



ᓄᓇᓂᓄᓂ ᓂᓄᓇᓂᓄᓂ  
Nunavunmi Parnaiyiit  
Nunavut Planning Commission  
Commission d'Aménagement du Nunavut

# Public Hearings Report on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan

*(September- November 2022)*



Submitted on, June 20, 2023

**Contents**

- 1 INTRODUCTION ..... 1
  - 1.1 Purpose of the Report..... 1
  - 1.2 Community Preparatory and Orientation Sessions ..... 2
  - 1.3 Report Methodology ..... 3
- 2 NPC PUBLIC HEARINGS ..... 3
  - 2.1 Advertisements..... 5
  - 2.2 Participation ..... 6
  - 2.3 Format of Public Hearing..... 6
  - 2.4 Inuit Tradition and Oral Communication..... 6
  - 2.5 Public Hearings Participants’ Reference Materials..... 7
- 3 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC HEARINGS ..... 7
  - 3.1 Kitikmeot Public Hearing (Cambridge Bay, NU, September 12 - 15, 2022) ..... 7
    - 3.1.1 Key Migratory Birds ..... 8
    - 3.1.2 Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings ..... 9
    - 3.1.3 Caribou Sea Ice Crossing..... 12
    - 3.1.4 Polar Bear Denning areas..... 12
    - 3.1.5 Walrus terrestrial Hall outs ..... 13
    - 3.1.6 Whale Calving Areas ..... 14
    - 3.1.7 Climate change..... 14
    - 3.1.8 Future Parks ..... 14
    - 3.1.9 Conservation Areas..... 14
    - 3.1.10 On ice community travel routes..... 15
    - 3.1.11 Community Areas of Interest..... 15
    - 3.1.12 Community Drinking Water Supplies ..... 15
    - 3.1.13 Contaminated Sites ..... 16
    - 3.1.14 Transportation and Communications Corridors..... 16
    - 3.1.15 Commercial Fisheries ..... 16
    - 3.1.16 Existing Mineral Rights ..... 17
    - 3.1.17 Other Issues..... 17

---

3.2	Kivalliq Public Hearings (Rankin Inlet, NU, September 19-23, 2022) .....	19
3.2.1	Key Migratory Birds .....	19
3.2.2	Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings .....	20
3.2.3	Caribou Sea Ice Crossing (including summer and late summer areas, rutting areas, mainland winter ranges and migration corridors).....	21
3.2.4	Polar Bear Denning areas.....	21
3.2.5	Walrus terrestrial Hall outs .....	22
3.2.6	Whale Calving Areas .....	22
3.2.7	Marine areas of Interests .....	23
3.2.8	Climate change.....	23
3.2.9	Conservation Areas .....	23
3.2.10	On ice community travel routes .....	23
3.2.11	Community Areas of Interest.....	23
3.2.12	Area Shared with Non-Nunavut Communities .....	24
3.2.13	Community Drinking Water Supplies .....	24
3.2.14	Contaminated Sites .....	24
3.2.15	Transportation and Communications Corridors.....	24
3.2.16	Commercial Fisheries .....	25
3.2.17	Existing Mineral Rights .....	25
3.2.18	Other Issues.....	25
3.3	Thompson Public Hearings (Thompson, Manitoba, September 26-27, 2022).....	26
3.3.1	Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings .....	27
3.3.2	Polar Bear Denning areas.....	28
3.3.3	Transboundary Considerations .....	29
3.3.4	Community Areas of Interest.....	29
3.3.5	Areas Shared with Non-Nunavut Communities .....	29
3.3.6	Transportation and Communications Corridors.....	30
3.3.7	Existing Mineral Rights .....	30
3.3.8	Other Issues.....	31

3.4	North Baffin Public Hearings (Pond Inlet, NU, October 24-27, 2022)	32
3.4.1	Key Migratory Birds	32
3.4.2	Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings	33
3.4.3	Caribou Sea Ice Crossing	34
3.4.4	Polar Bear Denning areas	34
3.4.5	Walrus terrestrial Hall outs	34
3.4.6	Whale Calving Areas	35
3.4.7	Marine areas of Interests	35
3.4.8	Transboundary Considerations	35
3.4.9	Climate change	36
3.4.10	Future Parks	36
3.4.11	Conservation Areas	36
3.4.12	Proposed National Marine Conservation Areas	36
3.4.13	On ice community travel routes	37
3.4.14	Community Areas of Interest	37
3.4.15	Community Drinking Water Supplies	37
3.4.16	Contaminated Sites	37
3.4.17	Transportation and Communications Corridors	38
3.4.18	Commercial Fisheries	38
3.4.19	Existing Mineral Rights	38
3.4.20	Other Issues	39
3.5	South Baffin Public Hearings (Iqaluit, NU, November 14-19, 2022)	40
3.5.1	Key Migratory Birds	40
3.5.2	Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings	41
3.5.3	Caribou Sea Ice Crossing	44
3.5.4	Polar Bear Denning areas	45
3.5.5	Walrus terrestrial Hall outs	45
3.5.6	Whale Calving Areas	47
3.5.7	Climate change	47

3.5.8	On ice community travel routes .....	47
3.5.9	Community Areas of Interest.....	48
3.5.10	Area Shared with Non-Nunavut Communities.....	48
3.5.11	Community Drinking Water Supplies .....	48
3.5.12	Contaminated Sites .....	49
3.5.13	Transportation and Communications Corridors.....	49
3.5.14	Commercial Fisheries .....	50
3.5.15	Existing Mineral Rights .....	50
3.5.16	Other Issues.....	50
4	SUMMARY.....	51
4.1	Key Issues Identified from Public Hearings .....	51
4.2	NPC Rules of Procedure Considerations .....	51
5	Appendix A: Agenda for the Regional Public Hearings .....	53
6	Appendix B: Summary Listings of Attendees at Regional Public Hearings.....	75
7	Appendix C: Newspaper Advertisements for Public Hearings .....	99

## List of Figures

Figure 1:	Community members public hearings preparatory session in Coral Harbour .....	2
Figure 2:	Community Roundtable during the North Baffin Public Hearing in Pond Inlet .....	4
Figure 3:	NPC Commissioners and Executive Director at the Public Hearing in Cambridge Bay .....	5
Figure 4:	Community Participants during the South Baffin Public Hearing in Iqaluit .....	6
Figure 5:	Community Roundtable during the Kitikmeot Public Hearing in Cambridge Bay .....	8
Figure 6:	Community Roundtable during the Kivalliq Public Hearing in Rankin Inlet.....	19
Figure 7:	Participants during the Public Hearing in Thompson, Manitoba.....	27
Figure 8:	Community Roundtable during the North Baffin Public Hearing in Pond Inlet .....	32
Figure 9:	Community Participants during the South Baffin Public Hearing in Iqaluit .....	40

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC or Commission) is pleased to present this written report of the Public Hearings on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan (DNLUP). The Commission has worked over 15 years towards fulfilling the task of developing a Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan, and in July 2021 released its fourth draft of the land-use plan which has been developed in consideration of the written submissions on the Public Record, and the oral representations made during the public hearings held in mid-September to November 2022 as part of the review process of the 2021 DNLUP.

In accordance with Articles 11.5.4 and 11.5.5 of the Nunavut Agreement (NA), and Section 53 of the Nunavut Project Planning and Assessment Act (NuPPAA) which requires respectively, that:

“The NPC shall:

- (a) *conduct public hearings on the draft plans;*
- (b) *evaluate the draft plans in light of representations made at the publichearings; and*
- (c) *as appropriate, revise the draft plans.”* (Article 11.5.4 of the Nunavut Agreement)

*“Upon completion of the process in Section 11.5.4, the NPC shall submit the draft plan as revised along with a written report of the public hearings to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Territorial Government Minister responsible for Renewable Resources. The NPC shall also make the revised draft land use plan public.”* (Article 11.5.5 of the Nunavut Agreement)

*“The Commission must submit the original or revised draft land use plan, which it must make public, and a written report of the proceedings at the public hearing held in respect of it, to the federal Minister, the territorial Minister and the designated Inuit organization”.* (Section 53 of NuPPAA)

## 1.1 Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to summarize the key evidence heard by the Commission and outstanding issues brought forward at the Public Hearings. During these Public Hearings, the Commission has listened closely to the views expressed by individuals and communities across the territory and by Inuit representatives, transboundary governments and groups, Inuit, Metis and Indigenous with shared use and occupancy and/or asserted rights and interests in the Nunavut settlement area, Designated Inuit Organisations (DIOs), Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) and Regional Inuit Organisations (RIOs), the Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, Industry groups, and other participants in the planning process. The NPC has made every effort to ensure that the consultation and engagement process focused on ensuring that the Hamlets, Hunters and Trappers Organisations (HTOs) , and community members are fully informed of the proposed changes in the draft Nunavut wide land-use plan, hear comments and concerns from Nunavummiut and help prepare community members for the NPC’s hearings on the 2021 DNLUP which took place from mid-September to November 2022.

Prior to the 2022 public hearings, the Commission engaged in technical meetings with individual organizations to facilitate their understanding of identified issues on the 2021 DNLUP to further inform their written submission. In addition, the Commission had received several written submissions from a variety of planning partners including governments and regulatory bodies, Designated Inuit Organizations, first nations, industry groups, environmental organizations, other non-profit organizations, and members of the public before the hearings.

Following the completion of the final hearings in Iqaluit in November 2022, the Commission notified participants including communities potentially affected by the DNLUP that the Public Record would close on February 24, 2023, to provide an opportunity for participants to submit supplementary comments, responses to questions, and to enable comments on any supplementary comments received.

## 1.2 Community Preparatory and Orientation Sessions

To ensure effective community participation towards the development a Nunavut-wide Land Use Plan, the NPC staff held information sessions with appointed community representatives from the 25 communities in Nunavut, including transboundary groups in Northern Quebec, Northern Saskatchewan and Northern Manitoba between April and November 2022.



