

Participants

Community Delegates & Ikaluktutiak Hosts	
Derek Elias	Mayor of Cambridge Bay
Jim MacEachern	CAO Municipality of Cambridge Bay
Laurel Bennett	Cambridge Bay Planning & Lands Administrator
Elder Mary Kaudaluk	Lighting of the Qulliq
Bobby Greenley	Ikaluktutiak CAO Chair
Beverly Makasagak	Ikaluktutiak HTO Manager
Harry Makasagak	Ikaluktutiak HTO
Salomie Qitsualik	Gjoa Haven Hamlet Council
Jacob Keanik	Gjoa Haven Hamlet Council
Brandon Qirqqut	Gjoa Haven HTO
Roger Ekelik	Gjoa Haven HTO
David Siksik	Gjoa Haven HTO
Athol Ihakkaqag	Kugaaruk HTO
Lucy Taipana	Kugluktuk Hamlet Council
Randy Hinanik	Kugluktuk HTO
Darlene Hokanak	Kugluktuk HTO
David Totalik	Taloyoak Hamlet Council
Jeannie Ugjuk	Taloyoak Hamlet Council
Joe Ashevak	Taloyoak HTO Chair
Jimmy Oleekatalik	Taloyoak HTO Mangaer
Viola Neeveacheak	Taloyoak HTO Board

NPC: Nunavut Planning Commission – Commissioners & Staff	
Andrew Nakashuk	Chairperson
Shawn Lester	Vice Chair
Joshua Arreak	Commissioner
Patricia Enuapik	Commissioner
Dorothy Gibbons	Commissioner
Abraham Keenainak	Commissioner
Simon Mikkungwak	Commissioner
Darrell Ohokannoak	Commissioner
Sharon Ehaloak	Executive Director
Nowdlak Kelly	Executive Assistant to Directors & Managers
Jonathan Ehaloak	Assistant Executive Director & Manager of IT
Brian Aglukark	Director of Community Engagement & Translations
Jonathan Savoy	Director of Policy & Planning
Goump Djalogue	Manager of Planning and Implementation
Solomon Amuno	Senior Planner
Adrian Gerhartz	Planner, GIS Technician
Annie Ollie	Interpreter-Translator & Regional Planner
Tommy Owljoot	Interpreter-Translator
Henry Ohokannoak	Interpreter-Translator
James Panyoak	Interpreter-Translator
Natalie Labossière	Interpreter-Translator
Alan Blair	Legal Counsel
David Livingstone	External Advisor
Beth Gorham	Communications & Media Advisor
Willi Puerstl	Videographer, Director of Skyline Productions
Chris Hellig	Audio Technician
Bessie Joy	Cambridge Bay Support Staff
Annie Jane Kamingoak	Cambridge Bay Support Staff
Rosie Kaiyogana	Cambridge Bay Support Staff
Kaliq Komak	Cambridge Bay Support Staff
Joan McCallum	Cambridge Bay Support Staff

Signatory Parties

Government of Canada	
Terry Audla	Regional Director General, CIRNAC
Spencer Dewar	Director of Resource Management
Jeff Hart	Manager of Land Use Planning
Michelle-Claire Roy	Environmental Policy Analyst
Greg Matthews	Department of Defence
Simon Gruda-Dolbec	Department of Justice
Lindsay Armer	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Nathalie Lowry	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Ranier Duschinsky	Global Affairs Canada
Anita Gudmundson	Transport Canada
Scott Kidd	Transport Canada

Government of Nunavut	
Henry Coman	Assistant Deputy Minister for Dept. of Environment
Eamonn Carroll	Legal Counsel

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	
James Eetoolook	First Vice President
Burt Dean	Department of Wildlife and Environment
Ezra Green	Sr. Research & Tech Advisor, Wildlife & Environment
Christopher Kalluk	Lands Department
Marie Belleau	Legal Counsel, Lands Department
Nada Gonazlez	Advisor

Registered Participants

Kitikmeot Inuit Association	
Stanley Anablak	President
Peter Taptuna	Director of Environment and Resources
Bob Aknavigak	Vice President of Social & Cultural Development
Clara Evalik	Economic Development Officer
Luigi Toretti	Consultant
Mike Settington	Environmental Dynamics

Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	
Paul Ikvalaq	Chair
Peter Kapolak	Vice Chair
Pamela Wong	Senior Research & Technical Advisor
Clara Evalik	Economic Development Officer
Luigi Toretti	Consultant

Nunavut Impact Review Board	
Tara Arko	Director of Technical Services
Phillip K Omingmakyok	Board Member

Nunavut Water Board	
Assol Kubeisinova	Technical Advisor
Jesse O'Brien	Consultant

National Marine Council	
Heather Rasmussen	NMC Representative from NIRB, Senior Policy Analyst

Agnico Eagle	
Nancy Duquet Harvey	Environmental Superintendent, Hope Bay Mine
Greg Sharam	Wildlife Biologist

Nancy Duquet Harvey	Environmental Superintendent, Hope Bay Mine
Greg Sharam	Wildlife Biologist

Glencore	
Daniel Vriend	Senior Mining Engineer

Daniel Vriend	Senior Mining Engineer
---------------	------------------------

Sabina Gold & Silver	
Merle Keefe	Manager of Environmental Permitting
Andrew Moore	Director of Indigenous & Northern Affairs
John Kaiyogana	Community Liaison Officer

Merle Keefe	Manager of Environmental Permitting
Andrew Moore	Director of Indigenous & Northern Affairs
John Kaiyogana	Community Liaison Officer

World Wildlife Fund Canada	
Erin Keenan	Manager, Arctic Marine Conservation
Brandon Laforest	Senior Specialist, Arctic Species & Ecosystems

Erin Keenan	Manager, Arctic Marine Conservation
Brandon Laforest	Senior Specialist, Arctic Species & Ecosystems

Chamber of Mines	
Scott Trusler	NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines

Scott Trusler	NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines
---------------	----------------------------------

***Other attendees at the meeting are not included above, only those presenting or at the panel of presenters. A more fulsome list of all attendees can be obtained upon request.**

Table of Contents

Topic	Page
Introductions & Opening Remarks	9
Overview of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan:	16
Chapter 1: Land Use Designations	19
Chapter 2: Protecting and Sustaining the Environment	21
Key Migratory Bird Habitats	21
Caribou Habitat	22
Polar Bear Denning Areas	23
Walrus Haul-outs	24
Whale Calving, Cod Lakes, Polynyas & Marine Areas of Importance	24
Transboundary Considerations	24
Climate Change	25
Chapter 3: Encouraging Conservation Planning	25
Parks Awaiting Full Establishment & Proposed Parks	25
Proposed National Marine Conservation Areas	26
National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries	26
National Historic Sites & Historic Sites	26
Canadian Heritage Rivers	26
Marine Protected Areas	27
Chapter 4: Building Healthier Communities	22
Community Areas of Interest	27
On Ice Travel Routes	27
Boothia Peninsula	28
Community Identified Priority Areas	28
Use & Occupancy Mapping	29
Transboundary Considerations	29
Unincorporated Communities	29
Community Drinking Water Supplies	29
Priority Contaminated Sites	30
Military Facilities & Aerodrones	30
Chapter 5: Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development	30
Mineral Potential & Oil and Gas Potential	30
Terrestrial Transportation & Communication	31
Marine Shipping	31
Commercial Fishing Areas	32
Chapter 6: Implementation Strategy	33
Existing Mineral Rights	34
Minor Variances, Plan Amendments & Periodic Review of the Plan	36
Inuit Owned Lands	38
Questions and Answers Regarding Overview of the 2021 Draft Land Use Plan	40

Presentations	Page
Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Ikaluktutiak	46
Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Gjoa Haven	52
Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Kugaaruk	56
Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Kugluktuk	56
Presentation by the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board	71
Presentation by the Kitikmeot Inuit Association	75
Presentation by the Hamlet and HTO of Kugluktuk	95
Presentation by Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	98
Presentation by the Government of Canada	117
Presentation by the Government of Nunavut	133
Presentation by the Nunavut Impact Review Board	148
Presentation by Nunavut Water Board	153
Presentation by the Nunavut Marine Council	159
Presentation by Sabina Gold & Silver	164
Presentation by Agnico Eagle	170
Presentation by Glencore	175
Presentation by World Wildlife Fund Canada	180
Presentation by the Chamber of Mines	190
Closing Remarks	192

DAY 1: SEPTEMBER 12, 2022

INTRODUCTIONS & OPENING REMARKS

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: I think we will start. Qujannamiik. Good morning to all and welcome. There are transmitters at the front. If you don't know the channel, Inuktitut is on channel 4, English is on channel 7, and French would be on channel 3. If you need assistance on anything, for batteries, transmitter problems, there are little buttons at the back. You have to open it and choose your channel. Qujannamiik. Before we proceed, we will open the proceedings with an opening prayer. Joshua, would you please say the opening prayer? Let's all stand up together.

Joshua: *(Translated)*: I will say my prayer in Inuktitut.

(Opening Prayer including a moment of silence in respect to the late Queen, Her Majesty).

Chairperson: Thank you, Joshua. Our proceedings will start for the morning. I would like to welcome from the community, Assistant Mayor Derek Elias.

Mayor: Hello, good morning. Can you hear me? Good morning, everybody. Ulaakut. Good morning to Cambridge Bay Elders, residents, NPC board members and their visiting guests and delegates. On behalf of the Hamlet Council Administration and community residents, it is my pleasure to welcome you all to Ikaluktutiak for the Kitikmeot Public Hearings to discuss the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, in consultation with the Government of Nunavut, the federal government, Inuit organizations, municipalities, and other organizations. The Nunavut Planning Commission is responsible for the development, implementation, and monitoring of land use plans in Nunavut.

The municipality of Cambridge Bay is very pleased to host these regional public hearings and to participate in these discussions. We look forward to working with all of the stakeholders here today and identify issues and opportunities to enhance the lives of our residents and businesses in Ikaluktutiak and across the region. This time of collaboration will help ensure that all Nunavummiut are informed and are able to participate in the planning process. Once again, welcome to Ikaluktutiak. Thank you for taking the time to join these public hearings and for participating in these discussions. On a side note, I would like to welcome home, Sharon Ehaloak and her son, Jonathan. Welcome home back to Cambridge Bay. Thank you very much, and hopefully you guys enjoy your meetings. Quana.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We will proceed with Qulliq lighting with Mary Kaudaluk as she lights the Qulliq.

Elder Mary K: *(Translated)*: Our forefathers, over the years, I was taught to light this Qulliq. It is an all saving device. When I moved here, I was taught how to light it.

(Ceremony of lighting the Qulliq)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Thank you, Mary, for this demonstration. Before we proceed, Sharon has some housekeeping to attend to. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning, everyone. It is wonderful to be back in my home community. I lived here for 34 years before relocating to Iqaluit with opening the NPC office in Iqaluit. It has been just wonderful to see family and friends from all over the region and to be home.

First of all, the meeting times on the agenda, I would like to review. We are going to switch them slightly. Instead of stopping at 12 noon, we are going to stop at 11:45. We will start at 9:00 a.m. in the morning. Then in the afternoons, we are going to start at 1:15 to 4:30, and the evening sessions as required will go from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

I remind all presenters that as you are coming up, we are translating and using translators, so please as you speak, try to speak slowly so they can keep up. If while you are in the hall, if you could please put your phones on silent so it is not distracting the presenters or the proceedings. These proceedings are being recorded as well as transcribed. They are being broadcast live on Uvagut TV channel 240, 267, and on the link on their website and the Commission website, Nunavut.ca. We are also broadcasting live on a YouTube link like through our website. You can find that or on our Facebook page.

We will be taking two 15-minute breaks, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, as close to 10:30 and 2:15 as possible. When you came in, everyone was given one of these. The Chief Medical Health Officer, although we are not in COVID, has asked us to please keep track of all participants at the proceedings. On the back, you have a scan code. As you come in, in the morning or leave and come in in the afternoon and leave in the evening, if you could just walk by and scan. For the community delegates, this is really important for you as well, for our purposes for your meal per diem, etcetera. Please try to remember. The team at the table will also remind you as you are going out. Please do not take these out of the hall. Please leave them in the facility.

We have many delegates who will be presenting today and throughout the week. We would ask that everyone please be respectful while they are speaking. There will be an opportunity at the end of the participant's presentation to ask questions. When you speak, as we are recording these and the sessions are being transcribed, so every time you speak, please state your name and organization, or for our community members, your community and who you are representing.

Chairperson Nakashuk is chairing these proceedings, and he will recognize all speakers. We ask that only one person speak one at a time. Again, we are translating, so speak slowly. We will be sticking to our agenda, and I will be reviewing that momentarily.

We have coffee, tea, water, and snacks, so help yourself. The washrooms are located as you come in the facility. There are three emergency exits: the one everyone came in, one at the rear, and one at the front of the hall. If there should be an emergency, please exit through the exit closest to you.

We are on the other side of COVID, we hope, and there is not a requirement to wear masks, but please whatever your comfort is, and we have masks provided. It is at your discretion. If you are not feeling well, we ask that you do not attend the proceedings. If you are a community member and you become ill, please notify Nowdlak, and we will follow-up with you. If you have any

questions, we have support staff and a team at the front table to assist with any clarification or questions that you might have in relation to the proceedings. I am going to turn it back over to Chairperson Nakashuk for the introduction of Commission members. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Thank you, Sharon. At this time, we are going to have an introduction of the Commissioners.

Simon M: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Chair. Simon Mikkungwak with the Nunavut Planning Commission, Commissioner.

Darrel O: Darrel Ohokannoak. Happy to be sitting here in my home community.

Dorothy G: *(Translated)*: Good morning, everyone. Dorothy Gibbons, Commissioner.

Shawn: Shawn Lester, Vice Chair.

Patricia: Ma'na. Patricia Enuapik, Commissioner.

Joshua A: *(Translated)*: Joshua Arreak, Commissioner NPC.

Abraham: *(Translated)*: Abraham Keenainak, Commissioner.

Andrew: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Thank you for the introductions. My name is Andrew Nakashuk. I am Chair of the Nunavut Planning Commissioner from Pangnirtung. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning again. My name is Sharon Ehaloak. I am the Executive Director with the Nunavut Planning Commission. I will first introduce the Commission team. I would ask our staff and our support staff to stand as I call your name to be recognized.

Brian Aglukark: Brian is our Director of Community Engagement and Translations based in our Arviat office.

Jonathan Ehaloak. Jonathan is our Assistant Executive Director and Manager of Information Technology based out of the Iqaluit Office.

Jonathan Savoy. Jonathan is our Director of Policy and Planning based out of our Cambridge Bay office.

Goump Djalogue. Goump is our Manager of Planning and Implementation out of our Iqaluit office.

Solomon Amuno. Solomon is our Senior Planner based out of our Cambridge Bay office.

Adrian Gerhartz. Adrian is our Planner, GIS Technician extraordinaire. He is the one responsible for all the maps that you see. He is based in our Iqaluit office.

Tommy Owlijoot. I think everybody probably knows Tommy. Tommy is our Interpreter-Translator and is back in the translation booth.

Annie Ollie. There's Annie. Annie is our Interpreter-Translator and Mapper. Tommy and Annie are both based out of our Arviat office.

Nowdlak Kelly. Nowdlak is our Executive Assistant to all the Directors and Managers, as well as our Office Manager for all three of the Commission offices. Nowdlak is based out of the Iqaluit office.

David Livingstone is an advisor to the Commission. He has been working in land use planning in the NWT and Nunavut for, I'll say 40 years, but I think it is closer to 50. He provides us with external guidance.

Alan Blair is our Legal Counsel.

Jazz Adkins is our stenographer and is transcribing the proceeding.

Henry Ohokannoak. Where is Henry? Oh, there is a hand. Henry and James Panyoak are our translators. Hi, James.

I would like to recognize our local support team: Bessie Joy, Annie Jane Kamingoak, Rosie Kaiyogana, Joan McCallum, and Kaliq Komak. If you need anything, that is our dream team over there to help provide support.

I would like to recognize our communications and media advisor, Beth Gorham. On the cameras is Willi Puerstl, and Chris Hellig...I hope I say your name right, Chris. Chris Hellig is over in the corner.

I would like to recognize and introduce the participants. If you could please stand as I call your organization to be recognized.

- The Government of Canada
- The Government of Nunavut
- Nunavut Tunngavik and I would especially like to recognize James Eetoolook, first Vice President. We are very pleased to have you here today.
- The Kitikmeot Inuit Association
- The Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board
- The Hamlet of Cambridge of Bay
- Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization
- The Hamlet of Gjoa Haven
- Gjoa Haven Hunters and Trappers
- The Hamlet of Kugluktuk
- Kugluktuk Hunters and Trappers
- The Hamlet of Kugaaruk
- Kugaaruk Hunters and Trappers
- The Hamlet of Taloyoak
- Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers
- The Nunavut Impact Review Board
- The Nunavut Water Board
- The Nunavut Marine Council. Heather is wearing two hats today.
- Agnico Eagle

- Sabina Gold and Silver Corp
- Glencore
- The Chamber of Mines
- MMG
- The World Wildlife Fund
- Friends of Land Use Planning

Before we start our proceedings, I would just like to review the agenda. Everyone has a copy of the agenda. You can see from the agenda that we have a very full schedule. As we go through today, the Commission will be providing an overview of the Land Use Plan, the history and structure of the proceedings, and we will be having a question-and-answer period for clarifications on the proceedings and the Plan.

For tomorrow, we will start our opening remarks, and we will have the presentations first from the signatory parties: The Government of Canada, Nunavut Tunngavik, and the Government of Nunavut. These parties will have 60 minutes for their presentation, and then there will be a 30-minute period for questions and answers. Again, we ask that everyone be respectful of the presenters and ask the questions at the end of the presentations.

For the community members, each hamlet and HTO will have 30 minutes to present, and it is up to them if they want to present separately or together. Then there is 30 minutes for each of the question and answers. So, if they are presenting separately, 30 minutes each, and if they are presenting, an hour, then the hour for questions.

The order that we are doing the presentations after the signatory parties: Hamlet of Cambridge Bay, Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers, the Hamlet of Gjoa Haven, Gjoa Haven Hunters and Trappers, the Hamlet of Kugluktuk, Kugluktuk Hunters and Trappers, and the Hamlet of Kugaaruk, Kugaaruk Hunters and Trappers. Then there will be presentations by members of the public who have advised the Commission they want to present. Then there will be questions and answers, oral comments, and then closing day.

For Day 3, presentations by the registered participants continue. First will be the Hamlet of Taloyoak, Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers, the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, and I have Nunavut Tunngavik, Government of Nunavut, and then Government of Nunavut. Then there will be questions and answers, oral comments, and closing day. I think I got the order messed up. It will be the community participants first, and then the signatory parties second. Apologies, Mr. Chair.

On Thursday, Day 4, we will continue with our registered participant presentations, the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, the Nunavut Marine Council, Agnico Eagle, Sabina Gold and Silver Corp, Glencore, the World Wildlife Fund, and any other presenters who have advised the Commission that they wish to present. Then we will have the final closing statements, 3 minutes from each of the community members and 15 minutes from the signatory parties, then the closing remarks by the Commission, and the closing prayer.

With that, Mr. Chair, I will turn it back over to you. Thank you very much. Again, please silence your phones if you have not done so already. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Sharon. The delegates that will be at the mic, make sure you state your name for the proceedings. We are going to present a short video before we proceed into the hearing. Qujannamiik.

(NPC Video shown introducing the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan)

<https://youtu.be/8bFYz5g0bpY>

Qujannamiik. Before we get started on the real business of this hearing, I would like to make some opening remarks to set the context for our next few days together.

(English): First, I want to touch on the larger context and relevance of land use planning in Nunavut. Land use planning is about understanding the integral environmental, economic, and social-cultural context within which a plan is to be developed, the possible alternatives for land uses, and the selection of the best option in the circumstances given the best information we have at the time.

Across the North and across Canada, land use planning processes have experienced many different challenges. Those challenges are often due to diverse interests and the range of their environmental, economic and social conditions. Our experience in Nunavut can be even more challenging than other planning processes because of the size of Nunavut, the varied interests, often from region to region, as well as within regions.

We often have different views on an overall vision for land use planning in Nunavut and the scope and the content of a first-generation plan, as well as disagreements over the necessary resources for planning and how hearings should be conducted.

We must also address the unprecedented size of our planning area which further increases the number and complexity of the issues. No other jurisdiction in the world has attempted this at such a scale.

Regardless of the challenges identified, land use planning is essential. It matters to Nunavummiut, to our communities, to governments, various organizations, and industry. It matters to the land and all those that rely on the land, all living things. It matters to all of us collectively as we seek to protect the environment and develop resources responsibly and sustainably in the short term and for future generations.

Article 11 of the *Nunavut Agreement* sets out the principles that guide land use planning in Nunavut, and I will quote some key sections:

- The primary purpose of land use planning in the Nunavut Settlement Area shall be to protect and promote the existing and future well-being of those persons ordinarily residents and communities of the Nunavut Settlement Area, taking into account the interests of all Canadian. Special attention shall be devoted to protecting and promoting the existing and future wellbeing of Inuit and Inuit Owned Lands.
- The planning process shall ensure land use plans reflect the priorities and values of the residents of the planning regions.

- The objective of the planning process shall be to prepare land use plans which guide and direct resource use and development in the Nunavut Settlement Area.

Land use planning is much more than drawing lines on a map. It is about setting and achieving goals, identifying and living within limits of acceptable economic, environmental and social change. We must ensure the future is more than the result of a series of decisions about individual projects and activities. This Plan – your Plan - provides an opportunity through an inclusive process to meaningfully address and have essential conversations about difficult things.

There are several reasons why a supported and approved Nunavut Land Use Plan matters:

- It will support decision making with respect to environmental stewardship, sustainable resource and economic opportunities, and social benefit.
- It will serve as a filter and an entry point into the Nunavut regulatory system, and by doing so avoid single project-by-project reviews in the absence of a regional context.
- It will provide a structure and process to identify what is important, and confirm why it's important, in a larger sense, not just on a single proposed project.
- It will set out a framework for public and private investment, resource and environmental management, and progress as Nunavummiut define it.

Planning needs to be understood as a continual process that has to be monitored and reconsidered over time as circumstances, needs, and opportunities change and when new information becomes available.

There is no magic formula for creating a land use plan. It is always a question of achieving an acceptable balance among differing views, values, and visions. Understanding and knowing comes in different forms. Both Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit and western science acknowledge the importance of experience, wise judgement, and intuition.

Compromise by all parties is essential. No one party will get everything it wants but all parties should achieve enough to be satisfied with the outcome. The planning process is both a challenge and an opportunity. We are challenged to see and understand the different views, values, and priorities from all perspectives.

This gives us the opportunity to see things through others' perspectives; build a bridge and reach a consensus; find some balance; and adapt and improve the plan over time as circumstances and new information become available.

The Nunavut Planning Commission's decision-making framework presented in the 2021 Draft Plan and the *Options and Recommendations* document, is disciplined and transparent. The process is framed by considering options and trade-offs. Final decision-making relies on a combination of information, values, experience, and professional judgment.

The Nunavut Land Use Plan will be a living document. The 2021 Draft Plan incorporates ongoing monitoring and periodic reviews and amendments of the Plan, a continued commitment to achieve and maintain balance.

The Plan will be adapted to meet changing circumstances and events including:

- Community population changes,
- Wildlife population and habitat changes,
- Mineral and hydrocarbon demand and supply, and
- Impacts of climate change on the land and its use.

We Commissioners are committed to making all efforts to ensure that balanced decision-making remains at the core of our discussions. We will continue to rely on the best available information – Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and western science - for the analysis of facts and consideration of values.

The last 15 years of Plan development have consumed resources and placed demands on communities, regional organizations, and other planning partners. Now is the time for our collective efforts to come together and complete the Nunavut Land Use Plan. It is time for us to see issues from each other's perspectives to understand and commit to the compromises necessary. Working together, we will finalize a plan for Nunavut that reflects the priorities, values, and vision of Nunavummiut and our communities.

Thank you for your attention. *(Translated)*: Before we proceed to the next topic, we will take a 15-minute break. Thank you. Thank you for your attention.

BREAK

Overview of the 2021 Nunavut Land Use Plan Jonathan Savoy, NPC Director of Policy & Planning

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Let's proceed. I am handing it back to Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak with the Nunavut Planning Commission, Executive Director. At this time, we are going to be turning it over to Jonathan Savoy with the Planning Commission to do a presentation of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and a review of the maps. Just before we start, if I can ask the community delegates when we break for lunch, if you could just stay behind. We do want to talk to you at lunch break. So, everyone around table, if you could stay after Jon's presentation, it will probably go to lunch into this afternoon, If you could just stay back. With that, Mr. Chair, I would like to turn it over to Jonathan Savoy. Thank you.

Jonathan: Thank you very much and welcome everyone to my home community of Cambridge Bay. It is wonderful to see everyone here and to be starting this really exciting hearing process here in town. This morning, I will be providing an overview of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, just highlighting some of the key concepts that are proposed in the Draft Plan that we will all be

discussing throughout the week, as well as highlighting some of the issues, in particular here in the Kitikmeot region, as well as noting some of the areas where there is currently a lack of consensus in the written submissions that have been received to date on the current Draft Plan.

Very briefly, as I am sure we are all aware, the Nunavut Planning Commission is an institution of public government established in 1993 under the *Nunavut Agreement*. The Commission's main responsibility is to develop, implement, and monitor land use plans for the Nunavut Settlement Area that guide and direct resource use and development. The Commission is the entry point into Nunavut's regulatory system, so we are the first step when project proponents are looking to conduct activities in the territory, and the Commission's land use plans lay a foundation or a baseline for how these activities are to be conducted.

The Commission currently has two existing approved regional land use plans, one in the Keewatin or obviously the current Kivalliq region, as well as the North Baffin planning regions. These land use plans were originally developed in the 1980s and approved in early 1990s. They were then updated mostly on an administrative level to be consistent with the *Nunavut Agreement* and the creation of the Nunavut territory and approved again in the early 2000s. So, these plans are fairly dated. Other regions of Nunavut, including here in the Kitikmeot, have never had an approved land use plan to guide land use in a consistent way across the region. I will note that when the Nunavut Land Use Plan is approved, these two current regional land use plans will be replaced, and regions like here in the Kitikmeot will have an approved land use plan for the first time.

This planning process began quite some time ago and really got underway in November of 2007, about 15 years ago, with the approval of the Commission's *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals*. This document was developed in close collaboration with the Government of Canada, the Government of Nunavut, and Nunavut Tunngavik to provide the foundation or the framework for how land use planning in the territory would be conducted. With this overarching framework established through these *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals*, the Commission began developing the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan in 2007.

There have been many years of workshops and meetings, and discussions on the priorities and structure of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. I will just quickly note that previous drafts of the Plan were released in 2012, 2014, 2016, and most recently in July of 2021. Each of these draft plans have built on the previous draft and have all followed a similar but changing structure as feedback was received on each of the drafts.

Since the Plan was released a little over a year ago, Commission staff have visited all Nunavut communities and met with community representatives to provide a similar overview of the Draft Plan and prepare them for these hearings that we are very pleased are now happening this fall. Commission staff have also been in regular contact with all participants that expressed interest in holding information sessions where we have responded to questions and clarified the content and intent of the Draft Plan. We have very thankfully received many written submissions already on the Draft Plan from a large number of participants, and we thank all the participants for their keen engagement and interest in this planning process.

Just a few more notes on the community involvement throughout the development of this Plan: The Commission has a strong mandate and responsibility to work closely with communities in the development of this Plan, including not only here in the Kitikmeot but across Nunavut, as well as to

transboundary communities, in particular Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan, as well as communities in Northern Quebec who have equal rights in certain areas of the Nunavut Settlement Area.

The Commission has visited each community multiple times and recorded extensive values that each community has prioritized. So, we have many thousands of areas recorded directly with groups of community members reflecting their priorities and values on their lands. We have also repeatedly visited communities to not only do group mapping sessions to identify values, but also individual one-on-one interviews with land users to document where and how community members are using the land. We have also worked closely with communities on each draft to present the concepts in the Draft Plan, collect feedback, identify gaps, and propose management strategies at each step of the way.

I will note that the Draft Land Use Plan is also supported by a much larger and more detailed document called the *Options and Recommendations Document*. In 2021, this document was given a significant update and overhaul to make the Commission's decision-making and considerations more transparent and consistent for the benefit of all participants in the planning process. This runs for many hundreds of pages, and we do not expect that all participants would have reviewed all of this in detail. However, if there are particular areas of interest or concern, this document provides the background information to understand why the Plan looks the way it does.

In this document, the Commission introduced consistent and rigorous rating criteria for each individual area. I just want to note briefly that a number of criteria were considered, including the overall importance of an issue. So, this was used to identify, for example, the priorities of participants in this planning process and why the Land Use Plan currently addresses, for example, species like polar bear and their habitat, but not grizzly bears and their habitat. Polar bear was identified as being overall more important to participants in this planning process.

The Commission all considered how well the geographic boundaries, or identified areas, were determined. Some areas can be very precisely known, like a watershed for example, while others may be more variable or more difficult to define, for example like moving wildlife habitat.

We also for each and every issue considered the environmental and cultural importance of these areas. An example would be distinguishing between the importance of caribou calving areas compared to caribou summer habitat. For each issue as well, non-renewable resources, transportation, and linear infrastructure potential were considered. That is an important aspect of the Plan to consider in balance to the environmental and cultural priorities that are being considered. We also for each and every issue considered the sensitivity to impacts of an area, again, hearing things like walrus haul-outs or particular areas where wildlife are very sensitive when they are at these locations.

Finally, other regulatory tools were also considered. The Draft Plan is not intended to duplicate or overlap strongly with other organizations' mandates. So, that was considered for every issue. I just note these criteria to emphasize that a consistent and transparent process was undertaken to consider each issue in the Draft Plan, and then this was followed by an evaluation of the different options that were considered for how to manage each area that had been identified.

The structure of the Land Use Plan itself consists of six main chapters. We will go through each of those in turn today. The document is supported by a series of appendices and tables at the back of the Land Use Plan that provide more detail on certain Plan requirements. There is also very importantly a series of large format poster maps that you see at the back of the hall that show areas where certain areas are managed in particular ways. We will look at those in turn as well.

Chapter 1 Overview:

Chapter 1 deals with land use planning in the Nunavut Settlement Area generally and provides an introduction to the Land Use Plan itself. There are some key concepts in this chapter that we just want to highlight for this week's discussions.

First of all, on the jurisdiction of the Land Use Plan, it is important to note that any of the requirements that are being proposed in the Draft Plan would not apply to community land use. So, when community members go out and conduct harvesting activities, camping, or boating, all of these activities are not affected by the requirements of any of the Commission's land use plans. These requirements are meant to apply to other, what we call project proponents, that are coming into the territory looking to conduct activities including things like mineral exploration, tourism, scientific research, and things of that nature.

For the geographic jurisdiction, the Nunavut Land Use Plan is drafted to apply to the entirety of the Nunavut Settlement Area, as well as what is called the Outer Land Fast Ice Zone off the coast of Baffin Island. The Nunavut Settlement Area is defined under the *Nunavut Agreement* and is slightly different than the Territory of Nunavut, primarily in that it does not include portions of the marine environment that are within Canada but not within the Settlement Area, as defined in the *Agreement*.

I will also note that the Commission does have jurisdiction within municipal boundaries, but only for certain uses. The construction of municipal roads and subdivisions, for example, are not subject to the requirements of the Nunavut Land use Plan. However, certain industrial activities do need to conform to the Commission's Land Use Plan, such as things like quarries, deposit of waste, or the bulk storage of fuel.

The Land Use Plan also applies equally to Crown Land and Inuit Owned Lands, both surface and subsurface. Areas where the Commission does not have jurisdiction within the Nunavut Settlement Area include established parks, both national and territorial, as well as certain national historic sites when administered by Parks Canada, including the nearby wrecks of the *Erebus* and *Terror*.

Map A is a really important part of the Plan that sets out the locations where Plan requirements apply. There are a lot of different mapping components as part of the Draft Plan, but Map A is the most important aspect, again setting out the geographic or area-based boundaries where certain requirements are proposed to apply. Again, you can see those at the back of the hall.

There are three different types of land use designations in the 2021 Draft Plan. The first shown in red on Map A are Limited Use Designations, within which there is at least one type of activity that is prohibited or not allowed all year round. These are the most restrictive types of land use designations, and they can also include other plan requirements such as seasonal restrictions or

setbacks from certain areas. A setback is a minimum distance that you need to stay away from sensitive areas.

The second type of land use designation is known as Conditional Use Areas. These are shown in yellowish-orange on Map A. They are more flexible than the Limited Use Designation. There are no year-round prohibitions or restrictions on activities, but there are other conformity requirements, including those same examples of seasonal restrictions or setback requirements.

The final type of land use designation is known as Mixed Use. In these areas, there are no prohibited uses or other plan requirements. However, in these areas and indeed in all designations, there can also be what we call Valued Components that are identified for consideration. These Valued Components are presented in Map B.

Again, the Commission has been consulting on this Draft Plan for 15 years, and in that time has collected a lot of information on different values across the territory. Not all of that the information is reflected on Map A as land use designations with boundaries and specific Plan requirements. The other information that the Commission has collected is a very important part of the Land Use Plan. It is proposed that by identifying all of these Valued Components, the Commission through our Land Use Plan, can add value to the regulatory system by identifying all this information at the very beginning of the regulatory process for project proponents to consider in the design of their projects. As well, this information can be packaged and passed along to other regulatory authorities to give them a bit of a head start or some advanced information on the areas where their project proposals they are considering will be taking place. This has the benefit of preventing communities from repeating themselves as different individual projects are being reviewed, and it captures and reflects all the information that was collected by the Commission over the last 15 years.

A brief summary of some of the area calculations, and we will take a more detailed look later in the presentation. We just want to highlight off the top that in the 2021 Draft Plan, Mixed Use Areas, again these are the least restrictive where all land uses would conform or be supported by the Land Use Plan. These Mixed Use Areas account for over 65% of Nunavut. Conditional Use Areas, the more flexible type of designation shown in yellow on Map A, represent a little over 9% of the Settlement Area and Outer Land Fast Ice Zone. Limited Use Areas, again the most restrictive type of designation that typically prohibit or does not allow a number of industrial activities, represent over 22% of the Settlement Area. Finally, areas outside of NPC's jurisdiction, including established parks, represent a little over 3% of the territory. We will be taking a closer look at some regional breakdowns in a later section.

Just a quick note: I have mentioned a few times that seasonal restrictions play an important part of this Draft Land Use Plan. The commission has considered the six traditional Inuit seasons that are more reflective of Nunavut's environment rather than...

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: You are directed to have your cell phones shut off. Please turn them off. There is still evidence of cell phones in here. Please turn it off. We need to hear what is going on. Qujannamiik. Go ahead. Continue.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. As I was noting, the Draft Plan recognizes and includes seasonal restrictions on the basis of the six traditional Inuit seasons. Also included in an appendix at the back of the Plan are regional variations of the calendar days applicable to the different seasons. We just

wanted to highlight that as an aspect of the Draft Plan and how these seasonal restrictions are managed in a way that is appropriate to the territory.

Chapter 2 Overview:

Chapter 2 of the Draft Plan moves into the first goal of the Land Use Plan. This is on Protecting and Sustaining the Environment. I will note that this goal comes from that 2007 *Broad Planning Policies Objectives, and Goals* document, as will the following chapters and their associated goals. As you can see, there are a number of different wildlife habitats primarily included in this chapter. I'll go through each of these topics, focusing on those of most relevance and priority to communities here in the Kitikmeot. We will pass over some of the sections more quickly that have less relevance here in this region.

Key Migratory Bird Habitat Sites

The first section of Chapter 2 deals with key migratory bird habitat sites. Nunavut is home to abundant populations of migratory birds during the spring and summer months. The Commission has received very detailed submission from, in particular, the Government of Canada through Environment and Climate Change Canada regarding the various migratory bird habitats across the territory, their relative importance and sensitivities, as well as recommended requirements for these areas. Again, the information here primarily came from the Government of Canada and has been supplemented by feedback from other participants in the planning process. There are three different classes of migratory bird habitat sites in the Draft Plan.

The Class 1 sites are identified in the Draft Plan as Limited Use Areas with year-round restrictions on some industrial activities, including things like mineral exploration and development, oil and gas exploration, quarries, all-weather roads, and also include additional setback requirements from key nesting areas within the larger area. These setback requirements would apply to other land uses that are supported by the Draft Plan. For example, there can be marine setbacks that a cruise ship, for example, would need to adhere to, as well as aerial setbacks or minimum heights that things like helicopters or aircraft would need to maintain when flying over these bird colonies.

There are also Class 2 sites where there are no proposed year-round restrictions, but there are still setbacks that would apply to project proposals in these areas.

Finally, there is a Class 3 of migratory bird habitat sites that are identified as Valued Components. Here in this first section, we can see the full range of different options that area available in the Draft Plan, from Limited Use Areas to Conditional Use Areas, or in fact, Mixed Use Areas with a Valued Ecosystem Component overlay on top of that. There a few of these locations here in the Kitikmeot including the Bathurst and Elu Inlet area south of Cambridge Bay here, as well as some important polynya areas near Kugluktuk, as examples.

Caribou Habitat

The next topic in Chapter 2 is a very important one for all of our public hearings, and we expect to hear a lot about this topic this week here in Cambridge Bay. As we all know, caribou are an essential part of Nunavut's environment and community wellbeing and are a key concern for many of the participants in this planning process. The Draft Plan includes a number of different types of caribou habitat, and we will go through each of those in turn.

The first slide here shows caribou calving and post-calving areas, which have both been identified in the Draft Land Use Plan as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions or restrictions on many industrial activities, again including things like mineral exploration and development, all-weather roads, quarries, oil and gas exploration and development, as well as hydroelectric power generation.

With both calving and post-calving areas, the primary or initial dataset for these habitats was provided by the Government of Nunavut, and it was based on satellite collaring data for analysis into area-based locations that caribou are using during these different parts of their life cycle. It is important to note that the Government of Nunavut's statistical or computer-based analysis was only able to be done for caribou on the mainland of Nunavut, not on the islands. The Commission, of course, has been consulting on this Draft Plan for some time, and that initial Government of Nunavut dataset has been supplemented or added to through community consultations on additional important caribou habitat. You will see, for example, a caribou calving area added north of here on Victoria Island. This came from community members here in Cambridge Bay, as well as islands throughout the rest of the territory as identified by community representatives and Hunters and Trappers Organizations.

Although the Draft Plan proposes this Limited Use Designation in these areas for these herds of caribou, the Commission notes that in written responses that have been received so far, there are certainly a number of different views and recommendations on how the Plan should be modified or changed to reflect different perspectives.

For example, some participants have recommended that year-round prohibitions are not required on either of these types of habitats. Other participants have noted that even drawing boundaries on the map and having area-based protections is not appropriate, and that mobile protection measures that move with the herd, would be a better approach. Others take issue with the way the boundaries have been defined. Of course, others support the Plan the way it has been drafted with the measures that have been included. The Commission appreciates all of the feedback that has been received to date. All of that will be given full consideration, and we look forward to hearing from all participants, not only this week but in the hearings to come, about participant views on how to manage this really important issue in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

Moving on, we also have identified caribou key access corridors on the mainland. Again, this was habitat defined by the Government of Nunavut as areas important for caribou to access their calving areas. This has not been the subject of a great deal of discussion among community members, for example. The data as represented, does come from the Government of Nunavut and is included in the Draft Plan, again as a Limited Use Area with year-round prohibitions as well as seasonal restrictions on other uses that do conform to the Land Use Plan.

On the righthand side of this slide, we also see caribou freshwater crossings. These areas have also been included in the Draft Plan as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions. In this case, there are no seasonal restrictions on the caribou freshwater crossings, as that information was not available for each of these locations. I will note that the caribou freshwater crossings have been given a 10-kilometre buffer around the site of the crossing. So, that is 10 kilometers in each direction, as was recommended by several participants in response to the 2016 Draft Plan. We note this continues to be an area of discussion, and some participants have recommended, for example, that this 10-kilometre buffer could be reduced to 5 kilometers, for example. That is another example of an issue where the Commission encourages all participants to provide feedback on whether these types of changes are appropriate or not.

Continuing with different kinds of caribou habitat, on the lefthand side, we have the caribou sea ice crossings. This is a big concern here in Cambridge Bay. In particular, we know where caribou herds migrate on and off of islands each year as part of their life cycle each year. There is a significant concern regarding shipping disrupting the ability of caribou to migrate across the sea ice. The Draft Plan identifies these areas as Conditional Use Areas with seasonal restrictions on shipping to prevent ice-breaking that would disrupt migrations. On the righthand side, we have Peary caribou areas, not here in this region, but I will just quickly note that those are included in the Draft Plan as Limited Use Areas as well.

For caribou winter ranges, I want to note that there are regional and herd specific differences in the importance of winter ranges, and the Commission has taken a different approach for winter ranges depending on the herd. Here in the Kitikmeot, based on information provided to the Commission, it was considered that winter ranges on the mainland were not as important habitat as some of the previous ones that were discussed, and are identified as Valued Components here in the Kitikmeot. However, just for point of reference, in some locations like the Qikiqtaaluk region, caribou wintering areas are considered to be very important locations and essential for caribou survival. Those locations are included as Limited Use, but that is only in the northern portions of the Qikiqtaaluk region.

On the righthand side, we have caribou migration corridors, which are included in the Draft Plan as Valued Components as well. Again, demonstrating the abundance of caribou information that has been submitted as part of this planning process, we also have caribou summer, late summer, and rutting areas identified. These are all other examples of Valued Components in the Draft Plan.

Again, that represents all of the different caribou habitats that have been raised and fully considered in the 2021 Draft Plan, and we do anticipate hearing a great deal about the management of these areas throughout this hearing.

Polar Bear Denning Areas

The next section of Chapter 2 deals with polar bear denning areas. This information came from a variety of sources, including the Government of Nunavut as well as the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in the Qikiqtaaluk region, and through direct community consultations that the Commission has conducted with community members.

All of these polar bear denning areas are included in the Draft Plan as Conditional Use Areas with seasonal requirements on certain activities. Again, in polar bear denning areas, there are no prohibited uses, and there is a requirement proposed that in identified polar bear denning areas during denning season, that proponents looking to disturb the ground or move the earth or snow, like drilling, blasting, or using heavy equipment, would first have to have a polar bear monitor conduct a survey of the location they were looking to conduct work in; identify any potential polar bear dens; and then avoid that area until the polar bear monitor confirmed that the bears had left the location

Walrus Haul-Outs

The next topic is walrus haul-outs. They are identified as Limited Use Areas in the Draft Plan. Not having any identified in the Kitikmeot region, I will move on.

Whale Calving Areas, Atlantic Cod Lakes, Polynyas & Other Marine Areas of Importance

Next, we have a series of whale calving areas. On slide 30, we have beluga and narwhal calving. On the next slide, there is also bowhead calving areas. Most of these areas are in the Qikiqtaaluk and Kivalliq regions. I will note that some select calving areas for all three species of whale are included as Limited Use Areas. These tend to be smaller coves or bays where shipping does not normally occur, so these measures would restrict vessels from entering the areas. However, many of the identified calving areas intersect or overlap with primary shipping lanes within the territories. For all of those calving areas, a Valued Component approach was recommended in the Draft Plan.

Also on this slide, there is a section of Atlantic cod lakes, again applicable in an area around Iqaluit. I'll move past that, but it is included as a Valued Component.

Moving on to slide 32, there are some different marine areas identified across the territory. On the left-hand side, we see – it is a bit of a mouthful – but ecologically and biologically significant areas. These are portions of Nunavut's marine environment identified by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans within the Federal Government as being important for various reasons. As you can see on the map, they are relatively broadly identified and did not come with specific recommendations for managing use in these areas. The Commission has received the information and included them in the Draft Plan as Valued Components.

A similar approach was taken generally for polynyas, or areas of open water during the winter season of identifying most of them as Valued Components. However, some polynyas, including in Section 2.1 we noted, are included within migratory bird habitat. We will see on the next slide an example of a Conditional Use Area.

Transboundary Considerations

The last section I want to touch on here is transboundary considerations, or areas that cross borders. On the lefthand side of the slide, you can see down on the Northwest Territories border, there is a portion of the Great Bear Lake watershed that extends into Nunavut. This lake has been identified

in the Sahtu region as a really important cultural and environmental area, and part of that watershed begins in Nunavut. So that is identified in the Draft Plan as a transboundary issue and is included as a Valued Component.

The righthand side shows a particular polynya near Grise Fjord, the North Water or Savarjuaq Polynya. It is being considered as an internationally managed Inuit-driven conservation area. The Draft Plan identifies it as a Conditional Use Area.

Climate Change

There is one final section in Chapter 2 that addresses climate change. I just want to note there are no maps here for climate change, However, there is a section in the Draft at the end of Chapter 2 that notes while there are no specific areas identified in this land use designation system, the issue of climate change has been considered throughout the development of the Plan.

For example, increased sensitivity of caribou due to the effects of climate change was considered by Commissioners when they made their recommendations on how to manage habitat in the Draft Plan such as increased insect harassment affecting caribou; increased forest fires in the southern portions of their ranges; things like increased icing events of having thicker ice rather than snow for caribou to dig through; or climate change impacting how much time polar bear can spend feeding on sea ice. Those types of considerations are part of the Land Use Plan overall as well.

Chapter 3 Overview:

Chapter 3 reflects the second goal of the Plan: Encouraging Conservation Planning. As I noted earlier, the Commission does not have jurisdiction within established national and territorial parks, but there are a number of them that are still in process and not yet fully established where the Commission still does have jurisdiction. In addition, the Commission does have jurisdiction within established conservation areas. These are all considered within this chapter.

Parks Awaiting Full Establishment and Proposed Parks

The first section is on future national and territorial parks. These areas have been identified as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions on oil and gas, mineral exploration and development, all-weather roads, and those similar type of activities I noted previously. I just want to note that there are a number of territorial parks here in the Kitikmeot, particularly here in Cambridge Bay and Kugluktuk. There are territorial parks people may believe are fully established. There is a sign if you want to drive out to Ovayok Territorial Park. There are flags flying and picnic benches and all that, but the paperwork isn't done. Because of that, the NPC still has jurisdiction within these areas, and they are included in the Draft Plan as Limited Use designations.

Proposed National Marine Conservation Areas

The righthand side shows a bit of a special case that I will mention. National Marine Conservation Areas, despite the title, act more like a park under legislation. So, fully established national marine conservation areas will not be within the Commission's jurisdiction. There is one, of course, in the Lancaster Sound area, the proposed Tallurutiup Imanga National Marine Conservation Area. It is well advanced but not yet finalized, so it is also included as a Limited Use designation in this Draft Plan, again applying to the Qikiqtaaluk region.

National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries

On this slide we have national wildlife areas and migratory bird sanctuaries. These are all proposed to be Limited Use designations in the Draft Plan. Here in the Kitikmeot, we do not have any national wildlife areas. However, there is a very large and prominent migratory bird sanctuary, the Queen Maude Gulf. To the south shown on the righthand side, this area is included again, as a Limited Use designation with year-round prohibitions as well as setback requirements for other conforming uses.

I will note that this is another example of an issue where there are some significant differences of opinion on how the Draft Plan should manage these areas. Some participants support the Draft Plan, including a Limited Use designation and prohibiting certain activities within these established conservation areas. Other participants view this approach as an overstep or an overreach compared to what is already included in the negotiated Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreements for these conservation areas, and the existing management structures. So, there can be an option to, of course leave this as drafted, or to include this more as effectively a Mixed Use Area where all projects would conform, and the existing management structures would continue to consider all projects that are submitted within these areas. I note that applies more generally to several of these conservation areas that are identified as Limited Use Areas, including things like historic sites shown on slide 37.

National Historic Sites & Historic Sites

For national historic sites, I noted at the start, if they are administered by Parks Canada, the Commission does not have jurisdiction. However, there is only the recently discovered Franklin wrecks that fall within that category. Other national historic sites, as well as territorial historic sites, remain subject to the Commission's jurisdiction and are included as Limited Use Areas in the Draft Plan.

Canadian Heritage Rivers

The righthand side shows Canadian Heritage Rivers. Each of these Heritage Rivers have their own management plans that have been prepared. However, they do not have regulatory authority or teeth, to use a more common term, to enforce any particular requirements. Through the planning process, the Commission has reviewed those management plans and included different

requirements in the Draft Plan for each river. I will note here in the Kitikmeot, the Copper Mine River is a nominated river that has a draft management plan that has not been approved. The 2021 Draft Plan identifies the Copper Mine, a nominated Copper Mine Heritage River, as a Valued Component.

In other regions, different approaches are taken based on those management plans, but I won't go into that in detail today. We also have here in the Kitikmeot and shared with both the Kivalliq region as well as the Northwest Territories, the longstanding Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary. It was initially established in the 1920s and is still in place today. This is included as a Limited Use designation with year-round prohibitions on many activities as well.

Marine Protected Areas

Finally, this chapter also considers marine protected areas being considered under the Oceans Act by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. DFO, or the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, have identified two locations where they are beginning to discuss and consider the establishment of marine protected areas. They are included as Valued Ecosystem Components in the Draft Plan. Neither of them is here in the Kitikmeot.

Chapter 4 Overview

Chapter 4 is our third goal: Building Healthier Communities. This chapter identifies a number of areas important to community health and wellbeing, and areas are relied on by communities, not only for things like drinking water but the continuation of cultural practice, harvesting, and general community use. This chapter starts off with a very important topic, which is called Community Areas of Interest. Of course, through this planning process, communities have been an integral part of identifying priorities. They have provided feedback on lots of wildlife habitat or economic opportunities, but this section focuses on areas identified by communities for their own use.

Community Areas of Interest:

Community Areas of Interest: On Ice Travel Routes

The first subsection applies territory-wide, and it is community on-ice travel routes. Throughout Nunavut, the sea is frozen for much of the year and functions a lot like land. Communities, of course, use it for transportation. Just like in Chapter 2 we talked about the concern of shipping during the frozen water months of being disruptive to caribou, it can also be extremely disruptive to community travel by creating open water while potentially land users and harvesters are away from home. Throughout the territory, the Commission identified routes used by community members through existing documentation and through direct mapping with communities themselves. The Draft Plan proposes a Conditional Use designation for all of these on-ice travel routes.

A fairly unique approach is proposed whereby any project proponent that is proposing to ship during the winter months or the frozen water seasons, whether that is a single transit or a large number of transits in a given season, there is a requirement proposed in the Draft Plan where that company would be required to contact each community through their municipal council as well as Hunters and Trappers Organizations, within 300 kilometers of the point where the ship track would

cross one of these on-ice routes. They would need to discuss the proposed shipping, the scope and timing of activities, provide notice to communities, and consider whether solutions such as ice bridging could be appropriate in the particular situation at hand. An ice bridge is a proposal that the Commission has been made aware of that has been used in other jurisdictions where a sort-of pontoon bridge is placed over the track of a ship at known locations and times so that community members leaving home would know where to cross these ship tracks if they exist.

There are a few slides on different regions. I will just jump to slide 44 and show the Kitikmeot. Here we have primarily Community Areas of interest included under this category in the Draft Plan. One to the south of Cambridge Bay known as the Hiukitak River, was identified by Elders of Bathurst Inlet and Umingmaktok back in the early 2000s as a really important cultural area that they would like to see protected over time. This is an example of one of the earliest inputs into this planning process. This was considered as part of the *West Kitikmeot Regional Land Use Plan* and has been carried forward. It is included in the Draft Plan as a Limited Use designation with year-round prohibitions on many Umingmaktok industrial activities.

Community Area of Interest: Boothia Peninsula

Another topic we expect to hear a great deal about this week is the area north of Taloyoak, the Boothia Peninsula. It has been for several years now the subject of discussion for some form of managed protection for this area. It has been included in the Draft Plan at the request of the community as a Limited Use Area with year-round prohibitions on activities for the terrestrial component of the Boothia Peninsula itself. I will note that there have been additions to that area over time, including identified marine areas around the peninsula. In the 2021 Draft, Commissioners recommended to include those marine area as Valued Components, so there are no restrictions in the Draft Plan in the surrounding marine areas around the Boothia Peninsula. The peninsula itself is include as a Limited Use designation.

Community-Identified Priority Areas

I mentioned several times that the Commission has conducted extensive mapping with communities within Nunavut and adjacent areas. These maps are kind of hard to look at in a static digital form, but I want to emphasize that on the lefthand side, these other community-identified priority areas represent over 3,000 individual areas that were identified by communities for a particular value. There are specific comments associated with each of those thousands of areas. Some of that information has been used to inform Community Areas of Interest and considered throughout development of the land use plan for all other areas. However, collectively, that entire dataset is included in Chapter 4 as a Valued Component by itself.

There are tables at the back of the Land Use Plan that attempt to show that information in a summarized way in a hard copy document, but the real value of this information, and it can be unlocked with computers and digital technology and through our online implementation system - all of this information can be summarized and presented to project proponents when they are applying for submitting project proposals. They can also be passed on to other regulatory authorities for their consideration as well.

Use and Occupancy Mapping

On the righthand side of the map, we also have our collection of Use and Occupancy Mapping information, reflecting over 10,000 individual points of how communities are using their lands. Again, it has been considered throughout the development of the Land Use Plan and is packaged here as a Valued Component for consideration.

Transboundary Considerations & Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy

I will just briefly note that there are two sections here on other transboundary areas. The Dene Sųfiné in Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan are negotiating settlements to gain rights within southern Kivalliq. That work is ongoing, and we expect to hear about that in the coming weeks. I will just note here that those areas are identified as Valued Components in the Draft Plan. On slide 47, we also show areas of equal use and occupancy. Those are between the Inuit of Nunavut and Nunavik. They are identified as Valued Components.

Unincorporated Communities

Closer to home here, we have on the righthand side, unincorporated communities. I just want to note that this title of “Unincorporated Communities” refers only to the communities of Bathurst Inlet and Umingmaktok who are no longer considered by the government to be full communities with municipalities, the funding that gets accessed through that, and government initiatives in place.

They are different from things like camps, cabins, or even outpost camps. They are a unique subset of areas in Nunavut. These two communities, because they do not have any government support, do not have things like planning. The Commission has chosen to identify these two communities as Limited Use Areas with prohibitions on certain activities within a 2-kilometre radius of the residential base.

Community Drinking Water Supplies

Also, an important part of the chapter deals with community drinking water supplies. Each community draws its drinking water from somewhere within the municipality. In many cases like here in Cambridge Bay, the community’s drinking water supply comes entirely from within the municipal boundary. In those cases, the community’s land use plans manage those areas already, and the Commission has chosen to just label those as Valued Components for consideration in the Draft Plan.

Other communities like Kugaaruk have their community drinking water supply come from areas that include areas outside the municipal boundaries, so waters flow into the municipal boundary. In this case, the Draft Plan proposes to pick up the protections or restrictions within municipal boundaries where communities are able to enforce those and extend them beyond the municipal boundary to support the wellbeing of your communities.

There is another category of drinking water supply, like Kugluktuk, where they are drawing water from the Copper Mine, which is a very large river. In these cases, the Commission recommended to identify that very large watershed as a Valued Component with no prohibited uses. The consideration was that would have been overly restrictive, for the example of Kugluktuk and Baker Lake, which draws from the Thelon. So, there is a different approach for drinking water supplies for each community.

Priority Contaminated Sites

The Draft Plan also identified what are called priority contaminated sites. The Commission is aware that there are many waste sites, abandoned fuel drums, abandoned camps, up to abandoned mine sites and military installations that can be very harmful to human health. The Draft Plan is only trying to identify these priority sites that are of particular concern. They are included as Limited Use Areas with restrictions on activities like drilling, establishing landing pads, and things like that.

Military Facilities & Aerodrones

As you know, Nunavut is also home to a number of military facilities. Here in Cambridge Bay, you certainly would have seen the old DEW line site, or the North Warning System site out by the airport. These locations across the territory have operated for quite some time, and based on recent announcements, look to continue for quite some time as well. There are concerns about other types of activities impacting the functioning of these military facilities. The Draft Plan includes Limited Use designations where they fall outside of municipal boundaries. When they are within municipal boundaries like here in Cambridge Bay, they are identified as Valued Components.

The Draft Plan also identifies a few potential alternative energy sources. These are all hydroelectric power locations, or potential hydroelectric power locations. They have been included as Valued Components as well.

Finally, Chapter 4 also includes aerodrones, or the area around airports. These locations are now fully managed by Transport Canada regulations that govern what can be built near airports. This Draft Plan only includes these areas as Valued Components with no formal plan requirements.

Chapter 5 Overview

Chapter 5 moves into our final goal, which is Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development. There are four topics in this chapter, and we will go through each of these in turn as well.

Mineral Potential & Oil and Gas Potential

The first topic is on mineral exploration and production. This collectively is included as a Valued Component. I will also note on this map in the darker orange shade are areas with existing mineral rights. We will talk about those in the next chapter in more detail. Here, we just want to note that both areas with evidence for mineral potential and areas with existing mineral rights have been

considered in each subsection of the Draft Plan. I noted in the *Options and Recommendations Document*, there is an assessment of the potential for nonrenewable resources, and these are the datasets that were relied on in the 2021 Draft Plan when making those assessments.

