



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

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

WHALE COVE

January 29, 2020



Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1 Context.....	3
1.2 Purpose	3
1.3 Methodology.....	3
1.4 Public Awareness	4
1.5 Follow Up	4
2. Breakout Group Questions and Participant Responses.....	5
1. Polar Bear Denning	5
2. Point Locations Identified by Heritage River Management Plans	5
3. Community Areas of Interest: Corbett Inlet	6
4. Caribou Calving Areas	6
5. Caribou Post Calving Areas	7
6. Caribou Fresh Water Crossing.....	8
7. Final wrap up Question.....	9
Appendix A: Breakout Group Reference Maps.....	10
Appendix B: Breakout Group Map Revisions.....	13
Map 1: Char Fishing Rivers	

1. Introduction

1.1 Context

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

1.2 Purpose

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

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

1.3 Methodology

During the community visit the following events took place:

- **Elected Officials Meeting;** (10:00-11:00) Attended by Hamlet council and HTO members
 - The Commission Chairperson and staff met with the Hamlet Council and hunters and Trappers Organization in Council chambers to provide a brief overview of the NPC's role and responsibility in Nunavut's regulatory system, process history, and preparation for the Information Sessions to be held in the afternoon and evening. An opportunity for questions and answers was provided, but no formal feedback on the 2016 DNLUP was provided or recorded during this meeting.

- **Afternoon Information Session;** (1:30 to 4:30) Attended by approximately 20 people, held 1 breakout group.
 - **Posters;** Multi-lingual posters for each chapter of the Draft Plan were posted in the Community Hall for review.
 - **Presentation;** The Commission chairperson and staff provided an introductory presentation that included a brief overview of some background information, the Commission role and responsibility, role in Nunavut's regulatory system, process history, 2016 DNLUP chapter overview, and preparation for breakout groups including the types of questions that would be asked.
 - **Breakout Groups;** Held breakout group discussions to review community-specific maps (see Appendix A) and ask questions on priority issues (see section 2). Recorded oral feedback and mapped suggested revisions and additions to geographic boundaries (see Appendix B)

- **Evening Information Session;** (6:30 to 9:30) Attended by approximately 20 people, held 1 breakout group.
 - Repeat same format as afternoon session

1.4 Public Awareness

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

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

1.5 Follow Up

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

2. Breakout Group Questions and Participant Responses

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

1. Polar Bear Denning

Polar bear denning areas have been identified in the 2016 DNLUP as Valued Components (VEC).

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

➤ ***Whale Cove community participants did not comment on whether it was appropriate to identify polar bear denning areas as Valued Components.***

- Group 1 – Participants noted that today skidoos go everywhere and if a skidoo moves nearby a den the bear will desert the den and not return. Skidoos travel everywhere, no rules, so if a place has been identified in the past it is likely the bears are not denning there anymore. Further, if someone finds a den now people spread the news via internet and people will go and skidoo there, and likely the bear is not denning anymore
- Group 2 - When growing up, no polar bears were observed, had very little experience with them. Now they are coming into the community. Perhaps the bears that den in Churchill and they come up along the floe edge. Because of slow freezeup of bay sea ice that is why polar bears are in town now – does not freeze like it used to. Bears den on slopes where they can find good snow. Hard to tell where they go – can be anywhere and they look for an appropriate place to den. Can't really answer this question

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

- Group 1 – no other locations identified
- Group 2 – no other locations identified

2. Point Locations Identified by Heritage River Management Plans

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

- a) Is this the right approach?

➤ ***Whale Cove community participants support the protection of point locations on Kazan River.***

- Group 1 – yes, support this approach
- Group 2 – Yes all agree

b) Do you agree with the locations identified?

➤ ***Whale Cove community participants agreed with the identified locations.***

- Group 1 – yes, support the locations as identified by other Inuit
- Group 2 – yes, support the locations identified by other Inuit

3. Community Areas of Interest: Corbett Inlet

The Rankin Inlet community identified Corbett Inlet as important, and recommended protections. Because the boundaries shown, and the proposed regulations were not specified, NPC labelled this area as a VEC, with no restrictions.

a) Do you agree with the location and boundaries of the Corbett Inlet area of interest?

➤ ***Some Whale Cove community participants supported the identified area.***

- Group 1 – This is the first that we have seen this area identified. No comments.
- Group 2 – Yes, support this. Inuit support and help each other. If neighbor community wants something like this they will support.

b) Do you agree with the proposed identification of Corbett Inlet as a VEC? If not, what would be preferable?