Figure 1: Community members public hearings preparatory session in Coral Harbour

Prior to the information and orientation sessions, NPC sent hard copies of English and translated copies of the 2021 DNLUP including associated maps and Options and Recommendation document to the communities to allow them to review the materials in advance of the Public Hearings. After the preparatory sessions, NPC staff continued to communicate with interested communities and organizations to clarify questions on the 2021 DNLUP and to explain how community input and feedback have been incorporated

into the current version of DNLUP. The information sessions were open only to the representatives appointed by the hamlets and HTOs of each community. To facilitate a better understanding of the 2021 DNLUP, the NPC staff gave a PowerPoint presentation at each of the information meetings which provided an overview of the DNLUP, the description of the land use designations and the community areas of interests within the 2021 DNLUP. The NPC presentations were delivered in English with simultaneous interpretation in Inuktitut and the representatives were encouraged to speak about community's ideas or concerns about the DNLUP and requested that they provide information to the Commission staff on the following questions:

1. What parts of the 2021 DNLUP do you support or not support, and why?
2. What changes to the 2021 DNLUP do you recommend, and why?

In each community, questions or concerns were raised and, in each case, the NPC staff explained how those concerns were addressed in the 2021 DNLUP and how their comments at the public hearings would be considered by the Commission in further revisions of the DNLUP.

### **1.3 Report Methodology**

This report summarizes what the NPC had heard from participants' presentations, questions, and responses at each session of the public hearings. Some questions were taken as notice and committed to a response in writing or to be discussed with the questioner outside of the hearing hearings on the 2021 DNLUP. This report is not intended to include all the views or concerns raised by interested parties in the draft Nunavut Land Use process. The public hearing report is drafted based on the transcripts of the public hearings as well as supporting presentation materials used by the participants at the hearings. Most participants have submitted supplementary comments and recommendations in oral or written submissions before or after the hearings. Some may have changed their views or recommendations after the hearings, and all the submissions will be considered as part of evidence for the revision of the Draft plan. The Option and Recommendations document presents in more detail the considerations and context of all the submissions, and their respective options and considerations. The referenced documents in section 3 of this report e.g. 21-142E, are available on NPC public registry at <https://lupit.nunavut.ca/portal/registry/#>!

## **2 NPC PUBLIC HEARINGS**

The Public Hearing provided an opportunity for Commissioners to hear directly from community members and other participants on the content of the 2021 DNLUP, both oral and written evidence were given equal consideration. During the regional Public Hearings, the NPC heard community's views on the draft plan and representatives were provided with the opportunity to ask questions of other participants in the planning process, as well as the NPC staff. The NPC made best efforts to accommodate all parties listed in the public hearing agendas, but in some hearing locations some registered participants chose not to make their presentations which affected the sequence of participant presentations noted in the original agenda.

While the engagement and consultation focus on this report is on the five public hearings to consider the 2021 DNLUP, the Commission had developed and completed an array of communications, public consultations, engagements, technical workshops, and a public hearing dating back to 2007. In that context

the development of the Recommended Nunavut Land Use Plan (RNLUP) through this engagement and consultation processes can be characterized as the most comprehensive, substantive, sustained duration, and intensity, inclusive, and culturally appropriate. This process involved the investment of tremendous human and financial resources by the Commission and the planning partners – that have provided invaluable insight through extensive engagement and consultation efforts and whos’ participation and contribution is greatly appreciated and valued by the NPC.



Figure 2: Community Roundtable during the North Baffin Public Hearing in Pond Inlet

Over the course of the five public hearings, the NPC held 21 hearing days, including several days with extended hearing hours to ensure opportunities for all participating voices to be heard. The Public Hearing was conducted on the following schedule.

Table 1: Public Hearings Schedule

Location	Venue	Meeting Date	Estimated Attendance (see list of participants)
Cambridge Bay (Kitikmeot) NU	Luke Novoligak Community Hall	September 12-15, 2022	142
Rankin Inlet (Kivalliq), NU	Singiituuq Complex	September 19-23, 2022	148
Thompson, MB	Royal Canadian Legion	September 26-27, 2022	125
Pond Inlet (North Baffin), NU	Community Hall	October 24-27, 2022	139
Iqaluit (South Baffin), NU	Cadet Hall	November 14-19, 2022	208

The Public Hearings were facilitated by NPC staff, with participation by several parties as noted in [Appendix B](#). Each Participant was represented by one or several individuals, and over 125 people participated in each session.

## 2.1 Advertisements

Pursuant to Rule 7 of the NPC Rules for Public Proceedings, the Commission made reasonable best efforts to notify communities or potentially interested or affected parties by the Proceedings as much as possible in Inuktitut, English, and French and used various methods to distribute notices. The NPC informed the communities and Participants of the upcoming public hearings through various advertisements including, emails, NPC website notices ([www.nunavut.ca](http://www.nunavut.ca)), social media postings, print media, radio, and cable advertisements. Newspaper advertisements in English, Inuktitut, and French were printed in the Nunatsiaq Newsprint publication for two (2) weeks prior to the commencement of the NPC Public Hearings. (See [Appendix C](#) for an example of the Newspaper advertisement that were published).



Figure 3: NPC Commissioners and Executive Director at the Public Hearing in Cambridge Bay



Figure 4: Community Participants during the South Baffin Public Hearing in Iqaluit

## 2.2 Participation

Participants were encouraged to register for and attend any of the regional hearings in person in Nunavut and Manitoba. The Commission made all possible efforts to ensure that simultaneous English-Inuktitut-French-Dënesuqiné interpretation were available during the public hearings.

## 2.3 Format of Public Hearing

Pursuant to Part III of the *NPC Rules for Public Proceedings*, the Regional Public Hearings was held by in-person meetings, facilitated by NPC Chairperson and Executive Director. The NPC also notified all participants that the upcoming regional public hearings would be livestreamed on the NPC's YouTube channels in two (2) languages – Inuktitut and English. The links for the live streaming were:

**English:** <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCxkzZox84XiQva2dAKwTNaw>

**Inuktitut:** <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCNizGYp5wg5UMwAPcFxWZ4A>

These additional broadcasting access options enabled additional community members, other interested organizations across Nunavut and across Canada to engage virtually and remain aware of issues being discussed through the Public Hearings.

## 2.4 Inuit Tradition and Oral Communication

The Commission gave great weight to Inuit tradition regarding oral communication and decision-making and accorded to the Designated Inuit Organizations full standing to appear at the public hearings for the purpose

of making submissions on behalf of Inuit. In addition, there was no requirement for any participant to provide submissions or comments in writing, and all oral communication during the hearings were fully accommodated and considered. Additionally, the full proceedings were recorded and transcribed verbatim for the NPC's Public Registry record and accessible to the process participants and the public more generally.

## **2.5 Public Hearings Participants' Reference Materials**

At each public hearing, the following materials were provided:

- NPC PowerPoint presentation in English and Inuktitut
- High resolution maps of Land Use Designations etc., in digital and large printed format.
- Executive Summary of the 2021 DNLUP
- The 2021 DNLUP, and Options and Recommendations document.

All above listed materials are available on NPC Public Registry at <https://lupit.nunavut.ca/portal/registry/#!>.

## **3 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Throughout the public review process of the 2021 DNLUP, the NPC provided interested parties and participants with opportunity to submit technical comments (written and oral as appropriate) and respond to comments, including the option to respond to questions and/or comments in written format post the hearing). To facilitate the Community Roundtable portion of the Public Hearings, the NPC invited representatives from the 25 communities in Nunavut, including transboundary groups in Northern Quebec, Northern Saskatchewan, and Northern Manitoba to select hearing proceedings. The NPC invited five (5) representatives from each of the Nunavut communities appointed by each community's Hamlet, Hunters and Trappers Organization (HTO) and encouraged them to support through their respective representation's, the views of their community's Elders, Women, and/or Youth.

During the Community Roundtable, community representatives from each of the communities present were invited to sit at the presenter's table to enable the Commissioners to hear directly focused presentations by NPC staff on the 2021 DNLUP and other parties' position on the 2021 DNLUP. Community representatives were then invited to pose questions to NPC and other participants. The Community Roundtable allowed each community to provide a summary of their views in respect of the 2021 DNLUP and in some instances community representatives displayed maps or videos to support their position. During the question-and-answer component of the Community Roundtable, a range of questions and/or comments were asked by community representatives and members of the public. The following is a summary of oral and written comments. These comments have been arranged to highlight issues and recommendations that should be addressed through the NPC's consideration of potential revisions of the 2021 DNLUP.

### **3.1 Kitikmeot Public Hearing (Cambridge Bay, NU, September 12 - 15, 2022)**

The following table summarizes participants' input through presentations and discussion at the Kitikmeot regional Public Hearings held in Cambridge Bay from September 12 to 15, 2022.