In addition, this chapter also includes oil and gas exploration and production. There is, of course, currently a federal moratorium on oil and gas exploration in the Arctic, but there are still a number of oil and gas significant discovery licenses that are still held in the very high Arctic in the Sverdrup Basin. None of these are within the Kitikmeot, but we can just note that those significant discovery licenses are identified as Valued Components in the Draft Plan.

Terrestrial Transportation and Communication

The next topic deals with terrestrial transportation and communication. The Draft Plan has identified existing linear infrastructure or transportation, things like roads, as well as proposed linear infrastructure. It has taken some different approaches depending on each individual circumstance. I first want to note as an example on the righthand side of the slide, you can see the Kivalliq to Manitoba linear infrastructure corridor. I use this as an example to note that the Draft Plan identifies this corridor as a Limited Use Area that attempts to protect that area for future development.

In the Draft Plan, this corridor is identified as an area for future development, and the construction of all-weather roads, linear infrastructure, things like transmission lines and communication cables, would explicitly conform to the Plan as drafted. In other areas like in the North Baffin region with infrastructure associated with the Mary River Project, the Commission has carried over certain Plan requirements to the amended *North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan*. Other existing and potential linear infrastructure is included in the current Draft as Valued Component. So, things like the Meadowbank Road are included as a Valued Component.

Coming back here to the Kitikmeot, we note there are a few transportation initiatives that have been or are being considered, including the Grays Bay Port and Road, as well as the Bathurst Inlet Port and Road. These two initiatives are included in the Draft Plan as Valued Components. The Commission notes that multiple participants have made very strong recommendations that these initiatives, in particular the Grays Bay Port and Road, as well as the Bathurst Inlet Port and Road, be included in the Draft Plan explicitly as areas where this type of use would be supported or conformed to the Land Use Plan. That is something our Commissioners will be considering in the New Year when revising the Plan. We, in particular, draw attention to this issue and invite comments from other participants on this recommendation noting, for example, the Grays Bay Port and Road does pass through identified caribou habitat that would currently prohibit its development the way the Plan is currently drafted.

Marine Shipping

The next slide shows marine shipping. This represents draft work done by the Northern Marine Transportation Corridor Initiative being worked on by Transport Canada and the Coastguard and other partners. This information was provided to the Commission for consideration, but explicitly recommended not to be included in the Draft Plan itself. This slide simply shows information on

where future corridors may be developed and where shipping is currently occurring, but it is not reflected in the Land Use Plan itself.

Commercial Fishing Areas

The next slide identifies different commercial fishing areas. Here in the Kitikmeot, of course, there is an abundance of Arctic char. There are active commercial fisheries. I hope you get to experience some of the char from the Kitikmeot Foods Plant here in town while you are visiting. The Draft Plan identifies both areas of char abundance shown in the gray shaded areas on the lefthand side, as well as locations identified within Fisheries regulations as having commercial quotas on them. So, not all of these points are waterbodies that are currently being fished or may even have ever been fished, but they have been identified as having that type of potential and quota capacity. All of this information is again identified as a Valued Component for consideration. There are also a number of turbot and shrimp fishery considerations. None of those are applicable here in the Kitikmeot, so I will just move on.

Chapter 6 deals with...

Chairperson: Jonathan? Recognizing the time. We are at Chapter 6, and it is a quarter to 12:00. We should take a quick lunch break and come back at 1:15 p.m. Qujannamiik. Delegates from the communities, please stay behind.

Lunch Break

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We can start the proceedings this afternoon. Before Jonathan starts briefing, as a reminder, please turn off your cell phones. Thank you for your attention. Before Jon starts, for those of you who are new, welcome to the Community Hall. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Nunavut Planning Commissioner Executive Director. I'm turning it back over to Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much. I hope everyone had a good lunch break and got to get out and stretch a little bit. A warm welcome to those who just arrived on the plane. We are happy to have a full house. It is fantastic to see.

This morning we covered Chapters 1 through 5 of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. As a quick recap, in Chapter 1, we touched on some of the key concepts that the Plan relies on, including the three types of land use designations. The Limited Use Areas come with year-round prohibitions or restricted activities as well as other Plan requirements like setbacks or seasonal restrictions. Then there is the more flexible Conditional Use Areas where there are no year-round prohibitions, but there are Plan requirements including things like setbacks or minimum distances to stay away from important areas, as well as seasonal restrictions. Finally, there are Mixed Use Areas where all land uses are permitted. Those are the three main types of designations that the Plan proposes to guide

land use. On top of that, the terminology Valued Component, is used to identify all other types of valued information that has been identified throughout the process.

Chapters 2 through 5 deal with the different goals of the Land Use Plan. In Chapter 2, we talked about the key migratory bird habitat sites and the extensive information on caribou habitat that we are expecting to hear a lot about this week, as well as things like polar bear denning and marine mammal habitats.

Chapter 3 was on Encouraging Conservation Planning. Here in the Kitikmeot, a significant issue around the Queen Maude Migratory Bird Sanctuary.

In Chapter 4 on Building Healthier Communities, we talked about areas important to communities, including the Boothia Peninsular, the Hiukitak River, and community drinking water supplies.

In Chapter 5, we discussed areas important to Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development. We noted the existing rights – the existing mineral rights – that we are going to discuss at greater length here in Chapter 6, along with economic development initiatives like the Grays Bay Port and Road as well as the Bathurst Inlet Port and Road, that have been recommended to be included explicitly in the Draft Plan, as well as commercial fishing areas here in the Kitikmeot.

The Draft Plan is required under the *Nunavut Agreement* to have an Implementation Strategy, or a plan for how it will be implemented and used once the document is approved.

Chapter 6 Overview:

Chapter 6 is this required Implementation Strategy, and there are a few key concepts and approaches in this chapter that we just want to highlight and flag some likely areas for discussion this week.

Again, just a quick clarification that the Nunavut Land Use Plan will not apply to community land use and harvesting. So, if there is a setback requirement around a bird colony, for example, that would not need to be followed by community land users, it is not subject to the requirements of this Plan.

In addition, the Limited Use Areas all include at least one prohibited use, or a use that is not allowed at any time of the year. It is important to note that activities that are not included in those lists of uses that are prohibited, are permitted. So, if the list includes mineral exploration and oil and gas exploration and development but does not mention scientific research or tourism or military exercises, then all of those other uses would conform or be supported by the Plan as drafted.

One other important clarification in the Draft Plan is that in many Limited Use designations, linear infrastructure is prohibited. Linear infrastructure is defined to include things like all-weather roads, pipelines, transmission lines, and fiberoptic communication lines, but it does not include seasonal or winter roads. So, in the Limited Use Areas in the current Draft, the construction of all-weather roads would be prohibited or not allowed, but project proponents could rely on winter roads in all of the areas of the Draft Plan.

Existing Mineral Rights

I mentioned this a few times already today. The 2021 Draft Plan proposes a new approach in the planning process for considering and addressing existing mineral rights. I will note that this approach was only applied to existing mineral rights, not other types of rights. This is because the Commission understands that mineral exploration and development occurs in stages. When a project proponent's company goes out on the land looking for minerals, they are not in a position to propose a full-blown mine. It is a staged process that can take a great deal of time and resources to fully develop into an operating mine.

There is an issue that arises with the drafting of this Land Use Plan and the way the legislation works where when a project undergoes what is called a significant modification or a major change in the scope of their activities, a new review by the Nunavut Planning Commission and Nunavut's regulatory system is required. So, significant investments have been made in many areas that are included in the Draft Plan as proposed Limited Use Areas that would prohibit mineral exploration and development. As a way to recognize these investments and the importance of the mining industry to the territory, the 2021 Draft proposes that projects with existing rights in Limited Use Areas would be exempt from prohibitions on mineral exploration and development when they undergo one of those significant modifications or changes that requires a new review by the NPC.

The Draft Plan identifies these projects with existing rights in Limited Use Areas in Appendix A of the Draft Plan. It is important to note that as drafted, these projects would only be exempt from the prohibition in the Draft Plan on mineral exploration and development, but other requirements of the Draft Plan would continue to apply. So, if there is an existing mineral exploration project in a Limited Use Area and there are prohibitions on mining, that project would be exempt from the prohibitions. It would be supported or conform to the Land Use Plan, but there may be other things like setback requirements around particularly important areas that would continue to apply to these projects.

This proposal has generated a lot of response and discussion in the written record that has been received to date. We expect to hear a great deal about this approach during the hearing, not only here but in the hearings to come. I would just like to make few more points about this approach for everyone's context in advance of these discussions.

This material was previously released in one of several *Question and Answer Documents* that the Commission has responded to in writing, but for everyone's clarification today, there were several choices that the Commission made when determining which projects with existing rights within Limited Use Areas would appear in Appendix A with the proposed approach to gain exemptions from any prohibitions.

The first step in preparing this appendix for the 2021 Draft was that the Commission went and downloaded mineral rights data from both the Government of Canada on Crown Land, as well as from Nunavut Tunngavik for Inuit Owned Land subsurface parcels. This data came from the spring of 2021. That is an important factor to consider that all of these projects come from before the spring of 2021. The Commission then chose to select only active projects from within those databases. There are other projects that lapsed or are no longer active. Those were removed from the database. We then selected only the rights that overlap with proposed Limited Use designations

in the 2021 Draft that would prohibit mineral exploration and development. So, if any companies or industry representatives are here today and don't see a particular project that is active, one possible reason that it is not on that list is that it did not overlap with Limited Use Areas in the current Draft.

The Commission then also chose to select projects that have been previously reviewed and approved by the Nunavut regulatory system. We did that by searching through our own records, which are complete since 2015 when we became the entry point into Nunavut's regulatory system, and for projects predating the enactment of the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act. We also conducted searches of the Nunavut Impact Review Board and Nunavut Water Board registries to find traces or records of these projects entering Nunavut's regulatory system.

For example, if a mineral right had been issued early in 2021, but that proponent had not yet submitted a project proposal to Nunavut's regulatory system, it would not appear in Appendix A. That is a choice that Commissioners made when preparing the Draft. In addition, a very small number of project proposals that were reviewed and not approved by the Nunavut regulatory system, but for which rights were still actively held, were also removed from the Appendix A database.

Again, these are the selection criteria that the Commission used to identify the projects in Appendix A. There are certainly diverse views on whether these criteria were appropriate, and some participants have recommended, for example, that all existing rights be included in this appendix, regardless of whether they have been reviewed by the Nunavut regulatory system and regardless of whether they have been approved by the system. All of this feedback of course will be given full consideration by Commissioners in the New Year when revising the Plan. We look forward to hearing additional comments and suggestions on this approach during these hearings and in any further written submissions that may be received.

This small inset map shows a portion of Appendix A where these projects with existing rights are identified on a separate map, including a summary of the company name and project name for these projects with existing mineral rights. It was a deliberate choice to identify these projects in an appendix to the Land Use Plan, as the Commission anticipates that over time, some of these projects will not proceed to full development as mines. As we know, not every exploration project is successful and ends up in an operating mine. So over time, if some of these projects abandon some of these rights, then this appendix could be amended through an administrative process to remove those areas where rights have been abandoned or lapsed to just maintain a consistent record of those projects with existing rights within Limited Use Areas.

I mentioned that there have been some comments relating to the selection criteria that the Commission used for this proposed approach in the Draft Plan. There have also been a number of other suggestions made to modify this approach. One of the concerns that has been raised by a number of participants is that associated linear infrastructure with these projects with existing rights would currently require a plan amendment to, for example, build an all-weather road to access some of these locations. The existing rights only expands to the footprint of those mineral rights that have been issued, but if an all-weather road for example, is required to reach the site, and a winter road is not appropriate, then a plan amendment would be needed.

Some participants have suggested that associated linear infrastructure also be permitted to travel through the surrounding Limited Use Areas. In addition, some participants have noted the concern that these current existing rights under the Plan as drafted would not be allowed to expand. So if viable resources were identified on that property and looked to expand beyond the current footprint, again a plan amendment would be required under the current Draft. That is another example of some of the feedback that has been received to date. I will just reference for reference of all participants in advance of our discussions.

Minor Variances, Plan Amendments & Periodic Review of the Land Use Plan

There are a number of ways that the Plan can be changed or modified over time. The Plan has often been described as a living document in that it is meant to be changeable over time and respond to changing circumstances.

The first and simplest way to change the requirements of the Plan is what is known as a minor variance. A minor variance is a small change to a requirement of the Land Use Plan. This could be used, for example, to reduce a setback. For example, if a road had to stay 1km away from a certain identified area, but perhaps there was a rock outcrop or a cliff or something that prevented them from staying a kilometer away, they would have to go 800 meters away.

A minor variance is an efficient way for the Commission to consider the circumstances of that particular project post-notice for a very short period of time and identify if there are any objections to the granting of such a variance, and then process that in an efficient timeframe. That is only applicable to plan requirements that are not prohibitions. If an exploration project wanted to expand into a Limited Use Area, that could not be done with a minor variance.

Land use planning has other processes to deal with more significant changes to the Land Use Plan, and those are known as Plan amendments, which can be proposed at any time. As I noted in that example, a project proponent can propose a Plan amendment to modify or change the requirements of the Land Use Plan to allow their project to proceed.

A Plan amendment can also be used to change the Plan in the face of new information or changing circumstances. For example, if a community identified an additional or secondary drinking water supply that was not contemplated today, in a few years from now, that municipality can propose a Plan amendment to the Commission to include measures to manage their drinking water supply that may extend beyond municipal boundaries. That process would require a public review by the Commission including, if appropriate, public hearings like this event here today, and would have to be submitted to the federal government, the territorial government, and Nunavut Tunngavik the same way as this Draft Plan must be before it takes effect. In addition, those Plan amendments could have an even greater scale, so not just one municipality's drinking water supply. It could be a regional or territorial issue that could be reconsidered. The scope or scale of the public review would be at the Commission's discretion and could be tailored to meet the requirements of the given amendment.

In addition to minor variances and Plan amendments, there is a requirement under the *Nunavut Agreement* for the Commission's Land Use Plans to be periodically reviewed. From time to time, they need to be considered in their entirety. Neither the *Nunavut Agreement* nor the legislation

specify a timeframe for this periodic review, but the Commission has heard throughout the planning process that participants are interested in having certainty on when and how these periodic reviews will be conducted.

In the 2021 Draft Plan, there is a new proposal by the Commission that within 7 years following approval of the Nunavut Land Use Plan the Commission would begin a full review of the entire Land Use Plan, and complete that review within 10 years of approval. Recognizing the enormous scale of the territory and the enormous effort that has been put into developing this Draft Plan, the Commission felt that was a reasonable middle ground as to how frequently these periodic reviews can and should occur

So, with this proposal the Commission, of course would continually be conducting land use planning efforts, working with community and other participants to be responsive to things like Plan amendments and ongoing changing circumstances, but we could all agree in advance that within this 7 to 10 year timeframe following the approval, there would be extra effort put in to conducting a fulsome review of the entire Draft Plan, going back to including, revisiting those 2007 *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals*.

On slide 62, there is an overview of Map A1, which is a summary of the land use designations in the Draft Plan in the Kitikmeot region. Looking at this map, you can identify a significant number of red Limited Use designations. Right in the center is the Queen Maude Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary, which sort of dominates the central portion of this map as a Limited Use Area.

You can also see a lot on the mainland of red Limited Use Areas that correspond to different caribou habitats, from calving and post-calving areas through to caribou freshwater crossings. Again, this takes up a significant portion of the Kitikmeot mainland. North of Cambridge Bay on Victoria Island there is an additional calving area for the Dolphin and Union herd.

Passing through the center through the bulk of Northwest Passage in the Kitikmeot are the yellow Conditional Use Areas for caribou sea-ice crossings that come with proposed seasonal restrictions on shipping. It may be a little hard to see on this map, but they are also overlaid on top of this, those projects with existing rights. You can see some in particular, near the community of Kugluktuk. There are a number of projects with existing rights that overlap with identified caribou habitat that is recommended to be a Limited Use designation in this Draft Plan.

There are also existing rights identified, for example, north of Taloyoak on the Boothia Peninsula, identified not only as a Community Area of Interest, but also as caribou calving areas. Also, south of the community of Kugaaruk, there are more existing rights that overall, primarily again with caribou habitat.

Moving towards Bathurst Inlet and Umingmaktok, there are portions of the Hope Bay Greenstone Belt overlapping with some caribou calving areas identified by community members that extend beyond the Hiukitak River, Community Area of Interest in the same location. There are a few more, relatively small portions of existing rights overlapping with caribou post-calving and caribou freshwater crossings for the Bathurst herd to the west of Bathurst Inlet.

Here in the Kitikmeot, I also forgot to mention on his map, there are some polar bear denning areas identified. It is a little bit hard to see some of those, but certainly north of Cambridge Bay and

M'Clintock Channel, to the east as well, there are a number of polar bear denning areas that have been identified as well. This more detailed table represents a number of different area calculations. We do note that over the years, there have been increasing requests and interests in calculating percentages of overlap, or percentages of different designations contributing to the Draft Plan. We recognize that these numbers are often more challenging to calculate than one may assume and do vary depending on the geographic projection that is used and how certain overlaps are removed.

For this Draft, the Commission after the Draft Plan was released, went and conducted these calculations and issued some Question and Answer Documents outlining the methodology that the Commission was relying on. Here again, you can see the overall Nunavut-wide breakdown of 65% being Mixed Use, a little over 9% being Conditional Use, 22% being Limited Use, and another greater than 3% within things like established national parks where the Commission does not have jurisdiction.

Those overall numbers present one view of the Draft Plan. However, different participants have different priorities and perspectives. This table proceeds to breakdown those numbers, for example, terrestrial and marine components. You can see how that changes overall. In general, there is a higher percentage of the terrestrial or land-based environment within the Limited Use designation. You can see 26% in the whole territory of land, compared to 15% of the marine environment.

We also have a regional distribution. So, for the Kitikmeot, there are breakdowns by overall land and marine area distribution, and then also for terrestrial and marine. I will draw attention to one number that has generated some significant discussion. For example, in the Kitikmeot terrestrial or land-based areas, the Limited Use percentage jumps to 46½% from again, 22% over the entire territory.

Moving down, we also see a mineral rights distribution. In the Kitikmeot, for example, 28% of existing mineral rights are in Limited Use Areas, remembering that all of these existing rights would not be subject to prohibitions. 70% of existing mineral rights in the Kitikmeot are already within Mixed Use designations where all uses would conform, and 28% of existing rights are within those Limited Use Areas where the Appendix A exemptions would apply.

Inuit Owned Lands

The final section, which has also been subject to a great deal of comment and discussion is Inuit Owned Lands. Again, these fall into the categories of surface lands as well as subsurface lands. Picking out numbers, for the Kitikmeot, we can see that overall, Nunavut-wide Inuit Owned Lands for surface sit at 31% within a Limited Use designation, while in the Kitikmeot, that number increases to 48%. For subsurface lands, Nunavut-wide the number stands at 43% of Inuit Owned Land subsurface within Limited Use, and 47% in the Kitikmeot in particular.

We noted at the beginning of the presentation that the Nunavut Land Use Plan will apply to Inuit Owned Lands, and some of the overlaps are presented here. We do note that some participants have recommended that the Nunavut Land Use Plan not include any plan requirements on Inuit Owned Lands. There have been suggestions to designate all Inuit Owned Lands as Mixed Use, where all uses would conform to the Nunavut Land Use Plan regardless of the values that have been

identified. The Commission looks forward to hearing further discussion on this matter in the days and weeks ahead.

Other Considerations

I will make a few final comments. Another area of concern that has been identified with the Draft Plan is in regard to how geographic boundaries are defined and how confidently they can be determined. I do note that throughout this planning process, the Commission has relied upon the best available information to define all of the geographic boundaries included in the Draft Plan.

There is a relatively small but also significant issue with coastal mapping within the territory. This is the result of different participants providing information to the Commission at differing scales of precision. This really comes to the forefront when looking at Nunavut's extensive and complex coastlines. One participant may have submitted, let's say a caribou habitat area that is meant to be terrestrial, and it identifies the boundary on the coast. Another participant may have identified a marine area. It could be even a caribou sea ice crossing that again, could rely on a different scale map to define the boundaries. In the end, if you zoom in really close on our digital maps, which are all available online, you can get strange overlaps along the coast where caribou are calving in the marine environment or whales or calving on the land, and there are these small adjustments.

I just want to note that those who are interested in these issues that have long been known and understood by the Commission and participants with expertise and geographic information systems, that the Commission is currently working to standardize all of the coastlines to the highest resolution version that we have access to. We would be adjusting the boundaries submitted by participants where they are intended to be coastal, and piece-by-piece matching those up so that we have one consistent version of Nunavut's coastline across the territory. That is an extensive process that is ongoing and would result in slight modifications to some participant's identified geographic boundaries, but the result would be the removal of these strange coastal overlaps. Again, you can't see it on our large-scale maps, but it becomes problematic at very fine scales.

In here, there are a few more slides for different regions. I would just jump over those given that we are here in the Kitikmeot hearing. At this time, I think we can open for questions. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Jonathan. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Nunavut Planning Commission, Executive Director. At this time, we are going to ask first the community members if they have any questions on Jon's presentation or require any clarifications on the materials that were presented in the presentation this morning and this afternoon. For other members, then we will then go to the registered participant. If you are not a registered participant and you would like to ask a question, there is sheet to sign your name up to ask a question. Rosie has the signup sheet if you want to ask a question after we go through the community members and registered delegates.

Again, everyone will be doing their presentations, and there will be opportunities to ask questions on those presentations, but what we would like to do is if you have any questions on material that was just presented, Jon will answer those questions before we proceed into the presentations. Beth

has the microphone if you are a community delegate sitting around the table. Mr. Chair, I see Bobby Greenlee from Cambridge Bay has a question. Thank you.

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Sharon. Just going back to page 61, it says it is a living document that is going to be reviewed within 7 years and be done within 10 years. With the way things are going with climate changes and board members coming and going, wouldn't you think that is a long time away to this Plan again? I would suggest maybe reviewing 5 to 7 and then completing within 10 years. Seven years is such a long way away to review everything again. Why 7 years? How did you come up with 7 years is my question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Nunavut Planning Commission, Executive Director. Thank you for your comments, Bobby. I am going to turn it over to Jonathan to identify why we picked the timelines, and if you could touch on the amendment process as well, Jon. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and thanks, Bobby for the question. This is a new proposal in this Draft Plan. There were previous comments on how frequently this should be updated. Some participants felt 5 years was more appropriate. Some felt it was more realistic perhaps to say every 10 years. Really, this is set out, as all things are, in the *Options and Recommendation Document*. We can refer there for fulsome details, but really 7 years was picked as a compromise or a balance between doing it every 5 years and every 10, recognizing it has been 15 years and counting on the development of the first Draft Plan. The resources and time needed to conduct the Plan, it was thought that 7 to 10 was reasonable.

Again, the purpose of this Draft Plan is to collect feedback, so if that is not supported by participants, Commissioners will reconsider. Again, as Sharon noted, there are plan amendment processes for more urgent or pressing matters. Maybe there is sufficient information on hand four years from now that this should be changed now. Anyone affected by the Land Use Plan can propose an amendment at any time. The Commission itself can also propose amendments at any time if something is not working. Again, feedback is welcome on all of this, but that is some of the thinking that led to the 7- to 10-year timeframe.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the delegates? (*Pause*) It appears none.

Jim MacE: Jim MacEachern, Municipality of Cambridge Bay CAO. Jonathan, thanks for the presentation. At the very beginning, you touched on the areas within municipal boundaries. I think you mentioned quarries and tank farms, but you did not really expand on That. Can you expand what the impacts are within municipal boundaries?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Jim. There are only certain types of projects that are required to be submitted to the NPC and conform and be supported by our Land Use Plan. Those include things like tank farms, quarries, and if there is mineral exploration within municipal boundaries, which does happen in Nunavut. Those activities all need to be supported by the Land Use Plan itself.

Most municipal activities, like I mentioned something like a subdivision or the construction of new buildings, all of that is completely governed by the municipality's land use plan, and the Nunavut Land Use Plan just does not apply to those types of activities. Really, it is other types of activities coming in that need to conform with a few exceptions. It is all set out in legislation, which proposals do have to be submitted to the NPC and be reviewed, a conformity determination or a check as to whether it is supported by the Plan itself.

In general, this Land use Plan tries to stay out of the way of communities doing their own planning. I mentioned the example of the North Warning System site here in Cambridge Bay. Those North Warning System sites that are not within municipal boundaries are designated Limited Use with prohibitions on other activities to prevent them from encroaching on things like radar facilities, landing strips, and things like that. Within municipal boundaries, the Commission chose to cut those areas out of the municipal boundary and just identify them as Valued Components. So, people coming in would know that it is adjacent to a military facility, but the Plan itself does not include any requirements.

That approach has generally been taken, but there are exceptions to that in the Land Use Plan. I think of Ovayok Territorial Park that is within municipal boundaries. The Commission has jurisdiction because it is not yet fully established. The Commissioners chose to designate that as Limited Use even though it is within municipal boundaries. So, it is kind of a case-by-case basis. Thanks.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions, please? I cannot see your name plate. Can you state your name please?

Paul: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. *(Translated)*: I have a question. It relates to polar bear denning. You mentioned the information you have given us was derived from what part of the year and what part of the island are they in?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Before I go to Jonathan, just a reminder to say your name and where you are from. Qujannamiik. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much, Paul, for the question. The polar bear denning areas themselves were identified. Here in the Kitikmeot, we relied on information provided by the Government of Nunavut's polar bear biologists combined with information we collected from Kitikmeot communities ourselves.

It is a little hard to see on this map. The posters in the back would be an excellent place to view those denning areas. Perhaps I can show you on a break, but generally north of Cambridge Bay on the north side of Victoria Island, as well as the eastern coast. There are none near Kugluktuk. Those are the closest to Cambridge Bay, then north of Gjoa Haven and in the areas around both Taloyoak and Kugaaruk identified both by government and communities.

In terms of the timing, the Plan considers denning season to be from September 15th to April 15th. If someone wants to conduct earth moving activities, they would have to have a polar bear monitor go conduct the survey before they did any drilling or blasting. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: Are there any more questions please? Brandon?

Brandon Q: Brandon from Gjoa Haven Hunters and Trappers. One of my questions was about Limited Use on the caribou calving. Can hunters put their input on where they want more Limited Use on the caribou calving grounds around Gjoa Haven?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Brandon. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Brandon for the question. Again, it is hard to see on the maps, but community representatives in Gjoa Haven have previously identified additional calving areas around your community. Commissioners have included those in this 2021 Draft. So, through previously consultations and review of the maps, information that was again primarily provided the Government of Nunavut, at Gjoa Haven community representatives were very active in identifying additional areas near the community.

That being said, any further changes or modifications to any boundaries in the Plan are of course welcome. So on review, again, we can look at some of the larger posters at the back to take a more detailed look, but yes, information from Gjoa Haven has been directly included in the Draft Plan. We encourage additional feedback as needed. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any more questions? (*Pause*). It appears none. There is one more additional question. Lucy?

Lucy T: (*Translated*): Thank you, Chair. Lucy Taipana, Kugluktuk Hunters and Trappers Organization and Hamlet. I have questions about the grizzly bears. It appears there is not enough in this document. In our region, grizzly bears are coming numerously. Their territory is expanding.

(*English*): My question was on grizzly bears and the colored bears, because they are now migrating to other areas. Why are they not included in this? We are getting more and more grizzly bears migrating to other areas like the Ulukhaktok area, north of Victoria Island around there. I would like to know why they are not included in this. Quana.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you again, Lucy for the question. As I noted, beginning in 2007, the Commission has been consulting on what the priority issues are for being addressed in this first-generation Nunavut Land Use Plan. I gave the example of grizzly bears as something that had not been included, where polar bear habitat has been included. That directly reflects the feedback the Commission has received over the last 15 years. We do know that grizzly bear populations are increasing around much of Nunavut. A lot of discussion has not been held on grizzly bear habitat and the need for the Land Use Plan to manage that habitat.

Another good example is muskox, umingmak. Similarly, the Plan deals with caribou, tuktuik, extensively but not muskox. That is reflective of the priorities of this process to establish this first-generation Land Use Plan. We are sitting here today, hopefully nearing the end of this first-generation process, but that does not mean the Land Use Plan would never address other habitats. It simply reflects the priority issues identified by all participants.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Just a reminder for Jonathan to state your name as you speak. Are there any questions?

David T: *(Translated)*: David Totalik. The topic and questions we have heard with marine wildlife, we have been seeing new species. We have to look at what is surviving, and we need to know if it is due to climate change or warming climate. The marine mammals occur at the same time that some of the wildlife has become less and less. There are new species arriving to the territory. At this meeting you are in Cambridge Bay, which is an island, although my home, Gjoa haven, is an island as well. We have concerns of Boothia Peninsula, which is on the mainland of Canadian terrain. So with further planning, the new species are arriving to the territory at Taloyoak.

We are on migration for caribou herds and for some reason the route has changed and diverted to other areas. Machinery, Hondas and skidoos are moving. It is easier to travel to the tundra, but as hunters we have Traditional Knowledge of where the migration used to take place. I wanted to know why the new species are arriving. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Direction, Nunavut Planning Commission. David, just for clarification, I want to make sure we have the translations properly. Are you asking the Commission if we are aware of new species that are coming into your area? Thank you. Beth?

David T: *(Translated)*: That is the question I have, the future planning of the new species arriving to the territory. I have noticed a lot of new arrivals are marine animals, especially killer whales or orcas arriving to the arctic waters. It has been noticed over time that they are becoming numerous, although we know that land mammals, they are very much in evidence so it is terrestrial and marine that I am asking.

Andrew: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. David, thank you for your comment and your question. This Plan addresses, as Jon said, the priority areas that were identified, but as we go forward, we know with climate change that different species are coming into the territory. As we have information or community organizations or others providing us with new datasets, there is opportunity to look at that to be included in the Land Use Plan going forward, probably the next version of the Plan as it is updated.

One significant area is if it is emergent, if we see the data is there and provided to the Commission and there needs to be a change with management areas or how it is affecting the land, the Commission or others can request an amendment to the Plan. So, as that information comes forward, we can change the Plan. Currently, with these new species coming in, that is why they are not addressed. We did not have any data currently, and it was not identified as a priority area. I hope that answers your question. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Good? *(Pause)*. Okay, Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions? Jeannie?

Jeannie U: *(Translated)*: Jeannie Ugjuk, Hamlet of Taloyoak. As the people of this region, we have heard what has been planned and what the future holds for us. We have heard this over the years and made understood what is coming. It is arriving today what we are discussing. We have heard that other regions will be hosting this magnitude of meeting. We just want to be equal to Kivalliq and Baffin Island of how the planning process will be. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It was a general comment. It was not a question. I am asking for questions, but at this time, I think we all take a short break of 15 minutes. Thank you.

Break

Chairperson: Just a reminder to check in in the morning and check in in the afternoon. You don't need to checkout. Anything else? *(Translated)*: Back to our meeting. I think there were no further questions before the break. Bobby, did you have a question? Go ahead.

Bobby G: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bobby Greenley, Ikaluktutiak Chairperson. Just a comment for everybody that is here sitting at the table: I'm sure a lot of this may be a little bit technical, but we still have time to do submissions for each community area for the Kitikmeot. As we are going through the meeting, and we are seeing some of the stuff that is up there already from the Draft here, as we are listening, keep thinking and having those other points ready for your community area, like the grizzly bear stuff, more caribou, waterways and whatnot. Just so you know, you have more time to January 10th now for the submission deadline. Just some information for the community members that are sitting here. That way, they can start to think, get ready, and add more stuff that they want to submit. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik for the clarification. Good. Qujannamiik. Does anybody want to ask from down there? Salomie?

Salomie: *(Translated)*: Thank you, chair. Salomie Qitsualik, Gjoa Haven Council. I would just like to say thank you to the Nunavut Planning Commission for being part of this process that is taking place right now, and for the Commissioners and the staff who have appeared to have done a great deal of work that is presented now. All boards everywhere are always changing, but we shouldn't worry about that. We should worry about what is to be in place in the future, to understand what is in place and what took place, and what is to be followed. You have done a great job. The future looks good for the people who will have to look at this Plan and work with it. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Registered participants, if there are any questions to Jonathan's presentation, then go ahead. Go up to the microphone – standing microphone. State your name and who you are with.

Merle Keefe: Merle Keefe, Sabina Gold & Sliver. Can you hear me okay? Quana, Jonathan, for the presentation. Sabina's Back River Project is located south of Bathurst Inlet. Our project currently is not located within a Limited Use Area. However, some supporting activities do pass through Limited Use Areas, such as shipping. So, my question is, I'm just seeking to clarify that shipping activity to support the project can transit through the Limited Use Area, for example the Bathurst or Elu Class I key migratory bird habitat. The shipping activity can pass through that Limited Use Area because it is

not specifically listed as a prohibited activity. That said, the shipping would still have to comply with the Table 1 setbacks. Quana. Thank you.

Chairperson: Thank you for the question. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Jonathan Savoy, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks very much, Merle. Your understanding is correct.

Chairperson: Thank you, Are there any other questions? *(Pause)*

I don't see any more hands. I think we can get back to our agenda here. I will turn it over to Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the first time in history, we are ahead of agenda. We had actually allocated the rest of the afternoon to questions. We took to heart very seriously the comments from everyone that had asked the Commission to ensure that we allow sufficient time for questions and comments. With that...wow. I guess we will take 5 minutes, and we are going to set up for community presentations. Although we just had a break, we did anticipate to have more questions, so this is a pleasant surprise. We will continue on with our agenda. If we could just have five minutes, we will do that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Thank you.

Break

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. We will proceed. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director, Nunavut Planning Commission. Just to clarify where we are at on our agenda, I guess there was a little bit of confusion about our presentation and the questions-and-answer period, so we are just going to refocus so everybody understands where we are at. I would ask Jonathan just to walk through the part of the agenda for the presentation and the questions submitted. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Sharon. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. I just want to confirm that under the agenda, we had separate agenda items for presentations on the Draft Plan and Commission responses to pre-submitted questions. I just want to confirm that the Commission has previously received multiple rounds of written questions and has issued three separate written responses to questions that were previously received. I chose in the overview presentation to incorporate some of those questions that we felt were most relevant to the discussions here today. For example, the additional context on the selection of existing rights.

We did not receive additional pre-submitted questions to respond to during the hearing. From our perspective, we have responded in writing as requested, to the questions that have been submitted. We have chosen to highlight some of those responses during the presentation. We did not intend to review our three separate Question-and-Answer Documents that have been released over the last year.

We understand there may have been a little bit of confusion as to the process for responding to these questions. I think today, we just want to clarify that the questions that have been received have been responded to in writing. Additionally, we have responded to likely hundreds of questions with each individual participant through our participation information sessions that were done orally. Right now, we are really opening the floor to further oral questions. If part of the responses were not clear in the written record, we will provide an opportunity for any follow-ups or highlights of particular issues that were not covered.

So, apologies for any confusion about that timing and purposes of this question period. I think at this time, we can just maybe reoffer if there are any further questions. We can get into it at this time, or alternatively we can pivot to the first presenter, which is the Municipality of Cambridge Bay and the Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers. Thanks.

Chairperson Qujannamiik, Jonathan. *(Translated):* Any questions from the registered participants regarding Jonathan's presentation or what he just said? *(Pause)* So, I don't see any hands. We can just continue with our agenda and move on to Cambridge Bay. Just a reminder, please state your name and who you represent. Qujannamiik. You can sit down that way.

Presentation by Ikaluktutiak Hamlet and HTO

Bobby Greenley, Cambridge Bay CAO Chair

Beverly Makasagak, Manager of the Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Welcome.

Bobby G: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have just a minute video of what our Hunters and Trappers... Sorry, Bobby Greenley, Cambridge Bay CAO Chair. This is a an 11-minute video. Some of it is going to be part of our submission here. It is based on a lot of the stuff that was brought up today and some other issues. We created Victoria Island's Waterway Safety Committee. That is through the Ocean Protection Plan Project that we have been doing. We will just show this video. After that, I can mention on some of the stuff that we want to point out or areas that we are going to point out in our submission. We have this 11-minute video. Thank you.

(Video Presented)

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Bobby G: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That is just some of the stuff that we wanted to show you. It adds up to a lot of things for our submission, like we have a unique caribou herd compared to everybody else. Ours migrate from the island to the mainland and then back. You know, on some of the presentation, it showed for the calving ground, sure at one time it might have been the main area for calving ground. It is not just a specific area on the island. It is the whole north end of the island that is the calving ground. They just don't go to one area. How it is now, we have them crossing on the west side, east

side, to go to their calving grounds, which is the whole north end of our Victoria Island. That is stuff that we are going to be submitting and making clear. It is not just one specific area for calving grounds.

We have five river systems that we do commercial fishing, plus local fisherman or community members to go out. There are five main ones, and we have a sixth one that is right close to the community. We want to protect those river systems and waterways and the areas around it. All this stuff is going to be added into there.

We have muskox. They don't migrate, but they are on the island. We have a lot more polar bears come around now. Grizzly bears are another thing. They are new to us on the island, but that is something that we are learning about as well. We don't know about their denning areas.

We deal with a lot of wildlife that are classed as Species of Concern or endangered. We just did a study with a university out of Texas for sandpipers, which are listed as endangered that migrate through here. Their land is getting smaller and smaller. So down in Texas we have certain stuff coming up here. We have to look at stuff like that. Sure, it is not an animal that we harvest, but it is an animal that we should be looking after because it is getting endangered as well. All this kind of stuff, we will be submitting in the future here.

I just wanted to show you the video. We see shoreline erosion. You know, that was brought up earlier, all the mammals. We are doing underwater noise pollution studies as well. I just wanted to bring that stuff out. When we do our submission, we will have maps and everything showing the locations. We did circle some when we met in the past. Yeah, that is all I can say right now.

Also, there is not commercial fishing anymore, but it is where our families come from. It is in the bird sanctuary, Ellis River, Perry River, Perry Island. A lot of our families come from those areas, and stuff like that should be protected as well. Like I said, this will be in the maps when we do our submission. I just wanted to point out those locations.

We have an area on Wellington Bay there. Sharon and Darrel probably remember about it when they discovered the old campsite there. Stuff like that has all got to be brought forward and brought to your guys' attention as well. We will have all that information for you before the deadline. I just want to say thank you to everybody for giving us the opportunity to speak and show this video. If there are no questions for me, I will hand it to Beth. There is some information from Harry Makasagak. He had to leave today, so he asked if we could have this information brought up, his concerns. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Before we go to the floor for questions, you guys can finish your presentation first, and we can get questions from the floor after. Thank you.

Beverly: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Beverly Makasagak. I am the manger for the Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization. I am also sitting with Jim MacEachern who is the SAO for the hamlet. Harry had to leave early today. He is on a plane going on a medical trip. He wrote down his concerns and what he wanted the NPC and the public to hear.

In the time of my parents and late grandparents, we did not exist in a reactive attitude but in a proactive attitude. We recognized that if we do not care for and protect the land, animals, and

environment, there would be a great price to pay in our harvesting and nomadic travels with each seasonal change of subsistence.

As the western culture and the establishment of the government at various levels move on, Inuit have adapted to the familiarities and the written documents on how we should be looking at ourselves. As Inuit, we have a vocal way of exchanging information, such as terrain, ice conditions, animal spotting, change of migratory pattern, and how the atmosphere or weather affected our harvesting capabilities.

Today, as our communities are growing and expanding, there is a concern and serious issue around land use. Our harvesting rights as industrial and diverse are becoming more active. There are several entities that make up the community, and these include Transport Canada, the Distant Early Warning facilities, minerals, and oil and gas interests. Our local government, the Hamlet of Cambridge Bay, each entity has identified their purpose and the required land for their facility and movements. As spirit of consideration and cooperation, it is explained very eloquently in these 8 items I wish to read from the IQ principles. That is coming from Harry Makasagak. I will let you read those.

Jim M: Jim MacEachern, Municipality of Cambridge Bay. So, from Harry Makasagak, the IQ principles:

- Respecting others in caring for people
- Fostering good spirit by being open, welcoming, and inclusive
- Decision making through consensus
- Serving and providing for others
- Development of skills through practice and action
- Working together for a common cause
- Being innovative and resourceful
- Respect and care for the land, animals, and the environment

Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are you done with your presentation? Go ahead, Bobby.

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bobby Greenly. I just want to add also to our presentation from the video that we also have a Notice to Mariners in place around here for shipping. So far, it's working really good. We get a lot of communications from the ships and the companies going through, coming and going. I wanted to add that. We do have a Notice to Mariners in place for shipping around here as well. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Thank you for your presentation. Is there any question for the presenters? Any question from the staff?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for Nunavut Planning Commission. For the record before I ask the questions, Bobby and Beverly and Jim, thank you for your presentation. I want to also confirm that you are providing a written submission that will be included in the record. Correct? The nods are confirming yes. Bobby?

Bobby G: Yes, we are going to be submitting a written submission, two of them: one from Hamlet and one from our Hunters and Trappers Organization. That will be submitted before the deadline, the new deadline given this morning – this afternoon, sorry.

Sharon: Thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chair. Commission, Jon Savoy, are there any questions to the presentation? Mr. Chair, may I turn it over to Jonathan Savoy, please?

Chairperson: Thank you, Sharon. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much for your presentation. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Bobby, you had mentioned the calving areas on the north of Victoria Island and indicated that is part of the historic calving range, and you would be providing some updated mapping in a future submission.

We noted in our presentation earlier that the current Draft Plan proposes Limited Use designations for caribou calving habitat with year-round prohibitions on activities, certain industrial activities. Do you have any comments on the appropriateness of year-round area-based protections or would some of the other alternatives provided by participants be appropriate as well? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Jonathan. Bobby?

Bobby G: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Jonathan. It's so hard to answer that kind of stuff with the different wildlife that we deal with and the lands for the caribou. They leave here in October or November, and they come back in April. That is just for our herd that come to the island. You're looking at April to mid- to late-November now the way the ice is freezing over now for them to migrate. They migrate from the south in the spring to the Islands starting in April. I would say they would leave around mid- to late-November the way the freeze-up is going.

That time of the year, season, I would say it is very limited to nothing, in my opinion, just because of the herd's status and the shape they are in. They do change their migration routes. Right now, a lot of them are going to the west, but they still cross on the east side where the original calving ground is that is posted on your presentation. Now they are on both sides, and more of them are on the northwest side of the island. From April to November is a very tough time for mining and whatnot, I would say, minerals or whatever. That would be the best time to have really little to nothing happen. Hopefully that answers your question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Before I go back to Jonathan, I just want to you to know that if you cannot answer at the moment, you can also answer by written form. That goes for everybody. I just wanted to put that out there. There may be times you may not be able to answer right away, but you can answer in written form and be submitted. Thank you. Are there any other questions? No? Jonathan?

Jonathan: Jonathan Savoy, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair and thank you, Bobby for your previous response. I have just one other question on caribou. We talked about the boundaries on caribou freshwater crossings and there being some debate about an appropriate buffer around a caribou freshwater crossing. Does the Ikaluktutiak HTO have any advice on an appropriate buffer or distance around caribou freshwater crossings? I will just further clarify that the current Draft Plan includes a 10-kilometre buffer, and some participants have suggested that is too large and could be reduced to 5 kilometers, for example

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Jonathan. More is always better for a buffer, especially for caribou. It is really a hot topic right now, everywhere, not only here but pretty much everywhere in Nunavut and even in the NWT. Ten, sure, I would not want to reduce it. That is something that we can have in our presentation when I discuss with my board in our submission. Our board works very well together, and we have a wide group of people. They have been here for a while. It is something that we will have on our submission. I don't want to get a definite answer, but it is something everybody has to work and meet on. If everybody wants 5 and 10, maybe meet in the middle as just a suggestion. Right now, I can't really answer that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Jonathan Savoy, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you again, Mr. Chair, and Bobby for your thoughtful response. I have one last question I was interested in asking. Some participants have recommended different approaches for land use plan requirements depending on the land ownership. For example, removing plan requirement on Inuit Owned Lands, in particular. We are also wondering if the Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers, or the municipality of Cambridge Bay have any thoughts on the appropriateness of tailoring Plan requirements to Inuit Owned Lands differently than would apply to Crown land. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Johnathan. Bobby?

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Johnathan. That, I cannot answer right now. Yeah, I'm just going to defer that to Bev. It has it marked down here. I will discuss that with the board. That is something I can't answer right now. Yes sir, I will hand the mic over to Jim. For myself, I can't answer that right now.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Jim M: Jim McEachern, Municipality of Cambridge Bay. I think just to add to Bobby's comment, I think that would be a discussion for the HTO, for the municipality, and for the KIA to have together, to find out and get a better sense of why they would want those lands removed from the Plan. At this point, I think it is premature whether that would be appropriate or not, but I think that is a great conversation for us to have jointly.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Thank you. Is there anything else? Is that good? I don't think there is anything from the staff. Community participants, is there any questions to their presentation? *(Pause)*

Okay, I don't see any hands. Registered participants, is there any question to the Hamlet and Cambridge Bay HTO and their presentation? *(Pause)*

I don't see any hands. Thank you. Thank you for your presentation. It is something that our board will definitely think about. Qujannamiik.

(Applause)

(Translated): Thank you for our discussions today. It appears we are on the right track for the agenda and can leave a little early. Tomorrow morning, we will resume at 9:00 a.m. with the Hamlet of Gjoa haven. Qujannamiik. Please have a good day.

End of Day 1

DAY 2: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022

Chairperson: Before we start, make sure you have your cellphone turned off. Qujannamiik. Sharon has a few housekeeping items to discuss with the delegates.

Sharon: Good morning and welcome back to Day 2 of the Nunavut Planning Commission Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. We do have some new people that were not here yesterday, so welcome. I see one of the NIRB board members that has just arrived from their meetings. Welcome.

I will just review the emergency exits, the washrooms, and the housekeeping from yesterday as there are new people here. We have three emergency exits, one at the rear on this side, and one at the front, the exit that you came through. The washrooms are in the lobby as you come in the hall. Coffee, tea, water, and snacks are help yourself over where Kaliq and the ladies are. Please remember to scan your nametag in if you have not done so. It is very important to know who is here and the numbers in the hall.

The Hamlet of Kugluktuk, the one member, is delayed and won't be arriving until just after 1:00 today, so we are going to defer the Hamlet of Kugluktuk HTO presentation until their members arrive. That will be a change in order today.

Again, Bessie and her team, if you have any issues or concerns, please see Bessie and the administrative team.

We want to remind you that we are live. We are live on TV. The mics are very sensitive and pick up everything. They picked up the coffee breaks yesterday, so we are taking those out of the feed. Today during the coffee breaks, the audio will be muted. Day 1 we have lessons learned, and we are moving on. With that, Mr. Chair, the Hamlet of Gjoa Haven and Hunters and Trappers. If you are doing it together or separate, the Hamlet of Gjoa Haven is up first. I would ask if the members are doing it together or would like to do it separately, if you could advise the Chair. Thank you.

Presentation by the Hamlet of Gjoa Haven

Jacob Keanik, Hamlet Council

Salomie Qitsualik, Hamlet Council

Jacob: *(Translated):* We will speak in our language.

Chairperson: It is better to do it over there. As you are getting ready, just a reminder, state your name and your organization. Another reminder when you are talking, make sure you think about the translators, too. If you could slow down and talk to the microphone, it would be better. Qujannamiik. You may proceed whenever you are ready.

Jacob: *(Translated):* Thank you, Chair. I am representing the Hamlet Council. I have not fully prepared my presentation this morning for the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, but from my understanding it is a very worthwhile document to work on for our youngsters. Tourism is also very important in our region from KIA and Parks Canada who are working around our region. Our future will need to know what we are doing and how we are proceeding to work on this Draft Land Use Plan. It is a real thing that should be worked on and finished.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Come closer to the microphone so we can hear you better. Thank you.

Jacob: *(Translated): (Partly Inaudible)* The hamlet Keewatin and Parks have been arriving to Gjoa Haven for various things. At that time, I thought you know, it would be nice to have that Draft Land Use Plan finished, and the areas that we need to discuss should be expanded or enlarged so our future can enjoy what has been planned. As for the two ships that were found near our area, Parks should really be assisted to do the kind of work they need to do with heritage in our area.

Our future will be shaped by what we are deciding here today. At the same time, they will have to live on the land for survival, for food subsistence, so we really need to get something here. As for Parks Canada, I have mentioned earlier that I am not very well prepared, so I will hand it over to my colleague.

Salomie: Ublaakkut *(Translated):* My colleague has mentioned some of the items that I would like to bring forward. Our councillors at Gjoa Haven are very concerned about what has taken place and what is planned. What is important to our community is the watershed, our water system. It needs to be looked at by the authorities. It is so close to the community. It is not too clean, and that is a big concern for us in our community.

Also, the Plan should include the sewage system. For our lakes for fishing, it is really close and seeps into the seawater nearby due to its proximity to the shore. We are looking and hopefully we will relocate. All of these concerns I bring forward remain hamlet concerns in our community. The shore in our vicinity has become very unclean, and it is not a good site. People are getting careless with their rubbish, and we are in need of correcting the situation with the problem on our shorelines in our community. The land has to be pristine as it was, and I tell you the money is always a problem, funding shortages. Not enough is done to many communities because of it. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: Have you concluded your presentation? We will proceed with questions following the program. Just a reminder to the speakers to state your name and your organization, please.

Salomie: I'm sorry. Salomie Qitsuarik, Gjoa Haven, Hamlet Councillor.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That is just a reminder, please, for the duration of the day so you can be identified as a speaker.

Sharon: Jonathan, any questions?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Delegates, do you have questions for the presenters? *(Pause)*.

It appears there are none. Are there any questions from the registered delegates? *(Pause)*

It appears none. Oh. Before you talk to the mic, if you don't mind removing your mask so we can hear you better. Thank you.

Ezra: Ezra Green, Nunavut Tunngavik. I have a question for clarification from the Planning Commission. The Parks Canada work around the Erebus and Terror ships was mentioned. Can you clarify how close ships are in the Land Use Plan or not in the Land Use Plan, or what the jurisdiction is there?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Jonathan Savoy, Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for the question. The areas around the Erebus and Terror wrecks are administered by Parks Canada and are therefore outside of the Nunavut Planning Commission's jurisdiction. They are very small areas, and they are the only national historic sites in the territory currently administered by Parks and not in the jurisdiction of the NPC. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian? No? Good? Are there any questions from the registered participants? Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. During the consultations on the 2016 Draft Plan, community members in Gjoa Haven identified King William Island as an important caribou calving area and requested it be included in the Draft Plan. The Commission has included King William Island as a Limited Use Area for caribou calving with year-round prohibitions or restrictions on many types of industrial activities. We are wondering if the hamlet representatives have any specific comments on the inclusion of the island as a caribou calving area with year-round restrictions on activities. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Just for your information, if you are unable to give immediate answers to the questions, your answers may be submitted in a written form. I will leave that up to you. If you are able to respond at this time, you may do so. It is just a reminder that you have other options in responding to the questions.

Jacob: Thank you, Chair. In the 2016 meeting,...I am quite new to the municipal government as a councillor, so I don't have a whole lot of opinions to state. I only had one meeting so far since I was installed. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Good? Thank you. Are there any other questions? *(Translated)*: I think that concludes the presentation.

(Applause)

Presentation by the Gjoa Haven Hunters and Trappers Organization

Brandon Qirqqut

Roger Ekelik

David Siksik

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: Just a reminder before you proceed, please state your name for the record and your community. Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Brandon: Good morning, everyone. My name is Brandon Qirqqut from Gjoa Haven HTO. I am also going to be speaking for myself as a hunter and provider for the community. I would like to thank the NPC.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Can you talk to the microphone closer? It would be better. Thank you.

Brandon: Thank you, NPC for having us at this meeting. I have been with HTO in Gjoa Haven since January. Since the meeting in Gjoa Haven with Solomon and Jonathan, I have wanted to tell the NPC that I don't want any mining activities near Gjoa Haven hunting grounds. I feel that there needs to be more restrictions where we hunt to prevent anyone from mining in those areas. Our lake restrictions on the Back River, Ellice River, Franklin Lake to protect the caribou, fish, seals, and birds from any mining activities.

On our winter harvest for caribou, we travel as far as halfway to Baker Lake. Baker. I would like stronger restrictions from mining activities because I want the next generation to hunt in the same place as we do. Thank you, NPC, for your time.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: Are you going to give a presentation?

Roger: *(Translated)*: Roger Ekelik, HTO member. We have given you a short presentation. We were quite idle over the spring. This is the time when we are very active out in the land when the weather warms up. We do this, but starting in October, we are quite stationary at the community. During warm weather, it is very hard to get members together due to activities out on the land in Gjoa Haven.

We have very high importance of our outpost camps. Some have been disturbed. From the 1960s, we still use them, and they are being neglected by the community. Bobby mentioned about caribou ice crossings during the months of May. The migration route of the caribou, it is very important that this is planned properly. We have to have stricter laws when caribou are migrating. What is happening today is that today people are harvesting the leaders of the caribou herd. It also applies to marine mammals, and their migration routes are very stable. This is the IQ knowledge that we want you to pay attention to as well. Thank you Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. State your name and organization please.

David: *(Translated)*: David Siksik Gjoa Haven. I am a member of the HTO committee. I have no written presentation. Our secretary manager is on holiday, so we had no chance of meetings to put a document together for a presentation.

It is not just Gjoa Haven that is concerned about spring migration, especially during the calving season. We have to keep this practice to date. Then when we are careful, we are able to harvest wildlife for the community members who have no hunters in their household. We are very careful with caribou herds. It is not only my community that practices this.

As I mentioned earlier, I have no presentation and I can only talk from what I have learned from the HTO meetings. You have to understand for those of us who live up here, time of year is very important. It is only time when we have activities for warmer weather.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik *(Translated)*: Just a reminder. For those of us who are up here, we have the *Land Claims Agreement*. Many of your concerns are stated in that document, and you are protected in many ways. We are following that *Agreement*. We are following the *Land Claims Agreement*, so we are having this proceeding. Although you said you don't have documents to present, your verbal presentation is very valuable. Any questions from the staff?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Jonathan Savoy, do you have any questions? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. There are no questions. Are there any questions from the delegates? Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director, Planning Commission. In the presentation that the Commission gave regarding the migration route for the caribou, did the HTO have any questions or comments on the map and the materials in the Plan about the migration routes, or will you be submitting for the record a further written presentation when your manager gets back specifically to the issues that you mentioned today? Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Your name please.

David S: *(Translated)*: Thank you. David, Gjoa Haven. The calving grounds have been our concern for many years. We stress this to everybody in our community, especially in our surrounding area. This is for your information coming from us. When you do your planning, and it appears you have done so, you have to be careful where the calving grounds and crossings are, the areas where caribou cross rivers. This is local knowledge to all of us up here. We follow these traditional teachings from our forefathers. They have always stressed that the calving grounds are to be protected. They have rightly so given us advice on this topic. When we discuss this topic of calving grounds, it is very important, and it is true there should be strict rules to the land. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Registered participants, any questions to the presentation of Gjoa Haven HTO? (Pause). It appears none. Thank you, presenters, for your presentation.

(Applause)

(Translated): We have just heard that there are some delegates that have not yet arrived. We will skip their slot to the Hamlet of Kugaaruk. Kugaaruk Hamlet and HTO, please take your seat.

Presentation by Kugaaruk Hamlet & HTO

Athol Ihakkaq – HTO Member

Athol: Athol Ihakkaq. I am just a replacement for the Kugaaruk representative. I am with the HTO. I have no document presentation. We haven't met all summer to discuss the issues. We have concerns this summer on beluga whales, although we have harvested over 20 this summer. I think my colleagues when they come in would be echoing me when I say we have concerns about beluga migration. Our hamlet delegates have chosen to attend other meetings that they will be going to, so I cannot speak for the hamlet, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. With the topics from the other community, do you have any questions for the previous presenter?

Athol: As with the other communities, we have great concern of caribou calving grounds and the migration route. I have not much to say to that because it has always been a priority where they migrate, sometimes to Taloyoak when they are migrating north. They take the same migration route in the summer. We have stated this many times to be aware of this to anyone who is coming up here to explore, to use the land. These are my traditional lands that we are speaking on, and many communities will echo this.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Are there any questions from the delegates? *(Pause)* There appears to be none. Does any registered participant have any question? *(Pause)*. It appears there is none. Thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

Let's look at the agenda. Hamlet of Taloyoak and HTO, please take your place.

Presentation by Taloyoak Hamlet and HTO

Joe Ashevak, HTO Chair

Jimmy Oleekatalik, Manager of Taloyoak HTO

David Totalik, Hamlet Council

Jeannie Ugjuk, Hamlet Council

Viola Neeveacheak, HTA Board Member

Jimmy: First of all, we have a video presentation before we proceed.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. Sorry for the delay. We will take a short break so technical problems can be worked on. We will proceed after the short break. Qujannamiik.

Break

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Just a reminder that our staff did not know that the Taloyoak delegation would have a video presentation. If community delegates have a video to present at this proceeding, please notify the staff well beforehand so we can be prepared to work on technicalities. We would appreciate if you would give us a day's notice to set things up.

(Video presented regarding the Community of Taloyoak and their desire to conserve the land and have an economy in place based on harvesting and processing of country food in order to maintain local employment, reduce poverty, and increase health.)

