove the protection a priori. But I really appreciate you bringing something forward, because we need creative solutions to this issue and creative solutions to get us all talking to solve this problem.

What I'm suggesting is maybe there is a term in the Plan that stipulates that the periodic review will really focus on these caribou habitat aerial protections, will involve another caribou workshop of this sort with all the parties that are here today and have an opportunity for public comment so we can flesh this conversation out again in five years when perhaps the Chamber of Mines has more time to look into mobile protection or seasonal protection measures. We can actually adequately assess if these are possible, if there is funding for them. We can see if the caribou ranges have shifted, like there are ecological issues, development issues, and IOL issues. I'll bring something more clear to the table later. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Warren. Brandon.

Brandon: Brandon from WWF. It was more of a process question about review, so I can defer and talk about it over the break with NPC. That's fine. Thank you.

David: That would be most appreciated. Thank you. Luigi?

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. We do have to talk about process issues. That is something that NTI and the RIAs have put forward as a concern. I think the sunset idea is something I'm hoping everybody is willing to explore. So I'm encouraged by that, and I'm looking forward to bringing that back to my executives and decision-makers.

If I look back at my region and the polygons that are there. We had a little bit of a discussion earlier about reviewing regionally those polygons. I want to speak to the Bluenose East calving ground. It's quite an extensive area, and the KIA at this point in time is unsure that is representative of the calving grounds. That's one of the reasons I talked about regional, a little bit more information regionally in terms of what would be appropriate with certainly some Elders and HTO and RWO involvement in that discussion, because that does look quite extensive to my understanding of the use right now.

At the present time, in terms of the prohibitions that are listed, I cannot speak for the Board. It's going to be the Board's decision on this, but the prohibitions do not seem unreasonable so long as we can come to an understanding or a reasonable conclusion for the calving grounds. But again, I'm not the decision-maker here. I'm the messenger. I'm relaying this information back and forth.

The KIA was actually one of the organizations that suggested why the concern or why the ban on tourism. So I appreciate the BQ Board talking to the concern about ecotourism in their experience. We weren't really thinking in that direction, in terms of flights and stuff like that. So those are some prohibitions that I need to take back to my Board and see if that is something they share as well, and it likely is. There are very many similarities. So thank you for bringing that up. Thank you. My apologies for being too fast. Sorry to the interpreters.

David: Thanks, Luigi, and I'm suspecting that maybe you can take the target off your chest. Peter.

Peter S: Peter Scholz, NPC. I have a technical question for the parties, and this refers to any sort of seasonal or temporal restrictions that you would be interested in. I've heard noise, aerial, and a few other potential prohibitions floating around. Dates. What dates would fit into those temporal restrictions? We saw about 18 sets of dates from the GN yesterday, each one for different herds. Those are the only ones we've seen. Are those the right dates to use? Would we want different dates for different herds, or do you want one set of dates across the board? That would be needed by the planners. Thank you.

David: Alright, and whenever you can provide clarity, I'd encourage you to do that to the Commission. With respect to the issue raised by Luigi on the Bluenose calving ground, I would expect that the GN will follow-up with Luigi and company and try to sort out what differences there might be and resolve those. Ken?

Ken: Thank you, David. Ken Landa from Government of Canada. I apologize for having been out. I was on a call, and it was related to land use planning. I hope that softens it a little bit. I may be talking us over ground that has already been covered.

I wanted to raise the question of related research and tie that back to what I was saying before about precision in what's being prohibited here. Because we know there is already activity – mining for example, or exploration activity at least on calving grounds - if you prohibit research related to mineral exploration, you are prohibiting research on how exploration may be affecting the caribou calving ground. I think you need to be careful about putting as broad a category as research into your prohibitions without being very certain you want to prohibit all research related to every one of those topics.

David: Thanks, Ken, and I think that comment relates to the nature of the activity, not the category of activity. Mitch.

Mitch: Thank you. Mitch Campbell, GN, and thanks very much for that comment. It was very good, and this is just a follow-up to that. Obviously in any kind of protection measure strategy, the intensity of actual research and monitoring would be increased. There is no way around that. So that was a very good comment, and people should be aware that is another thing to consider as we move forward. Thanks.

David: Alright, Jackie and Bruno. Bruno is being shy about raising his hand, but I think he was raising his hand.

Bruno: Thank you, Jackie, Mr. Chair. Bruno Croft, GNWT. I try hard not to jump in because of the time and everything. Luigi's comment about the size of the Bluenose East calving ground is a valid one. I think

it points to always look at the total amount of knowledge that we do have available to make those decisions: collar data, survey data in the case of the Bluenose East, which is quite extensive, local information... So it is a good point that at some point we need to sit down and define or relook at everything we've got so we're on the same page and we all understand where we're all coming from. So that is a good and healthy process to go through. I'm quite prepared to sit down with Luigi's group and go through what we know and what they know, and the GN.

A quick comment to the Co-Chair about activity is an activity is an activity, and calving grounds, and once they are defined, they are defined. I could not agree more with you. We get requests all the time – filming crews, ecotourism – to either tag along or go on the calving ground after we're not there. We always say no. If we could do the acquisition exercises that we need to do at the time of calving without flying, we would do it. I would prefer to leave those calving grounds alone as much as possible. So yeah, let's approach this calving ground thing carefully. If we can leave them alone, leave them alone.

We can answer those questions about how to define calving. When we do our surveys, calving ground surveys – photographic distribution surveys, composition surveys – we always try to go at peak of calving, which is defined as more or less 50% of the cows have given birth. There is a period of time before that, six or seven days maybe, and after that where movement rate is low, and this is why it coincides with movement rate analysis. So we can easily define that for your sake, and then get into the post-calving area. I'll stop it there, Mr. Chair.

David: Thanks, Bruno. Jackie.

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I will admit this morning that I've been hugely inspired about what Mitch said earlier about moving beyond the conceptual into action and actual activity. This is just a quick comment. In these last discussions, we've discussed a lot of things – research, exploration, sunset clauses, and I just wanted to remind the group that Hunters and Trappers Organizations have been within the communities for a long time. They predate Nunavut. They predate the Land Claims Agreement. So as organizations, they have an extensive history in dealing with things like research applications, being aware of the different types of research that is happening. They also have significant experience in sunset clauses.

I bring this up not to be a downer, and in my short, short history of working within the regime of wildlife management, sunset clauses are tough to follow exactly. We have multiple management plans with a small amount of co-management partners involved, and we have sunset clauses that come and go with limited activity for a variety of fair reasons. So I don't really have a question, but it's a comment that when thinking about the scale of partners and parties involved, we need to be cautious in how we view the role of those sunset clauses and revisions. It takes a lot of work – not to say it's impossible. I just wanted to offer that as caution for everyone. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jackie, and I guess it will be up to smarter people than me to figure out how this can work. But I think the essence of it is that those prohibitions to provide adequate comfort to all the parties, need to be time limited and should only be extended through a very deliberate process. That would be backed up by science, TK, and a thorough engagement process. That's the essence of it. Let's break for lunch and come back... I guess I'd ask people to come back at 1:15 so we can start at 1:30. We'll pick up the discussion on the key migratory corridor aspects. I suspect in that case, it's more an issue of activity and infrastructure that we need to think about.

LUNCH BREAK

(Audio Recording came in at the following juncture after the Lunch Break):

Leslie: I just wanted to speak to the issue that you actually raised, David, about there being all these different versions and interpretations of protection measures. The two on the table – well three on the table at the moment I guess – are the existing measures from 1978. There are the other ones that Mike has said that are being applied by Industry in a mobile fashion, and then there is the KIA's proposal for the new mobile protection measures.

I know a few people in the room have read the total proposal, but it wasn't presented yesterday for time limitation reasons. I think people don't understand, perhaps, that the proposal is actually quite different than what's going on. It's way more complicated. It involves a lot more levels of seasonal restrictions, and a whole bunch of other things. So I think it should be clear when people are talking about mobile protection measures, we're actually all talking about a bunch of different things.

If people are thinking that it's a magic bullet that's going to solve all our problems for caribou protection, you know, first of all it hasn't been developed. But I don't even know, so this is a question for Mike. Has this proposal been discussed with Industry? Has Industry said this is a feasible way to go? If that's not the case, maybe it's premature to be discussing that particular version of mobile protection measures at all at this time, because if Industry isn't at all willing to entertain the idea of going that way, then we shouldn't be wasting our time on it at the moment perhaps.

What we should understand are what the options are that are being discussed, and if they are feasible outside of calving and post-calving areas, our Board would be willing to look at it further.

David: Thanks, Leslie, and I think that's what I was getting at earlier that there seem to be a number of different concepts being thrown around. Some of them have been applied. Some of them are just concepts. As Mitch said, some don't work in certain circumstances and are fine in others. In the case of aircraft, it's advisory to the pilot in any case. It is not legally binding to stay 1000 feet above the ground.

So there are a number of constraints, and what I would like to see is that people come together in the time between now and the Public Hearing and present to the Commission some consolidated list of protection measures and assessment of how successful they have been and where they have been applied in the past, and where they might be applied in the future and what process would be used to validate them. That's what needs to be done, because otherwise, we're just kicking around this notion that mobile protection measures will protect caribou outside the calving grounds. It ain't necessarily so. Rosanne?

Rosanne: Thank you, David. Rosanne D'Orazio with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association. I just wanted to address one thing that came up internally in our discussions with respect to mobile caribou protection measures. You had initially asked – and I think it's a good idea – that we need to clarify what the definition of mobile protection measures is. Mitch, thank you for your explanation of just the understanding of how complicated just a collaring program could be and how much mobile caribou protection measures would depend on a collaring program. I think one other thing that needs to be

included in that definition is measures for monitoring and enforcement of those mobile protection measures.

It has come up a lot internally – who would be responsible for monitoring to ensure that those measures are even being enforced? And whose responsibility is it to enforce those measures? What Leslie said about different definitions for Industry or for the Government of Nunavut, in each of those definitions, if it is Industry's mobile protection measures, is it Industry that is monitoring and enforcing those measures, or does the Government of Nunavut have a role in that? Is there a capacity at the moment to be able to be rigorous enough to be able to actually enforce them?

So for us, when I spoke with our Board, there wasn't a support for that, because there just didn't seem to be a mechanism in place. So I just want to add that whatever definition we come up with needs to include a responsibility or role for the enforcement and monitoring of those measures.

David: Good point, Rosanne. Who was next? David, did you have a question? No? Miguel? Well, Miguel, why don't you make your presentation now? It's almost 2:30. We'll go from there.

Miguel: Thank you, David.

David: Just a sec. Just to let people know where we go after Miguel's presentation, depending on the time, we'll take another break. Then I want to move from the mainland herds to touch on the other herds and just get a sense of what we talked about works in principle for those other herds, whether there was some significant considerations, differences that we need to think about. Then that will probably take us close to the end of the afternoon. I'm going to suggest that we meet again this evening, just in case. It's a bit of a risk management thing, but while we could probably get away with just meeting tomorrow morning I think, I'd rather have some time in the bank just in case the conversations run longer. Then tomorrow morning, if we're done with the main part of the agenda, we can talk about next steps and get some sort of commitment to those next steps and who is going to participate and how. Thanks. Sorry, Miguel, go ahead.

Inuit Owned Lands Discussion

NTI: IOL Designations in Caribou Calving Grounds

Miguel: Thank you, David. Thanks to everybody for allowing me to do the presentation a little bit early. With the blizzard that was coming on, I thought perhaps one of the other members of my NTI family would be willing to do the presentation, but nobody seemed to be willing to put on the target shirt. So I'll continue to do the presentation as planned.

(Laughter)

Mineral Potential and Inuit Owned Land – Finding the Gaps: I certainly want to make the condition that this presentation in no way construes that there is a position on caribou by NTI. That's what that basically says. As an outline of what I'm going to go through, I must admit it's perhaps a little ambitious. I'll try to take my time with it and maybe we'll skip over some things.

How can we make progress? It seems to me that we have to have some fundamental assumptions to be able to make progress. I mean, we've all talked about these during this session, but I hope that we all agree on them:

- Caribou are vital to the identity and wellbeing of Nunavut and Inuit.
- Caribou calving grounds will shift over time.
- Mineral exploration and mining is a necessary component to ensure prosperity in the territory.
- Not all ground is equal and as rich in resources.

I hope we're all good with those assumptions. Everybody can perhaps argue later. This is something that we have – or David has – brought up on a number of occasions, and I won't belabor the point. But we really do need to find a definition on protection or on the various ideas that we have about protection, put labels on them so that we can actually have proper discussions about it.

Caribou and mining exploration – caribou and mineral resources intersect geographically, as we all know. To develop an approach for one without consideration for the other will undoubtedly result in an imbalance. I'll just bring us back to David's comment on the three-legged stool at this point. I understand it's not an analogy that's unique to David, of course, but it's important just the same especially for this presentation.

Essentially this answers the likely question that I'm sure people in this room will have as to why at this workshop on caribou, this presentation is focused on exploration and mining. So to start out, we should probably review some parts of the NLCA. This also has very much to do with communication.

Article 11.8.2 states, "The land use planning process shall apply to Inuit Owned Lands. Land Use Plans shall take into account Inuit goals and objectives for Inuit Owned Lands. It seems to me this could be interpreted in many ways, as with the other Articles that I put out. Could we say something like, "Doesn't this imply that the ones that apply to IOL are decided by Inuit and not outside agencies? We should not have to fight for the rights we already have" – Inuit, that is.

Article 11.2.1: The planning process shall ensure land use plans reflect the priorities and values of the residents of the planning regions. Do we agree? Does the NPC have the same viewpoint as NTI as to who decides what the priorities and values are and how do we decide who that is?

Article 11.2.1: Special attention shall be devoted to protecting and promoting the existing and future wellbeing of Inuit and Inuit Owned Lands. Perhaps this implies that IOL should be distinct in the Land Use Plan. At this point, we were talking about the NLCA, and David my colleague here would like to say a few words about other Articles in the NLCA with regard to wildlife.

David Lee: Thanks. Thanks, Miguel, and I apologize for how much text there is. The important text is the one in bold, and I'm just providing this for context. As Miguel mentioned, this presentation is for discussion purposes. It is not meant to represent the position. I work for NTI Wildlife and Environment. My primary focus is on Article 5, which is wildlife. But for everyone here, Article 17 is titled "Purposes of Inuit Owned Lands." Under 17.1.2, you'll see Inuit Owned Lands are expected to include areas with the following characteristics, not in order of priority: areas of significant biological productivity or of value for conservation purposes. Having stated that though, there is B.), which also recognizes areas of value principally related to the development of nonrenewable

resources, which is why it is valuable for Miguel to continue with the rest of his presentation so that the balance can also be presented.

I work primarily with Article 5, and this is where my emphasis and my expertise comes into play. There are principles in Article 5. The two that I'd like to focus on is there is a need for an effective system of wildlife management that complements Inuit harvesting rights and priorities and recognizes Inuit systems of wildlife management that contribute to the conservation of wildlife and protection of wildlife habitat.

There is a need for systems of wildlife management and land management that provide optimum protection to the renewable resource economy. So there is literature available. I just want to read one quotation.

"During 1988 to 1994 when weather conditions were more severe, the calf birth rate in the western segment – this is the Prudhoe region – was 64%. The birth rate for the eastern segment, which was disturbance free, the other section was affected by development, during the same period was 83%."

This is Cameron, et al. 1985. I wanted to provide some evidence. I'm not saying this is cause and effect. Rarely do we have any type of cause and effect. I think the advice that biologists are providing is precisely (*inaudible*), which is to provide optimum protection to the renewable resource economy so that Inuit can continue to harvest wildlife into the future.

Sorry, Miguel, this is my last slide. Conservation is defined in Article 5, and it also includes principles that include the protection of wildlife habitat and the maintenance of vital healthy wildlife populations capable of sustaining harvesting needs. That has been my primary objective working for Nunavut Tunngavik. That is my driving goal is to assure that Inuit have these rights into the future. Now Miguel will present an equally important side. Thanks.

(Laughter)

Miguel: I don't think I can match you, David. Wildlife is obviously very important, and we really do have to find a balance. Very much in that line, I did want to say off to the start, I really appreciate your last comment, Leslie, where you made note of what it is that Industry needs. That really gives me a lot of hope that people are actually considering that as well, as being part of things. So thank you for making that comment.

So NTI's mining policy – David said he works for Wildlife and Environment and I work for NTI Lands. This is very much my mandate. NTI will support and promote the development of mineral resources in Nunavut if there are significant long-term social and economic benefits for the Inuit of Nunavut and is consistent with protecting the ecosystemic integrity of the Nunavut Settlement Area. Of course, what equates to significant benefit is quite often the question.

NTI Lands clearly – we have a mandate to find a balance between the two. Therefore, we must promote sustainable mineral exploration and mining as well as caribou conservation. Specifically, and how are we doing Tommy? Specifically to do with caribou and caribou calving grounds, these are some percentages with regard to how much intersection there is between IOL and caribou calving grounds. They're not insignificant. These were generated, though, from the DNLUP of 2014, and they are separated out into the Protected Areas that prohibit mining and exploration and the

Special Management Areas. I'm not sure if I can say at this point that it's old news, although I did put that in there.

As you can see, the numbers can be quite high – subsurface and surface. 8% in the Kitikmeot of subsurface intersect with caribou calving grounds. These were rights that were given to Inuit. Of course, not all subsurface IOL are for high mineral potential, but I think it's safe to assume that a good amount of them are. And because we've been speaking so much about the Qamanirjuaq calving ground, I just thought I'd put a quick slide up to show these intersections. So you can see the dark red is the subsurface, and the pink is surface. This also includes Crown leases and prospecting permits and claims from the most recent data, at least that I have. You can see that they intersect quite a bit as well.

It has yet to be determined how much of that will be grandfathered as per NUPPAA, at least as far as I know. I thought I'd try a quick thought experiment. Initially I thought I might get some biologists from the group to respond to this, but then I thought it might turn out badly if I did.

(Laughter)

So I thought better of it, and I answered my own questions here to a certain extent. So what amount of disturbance to a caribou calving ground would have only a negligible effect on the vitality of the herd? 50% disturbed? That's probably a problem. 20%, I still see that as being a problem. 5%, 1%, a tenth of a percent - perhaps that might seem reasonable. I don't know. Certainly, the reason I know this wouldn't work out is because it all depends on where it is in the calving ground when we're talking about disturbance and how it is disturbed.

However, just to follow-up on the thought experiment, this is the Qamanirjuaq calving ground as per the GN data. It's about 2.2 million square hectares. This is the mine footprint from Meadowbank around 2010. It's about 1200 hectares. If you actually draw circles that represent those areas to scale, the GN calving area is 1898 times larger than the footprint, and it's 0.5% of the calving area.

What does this prove? It doesn't actually prove anything. However, it does provide some perspective perhaps. With current commodity prices and the cost of mining in Nunavut, it'll be decades before any significant number of mining projects could begin. By that time, we should have a much clearer picture of the best methods to manage and protect caribou. As we perhaps have noted, the Land Use Plan is a living document, which is meant to be adjusted to provide the appropriate balance. We have time to prevent excessive mining, which might be detrimental to the caribou.

I thought I would talk a little bit about risk with Industry. For industries that pursue such risky endeavors, mineral exploration and mining is particularly risk averse in terms of the variables that can be controlled. They include cost of operations, and I'm sure that everyone in this crowd knows that operating in Nunavut is very expensive, up to 2.5 times higher than in the south. Industry needs certainty regarding mineral rights. Theoretically with a land claim, we should have that. And they need access to lands.

However, the issue of caribou could complicate things. Considering the cost of doing things in Nunavut and the markets, which we all know are severely depressed, we should be doing all we can to make our lands more attractive for development and not less.

A small scenario I developed, and it's really just theoretical, but a company has identified a property outside of caribou calving grounds having proven resources, and they develop a mine. They secure additional ground around the property, knowing further opportunities make the project more attractive. So if we consider Hope Bay with Boston or Meadowbank with the deposit, as the mine is developed, the caribou calving grounds shift to surround the property. The mine, of course, is grandfathered, but the surrounding property, perhaps, is not. Is this possible? Again, I'm not a lawyer, so as far as interpreting NUPPAA, I don't know. That may or may not cause a problem. But it seems to be it creates some uncertainty to the industry that we perhaps don't need. And it would be imperative, I think, to make that clear.

Kind of shifting gears a little bit, I'll go on to exploration versus mining. We've talked a lot about this over the last couple of days. Although the ultimate goal of exploration and mining is focused on resources, the activities are dissimilar. With exploration, we have larger areas, relatively low impact. One of the comments that was sent back to me about this presentation was that I said they were low impact, and they said, "No, no, you'll have to say something to modify that," so relatively low impact in comparison to mining, and exploration is flexible. Mining is the opposite in many ways.

Again, something that has been brought up a number of times, one justification for a prohibition type of caribou protection has been that minerals are not going anywhere, but the caribou might. Therefore, the precautionary principle should be applied with regard to their protection. This is correct if the only risk factor that is important is the presence of resources. However, two other factors – again the third leg of David's analogy – should be considered: the socioeconomic needs of Nunavut, the markets that distribute the resources. I think everybody's pretty familiar with this. For a prosperous and equitable future, Nunavut needs infrastructure, employment, training, and social programs. I'll readily admit, of course, caribou are vital. But, mining and exploration have the potential to provide these benefits.

Now as far as the markets go, the process of mineral extraction is very time sensitive. Targeted resource must be forecast to provide a calculated profit, which exceeds the cost associated with the building, operating, and closing a mine. The cycles of profitable resource extraction, and especially with the high cost of operating in Nunavut, can be measured in decades. As we've talked about, the cycles of caribou can also be measured in decades. Therefore, it's possible the right time for opening a mine may not occur for 50 or 100 years or even longer when those two factors coincide. Nunavut has already proven resources that fit into this time frame. It takes a long time for a mine to come to fruition.

To continue on that vein, only about one in 1,000 mines leads to a successful mine. The process of finding a viable resource requires many years of exploration. If mining and exploration are treated the same as prohibited activities in caribou calving areas, the first cycle of discovery may occupy the first coincident opening of a calving area when the caribou move, and then the mining component may have to wait until the next cycle. We're talking about many decades then. This could unnecessarily extend the time until the benefits from a resource could be realized. That would be fine if Nunavut didn't need the socioeconomic benefits right now, but it does.

If we assume that exploration is low impact and flexible, able to provide adequate caribou protection through mobile protection measures, that the exploration work needs to be done to

enable appropriate timing for mineral extraction, if we assume that the caribou will move over time and that Nunavut needs benefits from its resources sooner than later, then exploration should be defined as an industry with needs and restrictions distinct from the operations of mining.

Almost done. On top of all the complexity involved with existing rights and cumulative impacts, issues of caribou and mining mineral exploration have emotional connotations. The past makes it easy to love the caribou and just as easy to hate exploration and mining. That appears to make the decisions simple, but really it just complicates things, because the future of Nunavut will be determined by the success of both. Perhaps it would be more productive to decide on what we want the future of Nunavut to look like and then work backwards to see what we need to do to accomplish that vision.

This is basically a summary of everything we've talked about in this. So, any approach on caribou should take into account the needs of Industry. Thank you, Leslie. We need to be speaking about the same things to make progress. Inuit Owned Lands are significantly impact by caribou calving grounds, and Inuit rely on much of those lands for future self-sustainability. Considering the scale of development, there is a time to better perfect methods. There is time to better perfect methods of caribou protection. We need to provide certainty if we want to attract exploration and mining. Exploration and mining are two distinct activities that should be regulated distinctly. Nunavut can have a meaningful and prosperous future that includes both the caribou and mining and exploration. Thank you.