Figure 5: Community Roundtable during the Kitikmeot Public Hearing in Cambridge Bay

Topics/Issues	What We Heard
<p><b>3.1.1 Key Migratory Birds</b></p>	
<p>Class 1 sites are identified in the Draft Plan as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions on some industrial activities, and table 1 setbacks requirements on others.</p> <p>Class 2 sites are designated Conditional Use Areas where there are no proposed year-round prohibitions, but there are table 1 setbacks that would apply to some project proposals in these areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants generally support the Conditional Use designation on Class 2 sites and Valued Component on Class 3 sites. However, there are a couple of varying opinions on the Limited use designations for Class 1 Key migratory Birds habitats sites, despite the overall support for the need of protection.</li> <li>• Representatives of KIA noted their general concerns about limited use and Conditional Use designations in all areas, including Migratory Birds habitats sites in the Kitikmeot region and recommended to change the designations to Mixed use. (21-142E, p. 77)</li> </ul>

<p>Class 3 of migratory bird habitat sites are identified as Valued Components (VCs), with no prohibitions or restrictions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representatives of Kugluktuk noted their support to the protection of both Migratory Bird Habitat sites around their community (Bathurst Elu Inlet, and Lambert Channel) through Limited Use area designation and seasonal restrictions, however they have reiterated that the areas are too small and recommended expanding the protection to Reed Island. They have also noted concerns from some community members regarding the restriction on shipping that they felt is too strict because of its potential impact on future mines. (21-142E, p.96)</li> <li>• Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) noted that Migratory birds must be protected and that they would be consulting HTO's before deciding whether to support the Limited Use designation on Class 1 habitats sites overlapping Inuit owned lands. (21-142E, p. 103)</li> </ul>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.1.2 Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings**

<p>Designated Limited Use areas with prohibitions of some incompatible uses. In addition, in Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, there are also some seasonal restrictions on other activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, participants generally expressed concerns regarding caribou calving grounds, key migration routes and freshwater crossings and support the need of protection of those sensitive areas.</li> <li>• Community participants generally support habitat base protections of caribou calving grounds through the land use plan prohibitions of incompatible industrial uses such mineral exploration and development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>"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. "(Brandon Q, Gjoa Haven, 21-242E, p. 54)</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some community participants (Gjoa Haven and Cambridge Bay) noted that the identified areas are not representing all the calving grounds around their communities. They have expressed their intention to identify more Calving ground around Gjoa Haven and on the North end of Vitoria Island (21-142E, p. 42, and 47). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>"I would like stronger restrictions from mining activities because I want the next generation to hunt in the same place as we do" (Brandon Q, Gjoa Haven, 21-142E, p. 54)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Some participants expressed concern about calving grounds and spring migration routes and freshwater crossings and requested to include strict rules to land use.
- Taloyaok participants expressed concerns regarding major caribou calving grounds and migrating herd on Boothia Peninsula and have indicated their support of the Limited Use designation including the prohibition of industrial activities. "...It is the mining, and if industry was to come into that area, we have nothing. We lose everything including the land." (Joe E., Taloyaok, 21-142E, p. 62)
- Kugluktuk HTO representatives presented their support to mobile calving and post-calving protection measures and indicated that the proposed 10 km buffer around freshwater crossings are too large and suggested to bring it down to 5 km. (21-142E, p. 95)
- Kugluktuk hamlet representatives reported that some community members disagreed with the Caribou Fresh water crossing designation and would prefer Valued Component (VCs) designation since they are on Inuit Owned Lands. In addition, the community expressed their support to changing the designation for caribou calving grounds to seasonal restrictions. (21-142E, p. 97)
- A participant asked if it is possible to have different types of designation for different herds in the territory. (21-142E, p. 66)
- Kitikmeot Inuit Association (KIA) voiced their concerns that area protection does not make sense in the Kitikmeot because calving grounds change regularly. They've moreover mentioned that several instruments already exist that are specifically designed to ensure caribou and other wildlife, and as such area protection ought to not be utilized as a tool for caribou protection. In addition, they support that the NLUP must reflect their objectives and goals of Inuit Owned Lands, by assigning caribou and other wildlife habitats a Mixed-Use designation. (KIA, 21-142E, p. 78)
- The Government of Canada (GOC) noted that clear guidance on some outstanding issues regarding existing rights needed to be addressed before it can take a position on caribou conservation. *"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.” (GOC, 21-142E, p. 120)*

- The Government of Nunavut (GN) clarified that it is confident that its delineations of caribou key areas are accurate, and the government rely on IQ when it does not have sufficient data to delineate caribou habitat, such as Baffin Island. (GN, 21-142E, p. 135)
- The GN highlighted that caribou are important to Nunavummiut because they are culturally significant, contribute to the economy, and provide a good local source of food. They have also noted that many herds are in decline, and the territory’s population and socioeconomic needs are increasing. (GN, 21-142E, p. 135)
- The GN presented that Conditional Use designation with seasonal restrictions for caribou calving and post-calving grounds, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings can better achieve the balance between conservation and economic development. (GN, 21-142E, p. 136). \*Please note that the GN’s policy position on some caribou areas designations has changed post-hearings and their most recent position as presented in their written submission dated February 10, 2023 (21-192E) has been considered in the revision of the draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.
- Some participants also raised concerns about caribou calving habitat designated Limited Use areas within municipal boundaries with prohibitions on uses such as quarries. (21-142E, p. 146)
- Mining companies generally argued that the existing NIRB process and Mobile Protection Measure in place for mines are robust enough for caribou protection, so the Nunavut Land Use Plan should not include Limited Use designation with prohibitions of industrial activities. *“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*

	<p><i>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.” (Agnico Eagle, 21-142E, p.171, and 174)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WWF-Canada recommended maintaining the Limited Use designations and associated year-round prohibitions on incompatible uses for caribou calving areas, caribou post-calving areas, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings, and argued that there is not convincing evidence that mobile measures could be effectively used as a land use planning tool to manage caribou habitat (WWF, 21-142E, p. 181)</li> <li>• WWF-Canada also commented that caribou calving grounds cannot be managed at the impact review board level, and explained that the Land Use Plan, is the first level to give a clear direction on how to handle caribou calving grounds. (WWF, 21-142E, p. 182)</li> <li>• KIA representative argued that caribou herds across the Kitikmeot region and across North America have declined and increased in the complete absence of human development disturbance, and that these cycles are normal trends observed by Traditional Knowledge as well as science knowledge. (KIA, 21-142E, p. 189)</li> </ul>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.1.3 Caribou Sea Ice Crossing**

<p>Designated Conditional Use areas within which, except as required for safe navigation, community resupply or emergency response, icebreaking activities are restricted during certain season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants generally support Conditional Use designation for caribou sea ice crossing, including seasonal restrictions on ice breaking.</li> <li>• Some participants raised concern about Sea ice crossing during the month of May and requested strict regulations when caribou are migrating (21-142E, p. 54)</li> <li>• The Government of Canada (GOC) raised concerns regarding restrictions on Ice-Breaking and recommended to consider developing an exception in the plan to allow Canada to meet its international obligations. (GOC, 21-134E, p 13 and 21-142E, p 54)</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.1.4 Polar Bear Denning areas**

<p>Designated Conditional Use areas with seasonal requirements on certain uses. There are no prohibited uses. Requirements are that in identified polar bear denning areas during denning season (September 15<sup>th</sup> to April 15<sup>th</sup>), before conducting any activities involving earth or snow moving (e.g., drilling, blasting, or using heavy equipment), proponents must first 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No participant has expressed concerns regarding the proposed designation and plan requirement at the hearing.</li> <li>• Some participants including NTI and the GN voiced their support to the proposed land use policies for Polar Bear Denning Areas.</li> <li>• NTI noted: <i>“We are in support of you with polar bear populations, how to safeguard the species...NTI believes truly that the polar bear protection is of paramount importance and should be priority in all of the regions.” (NTI, 21-142E, p. 100 )</i></li> </ul>
<p>Other related comments or concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns noted about increasing grizzly bears migrating to the territory (21-142E, p 42, 44, 47)</li> <li>• Concerns raised regarding Polar Bear quotas in the region. It was noted that the NPC has no jurisdiction regarding wildlife quotas.(21-142E, p 74)</li> </ul>

**3.1.5 Walrus terrestrial Hall outs**

<p>Designated Limited Use area with year-round prohibitions on some industrial activities, as well as marine and aerial setbacks. No terrestrial walrus haul out has been identified in the 2021 DNLUP in the Kitikmeot region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants are generally supportive of the Limited Use designation for active terrestrial walrus haul-outs.</li> <li>• The GOC note concerns regarding setbacks around walrus haul-outs and argued that they should not prevent the delivery of services to communities. In addition, the Government of Canada supports the exceptions in the provided in draft plan for community resupply, emergency activities and safe navigation and recommended to clarity of the wording “safe navigation.” (GOC, 21-142E, p 122)</li> <li>• WWF-Canada recommended the addition of abandoned haul-outs as Valued Ecosystem Components (VECs) with notice to proponents to voluntarily avoid these areas. (WWF, 21-182E, p 122)</li> <li>• A Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board (KRWB) representative note that hunters know there are walruses in the Kitikmeot region. (KRWB, 21-182E, p 184)</li> </ul>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>3.1.6 Whale Calving Areas</b>	
Some selected areas on Southampton Island and Clearwater Fjord were Designated Limited Use areas, and all other areas as Valued Components.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A participant noted concerns regarding migrating beluga whales. (21-142E, p.56)</li> </ul>
<b>3.1.7 Climate change</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A participant noted concerns new species arriving to the territory. (21-142E, p 43)</li> <li>• A participant noted concerns regarding changing ice conditions including late freeze-up, as well as changes on the land, and eroding shores due to climate change. (21-142E, p 98)</li> </ul>
<b>3.1.8 Future Parks</b>	
Designated Limited Use areas with prohibition of incompatibles industrial uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ekaluktutiak Hunters &amp; Trappers Organization (EHTO) requested clarification from the NPC on whether the Commission still has jurisdiction over Ovayok Park near the community of Cambridge Bay. ( EHTO, 21-142E, p.152) The NPC clarified that it still have jurisdiction on many territorial parks including Ovayok Territorial Park since they are not fully established under the legislation yet.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1.9 Conservation Areas</b>	
Designated Limited Use areas with prohibition of incompatible industrial uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KIA expressed that the problems with the 2021 DNLUP are that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the designations applied to the conservation areas (i.e., Limited Use and Conditional Use) over-exceed the permitted uses formally agreed to by Inuit, the GN and GOC; and that,</li> <li>○ the Limited Use designation applied to National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries does nothing to recognize the RIA-supported Permit Applications process outlined in Article 4 of that IIBA.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• KIA recommended that the NPC must give consideration to IIBAs and that the DNLUP must not interfere with the terms agreed upon in an IIBA and must allow DIOs the capacity to exercise their IIBA-authorized roles and responsibilities (KIA, 21-122E, p. 11)</li> <li>• A representative from the Taloyoak HTO expressed that the local community wants Aviqtuuq to be designated as an Inuit Protected and Conserved Area (IPCA) (21-142E, p. 87)</li> </ul>