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Thank you. I will hand the table over to you. Although you mentioned that you do not have a paper presentation, your verbal presentation is just as valuable. It says in the *Land Claim Agreement* that if you have worries, they can be presented in any form. We know you mentioned previously no documents. It's fine. Let's proceed. State your name and who you are with please.

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Good morning. Jeannie Ugjuk, Taloyoak Hamlet Council. I have a presentation, a short statement. David Totalik and I are from the Hamlet Office of Taloyoak. At the meeting in our community, we are fully aware what HTO concerns are in our community. They have been in full communication with us, and we are two groups in full agreement on the Boothia Peninsula.

There are hardly any jobs in the communities for the regional inhabitants, so food security at times is a problem. There are people employed. When they go out hunting, they share that food with the community, with the widows and those who are not able to hunt for themselves., So, the food harvested is shared. Although there are problems with this, it is still a community effort to work together. It is a tradition that we have practiced for many years.

Although today's economy dictates, things are becoming hardships, especially to our community. The hunting equipment and vehicles of all sorts, all-terrain vehicles and canoes, are very expensive and not everybody can afford the hunting transportation equipment. Sometimes people go into heavy debt to acquire just so they can hunt and harvest. Taloyoak has been in place for many years for people to have it as a protected area. We planned this for future use so our future children can be as comfortable as they can in using the land. Although we go through hard times today, our grandchildren, their grandchildren, their future will need to use what we are preparing today. They should not go through hardship due to bad planning.

Just so the community can be healthy, food security is a big problem that should be looked at. In the community of Taloyoak, our forefathers came from the Baffin area, Cape Dorset. When we arrived, Netsilik people were already living here. Taloyoak means migrating path of a caribou. There are blinds in our area. We used to harvest caribou in the early days. That is how the named arrived for the community. It is a major migration route then and now, and we live just right outside that major migration route.

As I mentioned, what we want to say is we are originally from the Cape Dorset area, mixing with Netsilik people, and we live in good harmony. My late father said I want you to know before I go, I don't want your mother to be hungry. Up to today in any way I could, I have tried looking after my

mother because I was told to look after her. Many of us are following the last words of our late parents. We are a hamlet council, and as our mayor has said, you are the communities. We are not the mining companies. We are not a big company. We are the hunters living in this land. We are the harvesters. We are the hunters, and we are not miners or explorers. When told that, I remembered those words. I have had long discussion with what I was told.

The HTOs in communities are working hard protecting the land, marine and terrestrial animals. They are going further and further to harvest beluga whales. Me and my husband have a cabin quite far from the community, and we still travel there. It is the Abernethy area in English. My forefathers have traditional land in that area. It is a good harvesting ground for marine and land animals. We are truly still today land people. Boothia Peninsula is a very beautiful area used by our forefathers and the Netsilik people. It is a shared area, our area, especially near Fort Ross. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Before you start, state your name and the organization you represent, please. Thank you.

David T: *(Translated)*: Thank you. David Totalik. I am a hamlet councilor, so just to be sure I will take off my sweater. The HTO works well with HTO groups. I am an avid hunter. In our presentation I will echo the importance of the video you have seen. It is well prepared, and my colleagues who have spoken, mentioned the close-working harmony we have with this group. Our secretary treasurer for the HTO is very helpful, and he works hard. I am not saying this just because he is my friend as well as my relative. Sitting next to me is my sister-in-law, my Elder Jeannie Ugjuk is here.

I have mentioned that my working colleagues, their deceased relatives, their parents, and mine have worked hard over the years in respect to the land, especially Boothia Peninsula. First, it has been a very valuable land. It has provided everything to us. It was so when I was a youngster, and it is still today. The Boothia Peninsula is valuable territory, not only to us, but to the surrounding area. There is abundant wildlife and bowhead whales. I have heard over the years, and I will tell you what I have been told about how valuable the land is, the marine life. Do you know siqiniq? It is like night and day. It comes from the east and goes down in the west. Our life is just like that. It is ongoing. The marine areas in our communities are abundant in wildlife, so I use the rising of the sun and the setting of the sun, because we are carrying on as the days go by.

Our forefathers are gone and left advice to be in harmony with the Netsilik people. We follow what we have been told. They told us and advised us to always keep the land clean, and it will provide for you above ground, especially the freshwater. Before people started arriving in abundance, the land was pristine. We did not hear of mining company explorations until recently. Our forefathers came before these companies that arrived to us. Our teachings from our forefathers are the priority. We will not give them up for anything, even when the companies say to us it will be good for your economy. The land comes first. We will follow that as we always have. If there is exploration to my island, when the mining companies start emerging, we will be like at a town on an island surrounded by a boundary not being able to go to places where we used to go. Our forefathers have told us to travel freely on the land where animals will provide for you.

We are told that jobs will be created, and there will be employment. It is short term. Hunting is how we live and what we use to provide food for our household. We still obey. We still follow what we are being taught. We try to pass this on, although we are told that the economy is good for you. Job creation is good for you. It will prosper you for such a short time but at a heavy price. We are told

you will have a wage economy and you will earn, but at what cost? Buffalo? Muskox? Caribou? Wildlife? At the cost of those?

People before me obeyed. We take their advice and teaching as very valuable lessons in our lifestyle. I remember this. The Elder you know from Kivalliq, he has passed now. Mariano Aupilardjuk. He is a wise man and advisor. He has advised us over the years. We take his teachings very seriously. He talks and speaks from the heart. He teaches with feeling, and the words that we have learned from him are true. So many times I have heard him and I listened to him, even though he is from the Netsilik area. We prospered many times under his teaching. I just thought I would mention his name, because he was a wise man, a good teacher.

Jeannie and I have heard these teachings for many years, while at the same time, listening to what you have to present to us. Helping and working with each other today has to be in evidence, but at what point? We agree with progress in the proceedings here and hamlet councillors being invited to give a presentation. It is not too late. We can still work together and come up with a good Plan. I tell you, we will work with you, our colleagues from the region and other organizations. These people sitting next to me are just as concerned about the future as I am. I gave you a short presentation to let you know about working in harmony.

Chairperson: Are there other presentations?

Jimmy: Thank you, Chair. Jimmy Oleekatalik, Manager of HTO Association. I have been working since 2015. When I started the board, the board wanted me to protect. I remember in 2016 I was asked how we would protect Taloyoak. Since then, we have really had a really important... we need a full-time translator so the funding went to that. That is very worthy. We went to Glasgow, Scotland last year and since then we have been complemented. We are the leaders on the protection of Taloyoak as a community-based initiative. We would like to thank our partners for helping us out.

The Niqihaqut facility we will create since we don't want mining. But we need income. We need jobs. The Niqihaqut facility will create jobs for our facility, and we will only hire experienced hunters that will go with younger people that will be trained. Like I said before, five guardians and two youth guardians are in training. We are doing water sampling since 2015, because we know the water is clean and we need a baseline. If anything ever happened there, we would come back to that document and say look how clean it was and we want it to be that clean again. Those are some of the things that we are doing.

We are partners with Canadian outfitting now, but because of COVID, we have not had any active happenings. We do muskox sports hunting as part of our income. We are looking at fishing lodges, nature walks, nature shows, tourism, and a lot of a different ideas for winter and summer tourism. Instead of catching polar bears, someone could go take pictures of polar bears, things like that. We are looking at things like that to benefit our community.

Again, the Niqihaqut facility is for the town of Taloyoak to contribute to access of country food to the locals. With that, we want to create a management plan. We are creating a management plan for our wildlife, our environment. Before, it was like we were randomly hunting. People don't have access to snowmobiles and ATVs, so they have to borrow somebody's and try to go out and catch as much as they can or whatever. That is random hunting. That is not our way of life. Our way of life

was a planned hunt. They were not always successful plans, but they were always planned. This way we have a management plan in place. We will protect the wildlife, the environment as well.

Historic sites: The radiocarbon dating dates up to 10,000 years, so we have been occupying the land for many, many years. Since we have the Niqihaqt facility, we sat and looked at how it could be run and how much money it could make. We will be conservative. We will make a million dollars a year on profit, and we want to use half of it to keep the Niqihaqt facility going and half of it to create youth and Elder programs to get back to our roots. A lot of people don't go out on the land. Even though they are Taloyoak, there are no means to go out on the land, because how do you get jobs in Taloyoak?

We are not saying we do not want people to work in the mines from Taloyoak. There are some people that work in the mine, maybe two or three people. It is just that we don't want mining in Taloyoak. We have our leaders, and it is community-based, and it is very rewarding to create jobs, and all Inuit are working. There is so much shipping. If there was any spill – oil spill – that is going to contaminate the waters and narwhals. We have many, many char; many, many char. We want to protect the char, seals. A few years ago there was a report for Canada (*word inaudible, possibly Nunatsiaq*), clean for the polar bears in the world. We want to keep it that way. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: (*Translated*): Qujannamiik. Another presentation. State your name.

Viola: Viola Neeveacheak, Taloyoak, HTA board member. Thank you, Chair, for coming. I would like to say out of respect, you are here because I am here. You're here because I'm here. You're here because my ancestors and their ancestors before them inhabited these lands, our lands. They mapped these lands. They strived. They lived through the harshest conditions. Because of their failures and succeeding and accomplishing what they had gone through with their obstacles, their knowledge.

That is where oral history comes, and it is very important. It is very vital for us. They taught their children and their grandchildren. It's coming down to my child. It's coming down to my grandchildren. With one hunter's catch, it could gather a lot of people in my community, not only in my community but there is extended family members throughout the territory and elsewhere. We share our catch.

With that being said, our ancestors gave us all this information. They have given us all our mappings. Each and every page is from them. It came from them. It is new to the world, but this where this where this paper comes from is from our ancestors. With today's world, economically, politically, poverty, high-cost living, education, physical, and emotional: it all intertwines to our knowledge.

Our community does not have a lot of jobs, but our HTA created a number of jobs that could feed everyone in the community. For the people who cannot go out because they are elderly or they do not have equipment, they can have country food for our people. It would be nice to see people who represent our leaders, our own community, and have seats in the GN, the NTI, the KIA, the NPC. That is where you got your information is from our leaders. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Joe: A:

(Translated): Thank you, Chair. Joe Ashevak, Taloyoak HTO Chair. I would like to thank NPC for giving this opportunity to speak at this proceeding with the HTO and hamlet councillors from my community. We are here to discuss something that is very important to all of us, the Draft Land Use Plan. I thank them for agreeing to present their opinions to you and say why we are here. Each presenter has spoken what is in their mind, so I thank them for being frank.

Taloyoak: I would like to go back to that a bit. We are a relocated people from surrounding tundra gathered into a community with hard times we have had before. A short presentation here. At the time when I was a child, we lived outside of the community as nomads. In 1956, at that time we were dispersed around where the community is now. During the 1960s, we started being relocated to one central location where we were ordered to live in one community. It appeared this happened throughout the whole territory. I was a younger at the time as a child when relocation was taking place.

Growing up as a teenager, our land at the time was quite harsh with mammals. Sometimes we had a hard time catching caribou. Our community, Taloyoak, was placed into a major caribou migration herd. Our parents hunted caribou with a bow and arrow and other crude instruments. People had to be very careful not to kill themselves. That was how the community name came about. At that time, Taloyoak was a major migration route. It was a calving ground area up to north of Boothia Peninsula where caribou migrated. There are caribou bones all over the area. There are many Inukshuks on the land where they used to hunt caribou, gather caribou in certain places. Our forefathers, we know where their hunting grounds are because of that. There are old stone rings where people used to live on the tundra. We know where they are, the lands of our forefathers.

As I mentioned earlier, when we moved to Taloyoak, things were hard at times. We were living together in a central location, so people started traveling very far by dog teams, even to the north shore of Boothia Peninsula. Taloyoak, as we call it today, at the time it had abundant mammal life. We were centralized into the community so the animals at the time were gone. The Inukshuks, the rings, were there. The caribou used to migrate through that area. Our forefathers, we still stand with their teachings and their advice about the land and wildlife. For those of us here today, we are respected to mind the wildlife. Although these rules are not written, it is all oral tradition. It is all still real today.

Things were hard in those days while living in a centralized location when we did not want to. Before we were forced to move to the community, as a teenager I remember moving to a centralized location where I grew up. My father's name was Ashevak. He was a true hunter. He worked hard. I used to hunt with him by dog teams and later on by mechanized mobile device hunting. My colleagues from the community will know. They have seen me as a youngster that I was a slow learner. I worked hard, and my father taught me that I will have to become a man. This is how you will hunt. This is how you will harvest, look after animals, find animals, regardless if they are marine or terrestrial. Even as a slow learner, I was taught well.

In the early 1990s, my father passed away due to his age and due to illness. He passed away. There when he passed on, his advice and his teachings to me as a youngster became a reality. I had to live by and teach myself, because his instructions and his teachings were real to me then. At the time when he was advising me, then I realized he was teaching me how I will survive for myself and my family. So, his words, his teachings, became reality.

Today in Taloyoak, as we live in the communities, we are concerned about the mining companies and exploration companies. They are to be kept at a minimum because we are not fully prepared yet how we should look after the wildlife, what protection we should place on wildlife and the land. There are many new species coming as well. The land is starting to look very precious to us. I have seen in other communities where the mining companies are in full operation. They say the economy is well and people are working. But today, I see that if we work to have a mine, the land will be ruined, never to be replaced. We will work in mines at the cost of losing mammals in the area.

Just going back a bit to the 1970s, oil and gas was in exploration, and they wanted to create a pipeline right through the community from the high Arctic to southern Canada. Polar Gas was in full operation, so the oil can flow. I remember in the 1970s, people who were living at the time, the ancestors, the elderly men, were hard dominated by government pressuring them to have a pipeline come through. People started meeting at nights to see what they can do to deter this pipeline coming through the community and the land. I remember at that time, we worked very hard. We were more concerned about the land and the wildlife that were not ruined yet by industry.

Taloyoak is at the point and the surrounding area of the community is all water. The caribou now come through our community migrating north, migrating westward. There are no other routes that caribou are migrating today. It is the mining, and if industry was to come into that area, we have nothing. We lose everything including the land.

Today we have learned as Inuit, the caribou have gone. If they are gone, it will take a long time to populate themselves again. They will find new migration routes. They will find new feeding grounds and not come back to an area where they were replaced by industry. You are in the Kitikmeot. I hear in the Baffin that the caribou are practically gone. Our forefather's teachings, who lived solely on wildlife as hunters, they miss their food, our Elders today because the caribou and the wildlife are gone. I feel for them because their food subsistence is replaced. They are in need for their food that they ate as youngsters. That is going to happen in Taloyoak if this proceeding here is not done properly. We have been given an opportunity of how we can plan the wildlife and the land. If we lose wildlife, it will be a long time before they start appearing again. This is a fact.

Today, the HTO in Taloyoak is providing a community subsistence living, as Jimmy said, to look after the land as a foundation. It is to teach people who have no hunting skills today how to hunt caribou, muskox, and fish, how to control hunt. As we are today going through these changes, the wildlife is more valuable. As it is today, we should for the future start to work hard in preserving a healthy life. My late father told me how I will survive and how I can live. Now he is gone, and his every word is within me. I know where I am and how to look after myself. Just for me, I am letting you know how I was taught. My father was a great hunter. He lived well. He taught me when you remember your teachings, you will succeed. He told me to feed those who are not able to feed themselves. Help them out. It is still with me today.

Before, I was a wildlife officer for Gjoa Haven, Kugaaruk, and Taloyoak. In that job, I have seen looking at my fellow people that I had to deal with them. One of my jobs was to keep the law up to date according to modern day. As a retired person, people I have had to oversee as a manager of wildlife, today being retired, my friendship has arrived where it was confrontational before. People have told me your father was a caring man. He hunted for the people who are not able to hunt. I never expected that people should think of me like that when I was enforcing wildlife policies as part of a governing institution.

Today, food subsistence is on topic and how we want to take control of our life and our land. For those who are not able to help themselves, we still have to deal with food crisis under controlled hunt so there can be an abundance with a healthy life and food security so we can be well fed in the future.

Today we are speaking of wildlife. We can help ourselves for many, many years to come. It is not easy work. It will not be done overnight. Colleagues from my community have touched on different topics in care of their community. We are not speaking on the same topic. We are the speaking for the health of the community in terms of development and mining. There are other ways to live, to be healthy outside of industries that want to come up North. There is food to be had from the land. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I think that concludes your presentation unless you have additions.

Jimmy: Thank you, Chair. Jimmy Oleekatilik. Since we started the process of trying to protect Taloyoak, we have received right now about \$5 million dollars to protect Taloyoak. We just got \$3.5 from DFO for the Guardian Program. We got \$450,000 for expression of price for Niqihagut. From ECCC, we also got some funding for consultation and stuff like that for our neighboring community. I just wanted to mention those. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. For the comments?

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Jeannie Ugjuk Taloyoak Hamlet. In our communities with the marine life, I did not mention this. Our marine areas, whaling areas are quite far from the community. When they arrive, we have abundance of muktuk for the community. To the other areas and to the mainland, we travel by canoe and by land, through the rivers and by boats.

The people in the community have transportation modes to acquire wildlife in different parts of our immediate area. In the Boothia Peninsula, the travel is quite far to other areas, going up north by Honda and by canoe. This is the way of hunting for hunters in Taloyoak. We travel in many different ways to hunt. We travel through different parts of marine life. There are polar bears, especially in the Ulukhaktok (*uncertain*) and going on to Iqaluktuuttiaq (*uncertain?*). There are many polar bears. I did not want to let that go by. I was going to mention it, and many people hunt for the community effort. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*. That concludes your presentation. Are there any questions from the delegates or the staff? Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for your presentations today. Just to clarify, the Boothia Peninsula is designated as a Limited Use Area in the 2021 Draft Plan, and that includes year-round prohibitions or restrictions on several industrial uses including mineral exploration and development, and oil and gas exploration and development. Do you have any comments on whether you support that designation in the Land Use Plan as drafted? Thank you.

- Jimmy: Thank you for your question. Yes, sorry. I forgot to mention the board supports the current Draft Land Use Plan. Also we made a motion, the HTO made a motion to support the Draft the way it is right now. Qujannamiik.
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any more questions, Jonathan? Go ahead,
- Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Jimmy for that confirmation. As a follow-up question, we noted that there are some different views on the management of Inuit Owned Lands and Crown Lands, identified by participants. Do you have any questions on the treatment of Crown Land compared to Inuit Owned Land on the Boothia Peninsula in particular, as there are extensive Inuit Owned Lands in Ikaluktutiak?
- Chairperson: Go ahead.
- Jimmy: Yeah, we looked at all that. There are a few things, you know, we want to look at some more. Again, we are working on this. Everything is takes time, but we are going to look at all that. We will find what is best so everybody is in a win-win situation. There are different options we are looking at. It's something the board and that community have not really gotten into details, so I can't really say what we are going to do. Those are things we are looking at, yes.
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any more questions? No? There appears to be more questions to the delegates. If there are no participants from that community... Microphone?
- Paul: Qujannamiik. Paul Ikualloq. The Boothia Peninsula you mentioned, has it been worked on? Other communities in your vicinities are very interested and need information, because we want to hear how everything is proceeding with you on this project you have mentioned.
- Jimmy: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: The projects that we are undertaking, we can work with Gjoa Haven and other communities. We are not able to travel too much because of COVID problems, but it will be there.
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Questions?
- Althol: *(Translated)*: Athol Ihakkaq, Kugaaruk. We know that land is precious. We also have to think about surrounding communities, and hunting appears to be a bit of a concern. At the same time, there has been a bit of topic on job creation. Is that still a problem with you?
- Chairperson: Go head.
- Jimmy: Qujannamiik. There is different tourism with nature watch, fishing lodges, and sport hunts. These are some of the things we are looking at in the future to make more money, for local people to make money.
- Chairperson: Do you have another question?
- Althol: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Jimmy. As you have said, people also want to be in business to make a wage economy for themselves. You said you are going to do various things as projects, and I will need to see how successful these ventures will be.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any further questions from the delegates? *(Pause)*

It appears there are none. Peter, you have the floor. Please state your name and organization.

Peter T: Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I just want clarification on a question that was asked by Mr. Savoy on whether IOLs should be Limited Use. I ask that question to the communities. First of all, I want to thank Joe Ashevak for the presentation. It was an excellent presentation. We just want clarification from this type of forum, the public hearing, to get all the facts. All the issues that we face as communities and as representatives of Inuit organizations, IPGs, we are not expecting questions with yes-and-no answers. We will be having our presentation sometime this afternoon, I believe. If Mr. Savoy can clarify the question for follow-ups with impact on the Limited Use designations on Inuit Owned Land, we will be able to do that to after our presentation. I appreciate the fact that this forum, this public hearing, is to get all the facts and not just a yes-and-no answer. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sharon Ehaloak, Nunavut Planning Commission, Executive Director. Peter, thank you so much for your comments. The Commission strives to seek information where there are competing interests. The objective of having the oral question time was recommended to the Commission. We are allowing that time for all participants for questions.

Where there are competing interests and the Commission has to make decisions, the question is relevant to seek information whether it is Crown Land, IOL, or the landowner. It helps the Commission gather the information from the community's perspectives and from organizations' perspectives. That is what we are striving to do. I believe the intent of the question was to seek clarification for the community members whether or not they see that the Inuit Owned Lands, known as IOL as an acronym, should be treated differently from their recommendations in their protection plan or do they see the Crown Land, Inuit Owned Land, or the landowner whether it is the municipality, whether it should be included or excluded in their suggestions of protection.

As we know, the Commission seeks for solutions from organizations and parties to give us the recommended options. We are very open to hearing that, and we do want to gather as much information from all participants who are here participating at these public hearings so the Commissioners, who are the panel to make the decisions and final recommendations based on the information given, have adequate answers. We look forward to the presentation from the Kitikmeot Inuit Association to gather your views as well when we have the presentation this afternoon. So, the Commission does need to seek clarity. If you or others would like to come up and ask the questions or context that you would like to see addressed, we would welcome that as well. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I hope that answers your question, Peter.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead. You can ask another question.

Peter T: Qujannamiik, Commissioner. Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I thank you for that response, Ms. Ehaloak. KIA is a Designated Inuit Organization with authority and jurisdiction over Inuit Owned Land. We would be obliged to receive those same questions that are being asked to the community members after our presentation. As you know, we are trying to get all the

information out there and facts that will give the Commission a better understanding – communities and the Commission – a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Inuit organizations. That is the intent of the *Nunavut Agreement*, that public consultation gets all the facts out there. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Good? Jeannie?

Jeannie: Qujannamiik. Jeannie Ugjuk, Taloyoak Hamlet Council. In the *Nunavut Agreement*, it is stated that Inuit Owned Lands identifies KIA. They have given us support. We are able to understand this IOL. We continue to looking forward to KIA support. We can work with KIA regarding land designation. We can work with them. We work with KIA. We are from the same region, Gjoa Haven, Kugluktuk, Cambridge Bay. We work together as a region. We are looking to a working relationship, especially with KIA. If we don't agree what is proceeding, we want you to listen to concerns of the community in question.

Chairperson: Are there any other questions? She had her hand up first. I will go to you after. Go ahead. I am sorry if I don't know your name. (*Translated*): I don't know all the registered delegate's names so forgive me. Go ahead, please.

Pamela: Pamela Wong here. Senior Research and Technical Advisor for the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board. I have a question for NPC regarding the different land use designations for caribou. Is it possible to have different designations for different herds, so on a herd-specific basis rather than a broad caribou designation? Thank you.

Chairperson: Sharon?

Sharon: Sharon Ehloak for the NPC. Jonathan Savoy?

Jonathan: Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Pamela for the question. Yes, there can be different approaches for different caribou herds. In fact, there are some examples of that including caribou wintering habitat that we noted yesterday. Peary caribou wintering habitat is treated differently than other herds' wintering habitat. A distinct approach could be applied for different herds depending on the evidence that Commissioners consider and recommendations from participants. They are largely treated the same, but there is nothing to prevent a different approach for different herds. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Eamonn C: My name is Eamonn Carroll. I am legal counsel for the Government of Nunavut. The Government of Nunavut is very interested and would like to get more information on these proposals. I would like to ask four questions to the Hunters and Trappers Organization, Chair.

Chairperson: Excuse me. I think they are having a hard time hearing you. If you could just speak to your mic a little closer, we would appreciate it. Thank you.

Eamonn C: Eamonn Carroll, Government of Nunavut. I would like to ask four questions to the Hunters and Trappers Organization about this fascinating proposal. Will they be following up with separate written submissions after this hearing? If not, where can we find more information about his

proposal? Additionally, there were two other components aside from protection of the Boothia Peninsula. The development of datasets, will they be sharing those datasets in any subsequent written submissions? Finally, will the project for a meat processing facility come as a separate project proposal or be shared in the submissions?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: Before somebody answers your questions, this is just a reminder. I mentioned this before. As Commissioner, we are under the *Nunavut Agreement*. According to how we would allocate this particular task, it says there that oral questions are acceptable, so we can proceed with proper planning. Although it is early, a verbal presentation now is quite sufficient and will be binding for deeper discussion. We ask for written submissions at times. According to the *Nunavut Agreement*, it says anyone who has concerns may do so verbally. According to Kabloona culture, you want to see science and other real means. We have ways too, for our groups. At this time, verbal presentations will be acceptable. He asked a question. You may answer his questions by written submissions if you are not able to answer orderly at this time.

Jimmy: Jimmy Oleekatalik, Taloyoak HTO. I forgot the question. Sorry.

Eammon C: Are you following up with written submissions? If not, is there somewhere we can go to get information about these two projects? Is the meat processing facility going to come as a separate project submission at a later date from the Boothia Peninsula? Finally, you mentioned development of datasets. Will you be sharing the datasets in the submissions or is there a means to have them shared with the Government of Nunavut?

Jimmy O: Qujannamiik. We submit a motion that the board supports the NPC Draft Land Use Plan. The Niqihaqt facility coexists with the protection. We are in the process of the business plan. We are in the process of branding names. We were going to get that Niqihaqt facility this year, but again, COVID delayed everything so it will not happen until next year. We are going to prove that the Niqihaqt facility is commonsense to every community in Nunavut. That is how we got the inspiration, because it is common sense to Nunavummiut. The Niqihaqt facility...it is 2022. Before, we could just give meat to anybody, and they could process it. But it is 2022, and in colonial days they said to gather the people and we will give you money, but the money could only be used at the Northern Store, at the time Hudson Bay there was processed food only. We got used to ground beef, steaks, but we could have all that in country food if we have a Niqihaqt facility, and it is healthier for us. It is separate. Yeah, Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Jeannie: Jeannie Ugiuk, Taloyoak Hamlet. I want to answer the question from the Government of Nunavut legal counsel. It appears that you want to know and you want the opportunity to the projects. Under the Government of Nunavut as a community, you are our governing body. Government always asks for details. What will you do? How will you make it appear? What does it look like? To the people of Taloyoak, the legislation to the community will become more and more, and become more comprehensive and detailed.

If government is concerned about the communities in terms of health and teaching to the communities, you can also have your ways to assist. We have our own culture and way of doing things. We have a hard time understanding government and where they are coming from because of so much data and so much detail. Despite what is being asked, we still work with people who are

concerned about our community, our projects, our economy. Will you work with us rather than having an attitude to delay and perhaps stop altogether what is happening in our region or community? We want to have a healthy community in the future. We need to do things our own way. So now, the question is will you work with us?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any other questions from the registered participants? Go ahead.

Ezra: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ezra Green, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. I have a question of clarification from the Commission. In the presentation, Taloyoak mentioned interests in outfitting and also potentially building a fishing cabin, I believe it was. The Boothia Peninsula has two Limited Use Areas, both related...well, more than two, but caribou-related Limited Use Areas and also the Community Area of Interest. I am just seeking clarification if there is anything within the limitations that might affect the interest to outfitting or sports hunting, or the building of a fishing cabin or hunting cabin.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director, Nunavut Planning Commission. Jonathan Savoy?

Chairperson: Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for the question. You are correct in that there are multiple designations on the Boothia Peninsula. The designation assigned as a Community Area of Interest for the Boothia Peninsula does not have any prohibitions on those types of activities you mentioned, including outfitting or fishing cabins as examples. There no Plan requirements associated with that designation.

However, the community has also identified the peninsula as a caribou calving area, and that has been included in the Draft Plan. So, again, there are prohibited uses for caribou calving. None of those would include tourism, outfitting, and those types of activities. However, there are seasonal restrictions also applicable to caribou calving areas, and those are listed as project proponents must cease all uses in caribou calving areas except for research and tourism related to caribou conservation during the dates set out in Table 2. If there was a fishing lodge, for example, the way the Plan is currently drafted, it could be interpreted to mean that the operation of a fishing lodge during calving season would not be permitted during that time. It is another example of details where additional feedback on this issue would be appreciated from any participants. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon, you want to add? Go ahead, Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For clarity for the record, and I think it pertains to Mr. Peter Taptuna from the Kitikmeot Inuit Association relevancy of the Commission's question. I will read into the record so all participants are clear why the Commission is asking the questions that we are asking, and the authority that is guided through the *Nunavut Agreement*.

Article 11, Clause 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.

Article 11.3.2: The purpose of the Land Use Plan shall be to protect and promote the existing and future wellbeing of the residents and communities of the Nunavut Settlement Area, taking into account the interests of all Canadians, and to protect and where necessary, to restore, the environmental integrity of the Nunavut Settlement Area.

Article 11.2.1b: The primary purpose of the Land Use Plan for the Nunavut Settlement Area shall be to protect and promote the existing and future wellbeing of those persons, ordinary residents and communities of the Nunavut Settlement Area, taking into account again, the interests of all Canadians. Special attention shall be devoted to protecting and promoting the existing and future wellbeing of Inuit and Inuit Owned Lands.

Article 17.1.3: Inuit Owned Lands, to the extent possible, provide for mixed characteristic outlined above in Article 17 in order to secure balanced economic development. However, the relative weighting of the characteristics with respect to any community or region shall turn on the actual or potential economic opportunities at hand, and the particular community or regional preferences.

So, the Commission is tasked to listen, to listen to everyone around this table and to listen to all organizations. It is our mandate to find a balance that serves the interests. That is what the Commission is striving to do, and I am grateful for the active engagement, and we will hopefully continue to do so. However, with the question of whether or not the Commission has authority on IOL – I apologize, Inuit Owned Lands – the Commission does have authority, and we need to find solutions collectively, respecting as you said, the IQ principles, working together, and finding solutions that meet the needs of communities and others that own the land. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Gentleman with the hand up, go ahead. State your name and your organization. Make sure you are close to the microphone when you speak. Thank you.

Luigi T: Qujannamiik, Mr. Chair. My name is Luigi Toretti. I am a consultant to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you very much for quoting those Articles, Ms. Ehaloak. Those are Articles or sections of the *Nunavut Agreement* that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association has been putting forward to the Commission for quite some time, along with NTI.

Just a point of clarification, and Ezra as a colleague, you can correct me if I am wrong. As I understood the question, the question was relating to Limited Use. On the areas there, there was no specific point to Inuit Owned Land. In terms of a clarification, if the Taloyoak HTO were to come to KIA and say, "This is the project that we have and it is on IOL," we would absolutely work with them. So, absolutely, whether or not there is a Limited Use designation or not. If it is on IOL, and this is a project that an Inuit organization would present to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, we would definitely move forward with that project.

Now for a clarification point to NPC, given the Limited Use specification, if the project is being proposed on Crown Land, would this Inuit organization be able to proceed forward with that project, or does the Limited Use classification have to exempt Inuit? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Planning Commission. Luigi, thank you very much for your question. Jonathan Savoy?

Jonathan: Thank you very much. This is Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. I don't think I understand the question, and in particular the reference to a project. It was not clear to me whether you were using the term "project" to refer to something like a fishing lodge like we were talking about earlier, or a project meaning the initiative to establish some sort of management area on the Boothia Peninsula.

Chairperson: If you could go up to the microphone, it would be great and say your name and organization for the record. Thank you.

Luigi T: Kitikmeot Inuit Association, Luigi Toretti, Consultant to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. So, the original question from Ezra was specifically relating to constructions and fishing lodge types of activities. I think I tried to clarify that if the project was on IOL, we would be dealing with it one way. If the project was on Crown Land, there was a different... does the Limited Use classification on caribou calving area, would that prohibit that project with its fishing lodge and fishing activities? Would it prohibit that activity from moving forward? Okay? Is that a little bit clearer?

Chairperson: Thank you. Thank you for the clarification. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy, and thank you, Luigi, for the further clarification. As we noted previously, a proposal for a fishing lodge on the Boothia Peninsula under the Draft Plan as it is currently written, would conform to the Plan on either Crown Land or Inuit Owned Land as is drafted. The clarification that the gentleman posed earlier is that the caribou seasonal restrictions would apply to the fishing lodge. So, as drafted, that lodge would not be able to operate before July 12th, for example. So, the project would conform to the designation as drafted, but the seasonal restriction for caribou calving would apply. We also note that the dates of those seasonal restrictions would be eligible for minor variance if a proponent wished to adjust the seasonal dates, again as drafted.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions from registered participants? *(Pause)*. I don't see any more hands. Qujannamiik. Thank you for your questions and answers.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: Looking at the time, I don't think we can do too much before 12:00 approaches. I think we will conclude for the morning and come back at 1:15. Qujannamiik.

Lunch Break

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: The camera has started to roll, and we are recording now. We will now proceed with the afternoon session. Good afternoon. Hope you had a good lunch. *(English)*: We will start with the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board this afternoon. We will give them five minutes to set up.

(Pause)

Kitikmeot Wildlife Board, please proceed. Thank you. Just a reminder to turn off your cellphone. Make sure your cellphone is turned off. Before you speak, get close to the mic and state your name and which organization you are from. Qujannamiik.

Presentation by the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board

Paul Ikuallaq – Chair

Peter Kapolak – Vice Chair

Pamela Wong

Bobby Greenley

Paul: Thank you. I am Paul Ikuallaq, Kitikmeot Wildlife Board. I am the Chair. Our colleague would have been here, but she will be late. I have a short presentation, and the other two colleagues will give their presentation as well.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Please move the mic closer.

Paul: These are just my thoughts, what I can review with interjection and consideration of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, which is important. Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit includes laws from long ago. We must try and maintain them to the present day. It is difficult but important to articulate and preserve Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit in western culture and context.

We know not to waste animals, not to play with animals, from the smallest mosquito to the biggest ocean mammal. We know not to bother them or just to play with them. As we know each year, the hunting season is different, different hunting seasons. We go hunting for some animals in the fall, and others in the spring and winter. Each month is different.

We had a meeting with Kitikmeot Inuit Association and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated staff. We appreciate their efforts in keeping us informed and preparing us in this process. We are aware that each HTO has their own project, experience, and position on this Plan. The Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board is in support of their HTOs and individual position submission. They submit to NPC, especially in considering different caribou herds and wildlife in each community in a region.

For example, we noticed that the Peary caribou was identified on Prince of Wales, and we will need to follow-up with our HTOs on this. Continuation of Inuit access to hunting and their wildlife is important for generations to come. We continue to collaborate with Regional Wildlife Offices and HTOs with needs and concerns with wildlife.

When agencies make laws that affect our community, they should meet with our community face-to-face and let us know what is happening. These organizations can also come to our AGM before they make the final decision. We would like more face-to-face consultation to happen, especially because we lose important information trying to connect through the telephone and Zoom.

We are looking forward to continuing to work together with this Plan and appreciate NPC for bringing the community participants together with this meeting so we learn organizations in the process. All the mapping we are doing, we are happy to see faces from NPC and staff and know who assists us in our information.

(Translated): These are my thoughts. We have prepared these presentations from years ago, and they were endorsed by the Kitikmeot Wildlife Service and the community delegates to this board. We often meet as a group in Kugluktuk. October 4th will be our next one, October 4, 5 and 6 in Kugluktuk for our annual meeting for the Kitikmeot Wildlife Board. We often meet with the Kivalliq Wildlife Board and the Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board. We work with them and have the same interests. Pamela will give a brief presentation, and Bobby Greenley will be here but will be late. I will hand it over to Peter. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. State your name and your organization, please.

Peter: Peter Kapolak, Vice Chair for KRWB. I just want to say welcome everyone to Cambridge Bay. We share seven HTOs in the Kitikmeot. They all have their own mandates, so the Kitikmeot Regional Board supports all the HTOs and whatever decisions they have to make. We comply with their wishes. We deal with all kinds of wildlife from A to Z. That is all I have to say. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I will ask our staff to see if they have any questions. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jonathan, any questions?

Chairperson: Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for your presentation. As we noted yesterday, one potential area of discussion in regards to caribou habitat was the size of the buffer or distance around caribou freshwater crossings. In the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, there is a buffer of 10 kilometers, and some participants have recommended that could be reduced to, for example 5 kilometers. I am just wondering if you have any comments on an appropriate distance around a caribou freshwater crossing for identification. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Pamela: Thank you. Pamela Wong, Senior Research and Technical Advisor for the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board. I am just going to echo a bit of what Paul and Peter already mentioned. It is quite a broad region in the Kitikmeot, and each HTO might have their own preferences. I suppose we will look to them.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. No more questions? Okay, we discussed this during lunch, too, the Commissioners. I know I was asking the participants if they have any questions. To make it easier, I will go by the communities to see if there are questions. I will say to each community and if there are any questions, raise your hand, but if there are not, I will go to the next community. Gjoa Haven, you have a question?

Salomie: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Chair. Salomie Qitaualik, Gjoa Haven. To the panel, the Kitikmeot Wildlife Board, I have a question and perhaps a statement. You mentioned Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit has been around for a long time. Everything mattered at the time with the harvested mammal. To many Elders and to us today, it is still a great concern. When we hear people harvesting caribou winter or summer, I think the practice of sharing is missed sometimes. Many have harvested caribou,

different parts like the head, skin, the entrails of the caribou are being wasted a lot. It is not the only time I have mentioned this. I have been concerned about this for a long time.

Proper harvesting and dressing of the caribou has to be taught, perhaps even to a seasoned hunter, I may not be making sense, but this is what you have to teach and to the other communities as well. It is a regional board. You have to teach to skin legs, and cows have to be properly used, dressed. For you to consider as you meet with different HTOs in the region, will you teach this? That is all I have to say.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: It is a statement not a question, so you can take it as a statement, panel. Are there any more questions from the community on the presentation by the panel? Go ahead.

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Thank you. Jeannie Ugjuk, Hamlet Council of Taloyoak. I have heard over the proceedings that the caribou crossings are part of the important areas to protect, and we also heard about the 10-kilometre buffer zone in each direction of a caribou freshwater crossing area. Up here we have different river systems and crossing areas, although there is no way to measure the distances that were mentioned. There is none. There are many crossing areas now. Some areas have a lot of wolves. They are changing their crossing patterns because of this. It has been mentioned since yesterday the distance on freshwater crossings. We know our animals. We know their crossing areas. When you travel inland and landmarks around Taloyoak including the islands in the immediate vicinity of our community, we know that they are crossing now in vast areas. To you, the Nunavut Planning Commission, how will you handle buffer zones on freshwater caribou crossings areas? What will you do?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for the Planning Commission. I believe Jeannie is asking if you can clarify the buffer zone.

(Pause)

Thank you, sorry. Misunderstanding. We will take it as a comment. That's fine. We will take it as a comment. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It was a comment. We will bypass that. Questions? Beverly?

Beverly: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, KRWB. First of all, I would like to say that it is great to see the Executive Director, Sharon, and also Paul Ikuallaq mentioned our IQ. We always need to keep IQ in the back of our minds when we have gatherings such as these. It is a good example, too, for our Government of Nunavut to also practice when they do their sittings. Thank you very much for that.

Pamela, you mentioned just a minute ago about each HTO having their own opinion on the different buffers or the kilometers of buffers. Unfortunately, Bobby can't be here, our Chairman for the HTO. He is at home. His wife is not feeling well. Our HTO would like to see 10-kilometre buffers on the freshwater streams and rivers and areas. The reason why we agree with the 10-kilometre buffer is so that any kind of mining or any industry cannot disturb the freshwater areas. This is a comment that I just received from Bobby to pass along. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Thank you for your comment. Do you have a question?

Paul I *(Translated)*: Paul Ikualloq, KRWB Chair. I just want to clarify on the buffer zone. This applies to industry, tourism, and to exploration, not just to the hunter. This applies to people who are not out actively harvesting. This is for the people who are using the land perhaps for work. We will talk about this in the regional HTOs, although it will be up to them on the buffer zone and how they deal with exploration people coming up to use the land for work. It is becoming clear now that the buffer zones will become very important.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Are there any questions? I'll turn to the other side. David?

David T: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Chair. David Totalik, Taloyoak Hamlet. I have a question to the panel. We are aware of your work in this region. When will you notify us, you and we as communities? You are living in Gjoa Haven close to Cambridge Bay and Taloyoak. Our polar bear quota in our region for the community of Cambridge Bay, Gjoa Haven, and Taloyoak, near Kurairojuark, near Taloyoak, and other harvesting areas near Cambridge Bay. What will be happening when policies are made where there are restrictions, say to polar bears? I have heard over the past, and I know for a fact that the polar bears are not stationary. They are roaming mammals.

I will say this: My brother and his father during the spring when the lights were becoming longer in the area of Ulukhaktok near Gjoa Haven, the north side, we approached a polar bear. My brother shot it and killed it. Wildlife people at that time had a tattoo and a tag on the ear at that time then. When he shot the polar bear, a wildlife officer looked at the tattoo and the number. So we were asked to come into the community, and they told us the polar bear has been identified as to where it has been. The tattoo on the polar bear was tattooed in Alaska, and it travelled all this way to our region. The polar bear was in our region, when we harvested it, the three communities of Cambridge Bay, Gjoa Haven, and Taloyoak. I wanted you to be aware. When you do the polar bear harvest study, what have you learned?

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: A question to the panel, to your organization. That question was directed to the Kitikmeot Wildlife Harvest Board. It is not related to NPC as a question to us. It can be discussed during the break if you want to further pursue the question you have. Thank you. You can ask varied questions, but try to stay within the topic. Qujannamiik. Are there any further questions? *(Pause)*.

It appears we have none from the delegates. What about the registered attendees? *(Pause)*.

I don't see any hands. Qujannamiik for your presentation.

(Applause)

Qujannamiik. We will follow the schedule. Welcome, if you have just arrived. KIA members and the Chair, Stanley, welcome. We are looking forward to your presentation.

(English): Up next is KIA Board. I would like to recognize the president, Stanley on the board. John, do you need five minutes to set up your presentation to set up? We will take a quick five minutes to set up the computer.

Presentation by the Kitikmeot Inuit Association

Stanley Anablak, President

Peter Taptuna

Clara Evalik – Economic Development Officer

Bob Aknavikag is our Social and Cultural Development Vice President

Luigi Torettei, Consultant

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Let's get back to the program. Let us proceed. Welcome. Just a reminder to state your name and organization, please.

Stanley: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Stanley Anablak. I am the president for the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I would also just like to introduce my board that is here with me. Clara Evalik our Economic Development Officer. Bob Aknavikag is our Social and Cultural Development Vice President. Attima Hadlari is our Economic and Wildlife Environmental VP. He is not here at the moment. Our board member for Kugaaruk is *(inaudible)*.

Chairperson: Stanley, if you could speak to the microphone. Thank you.

Stanley: How is that? Right on? Johnny is our board member for Taloyoak. Raymond is our board member for Gjoa Haven. Natasha is our board member for Cambridge Bay. Peter is also here as a board member from Kugluktuk. Our meeting is happening at the same time as your meetings are happening, but I see you guys are having a much heated discussion, because it is very hot in here.

(Laughter)

Ours is a lot cooler. Again, thank you very much, Mr. Chair and board members for the Nunavut Planning Commission. It is good to see some familiar faces. Before I begin, I just want to get into my opening remarks regarding the Kitikmeot Inuit Association presentation for this hearing. I would like to take a minute to recognize Ms. Lucy Taipana. Lucy was the spouse of our late Simon Taipana who was one of our key negotiators for the *Nunavut Agreement*. Simon was a very instrumental part of the Kitikmeot team of our negotiators. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association also recognized him by having a boardroom named after him and our old KIA office building. Please help me in honouring Lucy Taipana, as Simon is no longer with us.

(Applause)

To get into my opening remarks, you all know my team here I believe. Peter Taptuna and Luigi Torettei. Mike? Mike Settington. I haven't seen anybody for over two years, I think, because of COVID, so I forget who we are or who they are. Just to get in: This is an Inuit birthright organization established in 1976 and assumed birthright status when the *Nunavut Agreement* received Royal Assent.

In 2020, there were 6,500 Kitikmeot Inuit members, 5,000 of voting age. Our mandate is to manage the Kitikmeot Inuit lands and resources, to protect and to promote the sociocultural, political, environmental, and economic wellbeing of Kitikmeot Inuit. KIA is a Designated Inuit Organization

under the *Nunavut Agreement*, section 39.1.3. The Articles are 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21, 26, 37, and 41, referred to as the DIO master list.

The KIA, Kitikmeot Inuit owns 104,852.42 square kilometers of surface Inuit Owned Lands. As a Designated Inuit Organization functions impacted by the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, Article 8, Parks; Article 9, Conservation Areas; Article 19, Title to Inuit Owned Lands; Article 21, Entry and Access; and Article 26, Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreements. In order for the Kitikmeot Inuit Association to best serve, represent, and look to future wellbeing of Kitikmeot Inuit, our responsibilities as DIO are primarily important and must be preserved.

The Nunavut Land Use Plan must not unduly restrict or inhibit DIO functions and responsibilities. Limited Use and Conditional Use designations inhibit or restrict DIO functions and responsibilities. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association provided a detailed submission to the Nunavut Planning Commission regarding its concern about the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan on April 15, 2022. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association also worked with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Kivalliq Inuit Association, and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association on a joint submission. This presentation cannot cover all the details provided in those submissions due to the time limits, so we are presenting a summary of our key points. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association board resolution on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan on June 27 to 29, 2022, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association Executive Director supported by the Department of Lands and Environment prepared a statement for publication indicating that Kitikmeot Inuit Association cannot support approval of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan in its current form.

The Kitikmeot Inuit Association Executive Director wrote to the Planning Commission setting out KIA's concerns with the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and asked the Nunavut Planning Commission to postpone a hearing planned for Cambridge Bay in September while changes are made to the Plan. The Nunavut Planning Commission should advise that if no changes are made to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and the hearing goes ahead, KIA will oppose approval of the Plan. This letter requesting a postponement was sent to the Nunavut Planning Commission on July 19, 2022. That is my opening remarks. I will let our team take over from here, as I have to get back to my board meeting. I hope I can get back before you guys all leave before the end of the week. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Just a reminder to state your name and organization. I appreciate it that you are able to come during your board meeting. Thank you, Stanley. Go ahead.

Peter T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I will carry on as per instructed by my president. For the sake of time, I will paraphrase some of these slides that are up there on our presentation. As per Article 17 of the *Nunavut Agreement*, the primary purpose of Inuit Owned Lands shall be to provide Inuit with rights in the land that promotes economic self-sufficiency of Inuit through time in a manner consistent with Inuit social and cultural needs and aspiration. Inuit Owned Land includes areas valued for renewable resources, development of nonrenewable resources, commercial value, and archeological, historical, or cultural importance. In other words, Mr. Chairman, IOLs were selected for Mixed Use.

Inuit Owned Lands shall, to the extent possible provide for the mix of characteristics outlined above in order to secure balanced economic development. However, the relative weighting of characteristics with respect to any particular community or region shall turn on the actual and

potential economic opportunities that have in particular community or regional preferences. Again, Mr. Chairman, the emphasis is on Mixed Use.

This Draft does not allow the DIO to promote economic self-sufficiency of Inuit through time, nor does it allow the DIO to consider the actual and potential economic opportunities that are in a particular community or regional preferences. Inuit economic self-sufficiency, and particular community or regional preferences, are hindered by Limited and Conditional Use designations on Inuit Owned Lands. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association recommend that these designations be replaced with Mixed Use. A transportation corridor, access to Inuit Owned Lands, must be assured.

Article 11 of the *Nunavut Agreement* specifies that special attention must be devoted to protecting and promoting the existing and future wellbeing of Inuit and Inuit Owned Lands, and 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.

Article 17 sets the parameters of these goals and objectives, to promote economic self-sufficiency of Inuit through time. Inuit Owned Lands with Mixed Use characteristics, the actual and potential economic opportunities at hand, and the particular community and/or regional preferences.

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, the Draft takes away Inuit decision-making authority of over half of the land we have in the Kitikmeot region. More of half of the opportunity that Kitikmeot Inuit Association has to look to future well-being of Kitikmeot has been eliminated by this Draft. The only kept classification that would allow Kitikmeot Inuit Association to maintain our DIO functions and responsibilities is for the Nunavut Planning Commission to designate Inuit Owned Lands as Mixed Use and to assure transportation corridor access to Inuit Owned Lands.

This 2021 Draft Land Use Plan is too focused on area conservation at the expense of economic development, the standard of living, and the quality of life for Kitikmeot Inuit. It fails to recognize the management effort of the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, which have included conservation as an objective of Inuit Owned Land uses. Conservation is a Kitikmeot Inuit goal. Three Inuit owned land parcels are currently closed to development. We have submitted the Huikitak River Community Area of Interest as a conservation area.

For the DIOs to manage Inuit Owned Lands as outlined in Article 17, the Limited and Conditional Use designations must be replaced with Mixed Use. Transportation corridor access to IOLs must be assured. The Limited Use designation in this Draft inhibits terms and conditions in existing conservations in the Inuit Impact Benefit Agreement, for example, migratory bird areas, territorial parks, and heritage rivers. The Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement recognizes and allows some development potential within those conservation areas. This Draft as is, denies that potential.

The Draft inhibits the potential for Inuit to negotiate Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements for future conservation areas. IIBAs, Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements cannot be negotiated in Limited and Conditional Use areas in a land use plan. Kitikmeot Inuit will see no benefits and will not be involved in management decision-making in those areas.

The Government of Canada cannot use the Nunavut Land Use Plan to meet its international obligations to protect 25% of the land and water by 2025 and increase it to 30% by 2030 without first acknowledging their obligation to Inuit by negotiating a conservation area, an Inuit Impact

Benefits Agreement, to meet those targets. As with our repeated recommendation, Mixed Use is the only designation that does not hinder our designated function and responsibilities, including conservation measures on Inuit Owned Lands.

The Kitikmeot Inuit Association appreciates the efforts and expenses the Nunavut Planning Commission has taken to consult Nunavummiut. The shortcomings we see are that both Inuit and the Commission were not clearly informed that land use management and regulatory tools are already in place that the Plan should have enhanced. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association recommends that the Commission incorporate a section that identifies and reviews currently available regulatory tools. The Plan must work with the tools already existing instead of replacing them.

This Draft is deficient and shortsighted regarding transportation corridors in the Kitikmeot and in Nunavut as well. The Nunavut Land Use Plan must allow the development of transportation corridors in the Kitikmeot. The Ukkusiksalik National Park Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement creates a process to consider a transportation access corridor through the park to keep mineral development options available for the benefit of Inuit. This Draft denies that possibility. Kitikmeot Inuit communities lie north and west of the park, and the transportation corridor could provide future socio-economic benefits in the east Kitikmeot. The Nunavut Land Use Plan must not interfere with the terms agreed upon in that Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement. The DIOs must have the capacity to exercise their Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements authorized roles and responsibilities. A Mixed Use designation on Inuit Owned Lands will allow the DIO to do so.

Area protection does not make sense in the Kitikmeot because calving grounds change regularly. Several tools already exist that are specifically designed to protect caribou and other wildlife. Area protection should not be used as a substitute for caribou protection. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the Nunavut Land Use Plan must reflect the goals and objectives of Inuit Owned Lands, which as stated in Article 17, are Mixed Use. Additionally, the Nunavut Land Use Plan must not hinder DIO authority or interfere with existing Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements. Thank you very much, Itsivautaq and Commissioners for taking the time to listen to this presentation. We will be happy to take questions. Quana.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We will proceed with questions. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. Staff do have questions. I will start with Brian Aglukark. Thank you.

Brian A: Qujannamiik, Sharon. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Peter, I am going to read a section of the *Land Claims Agreement* under Article 17: Inuit Owned Lands to the extent possible, provide for a mix of the characteristics outlined above in order to secure balanced economic development. However, the relative weighing of the characteristics with the respect to any particular community or region shall turn on the actual and potential economic opportunities at hand and the particular community or regional preference.

I am also going to read the simplified version of the *Claim* that is posted on NTL's website, if I can find it. Give me a second... It is the plain language version: Inuit will have the right to use their land for economic self-sufficiency. Inuit will also have the right to live in the way that is true to Inuit culture and society on their lands. In particular, Inuit in each community will decide which lands are most important to them and the potential uses they have and that they will put to.

Basically, what I would like to understand and get more clarity from the Kitikmeot Inuit Association is that the NPC has been consulting extensively on different versions of the Plan since 2012 with Inuit organizations, NTI, the RIAs, government departments, as well as community residents. What we constantly hear is that there is the difference between how Inuit want with their areas of land interest versus what the Regional Inuit Associations want, and they are far apart. We heard some of that today. Most communities, if not all communities, regardless of IOL or Crown Land, want specific areas, within your parcels, within the IOL parcels and Crown Lands, protected. So, in hearing your presentation today, there is a huge gap. I am wondering if you can explain to us or to the Nunavut Planning Commission what you are doing to bridge that gap. Thank you.

Peter T: Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I thank Brian for that question. We have made every effort to ensure that our DIO status as outlined in the *Nunavut Agreement* is not hindered. There have been over 200 articles and functions designated to Inuit organizations, and of course, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. One of the designations is the management authority and jurisdiction over Inuit Owned Lands within the region. We want to ensure that our authority as a Designated Inuit Organization is not hindered, impeded, as per this Draft 2021 Land Use Plan. We want the ability to negotiate IIBAs for conservation areas and other matters that would include long-term future benefits for Inuit. I think under the DIO designation, only the Kitikmeot Inuit Association has the ability to negotiate Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements regardless of whether it develops a conservation. We want to maintain that for the long-term benefit of the Inuit of Kitikmeot. If I can, Mr. Chairman, I can have my colleague here supplement with other information on that. Mr. Chair, if I can?

Chairperson: Yep, Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Luigi T: Luigi Toretti, Consultant to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Quana, Peter, Quana, Mr. Chair. Brian, thank you for the question. The NPC, as we have noted in our presentation, the NPC has done an excellent job consulting. They have gone to the communities. They have gone to the communities multiple times.

The challenge that we see and the divide that the NPC is talking about that the NPC sees in terms of our presentation, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association presentation, and the feedback that you are getting from the communities is actually quite easy to explain. It is a matter of questions that are asked at the community consultations and the information that is shared or how the information is presented.

For example, one of the challenges that we have had as an organization is the Kitikmeot Inuit Association to communicate to NPC that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association is the Designated Inuit Association or Organization for Inuit Owned Lands, surface lands. As DIO for Inuit Owned Lands, any activity or request for access, the title and the request for access on Inuit Owned Lands, has to come through the KIA, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. So as the DIO, it is okay for the NPC to go to the communities and to say or to ask the questions. This is an area. This is an area of interest. It has valued wildlife components, and are you interested in protecting it? Of course, the question is going to be yes.

What has not been presented is there is Inuit Owned Land in those areas that are being suggested as being protected. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association has the mandate for title and access, and they

can negotiate and have the mandate for Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements, to negotiate those. So of course, Inuit may want to protect it, and that is what the feedback that the Commission receives at the community meetings, but the flip side of what opportunities do we have to protect it, has not been fully explored because the KIA was not able to present alternatives to those Limited Use Area designations that the NPC was presenting. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have a further question, Brian?

Brian: Thank you, Luigi. Thank you, Peter. Again, land use planning under Article 11 includes a human factor, and that human factor is the Inuit cultural lifestyle, the hunting lifestyle, the traditional oral language that we use in Inuktitut. All of that under the *Claim* is protected. I respect and we understand the issue with the IIBA process. Again also, the NPC is mandated to protect that Inuit lifestyle.

As I said, there is a huge gap between the KIA, the regional association in this region and what we heard from the community residents. The gap is huge. We just need to hear and learn what you are doing to bridge that gap. What is the process you are using based on the fact that what you are saying and what the communities are saying are miles apart? We have not heard that yet. Thank you. I will leave it at that.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Luigi: Luigi Toretti, Consultant to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Mr. Chair, can we have a minute or two to prepare a response to that?

Chairperson: Just another reminder that if you guys want to answer, just like everybody else, in writing, you also have that opportunity to do that. Just like everybody else here, if you want to answer in writing, you can also have that option, but if you want to take a quick two minutes and get back to us, I am okay with that too. My question is, should we continue with the questions and get back to that answer, or do you want to take a quick break and answer it? Go ahead, Peter.

Peter T: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Commissioners. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Brian for those questions. Yes, it is really critical that we fully understand the impacts of these land use designations as it pertains to Inuit Owned Lands. We have to understand that, all of us have to understand that there are certain differing interests and the understanding of DIO functions and of the Articles of the *Nunavut Agreement*.