David: Thank you. I was going to say, thank you Luis.

(Laughter)

Thank you, Luigi. Then I thought maybe I should get that on the record anyhow.

Miguel: Thank you.

David: Mitch?

Mitch: Thanks very much. That was an excellent presentation and did provide us sort of a very good balance of what the issues are here and what we're striving to try and properly balance. I know this wasn't intended that way, but I just wanted to – sorry, Mitch Campbell, GN – I just want to get this on the record here. There is honestly no hatred for the process at all on our side. I sometimes might – and I know you didn't mean it that way, so I'll be on the record saying that - but, it's just how others might've interpreted it.

I just wanted to be on the record saying that has never been an issue with us. It oftentimes comes across as that, but I have been in the resource industry in my younger days as well, and I understand – maybe not as well as you do obviously – but I do understand the needs. That's the main point I wanted to make. Just a secondary point is a separation between exploration and mining, I have no personal issues from a biological perspective with that, as long as the exploration doesn't have infrastructure or occurs during the calving period, and doesn't lead to existing rights down the road necessarily. I agree with the presentations that exploration, if it's done correctly, can be done outside of the critical periods and doesn't leave a lasting impact. So as long as it doesn't lead to

existing rights down the road, and we can find a way to separate that out – and I'd let my colleagues speak to that – but I can see that could be accommodated.

Another quick point, you were also mentioning perhaps we could allow...these mines potentially take a long time to generate. Just of concern is that what if the measures we seek out to validate turn out to prove to be ineffective in the calving grounds. So it's a concern that just because we're proposing potential mitigated measures or protection measures or whatever kinds of measures to protect caribou, doesn't mean we're going to find that they'll work. So we don't want to say well let's just let things go and by the time in 10-20 years it comes around to a different stage of development, that we have any answers yet. We really need before we get these sorts of existing rights in place, we really need to know that these are going to work and then proceed, so we're not locked into a potential problem down the road. So those are really just quick comments.

Again, just to sum up, I really hope that people understand that we – I mean just on a personal note, I have three kids. One of them – I've talked to Miguel about this – is a budding geologist and is going crazy with a rock hammer all over the place. I suspect that's the direction he's going to go, and I welcome that, because I think that's a very interesting direction to go professionally. So I think there's a lot we have in common. We just need to understand that we do have those things in common. We do want jobs. We do want to see things improve. We are of the belief that can be done in a very balanced form. We can have our cake and eat it too. I truly believe that. Thanks for the presentation. I appreciate it.

David: Thanks, Mitch. I think what we really want to have is our caribou and eat them too. Warren?

Warren: Thank you very much, David. Warren for the KWB, and thanks very much both David and Miguel for that talk. You both raised really interesting issues and interesting things to talk about. I just want to respond to a couple of things that you brought up to continue to muddy the waters, which I think is kind of what your goal was there – to raise some more points of discussion. I'll follow-up with that.

The first would be that to separate mining and exploration, I'm really not sure that's a feasible thing to do. Even if it ends up on paper, I'm quite sure once the company has invested significant money into exploration, they're going to want to mine there. They have way more resources than say an HTO does for a legal team to find some legalistic loophole to get access to those resources. We'd be stuck in a David versus Goliath battle trying to keep them out, if the community in these hypothetical situations we're raising, decided they didn't want the company to turn it into a mine. So I'm really not sure that would be a feasible thing in practice to bring forward. And I'm not even sure the industry would really agree to that within a Land Use Plan, or even if they did, I would assume down the line they would find some way to work through that.

Two: the assumption that we should be doing everything possible to attract investment – and I can understand that sentiment – but you run a huge risk of joining into what political economists call a race to the bottom when that's your development perspective, that you need to bend over to quote the very eloquent Earl Evans.

(Laughter)

I know, I know, but I'm just saying to muddy the waters, we need to be sure that this isn't the direction we're going when we do everything to attract investment. You can end up in a situation where Industry gets what they need, and the people don't get anything that they need. This is a phenomenon that we've been witnessing globally since the 1970s of deregulation, of lowering working conditions, of lowering environmental conditions. And even with this race to the bottom, we're still having huge global economic crises. So I think we really need to keep that in perspective when we try to coordinate investments that we don't join this race to nothing. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Warren. Miguel?

Miguel: Miguel with NTI. Yeah, I don't see any point in arguing the points being raised. However, I did want to emphasize NTI's guiding policy, which is that we are only looking for sustainable development that brings benefits to Inuit. So no race to the bottom. Thank you.

David: David?

David Lee: Thanks, David and thank you, Warren. I know you didn't ask any questions of me, but I'm going to muddy the waters. What I want to reiterate is how difficult it has been for me providing advice to NTI on this issue, and that's why I appreciated the opportunity to present what I'm guided by, which is the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. The points I highlighted – an optimum system of protection and land management – and if we understand what the constraints are, what the weaknesses are of mobile protection measures. There are a few options, at least in my mind, when you come to assess what the optimum system is if your objective – and I'm being completely transparent and clear – if your objective is to maintain healthy and vital subpopulations of caribou, at least for the next two or three generations. Thanks.

David: Thanks, David. And since we're confessing to things, I'll confess to a couple of things. I once was a geologist. I once was a geophysicist. My dad was a mining engineer. I grew up in mining towns all across Canada, and I have an education because of the mining industry. The flip side is that I now sit on the Giant Mine Oversight Board, which is looking at the remediation of the Giant Mine, which is a terrible legacy of the mining industry. It's a different era and a different way of doing business, but I think we need to learn from lessons of the past, and we need to make at least different mistakes in the future. I think collectively we're working toward that, but bottom line is...I think this is probably appropriate...

I was at an oil and gas conference once. The Minister of Petroleum Affairs for Norway was there, and her comment was if Norway has learned nothing else, it has learned that it has to put the environment first. It's development in the context of environment and cultural sustainability and community wellness. Let's get that context right, and then let's turn to sustainable and viable economic development. But in the case of Nunavut, there are different realities than there are in Norway. So I think that's the kind of discussion that we're having here today and will be for the foreseeable future. I think your presentation was excellent, and it laid out the challenges that we all face. Thank you for that very much.

Miguel: Thank you, David. Miguel from NTI. Just as a very last thing, that's a picture... I was camp cook for my buddy (*name inaudible*) at Byron Bay, just west of Cambridge Bay, about 60 miles west. Thanks very much.

David: Any questions of Miguel? Please?

?Elder: (*Translated*): Thank you. Caribou topics are continuing I'm hearing, and I'm hearing things that I understand. You talk about calving grounds. You've repeatedly said calving grounds. I'd just like to support that the land is decreasing for some reason, perhaps due to decline of caribou. It's not completely the fault of mining industry and Inuit. The yearlings, the calves, they were not like this I remember. We are neglecting some fundamental things. There are bugs and mosquitos, and some other bugs in midsummer have drained many herds completely of blood, especially the young caribou at the height of bug season.

On another topic, I'm a hunter, and I have been practicing for many years. Any species that we have, for some years they disappear for a long time. For instance, polar bear migrate as well from the south to our land. Our area is in water coming in from Pond Inlet. They are our neighbor, so I hunted polar bear towards the east. The caribou were trying to migrate, and the caribou came across where they have to cross. I know they were going to cross with their young yearlings, and I have seen these - and I tell you because I have seen it - if I've never seen it before, I'm not going to tell you. I'm not going to tell you what I know just by someone reading something to me. I will believe when I have seen it from my eyes. I'm not trying to say I don't believe you. I've seen a lot of data being quoted here and argued and discussed upon. But for those of us who use the land for sustainability, we see so we believe. But it's still, I reiterate again from this morning, where is the cooperation on something that we're going to present as a finished product? We have to solve this. We cannot continue and continue talking about it. There has to be some action. Something has to be done. To me, when we see these problems not being resolved, we resort to fabrication for the sake of an argument. Thank you.

David: Thank you. Any other comments? Jimmy.

Jimmy: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jimmy Haniliak, Elder Adviser of many people. I was going to tell Miguel that Byron Bay, I just...who got the land. I was going to ask you. But anyway, I'm glad that David brought up the issue of wildlife. You know, I'm going to bring to the local level. I'm from Kitikmeot, Cambridge Bay, and I belong to various Boards in Cambridge. One of them is the HTO. Wildlife in our area, if Inuit try and do it themselves, we will never have any accurate numbers of our wildlife in our area, whether it's caribou, musk ox, wolf, grizzly bears. You know, we need to keep the continuing work of our biologists. They do important work, and we need these people to keep us informed of what our wildlife are doing in our region in Nunavut and also in NWT. Thank you.

David: Thank you. Bartholomew.

Bartholomew: (*Translated*): Please moderate, I'm low.

David: How about Luigi?

(*Laughter*)

Bartholomew: I'd like to complement the guy who wants to do exploration without any much funding. Okay, I have many relatives in Mary River Project. Since it opened, my grandchildren, my cousins, they've all been up there. Although they make a lot of money, they haven't bought me a beer yet.

(Laughter)

I have also cousins in Rankin Inlet. I have a brother down there. I want them to have very good land. I don't want to destroy it, because it's the only source of my caribou food now. I have seen no benefit from Mary River. I just wanted to put this little joke. I have no benefit from it, but a short comment.

The caribou biologists, just to advise you, the animals migrating, they usually have leaders that lead through rivers, lakes, where they migrate. Don't do too much research in that area while they are migrating. Wait until they stop so you will know exactly what's involved. Don't be too anxious to get your findings. Let them settle down, and that way you will have accurate numbers. If you don't follow, let the leader stop, then you could do your research. Otherwise, they're all not going to come to an area where they are migrating to. That includes anyone involved in environment or biologists, waterfowl and land mammals.

David: Thank you. Mitch?

Mitch: Yeah, thank you. Mitch Campbell, GN. I just wanted to follow-up on that statement in that this is the same knowledge and advice that have been provided to us – I can speak in the Kivalliq region as well, and we follow that to the letter. We don't go in to do that kind of work into those migratory corridors, because the same knowledge exists I think across Nunavut that it can actually very seriously change the distribution of those animals and their movements. So I appreciate that. It's really good information to get read into this meeting. It's information that is shared in my region as well, and we do follow that advice. Thank you very much.

David: Thanks, Mitch. I'm going to suggest we take a 15 minute break now, and then either get back to the discussion previous or go to the Chamber and then go back to the discussion. Thank you.

BREAK

Mineral Potential

Chamber of Mines: Areas of High Mineral Potential in Caribou Calving Grounds

David: Mike will do his presentation now, and then we'll get back to the protection measures discussion explicitly. So Mike will take a few minutes, and then we'll finish off this component of the meeting. Mike?

Mike: Thank you. Mike Setterington representing the Nunavut Chamber of Mines. The issues of high mineral potential are clearly out of my expertise. I'm a wildlife biologist, so I'll give this my best shot on behalf of the Chamber.

Peter S: Sorry, Mike, we have this presentation. I don't know if I'm supposed to be putting up the slides or not.

Mike: It's one slide. You can put it up. Please.

(Laughter)

?Female: That's keeping it simple.

Mike: Overall, I'll just stress again, that was part of the opening presentation, the opportunity for discovery is a key thing for the Nunavut mining industry. That's a key issue. And shutting out areas for discovery is a key issue. Again, not all of Nunavut has been explored. Only a very small fraction has been explored.

So I don't have the background on how the high mineral potential areas are identified. I believe that database came from Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. If it was based on the current mining claims, the Chamber would just like to reiterate that basing high mineral potential on current mining claims likely underestimates mineral potential.

Miguel addressed the issue of the fact that during the land selection process, the Inuit Owned Lands during the Nunavut Land Claims negotiations, that many of the lands were selected based on high mineral potential. Many of the existing claims are sitting on top of Inuit Owned Lands, and I believe that some of the mines are being developed on Inuit Owned Lands.

Mineral potential assessments are only as good as the knowledge of the time. So this is coming into changes with technology. So future generations and technologies may identify new minerals that are essential to society, so we should preserve flexibility. But again, the Industry would need that clarity on the potential for development areas and leave it to the decision of the individual proponents, whether they choose to pursue exploration or a project within those areas. Just make the rules clear.

Just two examples I'd like to give for seasonal operations: My company works on several mine sites or proposed mine sites, one of which is a gold mine proposed that operates nine months out of the year and can't operate for the other three months. That's due to restrictions of snow, so they know they only have a nine-month operating period. So it was up to that mining proponent to decide whether that would be a profitable project or not.

As another extreme example of where the technology has come to, there is the Grand Duke Mine, which isn't operating right now in northwestern BC. That mine has a 17-kilometer underground access tunneling basically under a glacier to get to the deposit. So if the minerals have that kind of value, let the proponents decide whether there's an effective way they can get with it in dealing with the environmental challenges that may be there. There are the possibilities. So outright restrictions on development limit the opportunities. So ladies and gentlemen, that's the extent of my presentation. It wasn't the 'Opening Remarks' slide. It was the 'Need to Recognize High Mineral Potential,' slide 13. Ma'na.

David: Thanks, Mike. Any questions, observations from the room? I think the presentation reinforces Miguel's earlier presentation and adds a little bit more of a context to it. Okay, let's get back to the earlier part of the agenda – Item 17. We left off, I think, talking about key migratory corridors and water crossings. I don't know if there's anything that people want to add at this point to that discussion. It seemed to me that there is work to be done, and I'm not sure that it can be done effectively in this forum. It's one of those areas that would benefit, I think, from a small working group with key people getting together and addressing a number of work plan items and then reporting back to the Commission at one point or another with their findings. Mike?

- Mike: Mike Settingington representing the Chamber of Mines. Again I'm going to keep coming back and saying this, but we've been working with protection measures that deal with migratory caribou since 1978 in the caribou protection measures. As an example of an operating site that also deals with migratory caribou would be the Ekati and Diavik sites, which have commitments in their operating permits, I understand, to shut down when caribou are migrating through the site. I think over the years of operations, they've had to shut down in total for about 48 hours in 15 years or so of operation.
- David: Yeah, that's true. But we're talking about not just summer range or fall range, but caribou calving grounds as well. And I don't think mobile protection measures have been tested on the calving grounds effectively, and there are different views about what constitutes the suite of mobile protection measures, as Leslie and others have pointed out. So Warren and then Rosanne.
- Warren: Thank you, David. I'll be brief. Warren for the KWB. I must admit that I'm not expert on the Northwest Territories mining issues at present. However, at the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board Meeting that was held in November, Kim Poole gave a presentation on zones of influence that was drawn from those mines. Shutdowns notwithstanding, I think he showed pretty clearly that there was an impact on the migration routes because of those projects. Whether those had an ecosystemic impact, I'm not sure. But they definitely had a change on the migration routes. What that level of impact that would have on the calving grounds, I think would be probably more substantial from a population point of view, but maybe a biologist in the crowd could speak more to this, because I'm not one. Thank you.
- David: Is there a biologist in the crowd?
- (Laughter)*
- Rosanne: I'm definitely not a biologist, but I have a question more for Mike to follow-up on my comment before about monitoring and enforcing the caribou protection measures. You had mentioned that – and I'm not sure which mine you're talking about had been shut down for maybe 48 hours in total. So for myself and others around the table, can you just briefly explain how does Industry use these caribou protection measures from a monitoring perspective, or how do you enforce those measures? And is it up to the proponent to identify when mines should be shut down, or are there other regulators involved in the process that make that decision as to when it should or should not?
- Mike: Mike Settingington with the Chamber of Mines. I'm not familiar enough with Ekati and Diavik to know how it occurs, but it's likely a project term or condition of operation that they must follow. That was probably presented during the review process. Bruno actually might have better information on that. From my own experience with active monitoring on the Baffinland project, our protection measures are coming specifically out of project terms and conditions, and then out of continued regulator and interested party engagement through a terrestrial environment working group where we review twice annually the project terms and conditions, how they are being met, what mitigation measures are triggered, what triggers those mitigation measures. Unfortunately, we just don't have the caribou on Baffin Island right now to trigger too many of those specific mitigation measures. So I don't have a good example.

Red Dog Mine would be one. Red Dog Mine is on the coast of Alaska, and they have spring migration of a herd that comes through that mine site over the access road to the coast. That's a simple trigger. When they see the caribou coming, they just stop driving the trucks. They let the caribou cross, and the most they've had to stop trucks there was for a day. They let them cross, and then they continue on.

David: Yeah, Bruno, I don't know if you want to address the diamond mines. I can add a little bit to it. I was involved in the environmental assessment and follow-up to those and been on site a number of times. The shut down – I don't recall the entire mine operation in either of those mines being shut down, but road traffic has been suspended when there area significant number of caribou in the area. And they have an early warning system. They've got cameras set up to feed into the operations of the mine so that operators are aware when caribou are approaching the mine and then approaching the road. Traffic either ceases on the road or is slowed down significantly so that caribou can cross without significant disturbance. But I don't think they've ever shut the entire operation down, and the number of road traffic suspensions, I think, is fairly low. But that's an area recently where there have been very few caribou as well. I mean, Bathurst herd is the main herd in that area, and it's down to 3% of what it was at its peak. So similarly to the situation on Baffin Island, there are too few caribou around to really, at this stage, know how effective the mitigation measures are.

Zone of influence – Kim touched on it last night. I was involved in some of that work as well, and it's clear that there are energetic costs related to those mines, and that those scientific technical observations have been supported by the Tlîchô observations as well. But in any case, those mines are not in a calving ground. The other mine that I've been to and observed caribou around is the Lupin Mine, and there were caribou in good numbers at one time that I visited, but they were all bulls. They weren't cows and calves. Bulls are a little more tolerant of activity. Some of the bulls were actually in the warehouse getting out of the sun and the bugs. They can be pretty adaptable, but cows and calves were not there. It does depend on the location. It depends on the nature of the operation. It depends on the component of the herd that's in the area. We've heard David summarize the Prudhoe Bay example where activity on the calving ground had a measurable effect on reproduction. Bruno, anything to add?

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bruno Croft, GNWT. I think you covered it pretty well, David, and rightly so. You've been involved with this process for quite some time. You're pretty much on top of it. Just a couple of comments for Mike, if I may:

Making reference to the mobile caribou protection measures of 1978 is probably not appropriate. In those days, we were nowhere near understanding movement and distribution of the caribou as we do now. With the event of improvement in monitoring technology, including collars – the big C that some people don't like to hear, especially in the 90s – if we had enough of those way back then, there are a lot of question marks regarding caribou distribution and movement that we would have been able to answer much better in the 80s and in the 90s. So if we gave ourselves now the tools to redefine and redesign a new set of proper mobile protection measures, I think we would be in good shape, and we could look at all those things together outside the calving area.

Just to add a little more to what our Chair just mentioned, Prudhoe Bay, I think Mike had a question about using some of those mobile protection measures on the calving ground that might work. We don't want to tempt that one. We don't want to find out the hard way that it doesn't. The risks are

just too high. It's one thing to extrapolate for something that was never really put in place in the 1970s to something that could work now, let alone newer technology, so that's the other thing.

One final comment, Mr. Chair: As far as shutdown of the diamond mines and all those footprints on the fall, spring, and winter range of the Bathurst, we do have to acknowledge the Industry. They've been really good corporate citizens. They've gone out of their way to comply with the recommendations we proposed over the years. Many times we probably got carried away in some cases. They haven't had to shut down the mines, but when animals move within some of the roads going to their pits, they will terminate activities and let the cows and calves do their thing. They do time budget analyses for us, like some behavioral work. They wait until these animals go out, and they provide us with reports.

So, there is always improvement that needs to be made. Like I said earlier, we work together. Mobile protection measures – we still have a long way to go I think. There is lots of work to do to get something in place that will bring all of us in a comfort zone, especially as you get closer to the calving grounds. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Bruno. It just occurred to me that one of the other factors in this zone of influence discussion was not just noise and moving traffic and infrastructure, but it was dust – the dusting of the vegetation. That dust carries a long way from the mine. So there is an avoidance issue and increased energetic costs that is reflected in that zone of influence discussion, but as Warren raised, it's not necessarily clear what the ecosystemic implications are. We're getting a better handle on that. Earl and then Warren.

Earl: Earl Evans, BQ Board. One of the mines that is kind of often overlooked – that mine, I'm talking about the Colomac Mine, is probably the cause of the demise of both the Bathurst and the Bluenose East because of the location that it's on. The amount of damage it has done to those two herds because of its geographic location is not to be overlooked. I mean we talk about the other diamond mines further up the road, but as Bruno knows, in the late 2000s, late 90s, that road was heavily, heavily used. That's a main corridor where the Bathurst and the Bluenose East come down. Indian Lake is kind of the splitting point there. There have been several thousand caribou taken off that road every year. The trucks come up there. Trailers come up there. All the community hunts were done mostly off Indian Lake and the Snare Lake Road. Bruno knows that. He flew that, and there didn't seem to be any protection measures whatsoever on that road. Anybody could come up there and hunt, and it was just total devastation.

I know in 2007-2008 was the last year we hunted up there, but the four to five years prior to that, it was just a wholesale slaughter. It kind of went unchecked actually. I mean the resource officers were out there, but at that time, there were no limits on caribou. Every resident hunter in Yellowknife was allowed five tags, I think up to about 2008 or something. All that pressure and no protection measures in place I think really led to the slide of those two herds. So hopefully we can put some protection measures that are in place that people are going to abide by and can be enforced to help these herds recover from the state that they're in, if they ever will recover. But Colomac, they were in a stage of reclamation, but even in that stage of reclamation, you still have infrastructure, and people can access it. And access is the key to controlling the numbers of caribou that are taken. So I think that's not to be overlooked that one. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Earl. Warren.

Warren: Thank you, David. Warren for the KWB. I just wanted to raise a few other issues with the idea of mobile protection measures while we're on the topic of it. The first is the issue of minimum altitudes that Mitch had raised before. He kind of implied that wasn't really feasible during calving season. Every HTO that I've visited and numerous hunters in Baker Lake – because I've worked there over the past six years – all have stories of low-flying aircraft disturbing hunting practices despite the stipulations that helicopters remain a certain height.

I don't know what's going on there. You know, I wasn't the one that observed these things, but they say this over and over. So there have to be some issues with that being enforced properly with weather conditions perhaps, but according to hunter's knowledge, it's still disturbing caribou, and it's disturbing hunting practices.

Second is the collaring issue that Mitch brought up. He's right. They're not popular. We've heard numerous concerns that people have with collaring caribou. It's an emotional issue for them, and they really feel it's invasive and disrespectful to animals. Mitch was also right. He works very closely with the HTOs. It's a pill they're willing to swallow, because he works closely with them and always brings hunters out. That's the feedback I've heard when I've discussed this with hunters.

The third issue was dust that David just brought up. Yeah, that's the other thing that I don't know how mobile measures could deal with this dust impact issue. Kim raised that as a possible issue with the zone of influence when he gave his last presentation. And just on the point of dust, there is a term and condition for the Meadowbank gold mine that Agnico was supposed to suppress dust on their access road. This project is almost over, and they have yet to do that, despite the fact that it's a NIRB term and condition, and despite the fact that the Baker Lake HTO, Baker Lake Elders, and Baker Lake hunters raise this issue at every meeting with Agnico Eagle. Basil can attest to this. They've raised this constantly. Agnico refuses to budge. So I'm not sure. I think this is relevant as well, that these don't always get enforced properly. If this was in the calving grounds, I think this could have a much bigger impact.