### 3.1.10 On ice community travel routes

Designated Conditional Use areas within which, except as required for safe navigation, community resupply or emergency response, proponent are required to consult nearby communities before conducting any icebreaking activities during certain seasons

- Participants generally supported the Conditional Use designation for on-ice travel routes.
- Kugluktuk participants noted that the on-ice travel route they have identified to be removed from the map in 2019 was not removed in the 2021 DNLUP. The participants indicated that noise and vibration from icebreaking disturbs animals and should not be allowed at any time. However, the Kugluktuk participants suggested that the restrictions should be in June. (21-142E, p. 96)

### 3.1.11 Community Areas of Interest

Community Areas of interest have been assigned various designations including Limited Use designation for Hiukitak River, and for the terrestrial part of Boothia Peninsula

- Kugluktuk representatives noted their communities support for the Limited Use designation for Hiukitak River community area of interest and noted their concerns about ships being allowed to move through the inlet. (21-142E, p. 97)
- Taloyoak representatives stressed their support for Limited Use designation on the Boothia Peninsula.  
*"...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." (Jimmy o., Taloyoak, 21-142E, p 114)*  
*"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." (Jimmy o., Taloyoak, 21-142E, p 170).*
- NTI commented that the Boothia Peninsula has two Limited Use Areas associated with caribou-related Limited Use areas and also the Community Area of Interest, and requested clarification if there was anything within the limitations that might affect the interest to outfitting or sports hunting, or the building of a fishing cabin or hunting cabin. (NTI, 21-142E, p.68)
- KIA noted that it has submitted the Hiukitak River Community Area of Interest as a conservation area, and they believe that draft plan inhibits the potential for Inuit to negotiate IIBAs for future conservation areas. (KIA, 21-142E, p.77)

### 3.1.12 Community Drinking Water Supplies

<p>Assigned Limited Use designations outside of municipal boundaries (except for Kugluktuk and Baker Lake), and Valued Component within municipal boundaries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community representative from Gjoa Haven expressed concerns about garbage pilling near their community drinking water source and questioned the Nunavut Water Board about what can be done to keep the drinking water safe for the community. ( 21-142E, p. 157)</li> <li>• Another participant ask question regarding the addition of a secondary water source in their community. (21-142E, p. 158)</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.1.13 Contaminated Sites

<p>Priority contaminated sites are designated Limited Use areas with prohibition on some incompatible uses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A community member from Cambridge Bay said that when the military came to the arctic due to the Cold War, they left contaminated waste behind. (21-142, p.196)</li> </ul>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.1.14 Transportation and Communications Corridors

<p>Linear infrastructures are allowed uses in Mixed Use and Conditional Use areas; however, they are prohibited in most terrestrial based Limited Use areas. The Kivalliq-Manitoba LIC and the Mary River Milne inlet LIC are included as a Limited Use designation area which generally prohibits uses incompatible with the development of the linear infrastructures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide certainty for their future development, some participants have expressed their support of including Grays Bay and Bathurst Inlet Road and port projects in the plan like the Kivalliq-Manitoba Linear Infrastructure (21-142E p. 137 and p. 168)</li> <li>• The Government of Nunavut stated: <i>“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.” (GN, 21-142E, p. 137)</i></li> <li>• KIA stated that it is seriously concerned that the Limited Use designations in the DNLUP will prevent the development of the Grays Bay Road and Port and other transportation route between Kugararuk and Naujaat as indicated in public easements in Schedule 19-11.9 of the Nunavut Agreement (KIA, 21-122E, p. 14).</li> <li>• KIA also noted that by designating areas north of Ukkusiksalik National Park and the park itself as “Limited Use,” the DNLUP is interfering with DIO rights already committed to by contract between Inuit, Canada and the GN, and that the DNLUP must allow DIOs the capacity to exercise their IIBA-authorized roles and responsibilities (KIA, 21-122E, p. 15).</li> </ul>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.1.15 Commercial Fisheries

<p>The Cumberland Sound Turbot Management Area is designated as a Limited Use area, and char and turbot areas of abundance are designated Valued Components.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ekaluktutiak Hunters &amp; Trappers Organization (EHTO) expressed that the community of Cambridge Bay has five (5) river systems for commercial fishing and a sixth one that is right close to the community, all of which they recommend for protection. (21-142E, p.47)</li> <li>• A community representative from Gjoa Haven expressed concerns about the proximity of the sewage system to fishing lakes used by the community. (21-142E, p. 52)</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.1.16 Existing Mineral Rights

<p>The Draft Plan identifies projects with existing mineral rights in Limited Use areas in Appendix A. The listed projects are exempted from the prohibition in the Draft Plan on mineral exploration and development, but other plan requirements of the Draft Plan would continue to apply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although participants generally support the idea of providing certainty to existing projects, some participants, particularly mining companies voiced concerns regarding the 2021 DNLUP existing rights approach.</li> <li>• The Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, and Industry supported that all existing mineral rights should be protected, and that the issue of “stranded assets” be addressed so that all existing rights projects can be developed without a Plan amendment to access them. (21-142E, p. 137, 139, 140, and 177)</li> </ul>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.1.17 Other Issues

<p><b>Food security</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some participants raised concerns regarding food security for Nunavummiut. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Just so the community can be healthy, food security is a big problem that should be looked at.” (Jeannie, U., Taloyoak, 21-142E, p. 57)</li> <li>“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.”</li> <li>“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.” (Joe A. Taloyoak, 21-142E, p. 63)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• NTI noted that food security from the harvesting in the territory must be a priority in this Plan, but it believes it does not have to be seen as either-or proposition in the land use plan, but about finding balance. It should not be a choice between economic development and jobs or environmental protection and food security.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Inuit Owned Lands</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KIA noted that <i>“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.”</i> (KIA, 21-142E, p 78)</li> <li>• KIA recommended that the NPC must give much more consideration to DIO goals and objectives for Inuit Owned Lands and that <i>“these designations must be replaced with Mixed Use, and transportation corridor access to IOL must be assured.”</i> KIA, 21-122E, p. 9)</li> <li>• NTI wants to ensure that the Nunavut Land Use Plan contains a flexible approach adapted to support NTI and the RIAs decision-making on Inuit Owned Lands. (NTI, 21-142E, p 200)</li> <li>• The Government of Canada urges the Commission to pay a special attention to the NTI and RIAs’ request to apply a distinct approach to Inuit Owned Lands. (GOC, 21-142E, 198).</li> </ul>

### 3.2 Kivalliq Public Hearings (Rankin Inlet, NU, September 19-23, 2022)

The following table summarizes participants' input through presentations and discussion at the Kivalliq Regional Public Hearings held in Rankin Inlet from September 19 to 23, 2022.



Figure 6: Community Roundtable during the Kivalliq Public Hearing in Rankin Inlet

Topic	What We Heard
<h4>3.2.1 Key Migratory Birds</h4>	
<p>Class 1 sites are identified in the Draft Plan as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions on some industrial activities, and table 1 setbacks requirements on others.</p> <p>Class 2 sites are designated Conditional Use Areas where there are no proposed year-round prohibitions, but there are table 1 setbacks that would apply to some project proposals in these areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A community representative demanded more protection for waterfowl and other birds like ptarmigan. (21-146E, p.114)</li> </ul>

<p>Class 3 of migratory bird habitat sites are identified as Valued Components (VCs), with no prohibitions or restrictions.</p>	
<p><b>3.2.2 Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings</b></p>	
<p>Designated Limited Use areas with prohibitions of some incompatible uses. In addition, in Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, there are also some seasonal restrictions on other activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Kivalliq Wildlife Board (KWB) supports the decision to list caribou calving ground and water crossings as Limited Use areas and recommended a buffer around those water crossings (KWB, 21-146E, p. 126)</li> <li>• The Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board (BQCMB) presented overall support for the Limited Use designations for core caribou habitat but raised concerns that more needed to be done to protect freshwater crossings. An example was the Board's concern with the routing of the proposed Kivalliq-Manitoba corridor. The Board recommended that the corridor route be reconsidered and the proposed DNLUP's designation be changed accordingly. Additionally, the Board recommended that no grandfathering of existing rights in calving and post calving areas (BQCMB, 21-146E, p. 276-277).</li> <li>• Kivalliq Inuit Association (KivIA) expressed concerns regarding the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ differentiation between Key Access Corridors (pre-calving migration) and Migration Corridors is unclear and whether the maps for Key Access Corridors include migration off the calving grounds.</li> <li>○ the prohibited activities are not distinguished by the level or duration, such as the differences between mineral exploration and mining activities.</li> <li>○ Limited Use designations prohibit exploration and mining activities but does not draw a distinction between the likelihood of a mine or oilfield shutting down between May 15 and July 15.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• On IOL, KivIA recommends Conditional Use designation for caribou calving and post-calving areas with a complete shutdown of operations during pre-calving, calving, and post-calving seasons (May 15 – July 15) and Mobile Measures in other periods. KivIA also recommends refining the maps using the most recent collaring data and IQ, and a process be put in place to ensure regular updates and adaptability. (KivIA, 21-146E, p.196, 197 and 216)</li> <li>• The Government of Nunavut presented that Conditional Use designation with seasonal restrictions for caribou calving and post-</li> </ul>