One of the ways that we have been trying to close that gap is coming to the communities and taking part, or going to certain AGMs like their regional wildlife board, to explain some of our functions and their functions. We have done that in October of 2021 and also in April of this year. We intend to do that again in October. So, there are efforts by KIA to not consolidate, but to assure and make everyone aware of each other's functions, because they do differ under DIO designations and functions. As you know, there are always ongoing efforts. We strive to ensure that our communities understand there are a differing number of DIOs, which pertain to our RWO HTO. They have two functions. They are designated a couple of functions from the Nunavut Article and 8 different DIO functions in conjunction with other DIOs.

So, at the end of the day, we do make efforts to have our communities understand their roles and responsibilities and want to ensure that they understand the roles of the DIO functions of the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. That is going to take time, and we appreciate time that the NPC, the Commission has given us to put these answers and responses and questions for them to take back to their communities and make more efforts to fully understand the impacts of Inuit Owned Lands and that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association is under the designation as authorized with the responsibilities and management of Inuit Owned Lands for all of Kitikmeot Inuit. I hope that is close to answering your question. Again, Mr. Chairman if I can, I would like my colleague to supplement more for more clarification if I can, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Yep, go ahead. Luigi?

Luigi: Quana. Luigi Toretti, Consultant to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you for the question once again, Brian. The KIA has actually been managing land, and we have actually looked through our records. Our records date back to 1994 in terms of identifying Inuit Owned Land parcels to protect in the sense of closing to development. So, records date back to 1994. So, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association has been managing lands for multiple uses for at least a period of almost three decades.

During that timeframe, nine Inuit owned parcels were closed to development. As my colleague has mentioned, three of them remain closed. That does not include the Hiukitak River area, which was submitted by the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Those Inuit Owned Parcels that are in that conservation area that was submitted by the KIA as the result of a board resolution, there are additional parcels in there that are effectively closed to Inuit Owned Lands.

The process the KIA goes through when there is an interest in accessing Inuit Owned Lands is quite a detailed process. We have Community Beneficiary Committees in all of the communities in the Kitikmeot. So, if there is a request to access Inuit Owned Lands, one of the first activities that takes place is for KIA to contact those CBCs and get feedback from them. Specifically to your question Brian, of what is the Kitikmeot Inuit Association doing to bridge that gap, we have been doing it. That is the process that we have been undertaking for nearly 30 years. I hope that clarifies or answers the question. Otherwise, if there is a follow-up question, we will listen. My apologies, Mr. Chair. Peter, is there anything that you would like to add to that?

Peter T: Taima?

Luigi T: Taima.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for your responses. It is appreciated. I just want to refocus. This morning we heard from the communities. We heard from Taloyoak, Gjoa Haven, Cambridge Bay, Kugluktuk, and Kugaaruk what their priorities are. The Commission is looking for solutions of how to bridge the competing interests or the positions and the views, and fully respects the DIO's authorities. There is never any question of the Kitikmeot Inuit Association authority over land.

In Article 11, it does say that Inuit Owned Lands shall be included in the Land Use Plan. What Commissioners are looking for are solutions, opportunities of how we can meet the needs. We have heard very strongly from the Hamlet of Taloyoak and Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers. They want

full protection on the Boothia Peninsula, this morning as one position as an example. Your position is that we should defer to the DIO, but the Commission must listen to everyone. So, we are looking if you could provide a solution. How do we bridge that gap, or do you have any suggestions of how we work together to meet both your needs and the community members' needs? After that, Mr. Chair, I will be going back to our staff for further questions. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter, go ahead.

Peter T: Thank you. Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you, Sharon, for the question. It is a very good question. I appreciate the fact that Taloyoak has been working on this for many, many years. So has the negotiations with the *Land Claims Agreement*. It took over 30 years to complete that land claim process, which Inuit wanted for ownership of land and decision-making powers when it comes to ownership of lands.

Again, I have got to say that the KIA appreciates the fact that Taloyoak, both the hamlet and HTO there, have been working diligently to try and improve things within their communities and their organization. At the end of the day, there are still a lot of things that have to take place. Discussions have to take place. With COVID, the last 2½ years practically, again it has been a very difficult trek over the past two years with the pandemic. We are finally getting back. At times, the capacity within our organization is limited too. There are many, many files the Kitikmeot Inuit Association handles with very little staff. At the end of the day, we want to ensure that everyone understands fully the pros and cons.

We did invite the manager of Spence Bay HTO to Kugluktuk to have a discussion, to lay that baseline down for discussion last year. We had conversations back and forth of the implications and trying to figure out ways to help move their wish of having a conservation area. Again, I stated before that once you designate Inuit Owned Lands within the Boothia Peninsula, Kitikmeot Inuit Association has surface lands, Inuit Owned Lands of almost 12,000 square kilometers. That is a huge landmass. There is that ability to Kitikmeot Inuit Association to work with Taloyoak to ensure that if there is going to be any conservation designation that we have the ability to negotiate long-term benefits rather than relying on short-term grants and funding that may leave the community with a very, I guess you can say, desperate situation.

Some of these programs are developed by government. IPCA is not a legislated program from the federal government, so it does not trigger a need for an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement, meaning we cannot negotiate it. It does not trigger the need to negotiate an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement. If the area is conserved in a different program such as a national park, a national wildlife area, there is that ability for Kitikmeot Inuit Association as a Designated Organization to negotiate that Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement for long-term benefits of the community.

These things, there are a lot of moving parts to this. There is a territorial government that is negotiating devolution. They have to play a key part in this. It takes many, many parties to come up with an agreement between differing views of things out there, as NPC has noted. As the Commission has noted, there are all different viewpoints of land, conservation areas, and development. That will never go away. At the end of the day, Kitikmeot Inuit Association wants to ensure that the communities have this potential opportunity to benefit long-term rather than in the short-term. That's all for now, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any further questions from staff? Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you to the group for the presentation. I'll note that under the *Nunavut Agreement*, the Nunavut Planning Commission was established as a negotiated benefit to provide land use planning for the territory. This is meant to guide and direct resource use and development in the territory, and is not much more specific than that.

This Draft Plan takes the approach of recommending a series of land use designations to manage land use in the territories through things like Limited Use Areas, Conditional Use Areas, and the identification of Valued Components. NTI and RIAs have advocated for a distinct approach to planning on Inuit Owned Lands, and our understanding in the presentation today is that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association recommends Mixed Use designations on all Inuit Owned Land parcels, with perhaps a few exceptions for things like the Hiukitak River.

Given that Mixed Use would not include tools like prohibiting uses outright, seasonal restrictions on activities, setbacks from key areas, other seasonal requirements, for example on polar bear denning areas, we are hearing that none of those tools are appropriate on Inuit Owned Lands from the point of view of the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I guess we are curious as to how a Mixed Use designation that only includes the identification of Valued Components reflects a distinct approach on Inuit Owned Lands and adds value to Nunavut's regulatory process. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Johnathan. Go ahead.

Luigi T: Luigi Toretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you, Mr. Chair. We do want to answer the question. We would like to discuss it before we answer it fully.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

(Pause)

Are you good? Whenever you are ready, go ahead. Just a reminder that we have been hearing a lot of acronyms, like ROA. If you could pronounce the whole thing instead of just ROA, we appreciate it. Thank you.

Peter T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you very much for that question. Of course, as a Designated Inuit Organization, we want the responsibility and authority maintained with Inuit. Under the Mixed Use designation, Inuit would have that responsibility whether they want the Inuit Owned Parcel, Inuit Owned Lands, whether it is conservation, development, or other things. We do have other tools that communities and DIOs can use of course, whether it is conservation or development. There are other regulatory agencies. IPGs exist in Nunavut that are established through the *Nunavut Agreement* such as the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Water Board, for any kind of discussion on whether it is included in the Nunavut's Wildlife's Management Board. They do have the responsibility to designate or approve conservation areas through that NWMB process. That is what is established through the *Nunavut Agreement*.

At the end of the day, we want the decision-making powers to be left with the organizations and the Inuit in their respective communities on Inuit Owned Lands, whether it is development,

conservation areas, or otherwise. Limited Use designations on Inuit Owned Lands would take the power away from the Inuit communities, and of course a Designated Inuit Organization. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Peter, for that response. I have just one point of clarification. Again, the implication from your presentation is that Limited Use and Conditional Use designations are not appropriate on Inuit Owned Lands generally. Could you just clarify for the record whether that extends to the community of Kugaaruk's community drinking water supply, as an example of a Limited Use Area with Inuit Owned Lands parcels in that particular area? Thank you.

Chairperson: Atigo. Go ahead.

Luigi T: Luigi Toretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Clarification requested please, Jonathan? Can you speak to the Limited Use components there?

Chairperson: Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. The Limited Use designation for the community of Kugaaruk's community drinking water supply includes year-round prohibitions on industrial activities including mineral exploration and development, and oil and gas exploration and development. I could check that for the exact list, but certainly those two.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the clarification, Jonathan. So, this is essentially a process question for the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. If there was any activity that was going to be taking place, let's clear the waters a little bit and not even talk about the Land Use Plan as it is right now. If there was an activity that was of interest that would be proposed on the drinking water area of Kugaaruk, the project proponent because it is Inuit Owned Lands would come to us, would come to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association.

We would go to the Kugaaruk CBC, and they would inform us that this is our drinking water supply. My apologies, Mr. Chair. CBC means Community Beneficiary Committees. My apologies to the translators. The process would be that we would go to communities and ask them for advice before any kind of activity would actually hit the ground, because it is Inuit Owned Lands, and nothing can happen before Inuit say yea or no. Does that answer your question, Jonathan? I don't know if I can make it clearer than that. Mr. Chair, quana.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Luigi. At the Commission, we are certainly aware of the process as it exists for the management of lands in the territory, including on Inuit Owned Lands. Just in response, I am interpreting that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association would also not be favour of including outright prohibitions on the community of Kugaaruk's drinking water supply.

I will just note that there are benefits of land use planning from having an overarching vision for the territory in establishing in advance some measure of guidance on how lands are to be used in the territory. That is the process we have been undertaking for 15 years. We certainly appreciate the mandate and responsibility of the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, while at the same time trying to fulfill the Commission's mandate and obligation to provide land use planning for the territory that guides and directs resource use and development. So, if there are areas in the territory where certain uses can be agreed upon to not be appropriate, that can be included in the Draft Plan to provide guidance for all parties to land use in Nunavut, but I think you have clarified that position on these parcels. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Luigi T: Just a point of clarification, yes, there are possibilities to work together. The challenge that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association has always had is the Association has decision-making authority on Inuit Owned Lands. Now, all of a sudden it is the NPC that is making those decisions for the Designated Inuit Organization.

With a Mixed Use classification, what would basically happen is the Commission says it is Mixed Use. However, it is on IOL. You need to speak to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association if it is in the Kitikmeot, and we would be the organization that would likely say no to a project like that. So, I think there is possibility of collaboration, but the authority to say yes or no, the Kitikmeot Inuit Association would like to maintain if it is on Inuit Owned Lands. Quana.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the comments. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director of the Nunavut Planning Commission. In light of the conversation, and these are tough, tough discussions that need to be had, we heard closing remarks from Taloyoak this morning that they do want to work with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, and hopefully they can find solutions. If there is a disagreement, they requested that the community voice be the one that is heard. Could you provide a recommendation to us in light of your conversation of how the Commission can find a solution to that particular issue, because we do need to listen to everyone. It is imperative that Commissioners hear, and everyone understands the views. If you could give us direction or guidance on that, it would be appreciated. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Peter.

Peter T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for that question, Ms. Ehaloak. Yes, we are here listening to the presentation of Taloyoak SP HTO and of course the hamlet. As I stated earlier, we applaud the efforts that they have made as a small community to try and bolster their economics through conservation initiatives, as they have stated.

It is very difficult to get all parties when you want to create a conservation area. Some of these things do take time. Again, it involves a lot of parties, community members, and discussions on Inuit Owned Lands. The surface Inuit Owned Lands - the Kitikmeot Inuit Association is designated as an authority and is responsible for Inuit Owned Lands in the Kitikmeot. The Inuit Owned Lands belong to all of the Kitikmeot. It does not belong to one single community. It does not belong to one single Inuk individual. It belongs to all the Inuit of the region. When it comes to determining how impacts

are made between communities regarding Inuit Owned Lands, there has to be a lot of back-and-forth, a lot of discussion and consultation.

Again, we applaud the efforts that Taloyoak has made to try to establish an IPCA, but at the same time, we still want to maintain the ability to potentially negotiate IIBAs for protected areas that the community wants. We don't that ability and responsibility taken away. We do have to communicate more with the communities, not just Taloyoak but all the communities, to ensure that the goals and objectives of negotiating land claims on Inuit Owned Lands is met. We do not want the ability taken away where Inuit lose the potential benefits of a long-term conservation area or possibly even development. That would be the community's choice. Again, on Inuit Owned Lands, we do not want the impediments or that ability taken away from Inuit. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any more questions? I know there have been quite a few questions. It is pretty much 3:00. Before I go to the community representatives, we will take a quick 15-minute break and then we can resume at 3:10, ten after three. Thank you.

Break

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Just a reminder to turn off your cellphone. When you are speaking, state your name and your organization. We were told to slow down when we are talking, so just keep that in mind too. We have translators, interpreters. If we can try to avoid acronyms, that would be great. *(Translated)*: We will proceed again. There were some questions from Cambridge Bay. Beverly, go ahead.

Beverly: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Beverly Makasagak, Manager of Ikaluktutiak HTO. I had a question, but first I would like to mention if we could speak in plain language, some of us do not understand the legal or consulting languages. Thank you.

I am going to ask if KIA and maybe NTI could take some notes as well for clarification. Can HTOs or Inuit with beneficiaries stake a piece of land that is on Inuit Owned or Crowned Land? For example, this morning Taloyoak mentioned they wanted to attempt to build a fishing lodge. Would they be able to stake an area of their choosing if it is on Inuit or on Crown lands? The same question would apply for Nunavut beneficiaries. In our community, we have one Elder who has a cabin at the mainland on the Cam Peninsula. I am not sure how much land he has staked, but it is out in the *Kinngaaryuk (?)* area, like I mentioned on the Cam Peninsula. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter, go ahead.

Peter T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, and thank you for the question, Beverly. It is a bit little difficult to answer this question at this time. I don't have that background knowledge of the lodges, but when it comes to requests for any kind of development or inputting any type of infrastructure on Inuit Owned Lands, there is a process. It first goes through the KIA and the Community Beneficiaries Committee to assess and make recommendations on the process. Of course, there are multiple organizations including possibly GN that would license an operation like that. There is a process. We can certainly try and clarify at a later date if we are allowed to write to the HTO on clarifying the questions that you asked. Taima for now, Mr. Chair. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions? Jimmy. had a question. Go ahead.

Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik, Taloyoak HTO. Thank you for your presentation, Peter. For the record, HTAs under Article 4, Article 5, and Article 6: We looked at Parks situation and all that, but IPCA fit us best for what we want to do. Therefore, we want to work with you to get an IIBA. We need your help to do an IIBA.

You said earlier you've got records from 1994. That was about the time that we started trying to protect Aviqtuuq, 1994. Under the *Nunavut Land Claims*, we are basing on those. The Inuit in our settlement area know what they want in that place. We want to work with you to get an IIBA. We have been trying to protect Aviqtuuq since 1994, but it never left the dock until 2016. That's when it started the ball rolling. Community members there do not want mining any mining there. We are trying to create jobs for them. The way of this is very simple, sport hunting and the Niqihagut facility. in Kugluktuk. So, IPCA needs an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement. We want to work with you on that to get it started. We created 10 since we started. We could create more if you would get our IPCA. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter?

Peter: Qujannamiik. I will try to respond to that question and answer some of the parts of the question. Thank you, Jimmy, for that question. It is a very interesting question. You indicated that you really tried to push this file forward for conservation since 1994. Being a staffer, I can't make any commitments to say whether we are going to create a conservation area. There is a process there.

The process is usually a letter to the board or executive director, where DIOs such as KIA can make a decision. As I stated earlier, it is very difficult, if not impossible to negotiate an IIBA on Inuit Owned Lands while it is under Limited Use. Also, an IPCA, Indigenous Protected Conservation Area, is a program that is not federally legislated, meaning there are no abilities through the Nunavut Agreement for a DIO to negotiate an IIBA. It doesn't trigger that, but your concerns were heard. There are a number of people, KIA staff and others who heard our presentation and your question. I can't make that commitment as a staffer, but I will certainly bring it back to our leadership. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Another reminder about acronyms, if you could say the whole thing if the acronym, we would appreciate. Do you have a further question? No? Jeannie also has a question. Go ahead, Jeannie.

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jannie Ugjuk, Hamlet of Taloyoak. At the KIA meeting I was there as a representative for women. I sat at that meeting. , and I made a presentation to the group according to the Boothia Peninsula. They were requesting for the protection of Boothia Peninsula, but at the time COVID-19 was in full swing. You as KIA have been told we have requested full protection of Boothia Peninsula. It is a huge territory. Our request for the protection has not been adhered. Is it due to its size that is on the land? We were at that meeting requesting what we wanted and how the Boothia Peninsula should be. At the time, we were rejected. Nothing came out of it. Is this due to the size of the land and what its potential is?

You did not support us. You did not give us firm replies. KIA and at the meeting, we came numerous times to talk to you about what our concerns are in this region. At that time, Kovalak and Amanda

gave a good presentation. How many years since it has been since anything has happened from KIA to the requests that we have made from the past? Are you just letting it go? You're not going to act on it?

I think the working relationship is strained. I think there are times when you have no actual powers to the requests we have made with the land we wanted protected. Are you being stopped by other originations, say the federal government? We just don't want a small part of the Boothia Peninsula. We want the entire area for our use. Even Government of Nunavut has been pretty silent. I know our request are falling into futile ears. And CBC, we have heard from them that you are dealing with this local group regarding our large land.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter, go ahead.

Peter: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq and Commissioners. Thank you, Jeannie for the question. As I understand it from (inaudible), this effort has been ongoing since, I think in a presentation it indicated 1972 and later stated 1994. It seems like a long time. There are a lot of factors that are in concern. Thank you for the question, Jeannie. When you indicated, when you asked if there are other pressures that prevent the Kitikmeot Inuit Association from moving the file forward, as you can recall, the Government of Nunavut negotiated a devolution agreement. We do have an AIP, and at one point the premier had written a letter to the Prime Minister indicating that no more conservation areas be established until devolution is done. That is part of some of these things that slow things down.

According to the Premier's letter – public letter – it indicated they wanted to have a conservation strategy before the federal government starts puts in, establishing conservation areas. That is not the whole reason why I think it slowed down. It does take time to get all parties together. There are multiple discussions that have to take place, and consultations too costs money.

Again, KIA applauds the efforts of Taloyoak, making those efforts. Again, I cannot make that determination for the leadership. I'll get direction from them when it comes to conservation areas. As you know, Gulf of Boothia was shown on a slide there. Initially, it was over 67,000 square kilometers. That is a huge area, like you said. It is bigger than the Queen Maude Gulf area. Within that area, there is almost 12,000 square kilometers of Inuit Owned Lands. Again, we don't want to lose that ability to negotiate IIBAs through Limited Use designation from the Land Use Plan. We want to keep that option open where there are long-term benefits funding through an IIBA – an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement. We want the community to benefit. That is the sole reason why the Nunavut Agreement was negotiated, to benefit Inuit, whether it is for conservation areas or Inuit Impact Benefits, or negotiate to benefit communities in the region in perpetuity. Some of these are not in a legislative program, conservation programs that the federal government is not legislated. Again, it really makes it difficult for a DIO such as Kitikmeot Inuit Association to have any kind of involvement in trying to negotiate an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement if it is a non-legislative program, unlike national parks, sorry national wildlife areas and marine protected areas. If there is opportunity for conservation areas, an Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement, the KIA is the DIO responsible to negotiate IIBAs when it comes to that. I am trying to be plain and simple, and I apologize for using acronyms again. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Do you have further questions, Jeannie?

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jeannie Ugjuk, Hamlet of Taloyoak. I wanted you to understand, and many communities have agreed on many things. How can we open doors? How can we work together? Once we conclude this proceeding, what are we going to face next? We have stated what we want here. What other obstacles are we going to have to face when our path should just be opening so we can have what we want rather than being confrontational in this proceeding. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter?

Peter: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commission. Thank you for the question, Jeannie. There is no intention of trying to be confrontational with the community. The initiative driven by the Hunters and Trappers Organization of Spence Bay, the HTO, was given money from Environment Climate Change Canada for consultations on a purpose to establish and make aware of the other communities of that process that the Hunters and Trappers were taking to establish that Indigenous Protected Conservation Area. It does affect other communities. There are lands that were selected that were selected by Kugaaruk, Gjoa Haven. Consultations do have to take place there. It is not like anybody being confrontational. It does take a bit of time for that. The process sometimes is very slow. It does take a long time to create and establish conservation national parks and marine protected areas. It does take a long time. We try our best to ensure that - and when I say we it is Kitikmeot Inuit Association tries its best to ensure to find a solution to move these things forward for the community. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. David?

David T: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Totalik, Taloyoak Hamlet Conuncillor. I am representing my community and I will express my concern. Either today or tomorrow, you as a Planning Commission while you are here and Kitikmeot Inuit Association is at the table, I will say what I have in mind.

I know and I have heard that back in the 1970s and early 1980s before the Planning Commission came into being and KIA as an organization was in infancy, my late father Adam Totalik attended numerous meetings at the time when KIA started. Our language to him was very important. Iqaluit CBC, Kivalliq, and nearby radio stations at Kitikmeot and Western Arctic CBC radio as well. As of today, we have nothing in this region. I am just telling you what many things we lack in this region.

Our syllabics, our writing system, I don't know if all of you in the delegation table can use it. I just want to bring this up that it should be one of our priorities in language preservation. I use it. I was saving this concern for tomorrow's meeting, but since both parties who are here who are able to make decisions and try to get things done, I am saying it now. One of our many concerns is the language. CBC in other regions are pretty active. They have their own programming, but none over here. So, I am mentioning it to show what we lack.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: I understand you. It is a bit off our topic, but we have heard it. Paul?

Paul I: Paul Ikuallaq, KRWB. We heard here already that the KIA and the Niqihagut Project has been going on for a while. I think it's time for the KIA and our *Aviqtuuq* (?) project staff and boards to work on this together. It does not make it so legal. It is part of our inherited right to collaborate with each other and make each other understand. That is my comment. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. That was a comment, thank you. Are there any further questions to the subject, to the panel and their presentation? Go ahead.

Viola Thank you, Chair. Thank you. Viola Neeveacheak, Taloyoak Hunters and Trappers Association board member. Like again what I said this morning is that you are here because we are here, as Inuit people representing our community. You're here because we're here.

A number of years ago, as Jimmy said, our Elders they passed on. They met in the evenings trying to protect our hunting grounds and campsites from mining exploration. That is our way of life. That is our identity. You can't change that. It comes to our way of life, lifestyle. It comes to our dignity. It comes to traditions, values, customs. That is our way of life. That is all we know. That's how we continue to survive, and that is how we will continue to strive.

At the end of the day for our Elders, it was not about money. They really gathered together just to protect our land, just to protect our hunting grounds, just to protect our shores and our lakes and rivers. You mentioned that KIA has different aspects for different sectors, and you talked about balance. They need balance in every different sector. It needs balance for every community. You can't make it different. You have to keep it together.

Like Jimmy said, it is in the Article. I don't understand why a community has to negotiate with its very own Inuit Association. You have to be open minded. You have to accept their values, their tradition. You're talking about another community here, and you want them to live this way. How are you trying to force us to live as Kitikmeot Inuit Association, board members, consultants. You are telling us you live this way. You live this way. I tell you how to live. At the end of the day, you are not going home to that bounty. So, again, you are here because we are here. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter? Go ahead, Peter.

Peter T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, Commissioners. Thank you for your questions and comments, Viola. I probably did not make myself too clear when I used acronyms earlier. The negotiation does not happen when it comes to Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement. It does not happen with the community and Kitikmeot Inuit Association. It does happen with the Government of Canada or even Government of Nunavut depending on the type of conservation area that the community wants.

You are right. Every elected organization, community, puts a lot of efforts to try and bring their people out of poverty. There are a certain number of different ways. But when it comes to the *Nunavut Agreement* and having jurisdiction and decision-making powers on Inuit Owned Lands that is exactly why the *Nunavut Agreement* was negotiated by our Elders, some of them that are no longer here. The objective and the end result is that the negotiations that Inuit want with benefits, benefits for a better life and decision-making powers on things that happen our communities and on their land.

When it comes to selected lands, Inuit Owned Land parcels, you need to have a say, the community to have a say on what type of designation, whether they want to use it for conservation, a fishing lodge, or protection for wildlife. That is something that has to go through Kitikmeot Inuit Association, as they have DIO functions, Designated Inuit Organizational functions and responsibilities that were passed on from NTI through the *Nunavut Agreement*. Through this

process, it is the best way to get all the communities involved in what they want and have that decision-making power and authority to try and – I am not going to say prevent poverty within the community – but the end result of the *Nunavut Agreement* is to try and gain more benefits from land for Inuit and Inuit communities. Taima for now. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. You have more questions. You are good? I don't have any other names. Are there other questions from the communities? Go ahead.

Joe: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Joe Ashevak, Taloyoak HTO chair. What I have to say is not all that good, especially to the Kitikmeot area. During the general election when we were given, the plebiscite gave us Nunavut, our leaders at that time also participated in the process. It was a joyful occasion, especially with our Elders who were instrumental. Many are gone now. At the time, we thought now we are finally the masters of our own land.

Now as year progress, different bodies have different agendas, and nothing is coming into place. Here in the Kitikmeot, the communities are hungry. There is food insecurity and no abilities to acquire more food. There are no benefits. Many have no hunting equipment. Our youngsters, the suicide rate is terrible, although I think it is everywhere in Nunavut, because there is nothing to hope for, nothing to gain. They have nothing. We are becoming more and more adversaries trying to create something, which is not coming to a reality. People, organizations who said they would be there for us to help us, now that is not the case. Decisions made are becoming very harmful. I think I can even say we did not have these problems before Nunavut: people hungry, food insecurity, no hunting equipment. I will say this again in English.

(English): I would like to speak in English to the last bit of my comment. It has been decades now already almost. We got Nunavut. How many more decades are we going to wait until we iron out the technicalities of ownership and wanting to control our resources and our livelihood? We are losing our young people. We lack. Here are we are sitting munching. There is food available here, three meals a day. Out there, there are people starving and hungry asking for food. They have nothing, while we sit here talking about technicalities. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was more of a comment. Questions? Salomie?

Salomie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Salomie Qitsualik, Hamlet of Gjoa Haven. I have been listening all day, and it is interesting and understandable. Now I think KIA as a body, when there are disagreements with this body, KIA has assisted many groups in different projects, and giving out vouchers. I am just saying to this organization, I appreciate your efforts. People told me, I have heard it, and people claim that they are hungry and lack everything. Yes, yes, it is true, even in my hometown, but I also at the same time understand that with our grandchildren, our family, it is not every household.

When social assistance and other benefits in terms of money come, it is used for illicit drugs and to the bootleggers This is why we are hungry. This is why we turn to the families who are being responsible for their finances. We are approached. We have families, and we have children. We cannot just give away what we have because we were careful with what we have. I just want to say this, because not all of us are hungry by someone else's fault.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jeannie, you have a comment?

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: I asked a question earlier. When KIA had a meeting in this community, Amanda Main and Kovalak and I, came to make a presentation on Boothia Peninsula. We thought it might be a protection to the communities near to it and small outpost camps. When it comes to land, what KIA lacks is to find what people think when it comes to land. I have heard this today, and Kovalak and Amanda Maines' request at that time was never answered. You heard it, and told us also that you are always in community meetings with the public in each community. Have you directly communicated with hamlet council in my community? Have you sought their advice as to how to best approach our need? If you have not met with local authorities, you should meet them as the KIA body. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter?

Peter T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq, Commissioners. Thank you for your question, Jeannie. As staffers, we get our directions from our leadership on these types of situations. You mentioned outpost camps, where outpost camps can be established and consultations. The staff is listening, and we will certainly bring it up to our leadership. You indicated that there is a KIA board meeting. We will have to go back and look at that, because at times our direction is different from some of these things that do take place. We will take your question as noted and hopefully get back to you in writing. Taima, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jeanie, do you have any more further comments?

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Jeannie Ugjuk, Hamlet of Taloyoak. I will clarify this in English.

(English): A few years ago, I believe it was four years ago, we had a KIA AGM here in Cambridge Bay, here in this room. Kovalak, Ashevak, and Amanda Mains did a presentation to the KIA board requesting the Aviqtuuq project. They were basically asking the same thing we did this morning, but there was just two of them a few years ago.

My question is have KIA staff met with the community boards to discuss this issue? The consultant there said usually when there is a request from the community, they meet with the community board and hear the community people about the situation. I don't know why we slipped through the cracks. I am frustrated, especially hearing we are not supported from our own Inuit firm. That makes me frustrated. I wasn't given the answer that if you guys met with who you call the CBC. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter, go ahead.

Peter T: Thank you, Itsivautaq. Thank you, Commissioners. Again, thank you Jeannie for your question. Maybe the question wasn't too clear to me, but you indicated that the consultant, that there is a process when there is a request for land use on Inuit Owned Lands. The first thing that happens is it is reviewed by KIA staff and it goes to the Community Beneficiaries Committee who evaluates that request, assesses the requests, and makes a recommendation to the KIA Lands Department on whether the proponent of the request is allowed or not allowed for certain situations depending on what type of request is made by proponents. The Community Beneficiaries Committee is involved in that process.

I hope I made myself clear, but I do apologize that you're feeling frustrated. Like most other organizations that have folks, there is always that element of frustration when things move too slow. Certainly at the staff level, we apologize for your frustration. At the end of the day, everybody does their best to try and move files along. Things do have to come together to move files forward, and we always need the community's help at the same time. It is not only the community needing KIA's help. We do need the community's assistance and input too at the same time. I hope I am close to answering your question.

Chairperson: You still have a question, Jeannie?

Jeannie: Qujannamiik. Thank you for the answer. I still did not get an answer if you met with Taloyoak CBC, community board members. I honestly believe, me in my heart, that we were never taken seriously. That is how come we are here today with a big gap between our representatives, my NTI member goes through KIA. I really don't matter. That's how I feel right now. I thought it was a big thing when Joe Ashevak asked at that time, and we don't have progress today. I am airing out my frustrations. I'm going to quit at that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was more of a comment. Are there any other questions? I don't see any hands. I am going to go to the registered participants. Are there any questions down there from the presentation this afternoon? (Pause) I don't see any hands. Qujannamiik.

(Applause)

(Translated): The community members who were delayed are in town. I think we will resume tomorrow morning. It is late in the day, so we will come back at 9:00 tomorrow, and the delegation then can give their presentation.

(English). Tomorrow, we can continue, and we are adjourned for the day. Qujannamiik.

End of Day 2

DAY 3: SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

Chairperson: Good morning. We will proceed now for this morning's presentation. Before we start, I just want to remind you that your cellphones are to be turned off, just as a reminder. Sharon is going to say a few words.

Sharon: Good morning, everyone and welcome back to Day 3 here in Cambridge Bay of the Kitikmeot Regional Public Hearing. Just a reminder for the new participants that came in, the emergency exits include the one you came through, one at the front and one at the back here. Washrooms are as you walk in, and with the coffee, tea, and snacks, please help yourself throughout the day. Again, cell phones, please put them on mute. I just put mine on. With that, Mr. Chair, I will turn it back to you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik, Sharon. Yesterday, the presenters of Gjoa Haven did not finish their presentation. *(Translated)*: This morning I was told that you did not finish, Jeannie. We have some items to discuss. *(English)*: Beth if you could give Jeannie the microphone to make a quick statement. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Jeannie Ukjuk, Hamlet of Taloyoak. Yesterday, we had concerns about preservation of Boothia Peninsula and the KIA Board for this region. We have not heard fully from them yet to date. If they are able to also make a point of our concern at this proceeding, it would be a relief to my community and the group I work with. I don't think I had any clear answer from KIA as Taloyoak delegation, or the board of KIA had no clear standing to our concern. We have not seen them in our community to explain what was said yesterday at this proceeding. It was the first time I've heard.

The support is not there, and it confuses me how we will proceed with the project we have in mind. For those of us who are landowners and the communities, KIA is supposed to be our Designated Organization head along with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporation and their population in Nunavut. The support is just not there. It has been an ongoing problem along with the HTO organizations. They have told me that they have heard nothing with the community concern. I emphasize the support is not there. I don't even think the local land committee has met with the regional organization concerning Taloyoak's concern. This is just a short, short presentation. We need answers to the community's concern.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I think you have a comment. I don't think it is a question. If it can be answered, Peter, you may answer the concern. *(English)*: Just a reminder to state your name and board's organization. Go ahead, Peter.

Peter T: Qujannamiik. We have met with the KRWB on several occasions. We brought forth the concerns with Taloyoak. We have met with a staffer of SP HTO and the intention was to carry on communication to see what the next step would be. Every community has an elected board representative for KIA, and those are channels that the most organizations should be going through, because at the end of the day, we are just staffers. We can relay the information along to the board through our executive director. In any case, every community has a representative to KIA. Usually that is where the process starts. If you want to get information to the leadership, that is where it usually goes through. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jeannie?

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: The local land committee, will you be coming into the community? Just so we are clear where each organization stands. I just want to emphasize, what do we do? We do not see any support to our concerns in our community. From my understanding, John Kooktook (*name phonemically spelled*) has been told of the community concerns. Perhaps he is relaying community concerns to your organization. I know he is fully bilingual and for him not be understood is almost impossible. My understanding is to just come into the community. Deal with us in person rather than going through one delegate.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter, go ahead.

Peter T: Qujannamiik. Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I appreciate the concerns of Ms. Jeannie Ujuk. We will do our best. We had agreed after our staff meeting with the manager of the HTO that we are going to I keep an open line of communication. That was our intent. There are certain documents that are required to get the full understanding of some certain issues. Those have to be changed, sent forward, and looked out. If we don't have those documents, it is very difficult to analyze or evaluate and form a support around the initiative that the Spence Bay HTO has. At the end of the day, we do want to keep open lines of communication with the HTO and the hamlet. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: Thank you. We will turn our attention to the panel. We will get back to our agenda. Just a reminder before we hear you to state your name and organization for the record. Ensure the mic is close to you so we can hear.

Presentation by the Kugluktuk Hamlet and HTO:

Lucy Taipana – Hamlet Council

Randy Hinanik – Kugluktuk - HTO

Darlene Hokanak – Kugluktuk HTO

Randy: Good morning, everybody. Randy Hinanik with the Kugluktuk Hunters and Trappers Organization along with Lucy Taipana from the Hamlet of Kugluktuk, and Darlene Hokanak from the Kugluktuk Hunters and Trappers Organization as well.

This morning, the Kugluktuk HTO is in agreement with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association on behalf of the Draft Plan. Our chairperson, Larry Adjun, has forwarded me some information to pass on. He wanted me to pass on the message that our mobile calving and post-calving protection measures have been made in effect with the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board. The freshwater crossings proposed are too large. We would like to see those brought down to something like a 5-kilometre buffer range.

We have been managing our caribou numbers and tags along with the Government of Northwest Territories Regional Wildlife Organization since 2007. We are currently the only HTO that has been doing predator management with the wolf bounties that we have started with the Government of the Northwest Territories. That has been going on for the past three years now. We recently have been informed that predator management for wolves in Nunavut will be extended to Nunavut-wide now.

As for the three caribou herds that we currently harvest from around the Kugluktuk area, we have the Dolphin and Union herd, the Bluenose East herd, and the Bathurst herd to the south. We are currently in the works with the Government of the Northwest Territories and other Regional Wildlife Organizations on managing these herds. For all three herds we have a tag system, so we have a lot of restrictions in place already with these three herds. That is all for the HTO side at this point. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Hamlet representative?

Lucy:

(Translated): Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. My name is Lucy Taipana, Hamlet Councilor of the Hamlet of Kugluktuk. Stanley did a nice dedication to my late husband for the work he has done over the years, including myself. It was very appreciative. He worked for many years as a negotiator leading to today. The coworkers that he worked with, his fellow negotiators, thank you very much for being part of his life. As a hamlet councillor, passed to me as mayor, I will read this in English. I appreciate the interpreters at the same time for many of us participating so we can understand as participants. To ensure there are no mistakes in translation, I will speak in English and read from it.

(English): Kugluktuk feedback: Kugluktuk community members have provided feedback on the Draft Plan during NPC meetings including a March 2014 meeting to discuss the 2012 draft of the plan, and a November 2019 meeting to discuss the 2016 draft of the plan. Issues with the Plan: Community members have addressed several issues with the Draft Plan. The following key issues are explored in the summary document on migratory bird habitats, on-ice community travel routes, Hiukitak River Community Area of Interest, polar bear denning areas, caribou crossings in calving areas, and challenges with the planning process.

Issue 1: Protecting the migratory bird habitat. The 2016 proposed two migratory habitats protected areas near Kugluktuk: Bathurst Elu Inlet, and Lambert Channel with seasonally limited or fully banned several banned activities. This is what the community said about the mapping. From the 2019 NPC hearing, both areas need to be expanded. Protection should be extended to Reed Island. *(Translated):* The area is too small. We need to expand.

(English): How did the mapping change from the 2019 Plan? The area identified for expansion are mapped and designated Conditional Use, but it is unclear how they identified the migratory bird habitats. What concerns should be reviewed in the 2021 plan? The source was from the 2019 NPC hearing. Agree these areas are important bird habitats. Concern about the impacts of the restrictions on shipping and future mines in the area. Some members thought the restrictions were too strict.

Issue 2: On ice travel community travel routes. What did the community say about the mapping? The 2016 plan proposed seasonally protected routes from October 15 to August 14. Icebreaking would be banned during that time, during this time. Support for the identified on-ice travel route. Additional on-ice routes should be added. One should be removed.

How did the mapping change in the 2021 Plan? Additional on-ice routes were added. The route identified for removal by the community was not removed. On-ice travels routes were designated for Conditional Use Areas. What concerns should be reviewed in the 2021 Plan? Protection until Aug 14 is too long. Restrictions should end in June. The noise and vibration from icebreaking disturbs animals and shouldn't be allowed at any time.

The Hiukitak River Community Area of Interest is Issue 3. How was this issue addressed in the 2016 Plan? The draft identified the Hiukitak River Community Area of Interest as a protected area with a number of activities prohibited year-round. What did the community say about the mapping? Most people do not use this area but recognize its importance. How did the mapping change in the 2021 Plan? The Hiukitak River Community Area of Interest was included and designated as Limited Use. You can look at the definition on page 3. What concerns should be reviewed in the 2021 Plan?

Support the area outlined as the Area of Interest. The entire inlet could be considered as a park. Concerns that ships will be allowed to move through the inlet.

Issue 4: Protecting caribou sea ice crossings, freshwater crossings, calving and post-calving areas. How was the issue addressed in the 2016 plan? The plan included maps of important caribou sea ice and freshwater crossings as well as calving and post-calving areas. The ice crossing area in Coronation Gulf seasonally limiting ice breaking. The water crossing, calving and post calving areas were designated as protected areas, which applies restrictions on a number of activities. What did the community say about the mapping? The community agreed with mapped areas on sea ice crossings but also added more areas. Some changes proposed to mapping freshwater crossings. Agree with calving and post-calving areas but identified extensions and missing areas.

How did the mapping change in the 2021 Plan? Caribou sea ice crossing areas were expanded and designated Conditional Use. Caribou freshwater crossing areas were expanded and designated Limited Use. Caribou calving and post-calving areas were added and expanded and designated Limited Use. What concerns should be reviewed in the 2021 Plan? Some disagreement with protected area status for freshwater crossings since it is already on Inuit Owned Lands, would rather be labeled as Valued Components. Some calving areas may be missing from mapping. Would prefer seasonal restrictions only when caribou present.

Additional issues: The 2019 NPC hearing minutes identified a polynya that should be protected, a stretch of open water surrounded by ice, especially in the Arctic areas. The 2019 NPC hearing minutes want more opportunities for economic development.

Feedback timeline: 2012 draft plan, initial of draft plan was created. The 2014 hearings simplified consultation record with general comments produced. 2016 plan updated on feedback. 2019 hearings detailed minutes recorded and summarized in this document. Feedback focused on NPC raised. 2021 Plan, the final Draft Plan of the Plan created feedback based on feedback. 2022 hearings, the final hearings scheduled in regional hubs.

(Translated): That is the final presentation from the hamlet of Kugluktuk I would like to make a comment to the Commissioners. When you do your translation, you have always neglected Inuktitut translation, although you provide translation. An Inuktitut writing system is not recognized, although the language is recognized. Inuktitut translation should also be provided so translators and interpreters can interpret properly. We use this writing system, and it is never translated. It would also help people who want to learn this dialect. When it is not written in many meetings, it does not help. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. Are there any questions to the panel? Sharon, any questions? Qujannamiik. Are there other community questions. Go ahead.

Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik, HTO of Taloyoak. I have a comment for the record. Kitikmeot east always supports Kitikmeot west with whatever they want, because we are Inuit. For some reason, we don't get the same support from what we want from Kitikmeot west. I don't know why it is that way, but we are Inuit, so we always support what Kitikmeot want, just for the record. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: It is a general comment. It is not a question. Questions please from the community delegates. *(Pause)*.

I don't think there are any. Registered participants, do you have any questions to the panel? *(Pause)*. It appears there are none. Thank you. Do you have additional comments, panel?

Lucy: *(Translated)*: In relation to climate change, it has changed drastically over the years. There appears to be no great concerns up here of climate change, especially on ice conditions, the land, and eroding shores. The weather has become very late in freeze-up. The seasons have changed. Have you included this in you Plan how we should handle it in the future?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. Jonathan Savoy?

Chairperson: Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Lucy, for the question. The issues of changing climate and changing environment having impact on the timing of different events has been considered in development of the Plan generally. In response to changing circumstances, the Commission also notes that the dates that are included in the Draft Plan are eligible for being adjusted through a minor variance process for specific projects. In addition, the Plan is meant to be a living document that can be changed over time to reflect any changing circumstances. So, a Plan amendment could be applied for either by a project proponent to adjust those dates, more than a minor variance would allow for, or to simply adjust the dates in the Plan to reflect the current reality at any time. Thanks.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. That concludes our questioning period.

(Applause)

Next on the agenda is NTI, Nunavut Tunngavik.

Presentation by Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated

James Eetoolook – First Vice President

Burt Dean – Wildlife Department

Christopher Kalluk – Lands Department

Nada Gonzalez - Advisor

Marie Belleau – Legal Counsel

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Good morning. Welcome NTI to the table, to the proceedings. You may proceed. Thank you.

James E: *(Translated)*: Thank you. Good morning. I think the weather is closing in. My name is James Eetoolook, First Vice President. I have support staff with me as advisors: to my left is Burt Dean with

Wildlife Department, and Erin Green also works with that department. Nada Gonzalez is our advisor. Marie Belleau, Lawyer. Christopher Gillis works at the local office in Lands Department.

Thank you for coming here so we can discuss the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan by the Nunavut Planning Commission. The *Nunavut Agreement* says we have to work on the process of this project and how we can properly plan. There are many things that have to be corrected and amended. We are here today to discuss the Nunavut Land Use Plan and to plan what will take place, how it should proceed. It is not just for only us here today. It is for the whole territory, Nunavut, and the country in general. We need a plan so we can proceed.

Thank you for working on this project. It is very important work. You have invited many delegates and other organizations so the Nunavut Planning Commission can be heard. I am happy to be here participating in this proceeding in Cambridge Bay for Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. There are five public hearing so far conducted by the Nunavut Planning Commission. First is in this region. I want to recognize community delegates, especially the Hunters and Trappers Organizations. This is your land. You know what is best, how it should be planned.

I am happy that we are here discussing what should take place and how it should be prepared, but Nunavut Tunngavik has concerns at this stage on the Plan. The amendments need to be made, additions have to be made, as this is our concern, although we respect what has been done today in the Plan. I know at the end, there will be a final product, and it will be proper. I respect you, Commissioners, you staff especially who have worked tirelessly to produce these documents, how it was produced, what is in the future, and what is planned. Continue doing good work. We need to do the best for our land in our Nunavut and its people. Up there on the screen is my short presentation. These are NTI concerns and what we think should be done.

Inuit rights have to be recognized and worked towards. The rights produce many items that would enable the territory and people to make way and to change for themselves in the many things that they are concerned with. We don't need to be told, as the population up here, this is the best way to proceed so you can have a better life. NTI, this is why we appreciate and respect the delegates here to tell us what their concerns are in their localities. The Nunavut Land Use Plan has to be completed, and according to the *Land Claims Agreement*, we have our work not just toward the people. The wildlife should be looked after and planned for. We have heard over the years there are many endangered species being reduced to low numbers, but the Inuit rights as hunters, surface rights are very important to the population.

The other concern NTI has in what you are planning, it could be technical. In the Land Use Plan what has to be produced? How do we get this done? How do we complete it? What do we include in the Land Use Plan? NTI respects the Nunavut Planning Commission as a whole in general. The production you are producing, NTI also has concerns and the federal government for your participation in this process so we can get the Plan complete. There will be three signatories who will have to approve this Plan as it is presented and prepared by the Nunavut Planning Commission. So, we will need to hear what your worries are, what concerns you, and how we will react to it and respond to it.

Even though as it is, the Plan is very important to the Inuit population and to NTI, we have to be prepared how the land will be planned, the contents, animals, Inuit needs, to the communities and to the whole in general so the future can be brighter in our territory. We are trying very hard that

this Nunavut planning be established fully. NTI has worries on the initial plans that were produced and how they can be amended so they can be acceptable. How the Nunavut planning will take place, NPC has prepared this document. It says that the Plan will benefit all of the Inuit. As it is in our land, the Plan, how it was prepared, how it will be used, it has to be a proper document for our future and our people and include amendments if we have to. How will we conserve wildlife, the economy, and the people that will benefit from the economy? NTI works very hard and respects the Plan and hopefully our needs can be amended and the Plan to be expected. How will we deal with Inuit people in the communities according to the *Nunavut Agreement*? The Plan has to include the wellbeing of the Nunavut communities in the Nunavut Plan.

I think I have heard as NTI that the concern in Nunavut is towards wildlife and for safeguarding of the safety and Inuit hunting rights, and the food security from the harvesting in the territories has to be a first priority in this Plan. These are what NTI sees as a priority. We recognize how you have prepared the Plan. The HTOs are instrumental in each community in your Plan and Regional Wildlife Organizations are priority in your Plan also. There are also RIOs in Nunavut who are very interested in Nunavut wildlife. These all have to be included in the Nunavut planning.

Our Regional Organizations, you have to work with them to see what their ideas and see how this Plan can work and function properly towards the Nunavut population. Let's not forget Inuit communities, their culture, their way of life and how we should support their needs. NTI recognizes and has concerns that the Plan related to HTOs, Kitikmeot Regional Council, Kivalliq, Qikiqtaaluk, how they will react to your Plan. The Plan, any plan, can always be made better. Communities have to be participating, especially NTI.

We are in support of you with polar bear populations, how to safeguard the species, and the walrus haul-out areas. Although this region does not have any walrus population, your Plan indicated where these species are and the support has to be there and preserved for these species. Migratory birds also have to be protected and planned, as there is throughout the whole region in Nunavut, and the caribou habitats. We have to recognize that these are important species in all of the regions, although there are different caribou herds. How will we preserve these species, to look after them, to care for them? NTI believes truly that the polar bear protection is of paramount importance and should be priority in all of the regions. NTI, what we are able to do and what is in front of us as a job, you as a planning commission prepared this document for the entire community and its population. It applies to all regions, the Inuit.

The business owners are also concerned about the economic wellbeing to their regions and to their communities. How will the economy emerge in the regions and what job creations will there be? When we created and negotiated this *Agreement*, the economy was of paramount importance with self-government, Inuit lifestyle. Sometimes your Plan really impacts many people in negative ways. Your 2021 Plan was very good in many ways. For instance, NTI has power, and at they hold 1.8% of the subsurface rights in the territory. In that first plan, it was indicated there, but I did not think it went far enough. I think it should have gone to 43%. For the vast territory, this percentage is very small. NTI is concerned that these areas should be amended to reflect the real need of the Inuit in our territory.

As NTI, the Plan you have presented reflects what the region and Inuit needs are. I think some of them would have small impact to the communities as it states in the Plan. Inuit rights, Inuit concerns in our territory have to be addressed fully. For people in Nunavut, Inuit Owned Lands is a little

different than other problems. They are different from federal government territorial lands, so Inuit lands have to be prepared accordingly so it can be much better and more towards Inuit culture and how Inuit should manage their land.

NTI believes the wildlife protection should be of priority in our regions so we can accomplish all of these, for instance, in 50% of the Inuit lands. The other concern that we have towards NTI in this Plan is to encourage government. The government should work in a way that when you apply your policies, it should be obligated to work with the Nunavut Plan according to the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement. This has been a stumbling block for many years and has to be corrected. For instance, the Government of Canada has participated in IIBAs, and the permits applications of how they should be progressing, how people should apply for them. In our Nunavut territory, existing parks, wildlife areas, migratory bird sites, sanctuaries, these have to be in place, as they have been already and not be amended. We understand that the Government of Canada has concerns about some of the zones. They have concern with the word Limited Use on lands in this Plan. We have to have a little more clarity in reflection that international concerns have to be looked at as well. Freshwater and everything, all the plans related to the 2021 Plan, we respect as NTI. There are lands that are prohibited for long-term conservation of mammals. The Inuit according to the *Agreement*, have all the rights. They can negotiate and plan what their needs are, a lot of negotiating with the federal government, even up to the point. So I feel that the *Nunavut Agreement* has big concerns for the people of Nunavut, and both levels of government should be adhering to what we need.

I said briefly that NTI is requesting to know what the Planning Commission what you have prepared in 2021 should be revised, should be amended. You will have to present it as an amended product for the final Plan. NTI believes the Plan should also contain stricter control of wildlife preservation in all the regions according to what Regional Wildlife Organizations need. They are concerned for their land in their region, so we are asking the Nunavut Planning Commission to make amendments, consult. Concentrate on wildlife so the population could be healthy. Inuit rights as hunters should also be addressed and what their needs are as harvesters in each of the region through the Regional Wildlife Organizations. With these things in mind, the Plan could really benefit Inuit in Nunavut.

We know and we respect to work with other organizations. It is very hard at the best of times. Working with HTOs or RWOs, you as a Commission, you can work together quite well to come up with the Plan. So in concluding my presentation, the Nunavut Planning Commission Draft and its contents, concentrate on Inuit wellbeing. We will support that area. It is important. Community concerns are very important to us. Always consult them so you as a Commission prepare a good Plan. The Plan you have will have to be a living document, as you have said, so it is best now to prepare it well for future use of the communities, the regions, and the organizations. Thank you. Thank you. We know that you will plan well.

In my conclusion, the plan you have, it is a huge territory. It is the biggest one in the world that an organization has ever attempted to produce. We are not alone of who will benefit from the Plan, but the world, the Canadians will benefit from what we have. We need to finish this product, I say. For those who have selected land in the Kitikmeot, we had a meeting in Kugluktuk. The meetings were 12 hours. It was tedious work to get where we are today. We skipped breakfasts and lunches. We negotiated around the clock. We have to remember their hard work when we are preparing something towards what they wanted, what they envisioned for Nunavut. Traditional lands, wildlife, and camping areas are of foremost importance to them when they prepared the *Nunavut*

Agreement. After ratification, it was finally amended and accepted. It took a lot of work, so when you plan for the future, do it well.

(English): You guys said, let's rewrite it. I think all of us have a responsibility, even Inuit, they have a responsibility. The government has a responsibility, Nunavut, and Inuit themselves have a responsibility to implement (*too fast, inaudible*). It is going to be eventually put in writing how the land will be used. Let's take that and respect it. You know, we can work together. We have differences. We will have differences all the time. Not only here will we have differences. The government will have differences. Industry will have differences, but we have to respect the onus of the land and the Settlement Area. I think that is our goal. We didn't just sign. We signed to be responsible for implementation of the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*. Thank you very much. If you have questions, I have staff here that will be able to answer questions with me. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. Thank you for your presentation. Any questions to the panel on the presentation? Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much, James, for your presentation. In NTI's written submission and during the presentation today, it has been noted that NTI and the RIAs feel the 2021 Draft Plan unnecessarily constrains decision-making and management rights over Inuit Owned Lands and calls for an approach for Inuit Owned Lands with a requirement for different land use requirements on Inuit Owned Lands compared to Crown Lands. I would like to ask what specific options does NTI recommend for managing Inuit Owned Lands from a land use planning perspective?

James E: Qujannamiik, James Eetoolook. Burt Dean will answer that question.

Chairperson: Yep, Qujannamiik. State your name and organization. Thank you.

Burt D: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Burt Dean with NTI's Wildlife and Environment Department, and I will get Nada to help me out more on this. In terms of specifics, I don't think that we are in a position to be able to say specifically how that would go about. It has been talked about the last few days. We need engagement with the communities, whether it is the Hunters and Trappers Organizations with their Regional Wildlife Boards, but also with the Regional Inuit Associations.

Again, as we have heard the last few days, there is still a lot of discussions that need to happen. We can elaborate and provide more detailed responses to you, but in terms of what you are asking about specifics, it is more about a process. Delegates are here, and there are a lot of expectations that they are representing the communities. I think we just have one delegate from Kugaaruk, and Taloyoak has been doing a lot of work in their community around it, so there have been a lot of discussions. We heard from Kugluktuk this morning. So, some communities have had that opportunity to discuss IOLs, but I think the concern is, we want to make sure communities understand what the implications are. As James indicated, Inuit selected those Inuit Owned Lands, but we don't have that necessarily documented to say exactly what that is, and values change with time. I am going to stop there, but I would like to ask Nada to just supplement.

Nada: There is one example in the submissions. Sorry, Nada Gonzalez with NTI team as a consultant. There is one example in the written submissions, and I would state first that in the joint submission

between NTI and the Regional Inuit Associations, there is a desire to retain the right to Inuit decision-making and management over Inuit Owned Land, and also a desire to ensure that the values for which the Commission identified for wildlife are also considered in that process. So, there is one example in the written submission.

Recently, there has been correspondence to Hunters and Trappers Organizations to get their views and open discussions with the Hunters and Trappers Organization on this concept, and it is for the key bird migratory sites, those Class 1 key bird sites on Inuit Owned Land. We want to discuss with the Hunters and Trappers Organization a process on Inuit Owned Lands that would be different than Crown lands. On Crown Lands on those Limited Use Areas, the suggestion is that the prohibited uses continue. For Inuit Owned Lands, there is an interest in discussing. The Regional Inuit Associations and Nunavut Tunngavik would discuss with the Hunters and Trappers Organization when a proposal comes forward if it was in a key bird migratory site that was also on Inuit Owned Lands whether that project should go ahead given that the site has been marked important for key bird migratory sites.

I recall the presentation earlier from the HTO in Cambridge about an issue with sandpipers, so that would be an example. The underlying premise on this is the local Hunters and Trappers Organization would be the best place to know what migratory birds might be impacted by a proposal and would know how a proposal could be approached. If the Hunters and Trappers Organization and the Regional Inuit Association agreed that a proposal could go forward and still protect the migratory birds, then there should be the flexibility on Inuit Owned Lands to move forward with certain proposals.

What we are suggesting is that there is a discussion about a process that would take place different on Inuit Owned Lands versus Crown Land to respect that the *Nunavut Agreement* gives Inuit substantial rights, for not just title of Inuit Owned Lands, but management of those lands. The Land Use Plan does apply to Inuit Owned Lands, but it must apply in a way that minimizes the impacts to that Inuit right to manage those Inuit Owned Lands.

Marie B: Marie Belleau, Nunavut Tunngavik. I just want to supplement and support what my colleagues have mentioned. Just on the idea of treating Inuit Owned Lands in a different way than Crown Lands, it is not a new idea. It is actually entrenched in the *Nunavut Agreement* where special attention has to be devoted to Inuit Owned Lands in and of itself. As far as we are aware, currently in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, there is only one very short paragraph that discusses Inuit Owned Lands, and maybe in the *Options and Recommendations* here and there. All it says in Chapter 1 is that the Land Use Plan will apply, and it has to reflect the Inuit goals and objectives on those Inuit Owned Lands. So, we are on the same page there.

But, what has the Commission done to give that special attention to Inuit Owned Lands in and of itself? Just that the fact that they exist, the fact that they are there, and who owns the rights to those lands as landowners, that is a question – I think it is a fair question that could be asked. It does not have to be answered now, but it is not something that we have invented. That is how the *Agreement* has to be read as a whole, and every section has to be harmonious.

As Eetoolook mentioned, and he was there during those negotiations, it was a big sacrifice that Inuit made. It was a huge tradeoff that Inuit made in order to come to an agreement and to approve the *Nunavut Agreement*. Inuit collectively, not just NTI, it is a collective right. We don't own a lot of

land in total in Nunavut. It is a very small percentage of subsurface and surface rights. There was an intention there. There are many purposes behind the selection of Inuit Owned Lands and what they should be for, but part of it is for self-sufficiency, and also for conservation and otherwise.