Also is the enforceability of monitoring, and I'll just note that Anconia Resources, a company in the middle of the Qamanirjuaq calving grounds, went years without submitting their mandatory wildlife monitoring reports to NIRB. That's quite troubling on both counts. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Warren. I guess on the implementation of measures I have a little story. I'll confess again. I was responsible for the remediation of the Colomac site at one point. The Tl'ichô were really insistent on having a fence built around the tailings pond while that remediation was going on. So we agreed to do that, and I told the folks that were building the fence to make sure that there weren't any sharp angles in that fence, because we were told by the Tl'ichô that wolves will herd caribou into the corners. They understood what I was telling them. I went out to inspect the site after the fence was built, and sure enough, there were more right-angle bends in that fence than I could believe. I mean it just happens despite all the instructions you're going to give people. Things will go wrong.

So lesson learned there was to make sure that the inspection and enforcement was clear, and the instructions were clear and being followed daily, not just at the start of the fence construction and at the end of it. Once it was built, it wasn't going to be changed. And sure enough, wolves figured it out pretty quickly and pushed the caribou into the fence. There were a few more caribou taken

that way. I think Earl is quite right that the major effect though wasn't the infrastructure at the mine. It was the access to the mine that produced the greatest impact on caribou. Somebody had a question?

Lynda: Thank you. Lynda Orman, GN. I just had a quick follow-up comment, and also Rosanne had raised this earlier too. On the issue of capacity to monitor and enforce these issues from a regulator, we do not have the capacity currently in the Government of Nunavut to oversee this monitoring and capacity that would be needed for enforcement.

David: Great. Leslie?

(Laughter)

Leslie: Along related lines, I was wondering if INAC would be able to give this group a summary of inspection and enforcement of the existing caribou protection measures, for instance, on the Qamanirjuaq calving ground. And would they have any idea at an exploration level over the years. I know there have been lots of caribou protection measures and lots of permits issued, but would we have a good feeling for how much compliance there has been for those in terms of how much disturbance may have been avoided through the measures? Thanks.

Spencer: Thank you. Spencer Dewar, INAC. We commit it as an undertaking to look and see some summaries of inspections that have occurred in the past. So we'll do that and report back, I guess through the Commission.

Melanie: Melanie Wilson, Government of Nunavut. Just along similar lines, I'd just like to wrap my head around the idea of exploration and mining, and separating the two. This question might be better addressed by the regulators for exploration permits, but what is the current process to inform proponents early on when they apply for permits within calving grounds, that they are in an area of ecological significance?

Spencer: Hi, Spencer Dewar, INAC. Since the implementation of NUPPAA, all project proposals will have to go to the Nunavut Planning Commission to see if they conform with the Land Use Plan. I think in the absence of a Land Use Plan, projects would go to NIRB for impact assessment. NIRB would make a determination on whether the project would proceed with or without a review. Post that, it would go to the regulators, which would consist of the landowners, the Water Board, Transport Canada, DFO, there are a few others. Yeah, I guess the Land Use Plan is the first stop to tell if there are areas of high sensitive areas. Thank you.

Melanie: Thank you, Spencer, for your answer. Melanie Wilson, Government of Nunavut. Prior to, or in lieu of a Land Use Plan, it was my understanding that there are two avenues, through a Type A and Type B permit, the former being one that triggers a NIRB screening. The latter would be one that doesn't require a NIRB screening. The differences between these two are based on logistical requirements such as the number of man hours, number of fuel stored on site, etcetera. So how have these Type B permits been treated in terms of informing proponents?

Spencer: Okay, Spencer Dewar, INAC. Under the Territorial Land Use Regulations, you can apply for a Class A or Class B permit. It's a threshold-based system. Under a certain threshold of activity, it's a Class B. In that instance, INAC would send it to a Land Advisory Committee, which would do self-

consultation, provide copies to other regulators - HTOS, Regional Inuit Associations, NTI, the Government of Nunavut – for comment and feedback. Then they would issue a permit according to what they've heard. At the higher threshold, it's a Class A, and those would go to NIRB for impact review.

Melanie: Thank you. Melanie Wilson, Government of Nunavut. So for early mineral exploration where it could potentially just be someone walking on a calving ground with a hammer versus drilling, proponents are informed early on that is a calving ground? Is that correct? Because there are some, from the time that I've worked at the GN – there have been some permits issued on calving grounds that the GN has not been aware of and has not provided comment on.

Spencer: Okay, Spencer Dewar, INAC. Are we talking about land use permits, or are we talking about subsurface rights?

Melanie: Exploration permits – mineral exploration permits.

Spencer: Okay, sorry. Spencer Dewar, INAC. So land use permits – okay so, Class A permits would go to the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Class B permits would have been sent to the GN. I can't comment on the specifics, but if one was missed by the GN, we could look into it and see if there was a communication breakdown. But the process is that a land advisory committee would be notified of any activity that was to occur.

Melanie: Sorry I'm asking so many questions. The reason...the point I'm getting at is if we were to separate out exploration and mining, how will we ensure due diligence with regard to informing proponents that exploration may not lead to mining in a calving ground, and that the risk and responsibility is up front in that the risk doesn't get passed on to regulators or to government bodies?

Spencer: Sorry, could you repeat that? I'm not quite sure I understand what you're asking.

Melanie: It's just a technical question for future possibilities of separating out exploration and mining. And one of the ideas that was tabled was exploration because it doesn't require permanent infrastructure, if it is done outside a critical timing period, may have low impact on caribou. But the reason biologists are hesitant regarding that idea is the fact that everyone knows exploration leads to eventual development, and there are rights involved. So, how will regulators ensure that this is known by proponents and practice due diligence in informing proponents if that is something that we pursue – the Land Use Plan?

Spencer: Spencer Dewar, INAC. I'll attempt to answer your question, and then I'll maybe hand it over to Ken Landa who may be able to respond more clearly. Any undertaking or permit or application that is received by INAC, there is an effort to consult it out. That consultation is done via the Planning Commission, if they've received a positive proposal. That's a first attempt to let proponents know what is out there. The Nunavut Impact Review Board is a very consultative process where people get to see what's being proposed, and they get to provide comment. The Class B permits with the lower threshold, there would be a Land Advisory Committee distribution list and we're soliciting comments. So, those procedural steps are intended so that people that are interested, or groups that are interested or have responsibilities for reviewing can make comments so we can inform proponents of what the regulatory environment looks like.

Ken: Ken Landa, Government of Canada. I think I understand your question, and let me paraphrase it back and make sure that I do. Your question is there is some concern about separating exploration from mining, because current experience indicates that the consultation or the information flow on exploration may not have always been perfect or adequate. And your specific question is how will proponents be notified in an early way that a project proposal is proposed for sensitive areas?

I understand entirely – if I got that right – I understand entirely where you’re coming from. But the past is only so helpful in understanding what the future would be like, because the future is about designing a Land Use Plan that addresses exactly that issue, and demonstrates the information base to proponents that this is a sensitive area. So the particular problems about information flow about permits should be replaced by a Land Use Plan, that with GN data, is clearly delineating where these sensitive habitats are.

David: Yeah, I’ll get to you in a second, Jonathan. I’ll just add a couple of observations. The first is that process – as laudable as it might be – didn’t work particularly well with the Tundra Copper application, which was approved by NIRB in a calving ground, despite the objections of just about every other party. So, that would be one observation, that the past is not always necessarily a good predictor of future good behavior.

The second is that there is an onus on the proponent to do its homework too. The third is that given the current mineral regime, mineral rights acquisition and development regime, and we’ve talked about this in previous sessions – there is an expectation, a reasonable expectation by a company or individual that’s required a mineral claim, that it will be able to develop that mineral claim subject to the normal regulatory process. We’ve talked about grandfathering mineral rights, and we’re going to have to revisit that in the context of this discussion too, maybe tomorrow morning. So, there are a number of observations I’d make that the current system doesn’t work particularly well in terms of separating exploration from a reasonable expectation that successful exploration will result in the ability to construct a mine, which I think is the essence of the concern that people have in that context. Ken?

Ken: Ken Landa, Government of Canada. I think there are a number of issues raised by the question. I think the particular one that Melanie was trying to zoom in on were those things that go below the NIRB threshold where that process isn’t the process that flags it. So that’s why I was focusing on the Land Use Plan in particular at the earliest stage of the process. Right now, the GN is the primary provider of data that will delineate sensitive habitat. Everybody’s expectation is whether there are restrictions, prohibitions, or not, that those areas will be delineated clearly in the Land Use Plan. So from an information flow perspective, that should be a full solution to the problem, the particular problem that she was getting at. It doesn’t solve all problems.

David: And the cumulative effects discussion and all of that kicks in as well. Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you, David. That’s exactly what I was just going to mention. In the absence of a Land Use Plan across the entire territory that is managing this information flow and notification to proponents about particularly sensitive habitat, the Commission does still retain its ability to refer below threshold Class B land use permits to the Impact Review Board where it has concerns regarding cumulative impacts. And the information that has been provided by the GN regarding sensitive caribou habitat is something that we are considering when determining if there are cumulative impacts concerns for below threshold projects.

David: Thank you, Jonathan. Rosanne.

Rosanne: Thank you. Rosanne D'Orazio with QIA. I just had two points to make. From the perspective of Inuit Owned Land, if what you were explaining of an exploration project to happen, the process that we in the Lands Department go through is first to consult with what we call our CLARCs or Community Lands and Resource Committee, which provides feedback to the Lands Department, that we then turn in to terms and conditions that would go along with that permit, if it's issued. So that's one mechanism that we have to give feedback on sensitive or Protected Areas, Inuit Owned Land parcels where certain development is not wanted. So that's one way that we from an Inuit Owned Land's perspective can have that conversation with proponents.

The other point I wanted to make with respect to the Land Use Plan, a while ago, QIA submitted a notification and consultation guide that we've since discussed with the other Regional Inuit Associations and will hopefully be submitting a new version of this along with our comments. One of the goals of this is to include a requirement for notification within the conformity determination process. So right now, we know more of what goes on in Inuit Owned Land than we do on Crown Land, as do communities. So if a proponent wanted to do an exploration or a prospecting, there would have to be a certain level of communication that happened within the community, whether it be the HTO or CLARC, and this would apply to Crown land or Inuit Owned Land, which would help this level of knowledge, I guess, as to what's going on in their area. So that's one tool that we're hoping can help level the playing field I guess when it comes to knowing what the requirements are.

David: I thought I saw a couple of hands go up in that corner. Leslie and Luigi?

Leslie: I was just going to say from the historical perspective of the Board, this was a concern for many years, and the Board – the BQ Board – was tracking prospecting permits, mineral claims, and mineral leases on the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq calving grounds. So we put together maps. The Board reviewed them and could see that it was a pretty dynamic situation, but also that a lot of mineral tenures were being issued on the calving grounds. Speak up... I was told before not to get so close and talk so loud...Is this better? Okay.

So the Board actually contacted INAC at that time and said what can we do about this? We came to an agreement. INAC would send information to prospecting permit applicants that they were operating on the calving grounds. That was presumably done – it wasn't done through the Board. It was done as part of the process. Our understanding was that these companies all knew they were on the calving grounds when they applied for their permits. But yet, somehow there was not a two-way information flow at all I guess, because there was this instance or a couple of instances Melanie referred to where it got to the land use permit stage and it went through NIRB, and they got their permits without really anybody knowing this was happening. In particular, GN didn't know what was happening, and that's why they didn't submit comments to NIRB during the regular process.

So I'm not just point out that the current process or the past process didn't work, but the communication needs to go both ways. Also, it's not an assurance that a company won't proceed, just because they know they're working in a sensitive area. It's up to them whether they continue or not. And this gets to the issue that Warren has raised about social license. Did they want to continue on and take their chances that they will be able to pursue a mine on a calving ground? But I don't really think that helps the situation of protecting the calving ground at all. So that's where

the BQ Board comes back to the issue of needing to prohibit these activities from occurring in the calving grounds, because allowing companies to do exploration means you may end up with a mine, and that isn't what we need to protect caribou habitat. So I don't really see the other conversation is getting us anywhere, I guess is what I'm getting at. So from our Board's perspective, we get back to the fact that you don't want exploration somewhere you don't want mining. That has to happen through a prohibition and area protection. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Leslie. Luigi?

Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. The KIA also issues land licenses in a similar manner to what Rosanne explained for the QIA. So for new applications, we do consult with – they're not called CLARCs in our region. They're called CBCs, Community Beneficiary Committees. But the process is very similar. So likewise in the Kitikmeot, for projects on IOL, there is a better understanding, knowledge of what is occurring on IOL than there is on Crown Land at the present time. That's one item.

The second item I would like to talk to is I really appreciate Bruno's comment concerning new information and using that new information to potentially feed a discussion on mobile protection measures. So I'm actually quite excited to see a potential agenda item for hopefully some more technical discussions on that matter.

From the resource allocation standpoint, it's quite disappointing to hear from the GN that there is no funding available to monitor, to provide any kind of monitoring for protective measures. I understand. I don't like it. This is one area that I would suggest the GN have an undertaking to maybe discuss with other departments. Is there any funding – If the policy by the GN has changed to not look at those areas as Protected Areas and they are going to look at mobile protection as a possibility, then there needs to be some reasonable thought and budget allocation for the assessment of those measures.

David: Mitch?

Mitch: Thank you. Mitch Campbell, GN. I couldn't agree with you more. Thank you.

(Laughter)

David: Go ahead.

Lynda: Lynda Orman, GN. Just a point of clarification, Luigi: We currently do not have the capacity or enforcement funding to do the level of monitoring that would be required for the mobile protection areas strategy. Qujannamiik.

David: And correct me if I'm wrong, but Mitch, I think you mentioned that the Caribou Strategy itself, while it promised resources, never delivered.

Mitch: Thank you. Mitch Campbell, GN. Yes, we never got the full resources to fully implement the strategy. Thank you.

David: Hannah?

Hannah: Thank you. Hannah, NTI. I think that was largely the point that we tried to come across yesterday with GN's news of the change in their position. But regardless of which caribou protection measures that we narrowed down to, we hope that those agencies responsible for monitoring and reporting on any of these do come with resources required, albeit human resources, financial, or otherwise. That's why I asked Steve yesterday to confirm if the GN will be revising the Caribou Strategy or not, or what type of resources are put to today's requirements to monitor today's activities, or future activities.

I hope that the GN will go back, as Luigi suggested, to take a look internally to see what it would take to enforce any kind of policy direction the GN will be pushing forward. As my colleague stated earlier in their presentation, NTI hasn't come up with its own position yet on caribou protection measures. We will be bringing forward some recommendations to our leadership in the coming weeks, but we had hoped to bring to them as much information as possible following this workshop, following further follow-up discussions as well. We're exploring all of our legally viable options towards a policy decision, and any information or commitment on behalf of regulatory agencies would be very much appreciated. Qujannamiik.

David: Thanks, Hannah.

Lynda: Lynda Orman, GN. Just to reiterate Steve's point the other day that there are currently no plans to change or rewrite or reinstate the Nunavut Caribou Strategy. Qujannamiik.

David: Okay, any additional comments? What I'm going to suggest we do is break now. I'm also going to suggest we not resume until 7:00 tonight but that we do resume at 7:00. We should be able to finish the discussion of the tundra wintering mainland and tundra wintering island caribou tonight, and then we can get into the wrap-up discussion tomorrow. If we meet at 9:00 tomorrow, I'm sure we'll be done by noon. One thing I'm going to ask the Commission, though, to do is identify for us this evening outstanding issues and questions that they would like to see covered in the discussion, just to get as much out of this as we can. I think people are kind of tired now, and it would be good to have a decent break. Does 7:00 work for folks? Are we okay with that? Brian?

Brian: Qujannamiik. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. We would also like to find time tomorrow to discuss the existing rights issue. We would like somebody from NTI to be sure they are here tomorrow through the morning and part of the day so we can try to get some movement on that as well. Qujannamiik.

Hannah: Yes, I'll be here.

David: Great, thanks. We'll see everyone at 7:00. And there will be refreshments.

BREAK

David: So this evening, we're going to talk about tundra wintering mainland caribou, tundra wintering island caribou, Peary caribou, and Belcher Island's reindeer. I think we can do it all in two hours, but if it extends beyond that, we will pick it up in the morning. I do think we should be out of here by 9:00. But before we get started, Matthew would like to make some comments. I'll call him up, and we'll hear from him, and then we'll move into the technical discussion.

Matthew: *(Translated)*: I have a few items. We have been under a quota system today, and that derives from the time snowmobiles arrived to Nunavut and the noise. For instance, survey counters is an example of why we have no caribou. People were hunting for caribou, and during the survey, a helicopter came back. They were told that they saw only one caribou, same area. Immediately someone went to harvest it. There turned out to be 33 caribou or more. So, people during survey counting its accuracy, Baffin Island caribou the community surveys I think there was supposed to be someone doing surveys this summer – caribou biologist. Is there anyone coming up to replace him.

Second one was in 1972 when I arrived to Pond Inlet from Igloolik. There were geese researchers, and we were told again that the geese population was depleting. I think that is attributed to parks being established. Perhaps one day we'll get clarification and be assisted.

David: Thanks, Matthew. Please.

Lynda: Lynda Orman with the GN. Qujannamiik. I just wanted to mention, and I'll let Mitch speak a little bit to the survey, but you were asking about the biologists in Pond Inlet. Yes, we will have a wildlife technician hired for Pond Inlet within the coming few months, and beyond that another biologist. Qujannamiik.

Mitch: Yeah, there was also some work that was proposed by the biologist that is departing the department, and we are right now trying to coordinate our staff here to fill in and conduct that survey and include the HTO with that as well. Thank you.

David: Any comment from Parks Canada?

Andrew: I'm not sure I understood the question regarding Parks. Maybe somebody can reiterate it for me?

David: Well, he's concerned about the number of geese and the decline in the goose population. I'm just wondering if you've got any observations from the National Park.

Andrew: Well certainly every year there is research that goes on to do studies and censuses of the number of geese that are on Bylot Island. I haven't had a report from the researchers doing that work that there has been a large decline in recent years, but what I can do is I'll go back and make sure that the most recent data is shared with the community, if it hasn't been already. If it has been already, I'll reiterate that it maybe it can be shared again through the HTO. But there is information about the geese populations collected regularly, and we can certainly provide that.

David: Brian?

Brian: Thank you, David. *(Translated)*: Thank you for your concerns. Yes, you'll be answered eventually soon, but we're on caribou topics in this meeting. Thank you.

David: So, as I said, I think we're probably done with the mainland migratory caribou discussion unless the Planning Commission staff have any questions they feel are still outstanding. So I'm going to suggest is that we move on this evening to tundra wintering mainland and the others, as I outlined earlier. If there are any residual questions or comments, we can get back to that tomorrow morning. So Jonathan or Peter, do you have any outstanding issues at this point, significant outstanding issues?

Peter S: Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission. I wouldn't say we have outstanding issues regarding the tundra wintering mainland herds, just confirmation of our sense that the proposed policies that we discussed for the mainland migrating are transferable over. So the two types of herds can be treated similarly.

David: Well I guess that question will be answered as we enter the discussions this evening. What I'm going to suggest or request of Mitch is that he give us a quick overview of the ecology of these different herds, starting with the tundra wintering mainland herd. Then we'll have a discussion about that. Same process will follow. It seems to me that it's worth a bit of a reminder about the differences between these herds and the mainland herds. Mitch if you wouldn't mind?

Tundra Wintering Mainland Caribou

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. This is Mitch Campbell, GN. So I'll just do a quick overview, and I think for the sake of time here, there is a lot of knowledge around this table, so I would invite people to come in and share that where I may have skimmed over or left out. But I think for right now, we can probably say that ecologically, the island and mainland tundra wintering types are very similar. So, I'll just speak of tundra wintering caribou for right now. That would include everything.

So what we know about that group – and these are just fairly recently fleshed out ideas – but we do have good science on a lot of these populations. We've had a lot of good – especially during the Baffin Island consultation rounds that were done a couple of years back, as well as discussions in the communities of Chesterfield Inlet and Repulse Bay talking about some of the tundra wintering – the Lorillard and Wager Bay populations to be specific. There are also some discussions in Kugaaruk and Gjoa Haven, Cambridge Bay regarding the Ahik and other potential subpopulations in that area.

Basically you can scope them out by saying mainland migratory caribou migrate between the treeless tundra and the forested taiga or boreal forest areas – Northern boreal forest areas. They tend to have high sexual segregation throughout all periods of the year, except the rutting period and periods of time following the rut.

Tundra wintering barren ground caribou, although they are migratory, they are less migratory than the mainland migratory. They generally spend their entire annual cycle above the tree line, or north of the tree line. There are exceptions to this, but they are not common, where tundra wintering caribou have gone down into the northern treed areas. That is not obviously the case for the island version of the tundra wintering. So ecologically, these animals are less sexually segregated, but there is still a level of segregation that occurs throughout their annual cycle, with again the exception of the fall period where all the ages and sexes gather for the rut. Generally, calving areas are typically larger in scale than those of the mainland migratory populations or subpopulations. The remaining seasonal ranges are very similar to those of the mainland migratory caribou groups.

So from that perspective, and from what we've seen – because there has been a lot of work done on these populations, certainly on the mainland and within work done in calving areas as well – they

are consistent with some of the sensitivities that we have seen within the mainland migratory groups. That's a really quick overview of what we're dealing with, and I'm just going to quickly summarize.

Spatially, their calving grounds tend to be larger than those of the mainland migratory, and they tend to be less sexually segregated than the mainland migratory. You can find bulls on the calving grounds – not large numbers, but you can find bulls on the calving grounds. They are less migratory, though still migratory, but they don't undertake the same extent of migration. All the other seasonal ranges outside of calving tend to be very similar in terms of range use and size, as those of the mainland migratory.

I can just add one other component. When we looked at that chart that we had up during the seasonal discussion on the first day, the movement breaks are very similar to the mainland migratory. So the seasonal breaks where the spring migration starts, wolf pups are born, all that component plus the drop in movement rates in calving, are all consistent with mainland migratory caribou.

So that's a quick overview, but I can speak more if questions come up, or if anyone has anything else to add to that ecotype. Thanks.

David: Just one quick question from me. Whatever happened to the Ahik designation?

Mitch: It's still there. It disappeared, and it came back.

(Laughter)

David: It's just like GN policy decisions.

(Laughter)

Mitch: I'm sorry. I can't comment.

(Laughter)

David: Anybody have any additional information, comments on the herds themselves before we get into what we do about it? Jackie?

Jackie: Hello, Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Just a question for clarification: Are we just talking about the mainland, or are we grouping it in with the island?

Mitch: Yeah, we're dealing with the mainland, but the descriptions would be essentially identical. The only difference is that the island groups will never get down to the tree, whereas sometimes the mainland in rare cases, can.

David: And genetically?

Mitch: So genetically in general, and there is a number of people that have worked on this around the table that I would encourage come into this, but for the main groups such as the Lorillard and the Wager

and the Ahiak, they are very similar. In fact, they're very difficult to tell apart from the mainland groups. There are some exceptions that are being found in some of these groupings, which tells us that the tundra wintering caribou are more data deficient than are the mainland migratory. So we're still learning about that, and there is still work going on. I'm sure our knowledge and our ability to understand these ecotypes will be improving over the next few years.

David: Mike, go ahead please.