	<p>calving grounds, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings can better achieve the balance between conservation and economic development. (GN, 21-142E, p. 136). *Please note that the GN's policy position on some caribou areas designations has changed post public hearings and their most recent position as presented in their written submission dated February 10, 2023 (21-192E) has been considered in the revision of the draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KWRB asked for clarification on how mobile protection measures would be enforced on Inuit Owned Lands. (KWRB, 21-146E, p. 144)</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.2.3 Caribou Sea Ice Crossing (including summer and late summer areas, rutting areas, mainland winter ranges and migration corridors)</b></p>	
<p>Designated Conditional Use areas within which, except as required for safe navigation, community resupply or emergency response, icebreaking activities are restricted during certain season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants generally support Conditional Use designation for Caribou sea ice crossings, however, some participants expressed concerns that VECs do not add any level of protection for most of the year or on most of caribou annual ranges and this lack of protection is most likely to be a problem if herds continue to decline as they are less resilient as global warming increases stress on caribou and their habitat.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.2.4 Polar Bear Denning areas</b></p>	
<p>Designated Conditional Use Areas with seasonal requirements on certain uses. There are no prohibited uses. Requirements are that in identified polar bear denning areas during denning season (September 15<sup>th</sup> to April 15<sup>th</sup>), before conducting any activities involving earth or snow moving, like drilling, blasting, or using heavy equipment, proponents must first 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some participants expressed that it is unclear from the Options and Recommendations document the total area proposed as a Conditional Use area for polar bear denning sites as not all the datasets submitted to the NPC appear to have been used in creating the designation.</li> <li>• NTI supports the Commission's approach to protecting polar bear denning areas and walrus haul-outs. (NTI, 21-146E, p.130)</li> </ul>
<p>Other related comments or concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Naujaat HTO commented that there is an increase in polar bear population in the region and expressed concerns about the current quotas system. (21-146, p. 103) The NPC reconfirmed it has no mandate or jurisdiction in setting wildlife quotas.</li> </ul>

### 3.2.5 Walrus terrestrial Haul outs

Designated Limited Use area with year-round prohibitions on some industrial activities, as well as marine and aerial setbacks. No terrestrial walrus haul out has been identified in the 2021 DNLUP in the Kitikmeot region.

- NTI supported the Commission's approach to protecting walrus haul-outs. (NTI, 21-146E, p.130)
- The Government of Canada commented on marine transportation noting that 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 the environment. (GOC, 21-146E, p.161)
- Coral Harbour representatives noted concerns regarding the continue shipping activities around Coats Island.  
*"Coats Island, Coral Harbour, they are still coming in through the island and the communities. Where are my regional organizations? It is very heavy to us. It is concerning. On Coats Island, there are a lot of walrus species there, and we don't want any disturbance on that island and the community. There are a lot of walruses on Coats Island and surrounding the island. They are full of walrus herds. The herds are aplenty. How do I talk about Coral Harbour concerns? Where are the organizations who can look into this further besides us? No, we have not been able to move the shipping route to the south of Coats Island. It has been our concern for many years."* (Willie N., 21-146E, p.99)
- The Kivalliq Wildlife Board (KWB) supports the decision to designate walrus haul-outs as Limited Use areas. KWB recommends that the size of the setbacks on the haul-outs be determined on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the closest HTO.

### 3.2.6 Whale Calving Areas

Some selected areas on Southampton Island and Clearwater Fjord designated Limited Use areas, and all other areas Valued Component.

- Naujaat representatives expressed concerns regarding the impacts of increased vessel traffic on narwhal population in their area. (Naujaat, 21-146E- p.102)
- Chesterfield inlet representatives echoed similar concerns.  
*"Chesterfield is well known for marine traffic. There is heavy traffic with cargo ships going to Baker Lake. They travel throughout the whole season, summer. Our marine mammals are being affected very badly, not just by cargo ships but many other small-vessel traffic coming through our community over and over again throughout the whole summer season. When there was a nickel mine in Rankin Inlet, our community used to be a major route for beluga whales. There is a little anchorage spot, a little cove in Chesterfield that used to be full of white whale, beluga whale. Now there are hardly any today. It's not*

	<i>just whales but seals and other mammals are depleting. We had plenty of mammals during the spring on ice floes. Now they are gone. (Harry A. 21-146E, p. 91)</i>
<b>3.2.7 Marine areas of Interests</b>	
Designated valued Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Naujaat HTO sought clarification on whether small scale commercial fishing activities would be allowed should the marine areas from Rankin through Coral harbour to south of Naujaat become designated Marine Protected Areas under the Oceans Act. The NPC clarified that this process is in its early stage, the NPC do not have information on what use will be permitted or , and advise the representative to follow up with DFO and other parties participating in that process to get more information.(Naujaat, 21-146E, p. 60)</li> </ul>
<b>3.2.8 Climate change</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several community members expressed concerns about climate change in Nunavut and the potential implication to wildlife and their habitats and food security.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2.9 Conservation Areas</b>	
Designated Limited Use areas with prohibition of incompatible industrial uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No major concerns were raised by participants regarding the limited use designation in conservation areas.</li> <li>KivIA stated that except for specific valued areas such as territorial or national parks, and the Thelon Game Sanctuary, which have an existing Inuit Impact Benefit Agreements, the Draft Plan should not limit access to areas for mineral exploration without consultation with the KivIA (KivIA, 21-146E, p. 197)</li> </ul>
<b>3.2.10 On ice community travel routes</b>	
Designated Conditional Use areas within which, except as required for safe navigation, community resupply or emergency response, proponent are required to consult nearby communities before conducting any icebreaking activities during certain seasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arviat Hunters and Trappers Organization advised that they will be submitting to the NPC, a map identifying their community sea ice travel routes from Arviat to Whale Cove and then Arviat to the Manitoba-Nunavut border.(Arviat, 21-146E, p. 51)</li> </ul>
<b>3.2.11 Community Areas of Interest</b>	
Community Areas of interest have been assigned various designations including	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When questioned to provide clarification on their recommendation to designate Community Areas of Interest in the Kivalliq region as</li> </ul>

Limited Use Designation for Hiukitak River, and for the terrestrial part of Boothia Peninsula	Conditional Use areas, KivIA informed that they are still consulting the affected communities and planning partners to determine appropriate management policies for those areas. (21-146E, p.202)
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.2.12 Area Shared with Non-Nunavut Communities**

Mixed Use designation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some community representatives asked to have more information regarding the ongoing Dēnesūliné areas negotiations and if there is going to be changes to the borderlines?</li> <li>The Government of Canada explained that the negotiations are in their final stage and the parties are not able to disclose details about the negotiations due to signed confidential agreements.</li> </ul>
-----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.2.13 Community Drinking Water Supplies**

Assigned Limited Use designations outside of municipal boundaries (except for Kugluktuk and Baker Lake), and Valued Component within municipal boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some communities such as Baker Lake and Whale Cove expressed concerns about their drinking water sources and generally support their protection.</li> <li>The Kivalliq Inuit Association generally supports a mixed approach to manage community drinking water. However, the Limited Use designation for Arviat drinking watershed overlaps with high resource potential, therefore KivIA recommends a Conditional Use designation. When asked by the NPC to provide clarification on their proposed approach, KivIA advised that they are still consulting the community of Arviat, and will be providing their response in writing after the hearings (21-146E, p.201-202)</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.2.14 Contaminated Sites**

Priority contaminated sites are designated Limited Use areas with prohibition on some incompatible uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several community representatives expressed concerns about contaminated sites and requested that they be cleaned up.</li> </ul>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.2.15 Transportation and Communications Corridors**

<p>Linear Infrastructures are permitted uses in Mixed Use and Conditional Use areas; however, they are prohibited in most terrestrial based Limited Use areas.</p> <p>The Kivalliq-Manitoba LIC and the Mary River Milne inlet LIC are included as Limited Use designation areas which generally prohibit uses incompatible with the development of linear infrastructure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BQCMB indicated that it does not support providing special status for infrastructure developments in the Kivalliq-Manitoba corridor. <i>“This is not acceptable to the Caribou Board for several reasons including location. The corridor runs through the Qamanirjuaq caribou spring migration corridor north to the calving grounds. B: It crosses calving and post-calving areas and important water crossings for caribou... The Caribou Board recommends that KIA be required to apply for an amendment and that NPC should evaluate alternative routes and cumulative impacts and conduct a public review for this</i></li> </ul>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p><i>project proposal. A better plan is essential for the future of the Qamanirjuaq caribou herd.” (BQCMB, 21-146E, p. 278)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Kivalliq Inuit Association recommends designating the Kivalliq-Manitoba corridor as Conditional Use.  <i>“The Kivalliq Inuit Association does not support designating the Kivalliq-Manitoba linear infrastructure corridor as Limited Use... The Kivalliq Inuit Association recommends designating the Kivalliq-Manitoba corridor as Conditional Use with seasonal restrictions on construction and maintenance. No Plan amendment should be required to permit expansion of the Kivalliq-Manitoba corridor to allow additional infrastructure for approved projects.” (KivIA, 21-146E, p.198)</i></li> </ul>
<h3>3.2.16 Commercial Fisheries</h3>	
<p>The Cumberland Sound Turbot Management Area is designated Limited Use area, and char and turbot areas of abundance are designated Valued Component</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A community representatives asked whether Fisheries and Oceans is still doing fish count.</li> </ul>
<h3>3.2.17 Existing Mineral Rights</h3>	
<p>The Draft Plan identifies projects with existing mineral rights in Limited Use Areas in Appendix A. The listed projects are exempted from the prohibition in the Draft Plan on mineral exploration and development, but other plan requirements of the Draft Plan would continue to apply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although participants generally support the idea of providing certainty to existing projects, some participants, particularly mining companies voiced concerns regarding the 2021 DNLUP existing rights approach.</li> <li>• The Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, and Industry supported that all existing mineral rights should be protected, and that the issue of “stranded assets” be addressed so that all existing rights projects can be developed without a Plan amendment to access them.</li> </ul>
<p>Other related Comments: public easements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KivIA presented that access routes in Schedule 19.11 of the Nunavut Agreement must be included in Schedule A list of existing rights in the Land Use Plan. ( KivIA, 21-146E, p.198)</li> </ul>
<h3>3.2.18 Other Issues</h3>	
<p><b>Food security</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several community members expressed concerns about food security issues due to declining caribou populations across the territory</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inuit Owned Lands</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A community member noted that there are Inuit Owned Lands along the Thelon River, or Aberdeen Lake, Schultz Lake, Baker Lake, various areas surrounding Baker Lake, and would like to know what they were selected for.</li> </ul>

- KivIA and NTI presented that some of the Land Use designations infringe DIOs rights to manage Inuit Owned Lands parcels. *“I know that one of our statements and positions does relate to Inuit Owned Lands and how Inuit Owned Lands was an Inuit right that was negotiated. As land managers and landowners, we have a responsibility to manage and make decisions on that. We are seeing how the Land Use Plan has an impact on that. (NTI, 21-146E, p.154)*
- Several participants commented that Inuit Owned Lands parcels have been selected by community members for different purpose and some community representatives expressed concerns regarding allowing mineral development on their communities’ IOLs.