So, it is an actual Inuit right. That is why it is so important to preserve opportunities and possibilities for those lands. Land use planning can't be done in Nunavut in the same way as elsewhere in the world or across Canada even because Nunavut is unique. It is distinct where Inuit negotiated with the government this treatment, a constitutionally protected treaty. In that treaty, Inuit have become landowners. Where do you see that elsewhere in Canada, a very similar situation? It is absolutely unique, so land use planning has to consider this fact. It is an Inuit right. That is why we also mentioned the importance of the right for Inuit collectively to be able to negotiate Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement for benefits for the collective as Inuit as a whole, not just an organization, not just the other organization, it is collective rights.

So, how the NPC and how the Land Use Plan is going to reflect and devote that special attention to the fact that Inuit Owned Lands exist with their own rights around that is to be determined. That is I think, what we are all trying to figure out, but it can't just be mentioned in passing. So far, I think what we are seeing in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan is that Inuit Owned Lands are mentioned in passing but nothing further than that, so it is almost like consultation without accommodation. You can't just say that we know there are Inuit Owned Lands, you own this land. That's it. We are, in effect going to treat it like every other Crown Land or otherwise. I don't think that is a result that is...it is obviously not satisfactory for rights holders and landowners on behalf of Inuit as a collective.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks to all the NTI representatives here today for their responses. I would just like to note that the NPC still requires details of the distinct approach that NTI feels is appropriate on Inuit Owned Lands in the Land Use Plan. I will just ask if NTI anticipates being in a position to provide more specific details on this distinct approach before the close of the record on January 10, 2023. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. James?

James E: James Eetoolook, Nunavut Tunngavik. Nada will answer that question. Thank you.

Nada G: Nada Gonzalez, Nunavut Tunngavik. Yes, that is the desire. Each region has different approaches to this as well, so those discussions are ongoing. You will be hearing further during the other regional hearings about different concepts for this. The intention is to provide as much detail as possible to the Commissioners by the close of the record. As Marie has said, there is an expectation that the Land Use Plan will approach the right to Inuit decision-making on IOLs in a way that limits impacts. The effect should not be that Inuit are unable to use their right that they have to manage those lands. So we understand that the Land Use Plan applies to Inuit Owned Lands, but it should apply in a way that limits the negative impacts on Inuit ability to make decisions on those lands.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Brian, go ahead.

Brian: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Brian Aglukark, Nunavut Planning Commission. First of all, I think we are unclear in your presentation in relation to Inuit Owned Lands. This is our land. Inuit

owns the land. The *Nunavut Agreement* was negotiated for Inuit, and today before we heard from Inuit delegations what their aspirations are. You as NTI, now you are saying Inuit have a *Nunavut Agreement*, so the protection of land can be had, and you as NTI staff will make a plan. We as Nunavut Planning Commission, we travel to the communities and consult with the populations about Inuit culture, Inuit harvesting rights. On their own Inuit Owned Lands, they don't think of it as a divided land category. IOL at times is discussed as we travel to the communities as Nunavut Planning Commission. We have consulted with territories. Yesterday we have heard Inuit here in the Kitikmeot, and we as staff concentrate on Inuit. Our Planning Commission has been designated under the *Land Claims Agreement*. Our concerns are with Inuit, their culture, their way of life, their harvesting rights.

The plan is not yet complete. Jonathan said okay you show the way how the IOLs will be emerging as a parcel for Inuit. How will it be? I know negotiations were very hard. Because of that, we are here today as a result. We are here and are concerned about it. I will tell you this. We have our relative differences, but our goal for our people for the territory is exactly the same here. As the Planning Commission, with NTI when they signed the *Nunavut Agreement*, the understanding is for Inuit rights. We have been working toward that, but nothing much has come out of it. So, here I ask what do you think of the RIOs working in relationship with NTI?

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. James Eetoolook, First Vice President. I will answer your questions, but it will be supplemented by one of the staff. I will answer. Since the *Agreement*, the regions were given a designation to look after their own parcels of land in their regions. Inuit Owned Lands were to be taken over by RIOs. This is where we were able to make the designation, because each region identified the parcels, whatever the organizers may be. Not only that, everybody was given a chance to make the selection and work with Inuit Designation Organizations to show parcels of land.

I know you mentioned we have different working ethics but the goal is the same. This hearing by Nunavut Planning Commission, when you became a reality, I was a participant. You have been designated to work in this area. I work with many Inuit who own many of the lands, Inuit Owned Lands. Their wishes are where we stand now. The Commission was designated what they think if this body was to become a reality and work on Inuit needs.

Here in 2021, the Draft Land Use Plan restricts parcel of lands in many ways. You mentioned that NPC is working for the benefit of the territory according to the *Land Claims Agreement*, and we have heard there are too many restrictions, although the parcel of land selection was given to the Inuit. This initial work has become blurred and becomes very limited in many ways. It is a reality, and the Plan will be ongoing for many, many years. This is why we seem to be obstructive in its process so it can be planned properly.

People in communities have a lot of ideas about the economy, the money, finances are always a concern. Many organizations, Inuit bodies think they will benefit greatly from these monetary issues, but don't forget that the real value is the abundance of wildlife. If we manage it properly, abundant wildlife can bring economy to each region. The bureaucrats at federal level or other Inuit organizations are concerned about the economy. At the same time, many are opposed to the mining industry, while at the same time they ask where the money is coming for the worker class to have good transportations, good vehicle, and other things.

So, the Plan you are creating now, although it is a good Plan, is not going to be written in stone. It will have to work for everybody, and you will hear from people and organizations that your Plan is not good enough. Our work is based on this particular segment in the *Agreement* where it was given to you. Answers to your questions will be supplemented by my colleagues.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Marie B: *(Translated)*: Marie Belleau, lawyer for NTI. Eetoolook has good answers, so I will supplement his answers. *(English)*: I think in every society there is differing opinions, even in one family or one community. There is nothing wrong with that. It is normal. It is, but here talking about Inuit Owned Lands and as land managers and landowners on behalf of Inuit as a collective, our concern is the that the decision is made for us, or it is made already when up to almost 50% of Inuit Owned Lands have a very specific designation associated to them. We have no more choice. We have no more opportunity. The opportunity is lost to a certain extent.

We have no more options other than maybe a plan amendment, but we all know that will not be a simple process. So, I think we would be remiss as landowners not to do everything we can to highlight the fact that Inuit have negotiated this right to own land and have self-determination over those lands. It does not mean the outcome is already predetermined, but right now, it is already predetermined. The decision is made for Inuit. That is where it is a concern, because it impacts the ability to look at various options, and I think this also applies to our concern to Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements where if these areas are already predetermined in the Land Use Plan, we have very limited options after that. It is an impact on very hard-fought rights that become limited. The decision is made already.

With the land use planning process, land use planning has a role, and it is very, very important. So, how do we marry those rights so as to not close the door and limit any further possibilities for Inuit as a collective to negotiate benefits on the one hand, or to determine what will be done on lands that Inuit selected and governments agreed? Everyone has agreed that Inuit would own those lands, so how do we respect that process as well?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Burt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Burt Dean with NTI, Wildlife and Environment. I just went back to this slide with the importance of the Nunavut Land Use Plan to help. Go down to the fourth bullet. A first-generation Nunavut Land Use Plan should focus on the issues that are most important to Inuit. It is not like we are going to get it all right this first time, and that's why we focused on the amendment process, or if we do need to change it, or things down the road.

Some communities are at a different stage in terms of what they want done with their lands. Then once they have that experience, and I think we saw it at some of the NIRB hearings in Baker Lake for the Kiggavik project around uranium. The community had a number of years of experience with Agnico Eagle being there with the Meadowbank Mine, so they were familiar with what they liked or what they didn't like, or there were things with it, so a lot of the comments at that NIRB hearing weren't necessarily about the Kiggavik project. They were about their experience with mining in general or what was going in that community. So, we are not going to get all the details in.

We are going to hear different perspectives, as was mentioned I think by Jimmy. The east has had less maybe experience or impact from development or exploration, whereas Cambridge Bay and Kugluktuk in the west, there has been a lot more experience with mining with the Northwest Territories, on the mainland, and things like that. There are different experiences between those communities, so how can we come up with a first-generation land use plan that focuses on the issues that are most important to you from the communities? What are your big issues? I think we have heard them, some of them, but some delegates have been involved in this process and at the workshops. For some, I think this may be just their first or second time. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. There will be further questions, but before that, we will take a break. Just a reminder, if you are going to talk or speak, state your name and your organization. Thank you for the questions and answers to this point. We are here to work with everybody. We will take a 15-minute break for now. Thank you

BREAK

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Okay, time to get started. Qujannamiik. We will resume to the panel for those of you who have more questions to the delegates.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director with the Nunavut Planning Commission. We do have some more questions, and I would just like to recognize and thank you so much for your presentation. We do look forward to continue working collaboratively and getting the specific recommendations that will help the Commission and guide the Commission with decision-making on the presentations and directions. Jonathan Savoy? I will turn it over to Jonathan, Mr. Chair. Thank you so much.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Among the required revisions to the 2021 Draft Plan, NTI in the written submission along with the Regional Inuit Associations state that in terms of legal obligations, Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements “must be enabled through land use designations.” We were wondering if you have any recommendations as to how IIBAs could be “enabled” through the Plan’s land use designations, or any updates you could provide on those discussions would be appreciated. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Just a reminder before we go to James that if you are going to use an acronym, please say the full name. Qujannamiik. James?

James: *(Translated)*: James Eetoolook, NTI. Nada will answer the question.

Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nada Gonzalez with the NTI team. There are ongoing discussions with the governments that are happening on how that could be facilitated. We are hopeful that there could be more direction on that. I think as a preliminary answer, we certainly will be following up in writing that when there are Plan requirements that outright would prevent the government from meeting legal obligations in the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements that there will have to be adjustments to the Plan requirements that would allow the governments to meet their legal obligations. That is the

general premise. Certainly there will be a follow-up response in writing specific to each of the Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements.

Marie: Marie Belleau, Nunavut Tunngavik. Yes, I just want to supplement Nada's response. I have alluded to it a little bit earlier in the same kind of vein as the discussion on Inuit Owned Lands. Again, Inuit negotiated very important and specific rights within the *Nunavut Agreement*, and that includes the right to negotiate Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements when there is long-term protection and conservation areas, as well as negotiating land ownership on Inuit Owned Lands. So, what we are seeing in both cases is an effect, what the consequence of this current Draft is on those two sets of very important collective rights for Inuit.

We always have to ensure at every step that the *Nunavut Agreement* is being respected and implemented. When it appears that through a land use planning process some of those very important rights are being skirted around or that an opportunity is missed, or an opportunity is lost, that is a huge concern for Inuit.

Again, similarly to the Inuit Owned Lands question, how do we avoid that? How do we get a result that marries both the land use planning process while respecting Inuit opportunities to negotiate Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements? As Nada said, it is still in discussion. We appreciate that it is on the Nunavut Planning Commission's radar. This is something that we all have to put our minds to, to see how that can work, how that can happen, while giving reassurance to Inuit that the opportunity is not lost forever, or that we have reassurance or certain commitments that even if lands are conserved or protected similarly to other types of conservation areas and those types of things, that the door is not closed forever. Again, the decision is not made for Inuit in that we don't miss an opportunity. In fact, it is Inuit who will be negatively impacted in the end.

We don't want Inuit to miss out on opportunities, miss out on possibilities to negotiate benefits for their communities. That is the main concern. How to do that is something that the *Nunavut Agreement* has to be read as a whole. This will be the first Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan, so all of these rights, obligations, and processes have to be conducted and implemented in a way where Inuit rights will not be negatively impacted as a collective.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, any other questions? Go ahead.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for the response to the previous question. Among another one of the "required revisions" to the Draft Plan, NTI has noted that the Draft Plan has not sufficiently reflected the goal of Nunavut Tunngavik and the Regional Inuit Associations of retaining decision-making and management rights over Inuit Owned Lands. We noted that I guess over 50% of Inuit Owned Lands across the territory are in a Mixed Use designation where all uses would be permitted. We are just wondering what Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated consider as sufficiently reflecting your goals on Inuit Owned Lands. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. James?

James: James Eettoolook. Nada will answer this.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Nada: Thank you for the question. Nada Gonzalez, Nunavut Tunngavik team. I think we answered part of this question already today, but to reiterate, there will be multiple goals for Inuit Owned Lands. As it is written, it is Inuit Goals and Objectives, so it is definitely going to be a range of goals. I will just repeat that a foundational goal for Inuit Owned Lands is the retention of decision-making authority over the Inuit Owned Lands. So, I think that is the foundation. Then there may be specific goals for specific regions or specific parcels. We will be following up on more details on that, but I think as the starting point, we are looking for the Land Use Plan to explicitly recognize that the right to manage Inuit Owned Lands is an important, and the Land Use Plan has been modified to reflect what the various Inuit goals and objectives are at a territorial level, at a regional area, and in some cases at a community level. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, no further questions? Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you Nada for the answer. I am wondering through James speaking and the presentation that you told us where to give priority and great weight. I thank you for that, with wildlife and the protection and the Inuit goals. I am wondering if you could provide further direction or guidance to the Commission. We have heard all of the community members and their presentations on behalf of their communities, and how they would like to see the land in and around their areas in regards to the HTOs and the hamlets, how they would like to see their land managed. Their presentations are very different from the Kitikmeot Inuit Association and NTI. I am wondering if you could give us some guidance of how we could bridge the differences so the Commission could make sound decision-making that would meet the needs of the communities, all of the Inuit represented here today, the organizations, and NTI. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. James?

James: James Eetoolook, Nunavut Tunngavik. Nada will respond.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Nada: Nada Gonzalez, Nunavut Tunngavik. That is an important question. I think at this point, it will be a preliminary answer, because a lot of these consults are still evolving. At the outset, I would say given the presentation this morning that there is a desire to protect wildlife. It is an important priority. In the presentation, there is a clear statement that there is a strong belief that Inuit Owned Land decision-making can and should be in keeping with also wildlife priorities. There is a desire to do both so that Inuit retain Inuit decision-making on Inuit Owned Lands, and also wildlife is adequately protected and that there are protection measures.

We are working on how that can be accomplished. There has been start to those discussion for the key bird migratory sites. They are going to continue to have discussions. There will be different approaches that will be heard in front of the Commission from a regional basis, and we know that from the written submissions. We don't see a contradiction in the two concepts, that wildlife can be protected and Inuit can maintain decision-making over Inuit Owned Lands. It is working out how that happens and how it happens on a regional basis.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Marie: Marie Belleau, Nunavut Tunngavik. I'm not sure I have a lot to add that will be of value to this question; just general observations that, as I mentioned earlier, it is normal and natural that there are varying opinions, values, priorities, perceptions in a community, amongst a cultural group, and in a family. Even one individual from one day to the next, they have different ideas and different opinions. So, there is nothing wrong with this picture. No one is wrong in this. We each have mandates in our organizations. HTO has a mandate. A hamlet represents certain people. NTI has a mandate. Regional Inuit Associations have a mandate. Even within NTI, we have various departments. We have Social and Cultural Department, Lands and Resource, Wildlife and Environment, Human Resources, Legal, we have all of those mandates and views and perspectives within one same organization. There is no conflict there. There is nothing wrong with having different mandates and different perspectives and priorities.

I think the Nunavut Planning Commission has a difficult task, but you mentioned that right from the introduction on the first day that you have a difficult task to marry and to find a way to look at all the different groups, interest groups, right holders groups, any kind of group that will be contributing to this land use planning process to weigh all of those perspectives, all of the submissions, and come to a final determination. You have a very difficult job.

But as Inuit, to have differing perspectives, there is not anything wrong in any society. That is the case all across Canada. In Canada, we are all Canadians, but there are differing philosophies and perspectives. That's fine. Here we are not against each other. We all want the same thing: thriving Inuit, healthy environment, and prosperity for Inuit in the long-term. What that will look like is different for every person, and it is different for different organizations, but is one right and the other one wrong? No. I want to say there is no disagreement. There is no conflict. In a way, we all want to listen to each other and the Planning Commission has a difficult task of making those final determinations.

As NTI, we are a signatory. In the end, we will be part of the approval process. So, we also will be part of that task of looking at the bigger picture, looking at the Plan as a whole. It is not going to be easy, but NTI I think we have highlighted very specific elements that refers to very specific rights that were negotiated in the *Nunavut Agreement*. I think that is part of what we have highlighted. It is fine to ensure that those rights are preserved to a certain extent. I am not sure if that is helpful, but I wanted to add that.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon, do you have another question? Go ahead.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director of the Nunavut Planning Commission. I thank you for acknowledging the challenge that Commissioners have to strike a balanced Plan and listen to all of the evidence that is being presented. The Commission, you know this process has been a long process. There is a lot of pressure on the Commission to conclude the planning process. We encourage and continue to ask for open communications, specific solutions and recommendations, while respecting all parties as we are mandated to do.

The record does close on January 10th, so I would ask NTI and all others to please recognize that the communities have been saying they want this Land Use Plan. Others want this Land Use Plan, and this is a first-generation Plan, as James eloquently said. It is a first-generation Plan. It is not going to be perfect, but there is opportunity to change it and amend it. We encourage everyone to give us your submissions, your solutions, your ideas, and we also encourage all participants to work

collectively to find opportunities where you have common ground and help the Commissioners make those decisions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It was a comment rather than a question. Jeannie, go ahead.

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Jeannie from Taloyoak. In the opening remarks this morning, the foremost concerns are the Inuit in the Nunavut area. Despite having said that, what the lawyer has mentioned seems to be conflicting from the opening remarks and the answers given by NTI legal counsel. I want as the Taloyoak community to be in harmonious relationships with organizations including NTI.

The land is designated, and I was made to understand that designations are very small compared to the territory. How can we say this in Inuktitut? It still varies region to region. We need this to be passed as well and become a firm policy. As for me, I understood I think that both of you as organizations, NTI and Kitikmeot Inuit Association, are looking for more strongarm tactics, more control of each community and Inuit needs. Why is this?

Kovalak was here and made a good presentation. It is very hard now to see a real benefit from the organizations that are representing us. Our needs always appear to be neglected. You have to be clear with us. Where do you stand? Even in harvesting, Inuit share the catches. We would like to have a continued relationship with our communities and region. How will this work in working harmony? How will you look at us? Are we at lower ranks, different ranks? How will this work?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. James.

James: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. James Eetoolook, Nunavut Tunngavik. There are always different tasks. It is our duty to make presentations even to this group on how the Plan should be. At this point, we will not solve what we are discussing. It will have to be refined in further meetings and further plannings. There will be many hearings within Nunavut. We can have a working relationship. You have said that we cannot have all we ask for, but the harmony can be there. We can work, even if the Plan is not approved. How can we refine it? How can we work at it? So our questions here at this briefing can all have answers to benefit everybody.

It is normal in all boards that no consensus takes place like Water Board, NPC, and other organizations, Even when the public hearings are concluded, you will have to analyze and see what was proposed by the people in the proceedings. Ideas have to be put together to determine if what we are coming up with is ideal for our future. I cannot say it is a bad idea. How do you know it is a bad idea when we are not there, and when we have a lot of room to make it much better?

It is always better to negotiate, to come up with a conclusion that would benefit everybody. At this hearing, it has its benefits so this Plan can go ahead. It is just that everybody is given a chance to voice their opinion – land users, organizations who want to use the land, Taloyoak Hamlet, and explorations for a stake at Boothia Peninsula. There are many organizations and many factors that we will have to agree to at the end. We cannot say this Plan is perfect. It needs amendments. It needs modifications.

There are many ways to acquire funding so all bodies who are concerned can start working on how we can work harmoniously, say with harvesting and other benefits to the community. They are there. Everything is not that easy when you get down to it and start planning on it. When we

negotiated with the federal government, everything we wanted on the table was not granted. Makivik and Inuvialuit experienced the same thing. Once the plans were there, their rights were granted. They found there were many flaws to it, but we keep going. We keep working to make amendments like the Nunavut Planning Commission should. If your Plan does not work and is not perfect, don't stop there. See what else what you can do so you can continue modifying it and make it work for everybody. These are just my comments. We are not opposing you. We are not in favor of you. We are just at this time a presentation of what our opinions are towards the Nunavut Land Use Plan. That is where we are right now.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Salomie.

Salomie: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. First of all, I would like to say that today, my aunt has a funeral in Gjoa Haven. There will be a funeral of my relative. I would like to thank you as NTI. First I say that when the Land Claim was signed, land was designated to different parcels. This has been an ongoing with modification and corrections from the mistakes James mentioned.

James mentioned that nothing comes easy to resolve. There will be problems and negotiations to correct what the problem is. I know this will take place. In 1986, it appeared we had no rights. It was very hard for people up here to have any rights until NTI started negotiating for us and our future and what we have today. They are quite beneficial, but when will Inuit will be understood what our real needs are so the future can have a relatively easy life? I just wanted to express my opinion to everyone, to the panel. I have no questions for you and no disagreements with you or the Planning Commission.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. David?

David T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Taloyoak hamlet councilor. To our community population and to the region in general, my concern is that - while NTI is sitting at the panel with the First Vice President and KIA has also a high-level designation - I think this would be beneficial. I will try to keep it short. Since the *Land Claims Agreement* was signed, our language, I was made to understand that it will be recognized. Now, where is this today?

I still understand to today If you don't clarify it to me I will eventually perhaps have it clarified to me. The language, the dialects, Canada, English, French. The Inuit language needs to be fully recognized, put into the constitution. That way we can feel we are part of the country, through KIA, through NTI, our policymakers, Nunavut Planning Commission. If this is not your priority, how will you deal with unilinguals? Even today there are advances, I understand. Inuk Governor General speaks in our language. Inuit members of parliaments. I think we should strive to keep our language alive, and the groups should work hard to pursue its legality. Work on this, my language. Someone said from Kugluktuk, Lucy Taipana, had the same concern. As for me too, I am very much in favor of empowering my language. Is it really in legislation, so I can't have my language? If it is to go on into the future, it will have to go through legislation as a protected language. I mention this. Thank you for listening to my concerns, Chair.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It is just a general comment. It is not a question. We hear it, and perhaps will discuss it during breaks. It has been heard what your concerns are. I think here, we will concentrate on the Nunavut Planning Commission hearings towards the use of the land. We want

to concentrate on this. We are not looking at other policies wherever they may arrive from as a policy. Questions please.

Paul I: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I will speak in both languages. At this hearing, we are using the word 'I' too much. That's not harmonious for decision-making. There are too many of you who seem to be working alone. This is not a working relationship when you say 'I' too much. It does not fit well into this meeting. We should show that we are working together, and there is too much 'me.' We will not come to conclusions as a group. When you speak, be more aware that it is not you, me, or someone.

(English): There are a lot of people who represent the agencies. We would like to hear represented agencies. "We heard," "We were." We might have to come back to that word 'I.' In your meeting, that 'I' might cost as much as \$1 million dollars or \$10 dollars. Some of us are almost word perfect in our minds, but not in our speaking. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I will take that as a general comment. Do you have questions please? Bobby?

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bobby Greenley, Kugluktuk Hunters and Trappers Organization Chair. This is just a question that probably KIA or NTI or may be both groups can answer. We have a lot of traditional camping areas. We have families that go and fill out the required paperwork to stake that area or mark that area. I don't know if I am wrong in saying that, but if that is the case, I want to know if both entities are going to have that information present for those families so we can make sure that those camping areas that are staked by those families are going to be on this list, so no other entities can come in and mark that area for mining, exploration, or what not. I don't know if I am wording that correctly. If I could get clarification for, not only around here but maybe other communities that have the same situations going on. It would be nice to get that cleared up. That way, everybody knows. Those families would know what is going on if other entities like mining exploration or whatever coming into their traditional camping area that they thought they had marked. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. James?

James: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik, Bobby. James Eetoolook, NTI. I mentioned before during negotiations, these were a huge concern at the time, traditional camps, outpost camps and Inuit Owned Lands as opposed to Crown Lands. Under the *Agreement*, it is part of the backbone, Inuit culture and Inuit way of life. It is still today. Sometimes industry without any consultation just placed themselves in areas for work. This was before. Each family has their traditional areas. It is a real part of the *Nunavut Agreement*, and it is a protection for your concern, your question.

When the Nunavut Planning Commission started their public hearings, it was very much in evidence that they care about this, and they consulted the communities how the land will be used and reflected in the final Nunavut Land Use Plan. I know if it is better if we could have it recorded, and it is. If it is not recorded, general comments of these sites are almost impossible to pinpoint.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

- Nada: Nada Gonzalez, Nunavut Tunngavik. I think this is the type of question that we can speak to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association and get back to you and the group. If we could get back to you during this hearing, I think we could provide a better response.
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. No more questions? Are there any more questions from the community representatives? *(Pause)*. I don't see any hands. Oh, go ahead.
- Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik with the Taloyoak HTO. I would like to know if we have an Inuit protected area, if we had it, could we take the Inuit Owned Lands and use them somewhere else in Nunavut? Qujannamiik.
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. James?
- James: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Qujannamiik, Jimmy for your question. if we can work on Inuit Owned Lands, are you asking on the parcels of lands?
- Chairperson: Jimmy, go ahead.
- Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. The Boothia Peninsula, we need conservation and protection of that area that Inuit has used. We don't want too many changes made to what we have been asking for.
- Chairperson: James, go ahead.
- James: *(Translated)*: James Eetoolook, Nunavut Tunngavik. Yes, we are pretty much aware that the land is very important to you at its designation. There are overlapping areas in different land designations to the groups.
- Chris: Qujannamiik, Chair. Chris Kalluk, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. To answer this, in the creation of Nunavut and the *Nunavut Agreement*, some communities gave up significant amounts of surface and subsurface Inuit Owned Lands, namely (*Qikiqtarjuaq?*), Pang, Chester, and so on. They gave up mineral title lands - Kimmirut, Iqaluit, Coral, Cambridge, Gjoa, Arctic Bay - received very little, giving up almost all their quantum of mineral title lands.
- To our knowledge, there was no formal charter agreement or understanding signed between the Regional Inuit Associations to formally recognize this transfer of land, the mineral titles during the creation of the *Nunavut Agreement*. It was simply decided that mineral title would be jointly held through Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated on behalf of all Inuit in Nunavut. If we were to look at transferring existing Inuit Owned Lands to lands elsewhere, we would have to renegotiate the *Nunavut Agreement*. It would have to be signed by His Royal Highness, our new king, just for thought. Qujannamiik.
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any there more questions to the panel? *(Pause)* It appears none. Thank you. Registered participants, are there any questions? Go ahead, Peter.
- Peter T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for allowing me to come back up here. Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I probably omitted a clarification when I did not mention Crown Lands during our presentation. KIA, of course, does have the jurisdiction and authority on Inuit Owned Lands. Specific to the question on HTO and IPCA, we are aware that it is a huge land mass area - initially,

approximately 67,000 square kilometers, that would impact approximately 12,000 square kilometers of Inuit Owned Lands. The rest is Crown Lands. KIA really does not have any jurisdiction over Crown Lands, but we do play a part in anything that may impact Inuit Owned Lands through Crown Lands. That is yet to be determined. That is why I did indicate that there are multiple parties that we have to discuss with and come to some sort of arrangement or an agreement, just for clarification. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It was a general comment by KIA. Do you have a question? Go ahead.

Jim M: Ulaakut. I'm Jim MacEachern, CAO with the Municipality of Cambridge Bay. My question is I guess for NPC, and it is more of a process question. I have been involved in these discussions since 2010. During that time, there has been a lot in terms of climate change. We have gone through three different MLAs, five different mayors, countless turnover on council, so priorities are constantly changing. These discussions have been going on for 15 years, and the record closes January 10th now. I'm wondering how we get beyond just these discussion stages, and what the next steps are.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon?

Sharon: Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Jim, for recognizing the lengthy process. The next steps: As you know, we are holding the five public hearings. The next steps will be after the public hearings. The record does close on January 10th. The next steps as outlined in the *Nunavut Agreement* will be for Commissioners to review the evidence and the submissions at these public hearings, and for the Commissioners to weigh the evidence, make decisions, revise the 2021 Draft Plan, and put forward the final version of the Plan to the signatory parties for consideration. The Commission has committed to doing that in early 2023. That was our commitment to the parties and others. So, those are the next steps in the process.

Does it end the process? Absolutely not. It will continue. As we have said, the document is a living document. Once we have an approved first generation Plan in place, the opportunity as new datasets become available, will be provided through minor variance, amendments, or the complete review of the Nunavut Land Use Plan as we go forward. I hope that answers your question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Someone has a question? Go ahead.

Pamela: Pamela Wong for the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board. I'm just wondering if NPC could briefly describe the amendment process. I'm just thinking if it took 15 years to get to this point, how easy would it be to make an amendment and if you have any comments on that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. I'm going to ask Jonathan Savoy to outline the current amendment process. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission, and thank you, Pamela for the question. The Commission's plan amendment process is generally set out

in the *Nunavut Agreement* and *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, but the Commission also has an internal procedure on how we conduct plan amendments, so I refer you to those for more detailed guidance.

In summary, any person, organization, or the Commission itself can propose a plan amendment at any time. That could be a company seeking to get approval for a project that does not conform or is not supported by a land use plan, or it could be from any individual or organization with new information available to reconsider the requirements of the Plan to update it, in effect.

The Commission is required to consider all plan amendments, all proposed plan amendments it receives. It can ask for additional information that may be necessary to give full and proper consideration of the proposed amendment. The Commission then has the discretion to identify the appropriate scope or scale of the public review of the proposed plan amendment. So, the Commission is required to publicly review each amendment but does have discretion to set how that process unfolds. That could range from a very straightforward administrative amendment, for example if a national park is fully established while an approved land use plan is in place, a plan amendment process could be conducted to remove that area from the jurisdiction of the land use plan. The Commission would post notice and perhaps invite comments, but there would not be need for public hearings and steps of that nature.

Of course, the plan amendment could be much broader in scope than an established national park. If that was a single community's secondary drinking water supply, for example, the discussion, engagement, and consultation around that proposed amendment could be relatively small in scale. But if there were large wholesale changes to the Draft Plan proposed that impacted a whole region or the entire territory, the required public review process would be necessarily greater.

The Commission would then be required to submit a recommendation, again to the federal government, the territorial government, and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated before the proposed plan amendment could take effect. The Commission would be able to recommend the proposed amendment be rejected, but in order to actually amend the Plan, it would need to go through to all three of the signatory parties to the approved Plan itself. I hope that helps. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any further questions from the registered participants?

(Pause)

I don't see any hands. There was someone from the public that wanted to ask a question too. I am not sure if he is still here, but I will give the opportunity for that person to ask the question from the public. *(Pause)* I guess he left. Qujannamiik.

(Translated): I don't think there are any more questions. It is becoming near noon. Thank you for the presentation. Be back at 1:15

(Applause)

Lunch Break

Chairperson: Unusakut. *(Translated)*: Welcome back. We will resume where we left off before lunch. I was reminded this morning that there is a funeral this afternoon, Sara Kakiok's (*name phonemically spelled*) relative. Let's keep that in mind. In our community in Pang, there is also a funeral today for one of our friends, so just keep that in mind. Let's stand up a short while in remembrance of our friends.

(Moment of Silence)

Qujannamiik. Sharon would like to comment before we proceed. Sharon?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. Everyone knows that the federal government declared Monday as a holiday. For the next part of our journey for everyone who has been asking, we consulted with the signatory parties. We have agreed that we are going to recognize the Queen, but in saying that, we have all agreed because we are on the road, we will be working that day and providing for all of our staff another day off as a recognized holiday. We will be taking the appropriate time during the day to pay tribute to the Queen, as it is her funeral. For everyone who has been asking, we will proceed with our public hearing commencing in Rankin Inlet on Monday. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: Welcome to the federal government for your presentation to the panel. You may proceed anytime.

Presentation by the Government of Canada

Terry Audla, Regional Director General with CIRNAC

Spencer Dewar, Director of Resource Management

Jeff Hart, Manager of Land Use Planning

Michelle-Claire Roy, Environmental Policy Analyst

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. First of all, my name is Terry Audla. I'm Regional Director General with Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. With me is Spencer Dewar, Director of Resource Management; Jeff Hart, Manager of Land Use Planning; and to my right Michelle-Claire Roy, Environmental Policy Analyst. Before I go to the presentation, I would also like to recognize other Government of Canada representatives that are here behind me. With Environment Canada and Climate Change is Lindsay Armer and Nathalie Lowry; Transport Canada, Anita Gudmundson and Scott Kidd; Department of National Defence we have Greg Matthews; Global Affairs, Rainer Duschinsky; and Department of Justice, Simon Gruda-Dolbec. At any point in time during questions and answers, I may draw on them as well if there is need for more clarity and more detail. Again, thank you, Mr. Chair for inviting us to speak today.

(Translated): Thank you to the Community of Cambridge Bay for allowing us to host these proceedings, and for all of you who are here, thank you for your attendance. We will be open for questions when we conclude.

(English): The Government of Canada would like to thank the Nunavut Planning Commission for the opportunity to review the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and to present here at the public hearings. The Government of Canada would also like to thank the community of Ikaluktutiak for hosting this public hearing for the Kitikmeot region. Developing a first-generation Nunavut Land Use Plan is a difficult, complex task, and the Government of Canada recognizes the efforts and commitments of the Nunavut Planning Commission.

Principles and objectives in Article 11 of the *Nunavut Agreement*, and Part 2 of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* require an understanding of how people are supported by the land socially, culturally, and economically, the values and priorities of residents, and particularly the aspirations Inuit have to determine their own path to future wellbeing. The result must be a plan that meets these aspirations, guides development, and also provides for conservation and other uses of the land.

Since the Plan was released 2021, the Government of Canada has been working to provide productive recommendations to the Commission, as well as working with the Government of Nunavut and the Designated Inuit Organizations to discuss issues we have in common. The Government of Canada continues to be committed to this process for the benefit of Nunavummiut and all Canadians.

The Government of Canada under the *Nunavut Agreement* and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* is an approving party to land use plans in Nunavut. In addition, it shares a role in ensuring the principles and objectives of the planning process are met. Ten federal departments and agencies have been part of the Government of Canada's work to review and provide recommendations to improve the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

This submission was developed on behalf of the Government of Canada in part, by the Canadian Coast Guard, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada, Department of National Defence, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Global Affairs Canada, Justice Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Parks Canada, and Transport Canada.

Representatives from each department are participating in these hearings, either in person or in viewing on the live stream. The summary of each department's mandates can be found in the annex at the end of this presentation. Just on another note, this presentation that you see on the screens is available at the front in all languages: Inuinnaqtun, Inuktitut, English, and French. Help yourselves to the copies that are available.

The Crown has a duty to consult because of its role in deciding whether to approve the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Crown relies on the Commission's process to assist with fulfilling the duty to consult. When drafting and revising the Plan, the Commission considers comments at the hearings and community meetings as well as any written submissions. These could include any concerns brought forward on potential impacts to Section 35 rights.

The Government of Canada encourages Indigenous governments and organizations to identify to the Commission any potential adverse impacts to their rights and how these may be addressed through the Draft Plan. The Government of Canada remains actively engaged throughout the Commission's process, listening to Indigenous concerns, and seeking any information on how they may be resolved.

The purpose of this presentation is to provide a high-level overview of the comments and recommendations submitted to the Commission by the Government of Canada on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The written submissions we provided to the Commission are on the public record. They are more comprehensive and contain more detail on the issues than we have time to present today. It is important to note that although we are identifying issues that need resolution, the Government of Canada is confident and committed to a collaborative process that will make progress toward developing a sound, well-supported, and clear first-generation Land Use Plan that can be successfully implemented.

The remainder of our presentation will focus on key outstanding issues and recommendations for how they may be resolved. We will then provide some conclusions and talk about a process for moving forward.

The Government of Canada's review is guided by our priority expectations for a first-generation Land Use Plan. These include that the planning and resulting plan legally comply with *the Nunavut Agreement* and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*. The Plan must be consistent with federal commitments and policies. The planning process has credibility, so it is clear that the development of the Plan is supported by a meaningful, inclusive, and transparent public and stakeholder consultation process. As well, the Plan must be clear, understandable, and provide certainty for users. The Plan must be practical, implementable, and conformity requirements must be clear, and the Plan should contribute to the efficiency of Nunavut's integrated regulatory system.

Our review is also guided by the Commission's *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals* that were developed by the Commission with the Government of Canada, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and the Government of Nunavut. The 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan has addressed many concerns that the Government of Canada brought forward in 2017 and 2018. There have been significant improvements. However, several substantive issues remain, and these important issues should be addressed and resolved prior to the Plan being submitted for approval.

Clarity and certainty in how the Plan should be read are critical to successful implementation of the Plan. There have been improvements from previous drafts, but there are still areas that need work. For instance, overlapping land use designations remain. These should be eliminated from the Plan, or clear guidance should be provided on how overlapping land use designations are to be applied to avoid ambiguous interpretation.

Language in the Plan requirements should also be improved to add certainty. The Government of Canada recommends adding guidance on how to interpret the application of Plan requirements, especially where designations overlap, and revising language to be clear and in line with legislation. For example, replacing the term "no person" with "no proponent" would be in line with the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* definition of proponent.

Maps are the basis for being able to understand and apply any land use plan. The accuracy of the maps that show the zoning in the Nunavut Land Use Plan are necessary for project proponents and regulators, as well as the Commission to make decisions about the requirements that the Plan intends to apply to a project. The map on the slide provides an overview of Cambridge Bay and those overlapping lands that are legally recognized, in addition to those in the Plan. As you can see, the overlap in this case is extensive. The Government of Canada understands that there were some

challenges experienced by the Commission in accessing certain map data and understands that work is underway to address this issue. Before a final Plan is submitted, the Government of Canada recommends that the Commission revise all maps in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan to improve their accuracy and use a consistent mapping standard for the Nunavut Land Use Plan map and all the information layers.

The Government of Canada recognizes the efforts the Commission has made and the challenge involved in balancing the goals the Plan seeks to achieve. Nunavut includes important habitat for caribou and wildlife, which are critical to the wellbeing of people and the environment. As well, there are existing rights related to mineral tenure and other land uses. At the same time, there are important rights in the *Nunavut Agreement*, including the ability of Inuit to manage their own land to benefit from development and to harvest.

In our view, the Plan cannot and should not be counted on as a solution to protecting all of these values on its own. There are a number of mechanisms available in Nunavut that will help to achieve these purposes. The Plan's restrictions on land use in key caribou habitats should have the least possible impact on future economic opportunities for Nunavummiut and still ensure that all the benefits that caribou bring to Inuit and to the environment remain, and this is done in a manner that respects the rights associated with Inuit Owned Land. Overlap and conflict between existing mineral tenure and mineral projects and year-round prohibitions to support caribou habitat still exist in the Plan. Greater clarity and certainty are required to ensure the benefits and rights guaranteed in the *Nunavut Agreement* can still be realized.

Barren ground caribou population numbers have declined over time, which generates concern amongst all the participants here. The Government of Canada's objective is that whatever approach the Plan takes to barren ground caribou, it supports healthy populations that can support sustainable harvesting into the future. We think the planning process in Nunavut is a key opportunity for parties to work together to find the right contribution the Plan can make to conserving caribou, whether that be through a regional approach to zoning, possibly including mobile caribou measures, or other effective conservation measures.

The important thing is that the Commission ensure it knows whether the selected approach is working by integrating an adaptive management approach, so that when the Plan is reviewed, there will be evidence on whether the Plan has been effective for caribou conservation or whether amendments are needed.

At the same time the value the mineral economy brings to Nunavut must be a key consideration. A healthy mining sector provides opportunity for Nunavummiut. It provides employment, contracting, training, and vital contributions to government, Inuit organizations, and communities that allow support of local programming. The Conference Board of Canada expects mining to account for 40% of Nunavut's GDP – Gross Domestic Product – in 2022. We need to ensure the Land Use Plan does not close the door on economic potential when other mechanisms in the regulatory regime can mitigate impacts to the environment.

By example, mineral tenure covers 2½ percent of Nunavut. Over one-third of that tenure, within that 2½ percent, is overlapped with Limited Use zones that prohibit mineral exploration, development, and related activities. Many mineral projects and mines are on both Crown and Inuit

Owned Land, which are overlapped by Limited Use zoning, as shown in this figure. This will limit the development of new mineral projects and mines, and the ability of existing mines to further evolve.

The map on the slide shows that many projects in Limited Use zones include both Crown and Inuit Owned Lands. Consistency in zoning for the entire project area will be required for these projects to proceed. As well, a number of projects are fully enclosed within Limited Use zones with no means of connecting the project to anywhere else by road. Depending on the type of mineral project, this could prevent it from proceeding to production.

The Government of Canada's analysis reveals that the Draft Plan applies a Limited Use designation to three of Nunavut's four active mines: Meliadine, Hope Bay, and Mary River, excepting only the Meadowbank Complex. These projects are well regulated. All possess Nunavut Impact Review Board project certificates, Nunavut Water Board Type A water licenses, and land use permits or leases, which together describe a robust set of terms and conditions under which they must operate and that have been tailored to the specific operation to protect the environment.

The Government of Canada recommends that the Commission rezone areas with existing mineral tenure currently overlapping with a Limited Use designation as Mixed Use. There should be no overlap of Limited Use zoning with mineral tenure, allowing exploration, development, and associated activities such as quarrying and linear infrastructure to operate per the Nunavut mining and regulatory regime. However, the Plan should continue to keep information on important caribou habitat and should be retained under the Valued Ecosystem Components designation to ensure it is considered by proponents and other parts of the regulatory regime.

The approach in the current Draft Plan to address the issue of overlap between Limited Use zones and existing mineral rights is to include a list of projects in Appendix A that would be exceptions to the Limited Use prohibition on future mineral development. Should the Commission remain committed to using Appendix A to list properties that are an exception to the zoning, the Government of Canada recommends that the Commission rezone Limited Use Areas where the overlap with Nunavut's operating mines, to Mixed Use areas with no applicable prohibitions, seasonal restrictions, and setbacks.

As well, information on important caribou habitats not already identified as Valued Ecosystem Components should be retained under that designation to ensure that it is considered by proponents and regulators. In addition, all remaining mineral tenure should be included in Appendix A and clarified that the prohibitions for exploration, development, and ancillary activities, for example roads and quarrying, do not apply to new project proposals or significant modifications to current projects.

The Government of Canada continues to recommend that the Commission work with Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada and holders of existing mineral rights and interests to ensure that any existing or future projects arising from existing mineral tenure that would be impacted by the proposed Limited Use Areas, are accurately identified under Appendix A of the Plan.

The Government of Canada understands the importance of the marine environment to Inuit and to Inuit culture. Also important is the need for the Plan to reflect a balance of the Nunavut Planning Commission's *Broad Planning Policies, Objectives, and Goals*. For the Government of Canada, this

means the Plan must manage marine transportation in a way that protects the environment, promotes conservation planning and community wellbeing, and encourages sustainable economic development.

Given this, a number of key considerations are noted on the slide and have guided the Government of Canada's comments about marine transportation. Plan requirements for the protection of the marine environment such as setbacks around walrus haul-outs, should not prevent the delivery of vital services required to maintain healthy communities or to protect their environment.

The Government of Canada supports the exceptions in the Draft Plan for activities such as community resupply, emergencies, and safe navigation. We have recommended to the Commission that other activities such as law enforcement monitoring and the placement and maintenance of navigational aids be added to the list of exceptions in the Plan, and the Plan define certain vital services for clarity. For example, without definition, the meaning of "safe navigation" could be unclear. Someone could argue they can travel near a walrus haul-out when they think it is safe to do so. However, the Government of Canada believes that safe navigation is meant to be that a vessel can travel near a walrus haul-out only when it is required for the safety of the ship, crew, and passenger. The Government of Canada has provided a complete definition for consideration in our written submission.

The Government of Canada is also seeking confirmation that the Commission's conformity determinations will also include the exemptions granted to the Ministry of National Defence within the *Nunavut Agreement*. This will help the Plan comply with exemptions in the *Nunavut Agreement* and provide clarity and certainty for users.

Seasonal prohibitions on icebreaking through any part of the Northwest Passage could be problematic. A specific concern is related an agreement between the Government of Canada and the United States. This agreement is a legally binding treaty through which we essentially agree to disagree, and which requires Canada to allow passage to U.S. icebreakers through the Northwest Passage. We need to ensure the Government of Canada is able to consent to navigation through the Northwest Passage. When we are contacted by vessels prior to their transit, we communicate about environmental considerations such as ecologically sensitive areas or known mammal migrations, as well as recommended routing. It is our experience that these vessels take this advice into consideration.

It is the Government of Canada's understanding that the Commission does not apply the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan nor the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan to vessels traveling through but not stopping in the Nunavut Settlement Area, including those navigating through ice. To provide certainty to all Plan users, it is important that the final Nunavut Land Use Plan clearly state it does not apply to these activities, which the Government of Canada is calling individual vessel movements.

Having the final Plan clearly state it does not apply to individual vessel movements is one way that will help Canada to meet its international legal obligations, as land use conformity and impact assessment processes would continue to apply to projects as per *the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*, including mining development projects. The Government of Canada has recommended that the Commission consider a collaborative process rather than icebreaking restrictions to achieve balance within the Plan. We note that a collaborative process has been

included in the Draft Plan for on-ice travel routes that include consultation with communities. The Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization also spoke to a collaborative process for marine shipping earlier in the proceedings.

The Nunavut Land Use Plan will only apply to Tallurutiup Imanga until the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act comes into effect. A joint Inuit-Canada co-management board makes consensus decisions that include Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit for managing the marine conservation area. Some of the prohibited activities listed in the Plan requirements may change after legal establishment as the co-management board and planning process will make decisions on appropriate activities.

Migratory bird setbacks will apply to the key habitat areas located in Tallurutiup Imanga. The Plan requirements currently do not address this. It is recommended that activities that may be changed after establishment be identified as interim prohibitions to avoid confusion with future management direction. It is further recommended that the migratory bird setbacks identified in Table 1 of the Nunavut Land Use Plan be included in the Plan requirements for the National Marine Conservation Area. The Government of Canada has provided some suggested wording for Section 3.1.2 to clarify the difference between the National Marine Conservation Area awaiting establishment and for future National Marine Conservation Areas.

Slide 2.6: Disposal at Sea. The Canadian Environmental Protection Act governs disposal activities in Canadian and international waters near Canada. The act prohibits disposal at sea without a permit. The Government of Canada prefers that the disposal at sea prohibitions be removed from the Draft Plan and suggest that disposal at sea continue to be addressed on a case-by-case under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act using the mandated consultation process. As required under the act, the Disposal at Sea Program will continue to consult on permits in Northern waters to address environmental concerns, including those in Marine Conservation Areas and Limited Use Areas. It should also be noted that vessel discharges are regulated under the Canada Shipping Act 2001, the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, and their regulations.

The Government of Canada is reevaluating the prohibitions in all uses and areas zoned as Limited Use for military facilities. There may be an opportunity to allow for some uses that would not conflict with national defence and national security. The planning process would ideally include the Department of National Defence in decision-making and approval processes, which would allow activities not contrary to those of the department to advance. This may be achieved through a Valued Socioeconomic Component designation for military but would require a clear definition and what planning considerations are afforded as a result. The Government of Canada is seeking to strike a balance between having to uphold its national defence and national security mandate and remaining a partner in Nunavut.

Summary and Conclusions: The Government of Canada recognizes the importance of land use planning in Nunavut's regulatory system and will continue its role on a path towards a Plan that can be accepted. We believe the issues presented by the Government of Canada can be resolved through continued collaboration with all involved. The Government of Canada along with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the Regional Inuit Associations, and the Government of Nunavut recognize that issues related to Inuit Owned Land, Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements, and consultation as they relate to the Land Use Plan are important issues to understand. The parties have begun discussion on these topics in hopes to advise the Commission on a path forward to resolve these issues.

The Government of Canada supports the Commission working with the Government of Canada, the Government of Nunavut, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and the Regional Inuit Associations to develop a post-hearing process to refine the Draft Plan to collaboratively address concerns raised in this submission and at these public hearings. The Government of Canada will also continue to listen to Indigenous concerns, noting how they may be resolved and will take any further steps necessary to ensure its duty to Indigenous rights holders has been met.

Lastly, the Government of Canada would like to thank the Commission for this opportunity to present its views on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan to the Commission, to the other participants and communities in this room, and to the public, and we will be happy to answer any questions on our presentation.

(Translated): I have concluded our presentation. Thank you for giving us the time. Just remember, we have a lot of personnel who will be able to answer your questions. We have to wait a bit and allocate the question to the appropriate person. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any questions from the staff? Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy from the Nunavut Planning Commission. I would like first like to thank the Government of Canada and Terry for the presentation, as well as for the detailed review of the Land Use Plan that the Government of Canada has undertaken, and for the discussions that we have been having over the last several months.

Regarding the issue of existing rights in the Draft Plan, the Commission understands that it is the Government of Canada's preference to remove Appendix A from the Land Use Plan and replace those areas with a Mixed Use designation and Valued Component identification. The alternative slide you note on Slide 18, if the Commission chooses to retain Appendix A, the recommendation is to include all remaining mineral tenure in Appendix A. I note that some participants have recommended that all mineral tenure including existing tenure outside of Limited Use Areas be included in Appendix A. I would just like to clarify if the Government of Canada intends that Appendix would include all mineral tenure in the Nunavut Settlement Area or just all mineral tenure within Limited Use Areas, including those projects that may have been removed by the Commission through their selection criteria. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. As for the question, yes, the way the slide reads, and we underlined it, include all remaining mineral tenure based on the fact that all of these projects and tenures involved within Appendix A are currently being governed through our regulatory system. They are quite robust in that manner, so I don't see the need of including them within the Appendix A aspect of things. I will hand it over to Spencer as well if he wants to add to that answer if that is okay, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Yes. Go ahead. Just remember to state your name and get close to the microphone.

Spencer: Thank you. Qujannamiik, Mr. Chair. Spencer Dewar Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Yes, Terry has it right. What we are trying to do is ensure that any mineral tenure

that would be impacted by a Limited Use Area is included on Appendix, and we would like to work with the Commission to ensure that is updated and continued to be updated. It is certainly important to reflect all tenure that has been issued just so people are aware of it. For Appendix A, I think we would be good with just those who would be impacted by the Limited Use. Qujannamiik. Quana.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you again, Mr. Chair, and thank you to the Government of Canada representatives for their responses. Again, on the issue of existing mineral rights, the Commission appreciates the information that the Government of Canada has provided on mineral rights those overlap with Limited Use Areas but are not included in Appendix A. It is our understanding that those discrepancies arise from, for example the selection criteria that the Commission used, including whether a right was active or suspended, or was reviewed by one of the regulatory systems and approved or not.

We are wondering, and we do appreciate the offer of the Government of Canada to work closely with us to refine this list. I am wondering if the Government of Canada would be in a position to provide a summary and analysis of the difference between the rights presented in Appendix A and all mineral tenure as you suggest so we are aware there are differences. I am just suggesting that it may be helpful for, not only the Commission but for all participants if the Government of Canada provided a summary and analysis of what the impacts of changing from the Commission's selection criteria to simply including all mineral tenure in Limited Use Areas would look like. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Yes. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions? Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and thank you again for that offer. That is greatly appreciated. To switch topics to the subject of Inuit Owned Lands that have been the discussion recently in this hearing, we do note that Nunavut Tunngavik and the Regional Inuit Associations have made requests for a distinct approach on Inuit Owned Lands as opposed to Crown Lands and have outlined their mandate and responsibilities on Inuit Owned Lands. We are wondering if the Government of Canada has any comments or recommendations for management of Inuit Owned Lands through the land use planning process. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. On principle, the Government of Canada supports that the Plan may apply a distinct approach to land use planning on Inuit Owned Lands. The *Nunavut Agreement* is clear that the Nunavut Planning Commission must take into account Inuit goals and objectives for Inuit Owned Lands. It has been read over a few times already. I am not going to repeat it. You know the *Land Claim* as well as I do.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Regional Inuit Associations are in the best place to advise the Commission on the impacts of zoning on the Inuit Owned Lands that they manage and have title to. At the same time, there could be other interests for the Nunavut Planning Commission to consider that could be impacted by such an approach, including in the federal context mineral tenure that you asked about previously that is either partly on Crown or partly on Inuit Owned Land, migratory bird sanctuaries, national defence operations, transportation infrastructure, contaminated sites, and others. I am very tempted to read parts of the *Nunavut Agreement*, but I won't do that, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan, Atigo.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy again. Thank you once again for the response. On slide 21, you make a note of providing exceptions or exemptions for individual vessel movements within the Draft Plan, and this is understood in the context of Canada's international obligations in particular. We are aware through previous discussions about interests and exemptions for these international obligations. I will just note that the individual vessel movement generally is something that is identified in the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* as something that the Nunavut Impact Review Board is not able to screen or review. However, the legislation does not provide such exemptions from the Nunavut Planning Commission in its land use plans. We are aware of the interest in providing exemptions due to these international obligations. I am just wondering if the federal government has any comments on the appropriateness of the Land Use Plan exempting all individual ship movements from its authority when the legislation did not take that step. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. (*Translated*): My job has been known as part of (*inaudible*) and employed here, I think it be better answered by Transport Canada. They would be able to answer your question more thoroughly.

(*English*): So with your permission, Mr. Chair, I would like to call on Transport Canada, Anita Gudmundson, to respond to that question if that is okay, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Anita? Go ahead.

Anita: Thank you. Anita Gudmundson with Transport Canada. Thank you, Jonathan, for the question. If I could clarify to be sure that we are answering the right question and providing the right information, are you asking our thoughts on whether the exemption for an individual vessel movement would apply only to international vessels? I guess it may be a matter of terminology, because in particular for the international implications, we are considering movements that would not necessarily be considered a project under *NuPPAA*. I am not sure if you are able to clarify a little more for us.

Chairperson: Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Yes, the Commission does appreciate the interest in exempting foreign traffic as set out through government agreements with foreign countries. I am just drawing attention to the fact that under the legislation, not all individual ship movements were excluded from the Nunavut Planning Commission's jurisdiction. So, the submission from the Government of Canada appears to be recommending that all individual

ships, not just those, for example by an American icebreaker where there has been an agreement that could happen, but to broaden that to all vessel movements when the legislation has specifically retained that jurisdiction for the Commission, and just whether that focus of the exemption could be narrowed.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Anita: Thank you. Anita Gudmundson with Transport Canada, and thank you, Jonathan, for the clarification. If it alright, I will take one moment to confer with my counterparts at Global Affairs and attempt to provide an answer to that.

Chairperson: Thank you. Terry, did you have your hand up? Do you want to talk while they are talking? Qujannamiik, Terry.

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Yes, I'll talk.

(Laughter)

Just to expand on whether or not Canada views vessel movement as a project, it is the Government of Canada's understanding that the Commission does not apply the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan and the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan to vessels travelling through and not stopping in the Nunavut Settlement Area. To provide certainty to all Plan users, it is important that the final Nunavut Land Use Plan clearly state that it also does not apply to these activities, which the Government of Canada is calling single vessel movements. Having the final Plan clearly state that Plan requirement, 2.2.5-1 does not apply to single vessel movements, will also allow Canada to more easily meet its international obligations regarding passage through the waters of the Nunavut Settlement Area. I hope this clarifies it a little bit, Mr. Chair. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you, Terry, for that reminder of the comments you made previously. I will just note perhaps that the Nunavut Planning Commission has generally tried to stay away from summarizing legislative requirements in the text of the Draft Land Use Plan. For example, when a project requires a review by the Nunavut Planning Commission and all of those processes are set out in legislation, in the interest of clarity and certainty many participants including the Government of Canada have recommended the NPC not try to paraphrase or provide that type of guidance where it exists elsewhere in legislation. So, I don't think there is a common agreement and understanding to what constitutes a project, and the Commission has been hesitant to include that type of guidance in the text of a land use plan given the number of parties involved and the differences of interpretation regarding what is or is not a project. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I guess I will reiterate and say it in a different way that the activity itself, it is recommended that it can be exempted from the prohibition. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We will get back to the original presenter. Go ahead, please.

Anita: My apologies for having to step away momentarily and appreciating the conservation that has taken place while I am gone. I'm sorry, Anita Gudmundson with Transport Canada. Jonathan, I think the Government of Canada wants to ensure that any exception included within the Plan is as limited as possible. In consideration of our understanding of how single vessel movement is currently viewed in land use planning and may not be considered a project, or may depending on the circumstance, I think at this point it might be more helpful if we offered to ensure that we addressed your question in our final written submission if that is acceptable? Great. Thank you.

Chairperson: That's a thumbs up. Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions? Jonathan?

Jonathan: No, not at this time. Yes, of course, I think I will remind all participants that none of the questions being raised today require a response here on the floor, as the Chairperson has noted. Written submissions and further public hearings will also provide an opportunity for further discussion, so I will stop now and see if others have questions, but I really appreciate the responses from the representatives today. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any questions? Bobby?

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bobby Greenley, Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization Chair. I just want clarification on what you were saying about the icebreaking. I got a little bit confused. Are you recommending them to have icebreaking any time throughout the ice season? I just want clarification on that, or are you saying there should be no icebreaking in certain times of the year? That is my first question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. (*Translated*): I will let Transport Canada, Anita Gudmundson, answer it. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Anita?

Anita: Thank you. Anita Gudmundson with Transport Canada. Thank you for asking that clarifying question. When it comes to icebreaking restrictions that are in the Plan currently, the Government of Canada has talked about the potential impact to our international legal obligations. So, that is one aspect that we would have made recommendations in regards to the exemption. We do support the protection of the marine environment and wildlife from shipping activities, to reduce those impacts.