Mike: Mike Settingington with the Chamber of Mines, but now speaking as a biologist specifically. It's just a point of interest. We worked with three years of collar data from the North Baffin Island caribou herd. We tried and struggled to see what the seasonal movement patterns would be. We couldn't pick them out, and that was presented in our baseline report, just as a point of interest. Perhaps it's of interest to Jackie when they're considering looking at areas on Baffin Island. We just couldn't see a distinct seasonal change.

My second point is – and this was in one of the recommendations, and again, as a biologist, I'm just interested in a lot of these smaller and isolated areas and the number of caribou that those areas were based on. Again, like we saw on the Baffin Island caribou, which we're more familiar with the data having worked with it, we did see individual caribou going back to the exact same spot to calve. I'm just wondering if you have that same kind of nature in these small areas, and if that could be discussed in the final report that you'll be presenting, just so we have that record of the ecology behind it.

Mitch: Yeah, sorry Mike. Could you, for the individual...the second part of your question, could you just repeat that for me? Thanks.

Mike: Mike Settingington with the Chamber of Mines. So again, in the northeast, Kugaaruk, Gjoa Haven, Repulse Bay – I don't know the new name for it – these smaller areas, the smaller polygons that are identified as calving areas. Not knowing what data went behind it or if you had the same caribou returning to the same spot to calve, which would be very telling, or if you look specifically if there was reduced movement rate in those caribou, the number of caribou used to define those areas – that's just what I was wondering, if that would be presented in the final methods document, just to give the ecology behind these smaller areas, which are new to people like me.

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. So we did run...sorry, Mitch Campbell, Department of Environment. Baffin Island is data deficient. There is absolutely no question. And it's one of the reasons why the GN has not defined polygons for that area despite some of the collaring data that does exist up there. I can try to get a part of that. So we have a lot more work to do, including a lot more consultation to do with communities with what's going on in that area. Because we just recently lost a biologist, that's going to be delayed, but that's on the docket in that we need to move that direction, and also work with the communities to determine what they're comfortable with in moving ahead to try and fill some of these data gaps that exist on Baffin Island currently. And I understand that the QWB is in the process of filling some of those data gaps.

That being said, we did look at the North Baffin during a period of high abundance in the late 80s, early 90s, the collar dataset that's from there. I'm wondering, is this the dataset that you were looking at, or the more recent 2006 dataset?

Mike: Mike Settingington, Chamber of Mines. Just a point of clarification: I didn't have any issues with Baffin Island. It was just a point of interest that I had mostly for Jackie. What I'm really quite interested in are these smaller polygons. Sorry. I have no questions about the Baffin Island. I do have questions, and I'm wondering if it will be addressed in your final methods document and mapping of calving areas about the ecology about these smaller calving areas in the northeast for the tundra wintering caribou.

Mitch: Thanks. Mitch Campbell, GN. Actually, I knew where you wanted to go on the second point. I was just trying to flesh out the Baffin Island side. I didn't realize it was just a point of interest. But to add to the Baffin Island before I move to the smaller polygons, we have looked at the seasonal breaks and movement rates, and we have detected a pattern that mimics those we see in other tundra wintering and mainland migratory groups. These are admittedly – we need more information.

And in fact, the file report has just come out on the Baffin Island work in bringing some of these spatial files to light. We discuss those issues and show those movement rates, so that's available on the GN website, or I could supply it too. I believe it's available on the GN website, but I have a draft that I can supply. So that's Baffin.

Speaking to the smaller polygons you're referring to, those were related to the Wager Bay and Lorillard collaring programs. Those polygons and how they were defined will be clearly identified in the methodology of the map atlas publication that will be coming out. We will also be providing prior to that the methods section complete with peer-reviewed literature that was used to develop it, which is currently completed I think. We've had it ready to go, but because of the change that happened recently in policy, the document had the old policy written into it, and we had to go back and redo it. So everything is kind of on hold until we get that done. I hope that sort of covered most of what you were asking.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Any other comments or questions? Pete, did you have a question?

Peter S: Thank you, Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission. I left the table of dates behind me just to reiterate the question I had earlier and just to ensure that when we leave the session, there should be some plan for the Planning Commission to be informed of what the dates are for calving and post-calving. If there are any sort of seasonal restrictions need to be applied, there needs to be a process on how those will be established.

Mitch: Yeah, and those are, in fact, the seasonal breaks, and we can provide that in a separate document. Those are the breaks there for the different herds. Thank you.

David: Okay, so the question, I guess, on the table right now for these herds is does the same discussion and the same general conclusions we had with the mainland migratory apply to these herds as well – in other words, the same prohibitions, the same seasonal constraints, the same principles?

Mitch: *(Chiming in background)*. That's such a nice sound.

(Laughter)

David: Don't let it distract you.

Mitch: Mitch Campbell, GN. We believe that firstly, the GN and the GNWT – because the map atlas program and the development of the seasonal breaks, etcetera – was a joint program between the two jurisdictions. We are revisiting all those polygons again in 2017. I believe I said that earlier, so I apologize for repeating myself. But we'll be looking into the methods, and will be adding in all new data that exists to apply to the seasonal ranges. We would certainly welcome input onto that process, and I think that we could probably develop that process. Last time we did it, we worked as a working group with the subject matter experts to develop it, but I think that it might be helpful in this process to include other groups as we go along to let them know what's happening so they can get a sense of what we're doing and have some input along the way.

Ultimately, we'll have that same group of subject matter experts working on it, but we will make sure as we move along, we will share that information to the various stakeholders. So that being said, because of the similar seasonal ranges that occur, and movement rates – rates but not necessarily movement – we believe that the information should be treated the same as the mainland migratory herds, but we do acknowledge there are some differences. So far, those differences haven't suggested that the sensitivities are any different. Thank you.

David: Peter.

Peter S: Thank you. Peter Scholz, Nunavut Planning Commission. I have a question for Kivalliq Wildlife Board, which will probably expand to include others in the room. The Kivalliq Wildlife Board has made a recommendation to place a seasonal restriction on the entirety of Southampton Island, Coats Island and Mansel Island during the calving and post-calving periods on those islands. Could the KWB please go into a bit more detail? I'm just confirming it is the entirety of the island, and perhaps if you could flesh it out a little bit. Before I let go of the mike, I'm just checking the list here to ensure that we're not losing anything through the cracks.

Two tundra wintering mainland herds - small ones – the Melville Peninsula and the Boothia King William Island herds, don't relate to KWB but are similar in that they are sort of small tundra wintering herds on small geographic ranges on isolated pieces of geography. We don't have calving areas for those two herds. I'm just confirming that's the way we're going to leave it, or is there something similar between Southampton and those two other herds? I'm just asking to flesh that situation out. Thank you.

David: Okay, Warren, before you answer that, what I'd prefer to do is close off the conversation on the tundra wintering mainland herds. The island herds we'll get to in the next discussion. So if we can just – at least reading the herds sidebar here - so the Melville and Boothia King William Island, let's talk about that. That's part of the tundra wintering mainland. Let's talk about those now. If there is any additional information, as Peter is asking, we'll get to the island herds in the next discussion. Mitch?

Mitch: Sorry, I apologize. I just wanted to add one thing. From the island population perspective, and my colleague from the Kitikmeot just reminded me that the Dolphin and Union is a unique case, although they are similar in the same way we described tundra wintering. They obviously cross between an island and the mainland. So I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

David: That raises the issue of the sea ice and the marine transportation. But let's deal with one thing at a time if we can. So the general approach for the tundra wintering mainland herds, the same

prohibitions, same sensitivities as we discussed with the mainland herds, applies from the GN perspective. Any comments? Mike, David, and somebody else. Mike?

Mike: Mike Settingerton from the Chamber of Mines. And I didn't bring it up for the mainland ones. We're looking at spatial designation of the migratory routes, correct? We're looking at spatial designations within the Land Use Plan of migratory routes? I haven't seen these routes yet. I don't know if they were presented in Nunavut Planning Commission maps, because I didn't see them there. So I don't know what the migratory routes look like right now that we're talking about – Wager Bay and Lorillard. So it's a point of issue. Can the mineral industry live with it? I don't know how big an area we're looking at with potential seasonal restrictions.

Mitch: Yeah, we have developed migratory routes for those populations. I've got it with me, and I can provide it to you. It should be in the submission, the original submission. There was a seasonal range map that was up showing the Wager Bay and Lorillard migratory routes. But some of them were data deficient. Some of the tundra wintering populations were data deficient. WE set the bar pretty high for developing these seasonal ranges, and where we are data deficient, we didn't provide the seasonal ranges. So there will be some populations where that data is missing.

My question – I have just a question to ask. The Chamber of Mines, I thought that we sent the shape files to you for review, and those would have included the Wager Bay and Lorillard migratory corridors. Thanks.

Mike: Mike Settingerton with the Chamber of Mines. No, we did not receive any shape file data, although we did request it.

Mitch: Okay, I'm not sure what's happening, because there are no issues with releasing that shape file data. We've released it to several mining operations and groups, so I'll see what's going on there and make sure you get hold of that. It's got all the individual seasonal polygons. So we'll make sure you get that. Hopefully before you leave we can get them to you tomorrow.

David: Thank you. David?

David Lee: Thank you. David Lee with Nunavut Tunngavik. Thank you, Mitch. So to address David's question about whether we apply the same prohibitions for tundra wintering and for full transparency, as this is a Technical Workshop – I'm not completely comfortable with concluding that we can apply the same prohibitions for tundra wintering. I think you've answered the question that we need to...you'll involve other groups. You have far more knowledge of the mainland tundra wintering herds than I do.

But I think there is some other behavior and behavioral plasticity there with the tundra wintering herds, especially those that are not at the same population size. That doesn't require the same mechanism as a mainland migratory. I want to repeat that there is no question in my mind that there should be no disturbance in the calving grounds of the mainland migratory herds. I'm just less certain about the nature of the relative importance of the calving grounds for the tundra wintering versus the mainland migratory for those that we're speaking to. However, I would defer my judgment to your expertise and the sensitivity, and of course, the precautionary approach. Thanks.

David: Mitch?

Mitch: I mean it's correct that we don't have the same level of confidence because of some of the behavioral differences that we have seen, as we do with the mainland migratory caribou. So that's factual. There is also in the literature, some suggestion by a few authors that there is a higher sensitivity to the more migratory and spatially restricted in terms of calving areas, mainland migratory. So I think it's...There are the same sensitivities, but we don't quite have answers for why we're seeing these behavioral differences between tundra wintering, certainly in calving in the mainland migratory. The long and the short of it is, our confidence level is not as high for suggesting that we understand all the components that are going on in tundra wintering caribou, whereas it's extremely high for mainland migratory. But because we have those data gaps, the research division decided to err on the side of caution because we know the sensitivities, and apply the same restrictions.

But I have to say with what I understand that there is room for discussion in that and further investigation into tundra wintering populations and potential and associated behavioral differences that could apply to the kinds of disturbance events, etcetera, that we've been talking about. I think the GN would be very open to discussing that further for tundra wintering, and the collection also, discussing it further with Inuit from across the regions as well. Because I believe that when it comes to tundra wintering caribou, a lot of that high quality on-the-ground knowledge is going to come from the communities that harvest these groups. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Jackie?

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Just to get to the question raised earlier about Melville Peninsula, two Qikiqtaaluk communities harvest from that region, the communities of Igloolik and Hall Beach. Therefore, it will be a discussion that QWB will have with those communities when we meet to discuss about caribou within our region. Knowing the personality of the HTOs of those two communities, I trust it will be a fruitful discussion with very clear direction provided. So I'll just leave it at that, but I'm certain of it. That's part of the great part of my job, so thank you.

David: No ambiguity. Okay, any other comments? Clearly there are some areas to follow-up on, but it'll be between GN and the parties. Anybody else? Any observation on this group?

Lynda: Lynda Orman, the GN. Just further to a question you had raised earlier, David, about the genetics. I just wanted to point out that we have had some genetics recently analyzed for the Baffin Island caribou, and they do come out as being separate from Melville Peninsula.

David: Alright, well that's a good segue into the island caribou then – tundra wintering island caribou. That includes South Baffin, North Baffin, East Baffin, Southampton, Coats, and Mansel. Peter already has a question on the table of the latter three. But perhaps Mitch again, I can ask you to quickly overview the ecology. Peter, do you have a question now, or can it wait until afterwards?

Peter S: Peter at NPC. Did you want to talk about Dolphin and Union as part of the tundra wintering mainland, or with the Peary?

David: Yeah, sorry, I completely overlooked that. Yeah, let's finish off the Dolphin and Union.

- Peter S: Thank you. Peter Scholz, NPC. The NPC has been doing a lot of research on marine material, which I'm not going to summarize here. But I'd say what our thinking is of the Dolphin Union herd regarding the sea ice crossing, is that our understanding is that there is a fairly tight window with the Dolphin and Union herd crosses from the mainland to the island shortly before break-up, sometime around May, which is somewhere between four to eight weeks. And there is a fairly tight window coming back, right after freeze-up in October-November. During those two windows is when ship passage – specifically icebreaking passage – can do the damage. And there is a space in the middle between the two migrations, sort of December-January-February, when in theory, icebreakers moving through there would not have negative impacts on the Dolphin and Union herd. My question to the group here is, is that thinking reasonably accurate, and if so, is there a system to pin down dates or a system to inform mariners of what those dates are? And if we're completely on the wrong track, where should we be going? Thanks.
- David: Thanks, Peter. GN, you want to take that on?
- Lisa: Lisa Marie, Government of Nunavut, Kitikmeot Regional Biologist. From past previous collar data from '86 to 2007, we did actually pinpoint the fall and spring migration...sorry...from past collar data, we actually did identify the fall and spring migration of the timing of the Dolphin Union, and the windows when they cross. I've been actually expressed in a peer-review publication available. Thank you.
- David: Anticipating the follow-up question, what are those dates?
- (Laughter)*
- Lisa: Lisa, GN. So for the fall migration, it's around October 30 to December 1st with the peak migration the first week of November. And then for the spring migration, it's May 15th to June 15th.
- David: Thank you. Any follow-up from NPC? Peter?
- Peter: Thank you. Peter at NPC. Has there been any research on ice conditions south of Victoria Island so that we could have an understanding of how late an icebreaker can move through there, and the ice will refreeze to a point where the caribou could cross south? Our understanding of the climate is that somewhere sometime in April is probably when it warms up enough that one can anticipate that the sea would not refreeze, and the window – the icebreaking would have to end before that date in April.
- Lisa: Lisa, GN. For Dolphin Union sea ice crossing, for the spring migration, that statement is basically correct. In February-March, past collar data have not shown the Dolphin Union utilized the sea ice at that time. However, a very sensitive time is when the sea ice starts forming. It could be early. It could be later. Right now, data show it has been happening later and later, the freeze-up. They only need a couple of centimeters, like 10 centimeters, for caribou to be able to venture on the sea ice. Thank you.
- David: Okay, thank you. Luigi?
- Luigi: Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I suspect there are going to be some more follow-up questions, but for me to understand properly, is the NPC asking that from a biological standpoint,

after the island caribou move from the island south to the mainland on the ice and before they venture back onto Victoria Island, that period in between icebreakers can go through and break the ice? Is that part of the question?

Peter S: Peter at NPC. I think you meant the other way around, because you just described the summer season. But I get your meaning. Yes, that is what we were asking. If the ice refreezes in time for the main migration, is there a biological concern to icebreakers going through after they've gone to the mainland and before they come back to the island?

Luigi: Mr. Chair, thank you. Sorry, I will follow-up with a question. Luigi Torretti, KIA. I would not advise that. The biological concern would be hunters, and so I would – not I – I'm pretty sure the Inuit are going to have a little bit of an issue with that. There is a lot of traffic back and forth between the mainland and Victoria Island for hunting purposes, and I would say no, there isn't a very good time after freeze-up for an icebreaker to go through. I'm pretty sure that is a Board decision. I'm not going to make the decision there, but I'm pretty sure that's fairly clear. I invite Kitikmeot to come and speak to that.

David: Peter and then Jimmy.

Peter S: Thanks, Luigi. Yeah, the NPC is sort of categorizing its data. We are certainly considering harvesting routes and community-to-community routes. We do understand that those are important throughout the winter. The Federal Government has asked us formally and informally to provide detailed breakdowns of information on why icebreaking at different times would not be advisable. So we feel we understand the human traffic reasons throughout the winter, but we wanted to clarify our understanding of the caribou specific biology so we can be clear when we meet with the federal marine officials at the upcoming Marine Session. But thank you for raising that point of clarification.

David: Jimmy?

Jimmy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jimmy Haniliak, Elder Advisor. Yeah, I keep hearing icebreakers coming in April, and that's not the case here. I know this herd very well. You know, a number of years ago, we as the local HTO, when we start having the migration sometimes coming right through Cambridge Bay, I know when they go across. The freeze-up now, it's not in October. It's between November and December to the end to now – climate change I guess? I don't know. It has to be.

I want to correct you on the days that I heard you say. We at the local level, because a number of years ago, NTCL barge was wintered in Cambridge Bay, and the ice was probably about five or six inches in the bay. The barge was docked at our dock. They decided to go out to the ocean. That's when the migration right in the bay was going through. And nobody knew about it. The next day, we started seeing the big wide-open trail of water toward the ocean. I don't know how many caribou drowned after that. We raised hell with NTCL.

What we ask for, especially in the bay, is that when the ice freezes – you know, I'm still going by imperial. I don't know nothing about metric, but I can go with my skidoo by myself, and all I need is three inches of ice. You know, what we all are saying every fall, we're all hoping there are no ships going through after freeze-up. But it always happens, and we don't know about it. Just December, last year, an icebreaker and another ship went through the passage, and we didn't know about that. The guys from Cambridge were flying to Yellowknife, and it was a nice clear day, and

they took pictures of it. The Coast Guard, we phoned and phoned headquarters of the Coast Guard, and they don't want to talk about it. But Cambridge Bay – or community – was really, really upset. We even tried to have a talk with our MP, who is now Minister of DFO, without any luck on having talked to him.

I really wanted to clarify you on the dates. I keep hearing icebreakers in April. You know, we don't have any icebreakers in April - in July to end of September. And when the migration is from the island to the mainland, they wait around sometimes around the coast of Cambridge and further west. And now for with human disturbance, they are now changing their migration route. The GN, you know, we need to work with you. We need you on a yearly basis. I know that funding is always hard to get, but the biologists, they do a really great job by keeping us informed on how our herd is doing. I'm going to stop there for now. You know, I think that's going to be it for now. I'd like to speak more on it, but we're cut for time. Like Sharon says, I've never known you to be quiet, but I'm going to stop here.

(Laughter)

One more if I may, Mr. Chairman. We work closely with our biologists, our Kitikmeot biologists. On a good note, I always tell her, you need to start communicating with these caribou, so that they don't migrate south. When they come back up to migrate back to the island, they're all skinny. So I always tell her you need to find a way to communicate. Thank you.

(Laughter)

David: Keep them on the island and keep them safe. Okay, Ken?

Ken: Ken Landa, Government of Canada. I think people know this, but it's probably worth saying. Because of the blizzard, some of the federal officials who had planned to be here part of this discussion were unable to, so we're going to need to find a way to pick that up and make sure that we don't lose that knowledge and more knowledge like it. But I also, if I understand correctly what we just covered in the last few minutes, it seems like maybe there is some uncertainty about crossing dates and sensitive dates, and when icebreakers might be more likely to be interested in being in the area. So, from our perspective, if I understood correctly, I'm not sure the staff have what they need yet on this topic.

David: Well let's ask the staff. You guys have enough for now pending the marine workshop itself, or do you need more?

Peter S: Peter Scholz, NPC. For me, yes. Thank you.

David: Just so folks are fully in the picture, there was an intent to have a discussion about the marine issues – marine traffic – actually tonight and tomorrow. But given the storm and given the priority of the Caribou Workshop, that marine workshop has been postponed, and a date for reconvening has not been determined yet. But it will, and we'll bring this discussion into that workshop as well.

Lynda: Lynda Orman with the GN. I don't think it has been quite clarified here, but from the GN perspective, we were also calling for the sea ice between Victoria Island and the mainland to be a Protected Area.

David: Protected year-round?

Lynda: No, with appropriate seasonality.

David: So a Special Management Area essentially. Lynda?

Lynda: I have a correction here. I'm sorry, Special Management Area.

David: Okay, let's move on then. Earl, last question?

Earl: Earl, BQ Board. I just had a question for Lisa. Did you say you needed 10 centimeters of ice for one caribou? Because I know they can cross with three inches, at least the skinny ones.

Lisa: Lisa here. That's what the timing and the peak - it's based on collar information, because the open lead and so the difficulty to access the sea ice or filming it by drone what really happened when they migrate, it's really dangerous. It's unknown. You cannot fly a helicopter or fixed wing in half-open water.

TUNDRA WINTERING ISLAND CARIBOU

David: So let's leave that category behind for now and move onto the island herd – tundra wintering island. I'll turn it back to Mitch to quickly overview the ecology and perhaps genetics of those herds as well.

Mitch: Thank you. Mitch Campbell, GN. So, as we move further north and out to the islands, the information gaps increase, and the complexities of the genetics of these groups also increase. So we're getting into an area where we are, for the most part, data deficient, which is why depending on how you classify the Dolphin and Union, we've dealt with that. But with the true island populations, there have been no polygons submitted by the GN, because the information we had did not meet that critical bar where we felt we could provide that information with confidence.

So a quick overview, and then I could field specific questions. Maybe that would be a quick way of going through. Coats Island and Southampton Island caribou genetically are quite similar, which stands to reason as the Southampton Island population was introduced from Coats Island. It was interesting when we first did the genetics of Southampton Island. The geneticist called me up not knowing anything about this population. He said, "What's going on in Southampton Island? If I didn't know any better, I'd say that population came from a handful of caribou." It's just interesting that a genetics subject matter expert would have nailed it without knowing the history of the population.

Currently there has been a movement onto Southampton Island from the mainland. We had a population increase on the island in two years from 7,000 animals to 13,000 and change, which obviously was suspect. We went to the communities to seek IQ, Local Knowledge, and they said they believe animals came onto the island. They told us where they thought they came from, the northwestern side. So taking that advice, we ran the genetics prior to the increase and following the increase as we had samples. Sure enough, the genetics changed. So it's an example of how the

IQ had nailed a major event on Southampton Island, which we were able to also back up scientifically.

Baffin Island, too, has its early days. I'm not familiar with that data, but it's also shown to be genetically distinct from other populations. That's pretty much a really quick overview of tundra wintering island-based populations. It's a variety of genetics and data deficient in terms of understanding seasonal range. But we are starting to figure out the genetics, which is a good starting point for moving forward. Again, next steps are to engage the communities and move together as a team to try and figure out what's happening there. I know that Jackie and her Board have already started that process and are well along the way. So when we sort out the biological position on there, we will be sure to try and engage that process as well. I'm sure our research section, all of us will offer up any help that we can provide while you guys are moving through that process. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Warren?

Warren: Thanks, David. I'll just respond to Peter's question now. So there were some serious logistical issues during my time in Coral Harbour. These hamlet's water trucks broke down, and there was a bit of a state of emergency and a lot of serious illness, including myself. So the meeting had to end early due to violent vomiting, to put it bluntly.

(Laughter)

But this was the recommendation that I had from the HTO Board at that point, and I've been trying to work to communicate with them to tighten this up a bit to get something better. The KWB submitted what we had, and in our comments, we tried to make clear that we are going to try and continue to develop our recommendations to the Planning Commission through further communication with all the HTOs. I would flag the Coral Harbour issue as one of them especially, particularly around caribou. We have a lot more time to discuss marine issues, as that was really the main focus of the concerns that the HTO Board members had.