### 3.3 Thompson Public Hearings (Thompson, Manitoba, September 26-27, 2022)

The following table summarizes participants’ input through presentations and discussion at the Thompson Regional Public Hearings held in Thompson, Manitoba from September 26 to 27, 2022. The Thompson hearing provided a further important venue to discuss transboundary issues and concerns of First Nations from Manitoba and Saskatchewan, specifically, the Ghotelnene K’odtineh Denesūᑭiné and Athabasca Dēnesūᑭiné who have asserted shared use and occupancy and/or asserted rights and interests in the Nunavut settlement area. There was also representation from the Seal River Watershed Alliance.





Figure 7: Participants during the Public Hearing in Thompson, Manitoba

Topic	What We Heard
<p><b>3.3.1 Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings</b></p>	
<p>Designated Limited Use areas with prohibitions of some incompatible uses. In addition, in Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, there are also some seasonal restrictions on other activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacted Dēnesuḷiné communities expressed that the calving ground is extremely sensitive, and the caribou habitat areas should be protected.</li> <li>• The Athabasca Denesuḷiné presented that they strongly support the protection of important caribou habitats through Limited Use designations which provide year-round prohibitions on certain uses. <i>“For thousands of years, the Denesuḷiné have relied on barren ground caribou such as the Qamanirjuaq and Beverly herds. Those ranges overlap with our territories. We are caribou people. Caribou are essential for the life, health, and culture of our people. It is not too much to say that. Without caribou, there will be no Denesuḷiné today. It is important for us. Ensuring protection of this herd across its entire range and migration route is a top priority for the Athabasca Denesuḷiné. It is critical that the Nunavut Land Use Plan provide strong and meaningful protection to caribou habitat. This means that we cannot allow activities that negatively affect caribou to take place on important caribou habitat such as calving and post-calving grounds, and long migration routes.” (David B. Black Lake, 21-147E, p. 51)</i> <i>“The Athabasca Denesuḷiné do not bother the caribou where the calving grounds are and after they have the calves. We respect them. The mines and the industry should also respect them and not bother them. This is a sacred place to us. This place must remain protected as proposed in the Draft of the Land Use Plan.” (Chief Tsannie, Hatchett Lake, 21-147E, p.47)</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ghotelnene K'odtineh Denesuᑭᑎᑎᑦ (GKD) voiced concerns about developments in caribou habitats and supported the proposed Limited Use designations. Further they recommended that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some intensive land uses should be prohibited from some areas so that people will not harm the land or disturb the animals there.</li> <li>○ Support the Nunavut Planning Commission's proposal to designate Limited Use areas for caribou with year-round prohibitions on certain land uses for caribou calving areas, post-calving areas, key access corridors, and key freshwater crossings.</li> <li>○ Support that the Commission proposes to apply additional seasonal restrictions to further limit activities allowed during specific time periods for calving and post-calving grounds and key access corridors, and to designate Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions on certain land uses for conservation areas on the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq range.</li> </ul> <p><i>"Ghotelnene K'odtineh Denesuᑭᑎᑎᑦ are concerned about developments in 1: calving areas; 2: post-calving areas; 3: key access corridors; and 4: freshwater crossings. Development in these areas could reduce the ability of the herd to recover. This may limit the ability of our members to maintain their culture and way of life and may adversely affect our Section 35 rights to harvest caribou. "(Ghotelnene K'odtineh Denesuᑭᑎᑎᑦ, 21-147 E, p. 41)</i></p> </li> <li>• However, the GKD have requested that all land withdrawn by the Order-in-Council be designated Mixed Use to help with the conclusion of the Samuel/Thorassie litigation. (GKD, 21-147E, p.40)</li> </ul>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.3.2 Polar Bear Denning areas**

<p>Designated Conditional Use areas with seasonal requirements on certain uses. There are no prohibited uses. Requirements are that in identified polar bear denning areas during denning season (September 15th to April 15<sup>th</sup>), before conducting any activities involving earth or snow moving, like drilling, blasting, or using heavy equipment, proponents must first 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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ghotelnene K'odtineh Denesuᑭᑎᑎᑦ expressed that the lands subject to 2019 Order-in-Council should be excluded from Polar Bear denning areas Conditional Use designation. Specifically, they requested that any Conditional Use or Limited Use area should be changed so that all lands subject to the resolution of Samuel/Thorassie litigation are designated as Mixed Use. (21-147E, p.40)</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

polar bear monitor confirmed that the bears had left the location.

### 3.3.3 Transboundary Considerations

North Water or Savarjuaq Polynya was designated as Conditional Use, and Great Bear Lake watershed as a Valued Component.

- The Seal River Watershed Alliance submits that the Commission identify the Seal River Watershed as a Valued Ecosystem Component in transboundary consideration under section 2.8 of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.  
*“The Seal River Watershed is the wintering grounds of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou herd and home to at least 22 species at risk. It is also a territory of great cultural importance as we know, for the Inuit, for the Cree, for the Denesūḷiné people with community priorities and values of water management areas in the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.  
 The Plan does not identify any of the values of the watershed outside of Nunavut as transboundary considerations or contemplate further actions under Chapter 2: Protecting and Sustaining the Environment, or Chapter 3: Encouraging Conservation Planning. So, it is a recommendation the Seal River Watershed Alliance submits that the Commission should identify the Seal River Watershed as a transboundary consideration under 2.8 of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan. The portion of the Seal River Watershed within the Nunavut Settlement should be identified as a Valued Ecosystem Component.”* (Seal River Watershed Alliance, 21-147E, p.73-74)

### 3.3.4 Community Areas of Interest

Community Areas of interest have been assigned various designations including Limited Use Designation for Diana River and Duke of York Bay in the Kivalliq region

- In addition to being identified as Valued Component in Transboundary considerations section, the Seal River Watershed Alliance submits also that the Commission identify the Seal River Watershed within Nunavut as a Community Area of Interest and assigned it a Limited Use designation that prohibits incompatible uses. (Seal River Watershed Alliance, 21-147E, p.74)

### 3.3.5 Areas Shared with Non-Nunavut Communities

Designated Mixed Use areas

- Ghotelnene K’odtineh Denesūḷiné requested that all land withdrawal by the Order-in-Council be designated Mixed Use to help with the conclusion of the Samuel/Thorassie litigation. (GKD, 21-147E, p.40)
- Ghotelnene K’odtineh Denesūḷiné recommend that the Plan should describe the nature and extent of the Ghotelnene K’odtineh Denesūḷiné rights and interests and that when the Samuel/Thorassie litigation is resolved, the Plan should incorporate

	<p>the description of the Ghotelnene K'odtineh Denesuᑭiné rights and interests set out in the Final Agreement. (GKD, 21-147E, p. 42)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition, GKD recommended that regulatory authorities should not be encouraged but required to consider the Ghotelnene K'odtineh Denesuᑭiné area as a Valued Socioeconomic Component when reviewing proposed projects. (GKD, 21-147E, p. 42)</li> <li>• The Government of Canada also support the recommendation from the Ghotelnene K'odtineh Denesuᑭiné that the 2019 Order-in-Council overlap areas be designated as Mixed Use. (GOC, 21-147E, p. 82)</li> </ul>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.3.6 Transportation and Communications Corridors

<p>Linear infrastructures are permitted uses in mixed use and conditional areas; however, they are prohibited in most terrestrial based limited use areas.</p> <p>The Kivalliq-Manitoba LIC and the Mary River Milne inlet LIC are included as limited use designation area which generally prohibit uses incompatible with the development of the linear infrastructures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community participants generally support that the land withdrawal by the federal Order-in-Council be excluded from the Limited Use designation for the Kivalliq-Manitoba infrastructure corridor, and that the Commission must ensure that the Plan addresses important caribou-related interests with portions of the corridor that include areas of a sensitive caribou habitat.</li> </ul> <p><i>“The community voice is there should be no disturbance in the calving and the post-calving grounds. Why is the NPC making exceptions for this project? Having a line up to the cross and not only a critical migration route but into the heart of the calving and post-calving grounds would have more major impact on the caribou. This will impact the caribou herds that continue to come down and feed our communities. You must remove and have a special destination to let project adjust in areas that are off limits. The Inuit can still get their internet and power by letting an expert find the solution so that they are not blocking or impacting our caribou.” (Chief Tsannie, Hatchett Lake, 21-147E, p.47)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BQCMB does not support the Commissions’ designation for the Kivalliq-Manitoba corridor in caribou key habitats, and recommended that an alternative route be considered, and affected communities be consulted through a plan amendment process.</li> </ul> <p><i>“This proposed corridor gives development a higher priority than protection for caribou in these key habitats in the calving and post-calving grounds. The Caribou Board recommends that KIA be required to apply for an amendment and that the NPC should evaluate alternate routes and cumulative impacts and conduct a public review for this project proposal. A better Plan is essential for the future of the Qamanirjuaq herd.” (BQCMB, 21-147E, p. 67)</i></p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.3.7 Existing Mineral Rights

The Draft Plan identifies projects with existing mineral rights in Limited Use Areas in Appendix A. The listed projects are exempted from the prohibition in the Draft Plan on mineral exploration and development, but other plan requirements of the Draft Plan would continue to apply.