When we again look at that and how they are included in the Plan, from our perspective, we look at what the potential impact would be to shipping from the shipping restriction. When we look at the shipping restrictions or the icebreaking restrictions that are in the Plan, we took some time to evaluate how those would impact shipping within the Arctic. It is the Government of Canada's preference that where possible, we create protections while minimizing the impact to transportation in the Arctic.

So, I would not say that we support or don't support icebreaking restrictions. It is that we would like to work together as best as possible to make sure that whatever restrictions are in place if they are

deemed to be necessary, are done so in the way that limits the impacts to shipping as much as possible. I hope that clarified it for you.

Chairperson: Atigo, Bobby.

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bobby Greenley, Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization Chair. Thank you for the clarification. As you probably know, we do have the Notice to Mariners, which is just for everybody out there going through. It is just a courtesy basically for each ship. It is not a law. From that date to now, that has been working very well. The way it is worded, it is worded in there like unless it is an emergency for icebreaking and stuff like that, it is all put in place. It is a courtesy thing for all the ships that are coming through, and it works great so far. It is great. We are lucky there have been no emergencies since then.

We also got to look at it that the ice is our highway. It is not only for marine mammals or the caribou crossings. It is about us up here too. We live on the island. We travel to the mainland by snowmobile. We are not the only community. We have neighboring communities that come over and visit, and vice versa. We travel over there. It is our highway. The reason why this was put in place was when we started it back in 2015, we had hunters on the mainland. They came home, and the next day or a couple of days later they were ready to cross again. It was wide open. There was no communication, no notification. If it was dark, who knows, there could have been people falling through into the open water.

That was back in 2015 that happened, so this is why we started to put this in place, and it has worked very well. We do get notices to the Hunters and Trappers, the hamlet office, they do call ahead and say that they are coming through. I just hope it continues. It is just some more information. I just hope it continues and the ice does not get busted up here in the future. I just hope it does not come down to that, right? It is just some more information. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any further questions to the panel?

Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik, Taloyoak. Thank you for your presentation. When we started trying to get a protected area, we started moving only when I started using that western science terminology for hunters and fishers, that means we are not farmers. That is our livestock. We are very concerned about the Northwest Passage. There is a lot of traffic now. Like I said, arctic char and seal, that is our livestock. That has to be clean. I am just wondering is there a cleaning kit in place, especially for the Northwest Passage. Again, that is our food, or lifestyle. Once it is contaminated...it is just like we are not treated like Canadians. Farmers, if you go on the land, you get charged for trespassing. These are some of the things we want to be looked at for our community and our proposal. Qujannamiik. Who is going to be responsible to cleaning if there was a spill? Thank you very much.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. (*Translated*): The question will be addressed to Transport Canada.

Chairperson: Anita?

Anita: Thank you. Anita Gudmundson with Transport Canada and thank you for the question. With regard to oil spills or a spill from ships, there is a very strong regulatory regime in Canada. The first guiding principle of that regime is that the polluter pays. If there is a spill, it is the responsibility of the ship owner to clean the spill, prevent it from spilling more, and then also to pay for the cost of that cleanup.

What does happen in reality is when a spill occurs, the Government of Canada is notified. Both Transport Canada and the Canadian Coast Guard are notified. Typically, the Canadian Coast Guard will lead the activities on the ground, so they would direct the activities for cleanup on the ground. Transport Canada inspectors can come to the site and determine if the ship is seaworthy or if it needs repairs before it is able to be moved and provide some direction about what the ship captain must do.

Where additional supports are needed, our colleagues at Environment and Climate Change Canada may provide some support. There may be, depending on the situation, communication with the local hamlet or community, and potentially Health Services. It really does depend on the specific circumstance, but the ship is required to have a plan on board the ship as to how they will respond in the event of a spill, and they are required to put that into action with our support.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Taima. David? David Totalik?

David T: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. David Totalik, hamlet representative of Taloyoak. I might be a little off track but we are talking about movement of the ships and vessels. I have been with the Rangers for over 40 years now. I bring this up because once in a while we get exercises. The headquarters from Yellowknife come and then we go out in the summertime. It is easy. We use our small boats and then they let us identify the kind of movement of the ships and the vessels going around our land, Nunavut. They tell us to report it to headquarters in Yellowknife, and Yellowknife passes it on to Ottawa.

Now, the freeze-up comes, I guess we are going to use the snowmobiles. That is the only way. Our little boat can't break the ice and can't go. That is my question. I don't know if you guys are involved with contact with the headquarters, National Defence in Yellowknife or headquarters in Ottawa. That is my question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. With respect to Mr. Totalik's question from Taloyoak, in the exercises carried out by the Rangers specific to his question, Mr. Chair, I would like to call on the Department of National Defence, Greg Matthews, to see if he could respond to that. Prior to that, Mr. Chair, if we can also have opportunity to provide some more feedback to Bobby's comment from the Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers on the shipping icebreaking aspects that Anita could respond to as well. I will leave it to you, Mr. Chair, at this point if Greg Matthews is available for a response. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Greg, go ahead.

Greg: Greg Matthews, Department of National Defence, Government of Canada. I think we need a couple minutes to just prepare an answer if that is okay.

Chairperson: Go ahead. If you want to say something, go ahead.

Terry: Terry Audla, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Anita, you wanted to respond with respect to Billy's [sic] comments earlier? If that is okay, Mr. Chair?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Anita, go ahead.

Anita: Yes, thank you. Anita Gudmundson with Transport Canada. My apologies and my apologies to Terry. I believe it would be the Canadian Coast Guard who would be able to provide you a little bit more information in regard to icebreaking activities. It is the Canadian Coast Guard that undertakes those activities. So again, my apologies, Terry, for the confusion there.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. (*Translated*): The question, could you clarify your question please so we can give an answer? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: From Bobby?

Terry: No. Taloyoak, Totalik.

Chairperson: Oh, I thought you said Cambridge. David's question? Could you ask the question, David?

David T: I was wearing my other earphones. I did not quite get that. Could you please give me that again? Thank you.

Chairperson: I believe they want you to explain what your question was to them. Can you repeat it if you can?

David: Thank you. I have been with the Rangers for over 40 years now. Sometimes we get from headquarters in Yellowknife when they come for exercises, Rangers exercises. Sometimes in the summertime, they let us go out and observe what kind of movement of the vessels and ships going around our Arctic, or Land, our Nunavut. Now my question is I don't know if you guys are involved with them. That is my question. It is not hard during the summertime with our little boat, you know. We go out maybe 50 miles from our land from Taloyoak, or 80 miles out. Then we observe. They let us observe what kind of movement and what kind of ships there are. If they look different, we will report it to them, and they report it to the headquarters in Yellowknife, and Yellowknife to Ottawa I think.

Now that is easy in the summertime by boat. We use a small boat, but you say if the freeze-up comes, we can't use our boat. I guess they are going to let us use our snowmobile in order for us to do the same thing. That is my question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Atigo. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. (*Translated*): During the summer months, you observe and identify ships, as you said, as a Ranger by small vessel. All the ships coming through are identified, the other way

through Yellowknife and then to Ottawa. It doesn't matter what time of year the vessels are travelling. Does that answer your question? Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. There appears to be no more questions from the delegates. Are there any questions from registered participants? Yes, go ahead. State your name and organization. Make sure you speak to the microphone. Thank you.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund. My question is on Slide 18 on the note of "includes all remaining mineral tenure." My question is considering tenure issued post-release of the 2021 Draft of the Plan, is it the Government of Canada's intention to include those tenure as well in their final recommendation for claims that should be grandfathered? The question is based on considering the area proposed by the Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers Association. Earlier this year, a new claim was issued within their boundaries. So, the question is one that we have posed over the years. Is there a cutoff for when claims would not be grandfathered, recognizing it is a recommendation from the Government of Canada and ultimately the Planning Commission's decision?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. As it stands right now, we do issue them under the existing Canada mining regulations, but once the Nunavut Plan comes into effect, will be using that process. So, I guess to be clear, it is not going to be forever and a day, but it is at some point when we do find something that provides more certainty and clarity through the Nunavut planning process. I hope that answers the question, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. Thank you very much. I guess a quick follow-up for clarity would be to ask if a claim issued tomorrow would be recommended to be grandfathered into this Plan.

Chairperson: Terry?

Terry: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. All projects that are submitting for this time period will all be transferred over under the new Nunavut planning process. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions from registered participants? *(Pause)*

(Translated): Thank you. Thank you for the questions and answers to everybody.

(Applause)

Before we go on to the next agenda item, we will take a 15-minute break and resume at 3:00.

BREAK

Presentation by the Government of Nunavut
Henry Coman, Assistant Deputy Minister for the Department of Environment
Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: The panel from the Government of Nunavut is preparing, so let us proceed. Qujannamiik. As mentioned before, please turn off your cellphones. Please state your name and organization you work with. Go ahead, please.

Eamonn: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Commissioners, and particularly thank you to community delegates. Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel, for the Government of Nunavut. Seated next to me is the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Environment, Henry Coman. There are many Government of Nunavut experts and officers in the room today and following along online that he may refer questions to. Today, the Assistant Deputy Minister will be speaking on behalf of the entire Government of Nunavut. With that, may I introduce Chairman, the Assistant Deputy Minister, Henry Coman.

Henry: Hello. I'm Henry Coman, Assistant Deputy Minister for the Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut. Thank you to the Nunavut Planning Commission for the opportunity to present today, as well as the opportunity to listen to the thoughts of Nunavummiut and others regarding the Nunavut Land Use Plan. We are going to provide an overview of the Government of Nunavut's outstanding concerns regarding the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

Our presentation highlights what the Government of Nunavut sees as an imbalance between economic development and environmental protection in the 2021 Draft Plan. In the presentation, we will go over the Government of Nunavut's role in this process, as well as the mandate that guides our participation. Following this, I will present the Government of Nunavut's technical review of the 2021 Plan. Finally, I will conclude the presentation and be prepared to answer your questions.

The successful completion of the Nunavut Land Use Plan is a Government of Nunavut priority. The Government of Nunavut is looking forward to reviewing a revised draft as described by Article 11 of the *Nunavut Agreement* and Section 53 of the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act* after the record closes. Once approved, the Nunavut Land Use Plan will guide and direct the territory's long-term vision for development and conservation. This monumental task for the Commission requires a balanced approach that is reflective of a range of views.

No issue exemplifies the competing values of economic development and environmental protection more than the Draft Plan's proposed designations for caribou habitat. This will, therefore, be a primary focus of the technical review portion of our presentation today.

Katujjiluat is the vision and overarching policy goal that will guide the Government of Nunavut's final review of the 2021 Draft Plan once it is submitted by the Commission. As a territory, the Government of Nunavut wants more communities to benefit from fishing, harvesting, and tourism, as well as increased Inuit employment in mining and mining-related sectors. The Nunavut Land Use Plan should encourage sustainable economic development and diversification in all sectors that address the need for critical infrastructure.

Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit and its 8 principles are integral to the functioning of the Government of Nunavut, and we believe that the Nunavut Land Use Plan should operate in much the same way. The Plan must create the conditions for the responsible development of Nunavut's natural resources and diverse economic opportunities through increased employment and other investments, as well as through traditional activities that have sustained Inuit for thousands of years.

The Government of Nunavut employs what we call a "whole-of-government" approach in our participation in land use planning. Each Government of Nunavut department contributes to the review and makes recommendations to our senior management. Our submissions to the Commission represent a unified voice.

This slide brings us to the Government of Nunavut's technical review of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. This map is essentially the Nunavut Planning Commission's zoning map, or Schedule A, but instead of only showing where the three Draft Plan zones or designations are, this map highlights the underlying land values informing the Commission's proposed Limited Use and Conditional Use zoning choices. Essentially this map attempts to highlight what issues are at the forefront of the Nunavut Land Use Plan's drafting. It shows where land access restrictions have been proposed by the Commission and why.

The Government of Nunavut found that the *Options and Recommendations* document has been greatly improved and helped facilitate our review of the Plan. However, we found the Commission's rationale was not fulsome enough to understand the tradeoffs that they made.

Here are the main priorities that the Government has identified in relation to the Draft Plan. We want to ensure there is a balance in the Plan between conservation and economic development. This includes both environmental stewardship as well as current and future economic opportunities. Recognizing gaps or highly polarized recommendations for certain issues, the Plan must be appropriately balanced. The Plan must be reflective of a range of planning partner views. However, this is also the first-generation Nunavut Land Use Plan, and as such, it can and likely will change in the future.

The Plan must therefore be appropriately scoped and avoid using extensive land use prohibitions to development where insufficient evidence exists to justify these. Lastly, municipal views require more explicit inclusion in the implementation of the Plan to ensure that it is compatible with municipal plans and with current and future community development, such as their needs and priorities including transportation, electrical utilities, quarrying, and resource development.

Although the Government of Nunavut has outstanding concerns, we would like to acknowledge the Commission's progress, specifically on improvements to tourism and the management of polar bears in the Plan. The Government of Nunavut's main concern is that the Plan does not adequately balance environmental and economic goals. We understand that everyone may have a different understanding of what a balanced Plan is. A balanced Plan for the Government of Nunavut will ensure that there are adequate numbers of animals, such as caribou, to meet the dietary and cultural needs of Inuit, and that there are diverse economic opportunities for Nunavummiut including access to these opportunities via linear infrastructure.

This graph is a summary of land use designations proposed in the 2021 Draft Plan for the Nunavut Settlement Area organized by region. All Limited Use designations prohibit development activities including mining and oil and gas exploration. Limited Use Areas are 22% of the Nunavut Settlement Area broken down as such:

- 22% of the Kivalliq region
- 36% of the Kitikmeot region
- 17% of the Qikiqtani region

Further, Limited Use Areas disproportionately affect some communities, such as those with closer proximity with known resource potential or those with greater transportation or infrastructure potential. The 2021 Plan states that an effective Land Use Plan needs to achieve a balance between environmental, social, and economic needs and potential. One of the Government of Nunavut's major concerns is that this balance has not been achieved yet. However, we do think there is a path forward.

Caribou are important to Nunavummiut for many reasons. They are culturally significant. They contribute to the economy, and they provide a good local source of food. Sustainably managing caribou can guarantee that they will be a part of Nunavut into the future. Many herds are in decline, and there is uncertainty of the causes. The Commission's consultation record shows that many participants are concerned about the decline and feel that something needs to be done. In the 2021 Plan, the Commission has designated caribou calving and post-calving grounds, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings as Limited Use Areas. This comes with year-round prohibitions, which address what the Commission has heard.

The Government of Nunavut supports the protection of critical caribou habitat and has faith in the robust regulatory system in Nunavut to help address impacts. We must also consider the socioeconomic implications of those protections. The Government of Nunavut believes that the Limited Use designation increases the economic risk by limiting economic opportunity, such as access to resources, infrastructure development, and community development goals and priorities. The Government of Nunavut believes that Conditional Use zoning with seasonal restrictions can better achieve a balance between these priorities.

Baffin Island herds have been in decline until recently when surveys suggest that the herd has stabilized. The Government of Nunavut's Department of Environment works closely with wildlife partners to collect scientific data and Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit to monitor the health of caribou herds. Although there is a degree of uncertainty associated with caribou data, the Government of Nunavut is confident that its delineations are accurate and is committed to continuously monitoring the accuracy of these areas. Lack of information on Baffin Island caribou has made precise delineation of their calving grounds difficult. Where the Government of Nunavut does not have sufficient data to delineate caribou habitat, such as Baffin Island, we rely on Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit.

The population of Nunavut is growing. In the next 10 years, 10,000 young Nunavummiut will become adults who will need jobs. These youth will represent one-fifth of all Nunavummiut. This is shown on the graph on the right. Additionally, Nunavut has the highest unemployment rate in the country. A solution needs to be found to ensure that jobs are available for these young adults. The mining sector represents the largest private sector opportunity for employment in Nunavut and is

a key part of making Nunavut self-sufficient. Mining currently represents the largest private sector employer in the territory. The Government of Nunavut is also promoting other sectors related to fisheries and the traditional economy.

The Government of Nunavut believes that the 2021 Plan is too restrictive. The current Plan prohibits mineral exploration on approximately 21% of the planning region. This map shows how mineral exploration activities in gray, interact with the land use planning designations. Large areas of Nunavut remain unexplored. As such, the resource potential is unknown. This unknown resource potential itself, holds considerable value. The Limited Use designation prohibits exploration work that is needed to properly understand the resource potential to make informed decisions on the acceptability of the development.

Few exploration projects develop into a full productive mine. A plan that unduly limits exploration can therefore reduce the chance that a viable deposit is found. Nunavut is already considered a difficult area to develop. The Government of Nunavut does not want to create additional barriers to potential opportunities. Exploration activity can be low impact and have flexible schedules. The exploration industry also makes significant investment contributions. There is a lack of infrastructure in Nunavut. However, the mining industry is a source of infrastructure development that can benefit the territory as a whole.

The Government of Nunavut believes that Conditional Use zoning with seasonal restrictions for caribou habitat can better achieve the balance between conservation and economic development. For successful exploration projects, the Government of Nunavut is an active participant in the territory's robust environmental assessment process led by the Nunavut Impact Review Board. As mentioned, Nunavut's unemployment rate is high and employment opportunities may be limited. The economic impact of the current Draft Plan may be significant. Opportunities for Nunavut and its residents may be limited by prohibiting exploration and unduly restricting transportation or hydro connections for both development and communities.

Nunavut is home to an abundance of minerals and metals, including critical minerals for green technologies, as well as potential for significant oil and gas development. Post-devolution, the Government of Nunavut will rely on revenue and royalties driven by economic opportunities, such as from resource development, to provide services to the territory. A restrictive Plan limits the economic potential available.

As previously mentioned, the Government of Nunavut does not believe that the current draft appropriately balances environmental and economic goals, and that more consideration needs to be given to the socioeconomic impacts of prohibitive land use designations. Nunavut is experiencing a situation where caribou are declining, and the territory's population and socioeconomic needs are increasing. The Land Use Plan needs to guide development in a way to address both factors.

The Conditional Use designation with seasonal restrictions for caribou calving and post-calving grounds, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings is appropriate to balance environmental and economic goals. This would create formalized protection during the most sensitive periods of the caribou life cycle while allowing for a flexible case-by-case approach during the Nunavut Impact Review Board assessment. Further, the Government of Nunavut supports seasonal restrictions, up to and including the seasonal phased shutdowns in these areas. We have provided the critical timing windows for when caribou are present.

The Government of Nunavut does not consider large Limited Use Areas to be desirable in this first-generation Plan. As a first-generation territory-wide Plan, the Government of Nunavut recommends a more incremental approach to land access restrictions. The Government of Nunavut acknowledges that over time, more information and regional decisions may lead to amendments to make some areas more restrictive. The Government of Nunavut recommends a red-flag approach to identify areas of interest, concern, significance, and where competing interests exist and require greater scrutiny. As more information is known, the Plan can be updated through periodic reviews and Plan amendments.

The Government of Nunavut is concerned that the Nunavut Land Use Plan is not compatible with community plans. In this slide, we can see examples of how Limited Use Areas overlap with municipal boundaries. As per the *Nunavut Agreement*, the Nunavut Planning Commission must consider municipal views when developing land use plans. In addition to consulting the municipalities directly, their views are also found within the community plans. For example, some communities have Limited Use zoning with them that conflicts with community plans, such as the prohibition on quarries in Kugluktuk. Future projects before they reach the Commission may conform to these community plans and have community support. In order to address this, the Government of Nunavut recommends that a mechanism to recognize community views and priorities is included in the Nunavut Land Use Plan.

In summary, the Nunavut Land Use Plan needs to account for community plans within municipal boundaries. Community planning is central to the Commission's goal of building healthy communities and needs to be reflected in Chapter 4 of the Plan. To address these concerns, the Government of Nunavut recommends that the scope of minor variances be broadened so that projects that conform with community plans may be referred to the Review Board for screening, or a general exemption should be built into the Plan if the project is in conformity with the community plan, or areas within municipal boundaries are zoned as Mixed Use.

The Grays Bay Port and Road corridor is zoned as a Valued Component and overlaps with Limited Use Areas that prohibit linear infrastructure. The Government of Nunavut is a supporter in principle of this project. Since other priority transportation corridors are included in the Plan as Limited Use to support their development, the Government of Nunavut believes that the Grays Bay Port and Road corridor as a project of interest, should also be zoned as Limited Use.

Some of Nunavut's existing mineral rights are not protected in the current Draft Plan. Furthermore, the issue of stranded assets should be addressed in the Plan. Stranded assets, or existing rights, are those surrounded by Limited Use Areas and would need a Plan amendment to access them. The Government of Nunavut believes that all existing rights should be protected and able to reasonably develop without a Plan amendment. The surrounding Limited Uses restrictions also impact the value of those existing rights.

At this time, secondary drinking water sources beyond municipal boundaries have not been identified. Having access to clean drinking water is important. Recently, several communities have had to draw water from their secondary sources. However, it is important that the identification of secondary drinking water sources does not unduly restrict other municipal goals such as transportation and quarrying for aggregate resources. To balance drinking water with other

municipal goals, the Government of Nunavut recommends the Valued Component designation for secondary drinking water sources beyond municipal boundaries.

As part of its previously mentioned dual mandate in the Land Use Plan, the Government of Nunavut has been asked by the Nunavut Planning Commission to confer with its co-signatories on certain issues. These meetings between the signatories, the Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated are ongoing. As well as direct signatory meetings, all three signatories are also part of other ongoing negotiations. As part of devolution, some of what is currently federal lands will become Government of Nunavut lands. These negotiations are ongoing. Finally, all three signatories of the Land Use Plan are part of the ongoing treaty negotiations related to the Dene overlap area. All this work will continue for the Government of Nunavut throughout this process.

Furthermore, the Government of Nunavut continually works with local hamlets on municipal land management. The Government of Nunavut wildlife officers and biologists work with Hunters and Trappers Organizations to continually incorporate Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit and gather scientific data. The Government of Nunavut listens to both large project proponents and local entrepreneurs on development concerns. This work will all continue throughout the life of this first-generation Land Use Plan.

The Government of Nunavut appreciates this opportunity to discuss our outstanding issues and provide an additional perspective for our fellow planning partners' considerations. Development in the North can be particularly challenging, and we owe it to Nunavummiut to collect all the necessary information and input before making land access decisions. We must emphasize the importance of our integrated resource management system and the work carried out, not just by the Nunavut Planning Commission, but also the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. Together, these institutions safeguard the eco-systemic and socioeconomic integrity of Nunavut and ensure the responsible development of our natural resources.

At this point, the Government of Nunavut acknowledges that there have been improvements to the Plan. However, more work needs to be done to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan in order to achieve a balance between environmental and economic development goals. We look forward to hearing how other parties think this balance could be achieved and receiving an appropriately scoped revised Draft Plan from the Commission after the completion of these hearings. We will now be happy to answer any questions you might have for the Government of Nunavut. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon, any questions from the staff?

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sharon Ehaloak, Executive Director for the Nunavut Planning Commission. Jonathan Savoy? Questions? Jonathan, please.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for the presentation today and for the government's participation in our process over the years. One simple question to start off with: Would the Government of Nunavut be able to provide shape files for the secondary water sources you have identified as not being included in the Draft Plan?

Henry: Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. The answer is yes.

Chairperson: Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much for that. We will look forward to receiving those files. The next question on the subject of balance in the Land Use Plan and lack of balance in the Plan as the GN views it, we note that your presentation identified concerns with “large-scale Limited Use Areas” and you made specific recommendations for the treatment of caribou habitat through seasonal restrictions. That is clear and understood. I am just wondering if you could provide any additional clarity on other specific topics in the Draft Plan. For example, things like community drinking water supplies that extend beyond municipal boundaries where the Commission has proposed Limited Use Areas, or Community Areas of Interest in the Kitikmeot including the Boothia Peninsula and the Huikitak River. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Eamonn: Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel for the Government of Nunavut. We are happy to provide more in writing as to more Limited Use Areas, but as a general statement, the Government of Nunavut is seeking more use of the Conditional Use designation and more engagement in that process of seasonality and setbacks rather than having broad Limited Use Areas that are much more limiting on what can be accomplished in subsequent plans. In this first generation, Conditional Use might be more appropriate.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much for the response and yeah, I would just encourage further written submissions to be as specific as possible for Commissioners to give full consideration to the recommendations in January.

Also as noted, the Government of Nunavut is supportive generally of things like seasonal restrictions and setbacks in the Draft Plan. Do you have any comments on the applicability of those conformity requirements to projects with existing rights? So, in areas where the Commission has identified projects with existing rights, is the Government of Nunavut in support of including the application of these other conditions to these projects with existing rights? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Eamonn: May we have a minute to confer with some of our colleagues in the room?

(Pause)

We have faith in the case-by-case approach of the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board and would seek to *(word inaudible)* those terms and conditions that are existing on projects in the Plan.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you. So, just to clarify, I think that would be consistent then with a Mixed Use designation for areas with existing rights, similar to what the Government of Canada has recommended. Is that correct?

Eammon: Yes.

Chairperson: I know it is a short answer but for the record, your name and organization please.

(Laughter)

Eammon: Eamonn Carroll, legal counsel, Department of Justice, Government of Nunavut.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much again. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. During the presentation, you noted the importance of critical minerals to the territory, the country, and the world. Does the Government of Nunavut have information on the distribution or availability of critical minerals within the territory they would be able to provide to the Commission for its consideration?

Chairperson: Atigo. Go ahead.

Henry: Hi, Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. That is the reason why the Government of Nunavut is proposing less Limited Use Areas, because basically we don't know what is there. If there is Limited Use, it either difficult or not possible to go out and see what is available as a potential resource. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you for that response, and I guess the Commission would encourage the GN or any other participant that has information on the availability of critical minerals to provide that.

In your presentation, you also raised the issue of stranding of existing mineral rights, or not having all-weather road access to those locations. We have noted during these hearings that a winter road, for example, would be permitted to access a location of existing rights within a Limited Use designation. I was just wondering, and I don't expect necessarily an answer off the top of your head, but if the Government of Nunavut would be able to provide information on the number and extent of all-weather roads that have been built within Nunavut over the years to access mineral projects. Some examples would obviously include the Meadowbank and Meliadine mines, Mary River.

I am just wondering if the GN would be able to provide a summary of any all-weather roads built in the territory associated with mineral exploration and development that are not on mineral rights. So of course, there might be roads built within a camp, but I am referring to roads to access tidewater or other locations removed from the right itself. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Henry: Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for the question. I would have to take that opportunity to discuss this with my colleagues and provide that in writing. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? That's it for now? Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: We have questions from the delegates on the Government of Nunavut presentation? *(English)*: Any questions from the communities?

Viola: Thank you. Viola Neeveacheak, Taloyoak, Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers Association board member. With caribou herd and the survey for the caribou, we had a virtual meeting with the GN for the caribou survey in our region, near our community. The board members for Taloyoak HTO suggested asking advice for a selected date for them to start their caribou survey, but they did not take our advice. They wanted a selected date, which they chose.

With saying that, climate change every year is different. The timeframe for migration varies each year at different seasons. It could be earlier. It could be later. They came and did their survey at their selected date, and we asked them to do a later date because we know that the caribou herd did not pass through yet. This year was very different from last year. They continued with the survey. When they were done, they left. Shortly after, the caribou herd came crossing by. With that being said, your survey numbers are off. I just wanted to say that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I think that was more of a comment or statement. Qujannamiik. Harry from Cambridge Bay?

Harry M: Good afternoon. Harry Makasagak from Cambridge Bay. I make no apologies for my absence. My wife's health and wellbeing far supersede the information gathering and the sharing of information, but this is important.

I believe you all had the privilege of hearing a clear outline of the Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, the IQ principles. It seems to me that with the many gatherings that we are beginning to see and engage in that all of a sudden, the IQ principles are there but they are kind of pushed to the back unless someone really brings them up.

It was several sittings back of the territorial government, the Nunavut Government, that introduced the IQ principles as their foundation, as their pillar. In any kind of work that we do, whether it is at a municipal level, a regional level, or a territorial level, those principles must be adhered to because that is how we function. That is how my parents survived on the land, and that is how my great-grandparents survived on the land. I have learned that is how I survive on the land as well too.

I have missed several presentations, but I will collect the information that has been brought to us and go over them carefully. By the way, we have five children, 30 grandchildren, 13 great-grandchildren, and a 14th great-grandchild is on the way. They are the ones that are going to feel the full impact of what we are talking about here. Unless we come down to the very core of why we have gathered here, that being the Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, I'm afraid we are going to keep having these sessions without fully understanding why we want to have these gatherings for a full explanation.

I got a glimmer of hope last week when we found out who our new conservative leader is. I just say a glimmer of hope because we know how politics change in a heartbeat. Sounds enthusiastic.

Sounds like he wants to help the people, but we will just have to wait and see for that. I just wanted to make that comment, Mr. Chair. Thank you for allowing me.

In order for us to accomplish the full understanding of the land use, we need to work together. We need to work toward that common cause. We need to respect the very primary users of the land as we are looking at exploration. I am sure oil and gas is on the horizon, but again we have mineral exploration that still seems to be very strong, but they forget that there are some lines out there that says you are on Inuit land, or we cross a little imaginary line, and they are telling us that we are now on Crown land. It's amazing.

I came to Cambridge in 1961. We were not told that we can't do this and do that on this parcel of land. Now with the advent of the different levels of government and the different activities that want to be accomplished on that land, you are limited. You are restricted, or you just cannot go on the land. The only reason why we say you can't use some parts of the land is because we recognize our subsistence rights.

I'm so proud of our HTOs in the region that stand very strong in identifying the fact that there are calving grounds, there are post-calving grounds, there is a migratory pattern that has changed over the years, but we still have the animals there. That is what subsists us and allows us to get the strength and come and join a lot of people who have come from far away so we can grip on what we can, what we can't do on our land. Thank you for listening.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was more of a statement or comment. Are there any other questions? Roger? Going down the list...

Roger: *(Translated):* Hello. Roger Ekelik, HTO of Gjoa Haven Chair. I have a comment that caribou are decreasing. It is not totally the hunters that are doing this. There are numerous wolves. They are being neglected when caribou herds are depleting. This spring in Arviat a herd came by, came through the community, a caribou food source. For the caribou, when the ground is poor, the migration changes. Like any animal, if there are too many, they deplete their feeding grounds. Qujannamiik Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I think it is more of a general comment than a question, I guess? Could you categorize that please? I am not sure how it was translated. Henry, go ahead.

Eamonn: Eamonn Carroll, Legal Counsel, Department of Justice. As Henry stated in his presentations, we are in agreement that there is uncertainty as to the cause of the decline. Does that answer his question?

Roger: *(Brief statement, not translated)*

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jacob? Jacob first.

Jacob: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. *(Translated):* Jacob Keanik, Hamlet representative of Gjoa Haven. You keep mentioning economic development and job creation in your presentations. I have not heard much how the community will benefit locally. It is job creation through territory and other areas but nothing locally. I have heard over the day and yesterday that they are needing support. Housing is in crisis, and many are in desperate need of help, especially in the Kitikmeot area. Our needs are never really a priority. The priority seems to be to organizations coming into the territory from the

outside. Perhaps you need to focus on local economic development and job creation. Hamlets and HTOs are doing their best. Each community or organization is doing their best, but it is strained.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. It is not a question. It is just a general comment. We will go to David and then to Jeannie afterward. David?

David T: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Totalik, Taloyoak Hamlet. The presentation of Nunavut Government, you have given us a written report. Thank you for that. It is readable. I have not been able to hear your position as an ADM, so it is quite good. CBC has mentioned your title quite often, but the presentation you are giving as part of government representative and your plan, in a moment it could change.

For your information too, it is very hard to receive and get straight answers from the government. You are always giving obstacles to the community needs. You say it is part of the GN constitution, Nunavut constitution, the rules, the policies. You spoke well of the future endeavors, but I say what you have presented today can change very quickly. Perhaps government is top heavy. The public in the communities are there for the sake of looking up at the government at the top and begging at times.

At times, you say the Inuit language is very important, a priority, and this will greatly enhance when the *Nunavut Agreement* is signed, but it is still just at the discussion stages. Nothing really has emerged. I just wanted to state this general comment. I am here and been invited to the Nunavut Planning Commission in what they are trying to achieve. KIA was here, and NTI was here as well. I just wanted to say the presentations were eloquent but lacked substance.

Now coming from me, I look at my future, my children. I want them to have a reasonably easy life. The policies from the government have to be able to safeguard what my aspirations are for my family, so I say to you, I support my future through my children. Our youngsters, our teenagers need to have a relatively comfortable life. There are too many obstacles when we look for ways to improve our lives. I mention this to you. I mention this. I am not going to be always saying what I am saying now or complaining. Thank you, Chair.

Chairperson: That was a general comment. The general comments that he has made have been noted. Go ahead, Jeannie.

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Jeannie Ugjuk, Taloyoak HTO. In your presentation, let's go through the graph here. This graph here, the Kitikmeot, looking at the graph, it indicates what the situation is with this diagram here. Yesterday morning when I asked for support in proper care and development of Boothia Peninsula, that area is teeming with wildlife. We still have concerns about that area. I think to the government panel and to others like KIA and NTI, we are not just complaining of what we need. We are not just asking. It is a reality. We lack so many things from organizations who are in existence coming to our regions. We need to really work with our regional organizations whatever they may be. I am pleading to you. I know you understand me. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any further questions to the presentation of Nunavut Government? Paul?

Paul I: *(Translated)*: Paul Ikuallaq. Thank you. Chair. Thank you, GN for your presentation. This spring, the HTOs in this region were supposed to have our Annual General Meeting accommodations and

transportation. We decided to meet in June. Our funding has come in for caribou research. It was mentioned earlier that GN wildlife caribou research was late, left early. We were told we're here only for a certain time and then we have to leave. So, I asked the Government of Nunavut, why? Were you short of funding? You said you have to stick to your schedule and leave before the caribou came, and you were not able to do a proper survey of the caribou herd. I don't think you even went as far as towards the Baker Lake area where a major calving area is located. This is caribou research. When you do your research, can you look at Local Knowledge for when would be the best time to do this project? We are there to work with you, to advise you. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Henry: Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut.

Eamonn: Sorry, may we have a minute to discuss?

Chairperson: Yes, that's fine.

(Pause)

Henry: Hello, Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. I would just like thank you for your question. Just as a background, well, we are still recovering from the COVID pandemic, and that has brought some of our work a little behind schedule. There will be more surveys as a result of some items, some surveys being missed or being done at the improper time. We will be catching up on that, and I will be following up with our biologist with getting some more information directly to the HTOs and HTAs regarding surveys. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Salomie?

Salomie: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Salomie Qitsualik, Gjoa Haven Hamlet Councillor. Jacob is my co-councillor. David Totalik is coming from Hunters and Trappers. The calving grounds and post-calving grounds, and the caribou migration herd, which is widening and diverted in some cases, from their traditional route. The caribou crossings, the freshwater caribou crossings, we have the knowledge. My question is are they documented properly, the caribou calving grounds? Perhaps I may not be able to fully understand the scope of your work when you do this research. I ask you, do you know where these areas are?

The other problem is selling wildlife, caribou meat for the economy. When people harvest caribou, there are so many inexperienced hunters there now. They are harvesting female caribou who are about to calve. The bad part is that so many are killed by the wolves. I just want to say this. Freshwater caribou crossings, it has to be understood where they are, their traditional migration route. Where are they exactly?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Henry: Hello, thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. I would just like to acknowledge the question, so thank you for the question. Our biologists do work with the Hunters and Trappers Organizations and Associations whenever surveys are done. As part of the scientific surveys that are done, the biologist incorporate Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit into the survey in that they will gather

information from members of the community as well as members from the HTOs, Hunters and Trappers Organizations and Associations on various information such as caribou calving grounds and the like. However, we are always continuing striving to do better in our surveys, so thank you for that question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jimmy also had a question to the presenters?

Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik, Taloyoak. We have been...Those wanting to protect to Taloyoak, we see so many different mines that were developed down south, even Mary Mine. Everything, even the articles, mining affects that environment. How much does the Nunavut Government study on emissions of carbon from mining? Are there any studies on that? How is it affecting global warming? Everything that we read about mines, after 20 years, there is permanent damage. They said mining is a permanent job, but it is only 20 years with permanent damage. For some reason, it seems to be the only job. And here we are working on protecting Aviqtuuq, and we created 10 full-time jobs, not even in two years. Mining takes forever, and I don't know how many Inuit are working in mines. I don't think that much. There are so many different options. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for the question. One of the divisions that the Government of Nunavut has is the Climate Change Secretariat. In regard to the amount of pollution that is created within Nunavut, it is less than 1% of Canada's total emissions. So, although it may not seem like a lot, every little bit counts towards climate change, and we are continually striving to try and minimize that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Atigo.

Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik, Taloyoak. Yeah, climate change has been in effect for many years, but in the last five years, we really noticed it in our area. We have to talk to the Elders again, Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, as they know the dangerous areas in our land. Again, we have to go to them, because with climate change, they know what is dangerous and not, because they've been through it. Just because we don't have a word for – what's that word? We don't use the word cumulous cloud doesn't mean we don't know it's going to do that.

We have been up here 10,000 years, so we know the land. I heard a story about in the early '60s, mother and daughter. The daughter was playing outside. She started digging, and her mom said don't dig so deep because it is going to get too warm out. They knew about carbon gas and all that. With Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, we understand what is going on with IQ. Qujannamiik. I just wanted to say that.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was a general comment. Are there any questions from delegates to the panel? (*Pause*). It appears there are none.

Questions from the registered participants? Go ahead. State you name and organization.

Jim M: Jim MacEachern, CAO for the Municipality of Cambridge Bay. On Day 1 of the hearings after the NPC presentation, I had asked for clarification on the impacts within the municipal boundaries. I was

under the understanding it was primarily related to quarrying and fuel tank storage, that type of thing. After this presentation and with the slide that you had, can you bring that up? The Kugluktuk boundaries? On the left-hand slide, that is the boundaries of Kugluktuk. It looks to me that there is an awful lot of overlap with the Planning Commission Plan within the municipal boundaries. So, I would really like additional clarification. In this example with the quarry that has already been in the community plan, which takes precedence? Does the NPC Plan supersede community plans?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much, Jim, for the question, and thank you to the GN representatives for highlighting these two communities in particular. In general, the 2021 Draft Plan takes the approach that where possible, avoiding most Limited Use designations within municipal boundaries. We talked about the example here in Cambridge Bay where the Department of National Defence location was not included as a Limited Use designation within municipal boundaries. In the 2021 Draft Plan, caribou calving and post-calving areas in particular, that dataset was not clipped to the municipal boundaries. Several participants have identified this concern, because that designation, for example, prohibits quarrying. So, that is a conflict. Again, Commissioners will be reconsidering all of the available information early in 2023 and will give it full consideration, but this is an example where caribou habitat extended within municipal boundaries, and it was not clipped to the border in these cases. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions? She can go first, and then the gentleman behind there can go after. Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Pamela: Pamela Wong, Senior Research and Technical Advisor to the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board. I have more of a broad question. I guess from my experience working for the board, I think the board and the community have heard some of the positions from some of the organizations that have presented here. I am just wondering if there are any plans for the organizations to communicate some of the impacts of their positions on the communities to the communities directly. I know a lot of it is coming to NPC here in the communities receiving information that day, but I am just wondering if between organizations, there could have been, or if there could be more sharing of information so that the communities are aware of the impacts of what is being recommended here.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Henry?

Henry: Thank you. Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. I can say that yes, we will be providing that information in the implementation phase. However, we can only speak on behalf of the Government of Nunavut and no other organization. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Good? Go ahead.

Ezra Green: Thank you. Ezra Green, Senior Research and Technical Advisor for the Department of Wildlife and Environment with Nunavut Tunngavik. The Government of Nunavut has said that they support Conditional Use Areas for caribou calving, post-calving, key access corridors and freshwater crossings, and I believe the written submission has specific dates for different herds. I am wondering what restrictions or conditions you support during those dates. Could you elaborate more about that position? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Henry?

Henry: Government of Nunavut. I will have to consult with my colleagues on that and provide a written response. Thank you.

Chairperson: Yep. Go ahead.

Lucy: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I have a question for government representatives. The caribou collaring project applied to all the territory. The Bluenose herd coming in from Holman Island to Kugluktuk, they are migrating. They arrived to our area. I would like to know what... *(Portion not translated).*

(English) Sorry. That is why I said Inuinnaqtun is very important, because it needs to be understood for the dialect to be different. I don't know if everybody knows, but Inuinnaqtun is a Roman orthography written, and that is why most Inuinnaqtun speakers do not read syllabics. Our dialect is very unique. I would like to know if the Government of Nunavut and the Government of the Northwest Territories follow the same caribou tagging system. For the Bluenose caribou herd, the hunters from Ulukhaktok where I am originally from, they go all the way to Prince Albert Sound to hunt. I don't know if they have the same tagging system as Nunavut, because the Bluenose, the Kugluktuk hunters hunt the same herd. That is my question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Henry?

Henry: Henry Coman, Government of Nunavut. Thank you for the question. I do know that this is a herd that is shared between Nunavut and the Government of the Northwest Territories. We do collaborate with our other territorial partner on this. I am not, however, familiar with the exact way in which they do their surveys. I would have to come back with a written response for that one. Good question. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*. I don't see any hands.

Qujannamiik for your presentation and answering questions presented to you. I think that will conclude our day, and we will resume tomorrow.

(Applause)

End of Day 3

DAY 4: SEPTEMBER 15, 2022

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Good morning. Sorry for the delay. I think the technical difficulties have been resolved. Welcome back. This is our last day. Before we proceed, Sharon has housekeeping to do. Thank you. Sharon?

Sharon Thank you, Mr. Chair and good morning. Welcome back to our fourth day of our public hearing here in the Kitikmeot region hosted by the Community of Cambridge Bay. For any new participant, I will just review the emergency exits off to the side here, front and rear, and the entrance that you came in. Washrooms are still in the same place as they were. A little humour after our technical difficulties. Of course, coffee, tea, and snacks are over there.

We have a couple of changes on our agenda for today. We will be following the agenda with the exception of we will be moving Sabina Gold and Silver Corp after the Nunavut Marine Council. Then we will follow the agenda. We have had two requests from registered participants that will be presenting in other regions. If time will allow it for today, we will accommodate the Chamber of Mines and Friends of Land Use Planning with presentations after we complete the schedule agenda. With that, Mr. Chair, that is all for housekeeping for today. I'll turn it back to you. Thank you.

Chairperson: Thank you, Sharon. *(Translated)*: Just a reminder to state your name and organization when you are at the mic. In addition, please turn off your cellphones. I think we can proceed now. I think somebody wanted to speak? Joe?

Joe: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Just to let you know, our community member who was with us is now sick, very sick. He has not contracted COVID-19, but it is a terrible cold, so we will be one member short. His health is improving. Just to make you aware of that. We are missing one person; it is because he has a terrible cold. This is just to let the other delegates be aware of this.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. We are aware of this. Thank you for telling us. Now we know. We have asked in the beginning if you are not healthy, you are not to attend the proceedings until you are well. Whenever you guys are ready, you can start. Thank you.

Presentation by Nunavut Impact Review Board

Phillip Kadlun Omingmakyok – Board Member

Tara Arco – Director of Technical Services

Phillip: Hello. I'm Phillip Kadlun Omingmakyok. Along with me this morning is one of our staff, the Director of Technical Services, Tara Arko. I am the board member for Nunavut Impact Review Board. Firstly, I would like to thank the Commission for involving the Nunavut Impact Review Board in the land use planning process that has been underway for several years. The chairperson sends their regrets that they were unable to attend in person during the hearing. We wanted one of our board members to attend the meeting in Cambridge Bay to support the Nunavut Impact Review Board staff during their presentation, which is why I am here.

We appreciate the opportunity to present the Commission with recommendations for consideration as they continue to develop that Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Nunavut Impact Review Board's recommendations are based upon what we have learned through the impact assessment process, and we hope that identification of potential gaps and new understandings is useful so that the Commission finalizes the Plan. Our staff will remain available to answer any questions. We are confident that by working together, we will be able to advance Nunavut land use goals. Imagine for Nunavut before our time. We believe we are actively making that reality by continuing to work together through the co-management system in Nunavut. I hope that everyone has a wonderful week in Cambridge Bay. I will now turn the microphone over to our staff.

Tara. Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Tara Arco. Director of Technical Services with the Nunavut Impact Review Board. I will be presenting on behalf of the Nunavut Impact Review Board staff at the final hearing for the Planning Commission's 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Nunavut Impact Review Board is established through Articles 10 and 12 of the *Agreement* between the Nunavut Settlement Area and Her Majesty, the Queen in Rights of Canada, referenced as the *Nunavut Agreement* throughout the rest of this presentation, and our legislative base, the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*.

The Nunavut Impact Review Board's mandate is to conduct impact assessment of proposed development projects, gauge and define regional impact, review economic and socioeconomic impacts, and determine whether or not projects should be allowed to proceed, and if they are allowed to proceed, under what terms and conditions. The Nunavut Impact Review Board also monitors the effects of approved projects and their compliance with predetermined terms and conditions.

Through the integrated resource management regime established in the *Nunavut Agreement* where the Nunavut Planning Commission – I'll refer to it here as the Commission for the remainder of the presentation – deems a proposed project to be in conformity with approved land use plans in the area, and the Nunavut Impact Review Board conducts a project specific impact assessment prior to the project proponent being able to obtain any licenses, permits, or approvals to proceed.

The Nunavut Impact Review Board has participated in the Commission's development of the previous 2016 and current 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plans. Throughout each phase of the public process to date, the Nunavut Impact Review Board has provided staff level feedback on each draft, shared logistical information on undertaking community meetings, and continued to flag land use planning issues identified by Nunavut Impact Review Board during project specific assessments and reconsiderations of previously approved projects.

Nunavut's regulatory system requires integration between the Commission's land use planning process and the Nunavut Impact Review Board's impact assessment process to operate fully as envisioned. At present, there are significant portions of the Nunavut Settlement Area that have no approved Land Use Plan in place and are not subject to the Commission's Land Use Plan conformity determination as a result.

For these areas which have approved land use plans in place, with more than 50 years since their original approval, the plans themselves have become dated, and the Nunavut Impact Review Board has encountered challenges with project specific impact assessments where feedback from parties

has called into question the acceptability of the type of project and associated land use, which is something that land use plans are intended to address.

To create awareness, when these broad land use planning issues are raised during the Nunavut's project specific impact assessment process, the Nunavut Impact Review Board has provided notice to parties and the Commission when the Nunavut Impact Review Board has concluded that the issues raised during an assessment would more appropriately be addressed at the regional level through land use planning. This ongoing feedback has been provided in this submission and is carried forward through our submissions to make sure that they remain in people's awareness.

Where there are no land use plans in place, or where approved land use plans are not in place but have become outdated, issues more appropriately addressed through regional land use planning bypass the Planning Commission's conformity assessment process and are deferred to the Nunavut Impact Review Board to address through the project specific assessment.

This situation presents unique challenges because the development of a specific impact assessment process is not generally suitable to consider and address the broader issues of land or resource use at a regional scale. As such, considerations are beyond the scope of the considerations associated with an individual project. Examples include broader decisions about the development of uranium resources, nuclear power, the development of transportation corridors, limits on development with caribou calving grounds, and these broader issues deserve consideration through the land use planning process wholistically as envisioned by the *Nunavut Agreement*.

The Nunavut Impact Review Board is supportive of the Commission's efforts to establish a Nunavut-wide use Plan, and the board appreciates the opportunity to participate in the process for its development and approval and supports the Commission's efforts to develop and implement an initial version of the Plan and then to regularly review or periodically revise such a Plan following its approval to ensure that it remains effective and current.

The Nunavut Impact Review Board understands that many land uses may compete for resources. However, for developments that may specifically limit the value or viability of other resources, positive conformity determinations should provide additional direction on operational restrictions or development limitations to ensure that the impact assessment is appropriately focused.

Conservation issues previously identified in the approved land use plans have been updated, and in some cases changed in this version to reflect the state of specific resources and surrounding regulatory requirements. In recognizing the updated policy, the Nunavut Impact Review Board has also noted where updated information would be prudent to provide parties with clarity of where resource strategies have changed significantly between previously approved plans and the current versions. For the Commission's reference, the current presentation provides the link to issues raised within the Nunavut Impact Review Board's final written statement and section numbers.

On the current slide, to the first point, the Nunavut Impact Review Board understands that specifics around some land uses may be an evolving issue, while others are well defined in their limits. An example of these parameters of land uses may include the height of infrastructure, in triggering regulation, required offset distances, or operational windows. Some of these values and limits are found in the Land Use Plan with justification. Some values are in the Plan but with no supporting justification, and others may be found in the *Options* document.

The Nunavut Impact Review Board suggests that it is important for parties to understand how items are inserted into the Plan once there is certainty and encourages consistency between the handling of these values where only justified numbers are actually included in the Plan. Items that are unjustified or have uncertainty associated with them should be noted as such and contained in a more flexible portion of the document, still associated with the overall Nunavut Land Use Plan.

To the second point on this slide, while this may not be a frequent issue, the Nunavut Impact Review Board notes that there is uncertainty in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan on how proposals for development should be handled during the time that a territorial park is proposed, and between then and the time that the park management plan is approved. This lack of detail allows for rushes of applications during times of very high uncertainty and future acceptable land uses and creates significant challenges in a community's ability to provide feedback on a specific application.

Due to some projects proposed or approved being within Limited Use Areas with seasonal restrictions on operations as well as the topics of allowable research being restricted, sometimes only to caribou-related research, the Nunavut Impact Review Board has identified potential challenges that could arise in proponents meeting obligations for general environmental monitoring around major approved projects. Again, the written submission includes recommendations on how this could be dealt with.

To the second point here, the level of detail in allowable land uses around the communities is very detailed in the current draft, and with the overall development and updating of the Nunavut-wide Plan, some communities may not be able to update acceptable land uses as quickly as needed for community planning purposes.

As noted before, especially by Phillip the board member, the Nunavut Impact Review Board continues to contribute and carry forward some of these issues to make sure all parties understand how the land use planning and impact assessment process can work together. On the 2016 Draft version, the Nunavut Impact Review Board provided 20 recommendations linked to gaps and risks identified. In the 2021 Plan, the Nunavut Impact Review Board has provided some additional recommendations, and again are prepared to participate through the follow-up comment period should parties be interested in more detail on these issues.

In conclusion, the Nunavut Impact Review Board has participated in the Commission's process to develop a land use plan since the development of its initial drafts and continues to be supportive of implementation of a territory-wide Plan, especially to provide assurance to developers, regulators, and communities alike.

In its initial written submission to the Commission, the specific recommendations related to updates or clarification of issues have been retained by the Nunavut Impact Review Board to ensure that the Planning Commission has the ability to follow-up with justifications or redirections on how some of this feedback may have been incorporated. The Nunavut Impact Review Board has focused its presentation in this hearing on demonstrating the board's perspective on these issues so that the Commission and signatory parties may better understand the recommendations when it comes time to make the decision and implement the Land Use Plan.

The NIRB expresses appreciation to the Commission, its staff, parties, the signatories in attendance at this event, and members of the public for your attention during this presentation. The Nunavut Impact Review Board also appreciates the efforts of the interpreters-translators, and to the Commission, appreciates the resources invested in conducting these types of proceedings and thanks the Commission for the opportunity to present our perspective. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I think we will stick to our procedures. Are there any questions from the staff? Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much to the NIRB for their presentation here today. I just have one question. Is the commitment by the Nunavut Planning Commission to initiate a comprehensive review of the approved Land Use Plan within 7 years of its approval adequate in the NIRB's view? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Phillip?

Phillip: Thank you, Itsivautaq. I will direct the question to our technical staff. Tara?

Chairperson: Go ahead, Tara.

Tara: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Tara Arko, Nunavut Impact Review Board. Thank you, Jonathan for that question. I think the answer is very parallel to a lot of the other recommendations we've made through the written submission. We have to start somewhere. The board is supportive about finding a reasonable starting point and defer to the Planning Commission's expertise in defining how long that may take for your internal obligations as well.

So, at this point, the board supports many of these parameters just to get started, and we can contribute more feedback as we go along as to the fit that we are experiencing from the outside, which may also be somewhat determined by the amount of work coming our way in the future. I would just note that the board would be giving very comprehensive recommendations in the future but does support the Commission's ability to implement at least an initial cycle before providing additional feedback. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any more questions? Do we have questions from the community delegates to the panel? Questions may be directed to the presentation. Atigo, Beverly.

Beverly: Good morning. Thank you. Beverly Makasagak, Manager of the Ikaluktutiak HTO. You mentioned here the gap in defining the proposals. If I can just get some clarification from the Commission. On the first day, I was kind of confused on September 12th when they mentioned Ovayok Park that the signing had not been completed yet, and Ovayok Park still falls under the Commission's jurisdiction. Maybe I have my notes wrong, but the answer from Jonathan Savoy is it is administered under Parks Canada, and it is not under the Commission's jurisdiction. If I could just have a little bit of clarification there.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much, Beverly for the question. To clarify, the Nunavut Planning Commission does

still have jurisdiction within many territorial parks, including Ovayok Territorial Park here in Cambridge Bay, because they are not yet since not fully established. The Draft Plan includes Limited Use designations proposed to prohibit many types of industrial uses.

The comment I had made earlier in the hearing about national historic sites administered by Parks Canada was in reference to the Franklin wrecks of the Erebus and Terror. That was the only example of a national historic site administered by Parks Canada where the Commission doesn't have jurisdiction. But again, for territorial parks and as well as national parks that are not yet fully finalized, the Commission retains jurisdiction at this time, and the 2021 Draft Plan proposes Limited Use designations for these areas. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions or clarifications? Beverly, all good? Qujannamiik. If there are no questions from delegates, we will ask the registered participants if you have any questions to the panel. *(Pause)*

There appears none. Thank you for your presentation and answering the questions directed to you.

(Applause)

Presentation by the Nunavut Water Board

Assol Kubeisinova – Technical Advisor

Jesse O'Brien – Consultant

Chairperson: Nunavut Water Board? You may proceed whenever you are ready. Just a reminder to state your name and organization before you speak, please.

Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Assol Kubeisinova, and I am a Technical Advisor with the Nunavut Water Board. Next to me is Jesse O'Brien who is the consultant for the Water Board. The Nunavut Water Board would like to present its comments and recommendations on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. I will start with an overview of the Water Board's mandate, explain the reasons why the board is a participant in this process, provide the summary of the board's review of this Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, and list the ways anyone can contact the board in regard to this review. Then, we will be able to take your questions and record your comments.

The Nunavut Water Board is an Institution of Public Government established under Article 13 of the *Nunavut Agreement*. The board has responsibilities and powers over the regulation, use, and management of fresh water in the Nunavut Settlement Area. The objectives of the Water Board are to provide for the conservation and utilization of waters in Nunavut except in the national park, in a manner that will provide the optimum benefit from those waters for the Nunavummiut in particular, and Canadians in general.

The Nunavut Water Board has responsibilities and powers over the regulation, use, and management of fresh water or inland waters within Nunavut. The board's primary function is to license uses of water and deposits of waste. The *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut's Surface Rights Tribunal Act* states in Section 11.1: Subject to Subsection 2, no person shall use or permit the use of waters in Nunavut except in accordance with the conditions of a license. Section 11.2 lists those

exceptions as the use unlicensed by regulations, domestic use, use in cases of emergency, and uses in a national park.

Why is the Water Board participating in this process? The answer to that is that the *Nunavut Agreement* directs the board to contribute to the development of a Land Use Plan. Article 13, Section 13.4.1 of the *Nunavut Agreement* states the Nunavut Water Board shall contribute fully to the development of land use plans as they relate to water in the Nunavut Settlement Area by providing its recommendations to the Nunavut Planning Commission. In support of our obligations under the *Nunavut Agreement*, the NWB or Nunavut Water Board is working jointly with the steering committee, which includes that the Nunavut Planning Commission, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, Regional Inuit Associations, the Government of Nunavut, and Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada develop a Nunavut-wide management strategy. I will call it the Strategy.

The Strategy will create a unified vision for water management in Nunavut, ensure that policies and regulatory activities support sustainable water management and consider cumulative effects, uphold the principles of Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit, play a role in transboundary watershed agreements, and consider the devolution process.

During these public hearings, the representatives of the Nunavut Water Board have been and will continue listening to the discussions of water management issues and priorities to help inform the further development of the Strategy. Now I will touch upon the review of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan that the board has conducted.

The first comment that the board had was requesting clarification from the Commission about whether the 10-kilometre buffers around freshwater crossings that limit activities designated as incompatible uses, would operate to limit activities for 10-kilometres along a water course where there is a crossing. In discussions with Commission staff, this comment, this concern has been clarified and resolved.

The Nunavut Water Board asked how freshwater caribou crossings currently identified in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan would be updated by the Commission. The board also identified that if during water licensing, the Board receives information regarding changes to the existing crossings, the board will continue to consider this information in its licensing process.

The board identified that the Draft Plan limits uses of water in territorial park to a term of 5 years or less. This limit may be inconsistent with the discretion of the Nunavut Water Board, which authorizes the board to permit the use of water for a term of up to 25 years, or the duration of the undertaking using the water. The Nunavut Water Board requested clarification from the Commission as to how the 5-year limit on water use would be applied.