Ultimately, however, the issue is we have access to limited data on the ranges on this island, but there is still a big concern with the viability of the Southampton caribou population. The Board and the Elders there felt that seasonal restrictions were the best interim protections they could do for calving.

I'll just make two more preliminary notes. With regard to Southampton Island, the hunters said that the caribou kind of favor the east end of the island. So further comments will likely reflect that. We just needed to find out a bit better with conversations with the Board. And KWB would appreciate any datasets that government or any other parties may have access to that they could share with us as we move forward with our discussions with the Coral Harbour HTO to better define how those caribou can be protected while clearly still providing the ability for development. As the Board also made clear, they would also like to see economic development for mining. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Warren. Mitch?

Mitch: Thank you. Mitch Campbell, GN. Yeah, thanks Warren. Just to follow-up and just to let you know – I think as you know, but I wanted you to get your points out – that of course we're there for you

guys. Let us know what you need, and you've got it. We are going into Coral Harbour in the next couple of weeks, and we'll be discussing those issues. We'll coordinate with you towards that end. We'll also put together programs that the HTO might want to see to fill some of those gaps. So we can discuss that and propose it, fundraise for it, and try to move those forward. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Any other comments? Jackie and Mike.

Jackie: Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Thank you Mitch, as always, for the overview of tundra island caribou. As the group can appreciate, Baffin Island communities have been discussing Baffin Island caribou intently over the last two years, if not longer, but definitely the last two years. It is a highly politicized topic. The moratorium, the Public Hearing held by NWMB created a lot of discussion and concern from the community. We've talked with our Board about the GN submission and it not including significant areas within the Baffin region. So many of our communities are aware of the particular dynamics that are at play right now and the applicability with the Land Use Plan.

So, they'll have a lot to say. And they're fully aware that Baffin Island caribou will be different than how other populations have been discussed in this Plan. They are fully aware of the lack of science. They're also aware of the perceived leaning towards scientific information when drawing circles on maps. So this is just to say the communities, I think, or at least our Board is aware of the various dynamics that go into a discussion like this. As I think I mentioned already, KWB has reached out to organizations like the GN for caribou information that does exist. And we've also been directed to the information collected through the Baffinland process, which is very helpful. All of our communities were involved in the mapping that went into the Baffinland survey in 2013.

I anticipate that there will be discussions about calving grounds. I also anticipate significant discussion about access corridors. And also, something I just recently learned about, special wintering areas for when populations are low, so I guess there are areas across Baffin Island where caribou are known to go when the numbers are low.

Also in the conversations I've heard with our members, whenever there is discussion about calving grounds or areas significant for caribou, they seem to always be near lakes. Nettling Lake is one example I can think of, and I'm sure there are many others. I guess what I'm saying is we're prepared in the Qikiqtaaluk to engage this discussion slightly different than how the conversation has been structured for the mainland migratory. We're cool with that. That doesn't bug us to have a slightly different conversation.

Again, because of the low, low numbers, because of the experience of the moratorium, because of the response to the setting of a TAH with which some of our members here have already brought up, I anticipate that there will be a strong leaning towards prohibition and strict restrictions. That's just the nature of where we are in the caribou cycle right now. Again, we're cool with that too, just to let you know.

(Laughter)

It has been helpful to hear the discussion for me personally of the other regions and all the concerns and the constructive suggestions brought up. That will help formally our discussion. But again, and I'll repeat what I said the other day, we are approaching this largely from a community perspective

– an IQ perspective – and we’re going to stand by that. We’re hoping, at least at the staff level, that kind of stance or that kind of engagement with our members will lead to some really productive collaboration with science further down the road, which I think is always an ideal situation.

So I don’t have much more to add, other than I will say that I appreciate that the landscape of Baffin Island is hugely different from the other two regions. Our significant mountain range just adds another different reality to how we talk about caribou and our movements. Yeah, so that’s it. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jackie. I think we all look forward to the results of that work. Mike.

Mike: Mike Settington with the Chamber of Mines. I thank Jackie for that discussion, and I’d just like to add to that for the work that we did in the environmental assessment on Baffin Island that I started work on in 2008. I started right off as a typical biologist doing aerial survey, and we didn’t find a single caribou after three days of flying. So we had to turn it in to Traditional Knowledge work, which was going to be a component to be a component of the project. I just didn’t realize it would be the basis of the entire baseline and the bases of the effects assessment for the Mary River Project.

We spent a solid month just traveling to Hall Beach, Igloolik, Arctic Bay, Pond Inlet, and Clyde River to get information on caribou surrounding the area. It was interesting, because the deposit itself, the mine site itself we identified for calving areas. We were asking the Elders and the hunters to circle calving areas. We had some very knowledgeable people who started drawing large areas on here, and they said this is where you’ll see caribou in here, but it’s not like the mainland. There will be individuals. They will be up on the hills, high, staying away from the wolves. So this is where they are, but not like you see elsewhere. So that was very telling and very informative. Hopefully I’m paraphrasing as opposed to grossly misrepresenting what the Elders were telling me.

So we have that analysis and that baseline, a publically reviewed document. It has been through the assessment, but the data itself now belongs to the Qikiqtani Inuit Association, and I would encourage if the government is going to go I and look at potential areas of interest, to perhaps request that data and look at our analysis of that data as well.

Then follow-up work, post-hearing process again came from the Qikiqtani Inuit Association with Anne Gunn who developed the crossing area database for the mainland and also wanted us to look at water crossings for the North Baffin Island caribou herd, particularly where the road and rail were crossing. So we went out and looked for those areas. Again, it was an entirely different ecology. The rivers are different. There are no bottleneck points for crossing areas, and when the caribou do come back, which is a common description, they are usually moving when the water is frozen. So it’s not a flowing water crossing issue.

So there are certainly lots of information, but I would say hardly data deficient at all. Within a matter of a month, I was able to look at entire generation’s work of data sitting on maps, from people’s memories going back to their own childhood, and they would describe distinctly when it was their knowledge versus someone else’s knowledge, and we build that into the database.

And the final thing that we wanted to do with the Qikiqtani Inuit Association is look at a specific caribou protection plan, as per direction in the Land Use Plan. Again, it was based on knowledge of

mainland migratory caribou herds looking at specific areas for protection. We spent quite a bit of time looking at that, and we just didn't come up with anything effective between the two parties. So that's where it's sitting at right now.

So I'd just like to say if Industry can contribute anything to this, it's sitting in the Mary River Baffinland's Baseline and Impact Assessment. As much as the Government of Nunavut mistrusts that, they did ask us to do a cumulative effects assessment of the energetics of caribou as well too, which turned out to be quite an informative piece of work as well for us. Thank you.

David: Mitch, and then we'll take a short break.

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. Mitch Campbell, GN. Just a point of clarification for the Chamber of Mines: When we say data deficient, it means scientific data deficient. We're referring to the fact that there was no IQ. We never referred to that. So obviously my area is science-based, so it is scientifically data deficient in that area. We will certainly pass that along to the next biologist that comes in to take advantage of that information. But it hasn't already been provided, if there could be a connection – if you could help get that information over to the QWB – that would probably be very helpful to their process, if that hasn't already been moved over there, because they are in the middle of trying to develop those now as well. So it's a suggestion. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Mitch. Okay, let's take 10 minutes and then we'll finish off with Peary and reindeer. Thanks.

BREAK

PEARY CARIBOU

David: So we're going to move on to Peary caribou. I'm told that the resident expert on reindeer is, well, at the North Pole and unavailable. So we're not going to be able to discuss reindeer today. That will have to be at a later date. Mitch, if you can just do the thing with Peary, and we'll have a discussion. Then we'll be out of here.

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. I'd like to introduce the other Mitch in our department – the Peary caribou Mitch: Morgan Anderson.

(Laughter)

Morgan: Wow, I don't know how to take that. This is Morgan with the GN, Regional Biologist for the High Arctic. So I'll just try and introduce Peary. Essentially, any of the data gaps that we have already identified for tundra wintering and island caribou are essentially exacerbated for Peary caribou. So, parts of the range essentially had one survey...have had maybe one survey flown, essentially since the 1960s. We do have good IQ information for parts of the range where harvesters regularly visit. This is thanks to the knowledge of mostly people from Cambridge Bay, Taloyoak, Gjoa Haven, Kugaaruk, Resolute, and Grise Fjord. Resolute and Grise Peary caribou are the only source of caribou for those communities, so they do have a pretty good understanding of where they go and how they behave in the areas that those communities can reach.

If you do look at the map, Peary caribou essentially cover the Arctic Archipelago, so the islands north of the Northwest Passage, as well as parts of Victoria Island, Prince of Wales, Somerset, and down to the Boothia Peninsula. So it's a very large area, and much of it is very remote. So some areas even have limited IQ associated with those populations. So we're looking forward to working, helping out with KWB. I know Resolute and Grise are excited to get something on the map there. But there is definitely a lack of data for a lot of that region. I think that's about all I have to say.

David: Great. Thank you. Any comments? Mike.

Mike: Mike Settingington with the Chamber of Mines. Peary caribou are COSEWIC threatened...

Morgan: Endangered under SARA

Mike: ...Endangered. Yes, that's what I thought. So there is a specific recovery plan being developed, which will include identification of critical habitat. Can you enlighten us on that process?

Morgan: Certainly. So there is a recovery strategy under development. Currently, Peary caribou are listed under the Species at Risk Act as endangered. In November, COSEWIC reevaluated their status to threatened. It's based on how a number of the populations are doing. Several of them have increased since die-offs in the 1990s, including the Bathurst and Melville Island caribou, which are some of the better-known populations. That recovery strategy is due, I believe, by March 2017. It's to be posted, and we are currently working on how to deal with and define critical habitat, and what would constitute destruction of critical habitat with the recovery strategies now, or the recovery team. The draft has gone back out to communities. It's currently undergoing a second round of community consultations, so that's in the works I guess.

Mike: Mike Settingington, Chamber of Mines. So I guess my question is, critical habitat areas have been identified for Peary caribou?

Morgan: They are in a draft stage, but in the broad scope of it, it has come from the community knowledge. Generally large portions of the range are identified as critical, but then how is that going to be dealt with? Obviously the entire archipelago can't be locked out for development. We're going to have to move forward, but they are a species that uses very large areas. They rotate their ranges over years, decades, and generations. Certainly, some of the areas around Grise Fjord, harvesters and Elders have identified that they vacate ranges and then come back decades later, which makes it difficult to define critical habitat, when sometimes it is critical when the caribou aren't using it.

They are also, unlike the mainland migratory herds and more like the tundra wintering, they have a dispersed calving strategy. So there may be some areas where the caribou are usually calving, but they may not return to the exact same area every year. There is also a very wide range of terrain features across the archipelago, ranging from sort of cliffy areas, mountains, ice caps, to flat areas, rolling hills. Some of the islands are basically just mud.

So that's going to influence how they are using habitat across that broad range, and how they are using it for calving as well. They also cross between the islands and use the sea ice, both seasonally – so one caribou may use several islands within a year – as well as during years where there is a hard winter, then they make longer desperation movements that move them to other island groups that are much further than their usual seasonal movements would take them.

David: Yes sir?

Earl: Earl here from the BQ Board. Morgan, is there predation on those islands, and if so, what is the rate of predation? Do you know?

Morgan: We don't actually know the rates of predation, but certainly the guys in Resolute have pointed out seeing a lot more wolves in recent years, and that's not surprising since the population of caribou and of muskox has really recovered over the last decade or so. But as far as actual rates of predation, we don't even know what the populations of wolves are. There is potentially an interesting interaction with the muskox, because Peary caribou and muskox occur over the same general areas, although they don't necessarily occur right next door to each other, and use slightly different habitat. But in general, a lot of the communities have pointed out that when you get more muskox, you get fewer caribou in the area. So a lot of those interactions, and potentially how the wolves play into that as well, are big question marks.

David: Okay, Jackie and then Jimmy and Simon at the back.

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Just a comment: The QWB recognizes the work that the Peary Caribou Working Group has been doing on this population, especially the work of the members from Grise Fjord and Resolute. The members of their communities are very knowledgeable on that population, and Liza is also one of those people who holds a lot of knowledge. So I just wanted to acknowledge that and have that on the record. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jackie. Simon?

David Siksik: It's David.

David: David. Sorry. Apologies.

David Siksik: (*Translated*): I'll stay short, as they're being discussed. They migrate from Victoria Island, from islands north. These are our caribou, as they are called Peary caribou, the smaller species. They have come to our area – Gjoa Haven area – but they seem to have completely disappeared. We haven't seen this species for a long time. The smaller caribou species, they came in to our region at one time before, and they are inhabitants of Victoria Island. Perhaps they migrate well between the islands, although land up there is long distance and a lot of ice. They have managed to migrate from island to island. But from Gjoa Haven, the smaller species have vanished. We haven't seen them for a long time. Thank you.

David: Thank you, David. Jimmy?

Jimmy: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jimmy Haniliak, Kitikmeot Elder Advisor. Yeah, I just wanted to sort of give you an idea about Victoria Island on the Peary caribou. Back in the '60s and '70s, that was the only caribou that we hunted back then. They are always quite a ways from Cambridge. I know up to today, they still exist. If I can get Victoria Island map, please? The map? That's good.

Like I said, I hunted these. They were the only caribou on the island in the '60s and '70s. I'm just going to show you exactly where – I need to get those letters out there.

(Laughter)

Yeah, that's fine. Okay, I've hunted them around this area. You know, in the wintertime, way back then we got really early winters, I'd say in September when it was really -40. We didn't care.

(Laughter)

But right now, I know they still exist even in the wintertime. They hang around this area. You can't see them even a mile way. You can't. That's all year – spring, summer, fall, winter. They are white. The only way we know they're there is when we come across their tracks or paw prints or hooves. Woof, woof.

(Laughter)

They're around this area, and I know for a fact when we had the meeting in Kugluktuk about a couple of years ago with the Elders. We talked to them, and some of those Peary caribou they migrate from the island to around Kugluktuk area, and they were being caught there. They are still around. When I'm back home, I know they're around. Young hunters, they have asked me, "Where are they?" I know if I tell them, you know, they'll go up there and slaughter them, so I never tell them.

(Laughter)

Like I mentioned before, the biologists – they give really, really good firsthand information on what they do. You know, they should get a salary raise or something.

(Laughter)

Peary caribou, you know, we call them kingailik tuktu in my Inuinnaqtun language. The reason why I'm speaking English is I don't recognize any Inuinnaqtun interpreters, but that's okay. They understand me more when I speak English. Yeah, I know that the Peary caribou, they're not close by, but I know where they are. Whenever Inuit go up quite a ways to go up around this area, you have to have a really high-paying job to drive up there with a snow machine. When you are retired and on a pension, you know, it can't even cover that for the gas. But anyways, I just wanted to show you the area. Nobody else from Cambridge is here anyway, so...

(Laughter)

But that's the area they exist, and I've traveled up to this area. There are a lot up here too. A couple of years ago, I traveled probably up to here by snow machine, and that was in March. I never saw one caribou, not even tracks. But there were a lot of wolves. So, like I said before, wolves are number one killers of our caribou. I'm going to stop there, because we're pressed for time. Any questions, I'll be available tomorrow but not tonight. Thank you.

(Laughter)

David: Thanks, Jimmy. Liza?

Liza: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Moderator. Thank you. High Arctic biologist. I'm from Grise Fjord. Liza Ningiuk. I have traveled the High Arctic. I have been around for a while, and our biologist's remarks are true. I find them to be very accurate, and I have a question in a bit. But first, I'd like to make a remark and just listen to it; pay attention to it.

We have heard about Baffin Island caribou surveys – a large island. Our High Arctic lands are very small, although it's large. Once I have traveled it through an airplane, and by skidoo and all-terrain vehicles I have traveled it. The land I have seen, there is very little food resources up there. It's all ice packed snow and rock in some areas. Nothing grows up there. Although it's a landmass, it's all rock.

There are hardly any animals, and a lot of it is all icecaps. There are no animals up there. This is why the species we have are so critical due to lack of many things. It would only endanger them by exploration, gas exploration. And if that were intensified, the herd would have disappeared rapidly. I want you to understand this. Be aware of it, just because it's a landmass, it doesn't mean it can support species. Now it is all ice and rock. There are dangers to caribous with cracks, and that's not the only caribou I have seen. When they go through ice caps, there are cracks that they will fall through.

We know they are north of Resolute, the islands directly due north. I have traveled all those islands. We have skidooed. Some islands have plenty of caribou, and I know they have traveled to the Cambridge Bay area. These are a very big species for us. They are most delicious, perhaps, of all caribou. Caribou is the best. But the main predators are the wolves. Someone who mentioned this was true. I want you to remember when you said you surveyed Baffin Island, it's different up there. We don't have many lakes, so they are hard to see. The lakes are lacking in the High Arctic. It's all ice caps full of high hills, high mountains.

We are very concerned about the caribou population. When we say we are concerned, it's true. If we see exploration of any kind, it certainly is a danger to the species. The question I wanted to ask: We used to travel to Greenland or talk to them over the radio. The Greenland people said they now have caribou, same as our species. Is there any instance where they have migrated through the sea ice to Greenland? Does anyone have knowledge of this caribou crossing to Greenland?

Morgan: I wouldn't be very surprised, but we're actually getting genetic samples from north of Qaanaaq, and hoping to analyze those and see how the caribou on that side – on Greenland – are related to the Elsmere Island ones. So hopefully, we'll have a bit more knowledge about how often they cross back and forth, hopefully in the next few months.

David: Thank you. Karla, you have the last question for tonight...okay, second last question for tonight...third to last question for tonight.

(Laughter)

We can pick this up tomorrow morning too. It is a little after 9:00 already. Karla?

Karla: I have a related process question for the Planning Commission that goes back to the questions that Mike Setterington asked about critical habitat. I'm just wondering, so when critical habitat is

approved and when it's put into a recovery strategy, is that something that will trigger an amendment to the Land Use Plan? If so, has there been any thoughts on how to align the two processes in terms of the approval of critical habitat and then when that goes into the Land Use Plan?

Currently the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board works with Environment Canada to approve recovery strategies and critical habitat, so I guess I'm just wondering how that approval process would then go into the Land Use Plan. Thank you.

David: Who wants to take a shot at that? Peter?

Peter S: Peter Scholz, Planning Commission. As Sharon said earlier, anyone has the right to request an amendment. Establishment of Peary critical habitat, I'm pretty sure, would result in someone requesting that amendment. The NPC also has the right to initiate amendments, as duly noted. I can't comment on finding efficiencies for the establishment of any sort of conservation zones in the Plan you may be referring to, because I don't know how those processes work.

David: Okay, who else?

Andrew: Yeah, it's Andrew Maher from Parks Canada. As a recovery team member for the Peary caribou, I just had a quick comment that I think is relevant here, I think. Liza gave a very small snapshot of the wealth of information in the High Arctic about the Peary caribou. There was quite an effort during that process to gather that information and to sort of at least scratch the surface on what the communities felt were the important areas for the region. I have already mentioned it to Jackie, but it's worth being on the record that the information exists. It exists for across the range of Peary caribou. The records of those meetings exist, and they are the property of those HTOs and communities that participated in the process. I have encouraged the QWB to get that information, because it's a good starting point to then advance further discussions.

I think Karla's last question relates to my second comment I'll make, and that is that we recently visited Resolute Bay, Grise Fjord, and a number of other communities. I can only speak to the communities that I was participating in the meetings, but the question of how does the critical habitat that is now in draft form and the communities have seen in draft form, they asked the question, how does this relate to the Land Use Plan? Is this in the Land Use Plan? I think Karla's question deserves some careful consideration as to how the two processes overlap. I think if the timing was different, it would be a little bit more obvious, but because the process won't be finalized...sorry, the recovery strategy won't be finalized before the cutoff date for submissions for the Land Use Plan, I think there is a bit more discussion that could occur there. But certainly, there is a wealth of information for both the QWB but also for – I know QIA is inclined to go and talk to those communities specifically as well – I think it will produce quite a lot.

David: Thank you. Well I guess I'll ask the Planning Commission to think about it overnight, and maybe there's a more fulsome answer that you can provide tomorrow. But let's adjourn and call it quits for tonight. If there are any lingering questions about any of the discussion up to this point, we can bring it up tomorrow morning first thing, being 9:00. I'll ask people to be here shortly before so we can get started. I'm hoping that we can be done, well certainly no later than noon, and perhaps before. There are mostly process issues tomorrow. Okay, thanks very much, and have a good night everyone.

MEETING ADJOURNED FOR THE DAY

DAY 3 MARCH 10, 2016

- David: Thanks, Tommy. So the morning, the more I look at it and the more I think about it, the earlier I think we can get out of here. What I'm going to do is just ask people if there are any lingering questions, comments, observations about the discussion we've had the past two days. Then I'll turn to Spencer and company to talk about the existing rights issue. Then I suspect it will be time for a break, and we'll have a roundtable of wrap-up comments. We should be out of here by about 11:00 based on that. If the discussion gets a little longer, we've got till 12:00, but we have to be done by 12:00. People are heading to the airport by that point, key people. Jimmy, did you want to say something?
- Jimmy: Yeah, good morning. Jimmy Haniliak, Elder Advisor, Kitikmeot. Yeah, Peter I think it was, I just wanted to make sure about the dates of the migration from the island to the mainland, and from the mainland to the island. I just wanted to make sure because we never get any icebreakers in April. So I wanted to put it out that from the end of October at least until December for the fall migration to the mainland, and between March to May, that is when they are going back to the island. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure about the dates.
- David: Thanks, Jimmy. I'll ask NPC staff, are there any concerns or questions that you have that haven't been adequately addressed. Some I guess can't be, but are there any lingering questions? Peter?
- Peter S: Peter Scholz, Planning Commission. Regarding the Peary caribou that we mostly finished yesterday, we have a polygon showing significant marine ice crossings for the Prince of Wales-Somerset subgroup of Peary caribou between those two islands, and that's all we have is that polygon. We don't know the nature of the caribou crossings there. Is it on the Northwest Passage? We don't know if there are any marine shipping concerns, etcetera. Is anyone knowledgeable about that?
- David: Yep, GN can address that.
- Morgan: Morgan Anderson, GN. Historically, at least, that has been one of the larger populations of Peary caribou, although as we heard yesterday, they've kind of crashed in recent years. So how their migratory behavior has changed with the lower population is not clear at the moment. But historically and probably what we'd be looking to preserve in the future for their movement corridors would be that animals mostly move from Boothia and Somerset over towards northern Somerset and Prince of Wales in the spring, and then back in the fall. But then there are also some animals that would do kind of a reverse, or they would go from Boothia straight to Prince of Wales, or they would go from Prince of Wales over to Somerset. So they're not quite as defined in their movements as the Dolphin and Union caribou are, but they do use that ice crossing the same kind of way. Perhaps some of the Elders would be able to speak to that a little bit more, but that's kind of my impression of how they've been using that – the Peel Sound ice crossings, at least historically.

David: Please go ahead.

Andrew: Just a quick comment from someone working on the recovery strategy with Morgan and CWS. It's a similar comment to last night, but the communities of Resolute Bay and Grise Fjord and the other communities who we worked with in developing that strategy, did identify a significant amount of ice crossings in the High Arctic. I would imagine that when Jackie gets the information from that process – the community knowledge from that process – as well as asking the communities of Grise and Res and others about those crossings, they'll gather quite a lot of information about those High Arctic crossings. Thank you.

David: Thank you, and there was somebody on this side I thought raised an arm. Perhaps not. Any other questions? Mike.