- *Some participants recommended that no projects should be added to the list of exemptions in Appendix A and that the Nunavut Planning Commission minimizes as much as projects that are exempted from the designation.*  
*“We don’t support allowing projects with existing mineral rights to proceed through all stages of mineral development.” (BQCMB, 21-147E, p. 67)*
- The Government of Canada commented that the Commission rezone all areas where existing mineral tenure overlaps with a Limited Use designation to Mixed Use. However, should the commission be committed to keep the 21 DNLUP approach with appendix A existing minerals list, the GOC recommends that the NPC rezone Limited Use areas where they overlap with Nunavut’s operating mines to Mixed Use areas with no applicable prohibitions, seasonal restrictions, and setbacks. In addition, the GOC recommended that all existing mineral rights overlapping with LU areas be added to appendix A list and the wording be revised to include associated ancillary uses. (GOC, 21-147E, p.82)

**3.3.8 Other Issues**

**Food security**

- Several participants including the impacted communities expressed that the future of Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou are that they remain key food security and continue to be fundamental to culture, spirituality, and identity, and that everyone shares in the responsibility for taking care of these caribou.

**Inuit Owned Lands**

- Government of Canada expressed that the Plan’s restrictions on land use in key caribou habitats should not unduly limit economic opportunities and must be done in a manner that respects both the rights associated with Inuit Owned Land, and the Section 35 rights of the Ghotelnene K’odtineh Denesųliné and Athabasca Denesųliné.

### 3.4 North Baffin Public Hearings (Pond Inlet, NU, October 24-27, 2022)

The following table summarizes participants' input through presentations and discussion at the – North Baffin Regional Public Hearings held in Pond Inlet from October 24-27, 2022.



Figure 8: Community Roundtable during the North Baffin Public Hearing in Pond Inlet

Topic	What We Heard
<h4>3.4.1 Key Migratory Birds</h4>	
<p>Class 1 sites are identified in the Draft Plan as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions on some industrial activities, and table 1 setbacks requirements on others.</p> <p>Class 2 sites are designated Conditional Use Areas where there are no proposed year-round prohibitions, but there are table</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Qikiqtani Inuit Association ( QIA) expressed concerns regarding, the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan limited use designation for Class 1 Migratory bird habitats.</li> </ul> <p><i>“Qikiqtani Inuit Association and Environment and Climate Change Canada must negotiate Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements for all new migratory bird sanctuaries. As currently written, the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan designates that Class 1 key migratory bird habitats will receive similar protections to migratory bird sanctuaries,</i></p>

1 setbacks that would apply to some project proposals in these areas.

Class 3 of migratory bird habitat sites are identified as Valued Components (VCs), with no prohibitions or restrictions.

*without a clear need or directive for Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement negotiation. Class 1 key migratory bird habitat designations will directly interfere with Qikiqtani Inuit Association's decision-making authority in portions of 37 Inuit Owned Lands and a total area of 4,726.32 km<sup>2</sup>. "(QIA, 158E, p. 154)*

- Additionally, QIA explained that its' proposed changes to the Plan Requirements for Class 1 Migratory Bird Habitat Sites will ensure that community interests in protecting key migratory bird sites are respected while allowing the DIOs, including QIA, to maintain an appropriate level of management over IOLs (QIA, 21-158E, p. 154).

### **3.4.2 Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings**

Designated Limited Use areas with prohibitions of some incompatible uses. In addition, in Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, there are also some seasonal restrictions on other activities.

- Overall, participants generally support retaining the current Limited Use designations for calving habitat.
- Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated (NTI) noted that it has heard the concerns that community members of Nunavut have expressed regarding the importance of calving grounds, and how caribou populations have decreased and noted that the caribou and caribou birthing areas, crossing areas are not listed on the plans (NTI, 21-158E, p. 145).
- QIA expressed concerns about NPC approach to conservation of caribou habitats and recommended that more should be done throughout the Qikiqtaaluk region (QIA, 21-158E, p. 151-152).
- Community representatives from Arctic Bay identified the Navy Board Inlet area and expressed concerns about too many helicopters in that area and tourism activities (Arctic Bay, 21-158E, p. 166).
- The Government of Nunavut presented that Conditional Use designation with seasonal restrictions for caribou calving and post-calving grounds, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings can better achieve the balance between conservation and economic development. (GN, 21-158E, p. 219). \*Please note that the GN's policy position on some caribou areas designations has changed post-hearings and their most recent position as presented in their written submission dated February 10, 2023 (21-192E) has been considered in the revision of the draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government of Canada acknowledged that Caribou population numbers have declined over time, which generates concern amongst all the participants (GOC, 21-158E, p.175)</li> </ul>
<h3>3.4.3 Caribou Sea Ice Crossing</h3>	
<p>Designated Conditional Use areas within which, except as required for safe navigation, community resupply or emergency response, icebreaking activities are restricted during certain season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>QIA Expressed that some sea ice crossings that caribou use to cross during the winter were not listed in the 2021 Draft Plan (QIA, 21-158E, p. 152)</li> </ul>
<h3>3.4.4 Polar Bear Denning areas</h3>	
<p>Designated Conditional Use areas with seasonal requirements on certain uses. There are no prohibited uses. Requirements are that in identified polar bear denning areas during denning season (September 15<sup>th</sup> to April 15<sup>th</sup>), before conducting any activities involving earth or snow moving, like drilling, blasting, or using heavy equipment, proponents must first 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants generally supports the proposed Polar Bear Denning areas designation.</li> <li>Grise Fiord representatives noted their concerns and need of protection for Polar Bear Denning areas (Grise Fiord, 21-158E, p. 65)</li> </ul>
<h3>3.4.5 Walrus terrestrial Haul outs</h3>	
<p>Designated Limited use area with year-round prohibitions on some industrial</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants are supportive of the Limited Use designation for active terrestrial walrus haul-outs.</li> </ul>

activities, as well marine and aerial setbacks. No terrestrial walrus haul out has been identified in the 2021 DNLUP in the Kitikmeot region.

- NTI noted: *“For specific designations in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan, Nunavut Tunngavik supports the Commission’s approach to protecting polar bear denning areas and walrus haul-out sites.”* (21-158E, p. 124)
- The Government of Canada supports the exceptions provided in draft plan for community resupply, emergency activities and safe navigation but noted that the required setbacks around walrus haul-outs should not prevent the delivery of vital services for communities and recommended to clarity of the wording “safe navigation.” (21-158E, p. 177)
- WWF -Canada recommended the addition of abandoned haul-outs as Valued Ecosystem Components with notice to proponents to voluntarily avoid these areas. (21-182E, p.122)

**3.4.6 Whale Calving Areas**

Some selected areas on Southampton Island and Clearwater Fjord Designated Limited use areas, and all other areas Valued component.

- Community members from Resolute Bay expressed that some inlets they go hunting do not have whales in them anymore because of the cruise ships (Resolute Bay, 21-158E, pg. 82)
- Some HTOs also expressed that Beluga whales are being disturbed due to too much shipping traffic and that something should be done to control these vessels (21-158E, p. 74).
- A community member from Pond Inlet expressed that they see killer whales up here every summer and that narwhals are very terrified of killer whales and further suggested that Inuit Traditional Knowledge should be used to make rules for this area before the lands are polluted or destroyed (Pond Inlet, 21-158E, p. 98).

**3.4.7 Marine areas of Interests**

Designated valued Components

- Several community representatives expressed concerns about increased cruise ships and tourism activities and their potential impacts to marine areas of interests.

**3.4.8 Transboundary Considerations**

Designated Conditional Use (North Water or Savarjuaq Polynya), and Valued Component (Great Bear Lake watershed)

- A community representative from Grise Fiord expressed that they are working with an organization in Greenland including the Government of Greenland around the polynya area around the Høvik area.

<b>3.4.9 Climate change</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A community representative questioned whether climate change is responsible for why salt water has lost its saltiness and become less dense? (21-158E, p. 120)</li> <li>• A community representative expressed concerns about how land is changing and how climate change has caused havoc and causing geese to come in too earlier or late due to weather change (21-158E, p. 51)</li> <li>• A Grise Fiord participant noted concerns regarding the impacts of climate change on sea-ice travels routes, and on marine mammals' health. (21-158E, p 66-67)</li> </ul>
<b>3.4.10 Future Parks</b>	
Designated Limited Use areas with prohibition of incompatibles industrial uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QIA expressed concerns with the potential influence the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan would have on future Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements negotiations related to areas where land use designations and Plan requirements apply to future parks as shaded in red, such as Aggutinni Proposed Territorial Park and Katannilik Territorial Park, along with conservation areas for the national historic sites (QIA, 21-158E, p.154).</li> </ul>
<b>3.4.11 Conservation Areas</b>	
Designated Limited Use areas with prohibition of incompatibles industrial uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QIA is concerned that the NPC's proposal to designate all applicable Conservation Areas (e.g. National Wildlife Areas, Migratory Bird Sanctuaries, National Historic Sites, and Canadian Heritage Rivers) as Limited Use areas may interfere with the terms of existing IIBAs (e.g. Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement for National Wildlife Areas and Migratory Bird Sanctuaries in the Nunavut Settlement Area, Canadian Heritage Rivers Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement) as well as other current and future IIBA negotiations (e.g. with Parks Canada regarding a National Historic Sites IIBA). (QIA, 21-158E, p. 154-155)</li> <li>• QIA expressed concerns about Limited Use designations in the case of National Historic Site and Canadian Heritage River designations due to their overlap with IOLs in the Qikiqtani region, which has the potential to interfere with Inuit rights and land uses.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4.12 Proposed National Marine Conservation Areas</b>	