➤ ***Some Whale Cove community participants agree with identifying the area as a Valued Component.***

- Group 1 – no comment because this is new to the group
- Group 2 - yes agree

4. Caribou Calving Areas

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

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

➤ ***Some Whale Cove community participants agreed with the identified calving areas and some suggested the area is too large.***

- Group 1 – Participants noted that the map is adequate. Also noted that the caribou management board has held many meetings about exploration companies wanting to do exploration work in the calving grounds.
- Group 2 – Some participants agreed with calving area as mapped, other felt the mapped area was too large. Each year caribou go to different places and will return too – that is

why the area is so large. No one was ready to draw a new boundary on the map. There is some concern that mining activities displace caribou – noted example the airport area.

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

➤ ***Some Whale Cove community participants agreed that activities like mining, oil & gas, roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries should be prohibited in caribou calving grounds and some did not.***

- Group 1 –We want to see young people getting jobs but the exploration is displacing the caribou from the area. We would rather have meat on the table rather than money on the table. Would like NPC to make a statement that Inuit support the NPC map of calving grounds to be protected. Especially in May, June, July. Do not want exploration companies there because of impact on caribou. Emphatic about the support for protection and that others from Hamlet and HTO would express the same.
- Group 2 – Participants noted that in the area adjacent Whale Cove there are 2 companies actively exploring for minerals. Can't really make it a PA as the activity is already occurring. Plus the community does need some development.

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

- Group 1 – no comments
- Group 2 – no comments

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

➤ ***Whale Cove community participants that supported restrictions recommended that they be seasonal.***

- Group 1 – Participants recommended seasonal restrictions. Noted that May, June, July is the especially sensitive time and that is also when exploration companies want to do work in this region. Exploration activities do not occur in the winter. But if these areas are mapped everyone will see that this is important habitat. In the winter the caribou migrate to Manitoba so it seems that the protection is not needed in the winter.
- Group 2 – No comments

5. Caribou Post Calving Areas

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

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

➤ ***Some Whale Cove community participants agreed with the identified post-calving areas and some suggested the area is too large.***

- Group 1 – same comments as calving
- Group 2 – same comments as calving

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

➤ ***Some Whale Cove community participants agreed that activities like mining, oil & gas, all-weather roads, hydro-electric infrastructure, and quarries should be restricted in caribou post-calving grounds, and some participants would prefer to see development.***

- Group 1 – same comments as calving + regarding the Kivalliq to Manitoba speculative road participants noted that according to the news the Dempster Highway does not seem to bother the caribou migration. That highway is heavily used by trucks and it seems to be okay. If we got a road then it would be possible to control the highway traffic if the caribou is in the area.
- Group 2 – same comments as calving

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

- Group 1 – no comments
- Group 2 – no comments

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

➤ ***Whale Cove community participants that supported restrictions recommended that they be seasonal.***

- Group 1 – same comments as calving
- Group 2 – No comments

6. Caribou Fresh Water Crossing

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

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

➤ ***Some Whale Cove community participants agreed with the identified caribou freshwater crossing locations.***

- Group 1 – Participants noted that this does not really affect the coastal people, the crossings are far inland. Whale Cove people do not go that far inland in the spring and summer – not possible to travel except by helicopter.
- Group 2 – Participants agreed with the identified locations

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

➤ ***Whale Cove community participants were not clear whether it is necessary to restrict activities near water crossings.***

- Group 1 – Ancestors have said that it is essential to never bother caribou that are using crossings and not to bother the crossings themselves.
- Group 2 – Participants unclear about how best to protect the areas

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

- Group 1 – no comments
- Group 2 – no comments

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

- Group 1 – no comments
- Group 2 – no comments

7. Final wrap up Question

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

➤ ***Whale Cove community participants identified two char fishing rivers where there are concerns regarding mine development, but no recommendations were provided regarding management.***

- Group 1 – no additional areas identified.
- Group 2 – Participants identified 2 areas of interest for protection – rivers where they fish for char and one of the rivers provides drinking water. Ferguson River and Wilson River. Concerned about the potential impacts of gold mine development. Worried about tailings ponds contaminating fresh water and ocean water. At the same time people support mining exploration because it employs young people. If mining companies are required to not contaminate they usually will. Participants did not describe what protection measures may be required.

Appendix A: Breakout Group Reference Maps

Appendix B: Breakout Group Map Revisions

Map 1: Char Fishing Rivers