The board noted that there may be some confusion about terminology in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and that use by the Nunavut Water Board and recommended that the description and definition of the term “community water supply watershed” be added to the 2021 Nunavut Land Use Plan to clearly define these areas and to clarify that the term “community water supply watershed” is not intended to overlap or replace “water management areas” as identified in the Nunavut water regulations.

In regard to future revisions of the Nunavut Land Use Plan, the board noted the Commission's commitment to consider during its review of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan the emergence of relevant policy initiatives from planning partners. The board identified that the steering committee's work to develop the Nunavut Water Management Strategy is highly relevant to water management aspects of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Strategy will reflect watershed regional and territorial issues and priorities around fresh water.

The Nunavut Water Board thanks the Commission for the opportunity to attend these public hearings and would also like to thank all those who have been willing to share their knowledge, comments, and views about water management issues and priorities throughout this process. We would also like to thank the Hamlet of Cambridge Bay for welcoming us into the community. If anyone would like to further discuss the board's review of this Draft Plan, please contact the staff. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the staff? Jonathan?

Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much to the Nunavut Water Board for the presentation today. You mentioned the development of the Nunavut Water Management Strategy that the Commission is involved in. For the benefit of participants here, would you be able to provide any details on the current estimated timeline for the development of the Water Management Strategy and how that may or may not work with the Commission's proposed timeline of a 7-year periodic review of the approved Nunavut Land Use Plan? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to pass the mic to Jessie O'Brien.

Chairperson: Atigo.

Jessie: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Jonathan. Jessie O'Brien, Consultant to the Nunavut Water Board. We are in, as you know, the very early stages of the development of a Nunavut Water Management Strategy. We are looking right now at this juncture to do the necessary background research on water management in the territory as it stands today, conferring with the partner members of the steering committee.

The next step in the process will be to begin a process of engagement and consultation with the communities further with the RIAs or Regional Inuit Authorities, and with the other members of the steering committee. So, the consultation process we anticipate to begin near the end of this year and to extend into 2023.

From that process, we will take the outcomes and begin to draft a Draft Nunavut Water Management Strategy. This timeline will align with the NPC's proposed process for the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and will, by design, allow for the integration of comments and reflection of the Water Management Strategy to be considered within that 7-year review window for the NPC. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

- Jonathan S: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for the response to that question. One additional issue we would like to touch on: The Commission has heard concerns from communities in particular about impacts on the community drinking water supplies and for some community drinking waters supplies that extend beyond municipal boundaries but are not disproportionately large, those drinking water supplies are designated as a Limited Use Area with year-round prohibitions on some industrial activities. Does the Nunavut Water Board have any comments on the appropriateness of including year-round prohibitions on certain industrial activities within some community drinking water supplies? Thank you.
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Atigo.
- Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Jonathan, for this question. The board would like to defer to the Commission in regard to the designation of the community drinking water supply. On the licensing level, the board certainly considers the impact of any sort of activity on any water source, and especially those that are drinking water sources for communities in case of a single undertaking. I could also follow-up beyond that in writing Thank you, Mr. Chair.
- Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a reminder to state your name and your organization for the record. Thank you. Jonathan, are you finished? Are there questions from the community delegates to the panel?
- Paul I: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. *(Translated)*: Paul Ikuallaq, Kitikmeot Wildlife Board Chair. I just need some clarification to the presentation you made. I imagine you deal with hamlets throughout the territory. The people have many concerns at times to ongoing projects in the Nunavut area. I would like to know what are your concerns with Nunavut fresh water drinking supplies.
- Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for this question. The Water Board, and I have touched briefly on this in regard to when I talked about how the board deals with water sources on a project-by-project basis. How the Water Board's process works is that we receive an application from a proponent, be it the company or some other entity that would like to start a project in the area. We consider the possible impacts of this given project on the water sources in the project area. We are very much involved in the public review process, and the board always takes into account the feedback it gets back from communities or other interested parties when it comes to the board's decision-making for a license, what sort of conditions would be included in the license, what sort of concerns communities have about the project. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. This gentleman also had a question. Atigo.
- Athol: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. To the Water Board presentation, it is well said. I am from Kugaaruk HTO. I want to hear from the panel. The people and our rivers, I want to know what is causing these species dying, at times without any reason or explanation. Is it from the water sources? Are you able to do research on these mammals found in our waters?
- Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I could ask for a clarification. Could you please discuss a bit more about the cases of wildlife dying?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Athol: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I have known that the bowhead whales that have died on shores, some fishes near my community, and there is no explanation as to why. Have you done your research on these species?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Assol Kubeisinoa, Nunavut Water Board. I understand your question now. I would like to note that the board's mandate only extends to fresh water and inland waters in Nunavut. The marine waters are excluded. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from the community delegates? Lucy?

Lucy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. *(Translated)*: I would like to say it is not a question. It is a general comment. The rivers in our areas are running very low. The water levels are so low in many areas, and the shoreline is eroding at time in many areas. Is this a general problem in other communities that water sources are running low? It has been in evidence for a few years now. It is not only in my community. I have heard from other regions as well that their water levels are running so low.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was more of a comment. Go ahead.

Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for this comment. This is very valuable. I know we have had a bit of a sidebar discussion yesterday, and this is exactly the feedback that the steering committee for the Nunavut Water Management Strategy is looking for. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sorry, this is Assol Kubeisinoa, Nunavut Water Board.

(Laughter)

Chairperson: Thank you. Salomie? She had a question.

Salomie: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Salomie Qitsualik, Gjoa Haven Hamlet Councillor. I am very pleased in what you have presented. It is valuable. Now my question: Our watershed, our drinking water is from a small lake. We are from an island. I have seen in other communities their water supply and their watersheds are very well kept. They appear to have strong policies, so their water supplies are enviable. Our water source is so close to the community, and at the same time it is the community's fishing spot. It is quite dirty. The garbage is piling up around the lake. You as a board responsible for fresh water, how would you be able to deal with this so it could be safer drinking water for our community? I need help from anyone that will listen to me because we have a very limited water supply, and the watershed is not there. That is my concern.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Assol Kubeisinoa, Nunavut Water Board. Thank you, Salomie, for this question and outlining the issues with Gjoa Haven's water source. As the board is located in Gjoa

Haven, we are very much familiar with the situation. A bit of an issue with that is that the board does not enforce the conditions of a water license. That is done by an inspector, a water resources inspector.

In regard to maybe adding another water source, as a hamlet councillor, I am sure you are aware that the hamlet is working with the Government of Nunavut's Community and Government Services, and that is the entity that provides technical and financial support to hamlets in regard to the water infrastructure. The board is always open to consider an application from the hamlet for an amendment of its current water license to add another water source, or to switch to another water source altogether, but that is something that needs to be discussed between the hamlet and the Government of Nunavut's Community and Government Services. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions? Atigo, David.

David T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Totalik, Taloyoak Hamlet Councillor. My question to the panel is just for you to hear. In the land in Nunavut, perhaps it only applies to people coming up here to work or to explore. In our community, we have a lake for water source. You the Water Board have mandates to look at projects if it is outside the municipal boundary. Do you have specific policies for water plans for the communities that have deficiency in fresh water? That came to my mind listening to your presentation and questions.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. It is not really relevant to the progress, the proceedings that we are conducting. I will take that as a general comment. It is not related to Nunavut Planning Commission mandate. Some of these questions are posed to the panel. I know we are here to hear, and we have different organizations making presentations to the proceedings, so when we have questions, I would like specific questions to be directed to the panel at the table. Are there any other questions? Beverly?

Beverly: Good morning. Beverly Makasagak with the Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization. In the 2016 Draft here on page 8, it mentions about the Hiukitak River. That is close to Bay Chimo and Bathurst outpost camps. Also mentioned is the 10-kilometre buffers around the watersheds. Has the Water Board done any studies around these rivers with the buffer being 10 kilometers so we can confirm and know that the river system is being protected and that they are not being polluted by mining companies with any kind of seepage going through the rivers? Has anything like that been studied from the Water Board?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Assol: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Assol Kubeisinova, Nunavut Water Board. Thank you, Beverly for this question. We have not done any studies, per se, but the board does review impacts from a given project on a given area. So, if there is an entity, a mining company in your example, that is discharging waste somewhere in the area, they would require a water license to do so. The impacts, the process of that discharge would have been looked at during the board's licensing process, which relies heavily on public review and feedback from the communities and other interveners. I am not quite familiar with projects in that area, so this is the extent of what I can say right now, but we can always talk about that a bit later, and I can consult with my colleagues in Gjoa Haven and provide you with a more expansive response. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Any other questions, Beverly? Qujannamiik. *(Translated)*: Are there any more questions from the community delegates? *(Pause)*.

Qujannamiik, it appears none. Now to the floor from registered participants, are there any questions to the panel? *(Pause)*. No?

There are no questions. Qujannamiik. Thank you for your questions and for answering questions directed to you.

(Applause)

I think we will take a short 15-minute break at this time.

Break

Presentation by the Nunavut Marine Council **Heather Rasmussen – Senior Policy Advisor**

Heather: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Quana very much for the opportunity to present here today. My name is Heather Rasmussen. I am the Senior Policy Advisor with the Nunavut Impact Review Board, and I am also a member of the Nunavut Marine Council working group. Today I am going to be speaking on behalf of the Nunavut Marine Council. I am going to be providing an overview presentation of what the Nunavut Marine Council is and how the Council fits into the land use planning process.

First, I would like to thank the Nunavut Marine Council Policy Advisor, Colleen Parker, for preparing this presentation and also the Nunavut Marine Council working group members for their input. Unfortunately, Colleen was unable to be here today to present. However, she has been following along with the proceedings thanks to the video streaming.

The Nunavut Marine Council is defined in the *Nunavut Agreement* under Article 15, and it is further defined in the *Nunavut Waters and Nunavut Surface Rights Tribunal Act*, and the *Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act*.

The Nunavut Planning Commission, the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board made jointly together as the Nunavut Marine Council, or individually by themselves, advise and make recommendations to government agencies regarding the marine areas in the Nunavut Settlement Area. This is both territorial and federal government, and government must consider this advice and recommendations when making decisions that affect these marine areas.

Rather than create a standalone organization for marine management, like say another Institution of Public Government, the *Nunavut Agreement* provides this mechanism that allows the four organizations to use their collective experience and to coordinate to provide that advice on issues

affecting the marine areas of the Nunavut Settlement Area. I just want to clarify that the Nunavut Marine Council is not responsible for making rules, regulations, or enforcing them.

The function of the Nunavut Marine Council extends each of the four organizations' daily responsibilities, and it provides an additional role regarding marine management and makes sure there is no duplication. This just means that we don't do work that the four organizations are already responsible for, and I am going to go into this a little bit further in my presentation.

The area that we are talking about is defined under Section 1.1.1 of the *Nunavut Agreement*. "Marine areas" means that part of Canada's internal waters or territorial sea, whether open or ice covered, lying within the Nunavut Settlement Area, but does not include inland waters. For greater certainty, the reference to internal waters or territorial sea includes the seabed and subsoil below those internal waters or territorial sea.

I'm now going to provide a very high-level overview of some of the key organizational milestones of the Nunavut Marine Council. In 1998, the Nunavut Marine Policy Advisory Council was established. This included working together on a discussion paper, a draft Terms of Reference, a draft Memorandum of Understanding, and publishing a *Nunavut Marine Issues Action Plan*. Then in 1998, the Nunavut Marine Council was formally established. Then in 2008, the Nunavut Marine Council members reaffirmed the Nunavut Marine Council and updated the Terms of Reference.

Further milestones have included developing a Memorandum of Understanding in 2009; developing a business case; launching a website in 2016 that we recently redesigned; publishing an essay in a journal; and then as we are all very excited, we were able to hire a Nunavut Marine Council Policy Advisor, Colleen Parker, in 2019. Her role is to support the implementation of the Nunavut Marine Council's Strategic Plan, which was developed in 2017.

Building on the language in the *Nunavut Agreement*, the business case, as well as the strategic planning workshop, the Nunavut Marine Council adopted the following vision for the 2018 to 2023 period: to be an active, effective, and respected voice on marine issues for Nunavummiut. The Strategic Plan outlines three key functions as part of this mission in a manner consistent with principles of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit and Article 15 of the *Nunavut Agreement*. These principles are raising awareness, providing advice, and undertaking advocacy.

The Nunavut Marine Council is composed of the Chairperson, a Nunavut Marine Council representative from each of the Nunavut Planning Commission, Nunavut Impact Review Board, Nunavut Water Board, and Nunavut Wildlife Management Board. Each organization is responsible for nominating their Nunavut Marine Council representative. The Chairperson and the Nunavut Marine Council representative from each of the four organizations represent the interests of their respective boards or commission during meetings two times a year.

We also have a staff-level working group that has been established with the executive directors and senior staff representing each member Institution of Public Government along with the Nunavut Marine Council Policy Advisor. This working group is responsible for implementing the Strategic Plan. Both the Nunavut Marine Council and the working group operate by working together and through consensus decisions-making.

Under the *Nunavut Marine Council Strategic Plan*, there are two main goals. The first is to establish the Nunavut Marine Council as a key voice on marine shipping. The second is to establish the Nunavut Planning Commission as a key voice on marine conservation. Under these two main goals, the Nunavut Marine Council will achieve its vision by performing the key functions that were introduced earlier and are on the screen.

The Nunavut Marine Council undertakes work through public engagement, which includes public education and engagement activities. This involves increased awareness of what the Nunavut Marine Council is, and its mandate and activities for the public and government agencies. It also is about increasing the awareness of issues of importance to Nunavummiut within the marine areas of Nunavut.

Some of the awareness activities that the Nunavut Marine Council has undertaken include developing a new website and establishing a social media presence, and also conducting a Nunavut-wide logo contest. The Council through its Policy Advisor, participates in regional and federal level marine meetings, including the Nunavut Marine Conservation Target Steering Committee, the Canadian Marine Advisory Council, Arctic Shipping Forum, and Coastal Zone Canada Conference, among others.

Advice and advocacy work has focused on providing recommendations to the Government of Canada. Some recommendations have been produced of a response to ban on heavy fuel oil in May 2020; comments on Ocean Noise Strategy in 2021; comments on a Blue Economy Strategy in 2021; and comments on the National Marine Conservation Area Policy in 2022.

We are currently planning to host in the future a symposium that will bring together representatives from community and regional organizations, as well as representatives from territorial and federal departments, with a direct or indirect mandate related to Arctic marine conservation and shipping. This symposium will provide a platform to discuss shipping and conservation activities, issues, and potential options for coordinating and prioritizing initiatives. It will also guide the work undertaken by the Nunavut Marine Council.

We have already started to work with an external consultant to support this initiative, and they have started by gathering information on existing knowledge and perspectives on marine shipping and marine conservation that have been brought forward through the individual processes of the four organizations. The Nunavut Marine Council will also be developing plain language summaries.

Now to shift the discussion to the Nunavut land use planning process. As we all have heard, the Nunavut Land Use Plan applies to all projects and project proposals within the Nunavut Settlement Area and Other Land Fast Ice Zones. The Nunavut Marine Council is acting as an observer in this process. This is to inform the council's recommendation and advice to government agencies about non-project shipping, which is outside the scope of the Land Use Plan.

The Nunavut Marine Council's potential recommendations and advice are very broad relating to the marine environment in Nunavut and are informed by the information in the individual organization's processes, including these public hearings.

In conclusion, the Nunavut Marine Council's role in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan is to listen to the information, concerns, and knowledge shared, and to inform its recommendations to

government agencies regarding the marine areas. The Nunavut Marine Council is aware that in the past, participants in the land use planning process have suggested that the Marine Council be involved in the process as an outlet for marine issues. The hope is that with this presentation, there is a greater understanding of the role of the Nunavut Marine Council in the process.

Qujannamiik once again, for the opportunity to present on behalf of the Nunavut Marine Council as an organization, again made up of the Nunavut Planning Commission, the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, and the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, again with a mandate to provide advice and recommendations on marine areas to government. I am very happy to take comments and to answer questions. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. We have no questions from the staff. Jeannie? Does Jeannie have a question?

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jeannie Ugjuk, Taloyoak Hamlet. In your presentation, there are advisory groups to the four IPGs. Will you be travelling to the communities to inform what your new mandates are to marine of Nunavut?

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Heather: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Heather Rasmussen with the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Qujannamiik for your questions. Right now, we are looking at different ways that we can do outreach with the communities. One of the greatest limitations of the Nunavut Marine Council right now is funding. Right now, each of the organizations receive every year \$25,000.00 plus a little bit extra to account for inflation. We did receive funding from Transport Canada for two years to support the Marine Council Policy Advisor position. Right now, the four Institutions of Public Government are supporting that position in the Nunavut Marine Council work.

Currently, we do not have the funding to go into each individual community. However, with the Nunavut Marine Symposium, the plan is to bring representatives from each community, once we are able to get that off the ground since we ran into some issues with COVID-19. We are also currently looking at other ways of outreach in the communities such as going on radio stations, through Facebook, and reaching out individually to key organizations like the Hunters and Trappers Organizations and the hamlets. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have further questions, Jeannie? Atigo.

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jeannie Ugjuk, Hamlet of Taloyoak. You appear to have many limitations due to what you have mentioned. When you have time, when the funding comes through and you are able to travel, we have many concerns in our territorial waters, areas around Boothia Peninsula. We need preservation of these coastal areas. We, of course are looking forward to working with you and hope to see you in the coming years.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any further questions from the community delegates? Bobby?

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bobby Greenley, Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization Chair. It is more of a comment, and it is a little bit off topic here of what we are trying to go towards, but a lot of the stuff that you mentioned we have already started and put in place. Maybe contacting the local Hunters and Trappers Organizations would help you a lot. A lot of the information we brought

forward to the Planning Commission here, and we are going to submit that in the future. So, just some information.

A lot of the stuff that you mentioned we already started a while back, like with the heavy fuels. We asked for that to be banned as the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board. A lot of the members can probably remember when we submitted the paperwork. All this stuff was started a long time ago. Nobody has ever communicated to the HTOs from the Marine Council. I have never been approached, our office. There are so many ways to get hold of us. It is very easy. I just wanted to make note of that. Sorry for getting for getting off track. It's just information for the Marine Council. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any more questions from the community delegates? *(Pause)*.

It appears none. Are there any questions from registered participants? Go ahead, Beverly.

Beverly: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Beverly Makasagak with Ikaluktutiak HTO. You mentioned, like Bobby mentioned about the heavy fuel oil ban. We did support the World Wildlife Fund on the heavy fuel oil ban. I am just wondering if you could elaborate a little bit more on any consultation you had with the World Wildlife Fund. Even if you send a written answer, we would appreciate that. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Heather: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Heather Rasmussen with the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Quana for your question and quana for both of your comments. Just first to address both of what I heard, I just want to explain a little bit of what I mentioned earlier in the presentation. Our Marine Council Policy Advisor and the consultants that we have hired have gone through the reports from the different processes, such as the land use planning process from the Nunavut Planning Commission.

One of the key things we have heard as staff in communities has been that quite often, organizations come in and keep asking the same questions, and it does not always seem like we are listening. So, that is one thing that we try to do is to try to do background work and see what has already been shared so that we could have that as a starting point to show that we are listening to what has been shared through all of these individual processes, and then to get validation whether these concerns are still valid or not, but we will definitely be reaching out.

The Nunavut Marine Council through the Policy Advisor position has done a lot of outreach to organizations, including the World Wildlife Federation. With regard to the council's formal submission on the response to ban heavy fuel oil, the council submitted a letter to the ministers of Transport Canada, Fisheries and Ocean Canada, and the Canadian Coast Guard. This was in 2020. The letter acknowledged the benefits of the ban on the use and carriage of heavy fuel oils as fuel by ships. They recommended that the 10-year timeline for application of the ban be reconsidered. The council recognized the potential adverse economic implications of this ban for Arctic communities and local development. Similar to what organizations were also requesting, we requested that measures be developed to offset the adverse economic implications of this ban.

The council also recommended that spill response capacity be reviewed considering the change in types of fuel use in the Canadian Arctic, and that associated capacity improvements be made. The

Council did receive a response. Beverly, I can make sure that you receive both of those documents. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Quana.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Taima? Are there questions from registered participants? If there are no questions from the registered participants, a member of the public would like to ask a question. Atigo. He can go ahead. Nobody raised a hand from the registered participants. Whenever you are ready, you can ask the question. Qujannamiik.

Adam T?: *(Name barely audible. Approximated Adam Tenyo)* Local resident. I brought this up 26 years ago with KIA and HTO and Water Board. I did a little bit of studying myself about marine and our shorelines. I have been finding a little bit of garbage inside the char, and a little bit inside the seal in their stomachs. I am still waiting to find out when will our shorelines are going to be cleaned. I brought this up 26 years ago. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That question applies to someone else at the moment. Like I said earlier, I know there are people from other organizations that are here, and you can ask them privately. At the moment, we are dealing with the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. Maybe it would be better to follow-up with your KIA on that issue.

We can continue to our meeting here. Are there any other questions from the public regarding the presentation? *(Pause)*.

I don't see any hands. Qujannamiik for your presentation. Thank you.

(Applause)

Earlier this morning, we were approached about our agenda. We asked Agnico Eagle to see if it is okay Sabina Gold and Silver Corp could go ahead of them. They both agreed, so Sabina Gold and Silver Corp can take the seat. Whenever you guys are ready, you can start. Qujannamiik.

Presentation by Sabina Gold and Silver

Merle Keefe- Manager of Environmental Permitting
Andrew Moore – Director of Indigenous and Northern Affairs
John Kaiyogana – Community Liaison Officer

Merle: Mr. Chair, Merle Keefe, Sabina Gold and Silver. I am the Manager of Environmental Permitting with Sabina Gold and Silver. With me here today, directly to my right we have Andrew Moore. He is the Director of Indigenous and Northern Affairs within Sabina. To his right, I think most of you know him, is John Kaiyogana. He is Sabina's Community Liaison Officer, and he is based here in Cambridge Bay.

Before I get started, I would just like to give a sincere thank you to Mr. Chair and the Commissioners to allowing Sabina to move up in the agenda. We certainly do not feel like we are more important or should be prioritized over the remaining presenters, but full honesty/transparency, I received

some unfortunate news on the health of my father last night, and I am trying to get home as quick as I can. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

To get started, many thanks to the Hamlet of Cambridge Bay for hosting these hearings and to the Nunavut Planning Commission for inviting our participation. Before I forget, a big thank you to the translators, the caterers, the communication staff, etcetera. Thank you to all the hamlets and the HTO representatives who have travelled from the Kitikmeot to participate in this process. We have been an active participant in the planning process, and we look forward to continuing that.

Sabina's flagship project is the Back River Project. We have been in Nunavut quite some time speaking about the Back River Project. The original project proposal was submitted to NIRB approximately 10 years ago, a decade now, in 2012. There are three main components for the Back River Project. The Marine Laydown Area, which is located in Southern Bathurst Inlet. It is just that. It is a lay down area. It is where we bring in equipment, supplies, fuels, and we lay them down there. In the winter, we construct a 160- 170-kilometre winter ice road, and we truck that equipment, supplies, and fuels down to our mine site, which is called Goose Lake.

There has been previously some confusion around the location of the Back River Project. I would like to clarify that. It is not located near the headwaters of Back River, which are south of Gjoa Haven on the mainland. It is south of Bathurst Inlet, approximately 300- to 350-kilometres south of where we are at now.

Sabina's board of directors recently made the announcement for full project construction. It has been some time coming, and we are very excited about that. In 2023, Sabina will commence full construction of our project site. It is a milestone event for us, and we also feel for the Kitikmeot region as employment, training, and programming will begin to ramp up and rolled out by Sabina and its partners, specifically the Kitikmeot Inuit Association.

Sabina is requesting that Sabina's assets, the Back River Project, including the George Property and BIPAR be listed under Appendix A. They are currently not listed under Appendix A. Sabina appreciated the screening criteria that was presented by Mr. Savoy earlier in the week, which outlined the requirements to be listed within Appendix A. Upon review, Sabina believes we check the boxes for that screening criteria in their entirety with the exception that our project currently does not overlap a Limited Use Area.

However, as we have heard multiple times throughout these hearings and detailed within the Commission's responses to pre-submitted questions, the Nunavut Land Use Plan as proposed may be amended and is subject to legislated periodic reviews in perpetuity going forward. For this reason, we feel it is justified to reiterate our request for our assets to be listed within Appendix A.

We see no harm to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan to listing our projects within Appendix A. The Back River Project is active. We have mineral rights within the Government of Canada and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. It has been previously reviewed and approved through the comprehensive Nunavut regulatory system, all important criteria that the Nunavut Planning Commission have outlined as important criteria to be listed under Appendix A. That said, we are encouraged with the conservation that has gone on throughout the week and the references that have been made to reviewing Appendix A upon record close. We believe that our request should be reviewed as part of that review process.

During the very comprehensive Nunavut Impact Review Board and Nunavut Water Board review processes, multiple design changes to our project were completed due to Inuit or environmental concerns. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association, in particular, were instrumental in driving these project changes, which resulted in a more environmentally responsible project ultimately in the end. Some specific examples of that for reference include relocating our tailing storage facility to a more preferred location. Again, that was driven by the Kitikmeot Inuit Association.

We also realigned a section of our winter ice road, a northern section of our winter ice road around Tahikafalok Lake or Bathurst Lake. They wanted to avoid a section of traditional importance in vegetation abundance, and that is something that we did. Another example is updating our Wildlife Management Plan. We have heard lots about caribou protection measures and how important they are. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association was instrumental in providing feedback during the comprehensive review process, which we updated to generate one of the most developed sets of protection measures in the North.

In discussion with Nunavut Planning Commission staff, it was suggested that potentially some additional context regarding existing processes that are in place for the approval of mineral projects on Inuit Owned Lands and the joint development of these caribou protection measures with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association and other regulators may be beneficial. I will briefly try to talk about some of that process, and I am happy to answer additional questions.

There is a very rigorous and detailed assessment process in place currently for all screenings and reviews, especially regarding caribou. During Sabina's Back River Project environmental assessment process, and indeed during these hearings, we have heard from Inuit experts and scientific experts that caribou protection should not be based on a map. This is because caribou move. That is based on Traditional Knowledge. Everyone around the table here understands that better than I do. That feedback was incorporated into the Wildlife Management Plan that we developed with the Inuit through the Nunavut Impact Review process.

That is the development of the Management Plan, but it does not stop there. Once these management plans are developed and projects like ours are approved to proceed, we are responsible for adhering to these plans. To make sure that we are doing this, to confirm that we are adhering to these plans, we have frequent inspections by the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, from the Nunavut Impact Review Board, the Nunavut Water Board, and federal regulatory bodies.

In addition to that, we submit detailed annual reports that explain how we are in compliance with the terms and conditions set out in our permits, in our approvals. These are reviewed in great, great detail annually. In our last 2021 annual report, we received approximately 70 questions from just the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. We have requirements under our Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement to establish an Inuit Environmental Advisory Committee.

So, what is that? For example, representatives from communities are pulled together to form a committee. They are brought to our project site annually to review our operation and maintenance procedures. A change or a recommendation, for example, that could come out of that committee would be where to place caribou crossings within our existing road network on our project site. That would be an example.

I think I will probably stop there with the summary. If there are any additional questions from community members or the staff on the nuts and bolts of that management plan or how we implement our caribou protection measures when caribou are approaching or are present, I would be happy to explain that as well.

We have heard much about the importance of economic development and the need for strong environmental protection measures in this land use planning process, and we share that vision. We have a project certificate from the Nunavut Impact Review Board that governs our activities, as I have explained. We have frequent inspections from the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, the Nunavut Impact Review Board, and the federal regulatory bodies. We will work with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association to continue to establish the Inuit Environmental Advisory Committee, continue to actively engage the Kitikmeot communities in our project planning.

As I mentioned, Sabina has been around since late 2011, 2012, and we have completed over 300 community engagement sessions since then. We continue to encourage and welcome any feedback that there may be there to help meet the needs and the aspirations of the Kitikmeot Inuit. While our project is still in the very early days of its development, we are seeing success.

I will just quickly give some numbers for you. Between June and September of 2022 this year, we saw a 150% increase in Inuit employment on our project. We went from 24 Inuit on our project to 60 in September. We are very proud of that. In the first quarter of this year, we had a retention rate of Inuit employment of 92%, so 92% of Inuit that we hired remained with the project. That is a number that we are proud of, and it is above average. We have also provided over \$45 million dollars in contracting dollars, finances to Northern businesses.

As stated earlier, our project is still in its very early days. While those numbers and achievements should be celebrated, we know we have a lot of work ahead of us to continue to deliver the benefits to the people, the Inuit of the Kitikmeot. Thank you. Quana again, to the Commission, as well as those in attendance for sharing your priorities for land use planning in Nunavut, and we are excited to continually actively engage in this process. I will stop there. Thank you. Quana.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much to Sabina and to Merle in particular for presenting here today under some difficult circumstances. During your presentation, you mentioned the current use of a winter road to access and supply the site from the laydown area, and you also made reference to the existing authorizations for the Bathurst Inlet Port and Road. Just for the benefit of Commissioners and other participants, can you provide an update or comments on experience with the winter road and intentions for future use of an all-weather road associated with the project? Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Merle: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Merle Keefe, Sabina Gold and Silver. Thank you, Jonathan, for your questions. It is sort of two parts. One would be the winter ice road. Sabina has constructed our inaugural winter ice road only several years ago now. This upcoming year will be the first full construction of Sabina's winter ice road. Certainly, Sabina has used those first couple of years to understand the challenges

that come with a winter ice road, of that land, of the amount of equipment that we are going to bring down.

We have been successful to date in constructing and utilizing that winter ice road. We have also successfully better understood the construction and the operation processes that come with constructing and operating the winter ice road. In some cases, we have brought forward those criteria to the Nunavut Impact Review Board as part of that review process and sort of enhanced our ability. For example, and we heard this a lot throughout the environmental assessment process: Community concerns related to the winter ice road, they wanted to see camps situated along it, a minimum of three.

So, if we had emergencies or if we had weather, we had a place to go to on that winter ice road. That was a concern that we heard from community members, so it is something that we officially brought to the NIRB and were approved to do so. That was also partly to do with if there were on-land utilizers. If Inuit were on the land, they are absolutely more than welcome to stop in to those Sabina winter ice road camps and have shelter, or simply warm up and have a tea.

The second part, I should say that the second part of that is related to a potential all-weather road. Currently, Sabina does not plan on constructing an all-weather road. We are upgrading sections of that winter ice road to help us with future construction areas where we don't have a lot of access to fresh water, or they are very steep, or significant boulder fields that we need to get over. In those sections, we have placed a limited amount of aggregate as a base. We still build the winter ice road on top of that aggregate base. The requirements of those aggregate sections are clearly outlined in our framework agreement, which is associated with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. That was done very early on during that comprehensive Nunavut regulatory system review.

That said, changes in technology and engineering design, certainly we want to make sure Inuit continue to get the full benefits of our project. So, if there were any design changes in the future, we would bring that forward through the formal process.

In terms of BIPAR, which was the second part of your question, Jonathan, could I just get a little more clarity in what you are looking for with BIPAR?

Jonathan: Thanks very much, Merle, for the responses. Jonathan Savoy again from the Nunavut Planning Commission. In regard to BIPAR, you had mentioned including that as an existing right within Appendix A. I was just curious for an update on the intentions for the future of BIPAR. Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Merle: Mr. Chair, thank you. Merle Keefe with Sabina Gold and Silver. So, maybe we will take a step back a little bit. A little bit of background on the Bathurst Inlet Port and Road: Sabina does own Bathurst Inlet Port and Road. We purchased the rights from Nuna Logistics in their partnership in 2011. We did not purchase it from Glencore, which I think is a common misconception. Sabina and Glencore established a working relationship over the first few years to jointly support the advancement of Bathurst Inlet Port and road. However, since about 2015, we have not advanced Bathurst Inlet Port and Road, as it requires the development of a major project like Glencore's Hackett River Project. So, we continue to hold Bathurst Inlet Port and Road, and we may choose to advance it at a later date, but that is where it is at now, Jonathan.

Chairperson: Taima? Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions from the delegates? We will go to Beverly first.

Beverly: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Beverly Maksagak with the Ikaluktutiak HTO, Hunters and Trappers. It is nice to hear that the Inuit hire is above average. That is very good news for us to hear. With the increase in Inuit hire, how many of those Inuit are being trained and in what areas of the mine operations?

Chairperson: I'm sorry. Can we talk about the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan? You can talk to them directly after. So, on to Harry.

Harry: Morning. Harry Maksagak from Cambridge Bay. I noticed on one of the first or second slides, I think it is that one there that you were looking at being exempt from a prohibition on mineral exploration and production in a Limited Area. You are working in a very sensitive area, and I would just like to get a little more clarification on that particular statement. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Merle: Mr. Chair, quana. Merle Keefe with Sabina Gold and Silver. Thank you, Harry for that question. Just to clarify, any of the projects listed within Appendix A that are located within Limited Use Areas are exempt from mineral exploration and projection. Sabina is currently not listed within Appendix A, and this was the request to be listed. Currently, Sabina does not overlay with any of those Limited Use Areas.

In those Limited Use Areas, there is a prohibition on mineral exploration and projection, which is the basis of our request, but we are currently not located in those areas. We are located in Mixed Use Areas. That said, Harry, absolutely, we are in an area of ecological importance. We totally understand and respect that. That is why we went through a very comprehensive review process within Nunavut to develop a strict set of management plans that we have to adhere to.

I have spoken about the Wildlife Management Plan as an example, but it is only one of over 30. We have Air Quality Management Plans. We have Vegetation Management Plans. We have Archeology Management Plans, Fresh Water, Fish, etcetera. All those management plans were developed with the Nunavut Impact Review Board, with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, with the back from community members from HTOs-Hunters and Trappers Organizations, with working groups that Sabina established. Working groups would consist of youth from communities or Elders from communities. So, Sabina certainly respects the environment, and we continue to operate that way.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Taima? Are there any other questions? The gentleman down at the end.

Paul: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is mainly a comment, and part of it is going to be a question. Paul Ikualloq from KRWB. In the early years of the mine happening in the Back River area, I was with the Community Beneficiary Committee the one towards Gjoa Haven. I represented KIA at the time. I observed. I like what I see in the Back River surrounding Gjoa Haven, close to Gjoa Haven. I have seen the prospectors working, and I appreciate the way they were handling everything in that area. Thank you very much. In the oil-gas spill, it was taken care of right away. Also, in that area where we went to other prospecting areas toward the ocean, I observed there is no tracks anywhere close by. There are hardly caribou trails, and I also reported to some of our Elders in Gjoa Haven who said they were happy about it. But my term was up, and I could not report to KIA. Now I am chairman

for Kitikmeot Wildlife Management Board. For the time being, I have no complaints. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions?

Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik, Taloyoak. Thank you for your presentation. I am very impressed with the employment you guys have with Inuit. For Taloyoak, we can't say we don't want mining anywhere, and we cannot try and stop the mines that are existing. We just don't want mining in Aviqtuuq. Therefore, I just wanted to comment on that. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions regarding their presentation? *(Pause)*

I don't see any hands. Are there any questions from the registered participants regarding their presentation? Sorry, go ahead.

Luigi: Luigi Toretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association Consultant. Merle, thank you for bringing up the work that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association did with your project, with the Sabina project. I would like to bring the attention to the Land Use Plan and this particular project, and the view that the Kitikmeot Inuit Association has for the protection of caribou wherever they may be. The project is in a Mixed Use Area. That did not stop the Kitikmeot Inuit Association from requesting and having incorporated some very specific and valuable components relating to caribou for that specific project. Taima.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I don't think that was a question. It was more of a comment. Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the registered participants? *(Pause)*

I don't see any more hands. Qujannamiik. Thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

Recognizing the time, maybe we can come back and start again at 1:15. Qujannamiik.

Lunch Break

Agnico Eagle Presentation

Nancy Duquet Harvey – Environmental Superintendent, Hope Bay Mine

Chairperson: *(Translated):* We will have a presentation by Agnico Eagle at the table. You may proceed whenever you are ready. Thank you.

Nancy: I am Nancy Duquet Harvey, Environmental Superintendent for the Hope Bay Mine. We thank the Nunavut Planning Commission for this opportunity to present at this hearing. We also thank the Hamlet of Cambridge Bay for hosting this meeting and being a supporter of Agnico Eagle's Hope Bay Project for many years. Thank you to the HTOs who have travelled across Nunavut for this meeting.

Chairperson: Just a reminder to slow down for the translators. Thank you.

Nancy: Before we continue, we would like to pay our respects to (*inaudible*) who was our community liaison in Cambridge Bay and a good friend. We would like to pass along our condolences to his family and friends. He is certainly missed by all our colleagues at Agnico Eagle. Agnico Eagle was planning to have Jamie Quesnel to present. However, changes were made for personal reasons, and he will be presenting in Rankin Inlet and Thompson.

This is an overview of our presentation. We will be delivering a short form of the presentation today focused on caribou mitigations at our sites, and we will go into more details at future hearings. We respect the great effort that has gone into developing this Plan. However, we think there is a lot more work to be done to achieve the necessary balance for a first-generation Land Use Plan before it is ready. At this time, Agnico Eagle does not support the Plan in its current form but is looking forward to working with the Nunavut Planning Commission, Inuit, Inuit organizations, government, other proponents, to arrive at a Plan that will reflect a balanced consensus approach.

We recognize compromise will be necessary to arrive at a final Plan, but we are very concerned about the impact of the current Draft on Nunavut's economic and socioeconomic future. Our key concerns are that the approach in many areas is to restrict proponents from even submitting an application to the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Industrial activities are banned before their potential benefits and impacts can be considered. This approach is too restrictive and does not give proper weight to the Nunavut Impact Review Board's process, which is designed to assess potential for effects and proposed mitigations to prevent those effects.

The approach does not give proper weight to the mitigations in place at mine sites across the territory, including at Hope Bay, Whale Tale, Meadowbank, and Meliadine. It also does not give due consideration to the monitoring data that we are required to collect and report to the Nunavut Impact Review Board and our advisory groups, which includes participations by many parties, including Hunters and Trappers Organization members.

We also want to note the footprint of areas affected by mining. The actual area affected, including reasonably foreseeable future mining is very small. 99.97% of habitat would remain available even if the potential projects are approved by the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Agnico Eagle has developed robust mitigation plans in collaboration with Inuit and regulators, programs that keep caribou safe. We are looking forward to presenting more details on those for you today.

Greg: Good afternoon. I am Greg Sharam. I am a wildlife biologist who works with clients to help develop mitigations and protect wildlife at mine sites, and also help carry out wildlife monitoring at mine sites. I am going to focus my remarks here on how potential effects on caribou from mining can be prevented, and mitigation measures allow for caribou and mining to coexist.

First, all of Agnico Eagle's exploration projects and mines have robust mitigation and monitoring programs. The Kivalliq and Kitikmeot Inuit Associations permit Agnico Eagle exploration using mobile protection measures for caribou. Mines have a Terrestrial Ecosystem Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. That is quite long, so I will be referring to it here as the Wildlife Plan.

This Wildlife Plan is based on IQ and western science. It is reviewed by Inuit and technical experts and is a requirement by the Nunavut Impact Review Board project certificate. During mine

operation, each project has a Wildlife Plan that is followed. The results of monitoring and any adaptive management is reported to the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Inuit groups and experts then review the results, and the plan is updated through a working group. The Nunavut Impact Review Board asks for public comments on that monitoring plan as part of its process.

Management and monitoring of wildlife at mine sites is a collaborative process with Inuit organizations and government agencies, including Hunters and Trappers Associations. We have several examples in the following slides.

For example, the Meadowbank project has a terrestrial advisory group, which has been operating since 2018. That group includes the Kivalliq Inuit Association, the local Hunters and Trappers Associations, the Government of Nunavut, and Environment and Climate Change Canada. Agnico Eagle reports the results of its wildlife monitoring, and often fisheries monitoring, to this group. The group meets regularly. The group also conducts site visits, and together uses IQ and western science to update the Wildlife Plan.

The Meliadine project also has a terrestrial advisory group, which begins in 2022. It includes the Kivalliq Inuit Association, the Hunters and Trappers Associations, the Sayisi Dene First Nation, the Northlands Dene Suline First Nation, the Government of Nunavut, and Environment and Climate Change Canada.

In addition to these terrestrial advisory groups that work with Inuit and government organizations, Agnico Eagle includes IQ and wildlife advisors in their projects to include perspectives from Inuit and communities. Agnico Eagle employs two IQ and wildlife advisors. These are Inuit members of the communities. They meet with Elders in the communities, conduct site visits, and review the mitigation and the monitoring at mine sites. It should be noted that this is not a permit requirement. It is an extra step that Agnico feels is important for its projects.

Closer to Cambridge Bay at the Hope Bay project, Agnico Eagle has an Inuit Environmental Advisory Committee. This committee was formed in 2011. It is made up of Elders and land users with experience in the project area, including members of the Hunters and Trappers Association. They meet regularly to discuss and update the Wildlife Plan. Members conduct site visits. They interview staff and make recommendations on wildlife mitigation and monitoring.

In the left-hand photo, here you can see the Inuit Environmental Advisory Committee visiting the site. This is a ramp, which the committee suggested installing. There are several of these ramps installed at Hope Bay, which allow caribou more easily to cross the road. Here the Elders are inspecting the ramp and looking for caribou footprints on the ramp. On the right, Elders are interviewing the Hope Bay blasting manager to discuss mitigation for caribou.

Agnico Eagle has a robust monitoring and mitigation program at each one of its sites. These programs are broadly based on the mobile protection measures. They incorporate IQ and western science. What this means is we track when caribou are present. We monitor for these caribou, and we manage accordingly.

In addition to in-person meetings and site visits, Agnico Eagle has developed a virtual meeting room during the pandemic. This is an online platform to foster an open, transparent, and respectful dialogue with all communities of interest. It is completely accessible in Inuktitut and English. It has

a wide variety of materials from videos to interactive maps, story maps, infographics, and text. It allows meaningful sharing, as well as getting feedback from community members. Information is available on our efforts to introduce TK and IQ into Agnico Eagle operations, and there is a feedback form and questionnaires that are available to gather comments and questions.

A lot of the mitigation for caribou are things that you don't normally hear about. They are built into Agnico Eagle's projects, such as designs that allow caribou to cross roads. On the left of this slide, you can see that roads are built as low as possible to the tundra and with a gentle slope to allow caribou to cross. In the middle photo, you can see a bridge built across a caribou trail to help caribou cross the road. On the right, you can see a tunnel built underneath the road to help caribou cross under the road with many caribou footprints where they use this tunnel.

Agnico Eagle also conducts several types of road monitoring. Trail cameras are used to monitor where caribou cross the road and study whether there are particular types of road or material that improve crossing. Agnico Eagle also conducts daily driving surveys recording the number of caribou near the road. Agnico Eagle conducts monitoring for caribou at all of their mine sites. We see that caribou use the areas surrounding the roads and the mine sites.

At each of Agnico Eagle's projects, they have a Wildlife Plan, which is required by their Nunavut Impact Review Board's project certificate and Inuit Agreements and developed in consultation with our advisory groups. The Wildlife Plan has a program where caribou are monitored near roads. When a certain number of caribou are observed near the road, then the road is closed. In the photo, you can see there is a good number of caribou near this road. This is the Meliadine Road, and the road has been closed. Every year, Agnico Eagle closes its roads for many weeks at a time to allow caribou to more easily migrate unhindered.

Caribou monitoring and mitigation also occurs at mine sites. For example, at the Meliadine project, onsite technicians conduct daily surveys when caribou are in the area. The circles on this map represent a 5-kilometre buffer around the mine site. The white shapes are groups of caribou that have been observed from daily surveys. You can see that sometimes they are inside that 5-kilometre buffer, and sometimes they are outside.

Agnico Eagle conducts mine shutdowns so that caribou remain safe. This is an example from the Meliadine Mine. When monitoring at the mine site indicates that groups of caribou are approaching the site, in this case when more than 50 caribou are within 5-kilometres of the site, then the mine is shut down. In 2021, the mine was shut down for 10 days. This includes all vehicles, blasting, drilling, and helicopters. These shutdowns underline Agnico Eagle's commitment to avoiding effects on caribou. It should be noted that the only mines in Canada that conduct these types of shutdowns for wildlife are in Nunavut.

Agnico Eagle also monitors for effects of mining on caribou at each of its operations. The monitoring programs are reviewed by the Inuit Environmental Advisory Committee and the terrestrial advisory group, depending on the mine site, which includes participation from local Hunters and Trappers Associations. This includes ground-based monitoring, behavioral monitoring, tracking movement of caribou using data from the Government of Nunavut and Northwest Territories. Just to be clear, Agnico Eagle uses data from caribou collars but does not collar caribou itself. As well, Agnico Eagle uses camera monitoring to look for effects on caribou. These monitoring programs typically show

that the actual effects on caribou are lower than those predicted through the environmental assessment process.

At both the Meliadine and the Meadowbank sites, environmental monitors conduct behavior surveys on caribou. This has been going on for two years. These surveys show that caribou react to all-terrain vehicles and trucks on the road but typically return to base behaviors, so the behavior before the vehicle, relatively quickly, typically in less than 3 to 6 minutes. We thank the Kivalliq Inuit Association and the Government of Nunavut who have been collaborators on this monitoring program and for providing many helpful suggestions for fieldwork and analysis.

Nancy: Nancy Duquet Harvey, Environmental Superintendent for Agnico Eagle. Agnico Eagle would like to thank the Nunavut Planning Commission for this opportunity to provide comments on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. Agnico Eagle appreciates the hard work that the Commission and Nunavut rights holders and stakeholders have put into this Plan. However, we do not think that the Plan is ready, and there are existing mechanisms, such as the Nunavut Impact Review Board with the mandate to address environmental protection.

We look forward to working more on the Plan together with the Nunavut Planning Commission, Inuit organizations, hamlets, community group, governments, other proponents, and industry groups to arrive at a final Plan that can work for all of us and help secure a healthy environmental and economic future for Nunavut. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the staff? *(Pause)*

Not at the moment. Qujannamiik. Are there any questions from the community representatives?

(Pause)

Any questions from the registered participants? Other participants? Atigo, go ahead.

Pamela: Pamela Wong, Senior Research and Technical Advisor for the Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board. I don't know much about Meliadine Mine, so I just wanted to start off by saying that. I am curious from a business standpoint what it costs the mine to close down for 10 days. The reason I'm asking is, I am curious what the pressures are to keeping the window short that must be balanced with allowing in this case, caribou to cross. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Nancy: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nancy Duquet Harvey with Agnico Eagle. At this time since our panel chair is not here, we will gladly answer your question in writing.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions? *(Pause)*. I don't see any hands. Qujannamiik. Thank you for presenting and answering questions.

(Applause)

If Glencore is here, please take the table. *(Pause)*. Qujannamiik. Whenever you are ready, you can start.

Glencore Canada Presentation

Daniel Vriend, Senior Mining Engineer

Daniel: Daniel Vriend, Glencore Canada. Before I start, I would also like to just thank the Planning Commission, the participants, the panel, the translators, and the caterers here. It is no small task to arrange the people and logistics to come here in person, and very much appreciate the in-person activity over the remote events that we have all gone through for the past few years. Thank you.

Our view here is to listen, which we have done and I have done, for the past few days, and also to be heard and to present our view about who we are and the Hackett River Project and the impacts of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

Just an overview of who we are at Glencore: We are one of the world's largest natural resource companies, and we have been transforming the global commodity industry for nearly half a century through our acquisition of industrial assets, with individual histories going back further. We have over 150 sites that we operate globally in over 35 countries with 30 different offices. Our business is separated between industrial assets and marketing where we represent our industrial assets, being our mines and metallurgic facilities. We operate a series of mines and smelters within Canada, including in Nunavik and Northern Quebec. Our business, broadly speaking, covers exploration, extraction, processing refining, and marketing of logistics of materials in the metals business.

Glencore has mines and smelting operations in northern regions, including Canada and Norway. Hackett River has potential for development and exploration. Glencore has demonstrated itself to be a responsible mining company in Canada and has history through our predecessor companies for nearly 100 years. Glencore is committed to sustainability focused on safety, environmental health, and community and human rights for industry best practices and international standards and guidelines. The Hackett River Project is one of many projects in our portfolio, and we periodically review exploration targets and potential, and refresh it.

Canada is one of the most established jurisdictions for mining in the world through economic and political stability. The mining sector in Canada is committed to responsible development and social practices through sustainable development and is internationally recognized.

Chairperson: Just a reminder to slow down. Just try to slow down when you are reading, please and thank you.

Daniel: Okay. Nunavut has great mineral potential, but it is remote. It is deficient in infrastructure and subject to Arctic climates, which make economic considerations for natural resource development challenging. Nunavut's requirements and process for assessment and review of infrastructure and natural resource development projects is currently well established and robust.

Key facts about the Hackett River Project:

The project is located in the Kitikmeot region, about 350 kilometers southeast of Kugluktuk. Currently, there is no rail or road access, and development is required to export concentrates to the market. The current project status is in advanced exploration and early study works on the deposits

in the greater project. Studies have gone on since the 1970s and the project proposal was submitted in 2008. For reference in size, there are no other undeveloped zinc or silver assets or projects in Nunavut of this size, and very few globally of similar size to Hackett River. The project phase is again, in advanced exploration and preliminary economic assessment study phases.

The Hackett River Project has the potential to be a major source of jobs and economic growth for the region. Construction of an access road and port can lead to other major developments in the area. There will be a need for skilled employees and service providers leading to high demand for workers in the region, especially skilled trades and opportunities for the next generation of young workers. Further than what was presented in the project proposal in 2008, as with many mining projects, there is potential for additional resource development as projects get built.

The project proposal that was submitted in 2008 described the intent of a mine at the Hackett River area. The proposal provided an overview of the types of activities and infrastructure to allow the Nunavut Impact Review Board to determine whether a full Part 5 public review would be recommended for the project and to assist the development of draft environmental impact statement guidelines.

What was presented in the project and what is required to develop the project of this size is beyond just a mine. It requires a mine, a road, and a port. All three elements are required for a project of this size. During the recommended review process, the conceptual project is further defined, and primary project components assessed. I won't go through the details of the approvals process, but as understood at the time, it was clearly outlined through NIRB and through the Water Board, and the involvement with the KIA to be included.

I want to highlight and reiterate that the process of a project such as this does change from initial project proposals. There is considerable work that goes on after the proposal, and it is important for the Planning Commission to understand that flexibility is required as the project advances, not only in terms of the footprint of the mine, but the linear infrastructure and the required exports of products through ports to tidewaters. I do want to emphasize that the Hackett River Project is not a mine. It is a mine, a road, and a port where all three components are required.

Included in the project proposal was key infrastructure including access and transport, which involved an airport and aerodrome facility with all-weather runways, port facilities, and all-weather roads. The importance of all-weather roads is critical to outline in the case of Hackett River, as it is a base metal project and the products out of the mine are mineral concentrates, which are bulk and cannot be flown or moved easily out of site. They require a port and large storage facilities to house them.

At the mine itself, it is a pretty substantial infrastructure involved as well to house the operations, including power generation facilities, potable water and treatment, effluent and sewage treatment, water management facilities, personal accommodations, communications infrastructure, warehouse facilities, concentrator with crushing plants, concentrate storage facilities, fuel storage facilities, maintenance shops, on-site all-weather roads, and mine dry and offices. I challenge the Planning Commission to think of this less of a mine but an infrastructure project to support a mine.

Further considerations: The Hackett River Project has the potential to be a major contributor to metals under the *Canada Minerals and Metals Plan* and the *Canada Critical Minerals Strategy*. The

Hackett River Project has the potential to be a major driver of jobs, services, and economic growth to the Kitikmeot region. Port infrastructure will be for storage, transportation of concentrates from the project, and will be a key piece of regional support.

Additional opportunities: There are opportunities for capacity building for workers of the Kitikmeot region and opportunities for the next generation. A multiuser port and road can lead to other future jobs and business opportunities, and it may increase the supply chain opportunities within the region, investing and partnering with the communities where we operate. There are opportunities with long-term agreements, with social programs, with local stakeholders. There are also opportunities to support increased scientific research in the remote regions, and there is increased focus on monitoring.

To highlight, the link to the *Canadian Minerals and Metals Plan* and the *Mineral Strategy* is that Hackett River would be a very large producer if brought to production of zinc and a moderate producer of copper, which are fundamental in the greening and development of the world.

Areas of Concern:

This brings us to one of our areas of concern. The Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan does not fully recognize proposed roads and corridors, such as those associated with the Hackett River Project. The project will be isolated if it is located within Limited Use Areas that prohibit linear development and/or other associated activities. Without roads, mines would be unable to transport infrastructure, construction material, people, personnel, and concentrate. Again, I emphasize this point for base metal mines over many precious metals or gemstone mines where the product out of the mine is a bulk material and can only be shipped out by sea.

For projects that have not completed construction, flexibility is required in infrastructure footprints and road routing. During the proposal stage, conceptual drawings depict possible mine infrastructure, and road routes are prepared to allow government bodies and regulators to determine guidelines for the preparation of an impact assessment. These depictions undergo substantial revisions and evaluations over the established regulatory process. This flexibility is often captured during potential development areas or similar in draft and final EIS applications.

Again, it is important to maintain that flexibility in the Planning Commission's view that there will be many iterations of design, engagement, and involvement with communities and with stakeholders on what projects look like. It is important that there is enough flexibility built in.

Recommendations:

A few of our recommendations include ensuring that proposed road corridors are included in the protections offered to the existing projects and existing property rights, including flexibility for road corridors and exploration. The bullet points were previously highlighted. I am going to pass over the next two slides, because I don't believe they appropriately capture our concerns after some revisions.

The next area of concern is that the Hackett River Project will essentially be sterilized if the current Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan is adopted as currently drafted. We recognize that the Hackett River Project is amongst others listed in Appendix A. However, the project needs critical infrastructure,

and activities required to develop and operate such a mine are missing. Without the ability to undertake necessary management and mitigation measures for the periods of time, or the ability to transport materials to and from a project, projects such as Hackett River can never be feasible.

Projects such as Hackett River represent considerable economic activity. As an organization, we have spent over \$100 million dollars on the project through exploration. If the project advances, it could represent billions of dollars of future investment in infrastructure, services, supplies, and contracts. It could represent hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars in employment training and capacity development. It could represent hundreds of millions of dollars that would be generated for governments in taxes and royalties. There would be a significant opportunity for further research and development in the understanding of the environment in a remote northern area.

Another recommendation is to consider the science and methodology in determining the Mixed, Conditional, and Limited Use Areas in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan associated with prohibitions and restrictions. Consider the socioeconomic impacts of limitations to development or activities in Limited Use Areas and that the NPC be required to undertake a strategic or regional assessment of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan to assess its environmental and social impacts on the territory and existing property rights holders.

To conclude, the Hackett River Project contains critical minerals, which are essential to Canada's economy and economic security and required for advancing the global economy to a more sustainable future. Glencore is committed to responsibly sourcing commodities and critical minerals that advance everyday life and has demonstrated a long track record of operating in Northern Canada. Mining is a capital intensive industry, which requires long timelines and regulatory visibility over years and decades of planning and project progression.

Introducing the proposed Land Use Plan may annul the Hackett River Project and stifle billions of dollars of potential future investment in Nunavut. The proposed Land Use Plan should consider the science and methodology in determining the land use categories proposed. The proposed Land Use Plan should consider the environment and socioeconomic impacts of its implementation. Revisions to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan that protect and promote environmental and social integrity will allow responsible development of critical minerals and resources in Nunavut. Thank you. I'm happy to take some questions.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Now I know why the translators were bringing up your presentation. I don't know how many times they checked to ask you to slow down. Anyway, thank you. Jonathan, are there any questions? Go ahead.

Jonathan: Thank you very much. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thank you very much for the detailed presentation on Glencore's priorities for the Land Use Plan. You noted Appendix A does include the footprint of the current existing rights for the Hackett River Project or a portion of them that falls within some caribou post-calving habitats, but you correctly noted that the Draft Plan does not provide provisions for the associated all-weather linear infrastructure that would be required by the project.

You also noted that it would be appropriate to have design flexibility in the location of the linear infrastructure. Do you have any thoughts on how this could be achieved in the Draft Plan as it is

currently structured? For example, could Appendix A be retained with a footprint of the existing rights and wording added to the exemptions to authorize something like associated linear infrastructure? Would that address the concerns of Glencore regarding the certainty of being able to develop and retain the flexibility to do it in the most appropriate way? Thank you.

Daniel: Daniel Vriend, Glencore. I will try to get some of this right. I am going to answer that more formally through writing with some further support from the team. I think I would like to make sure what is reflected is that what is outlined and what was previously proposed and evaluated was accessed through BIPAR. That is not to say that it is the only option or available route to export product to market. Where the Hackett River sits right now to the north and west is restricted through Limited Use Areas, and if those were potential corridors to evaluate that option is not a possibility at that time. So, I will answer more formally through writing, but that is the concern with the linear infrastructure.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan? Any more questions? Community representatives, do you have questions?

Jimmy Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik, Taloyoak. Do you mind going back to the slide with the world map, please? Thank you for your presentation. Like I said earlier in a comment, we are asking a very small portion of the world to be protected. As you see, there are many mines in the world, and all we are asking is for our area to be protected from mining and exploration. Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That was more of a comment. Questions? Bobby also had a question in the back.