Peter: Peter at NPC. It's the lower large polygon that we're referring to.

David: Okay, well I guess we'll wait for Jackie's exercise to provide more data, more information. Any other comments from folks on this one? Peter, Jonathan, any other questions at this point? Now is the time to ask them. Any comments, observations or questions from anybody else about what we've talked about the last couple of days? Any concerns that might have arisen that we haven't time to address, because we did rush through. Bruno and Warren and Mike.

OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's not so much about what we have talked about in the last couple of days. Bruno Croft, GNWT. Where are we going from now, if someone could clarify the stepwise process to the endpoint? We've got this workshop here, and the next thing is a hearing in the fall. What's happening in the middle and then after please? Thank you.

David: Alright, I'll ask NPC to outline the schedule from now until the end of time.

Sharon: So we're going to show you two timelines and just give you a bit of background. Peter is just pulling up the document. So, originally, as we agreed, the timeline was tentatively for the November Public Hearing, as outlined up on the screen. We've been working with our planning partners, mainly Government of Canada, NTI, and GN, to refine our timelines and to add some extra consultation steps. We are – the Commission – is bringing this forward. Now it's contingent on the Commissioners approving the revised timeline, and also that supplementary funding for the additional consultation and the Public Hearing is given to the Commission.

I will say that working collectively and having the partners working together, I think that we've come to a good point of consensus of where we are at. Over the course of the next couple of weeks, I think the planning partners are taking it back internally to their organizations to look at the revised timeline, and the Commissioners will be looking at it the week of March 21st. Then again, our funding is the implementation branch, so the Commission requires the additional funding for additional consultation processes. Peter, do you have the other amended document with the timeline?

We need to tweak this, of course. The Commission is open to working with the planning partners to make sure we have incorporated the extra consultative steps that NTI has requested. Brian is just pulling it up for me. So the timeline would look like – NTI has asked for an extension of comments on the redraft to May 31st. We have asked them to give it to us by May 16th, and all other parties. Then the Commission is committed to – now this is pending Commission approval. This is not staff's decision. This is the Commission's decision. This is what we're putting in front of them. June 20th will be the release of the redraft with all of the information included, and we will post the translated version of the updated Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan by July 25th. August 15th, participants provide any expert reports to put on before the Commissioners in the Public Hearing.

On August 29th to 31st is the in-person Prehearing Conference, so this will be finalizing the witnesses and any motion by participants, and the procedures for the Public Hearing. In September, participants meet...sorry, I've only had half a cup of coffee this morning.

(Laughter)

I need a couple more. So participants submit any expert reports responding to the August 15th reports. Then we've been requested to consider additional consultation, and the Commission has looked at this, and we are putting in a funding submission. This will be consultation to inform communities on the redraft – the updated redraft – so they are informed on that. We've asked our planning partners if there is any other outcomes they would like to see as a result of the additional consultations.

For the Commission, our duty to consult, we have to consult with all parties who have equal standing. Sorry, Tommy, I know I'm going too fast. So we would do six regional consultations using the same methodology as NIRB, bringing five people from each community into a central location in Kitikmeot, a central location in Kivalliq, one in Baffin North, one in Baffin South, Makivik, and then we have the Athabasca Dene and Denesuline that we would also do consultation with.

After that, we would do the second Prehearing Conference in January, and the final Public Hearing to initiate in March and continuing into April. So that's the revised timeline again, pending supplementary funding and Commission approval. It's not within – as I said earlier and I can't stress that enough – it's not within staff authority to change the November timeline. But we are listening to our planning partners. We do want to have a cohesive Public Hearing that all parties are comfortable with the process leading up to it.

Also, as Executive Director, I have been directed to ensure that the Plan that does go forward is a Plan that is going to get approved – not just a Plan, a Plan that's going to be approved by the parties. So that direction to staff is to ensure that we are working with the partners proactively. I can say that we're listening and doing the best we can. I know we're not going to please everyone 100%, but we're working very diligently to ensure that concerns are being addressed and that everyone is being included in the consultation process leading up to the Public Hearing.

So these may tweak a little bit, as I said. Each of the parties has to go back and look at their internal processes and see what their respective bodies may want. So this will be what we're looking at for the timeline, and I think if all parties are all in agreement, we've asked participation in the consultation from the parties and a signoff on the timeline collectively. I think we'll be more successful at achieving a supplementary request from Canada, and they haven't committed to giving

it to us. They've committed to reviewing it, which is a first. We're very pleased that our relationship with Canada has improved significantly.

As I said with our technical partners, the Technical Sessions, the participation has been wonderful. I thank everyone in the room and around the table for your commitment, because it has been a very interested long haul. I do see the light that this Hearing is going to happen, and the first ever Nunavut Land Use Plan will come through and be a reality. As the staff work, I recognize the Commission team – we're very small. They work very hard, and they are very committed to the file. I commend them for their hard work and their diligence, because this is our team. We have our finance back in the office, but this is our team. We're hoping that we get more members on our team so we can work better and have more fulsome relationships and more communications. With that, if you have any questions, I would be more than willing to answer on the timelines, Brian, Jon and Peter will assist in a technical nature. Thank you.

David: Peter, can you scroll up a bit so we see the more immediate? Yeah, so for the immediate, obviously the Marine Session has been rescheduled. There is some question still about the written comment deadline. Is that still either the 16th or the end of May?

Sharon: Thank you, David. Hannah and I are working on that. We can have – as soon as NTI can provide us back an answer on that, we can make that definitive. We need the 16th versus the 31st to make the timelines for all our procedural notice and timeline to get to make the deadline for March-April. That's pretty important to our funders as well that we have identification in this fiscal year of the projects, and starting in March carrying forward to April meets their needs. It also meets the partner's needs to give a couple of more months and add the next layer of consultation that partners are more comfortable with.

David: So, I guess the immediate answer to your question, Bruno, is written comments on the current draft, and I would recommend targeting mid-May to get those in, even if you get a couple of weeks of relief on that. Then the rest of it, likely based on what Sharon has outlined, probably won't change a whole lot, assuming that the funding is provided.

Sharon: So this is the proposed timeline going forward to the Commissioners at this upcoming meeting. Until they approve this, it's the other timeline that is still in place. But the meeting is in two weeks, so we'll have confirmation on that of this timeline if they approve it. Thank you.

David: Ken?

Ken: Ken Landa, Government of Canada. So as we know, the Marine Workshop hasn't happened, as was anticipated when these dates were put together. I'm not sure what information is used yet and been worked through on when the Marine Session might happen. Depending on when that is, there might be a need for some variation, maybe a little and maybe a lot, to what we are seeing here. So, is it possible to get a sense of what the tentative thinking is so we can start projecting and work-planning around that?

David: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. It's Sharon from the Commission. We will work with Canada to get that session scheduled as quickly as possible, hopefully in the next couple of weeks. And the Commission is

flexible if it's conducive, because everyone was going to join by teleconference for this. If Ottawa works better and it's more cost effective, we're prepared to hold it in Ottawa if it's easier for the parties. So Ken, I'll work with Spencer to pin down the date, and we know we need to do that very quickly. Thank you, Mr. David.

David: Thanks, Sharon. Any other questions on tentative timeline? I hope this is the final timeline personally. The Public Hearing keeps - I keep thinking it's going to happen sooner, and then it gets delayed. I think for everybody's peace of mind, it would be nice to nail this down, and I recognize there are other factors engaged. Ken?

Ken: Ken Lana, Government of Canada. This is less a question about the timeline, but more about trying to understand better what one of these steps is about. The slide that we're looking at draws a distinction between written submissions on the one hand and expert reports on the other. Much of, but not all of the contents that come in our written submissions are supported by expert support within our institutions, but it's not a formalized approach of putting a person's qualifications forward and subjecting them to examination on their qualifications, etcetera. I'm wondering if the Commission can give us a sense of what they are anticipating and what would be useful. Does the Commission want us to move to a more formal approach of identifying the expert and the expertise and isolating that from other parts of our submissions, and if so, what might the implications of that be?

David: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, David. Sharon from the Commission. Ken, I'm going to let lawyer to lawyer have this conversation, so we'll ask Alan to respond to it. Thank you.

David: Should the rest of us leave the room?

(Laughter)

Alan: Good morning, everyone. Alan, Legal Counsel to the Commission. I always let Ken throw the first punch, and he usually holds back, so I never reply. Great question, Ken. When you look at the list, it's clear to us, at least, that the written comments are meant to be a fulsome thought process that all of the issues you have seen in these discussions in the Draft Plans.

We know that in addition to your written policy positions and thoughts generally, there may be the need for particular expertise, so we have separated that out to follow the posting of the Draft Plan, which might tweak additional thoughts when you see that, and then a chance for reply to expert reports with expert reports – Or as Jon Savoy sometimes says, “Comments on comments on comments.” All of this will lead up to a full sense of what the participants wish to say, both at a general policy level and at an expert witness level, leading up to the Public Hearing. So it was considered a useful step to have the expert report come after the posting of the 2016 Draft Land Use Plan once people see that next redline version. So I hope that helps your question, Ken.

I will say there have been two timelines, and this is the one with the Hearing next year, which is dependent upon the additional funding to specifically accommodate the requested regional sessions in October and November, as you see on that screen. But unless that happens, it's the first

timeline that perhaps Peter can put up again, which has the Public Hearing this November. That's the current deadline. This is the consultation inclusive deadline. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Alan. Ken, anything?

Ken: That's very helpful. Ken Landa, Government of Canada. Alan, that's helpful. It raises for me some questions about whether it might make sense to have an early identification of whether people are intending to file a specific expert report on a topic so that people know it's coming. Or if there is a topic that somebody thinks would be useful to have an expert report on, maybe it's the Commission that would find it useful to have an expert report produced. But that institution or person does it themselves think they are the appropriate commissioner – wrong word – appropriate person to seek out the report. A discussion of that earlier rather than later would be helpful, because those things do take a long time to put together. So what I'm getting at is if there are certain kinds of information or submission that would be given less weight, absent an expert report, but an expert report might have them considered in a more productive way knowing that's somebody's perspective on that issue, early would be helpful.

David: Alan?

Alan: Thank you for the question, Ken. The two places on the timeline on the screen that could accommodate those two parts of your question, I think would be what's presently up there – May 30th. Certainly in addition to submitting responses to comments, parties could also say you know, we intend to file an expert report on sea ice crossings – pick a topic. And that could give everybody an idea that somebody around the table is producing something. You wouldn't necessarily see that report until later in the timeline.

Likewise, it would seem to me on the June 20th date on this timeline where the Commission staff would be releasing the refined Draft Plan and the Options and Recommendations Document. At that moment on June 20th, the staff would then have released its Plan with Options and Recommendations document. It would have written comments and replies, and perhaps notification for intent to file. The staff at that point might then also be able to determine that additional expert reports could be sought by participants.

Indeed, as you know, it is possible for the Commission to have expert reports produced for itself. We've made a conscious effort to seek expert reports from the participants rather than an expert report that comes directly to the Commissioners. As some of you know, that can have the effect of giving the impression that the expert that reported directly to the Commissioner has more weight than some other expert. So on a given topic, we would welcome an expert report from any of you as preferable to a direct expert report. That's just a question of the perception. The expert advice should not be different, no matter who requests it, but it has the perception of perhaps being more neutral if the Commission themselves haven't commissioned it. So, Ken thanks for those two questions. On the fly, Peter has just modified it, and I think that addresses your concern, Ken? Thank you.

Ken: I think that's extremely helpful. One thing I want to say explicitly. When I'm using the term 'expert report,' I'm including Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (*laughed over his pronunciation*)

(*Laughter*)

IQ – I’m not going to trip on it again. I’m including gathering together into a focused piece relevant IQ. So I wanted to be clear that I wasn’t excluding other important forms of knowledge. I think there will be some challenges with the timing available with identifying that an expert report is required. Procuring one, if we need to go outside through contracting, those timelines would be impossible. If we have internal experts within the Government of Canada, they would be challenging depending on the availability of the expert. I suggest we not try and fix all these issues today with timing, but I do want to point out that will be a challenging piece of the puzzle for us.

David: Alan?

Alan: Thanks you. Alan for the Commission. Of course, these topics have all been studied for years, and please don’t wait for us to ask you to consider an expert report. You must surely have heard the dialogue around the table. If any of you think you need an expert report to buttress any of your individual policy positions, by all means, I’m sure you’ve notified those experts years ago. We’re merely letting you know when the deadline is. Thank you.

David: And I would just before I go to Mike, encourage that approach. From my perspective, every time I turn around, somebody is saying, “Well I need more time to do this or that.” You’ve had lots of time. It’s time to get this done. It’s past time. Mike?

Mike: Mike Settingington with the Chamber of Mines. It seems a bit like we’re making this process up on the fly, specifically around submitting reports. I like the deadlines up there – May 16th participants submit written comments. It seems like May 30th actually obligated the participants to respond to written comments, similar to a process like the Nunavut Impact Review Board process. So if that were the case, we probably would have resubmitted our technical report on May 16th so we could get a specific response by May 30th. But now it seems like we’re notifying again that we’re going to submit an expert report on May 30th, but I don’t see where an obligation to respond comes in similar, again to what we see with the Nunavut Impact Review Board process, which is effective for getting responses to an expert report with technical issues and questions. It’s not just our party. It might be any parties around there that would have questions to the other party where you’re obligated to respond in writing.

David: Thanks, Mike. September 12th looks like the response date for people to respond to any other expert reports, unless I’m misreading that. I mean, again, this is new to me too, but I think you can submit an expert report at any time, and as Alan and Sharon have emphasized, the sooner the better. But it looks like September 12th is the date to respond to any expert reports that have been submitted prior to that time. Am I misreading that?

Mike: No, you’re not misreading it. I just didn’t read it.

(Laughter)

David: More coffee for everyone. Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you. Sharon from the Commission. I can assure you that this is not on the fly. We have worked really hard to work with the planning partners to ensure that everybody is on the same page. Where we can, we have been flexible to revise the timelines. I can tell you every time the Commission has

to revise these timelines, it's very devastating to the team, who this is their file. They eat, live, breathe 10-15 hours a day trying to move this forward. So we are working very hard to hear all of you concerns, incorporate them into the process, and get this Public Hearing done. The Commissioners, honestly, I am going to present a very strong case to change the timeline.

I have had the initial discussions with the Chair, and the concern about moving the Hearing to March-April. When we did our consultations a couple of years ago, the communities said don't come in spring. We want to see you when our hunters are in the community, hence the November date was decided, because that's what communities told us. Now we're going to be telling the communities that if it's approved, we're making a change, and that's a balancing act for the Commission, because we need to listen to the communities just as much as we're listening to the parties around the table. We want to ensure maximum participation from everyone and that everyone's voices are heard – the Elders, the HTOs, the DIOs, that the communities have the right people at the table so their voice is heard and that the Commissioners have all information in front of them to weigh and make the final decisions for the Land Use Plan. So that's a compromise, and that's one if it is approved, are going to have to go back to the communities and talk to them about the change and work with NAM and all the other organizations to make sure that the communities are as prepared. We've committed that to NAM that our staff will work with communities so that the five individuals that are picked from the community are prepared and are not just walking into an unknown process. We have to work with them too. That's a change, and I can tell you we're working really hard to listen to everybody. Thank you.

David: Okay, in the interest of time...Alan, you have a quick one?

Alan: Thank you, David. Alan with the Commission. Just very briefly to the point Mike made about revising it on the fly – I don't actually think that's a bad idea. I mean, I think that demonstrates that the Commission is receptive to good ideas, and we put a couple of Ken Landa ideas up there. We can probably put his initials if you like next to them.

(Laughter)

They're going up now. With respect to changes with the timeline, the Commission is open to discussions, whether they are from Ken in person on Saturday Night Live, or whether they are via communication, and the best example of that is the Regional Community Representative sessions in October and November. That addition is a direct result of our last discussions in Rankin where we heard you all, and then there were sidebar conversations that led to the suggestion that it's a good idea and we all incorporate it. So I hope we can continue to be fair and responsive and make those suggestions on the fly. Now because David has his finger twitching on my mike, one last point:

The August 29-31 in-person Prehearing Conference – read those first two words really carefully. In Person. We've tried to be very accommodating to people calling in on technical matters. We understand not everybody can be here, but an in-person Prehearing Conference is for people to get their head around process. How will we use those very valuable ten days when we have a Public Hearing? How will we organize it? That's a roundtable discussion. And my strong advice to the Commission, which they are always free to ignore, is that it should be an in-person session. People might yield and allow for a telephone line, but I will be stressing again...*(muted)*.

David: You've stressed it enough, and the Commission has responded in sufficient detail, I think to the concerns that have been raised. Hannah.

Hannah: Ublaahatkut. Hannah Uniuqsaraq, NTI. Thank you, Sharon, for putting this proposed revised timeline and process up on the screen for us, because we hadn't had a response to our February letter. We appreciate the addition of the Regional Community Representative sessions, the consultations. I could just imagine at the community level how complex this might look, the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, as it is for us, so that's great.

What I committed to Sharon yesterday is that I will take this request to our powers at be, and will respond in short order. Just a quick note: We're all Canadians, Canada, Government of Canada. Thank you.

David: Alright, any other...Bruno, you had no idea the extent of the answer that you were going to get, did you?

(Laughter)

Bruno: Glad to know I'm Canadian.

(Laughter)

David: It's always reassuring. Alright, I think we can move on from the timeline discussion.

Sharon: He hates when I do this, but I just wanted to know, does anybody have any issues with what we're proposing, or do you have any suggestions? Tell us now, because when we move forward if we're going to the parties with this, we're going to be asking for commitments. Thank you.

David: Warren.

Warren: Thank you very much. Warren for the KWB. The process looks great. I just want to very quickly note on the record that I'm not sure the KWB is going to have adequate funding to properly participate in all this. The way that we budgeted for was the original timeline where we would have had a final Hearing this past November, and I just don't know where this money is going to come from. So I hope some other organizations might be able to help us find money to travel for these things. We have the staff, but the travel costs are huge, and I've no idea how we're going to make end's meet.

David: Yeah, and I'm sure that's not exclusive to your organization, but we're not going to solve that problem here either. I'm going to call it on the timeline stuff. If there are discussions, you can have them with Sharon and the Planning Commission and the other parties. But let's get back to lingering issues and concerns. Warren? No? Mike?

Mike: Mike Settingington for the Chamber of Mines. I think it might be a good way to round off a lot of the caribou discussion. The discussion has been focused certainly on the planning process and the protection of habitat, but I think the protection of habitat should be put in the perspective of broader caribou management, and I think that would inform the planning process.

In our technical review and then comments that Jimmy has also brought up several times when he has come up to talk, it's the matter of the key issues of limiting and regulating factors of caribou populations. That's limits on mortality, and Jimmy was focused on the predation of the grizzly bears and the wolves and what's happening in these calving grounds and elsewhere. That was a question we brought up as well, too, that there are tools for controlling mortality, and are those tools being considered in tandem with habitat protection as well? So I guess my question to the GN, the management authority or to the NWMB is what are the other tools that are being considered for caribou management beyond just the habitat protection we've been discussing for the past 2½ days?

David: Mitch?

Mitch: Yeah, thanks. Mitch Campbell, GN. We have always acknowledged in all our reports, and I think it's obvious to all the folks around the table who have spent a lot of time with caribou and understand the basic biology of the species and behaviors, that there are a number of environmental mechanisms that impact caribou and impact their abundance. The GN has been discussing, but not to a point of conclusion, a number of different mechanisms that we might be able to influence – and I stress not to conclusion.

There are differences across the range. Predators are one of those things that are not a consistent component in terms of abundance on calving grounds, although we acknowledge on some herds that this is an issue that is being discussed. Just a quick example for the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq populations: We have conducted reconnaissance work outside of and inside of calving areas over the last few decades. We have recently looked in these herds on predator abundance in core calving areas and have found that for these populations, predator abundance in the core calving area for Qamanirjuaq was less than 1%. However, just outside of those calving areas in post-calving areas and the southern reaches of the post-calving areas and along the spring migratory corridors following calving, that these densities increase substantially.

We had similar findings for both the Beverly and the Qamanirjuaq. We also acknowledge, and I know Northwest Territories has been working on this as well, that this is not necessarily consistent but certainly is what we have found. We have good quantitative data to back that up for both the Beverly and the Qamanirjuaq.

So it is something that we are monitoring, but something that is not consistent across the herds. There has been a call from my regional communities, the Kivalliq region, for more research into predators to understand what's going on with these herds. Just for the information here, the GN did submit proposals for research on predators over the last two years. However, resources were not sufficient to fund these programs, and they fell further down in the overall priority list from a GN standpoint. So they weren't funded. We will keep submitting these proposals, because we know they're important.

That's a brief overview of that situation and the fact that the GN is, in fact, looking into it and has been working on it. We do have some preliminary findings, as I just outlined. But it always comes back to all these mechanisms that impact caribou are cumulative. We are aware they all have impacts on abundance and distribution, and that includes activities – anthropogenic or man-caused activities – and disturbance. They all play a role in impacting caribou abundance overall.

The only activities we have ultimate control over are those caused by man, and that's what it comes down to. So in this suite of potential negative impacts to abundance, we have solid information and we know that we can reduce the overall impacts by protecting caribou in appropriate ways within their annual range with an understanding that there has been wide support, scientific information, IQ, and subject matter expert experience combined to suggest that calving grounds are the most sensitive of these seasonal ranges to these kinds of activities. I hope that helps flesh it out. Thanks.

David: Thank you. Karla, did you want to add anything?

Karla: Karla Letto with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. I think Mitch covered most of it there. I guess in terms of other tools or other things that are being used, it's the Government of Nunavut and NWMB and other partners – we are using other ways of managing the herds at this time, especially with the low populations. So as a lot of people know, there are TAHs in place for some herds. There are other herds that we have TAH requests in, and the Board is looking at Public Hearings for some of those. So we're not just solely looking at habitat protection. We're also looking at managing harvest with non-quota limitations and quotas there. There are also management plans being developed for several herds with other jurisdictions, and we have heard as well the predators. The GN has told us they are looking at some of those options as well. So it's not just solely focusing on the habitat protection. We are looking at other ways to manage the herds as well. Thank you.

David: Thanks. I'm cognizant of time, so I guess what I'm going to say – and it has some implications for folks – I want to wrap this morning session up by 11:30 and no later. So bear with me if I'm a little bit pushy. We need to talk about the existing rights. We need to have concluding remarks, a roundtable. So I'm going to ask people to be really succinct in their questions and in their answers. Peter and then Lou Phillips.

Peter S: Peter Scholz, NPC. Staff have been looking to mention one potential way the Plan can be used that hasn't been discussed too much, and this is as good a time as any I think. Under NUPPAA, Section 68, it binds the authorizing agencies to do what is said they will do in the Plan. That provides the opportunity to use the Plan as a piggybacking opportunity for basically those agencies to agree to do certain things that may not necessarily involve the day-to-day activities of the Commission after the Plan is accepted. Those could be things like research priorities, strategic environmental assessment, coordination of other activities...two more seconds... By doing this, the needs of those projects, such as consultations, informing Cabinet, developing MOUs, are sort of negated. They're, as I said, piggybacked onto the planning process. It's one way of leveraging Section 68 of NUPPAA that may be applicable to some of the discussion that is coming up. Thank you.

David: Thank you, Peter. Lou and then Jackie.

Lou: (*Translated*): I'm going to make this short. There was going to be a written proposal or something regarding caribou. I would like to say there has been a meeting in Nunavut, and there has been understanding and negotiations between the white people and the Inuit and how the things should be. Right now, the meeting that is coming, this is what I'd like to see the Planning Commission if they can make a written submission. They should be translated, and they should be sent out ahead of time before the Public Hearing, both written in Inuktitut and English. So any language that is used, please send them to each organization or HTOs or whatever. They need to be written in both English and Inuktitut. Let them understand this is important for the upcoming Public Hearing. I would want

to see it, and I would want to see all the HTOs receive all the information that are going to be used in a Public Hearing. Thank you.

David: Alright, Jackie.

Jackie: Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. Just a quick comment: Our organization was heavily involved in the discussion on the moratorium and the establishment of a TAH for Baffin Island caribou. At the Public Hearing, there was discussion about predators and wolves, but largely there was frustration coming from the communities on how we were discussing human impacts on a population. Many of the communities pointed out that harvesting impacts compared to impacts due to exploration and development was grossly uneven, and there was a consistent call by the hunters in this region to stop focusing on managing how much people hunted and to explore larger habitat considerations. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jackie. Bruno?

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bruno Croft, GNWT. That was a good question, Mike. What we're doing on our side of the border, of course everybody knows we have TAHs in place and more to come, which is the very reason why we're going through those Public Hearings. We also have a community-based wolf harvesting program in place that we've modified this year. We have also committed to do a full review or a feasibility assessment going through the entire suite of predator removal program that had taken place in our jurisdiction over the years. We have a year to produce this. It's also part of our joint proposal and the consultation we're going through. Then Aboriginal groups, co-management boards, and our respective governments will go through this and make a decision if they want to go further. There are things we cannot avoid anymore. If you go to the people in the communities and tell them you can't harvest anymore and take away their way of life, you better listen to the other things they are telling you. So predator removal is on the list. Protection of the calving grounds is also on the list. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

David: Thanks, Bruno. Luigi?

Luigi: Mr. Chair, Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. One question: There is a clarification request. There will be a roundtable. Is that correct?

David: Roundtable of concluding remarks, yes.

Luigi: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I realize that this discussion is difficult in the context of the Land Use Plan, because it is difficult to put polygons around this particular discussion. But I am tired. I am tired, and I am extremely pleased to see...I am tired because the Kitikmeot has brought this up to government for a long, long time. Inuit have expressed that frustration similar to other regions, that predators are an issue, and they need to be addressed. Instead of research, fund the hunters, because they will do an effective job of removing the predators. So I thank you for the example of what's going on in the NWT. I apologize for the frustration I am expressing, but it has been a long time that this discussion and this presentation have been given to the GN by the KIA and by others in the Kitikmeot. Thank you for that leadership at the GNWT. I hope that is followed by the GN. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Luigi. If you have any strong feelings about it, don't hold back.

(Laughter)

Mitch?

Luigi: Italian nature.

Mitch: Yeah, Mitch Campbell, Government of Nunavut. Obviously a point of clarification here: The GN has not rejected anything. The GN is trying to move forward with the funds that it has and the capacity that it has, and the GN is working with the GNWT as well through various processes and are involved in the predator discussions, myself included. So we are engaged. There are certain limitations to what we can and can't engage in with the suite of proprieties that we have in this territory, and we'll get into that issue.

However, - and this is always a great point of clarification here – there is always differences of opinion across this territory. We cannot take issues that are close to our hearts that are very regionalized or localized and apply them across to every HTO and every RWO. Predators are being discussed, and we are engaged in our own region with discussion of predators and their impact on caribou and what we might be able to do about it. To suggest that the GN is doing nothing is simply wrong. We are not doing nothing. We are engaging, and we are following and putting forward research proposals consistent with what our HTOs are asking us to do to try and flesh out some of these issues. So that's the perspective from the Kivalliq Regional Wildlife Biologist.

David: I'm just going to let some of the argument go outside, but Jimmy, you've got the last word on this, and then we'll move on to the existing rights question.

Jimmy: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jimmy – I'm speaking for myself and my community. I am on my sixth year with the Elder Advisor Committee, and from year one, I've been fighting for this. It seems to me, every time I talk about predators to our staff, I'm sorry but it goes here and it comes out and flies around. What will it take to go ahead? Will it take...(emotional pause)...a human life to do something? What are you waiting for? I've been fighting about predation for many years.

Our population in Victoria Island, they are growing. They are coming into the community at nighttime. The security guard for any building has seen this. Will it take a human life for the GN to do something? Thank you.

David: Thanks, Jimmy. I'm going to conclude this, but I've got to say, it is not a simple issue and people know that. I sat through several caribou workshops – well, I chaired them – in Yellowknife, and I heard every side of that argument time and time again, from First Nations, from everybody sitting around the table. Even within communities there are very different views on dealing with predators. I think one needs to be a little bit fairer on this question. It's not an easy one, and particularly when you're sitting in a government seat, not an easy one to address. It maybe simple from the perspective of those who are on the land and seeing the issues, but in the bigger picture, it's not a simple thing. So I appreciate the emotion and the concerns, and I appreciate that work that is being done, but I've got to say, we all know it's complicated, and there is no simple solution.

Are there any other lingering issues other the ones we've talked about with respect to the caribou discussions we've had over the last two days? Alright, I'm going to turn to the Government of Canada to talk about existing rights. Then we'll take a break and roll into the wrap-up remarks.

EXISTING RIGHTS DISCUSSION

Spencer: I'll be brief. Spencer Dewar, INAC. Thank you. Post-Second Technical Meeting, we put forth a discussion paper on existing rights in an effort to spell out our perspective on existing rights. I just wanted to clarify on the record that it was not our intention to provide the definitive. It wasn't to be the last word. We're certainly open to discussing and revisiting it in order to find the appropriate treatment of existing rights and grandfathering in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. As part of that preliminary exercise, we've identified a need to establish a baseline understanding of NUPPAA amongst the parties, so that work is underway. It's our intention to do this work within the land use planning process. We believe the new draft process is probably more conducive to success. Thank you.

David: Any questions or observations? Hannah and Leslie?

Hannah: Hannah Uniuqsaraq, NTI. Thank you, Spencer. Spencer brings up a very interesting point, and when we're discussing existing rights, NTI is exploring all legally viable options before we bring forth any policy recommendations to our leadership. We've been looking at existing rights in many different lenses under the context of NUPPAA. One thing we've noticed is perhaps we haven't done a very good job explaining what NUPPAA is, how it applies to the land use planning context and how it applies to regulators and to the Inuit organizations.

But needless to say, we've been engaged on this topic internally – NTI and within the Regional Inuit Associations as well as with the Government of Canada, and not just under the lens of exploration and major projects, but also under the lens of outfitters and hunting rights, etcetera. But thank you, Spencer, for clarifying that it's not a fait accompli for the Government of Canada's discussion paper, and we look forward to expanding our conversations. Qujannamiik.

David: Thank you, Hannah. Leslie and then Warren.

Leslie: Hi, Leslie Wakelyn, Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board. Thanks for the clarification and update. I spoke quite a bit on this at the last meeting, so I don't want to go through all the points I made, but I would like to repeat just a couple, because there are a lot of people here in the room that weren't here before.

The Caribou Management Board was trying to track mineral tenures on calving grounds for a number of years and put together maps and brought them to each Board meeting for each to see what was going on. There was clear there was a lot going on, and there were a lot of changes. The Board became concerned about existing rights on the calving rights for mineral development. So one of the things we did is we talked to someone in the Government of Canada about it and got more support to actually be producing these maps.

But in the process, what was explained to us by – I guess it was INAC at that time, a representative – their interpretation was that mineral tenures provide access to defined parcels of land for a specific time period and a specific use, meaning mineral exploration. But they don't provide rights for the mine development. So the Board proceeded with this understanding. Our interpretation, our understanding is that other people's interpretation...(muted)

Our understanding is that other people are interpreting mineral tenures to mean anything from a prospecting permit or a mineral claim, on up I guess is a mineral lease. All those tenures are interpreted to give the right to proceed to mine development, and that is our main issue. So we think there is clarification or information specifically needed, for sure. So one of the terminology questions we submitted last week when we thought the deadline for comments – I just have to put that in – was last week, we said basically at what point in time and for what duration are rights considered to be existing?

So our view is that existing means at the present time in the rights a party has now, and that the duration of those rights would be the time period designated by the type of rights. So for instance, for prospecting permits, that would be three or five years depending on where they are issued. So we'd like that clarified.

And then also the concern is that at what point in time would these tenures be considered existing in terms of the Land Use Plan? Would that be today? Would that be when the Plan is finalized and goes to the signatories, or would it be when the Plan is actually signed and approved, or some other time? We would appreciate that kind of thing being clarified.

Then the other main point that we would like to see is are there other options beside a blanket approach being put in place, where everything everywhere gets treated the same way? Because our understanding is that in some cases, when companies are at the very beginning of their projects, it may be a possible choice for them to be compensated, either in financial ways or it's been called a land swap, so they would explore in a different location if they would agree. Obviously, it would have to be negotiated.

So that was one of our points that we raised, and we would appreciate other creative approaches being looked into, and the possibility that it doesn't have to be just one-size-fits-all everywhere all the time. So, thank you.

David: Thanks, Leslie. And I assume, Spencer, those are considerations you're taking into account?

Spencer: Spencer Dewar, INAC. Yeah, and it is about hearing everyone's perspective so we can take them in and revisit what we've put down on paper. I would like to make one clarification. Maybe the terminology was used. The subsurface rights that are issued, there is little discretion. It's a free entry system, so they are issued, if they are issued, in accordance with the mining regulations. I think what was trying to be conveyed for past INAC officials was that in order to do work on the surface – access – you know, there is a different process. There is more discretion and it follows the process outlined under, now NUPPAA and the NLCA.

David: Alright, that discussion can take place at a later date. Warren quickly, and then we'll have a break.

Warren: Thanks, David. I'll try and go through this as quickly as I can.

David: Warren, just maybe to facilitate this, if you've raised the issue before, I don't think we need to talk about it again just now – just a head's up on that.

Warren: Okay, thanks. I'll just go through it point by point then very briefly. The KWB thinks that NUPPAA does not imply that existing rights can be upgraded. NUPPAA is the standard and was developed through consultation, and going beyond it, we feel flies in the face of these consultations and is of questionable legality since there is a duty to consult on policies that affect Aboriginal treaty rights.

There are some issues with consultations when existing rights were issued. As Melanie pointed out yesterday, Type A land use permits don't go through NIRB. NIRB screenings are the first time hunters and other beneficiaries are informed about land use permits being issued. And the only way they really have a say in the issuance of these other lower level permits is through the planning process. As plans haven't been updated regularly, I think it's not clear that the duty to consult on issuing many of these rights have been met.

Third, we want to suggest that Industry was well aware that they were making uncertain investments when they applied for rights to explore in the calving grounds, in particular, particularly for the projects that have gone through NIRB screenings. Because the NIRB screening reports and submissions by the GN, the BQCMB, a number of HTOs, the GNWT, and numerous Dene and Meté communities notified the proponents that these areas are contentious and that communities were fighting to have them protected, and Government was and a lot of people were seeking to protect them under this land use planning process.

So in our opinion, it's not clear that it's necessary to grandfather all rights, particularly in calving grounds, and we believe that the Government could reasonably expropriate some of these rights, or at the very least impose an indefinite moratorium on the exercise of rights within calving grounds. Thank you. I hope that was quick enough.

David: Thanks, Warren. Let's have a break of 15 minutes, and then I'll invite wrap-up remarks. If you want to address that Spencer, we can do that after the break.

BREAK

David: Additional remarks about the existing rights discussion? We're following-up on the existing rights discussion. I think Ken or Spencer may have something to say, and I gather there were a couple of others who had a question or two.

Ken: Ken Landa, Government of Canada. Before we broke, Warren raised some concerns, some questions and made some statements about issues around existing rights. We understand entirely why it was important to get those on the record. I didn't want to let them pass unacknowledged, because it's not respectful to let them pass unacknowledged. But we're sort of looking for enough room to go away from this table understanding that more work does need to be done on these issues, and some of the things you've raised, we may not think are fully accurate from our perspective, but that doesn't undermine the main point, which is that this is a crucial issue that deserves careful thinking with considerations like that taken into account. I don't think we want to have – we can't – have the substantive discussion today, but I didn't want to leave your comments unacknowledged.

David: And I guess it does beg one question about the three main parties getting together and perhaps sorting this out. Brandon, go ahead.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund, Canada. I want to thank Spencer for his clarification that they are open to exploring different options and that the clarification paper was just a starting point of conversation. But I want to raise that the longer we wait on imposing a potential moratorium on permits on calving grounds or other sensitive areas, the more we handcuff ourselves in dealing with those issues. The longer it's still available for people to apply for permits, the potential raises more permits being in. Then if we look at compensation, it becomes harder. If we look at land swap, it becomes harder. The liability of the government could go up if we do go to a compensation model, and the permits have increased and the number has increased. This is just a push from us to consider a moratorium, especially on calving grounds, as we move forward, and considering other options. Thanks.

David: Thanks, Brandon. Bruno.

Bruno: Quick comment: I don't want to stir the pot there, Mr. Chair. Bruno, GNWT. Ken, have we ever considered grandfather clause (*muted*)....

David: Just because I can.

(*Laughter*)

Bruno: ...calving ground, and the people that rely on them. After all, they were there before everything else. Just a thought. You don't have to comment on that.

Ken: I think I will comment and say that's a key perspective that needs to be taken into account.

Bruno: Thank you.

David: Any other comments, questions?

Earl: David, are you going to do a roundtable here?

David: Once we finish this discussion, we'll get into the roundtable. Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you. Sharon from the Commission. From the Commission, we would ask the parties if you could have a fulsome discussion on existing rights so you could come to some sort of consensus prior to coming to us with all the different divergent views for the Hearing. If you can find some consensus, it would make the Commissioners' job much easier than having to weigh all the different positions, if that is at all possible. Thank you.

David: Hannah?

Hannah: Thank you. Hannah Unuiqsaraq, NTI. As I had mentioned earlier, NTI has been engaging in conversations with the Government of Canada and our other partners to try and maximize areas of

agreement. That's not guaranteeing that we'll agree on everything, but we are and have been engaged in these conversations, and we will continue to do so. Qujannamiik.

CONCLUDING REMARKS FROM THE PARTIES

David: Thanks, Hannah. Any other comments on this particular issue? Alright, then I'm going to propose we start with the concluding wrap-up remarks, and I'm going to do it starting to my left. I'll leave the Planning Commission to wrap-up at the end. Mike, sorry for the abrupt notice. We can skip you if you want to prepare and move on. We'll just go around the table, and folks in the rows behind too are welcome to say whatever they like. Then we will wrap up the meeting.

Mike: Thank you, David. I'll take 4½ minutes, and then you can cut me off.

(Laughter)

Mike Settington with the Chamber of Mines. So the Chamber of Mines believes that exploration and mining can coexist with caribou recovery efforts in Nunavut. We work in a country, and in particularly in Nunavut, with some of the strongest and most transparent environmental protection policies in the world. As I said at the start of this meeting, the Chamber's position is to keep opportunities for new and advancing discoveries open for the benefit of the proponent, and associated benefits to Nunavummiut and the Nunavut and Canadian economy.

The Chamber is particularly interested in working in Nunavut with clear rules, and we think that this planning process will help clarify those rules. So that's all we're looking for. Tell us where we can work. Proponents come in asking for permission to harvest resources. We know we have to work through and get the social license in order to get those rights to extract the resources. We just need to know what those rules are and not see it towards the end of the process at a Final Public Hearing.

So if a proponent has gone through and gained a social license, it can't be stopped by a Final Hearing stage, so it has to start with a clear planning process that we've been talking about. So again, it is up to Nunavummiut to decide how to balance multiple objectives when considering the possibilities and opportunities provided by the Nunavut Chamber of Mines and mining and exploration. The Chamber is here to help to make informed and sound management decisions. So our expectations to the regulators are also to provide sound and informed regulatory advice. So ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much.

Warren: Thank you very much. Warren for the Kivalliq Wildlife Board. I guess in conclusion to this whole meeting, I'd just like to reiterate that with regards to calving and post-calving grounds on the mainland, the Kivalliq Wildlife Board favors the prohibition of mining, exploration, infrastructure, and the other prohibitions that were on the list.

With regards to the Island herds in the Kivalliq region, the KWB will work with the Coral Harbour HTO to provide clearer recommendations for these herds to the Planning Commission before the May deadline for comments. With regards to water crossings, the Kivalliq Wildlife Board executive and staff have discussed the Kivalliq Inuit Associations' proposal for water crossing protection and have determined that it is insufficient, and mining, exploration and infrastructure needs to be

prohibited within 10 kilometers of the crossings, as we expressed in our submission for this meeting and in our presentation.

With regards to access to Inuit Owned Lands, we hope that further clarity of plan reviews with specific regards to how the caribou protection measures will be reviewed periodically in an inclusive fashion, will help the Regional Inuit Associations and NTI be more comfortable with area protection for caribou habitat.

In closing, we hope the NPC will seriously consider the IQ information, and other information the KWB has provided as it revises the Draft Land Use Plan in preparation for the Final Hearing. Thank you.

Steve L: Thank you. Steven Lonsdale with QIA. Just as I said in my introduction a few days ago, QIA is in support of protection of caribou in the calving grounds, as well as the post-calving grounds. I spoke in my introduction on the importance of community involvement and community consultation. So we are pleased that the NPC is considering another consultation step. Although this is still pending Commissioners' approval, as well as even funding approvals, since it is pending we won't get too excited yet. But we're really rooting for that.

Since Warren did mention Inuit Owned Lands, I guess this whole consultation process is about having community say within their Inuit Owned Lands. QIA is the manager of the subsurface parcels, but we always try to get clear direction from the communities as to what they want permitted on their lands. When we're talking in say, Pangnirtung and then there is Inuit Owned Land outside of Pond, Pangnirtung does not speak to those parcels. So the closer you are to that parcel, to that community, the better and more accurate the say is within those lands. So I guess throughout this whole process, this is just a broad principle of ours where we want the people most affected by these designations to have their say. So within that Inuit Owned Land, it is still privately owned land, but within the NLCA, it says that the Land Use Plan shall apply to Inuit Owned Lands but with Inuit input. So throughout this process, we'll continue to push for that input. We look forward to further consultations.

Hannah: Qujannamiik. Hannah Uniuqsaraq, NTI. First of all, I would like to thank NPC for organizing this Fourth Technical Session. I can appreciate the pressure that everyone around the table is under as we work through these complex issues. Trying to protect or trying to strike a balance between wildlife protection and potential economic development, not only pertaining to caribou protection but all the topics we're working through that are being considered for the Land Use Plan, this session has been informative and a little confusing. But nonetheless, it has been informative.

NTI, along with the Regional Inuit Associations, will continue to work through this process in our best efforts to provide the best advice for considerations to our leadership. By no means do we want to delay this process unduly. It has been decades in the making. However, we are very pleased that NPC is considering regional consultations, as we strongly feel the need for community engagement as we explore how and when Nunavut will grow and develop. NTI and the RIAs are taking the lens of the best interest of Inuit rights, goals and aspirations. We look forward to the next session. Qujannamiik.

Bruno: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We wrote these closing remarks the day of the blizzard, and I sent this back up my chain of command. Our Minister saw those. We have had my government input. Some of

this has been read in the leg already. So what I'm going to read here is not my position only, it's our government:

Mr. Chair, GNWT ENR would like to thank the Nunavut Planning Commission for inviting us to participate in this important process of identifying key caribou habitats for protection in Nunavut. Once again, Mr. Chair, we would like to reiterate a few points made during our opening remarks. Many of the barren ground caribou herds in Nunavut are shared with the NWT and are valued subsistence, spiritual, and cultural resource of both territories. Management of these herds needs to be shared, particularly as some of these transboundary herds are in decline or at very low numbers.

Mr. Chair, we heard several times during this meeting that caribou are highly vulnerable in the days immediately prior to and during calving and the post-calving period. Disturbance impacts, associated with industrial activities including exploration, will disrupt caribou calving behavior and negatively impact calf production, cow-calf bonding, and increased potential for cow and calf mortality.

Mr. Chair, maintaining the integrity of the calving grounds is absolutely crucial to the survival and recovery of any barren ground caribou herds, and protection of the calving grounds is widely supported by communities throughout Nunavut and the NWT, and also by caribou-using communities in Northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The GNWT ENR position is that industrial activity of any type, including mineral exploration and production, construction of roads, pipelines, and other infrastructure, should not be permitted in calving areas.

The GNWT ENR does not support application of mobile protection measures within and around any core calving area of any barren ground caribou herd as described and proposed to this meeting and in a caribou workshop hosted by the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board earlier this winter. These measures, Mr. Chair, will not maintain the integrity of caribou calving habitats. Mobile protection measures are not tested and cannot be relied upon for use in the caribou calving ground. In our opinion, Mr. Chair, this is an unreasonable high risk.

The GNWT ENR is willing to continue further discussions on the concept of mobile protection measures yet to be developed and tested for post-calving areas, water crossings, and other seasonal ranges for barren ground caribou herds.

Mr. Chair, the GNWT ENR is willing to continue to discuss and explore the concept of a sunset clause. However, we would not support using a sunset clause to automatically remove any established protection of calving grounds at a set time in the future. Mr. Chair, Aboriginal people in the NWT have to face harvest restrictions as a result of the Bluenose East and Bathurst herd caribou declines. Baffin Island harvesters are also facing similar restrictions, and additional Nunavut communities may also soon be in a similar situation.

Here's the thing: There are no greater infringements to Aboriginal rights, and these measures can only be considered for conservation purposes. Decision-makers in Nunavut and the NWT are being asked to also consider all other options to minimize hardship to Aboriginal people and to make sure that the recovery of all the caribou herds is not jeopardized. Protected Areas established through the Land Use Plan to maintain calving ground integrity must be a priority.

Finally, Mr. Chair and Madame Co-Chair, GNWT ENR hopes that the Nunavut Land Use Planning Committee will rise to the challenge of making the right decision for the caribou and the people that depend on them. So, good luck with your process and thank you for having us. Thank you.

Luigi:

Luigi Torretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Mr. Chair, thank you. Thank you to the NPC for putting on this difficult workshop. As previously stated, the executive direction of the KIA is to examine mobile protection measures. It is not a Board direction as yet. We would like to flesh out the idea a lot more, including investigating to develop ideas for mobile protection measures. In that light, one of the things that I'd really like to see is the continued discussions with the GN, GNWT, other parties that can provide input on what management concepts and mitigation concepts can help improve those mobile measures.

What I really take home – what I'm going to take home to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association – is really the amount that I've learned here. You know, the GN's work on the calving grounds was the first time that the level of detailed analyses that went in - they are complex, and it's the first time they were clarified to that level for the KIA. So thank you.

The other thing that we've learned is in terms of effects and mitigations, and certainly what roads have resulted in the NWT and ecotourism concerns that we weren't really considering. Kivalliq Wildlife Board gave me an example of blinds at water crossings and the effects of planes and photography directly on the calving grounds. Those are things that the KIA was not really considering in terms of effects, so I appreciate that level of learning. The flying concept was not something that we thought about. We always use ATVs and skidoos to get everywhere.

We also hear a lot of talk about a first generation Plan. What I'm really looking forward to, as I mentioned before, is really hammering down a date and time to continue some of these important discussions. Unfortunately, we haven't really gotten there yet. As the Chair usually says, it's between the parties that you have to arrange it. So here is the olive leaf. People know how to get a hold of me, and the KIA I should say. Please let's get these discussions going and get closer to a Plan that can be approved.