Bobby: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bobby Greenley, Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Organization Chair. You made the comment about reconsidering the science and methodology to the Commissioners. You mentioned a lot about creating jobs for Nunavummiut, but you don't really mention too much about Traditional Knowledge. There is a little bit mentioned, but not very much. Even going back to the '70s, you mentioned you were doing studies there.

You know, we fight this all the time for many years now to have companies and scientists come up here. They tend to throw the knowledge of the people from up here way at the back or low on the totem pole, but that is something you have to take into consideration. I know you mentioned reconsidering the science methodology to the boards. I'm just not sure about that. There is very little bit of information about Traditional Knowledge. I think that is something that you guys should look at more as well. It is more of a comment I guess, and a suggestion. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Are there any other questions? Any more questions from the communities. *(Pause)*.

It appears none. Registered participants, any questions? *(Pause)* It appears none. Thank you for your presentation. Thank you for answering the questions.

(Applause)

Next on the agenda is the World Wildlife Fund.

PRESENTATION BY WORLD WILDLIFE FUND CANADA

Brandon Laforest
Erin Keenan

Erin: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Erin Keenan, and this is my colleague, Brandon Laforest with World Wildlife Fund Canada. We are also happy to answer to World Wildlife Federation as long as no one is calling us World Wrestling Federation.

(Laughter)

All joking aside, I know we are reaching the end, hopefully, of our proceedings this week. We just have a short presentation, and we are very grateful for the opportunity to address the room and speak as part of these proceedings. Our presentation is going to be quite repetitive of things that we have said throughout our participation in this process.

I also want to mention that we have a small team at World Wildlife Fund Canada working on this file, and our colleague, Paul Okalik has been following along with the broadcast. He will be present at the Rankin Inlet hearings next week.

World Wildlife Fund Canada has a permanent office in Iqaluit. We work on a variety of environmental issues in partnership with local, territorial, and federal organizations across the North. Our work includes supporting the development of local inshore fisheries, advocating for cleaner fuel and practices in the Arctic shipping industry, intervening where appropriate in regulatory processes, and supporting Inuit-led protected and conserved area initiatives.

As an organization, we have been actively engaged in the development of the Nunavut Land Use Plan for many years providing expert reports, datasets, geographic information layers, and specific recommendations and comments, as well as attending numerous technical and procedural meetings, and supporting the participation of other groups at their request.

We work directly with local communities and are always open to receiving requests from community groups and Hunters and Trappers Organizations to support their participation in this or any environmental process in Nunavut. So, on that note, I would like to encourage anyone in the room who has something they think they are interested in partnering with us to speak to us after our presentation.

As we all know, an immense amount of work by all parties has been put in to get the Nunavut Land Use Plan to this stage. We applaud the Nunavut Planning Commission on the release of the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan along with the subsequent resumption of public hearings.

However, the Plan remains in draft form, which as we have heard about this week, allows for mineral claims to be issued in areas that have clearly been identified for years as eventual Limited Use designations. The issuance of these claims serves no one, and simultaneously threatens the integrity of biological and cultural features that the Plan is designed to conserve, while also creating

lengthy environmental impact assessment processes. Areas that are important to communities are being claimed by interests that they do not agree with and without their input.

The Nunavut Land Use Plan is a living document that will be frequently updated, not only through regular reviews every 10 years, but also through amendment processes and ministerial exemptions. We have discussed that process as well in the prior days this week.

One of our key concerns for World Wildlife Fund is that without a Land Use Plan in place, there is no way to manage cumulative impacts on wildlife habitat across Nunavut. So, what we really need to do is to move past this draft phase into the implantation of a Land Use Plan for the territory.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. We just have a few, short technical comments. As indicated, these are mostly verbatim from our written submissions with no real surprises. The first is on caribou habitat. The reference is on the screen. I won't read it. Our recommendation is although some refinement through intervenor submissions and input received during the hearing process will be necessary, we recommend maintaining the Limited Use designations and associated year-round prohibitions on incompatible uses for caribou calving areas, caribou post-calving areas, caribou key access corridors, and caribou freshwater crossings.

At the time of the release of the 2016 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, most herds of caribou across Nunavut were in a perilous state. Six years later, the situation has only gotten worse. Total allowable harvests are in place for many herds, yet there is still no Land Use Plan. Communities and harvesters continue to shoulder the burden of management restrictions, while mineral exploration continues even on the core calving areas of herds that are in either precipitous declines or at historic lows.

The decisions made on caribou habitat land use will have longstanding impacts on the recovery and sustainability of caribou herds in Nunavut. We applaud the Nunavut Planning Commission for the *Options and Recommendations Document* from the 2021 Draft. In our read of it, it makes it clear that there is widespread evidence and importantly, community support that caribou calving areas, post-calving grounds, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings should be designated as Limited Use Areas with clear year-round prohibitions for incompatible uses.

Mobile protections from our perspective are not an appropriate land use mechanism, and I will save you from me reading out those four habitats again. You know, we are listening, and we appreciate and learn a lot from the project-specific mitigation measures in place from Industry, and even applaud years of work to develop these methods. We are simply putting forward that there are some areas that are too sensitive, and the risk is too high to move forward with the development of a mine, for example in the middle of a calving ground.

There is insufficient evidence that mobile measures could be effectively used as a land use planning tool. Again, we are trying to be specific to differentiate between land use planning and, for example, project certificate impact assessment processes. In calving grounds and from land use planning, these measures are unproven, prohibitively costly, and short-sided. Land use designations and the associated assessment of project applications by the Nunavut Planning Commission are the only mechanism by which to properly assess and prevent the negative aspects of cumulative impacts of multiple sources of disturbance across caribou habitat at the herd level.

We heard again from the Nunavut Impact Review Board this morning, of course, not giving a direction on where to go, but just the need for some clear direction at a planning level on how to handle caribou calving grounds. We put forward that you can't manage caribou calving grounds at the impact review board level, underscoring the importance of regional planning as we see here with the Nunavut Planning Commission, always envisioned to be the first level of assessment for projects in applying to operate in Nunavut.

The next technical issue is caribou sea ice crossings. The reference is on screen. We are supportive of the Conditional Use designation and associated restrictions in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan for caribou sea ice crossings.

We certainly respect and applaud the efforts of the Cambridge Bay HTO on their Notice to Mariners, and it is great to hear how successful that has been. Our position is that it shouldn't be voluntary. There is an opportunity with the Land Use Plan to make this law. There is widespread community support to seasonally prevent icebreaking during critical times for both Dolphin and Union and Peary caribou. We recognize the complex jurisdictional nature of these areas, and we really appreciate conversations with Transport Canada and Global Affairs, but we continue to advocate for these designations as Conditional Use with associated seasonal prohibitions on icebreaking.

At a minimum, there must be clearly stated restrictions on domestic projects. Projects operating within Canada should not include any sort of icebreaking activities during the time of these seasonal restrictions. We appreciate the desire for minimal limitations on vessel traffic as possible but put forward that it is common sense to say when people and caribou are migrating across sea ice, icebreaking is off the table. Proponents should be aware of these restrictions when developing projects in the region. To reiterate, a legal non-voluntary mechanism should be in place to prevent icebreaking activities.

I do know there are no walrus here. I'm going to ask for everyone's patience as I read these slides for the record and for some interveners in the back. We are supportive of the Limited Use designation for terrestrial walrus haul-outs. We are supportive of the specific requirements for non-research vessels, and we recommend that abandoned haul-outs be listed as Valued Ecosystem Components with notice to proponents to voluntarily avoid these areas. We put forward that this is a great example of how the Nunavut Land Use Plan will set clear guidelines for industry, including cruise industry, while safeguarding wildlife.

There is widespread agreement that designating walrus haul-outs as areas of Limited Use is appropriate given the high sensitivity of walrus at haul-outs, the high cultural importance of walrus to Nunavummiut, the small geographic coverage of these areas, and the very limited existing protections for walrus at their haul-outs. In informal discussions with industry, we have heard this is an easy one. There aren't that many haul-outs and avoiding them when safe to do so is quite possible and will have major benefit.

We note that research suggests, and IQ also suggests as noted in the *Options and Recommendations Document*, that walrus may return to abandoned haul-outs in the future and thus to set a precedent that it is easy to uphold. We recommend these sites be identified as Valued Ecosystem Components with voluntary measures to avoid these areas. I'll turn it back to my colleague. Thank you.

Erin: Erin Keenan, World Wildlife Fund Canada. One final topic that we wanted to cover is something that has come up through consultation meetings that we have had in communities across Nunavut in all three regions. It is a topic that has also been raised by the community representatives that have spoken this week.

In consultations with communities, we have noted many concerns around the protection of important watersheds and fishing areas to ensure clean water and healthy fish. We have heard directly of the importance of ensuring no disturbance or discharge is allowed upstream of these areas to ensure the pristine nature. In either this or future iterations of the Plan, we recommend the consideration of these area as identified by communities as off limits to exploration and mining development to ensure the health of lakes, rivers, and fish important to each community.

This will allow for the exploration of local fisheries as alternative economic development opportunities, as well as continued exercising of the constitutionally protected right of Inuit to fish for their food.

Just to conclude, we will note that the Nunavut Land Use Plan is an incredible tool that will facilitate the territory-wide conservation of environmental features of importance to Nunavummiut, while also providing greater certainty for industrial development proponents on areas that are open for development. We urge all parties to adhere to the timeline and deadlines associated with these final stages of the Nunavut Land Use Plan process to see Plan to completion. Again, we would like to thank the communities for their openness and willingness to share their areas of importance and their knowledge in this process. Again, we really appreciate the opportunity to be interveners in this process and wish the Nunavut Planning Commission and all parties successful hearings moving forward. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there any questions? Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. This is Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks to WWF Canada for the presentation today. We note that in your previous written submissions, you identified some concerns with the blanket approach taken to existing rights in the Draft Plan, but that you required additional time to consider the approach, and additional submissions may be forthcoming. I'm just wondering if you have any additional comments on that approach today or if there is any intention to file additional written submissions on the matter. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Atigo.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. Thank you Jonathan. Yes, this is an issue that as you know, we have followed for many years submitting legal opinions and having discussions with particularly the federal government. We asked a question at this hearing. To answer your question, we are looking forward to these hearings to hear more, especially from the federal government, and industry, on their needs and their views on existing rights. We do expect to file a final submission before the deadline, and it will be an issue we will discuss in the future. Thanks for the question.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Jonathan?

Jonathan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Jonathan Savoy with the Nunavut Planning Commission. Thanks for the response, Brandon. One last question: We have raised it a few times the issue of the periodic review proposed schedule in the Draft Plan of beginning that review within 7 years and completing it within 10 years of approval of the Draft Plan. Do you have any comments on the appropriateness of that schedule for periodic reviews? Thank you.

Chairperson: Go ahead.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. We defer to the expertise of the planners in the room and actually really appreciated the answer of the Nunavut Impact Review Board this morning to that question. You know more than anyone the workload ahead of you and burden it will be to review. I can say we don't think it is too short or too long, but you are the experts on that.

To us, what is really important is the commitment to review and the clearly laid out process of that review, because it mitigates some of the risks of closing some areas forever. It is good reminder that the Nunavut Land Use Plan creates land use designations that are reviewed as priorities shift. The priorities of everyone around this table may be different 7 to 10 years from now, and we respect that.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Taima. Are there any more questions? Paul?

Paul I: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Ikuallaq, KRWB. Going back to the walrus haul outs. People that go hunting all year round, they do see walrus in in our areas and other close by communities. I guess nobody cannot say that we don't see them. It is because the people, the interveners might say they did not see any walrus, but there is walrus seen up there in our area in the Kitikmeot region somewhere. I can't tell you exactly where it is, but they have been reported by mouth, not by papers. Thank you very much. It is just a comment. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik. That was a general comment. Are there any more questions from community delegates? *(Pause)*

It appears none. We will turn it now to registered participants.

Jim M: Jim MacEachern, CAO for the Municipality of Cambridge Bay. Actually, I was kind of hoping you guys would ask this question. On your first or second slide, you mentioned that part of your role is to assist Inuit communities in preserving land. Our colleagues from Taloyoak have been basically begging for help. Are you able to assist them?

Chairperson: I know you're nodding, but you want to state your name and organization before you verbally reply. Thank you.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, WWF Canada. Quickly before that, just for Paul, apologies for misspeaking. I should have said there are no new Land Use Plan designated haul-outs identified in this region. It is a limitation, I think of the technical comments. I didn't at all mean to imply there are no walrus, so apologies and thank you for the clarification.

For the question from the floor, we have worked closely supporting the Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers Organization for many years, and I think that answers the question. If there is further

discussions at that, at their request, they can speak to it themselves if there are further questions on that. Natural synergy. Thanks.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Before I go there, I think David had a question. Atigo, David.

David T: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. David Totalik, Taloyoak Hamlet Councillor. I would like to see a map of Boothia Peninsula, but we have one here. I would like to use it. The map here, I would like to use it with movement of caribou. I would like to use this, but I don't know where we can put it. *(Inaudible, David moved away from the mic).*

Anyway, I will try to make it short. Boothia, that's Boothia here, and we live Taloyoak here. First, they call it Spence Bay, but the old name is Taloyoak. That is where our community settled. Before it settled, they were all over the place, this area. Now Taloyoak here, before Taloyoak, in the late 1930s and early 1940s, Gjoa Haven was a place where there was a trading post, and also up here in Fort Ross trading post called HBC, Hudson Bay Company. There was nothing here.

They wanted to settle, Hudson Bay Company, they wanted to build one up here somewhere around this area. They picked some place areas around here, but my grandfather, which I never used to see him. His name is Tatolik. That is me, Tatolik. Around the late 1930s or 1940s, he picked that spot and said I think I could find a good spot to settle Hudson Bay Company, and that is where we all settled. Before they were all over the place. Now Taloyoak is a caribou blind. It was made long ago. Caribou blind, wish they could see it. That is how they kill caribou. They were guided, the caribou in the area, good caribou.

Now today, there is caribou movement. There is still movement there. They move up here, and they settle their calves. Then they go back. They don't go really by the town now. They don't use that. They come really close, but in different areas. Maybe some of them go by King William Island, down to the mainland. But mostly they go by here. We know the movement of the caribou, because they have their trail. We could see their trail today. Also, the HTO put some cameras here and they are finding out looking at them which way they travel.

That is why we want to protect Boothia Peninsula. At that time, there were prospectors coming, Polar Gas coming in. They know this area might be rich. Up here in the middle, we call it Aviqtuuq. They find some minerals there, and then our Elders, they don't want to get those guys to settle and use it, open a mine. They want to keep it like that, the way it is. We are following them, and we want to pass it on to our younger generations. I think that is what George wanted to talk about it. He brought the map here, my cousin, George Ishik. *(spelled phonetically)*

So, this area here, we call it Aviqtuuq. They know they found some minerals there, and our Elders said no, keep it the way it is. We the younger generation want to pass it on to our younger generations too. That is a wide caribou area. That is a big place, the caribou area around here.

Now, not only caribou area, but there is minerals all over the place. My brother George, 5 miles, 10 miles away from the town, he found gold about 15 years ago. Later on, the exploration people come to our town. They put tents and they brought lots of minerals to show us what they found in the Nunavut area, all over. They found one. They said if you found something that you don't really know what it is, bring it. We'll explain it to you.

Now five miles I have a camp from Taloyoak. Right on my cabin or near it, I found one, something that I don't know. I took a piece off, little bit, and bring it to them. Then they looked at it. Okay, the person that knows it said this is called nickel. It was on the ground. It was kind of big, but I took small pieces off. He said I think you are living in your cabin rich. Under you there might be a big nickel, good for mining it. That's what he said, around that area in Taloyoak. Also there are lots of fish, fishing around here. It's a good area.

That's what I want to say. I think that is why George wanted to bring it too to explain it to the public, to you guys about it. I want to make it short. There is more, but I want to explain this area. That's why Jeannie, that's why she wants to talk about this area here and someday explain why KIA never responded or answered. So we are still going to work, look at it, and work on it. That is what I want to say. Qujannamiik. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. That is more of a comment and explanation. Qujannamiik. The gentleman down there wanted to ask a question. Peter?

Peter: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you very much for allowing me to ask a question, and thank you for the presentation. My question is very simple. It is a yes and no answer. Does WWF have any legislative authority within Nunavut other than advocacy and funding programs?

Chairperson: Okay, go ahead.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. No, of course we don't.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are you done? Another question?

Peter T: Thank you. Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you for the response, the answer. My second question is, through your advocacy in developing and funding organizations, communities, have you ever contacted the landowners on the potential impacts of how these things are going? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, WWF Canada. I totally appreciate where the question is coming from. We think that is a discussion primarily between the HTAs or community groups to have directly with the landowners. We would be completely open to any sort of discussion like that, but referring back to your first question, we are not a regulator or a rights holder.

Our role is to support groups at their request. In particular, for this example, I would defer the question to the community group, in this case Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers Association to speak if that would alleviate concerns. To answer the question, we respect the regulatory system. That is why we are here, respectfully participating by following all regulations, but we are not in any sort of position to overstep or try to disrespect any Inuit organization. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Peter, is that it?

Peter: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you for the response. I look forward to receiving more responses to my question. I believe he had deferred the question to Taloyoak Hunters and Trappers Organization. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Yep, Qujannamiik. Jimmy? Jimmy had his hand up. I think he wanted to respond. Atigo, Jimmy.

Jimmy: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Jimmy Oleekatalik, Taloyoak. I started my job. I got hired to be a manger on May 28, 2015. In the fall of 2015, the board wanted me to send a request to KIA to help to start protecting Aviqtuuq. So, I sent a map outlining Aviqtuuq and all the species that go there to migrate or go there to give offspring. Because the members since 1972 wanted Aviqtuuq to be protected. I also sent the same map to the NPC. From there, we never got any response. The chairperson, Joe, was at a meeting in Iqaluit for a different meeting but had a chance to talk with WWF, and that was the only time our request was recognized.

Before that, our hands were handcuffed all the time you guys. Not even a "We'll get back to you." We explained it. We explained it over and over. It was 1972 since I have been here, but you guys seem to be somehow keep going back to you're not, you're not, you're not. I'm sorry, but we asked for help from KIA, but they never responded, so it seems like we have to go over them, which we don't like to do. I'm just getting frustrated here, so thank you very much.

Chairperson: Jimmy, you guys can talk about this. Can we get back to focusing on why we are here and what the presenters are presenting? Are there any questions about the WWF presentation? Go ahead, Peter.

Peter: Thank you. Peter Taptuna, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. The question was deferred to the community rep, so I am going to respond to that. There is an accusation made that, sorry I'm not going to get there, go to that level, but we did meet last year in July with Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers Organization at the staff level. We exchanged information on mandates, authorities, and so forth, on how KIA could better help with the proposal that Spence Bay HTO had forwarded.

Of course, there are processes. We requested the business plan and other documents to help the board make a determination. When you don't get all the documents that you need, the board can't make a determination on which direction to give the staffers or technical people to move forward. I appreciate your wisdom, Mr. Chairman, in resolving this internally rather than through this forum. Thank you. Taima.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Yes, you guys can talk more off the record here, but we need to get back to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan that we are here for. I appreciate it. There is another person that wants to ask a question. State your name and your organization. Thank you.

Luigi: Luigi Toretti, Advisor to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Question to the World Wildlife Fund: How often has the World Wildlife Fund participated in regulatory processes, specifically the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the NWB, Nunavut Water Board, specifically in the Kitikmeot region?

Chairperson: Atigo.

Brandon Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. As noted, I think on this slide... in the first paragraph ...We intervene where appropriate or where asked. In the Kitikmeot region, not very much. Our office is in Iqaluit, and it's not always our role to be front and center. In fact, we support a lot of

community initiatives from afar. We recognize very well as it is happening right now that we can be a distraction, and that's fair. That is not our intention in any way.

We have funding opportunities for research. We have funded the travel or the independent technical support for communities in processes in this region. We have worked with Government of Nunavut to fund research in this region. This list is just meant to answer the question, not to justify our appearance or indicate that we deserve to be here.

We are here because we followed every regulation to be a registered intervener. We have been an intervener for about a decade in this process. Tickets were booked for the 2017 Kitikmeot hearing that was called off. So yeah, I hope that answers the question. I expect to follow-up, but it is not our role to be ever-present giving testimony, and I think a review of what we presented, is that we gave one of the most innocuous, consistent presentations, consistent with submissions we have done in this process for a decade. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Do you have more questions regarding the presentation that they presented? Qujannamiik.

Luigi: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Luigi Toretti, Consultant to the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. Thank you for that response. The World Wildlife Fund is here at this hearing presenting and advocating for area protection. Obviously the Kitikmeot Inuit Association board has a resolution not supporting area protection and actually supporting mobile protection measures.

So, your organization is here speaking about something that is on the Nunavut Land Use Plan that is hindering Inuit choices on that Plan. It is at the first step of the regulatory process, but yet your organization has not participated in the regulatory processes even though it is open to Nunavummiut and Canada. Your organization has not participated in the Kitikmeot. I was just looking for a clarification. If I understood correctly in terms of yes-no, the answer is no, you have not participated in the Kitikmeot, and you have not advocated for area protection on the caribou file on any regulatory processes in Nunavut. Is that correct?

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Did you want to... okay, you don't need to, but go ahead.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. Just super quickly, I will note this is the regulatory process, and I will note this is the first public hearing in the Kitikmeot region that I am aware of. Your point is well taken. We are not at every Nunavut Impact Review Board hearing. We are a small organization at the end of the day, despite interpretation. I think actively participating in this process for 10 years and then showing up in person at the first opportunity in person in this region...yeah, I'll leave it there. Thanks.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Regarding the presentation? Go ahead.

Mike S: Mike Settingington with Environmental Dynamics here on behalf of the Kitikmeot Inuit Association. In regards to the presentation, I would just like to commend World Wildlife Fund, certainly an advocate for protected areas worldwide and has done some fabulous work throughout the world. My first exposure to World Wildlife Fund was in saving the tropical rainforests, so thank you very much. It was good.

But I would like to bring it back down to the Nunavut context, and here we are talking about barren ground caribou and the Land Use Plan being a Land Use Plan and trying not to turn it into a caribou protection plan. Given that you are an advocate for protected areas, you are using some language here that I would just like to address when it comes to caribou and the state of caribou.

Using both science, which I will focus on – I will focus on the science side with respect to the community members and Traditional Knowledge. I will try to incorporate some of what I know about that after having worked in this region for a few years on some development projects. You mentioned that the caribou here are in a perilous state, and it is true that we have seen caribou declines, substantial declines, large declines in some of the herds, the mainland herds.

However, these trends fall within Traditional Knowledge as well as science knowledge that we see these trends. In fact, the last surveys on two of the mainland herds, being the Bluenose East and the Bathurst herds, we are actually seeing those numbers start to stabilize. That is what the Government of the Northwest Territories reports. The Dolphin and Union caribou herd will likely continue to decline, and that is Traditional Knowledge. They will probably continue to decline to the point that we won't see them migrate. These are expected trends that have been observed before.

So, when you said the caribou are in a perilous state and six years later the situation has gotten only worse, I think that is very alarmist language to use with this group in the Kitikmeot region. We have had these herds increase and decline in the complete absence of any development on their calving grounds. We have seen the herds increase, and we have seen the herds decrease. We have herds across the north of North America that have declined and increased in the complete absence of human development disturbance. In fact, one of the herds that has continued...

Chairperson: Excuse me. Are you asking a question? Are you going to the question?

Mike: Yes, Mr. Chair, I am trying to put this in context, to put their presentation in context in some of the language that they used.

Chairperson: Okay, can you get to the question please? Thank you.

Mike: So the question is, what is the widespread evidence that caribou areas need to be designated as a Limited Use, when this has clearly not been presented in the science since at least 1984? The widespread evidence is not there. We do have opinions about protection, but where is the widespread evidence? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Go ahead.

Brandon: Brandon Laforest, World Wildlife Fund Canada. Thanks for the question, Mike. I'll just...I will defer to the *Options and Recommendations Document* and hopefully leave this discussion by saying that we submit our proposal. We appreciate there are differing opinions on it. We respectfully are participating in a process being overseen by the Commissioners and the Board. You, yourself and of course the rights holders, organizations, and the landowners submit information as well. I can't speak more. I don't think anything needs to be said. We appreciate being here. We respect the authority of the Board. We respectfully submit information, and we react to the outcome. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Registered participants, are there any more questions? (Pause)

(Translated): Thank you to the panel for your presentation and answering the questions.

(Applause)

We are going to take a short break. We still have two presenters, so the break will be brief. They are not on the agenda, but they have requested to participate, so we have a few more.

Break

Chairperson: Alright, Qujannamiik. Welcome to the table the Chamber of Mines. Whenever you are ready.

Presentation by The Chamber of Mines Scott Trusler – Vice President NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines

Scott: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Scott Trusler, Northwest Territories and Nunavut Chamber of Mines. Thank you very much to the Commission and the members of the HTOs and communities for the opportunity to speak here today. This presentation will touch on some of the high points of our written submission to the Commission. I just want to note that as a recent addition to the agenda, our translated version is in prep and will be made available to the Commission as soon as possible. We will certainly be ready for the Rankin Inlet hearings.

The Northwest Territories-Nunavut Chamber of Mines is made up of more than 200 member companies representing exploration, mine development and operation, and mining service and supply. The Chamber was established more than 50 years ago and has been advocating for responsible mineral development in the North ever since. The mission and vision reflect a focus on responsible and sustainable mineral development and benefit to people in communities. We have permanent offices in Yellowknife and Iqaluit. Our General Manager for Nunavut is Priya Sharma, and she is based in our Iqaluit office.

The Chamber recognizes the importance of land use planning and the importance of the Nunavut Land Use Plan as part of the Land and Resource Management System in Nunavut. The Chamber has been participating in the process since its inception. Today, there are four operating mines, and a number of advanced and developing mineral projects in Nunavut. These are distributed across the three regions and represent multiple commodities.

I just want to note that the operators of existing mining projects in Nunavut at present are all implementing toward the sustainable mining system, which has been developed by the Mining Association of Canada. I just mention that because there have been some discussions about mining methods and the operation of mining. I just wanted to highlight that this is a system that has been developed to help to demonstrate and to evaluate the degree to which mining companies are

delivering on the environmental and social commitments. It is externally audited, and the information is readily available to the public.

I also want to note that it has been adopted by a number of jurisdictions globally, including Australia, Norway, Finland, Brazil, Argentina, and others, which is a testament to the degree to which the world sees that this is a robust method of assuring that mining companies are operating in a responsible manner.

In terms of mineral production in Nunavut, I know it is a bit hard to see, but this chart is a histogram that shows the mineral production in the three territories. The Yukon is yellow. The Northwest Territories is blue, and Nunavut is in red. The line that you see angling up over the last decade is an approximation of the increase in the value of mineral production in Nunavut over that period of time up until the middle of 2021, so currently sitting at about \$2.5 billion per annum. This positive momentum reflects the attractive geology of Nunavut and the review from the mineral sector that Nunavut is an attractive jurisdiction to develop projects in.

In terms of Nunavut's economy, the mining sector in 2021 represented 37%, making it the largest private sector contributor to the Nunavut economy. In addition, there are indirect and induced effects that would add to some of the other areas of the pie chart, including things like construction, real estate, retail, and wholesale that relate to mining activity within Nunavut.

One of the things that the Chamber does is to compile data that is reported by mining companies as part of their socioeconomic monitoring requirements. So, this is a few points from the decade 2009 to 2020, highlighting the socioeconomic benefits that relate to the mining sector, with 30,000 person years of employment, roughly 20% of those being northern. In 2020, there were over 5,000 full-time equivalent jobs, which was a bit reduced due to COVID. Over that period, there was \$10.8 billion in expenditures on services and supply, and roughly half of that being northern and Indigenous. In addition, there are billions of dollars in taxes and royalties to public and Inuit governments, and hundreds of millions of dollars to communities and IIBA payment scholarship donations and community wellness projects.

With the Nunavut Mining Service and Supply, business has grown substantially, as you saw with the increase in mining production. A number of companies have been established or grown to provide support to those mining companies that are advancing or operating projects. There are 66 listed here. That is not an exhaustive list, but certainly it represents a broad array of services and supply categories to the industry.

I think this is well understood, but just to make the point, again with the size of Nunavut and the geological variability, there is very substantial mineral potential across a broad array of commodities. It is generally considered to be under-mapped and underexplored, so the odds of additional discoveries are high. That all contributes to Nunavut being recognized globally as having tremendous mineral potential.

The challenges related to the growth of communities and the stress on housing, jobs, and infrastructure have been discussed during these hearings. We won't go into detail except to say that it is the view of the Chamber and our members that the mineral sector can help to provide support and positive movement on a number of those fronts, in particular providing employment opportunities and opportunities for business development.

As I mentioned, the Chamber has been participating in the land use planning process in Nunavut for many years, and we provided feedback on the 2014 and 2016 Draft Plans. The message from our membership is that the 2021 Land Use Plan is more prescriptive, restrictive, and complex than previous drafts. It was put quite well earlier today. We are looking forward to working with the Commission and others to make adjustments to the Plan so that we can address some of those issues. I think at the end of the day, one of the key things that we are hoping for Nunavut is that it remains an attractive jurisdiction for investment by responsible mining companies.

The mineral potential map is on the left and then on the right is a map showing Conditional and Limited Use Areas. The issue identified here, or trying to communicate here is that in a general sense and it has been referenced by many, but a high proportion of mineral exploration and development projects and operating projects are located all or partly within Limited Use Areas that prohibit mineral development.

Our recommendations, to wrap up here, are first of all that we work to hit the right level for a first-generation Plan over such a vast area and such a diverse area. Secondly, reduce the level of prescriptiveness and Limited Use designations and look at potentially utilizing other tools as identified in some of the options in the *Options and Recommendations Document*. Third is to make sure that the Land Use Plan links effectively with other Institutes of Public Governance in Nunavut and allows the flexibility and balance for each of those IPGs to undertake their respective decision-making mandates.

Lastly, in perspective, this process, which has been a huge amount of effort and resources committed to collecting information from communities and from a wide variety of stakeholders, we want to collectively work to find a way to make sure that data going forward is used in the best possible way to support well-informed decision-making. I am going to end there. Thank you, Quana, and Qujannamiik.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Are there questions from the community groups? *(Pause)*

There appears to be none. Registered participants down there? *(Pause)*

I don't see any hands. Qujannamiik. Thank you for your presentation.

(Applause)

Closing Remarks by Community Representatives and Signatory Parties

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Before the break, I mentioned that there were two presenters not on the agenda. We will proceed on the agenda and start our concluding comments. We will start with community representatives. You may start your closing remarks and the limit to you will be 30 minutes. Both levels of governments and NTI will have 15 minutes, and you may at this time include your thoughts and your closing remarks. Beth, if we could give them the mic for closing remarks, we will start at this end.

Roger: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I want to express my appreciation for participating in this process. Roger Ekelik, Gjoa Haven, HTO member, Second Vice President. I appreciate participating in this important discussion for this region and to the questions we are discussion. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

Brandon: Brandon Qirqqut, Gjoa Haven. I just wanted to say thank you for having me here. Thank you to the Commission and to everyone that did their presentation. Thank you.

David S: *(Translated)*: Thank you. David Siksik, Gjoa Haven HTO member. The discussion we had in the past few days, every presenter was very interesting to listen to, and the opinions are varied. I think this organization hosting this proceeding is going in the right direction. We have heard from presenters who were not happy and some happy with what is being planned. Cambridge Bay, you have been a good host. Thank you for your hosting.

Jacob: *(Translated)*: Jacob Keanik, Gjoa Haven. I am a replacement for a Councillor. I liked being in this process. I have learned a lot in what is becoming of our region. Thank you.

Salomie: *(Translated)*: Salomie Qitsualik, Gjoa Haven. I want to thank the organizers for very good hospitality. Our accommodations are very good, and snacks being provided. Many have presented at this meeting, and especially to the Hamlet of Cambridge Bay and the Chair of this organization who has handled this meeting very well. Thank you.

Jeannie: *(Translated)*: Jeannie Ugjuk, Gjoa Haven Hamlet Coucil. Thank you for listening to our concerns. We also expressed what we wanted. This spring, Jonathan and Solomon Amuno came into our community. We were very well prepared. We came here expecting what was to take place, so a briefing prior to this was very important.

Our discussions here as a hamlet coucillor, my concerns were coming in from the community hamlet. For myself, I also voiced my opinion as a Taloyoak representative. I was very concerned and I voiced it on Boothia Peninsula. Nothing really came out of it. NTI, KIA, NIRB, and the other organization who made the presentation, nothing really came out of these groups with the concerns we have in our community on the Boothia Peninsula.

I appreciate the support I received, although at times, discussions were very complex and technical. Although that was the case to me, I noticed that I could come back. Especially the Taloyoak HTO, I think was very supportive to this region, voicing their needs, especially that the local RIO has to become more attentive to their communities in this region. I feel I was not being listened to, and we will continue this. If it is not accomplished in my lifetime, our grandchildren will accomplish it. Thank you.

David T: *(Translated)*: Thank you. David Totalik, Taloyoak Hamlet Councillor. I have been at boards for many times in my community, including some other organizations I belong to. First of all, to the Nunavut Planning Commission, thank you for allowing us to express our opinions. We are going to miss you when we go back to our communities.

The people before me, hamlet councillors had high expectations for this region, our community, and I was part of that delegation in continuing what they wanted to see for my community, especially the land planning aspect. I know it is time consuming. It requires a lot of work. I praise my God. He knows what we need, and He will pave the way for what we cannot accomplish. Let's continue depending on Him to get our needs completed. This mighty God has created a way for us to prepare the land use. He created the world after all. It is not ours. We are just here for a short time. If we have high belief, we will be able to be home in better places for eternity. I just wanted to express this on behalf of my community, and I have been fighting for my community for many years. The land, the land is not ours according to our ancestors. We are to use it wisely and enjoy what it has to give. Thank you.

Jimmy Qujannamiik. Jimmy Oleekatalik. I would like to thank Cambridge Bay. I have never acted on my own. I have a board, a board of directors that direct me. This meeting gave me more direction, so I would like to thank everybody again. We will keep in touch in the future. Qujannamiik.

Joe: *(Translated):* Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. I just wanted to express like everybody, I am happy to be here. The tasks and what we had here was quite tedious and difficult. We have to go through these exercises so we can stand on our own two feet, although there are many obstacles in this region. Some of them appear to be unable to be accomplished, but our cousins, the Greenlanders are well governing themselves. The Yukon Indigenous population are doing very well. They are their own bosses, and they are thriving. Here in this Kitikmeot region, there are so many bureaucratic decisions that are preventing us from moving forward. Bureaucrats are stopping us from advancing and to get things accomplished to our needs. Thank you, Chair.

Paul I *(Translated):* Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Paul Ikuallaq, KRWB. At our recent meeting, the other things come to us, new policies related to our organizations, our regions, and these policies at times are so restrictive. Many times too, when these new policies from regional boards come in, the information given to us arrives in such a short time that many times we have no time to respond.

The Kitikmeot Wildlife Board, the policies or lack of it that we have to use. The policies, you know it is only at that time too that we hear when they become a reality without much consultation. The communities that you are representing, come and talk to us. Come into the community when you have new policies that you want to impose onto the region. Come. See us face-to-face. We will have different opinions for you. At one of the meetings, there are discussions, people complaining that they hear nothing. They are not informed.

Lastly, I would like to thank the community of Cambridge Bay and your group for hosting this gathering. We will be seeing you this fall. Thank you for coming.

Viola: Viola Neeveacheak, HTO board member. Thank you Nunavut Planning Commission for coming here for this final agenda for regional public hearing. Thank you. First of all, I would really like to thank the Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the NTI staff. We can't forget our original negotiators who fought for Nunavut in one lifetime from their homeland, going to school, negotiating from right after school. That is a really big thing of why we are all here today is from NTI negotiators. Thank you for that.

Thank you Government of Nunavut, Government of Canada. Thank you all for coming here. Thank you KIA, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I just wanted to say the Kitikmeot Inuit Association is very

concerning to me. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association regional office and coming here to this hearing, you see a lot of representatives for organizations. Their representatives come with its very own regional office. It should be more eclectic from each community. Thank you.

Athol: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Athol Ihakkaq, Kugaaruk HTO Committee. The other delegates were not able to make it. I would like to express my appreciation to the information that was explained to me. Different organizations, we are different although in the same region, but there is always a but. We have to find ways to work together as people of this region. I know when we have to meet, the funding is always a problem. Thank you, Chair.

Randy: Thank you, Chair and thank you to the Nunavut Planning Commission. Randy Hinanik from the Kugluktuk Hunters and Trappers Organization. This has been my first time, and I learned a lot this past week. You guys are handling a lot of very important decisions for our territory. I really appreciate all the hard work that you guys are doing. Thank you.

Darlene: Good afternoon. Darlene Hokanak from Kugluktuk, Assistant Manager for HTO. I just want to say thank you to everybody for your presentations. That was awesome. We learned a lot. I want to say thank you to Cambridge Bay for hosting this meeting. It was helpful. It gave us a lot of answers, maybe some not, but thank you again. Hope to see you guys soon.

Lucy: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik, Itsivautaq. Thank you to the Commissioners. Thank you for hosting this conference and Inuit organizations who are here, the Government of Canada and other levels of government. My name is Lucy Taipana, Hamlet of Kugluktuk. I appreciate for those of you who expressed opinions for our questions and answering the panels, and our fellow people from this region. I thank you for hosting this proceeding. I know you are doing this for the future generation.

(English): I would just like to thank everyone who came to our meeting. Your presentations were very helpful and answering our questions that we had as best as you can. I would like to thank the Nunavut Planning Commission, the whole Commission, the staff, and our Regional Inuit Organizations for being here. Thank you so very much for a great week. We have learned a lot. We will share this information with our community members when we get home. I hope this has been helpful for the next planning session you have. Qujannamiik.

Harry M: Henry Makasagak, Cambridge Bay. Mr. Chair and your Commissioners, we thank you so much for coming in and listening to - let me put it this way for the moment – listening to the table of experienced people who are the primary land users. As primary land users, we are being encroached upon, and it is becoming a little more difficult for us to be able to go out and enjoy, as our friend mentioned, the creation that is out there that was given to us.

We as primary users, we are supposed to be the stewards of the land. We are here to look after the land. We want to teach our children and our grandchildren that they will take my place and protect the land, conserve the land, look after the land like we did for them, because on that land we have everything. We have food. We have clothing. We have shelter. It is absolutely beautiful to go out to the cabin and to listen to the songbirds and to listen to the migratory birds that have arrived, for our pleasure and for our use.

We are not saying that we are against Industry. We are not saying that we are against development, but unless you incorporate Traditional Knowledge into what you are attempting to do, as you say

on our behalf, then listen to the ones that are the caretakers. We have patches of land that are actually archeological lands that some of us don't even know about.

If you travel between Cambridge and Kugluktuk, and you go by Bathurst and Bay Chimo, as you go inland towards Kugluktuk, you come across a place called Bernard Harbour. You come across a place called Tree River. In and along those places, my late parents were there. My grandparents, my late grandparents were there as part of the caretakers of the land. They did not go in and squander and mess up the land. They left it the way they found it.

When the military moved in because of the Cold War, they up and left. We see it right across the land from Alaska to Greenland the mess that they left behind. The primary users of this land were not like that. You have heard many – I'll try to be short. I've got to be careful.

You've heard many words from many presenters. Most of the words to me I hope were taken as encouragement. Also, as a point of realizing that okay, they want to use the land and here is how we have set it up within the document that we called the Land Claim Agreement, which is a living document. In that living document, we have a Land Use Commission. Their documents within the Nunavut Land Claims is also a living part of the document.

As Commissioners, it is your duty on our behalf. We can't all be there together to say, "No you can't" or "You must do it like this," but you as our designated Commissioners, you will bring to the table of those who are still coming and saying you need to change this, you need to change this. It is not working for us to change it. It doesn't work like that, because we are looking after our land.

As we are looking after our land, we are also saving it for our children who will go out and use it as well after us, and our grandchildren. As I told you yesterday, I have many grandchildren and many great-grandchildren. The impact of what we have been hearing and what we are going to attempt to do, they are the ones that are going to see the change. We are trying very hard as parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents that we want to preserve it for them, like my parents did for me.

So Mr. Chair and Commissioners, again, you have heard many words. I am sure you are going to hear many, many more words down the line. We trust you, and we know that you will do as the people, the primary users have always looked after the land. Sharon, it is good to see you back home. Darrell, good to see you back home again for a short time. Jonathan, you were just a little tyke when you left. Welcome home. It is good to see you all, and I wish you a safe journey back to your home community. Thank you.

Beverly: Good afternoon, Beverly Makasagak with Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers. Thank you to the Nunavut Planning Commission for coming to Cambridge Bay and doing your hearing, bringing our region together. Thank you to the interpreters. I know sometimes it is very difficult to interpret from each language. Thank you to all the participants and the HTOs from across our region.

Like my dad Harry mentioned, we are stewards of the land and the water. I am going to talk about Cambridge Bay because we are on Victoria Island. With our animals, marine and terrestrial, they migrate by the season, so we need to really be careful in the springtime and in the fall time. That is when Inuit harvest their catch so they can have plenty for the winter storage.

Our caribou right now as mentioned by presenters, it is very critical. We are doing our best as an HTO to manage and try to bring up those caribou numbers. That is our main source of food. Our hunters, I like to call them the brave ones, because they are the ones that take the journey in the fall time when the ice starts to form. They risk their own lives to go from the island to the mainland to go hunt and harvest for their families and our communities. I would like to give them great recognition for their bravery.

As we mentioned to the Prime Minister when he visited, the ice is here 8 to 9 months of the year, and the ice is our highway. I would like to keep that in mind, especially with newer and bigger icebreakers that are capable to go through at the ice at some point in, maybe not our lifetime but in the left time for our generation. We need to respect our ancestors, where they used to live, and where their family members now today still go to visit. I will mention a few that are around: Perry River, Ellis River, Wellington Bay, and Anderson Bay. As mentioned earlier, we need to respect our ancestor's wishes and continue to be stewards of land and water. Thank you.

Bobby: Ikaluktutiak Hunters and Trappers Chair, Bobby Greenley. First I would just like to say thank you to NPC, all the Commissioners, the staff, like Bev said the interpreters, the ladies and gentleman over here doing all their running around and looking after everybody here. A big thank you to everyone.

What everybody has said already, there is not much to add. Sure there are disagreements, and everybody has their different point of views on how we see things. We are human. We see one way, and the person beside me sees it a different way. Having a group like this come together, sure there are differences. Eventually we may come together and meet in the middle. Somewhere we will meet eventually and have it all figured out and settled. Having these talks and having the disagreements, nothing gets settled if you don't have disagreements.

Everybody got to say and do a presentation. Everybody will see it one way, and then you start to realize what everybody is going through. It was great to see and hear everybody's presentation from the communities, from everybody out there sitting there doing their presentations. We get to see where they are coming from as well. It makes you think a different way.

Like everybody said, this is a big job. Hats off to everybody here. Hopefully we can get everything figured out and make sure we have everything in place for our kids and grandkids, like Harry said. It is going to take a little bit longer, but hopefully we can get it done and most of us be happy. Some may not be. Hats off to everyone though. I hope you enjoyed your stay in Cambridge. I'm looking forward to everybody coming back and going to your guys' communities as well. Thank you.

Laurel: Good afternoon. My name is Laurel Bennett. I am the Planning and Lands Administrator for the Hamlet of Cambridge Bay. Welcome all of you to Cambridge Bay, and welcome back to Ikaluktutiak. It is great to have you here. I would also like to thank our fabulous folks who have been keeping everything running smoothly. Thank you to the interpreters, big thank you to the interpreters, to the camera staff, the microphone staff, all the tech staff. Thank you to the Nunavut Planning Commission for bringing us all here together. I would like to thank Jonathan for the overview, beautifully informative. Quana. I would like to thank all of the panelists for bringing your opinions forward. I would certainly like to thank the community delegates for your advocacy, your views, and your Traditional Knowledge that is greatly taken to heart. Thank you so much. Quana.

Jim M: Jim MacEachern, CAO, Municipality of Cambridge Bay. I'll be brief because I think everything has pretty much been said. Just a couple of quick points: First, I think it is fair to say that the Municipality of Cambridge Bay historically has been open and receptive to mining, but not mining at all costs. Sustainable, respectful development, we have been open to. I think it is imperative or important that the experts, the HTOs across the territories, are the guide in developing this Plan. At the end of the day, our hope is that the Plan will strike a balance between sustainable, respectful development and wildlife and land management. I think ultimately that should be everybody's goal.

I think the last point I would like to make is I would like to work with our local HTO in a joint submission following our discussions here so that we are aligned moving forward. I think we are on the majority of issues. I would hope to see more communities take that kind of approach. In that joint submission, I will ask for a little bit more clarification within municipal boundaries.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. I will stick to the agenda. Next is the federal government for closing statements. A representative from the federal government please. Whenever you are ready, go ahead.

Spencer: Quana, Mr. Chair. Spencer Dewar, Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada. Sorry I am not Terry Audla. I will be speaking on behalf of the Government of Canada members in Cambridge Bay and those who are unable to attend in person. We certainly appreciate that the Commission has made the hearings available via live stream. We would like to thank the community of Cambridge Bay for their warm welcome, and everyone who helped bring this hearing together. We would also like to thank the Commissioners, the Nunavut Planning Commission team, and the interpreters for their excellent work.

This week has brought us together and has offered some valuable insights into the expectations of communities and participants of a first-generation Land Use Plan. This is an important step and highlighted the difficulties and complexities before the Commission in achieving balance required in a Land Use Plan.

Listening to the Hunters and Trappers Organizations, the hamlets, and the community members, it is clear that conservation is a priority. It often seemed presented as an either-or proposition, but land use planning is about finding balance, and it should not be a choice between economic development and jobs or environmental protection and food security. We believe finding the balance that provides for protection of the environment and economic development will require a closer look at some specific areas. This will take efforts from all parties to collaborate and compromise to find workable solutions.

At times, the best option to address these issues will very well be the Land Use Plan, but we cannot lose sight that it is not the only option. Other regulatory tools under the *Nunavut Agreement* and territorial and federal legislation can also be used to address important concerns. Working together through these options may provide broader agreement amongst parties to assist the Commission.

The Government of Canada would also encourage the Commission to pay special attention to the submissions of the Kitikmeot Inuit Association and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated as the designated Inuit organizations in accordance with the *Nunavut Agreement*, particularly in regard to the request for regional diversity and the treatment of Inuit Owned Lands, and give considerable weight to their recommendations on applying a distinct approach to Inuit Owned Lands.

This is the first of five public hearings, and the Government of Canada is optimistic. We appreciate the Commission's openness and flexibility as parties work together on the shared goal of a sound, well-supported, and clear Land Use Plan that can be successfully implemented. We remain committed to this process, and we will work with participants to help inform the Commission, as we recognize it is the Commission that has the difficult task of developing a first-generation Land Use Plan, one that can be jointly accepted by the Government of Canada, Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, and the Government of Nunavut. Quana. Taima, Mr. Chair.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Government of Nunavut?

Henry: Hello. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Henry Coman on behalf of the Government of Nunavut. On behalf of the Government of Nunavut, I would like to thank the Nunavut Planning Commission for the opportunity to be here and partake in the Kitikmeot public hearing for the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The Government of Nunavut remains committed to the processes outlined in the *Nunavut Agreement* for land use planning and continues to support the efforts of the Commission in this task.

The successful completion of the Nunavut Land Use Plan is a Government of Nunavut priority. Once approved, the Nunavut Land Use Plan should guide and direct the territory's long-term vision for development and conservation. This is a monumental task for the Commission requiring a balanced approach that is reflective of a range of views. I would therefore like to thank all those who have travelled here to participate in this public hearing. We have listened to and recorded the different perspectives we have heard regarding the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

Some of the key points that I would like to highlight is that we have heard Taloyoak's concerns regarding the Boothia Peninsula and look forward to continuing discussions about its future. We have heard the Gjoa Haven delegation on the uncertainty around herd decline, and we will continue our research into the causes. We have heard Cambridge Bay's concerns on municipal planning and share them. We have heard your regional wildlife board's concerns regarding the Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit and scheduling of this year's wildlife survey compared to previous years.

As Assistant Deputy Minister, I will take this back to my department's ongoing effort to improve. On other general concerns raised outside of the scope of the land use planning, we have heard these also. We will be directing them to the Government of Nunavut's relevant departments, and we thank you for raising them.

In closing, we wish to thank the Commission for providing this opportunity to comment on the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan and urge them to consider the recommendations that we have made and those recommendations made by other participants. As stated in our presentation, the Government of Nunavut sees the need for considerable revisions to the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan in order to achieve and improve the balance between environmental and economic development goals.

We look forward to working with the Commission and our planning partners to develop a territory-wide Land Use Plan that is appropriately scoped and in accordance with our mandate, Katujjiluat. We look forward to a refined Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan after these public hearings and a successful approved Nunavut Land Use Plan in the near future. Thank you very much.

Chairperson: You. NTI?

James: *(Translated)*: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am happy to be here in Cambridge Bay working towards our future and see what can be agreed upon. We know what was there before us, here we are working towards for even a better future. We appreciate the Commission. You allowed us to voice our opinions, and it really helps a lot. It creates harmony where each organization stands with your 2021 Draft Land Use Plan.

We have a short statement at this final stage of the proceeding about what we know and heard this week. NTI, we have heard, we looked, and we listened to the concerns expressed with everything. We appreciate it. We work for the future, and it was in evidence that you are working hard for this. It will impact many people, many communities, especially the land through land use process. Hamlets, HTOs in this region, the Wildlife Board, and KIA, we have heard as NTI. We liked how we can preserve conservation and harvesting in this region. What is out there is part of Inuit life. Harvesting, conservation of mammals is very important foremost in NTI's mind.

We also heard the Land Use Plan that we are here for, it touches varied things of how the land should be protected, and how it should be good for the future economically with a balance of Inuit needs as we progress. NTI says and stands that the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan needs improvement. It will be stable if it is done properly with conservation foremost in mind. As it is, let's not forget that economic development and job creation is also important to Inuit.

(English) The Inuit right to wildlife and harvesting and Inuit Owned Lands both need to be equally recognized in the Nunavut Land Use Plan. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated welcomes the Government of Canada's support in principle that the Nunavut Land Use Plan may apply a distinct approach to Inuit Owned Lands. Inuit have negotiated defined rights on behalf of Inuit within the *Nunavut Agreement*. These include becoming land owners to small portions of land in the Nunavut Settlement Area. I would like stress also that anywhere in the world, Inuit had the biggest private land ownership after the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*. That is very, very useful, and nobody else in the world has that size of private owned land. I think this is part of our achievement.

When we say the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*, we know that we have to put the management into it. I think this is a good idea what the Nunavut Planning Commission are doing right now to see how the land should be governed and used in Nunavut. It also includes a detailed process to protect land and wildlife, and both Inuit and government wish to do so also. This includes the right to negotiate Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements, including the swapping of land with the Crown when Inuit land is included in protected areas. This is good, and we have done that already in parts of the Nunavut Settlement Area in trading parcels of land with the Canadian government.

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated wants to ensure that these rights are not diminished to the implementation of the Nunavut Land Use Plan. In finalizing the Nunavut Land Use Plan, the Commission must respect the rules of Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Regional Inuit Association as land owners, managers on behalf of Inuit for Inuit Owned Lands. A flexible approach in the Nunavut Land Use Plan must adapted to support Inuit decision-making on Inuit Owned Lands. That limits the impact of a Nunavut Land Use Plan on rights of Inuit to manage Inuit Owned Lands.

(Translated): Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated thinks that surface and subsurface rights on Inuit Owned Lands, how the minerals should be extracted, how to achieve working relationship with the economy, this was a primary concern during negotiations of what was under the land. People before

us had thoughts working with the governments at the time how best to govern the land, so it is first and foremost that the Nunavut Land Use Plan be accomplished. It says in the *Nunavut Agreement* that the planning process should concentrate on what is really needed to the territory and to the communities and to its inhabitants.

The planning you are undertaking now really needs support to accomplish it. With a few minor amendments, the communities in the regions continue your work important work and has shown this past week. Your visions towards the Nunavut Land Use Plan, it is very important. So, we talk. We look for ways. We look for compromises so the land can be handled property of what the Commission is trying to achieve with this Land Use Plan.

So, we spoke. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, we are listening. We will listen again. We will listen to your concerns and how you want to proceed in progress of this draft implementation. Our support staff have been very helpful to both of our parties, and they are instrumental to what we are achieving and what we are discussing today. I appreciate that this Commission hearing took place in the Kitikmeot. Thank you, Nunavut Planning Commission and your staff. The preparation you have done in great detail. With interpreters, many of us would not be able to communicate, so the appreciation should be handed to them. Thank you. Thank you for the time you have taken to come to this region. Cambridge Bay is a very nice community. They are always welcoming in the facilities here.

In closing, it says that there were two concerns, that we were born and the land was given to us. We heard it today. Let's not forget that. Let's try to keep that in mind. We are here because of hard work of our forefathers. All your concerns will be included in the Nunavut Planning Commission documents. They say, we say it is a first-generation document. It needs improvement, and it will be so. It is not the first public hearing. There are other regions that will proceed even to parts of Manitoba, two times in Baffin Island. They will hear the same from NPC and receive answers to what their needs are. It is hard work. It is not an easy task to finish and acquire what we need. We look forward to the final conclusion of this process. If it is not right, it will be fixed. There are many ways to present and many ways to fix the problem. It will work. You have a good flight home. I am sure your families will be waiting for you and welcoming you. Thank you.

Chairperson: Qujannamiik. Sharon will have a short speech.

Sharon: Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you to all the participants that came, all the community members. I know everybody has thanked the translators, but truly we would not be all communicating without their dedication and hard work. I would just like to give them a round of applause.

(Applause)

I would also like to recognize John, Chris, and Willy, and Isuma team that you don't see here that has been supporting us on the other end for the live streaming. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Bessie, if your team can stand up, this team – Joan isn't here – but, they have been our arms and legs working with Nowdlak and our team on the ground since we arrived last Wednesday. They have just been a godsend, so Thank you very much.

(Applause)

To our staff who are never tiring and are very committed to this process and very open to this process, I thank each and every one of you too for your dedication, and our consultants and support staff. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

To all the participants and all the community members, I thank each and every one of you for having the confidence to come, to share, to be open, and give the Commission your submissions and guidance. Going forward, this was the first of the five public hearings, and we have four hearings remaining. For many of the delegates, we look forward to seeing you along this journey.

To the Community of Cambridge Bay, Jim, all of the water truck drivers who had to work overtime this week and all of the municipal staff supporting us, hats off to you. A big round of applause to them, because we all wouldn't be clean.

(Applause)

The Commission does foster the principles of working together and respects both the scientific and Traditional Knowledge. We continue both with our verbal and written presentations to ensure they are incorporated into our record. To all participants, the guidance that you can give us with specific recommendations of solutions and options to the Draft Plan will help the Commissioners with their final decisions on the final content of the Draft Plan.

I also would like to remind everyone that the closing of the record is January 10th, and the sooner your submissions are in, the better it is for the Commission. Thank you to each and every one of you, and may you have safe travels home. With that, Mr. Chair, I will turn it back over to you. Thank you.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. Thank you, speakers. Bobby mentioned that we are not done yet. I'd personally like to thank the Community of Cambridge Bay. You have been a great host. Thank you, Cambridge Bay and the delegates from the communities. You are all here, and you participated. The registered participants who gave a presentation and those who sat on the panel, thank you. To the staff of NPC, you have done great work. You have given us something to work with. You have prepared your documents well. Regardless, everybody thank you, and to the interpreters. Lucy, I apologize to you. Your dialect was a little different to me, so I will remember that.

We work together. We are not done. There is a lot of work ahead of us. My fellow Commissioners will have a hard task of analyzing everything to work this document into a solution hopefully. We still have to travel to other regions to conduct the same exercise. This is the first stop of five hearings that we will be conducting. Thank you for coming into this proceeding. On behalf of the Commissioners, thank you. They are always supportive. Although they did not say anything at this time, they know and will guide me in order to analyze what we have to put together at the end. Hopefully it will be acceptable. I have no more to say. I just want to say thank you in closing. Joshua, please say the closing prayer so we can conclude. One more speaker?

Luigi: Mr. Chair, Luigi Toretti, Kitikmeot Inuit Association. I am not a lawyer, and I do not understand law. I try to advise the Kitikmeot Inuit Association based on my knowledge and experience with the organization and my knowledge of the *Nunavut Agreement*. The Kitikmeot Inuit Association prepared a short closing statement, but we are not being given an opportunity to speak to it. If I understand correctly, and the lawyers may correct me if I am wrong, but the organization has standing at this hearing. It is really a surprise to me to see that we are not being given the opportunity. Taima.

Chairperson: *(Translated)*: Qujannamiik. I am sorry to hear that. I would just like to say that we don't always get what we want. You were given the opportunity to speak, and we are concluding. We are concluding because our agenda dictates that. Joshua?

Joshua: *(Closing Prayer)*

Chairperson: Qujannamiik.

End of Cambridge Bay Public Hearing