The first generation Plan – NTI and the RIAs have worked a lot on process-specific matters, and I think we're really looking forward to the redline version and seeing how the suggestions that we've put forward are incorporated in that. I'm really excited about the potential to look at the caribou situation on a regional basis rather than holistic, because there are differences between the regions.

So I'll just leave it at that. I think these have been very difficult discussions. I think we need to continue on, progressing on these discussions, and I really hope we can put something forward that won't be ideal for everybody, but will be good enough for everybody.

Earl:

Earl Evans, BQ Board. Feel free to cut me off whenever you want, David. I know you get a big thrill out of pushing that button.

(Laughter)

I'd like to thank Bruno there, because like I said, the advantage of speaking later is that everything is covered. I think Bruno must have stayed up all night thinking that. You did a good job, Bruno. Thank you. He covered a lot of points there that we were going to bring up.

But this Plan is unique in itself. It's a Plan that has to be developed in a place that's new – there are all kinds of new challenges. The geographic location of this place is unique. So, you can use parts of other plans, but they don't really fit this, because this country is totally different than down south. So all these things have to be considered, and the Plan is going to have to be adjusted as you go, I think, because there are going to be different things that come up that you haven't seen before. This is going to be in untested waters, a lot of this stuff.

A lot of plans that were developed down south in earlier projects, they came in with a real subtle approach. They came to the communities. They were going to do this and do this. Then all of a sudden, 40 years later...take the Peace Athabasca Delta – total devastation. People's way of life was totally destroyed. They can't even use the land. They can't use the water. The water is polluted. The snow is polluted. They can go out to their trap lines, but they have to pack water with them, because there is no water. There is a creek running at their door, but they can't use it. The landscape is still there, but it is totally useless to the people. So this is what we've got to look at.

We have to look at the big picture here. It's not just a matter of rerouting a road around some caribou or something. We have to look at the big picture and what's going to happen later. And it has far-reaching effects. That Peace Athabasca Delta is 800 kilometers from where we hunt geese in the delta, Great Slave Lake. That delta is dried up because of those two projects. Where we used to hunt geese with waders on, you can walk there with running shoes, and you won't even get wet. This is only 40 years, so we have to look at the real big picture here and what's going to happen here.

In order for a Plan to go ahead and be effective, you have to have compliance. And with compliance, you have to have enforcement. You have to have the capacity to do that enforcement. There has to be good will on both sides, both parties. They've got to be able to work together. If the people on the project see something that shouldn't be there, it's up to the project head to bring that to the attention of the enforcement division and let them know. There has to be a good working relationship for this Plan to work.

Like I said, it's challenging. Where can you put a road in Nunavut right now where caribou aren't going to cross it? You can't. It's totally frickin' impossible to do. Caribou go all over the place. They have some main migratory routes, sure. But one day they might not go somewhere for 40 years. All of a sudden, there is a whole herd there that will stay there all winter, like what's happening now? So you've got to really, really take a good look at how this Plan is going to work. There has to be room for adjustment. You've got to be able to adjust this thing as you go. As you see different problems come up, you have to make the adjustments there to mitigate those problems. It's a tough situation, and it's going to be challenging.

And I can see like for a lot of the communities, like when I walk down this street here. This is like Edmonton compared to where I am. We don't even have a damn Tim Horton's. You guys got three.

(Laughter)

Then you go to Kugluktuk where Lisa is from. There, holy man, that town is pitiful. So there are the Have and Have-Nots here. That's why you're so ornery.

(Laughter)

But you can see the differences in the communities, you know. All the communities need some economic boost, for sure. That's got to be balanced out throughout Nunavut. Sure there are parcels of land – Inuit Owned Land – but in order to get to that Inuit Owned Land, you're going to have to disturb other land that isn't. So everything is affected. It's not just taking resources out of that one place. You're affecting the whole region as you do it, getting the product to and from market or whatever.

You know, there are so many...I can go on until he hits a button again, but it's a tough situation for everybody to be in. It's challenging, and the only way it's going to work is if everybody works together and tries to come up with some kind of solution to how best to promote the growth for all the people in Nunavut, not just some. Everybody has to benefit from this. The harvesters, they are the most important people in Nunavut. They live off the land. This is their life, you know? And if you destroy this way of life 50 years from now, there won't be anybody out on the land. That way of life will be gone, just like the way it is in Fort Chipewyan. You'd never think it would happen, but it happens. I passed through there last week. With 30 trappers and cabins that I knew of, there wasn't one trapper out there. Nobody was living there. We don't want that to happen to this place. This is the last frontier on Earth right here, right here in Nunavut. There is no other place like this on Earth.

So you have to take care of the animals here, take care of the land, take care of the resources and don't take everything out at once. Like they say, how much is enough? How much do the people need? You've got to be reasonable about it and try to do the best we can here. I mean right now as we speak, the caribou herd here, the Qamanirjuaq herd, is taking a severe beating at Tadoule Lake. There is over a 1000 animals came out of there last week. There are trucks going in there with trailers, guys bringing out a few hundred caribou at a time. Those caribou were there all winter by Tadoule Lake. The people at Tadoule Lake, they took just what they needed.

David: Earl, I'm going to have to ask you to wrap it up. Sorry.

Earl: Okay, but the minute that road went in there, the skidoos, the trucks, everybody started harvesting that resource. So these are some of the kind of things we've got to look at and have some kind of controls. Like I said, I could go on forever, but thank you, David.

David: No pressure, Brandon.

Brandon: Yeah, no problem.

(Laughter)

Brandon Laforest, WWF Canada. I'll try to follow Earl. I'd like to start my comments by acknowledging the GN biologists. Your contributions have been very helpful and very clear. And I understand the position that your government has changed, but I appreciate your communication that the biology has not. I was hesitant last Thursday how the GN would contribute to this meeting, and I think you guys have done a great job. So thank you very much.

We support Protected Area status for calving grounds, post-calving grounds, freshwater crossings, as well as seasonal protection, from ice breaking, for sea ice crossings. We argue that mobile protection measures are unproven and conceptual, and we shouldn't be experimenting with these measures on calving grounds.

Further, given the lack of examples of mobile protection measures on calving grounds, in reference to the Government of Canada's point on the need for clarity when listing prohibitions, we would argue that imposing unproven mobile protection measures does not offer clarity to proponents when interpreting a Land Use Plan. We have heard that currently, there is not capacity from the governments to pay for or monitor the enforcement of these measures. And the suggestion that proponents cover all the costs themselves and monitor themselves is troublesome or unrealistic, either one.

We strongly support, as Sharon mentioned, a full review of the Plan after five years highlighting caribou habitat especially, to try and address the concerns that calving ground and post-calving ground protection will unduly impact or delay development. This has been a really detailed and fruitful conversation for an area that represents 6% of Nunavut.

I want to reiterate what we said in our submission and our opening comments that we aren't advocating for locking away the land and throwing away the key. It's a living document, and we believe it's already a fair compromise, given the conservative nature of the GN identified caribou polygons, the population status of barren ground caribou herds in Nunavut, and the unproven nature of mobile protection measures at this point, which can be developed and reassessed in five years. Thanks.

Jackie:

Thank you. Jackie Price, Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. I remember at the end, or at the last Technical Meeting in Rankin Inlet, the Chair had asked many of the participants if they felt it was fruitful to have a face-to-face caribou workshop. Many of us, including myself, said yes. We said that it would be good to have people around the same table being completely honest with their stance and having to look each other in the eye. I don't get to say this much, but it turns out I was right.

(Laughter)

This has been a hugely fruitful, rewarding – and to borrow Hannah's word – at times confusing meeting, but good on us for doing it. I appreciate that we may not have final conclusions, but I do believe there is a larger spirit of understanding and willingness to work together as a result of this meeting. So I think that's a great thing. So great meeting and thank you, everyone.

Speaking on behalf of QWB and as a staff person, I work with 14 separate Boards: the 13 HTOs of this region, and the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board itself. It can be a lot of work. Discussions on honoraria alone can be a little bit energetic and require patience.

(Laughter)

But that's the nature of our Regional Wildlife Organization. And even though I joke about some of the challenges, perhaps the greatest part of my job and the organization I work with, is that when it comes time to talking about caribou, it's the most engaging and life affirming conversation you can have. What is consistent across the 14 Boards when talking about caribou is the reminder that

caribou have never harmed people. They've done the opposite. They have been an important life source, and they bring joy. They physically bring joy to people.

As QWB works to develop their own proposals for future meetings, and as we work to develop maps and the technical requirements needed for this process, we do so with the knowledge that caribou have never hurt us. They've always given us life. And there is some solace, some comfort in that. So, in the next steps when we come forward and bring forward our recommendations, that includes prohibitions on lands and areas. Like I said earlier, we will be completely unapologetic on that, and for good reason. But we know things change, and we know circumstances change, so there is also a willingness for flexibility and an openness to work together.

I was really touched yesterday when we had many of the Elder Advisor Committee come up and talk about the need to work together to find solutions, and their willingness to share their frustration within a wildlife management context, but then to share their willingness to work with biologists, with government, willingness to jab at times, but willingness to compliment. So it's a complicated relationship, and that's okay.

The last point I want to say is that although I made it sound like Inuit communities are around the same common goal of caribou – at least the group I work with, there is a common theme – in no way do I want to represent Inuit communities in this region as being the same. We have a lot of major issues that we need to work out internally. Focusing on caribou – and although not discussed at length here – Baffin Island communities rely a lot on Kivalliq caribou. That discussion alone highlights the tension that exists between having access to caribou but also Inuit right to sell meat within the territory and to other Inuit. That's a huge, complicated issue that Inuit are working on now, including different regions.

I don't want to leave this meeting making you think like oh well, we all agree and it's all wonderful, and stuff like that. We're working through these hard, hard issues as well. When we talk about wildlife management and economic development, we understand that tension deeply. So we're trying to figure it out too. Thank you.

Karla: Karla Letto with the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. I would just like to thank the Planning Commission for hosting this Technical Meeting. It has been very informative, and we hope that it helps the Commission with the revisions to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. I'll keep our closing remarks short.

I just want to say that the NWMB is not against industrial development. However, the Board is of the view that there must be an appropriate balance between development and protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat. Since it is clear mandate under Article 5 of the Land Claims Agreement to secure to the extent reasonably possible the conservation of wildlife, the NWMB is committed to helping ensure a responsible balance between development in Nunavut and the protection of caribou and sensitive caribou habitat.

We feel it's important to take the precautionary approach and ensure that the Nunavut Land Use Plan takes into account both IQ and scientific information that has been provided to the Commission on the impacts of development on caribou and sensitive caribou habitat, in particular the calving grounds. As we said on Monday, the NWMB is working towards putting together our workshop

report and drawing the recommendations from that. We look forward to forwarding that report and recommendations to the Planning Commission. Thank you.

David: I'll ask Spencer to pick up, and we'll go around the wall as well and the phone. So, in that context, being succinct would be good.

Spencer: Hi, Spencer Dewar. INAC. This might sound like an Oscar speech, but I'd like to thank a lot of people.

(Laughter)

First and foremost, the Commission for holding this. I know the logistics alone are not easy, let alone holding these meetings. I want to thank the translators, which are key to allowing us to speak in our language of preference, and I want to thank the technical team for allowing teleconferencing, because it's allowing those who couldn't be with us to participate. I think these are all very important. I'd like to thank everyone around this table. You know, the depth of discussion this week was great. We got to hear from multiple perspectives, and it certainly did expand my understanding of the issues and the caribou, and I hope it did the same for the Commission who will be tasked with trying to capture it all in a reasonable approach.

Coming out of here, it appears there is still a lot to do, and you know, lots of discussions to be had. We're committed to doing that and working with the Commission to try and develop a first generation Land Use Plan for Nunavut. Thank you, and safe travels to those who are traveling.

Ken: Ken Landa from the Government of Canada. I would also like to say thank you, and in particular, thank you to those who have facilitated us in communicating with each other as well as we have. We always need to get better at it. It's easy to say we need to find compromises and we need to find balance. It is hard to find compromises, and it is hard to find balance. These are issues that go right to the heart of who a person is, who a person wants to be, and what a person wants for their children. I see that. I think we all see that. That's the thought I'm taking away with me to get ready for our next round of discussions on all of these issues. So thank you very much, and I'd like to invite Earl and Jimmy to all my meetings, because laughing helps a lot.

Peter: Thank you. Peter, KRWB. I'd just like to thank NPC for organizing this meeting and inviting us. The Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board would like prompt and effective steps taken by the management authorities to protect the caribou habitat, calving grounds, and water crossings especially. I also emphasize that something be done regarding predation, especially around the calving grounds, as mentioned by Luigi. And also, KRWB would also support the prohibitions of development and mining around calving grounds. Thanks, David.

Mitch: Thank you. Mitch Campbell, GN. First off, yeah I would just like to quickly thank the NPC. They've really gone out of their way to try and be inclusive of everyone's comments, and I commend them for that. I personally know how hard all you guys work, so thank you for that. Also regardless of the different ideas that might exist around the table – and I know my colleagues around this table also understand that we're all in this for the same reason, so there has got to be some common ground here somewhere. We're all trying to do the same thing. So I think we need to try and come together, and I can commit to that.

But just generally, the GN no longer advocates for the exclusion of industrial development from core calving grounds and key access corridors. Notwithstanding recent shifts in the GN position, I would like to include my professional, scientific opinion that includes my understanding and review of peer-reviewed scientific literature as well as my understanding and review of IQ and Traditional Knowledge that has been collected and listened to over my 30 years of working with caribou and consulting with the people that truly understand and rely on them.

Briefly, allowing industrial development into calving grounds represents a high risk to the long-term viability of caribou populations. All stakeholders need to understand this reality in order to make effective decisions that will decide the future of our caribou herds. With that, I'll just hand it over to Amy for a quick finish. Thank you very much.

Amy: Amy Robinson, Government of Nunavut. Again, I'd like to thank the NPC and everyone around the table, especially NPC for hosting this workshop. I know a lot of work went into it. So as technical level staff, we look forward to relaying the knowledge requests and positions shared here to our senior management, as well as our counterparts within other GN departments. We hope to continue to work collaboratively with NPC as well as all planning parties, to find balanced land use solutions to this important issue. Thank you.

David: I'll just go around the back wall if people have anything they want to add briefly – and this wall, if there is anybody who hasn't spoken and would like to. And again, brief remarks please.

? *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. I'm here with Executive Director, also with NTI. I am very sorry I couldn't be here because I had other commitments, but one of the employees is here on behalf of us. I understand, we all understand that our government is working in our future, and we have to revise or review whatever is happening. Let us work together, and we know that, and also understand that the communities in Nunavut, especially with anything to do with wildlife and regional wildlife officers, organizations, they have been saying that. They have been saying that the caribou migration calving grounds should be protected. This is from our own communities – Inuit communities- and from HTOs in each region.

As it stands, we also understand that we have to go forward. There is a lot of unemployment in Nunavut, but we have to go forward. That I know. You've heard and been advised that the exploration will always be with us. The exploration or mining companies will also affect our wildlife, because the migration also changes in wildlife, especially caribou calving grounds. Because the caribou migration or caribou calving grounds are always where caribou go to migrate, especially on the same area.

Please do not touch the migration area where there are calving grounds. Be cautious, because it is very sensitive. We know you can make a good Plan. Our government should make some kind of a Plan, and we should work together and go forward on this. Thank you.

David Lee: I'll be very brief, David. I just wanted to thank NPC, the excellent facilitation, interpreters, Paul for your support. Paul is my director, wildlife and environment, and the comments he made to everyone here. I think those were quite bold. Finally, I'd just like to acknowledge my colleagues and how professional they have been – obviously everyone, but especially my close friend, Mitch. I know how difficult it has been for you and all of your staff. I think you've conducted yourself extremely professionally. Thank you.

Leslie: Hi. Leslie Wakelyn with the BQ Caribou Management Board. It was pointed out to me that some people aren't really clear why I'm here. I think they know why Earl is here. But the Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board is very interested in participating in this process because of the transboundary nature of the herds. There are representatives here from many of the partners for the Board, so INAC, GNWT, GN, and the Kivalliq Wildlife Board, but there are not representatives here from portions of the caribou range in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

And so we are here to both put their views forward as well as to take what people say here back to our Board. So we have a meeting in May, and we will be telling people what has gone on at this meeting and what people's positions are with the difficulties and challenges. We will attempt to explain to them why whatever ends up in the Management Plan is hopefully the core Protected Areas for calving grounds, why they are so much smaller than the areas that our Board has been discussing for 20-30 years. So it's a two-way information flow as well as just here telling you what our Board thinks. I won't go through all our positions, because we did submit comments for the March 4th deadline, so they're on the record. They have been on the website for a while now.

But I would like to just say a couple of things in addition to reminding you about the shared resource. The Board does acknowledge that mineral exploration and mining will continue in Nunavut and wants to work to get the best solution. But the best solution for our Board, the bottom line is really that those activities would occur outside of calving grounds, post-calving areas and key water crossings.

The Board does not believe that mobile protection measures at this point in time are appropriate for any of those areas. There is a combination of area protection and other measures needed across the caribou ranges to protect caribou. We would say please keep in mind the precautionary approach. That's really important in assessing the actual risks to caribou over time, and over the long-term. As Earl pointed out, we have to think big, and we have to think long-term. That's the main points I guess. But I would also like to thank NPC for the opportunity and the organization, the facilitation, and the translators in particular, especially for those like me who talk too fast. Also we need to acknowledge the fact that we wouldn't be at this meeting if it weren't for support from WWF, because the Board does not have the capacity and the resources to attend these types of meetings. Thank you to everyone. We will attempt to participate in the rest of the process as much as we can. Thanks.

Jimmy: Thank you. Jimmy, Elder Advisor in the Kitikmeot. Although this is my very first Technical Meeting with the NPC and it's really hard for me to understand most of this stuff, I'm sort of looking forward to the next one. I don't know why.

(Laughter)

You know, it's really technical, and I just wanted to say a few words. I forgot to mention that I'm going to make it short and sweet, just like me.

(Laughter)

Anyways, I just wanted to say a few things on a serious note sort of. IQ, Traditional Knowledge is very important. I think it should be in every meeting in Nunavut, even in the NWT. You know, you

have to use the Elders. I'm sure you have Elder Advisors in your Commissions. I don't know, but I advise you to go into that direction. Most of all, I just want to thank our GN staff, our biologists. I see want to tell Lisa that find a way to communicate with the caribou from Victoria Island. When they migrate south, they come back. Thank you.

?Elder: *(Translated)*: I am an Elder from Kugluktuk. I'm going to say a short comment. I would like to thank the facilitator in regards to the caribou. I like this workshop, because it's talking about caribou in our community. If you go to each community, there are appointed HTO representatives.

(Pause)

I have a short speech to everyone. I'd like to see you, all of you who are concerned with caribou, whenever there is discussion on caribou, we welcome anyone, because it has been a problem in our area as well. For those of you who come into the communities and think they will be opposed, that's not the situation all the time. We need help. We need to know. We need to work with researchers or anyone concerned with caribou. We want to understand why the herd is depleting, why it's not coming to my region. So when you come in, I will sit with you. I will inform my community what you are trying to do. I'd like to thank you, that you have really assisted me in the last few days with new information that I have never heard of before. Thank you.

David: Thank you. Any other comments from folks at the back row or on the telephone? I know I have neglected folks on the telephone, but if there is anybody out there... Alright, I'll just say one thing. How we deal with this caribou crisis – and I'll call it a crisis – will define us, not just among ourselves but all those generations that will follow. It's an enormous responsibility, and I think folks have underscored the complications and the different viewpoints. But in the end, it's all about caribou. So I'll turn it over to Sharon now for final remarks.

Sharon: Thank you, David, and I thank each of you for your honest participation and giving so much to this session. I always say what our Commission mandate is and what we're guided by. We're guided by NUPPAA legislation and the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement in its entirety. Our main Article is Article 11, but every other Article all works together, and the Commission is very respectful of that. The Commission role is not an easy role, and trying to please everyone is next to impossible. But I believe the Commission always tries to demonstrate where we can, our flexibility within our limited resources and our funding. Our role is to gather data, to listen, to compile, and to ensure that everyone's voice is heard in a fair, respectful manner.

Steven, I thank you for your comments especially. It's very difficult for the Commission to always get into the community, and their voice is equally as important - we can't stress that enough - as everyone around the table. And as Warren said, the limited money for participation, and Leslie, that shouldn't be a block that their voice isn't heard or at this table or at the Public Hearing. I thank you for your commitment to this process. I've been with the Commission going into my 11th year. I cannot believe that. It seems like yesterday when we started and had to get 11.4.1A done before we could get the parties back at the table, and here we are today.

I would especially like to recognize our Elder Advisors, David, Jimmy, Liza, Bartholomew – always wise words and good guidance and good advice.

(Applause)

Jimmy has given me, over my lifetime – and I’ve known him since I’ve been a young lady – much advice, and sometimes pretty funny advice at my stake, at my expense. It’s always good to have our Elders participate, and I’m grateful for that. David said it for me. I can’t say it better, but to the GN Department of Environment, all of you, I’m so proud of you that you kept your professionalism. In light of everything that happened, I really appreciated that you participated, and you came. From all of us around the table, I think, thank you so, so much.

I’d like to recognize the Commission team. First of all, Annie and Tommie. They are our translators extraordinaire. They are not just translators. They are our mappers and administrators. They play a key part in ensuring good communications.

(Applause)

To Peter, Jon and Jared for putting everything together – they are our workhorses of the Planning Department with Brian. They are always amazing, and they always give 500%. We also have Alana, Doreen, in the back – some of our new staff that just joined our team, and we’re grateful that they are now part of the Commission staff. Alan, our Legal Counsel, I can’t believe he was so quiet this meeting.

(Laughter)

And to David...David and I have a love-hate relationship.

(Laughter)

He loves to hate, because I’m always objective with the Commission perspective, and David wants to get it done. And we do too, but it has to be clear and concise. The commitment to this Plan – this isn’t just for the parties around the table. It’s for our future generations: my family as well as many around this table, our Elders – that’s our family, our grandkids. So I encourage each of you, please continue working together, not just at this table. It’s our kids, our grandkids that are affected by what we do. And if we don’t get this first generation Plan right, they will pay the costs of our decision-making today.

I know everyone is busy, and we’ve talked a lot around this table. The next steps are critical, and I ask each of you, please make the time. Please set up the meetings. Please have the conversations. The existing rights issue, that’s not for the Commission to resolve. It’s with you parties to resolve. It’s a collective that has to happen. And the Commission is striving to ensure that this first generation Nunavut Land Use Plan that the rest of the world is looking at, is done in a way that’s best including scientific and IQ Traditional Knowledge.

The Commission team is small, but we’re like bunnies. We never stop. Our doors are always open. We’ve had a structural change, and we’ve gone back to the implementation plan direction of having three regional offices. We have our office open here in Iqaluit. We still have our office in Cambridge, and Jonathan is heading that office up now, and Brian, his team in Arviat. Even though you may not be in the communities, we’re a phone call away. We’re always there to support, to work with everyone, including the HTOs, the communities, the Wildlife Boards. The more we exchange

information, the better we're going to be. I wish everyone safe travel home, and I thank you. It's nice to see so many familiar faces and new friends. Thank you.

David: Thanks, Sharon. And I'll ask Tommy to do the closing prayer. Safe journeys to all who are traveling.

Tommy: (*Closing Prayer*)

MEETING ADJOURNED