<p>Designated Limited Use areas with prohibition of incompatibles industrial uses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants are general supportive of the limited use designation on the Tallurutiup Imanga National Marine conservation area.</li> <li>• QIA noted their concerns about vessel traffic and icebreaking in some areas and committed to work with the communities to identify and submit the specific areas of concern to the commission for protection. (QIA, 21-158E, p. 155, and 281)</li> <li>• The Government of Canada requested the Commission to add some overlapping Key Migratory Birds Habitats sites along with applicable setbacks to the Tallurutiup Imanga NMCA Limited Use designation. (QIA, 21-158E, p.179)</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4.13 On ice community travel routes</b></p>	
<p>Designated Conditional Use areas within which, except as required for safe navigation, community resupply or emergency response, proponent are required to consult nearby communities before conducting any icebreaking activities during certain seasons</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants supported the Conditional Use designation for on-ice travel routes.</li> <li>• Baffinland advised that in some cases, ice bridging plan may not be feasible and recommended that the draft be revised to require the proponent to work with the local communities to the develop a safe travel plan on a case-by-case basis. (21-158E, p. 236)</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4.14 Community Areas of Interest</b></p>	
<p>Community Areas of interest have been assigned various designations including Limited Use designation for Hiukitak River, and for the terrestrial part of Boothia Peninsula</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QIA does not support the NPC’s proposal to designate Community Areas of Interest in Sanirajak, Foxe Basin, Nettilling Lake as Limited Use areas where they overlap IOLs, as this would impair the right of QIA to manage these IOLs, per the Nunavut Agreement.</li> <li>• QIA noted that its spatial analysis revealed that there are a total of 18 overlaps between Community Areas of Interest (excluding On-Ice Travel Routes) and IOLs within the Qikiqtaaluk Region for a total area of 3,517 km<sup>2</sup>. Of these overlaps, 17 apply to IOLs with surface rights and 1 applies to an IOL with subsurface rights.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4.15 Community Drinking Water Supplies</b></p>	
<p>Assigned Limited Use designations outside of municipal boundaries (except for Kugluktuk and Baker Lake), and Valued Component within municipal boundaries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grise Fjord delegation expressed concerns about the potential effect of glacial melt on their drinking water (21-158E, p.258).</li> <li>• Government of Nunavut recommends that secondary drinking water sources beyond municipal boundaries be designated Valued Components (GN, 21-158E, p. 222)</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4.16 Contaminated Sites</b></p>	

<p>Priority contaminated sites are designated Limited Use areas with prohibition on some incompatible uses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community representatives expressed concerns about legacy contamination problems in the high arctic due to oil and gas exploration activities, as well as from the Nanisivik mine near the community of Arctic Bay. (21-158E, p. 79 and 84)</li> </ul>
<h3>3.4.17 Transportation and Communications Corridors</h3>	
<p>Linear infrastructures are permitted uses in Mixed Use and Conditional Use areas; however, they are prohibited in most terrestrial based limited use areas. The Kivalliq-Manitoba LIC and the Mary River Milne inlet LIC are included as limited use designation area which prohibit uses incompatible with the development of the linear infrastructures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Government of Nunavut recommended that the draft plan include a designation that supports development of the Grays Bay Port and Road corridor. (GN, 21-158E, p.222)</li> <li>Baffinland requested that the Mary River Transportation Corridor be redefined, and designated value component to avoid “unnecessary plan amendments” in the future. (Baffinland, 21-158, p.236)</li> <li></li> </ul>
<h3>3.4.18 Commercial Fisheries</h3>	
<p>The Cumberland Sound Turbot Management Area is designated Limited Use area, and char and turbot areas of abundance are designated Valued Component</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Clyde River resident mentioned the community’s desire to create a commercial fishing in Aulitvik area. (21-158E, p.118).</li> </ul>
<h3>3.4.19 Existing Mineral Rights</h3>	
<p>The Draft Plan identifies projects with existing mineral rights in Limited Use Areas in Appendix A. The listed projects are exempted from the prohibition in the Draft Plan on mineral exploration and development, but other plan requirements of the Draft Plan would continue to apply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although participants support the idea of providing certainty to existing projects, some participants voiced concerns regarding the 2021 DNLUP existing rights approach.</li> <li>The Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, and Industry supported that all existing mineral rights should be protected, and that the issue of “stranded assets” addressed so that all existing rights projects can be developed without a Plan amendment to access them. (21-158E, p. 177, 222, and 287)</li> <li>Friends of Land Use Planning asked that the federal government present its position regarding linear infrastructure or rights to put in linear infrastructure into projects that may have been acquired, or areas where mineral rights have been acquired before this Plan is signed off on (Friends of Land use Planning, 21-158, p. 195)</li> <li>Friends of Land Use Planning questioned the Government of Nunavut on what their research indicates in terms of the impacts of roads and linear infrastructure on caribou and caribou herds, and if</li> </ul>

	<p>this was taken into account when their position to not only allow grandfathering but linear infrastructure associated with grandfathering, like railroads or roads, be also included. (Friends of Land use Planning, 21-158, p.250)</p>
<p><b>3.4.20 Other Issues</b></p>	
<p><b>Food security</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some participants raised concerns regarding food security and food sovereignty for Nunavummiut.</li> <li>• NTI indicated that they would be working with Inuit organizations in the Nunavut regions so Inuit can have food security in the best possible manner.  <i>" We will be working with the Regional Organizations to be able to provide plans for food security" (NTI, 21-158E, p. 146)</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Inuit Owned Lands</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NTI recommends that the Nunavut Land Use Plan be revised to provide for an approach that support NTI and the RIAs' decision-making for Inuit Owned Lands. (NTI, 21-158E, p.128)</li> <li>• The Qikiqtani Inuit Association stated that the draft plan's designations will significantly hinder their decision-making authority.  <i>"Qikiqtani Inuit Association recommends that the Nunavut Planning Commission develop a unique approach to land use planning on Inuit Owned Lands that adequately respects and protects QIA's right to manage and determine acceptable uses of Inuit Owned Lands. As written, Qikiqtani Inuit Association does not agree with the application of land use designations that may interfere with the terms of existing Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements or unduly influence the negotiation of future Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements."</i> (QIA, 21-158E, p. 153)</li> <li>• The Government of Canada urges the Commission to pay a special attention to the NTI and RIAs request to apply a distinct approach to Inuit Owned Lands. (GOC, 21-158E, p. 176).</li> </ul>
<p><b>IIBAs</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Qikiqtani Inuit Association expressed concerns with the potential influence the land use designations on future parks, conservation areas for the national historic sites, and Class 1 Migratory Birds habitats sites could have on future Inuit Impact Benefits Agreements negotiations. Moreover, QIA is also concerned about the impacts of the proposed land use designations on existing IIBAS in migratory bird sanctuaries, national wildlife areas, and Canadian heritage rivers. (QIA, 21-158E, p. 53-54)</li> </ul>

### 3.5 South Baffin Public Hearings (Iqaluit, NU, November 14-19, 2022)

The following table summarizes participants' input through presentations and discussion at the – South Baffin regional Public Hearings held in Iqaluit from November 14-19, 2022.



Figure 9: Community Participants during the South Baffin Public Hearing in Iqaluit

Topic	What We Heard
<b>3.5.1 Key Migratory Birds</b>	
<p>Class 1 sites are identified in the Draft Plan as Limited Use Areas with year-round prohibitions on some industrial activities, and table 1 setbacks requirements on others.</p> <p>Class 2 sites are designated Conditional Use Areas where there are no proposed year-round prohibitions, but there are table 1 setbacks that would apply to some project proposals in these areas.</p> <p>Class 3 of migratory bird habitat sites are identified as Valued Components (VCs), with no prohibitions or restrictions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participants generally supports the 2021 DNLUP designations on the three classes of migratory birds' habitats sites. However, there were a couple of varying opinions on the proposed marine setbacks.</li> <li>● Representatives of Kimmirut noted that they do not want disturbance from activities on areas important for their communities for their children to enjoy abundance of wildlife. <i>"Our future needs this abundance we have. The hunting and harvesting areas we have should be protected. The bird sanctuaries where they do their egging in spring should be protected, not only the birds but as mentioned earlier, they are all important."</i> (Mikidjuk K., Kimmirut, 21-160E, p.71)</li> <li>● A representative of Kinngait noted that they rely on the Nunavut Land Plan process to protect the wildlife including the birds' habitats: <i>"All the wildlife and the birds that fly go through here. As a community that came out based on wildlife that animals could enjoy the area. We know we won't go back to the old ways. We are relying on you to represent us."</i> (Kumaarjuk P., Kinngait, 21-160E, p.77)</li> <li>● NTI noted their support to the birds' habitats designations.</li> </ul>

	<p><i>“You also have made very good plans on migratory birds, waterfowl coming in annually to Nunavut. Many of these areas are on Inuit Owned Lands.” (NTI, 21-21-160E, p. 177)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ivujivik (Qc) participants recommended that ships travel the farthest from their islands where there are colonies of birds nesting during the months of July up to August 31st. (Ivujivik, 21-160E, p. 237)</li> <li>• QWB representatives noted that according to Inuit, the proposed marine setbacks in the current Draft Plan for ships near birds’ colonies are far too close. In their written submission, QWB has proposed much larger setbacks for consideration by the Commission and requested that the Government of Canada provide their feedback as to whether they agree with these proposed larger setbacks. (QWB, 21-160E, p. 248)</li> </ul>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3.5.2 Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, and Fresh water crossings**

<p>Designated Limited Use areas with prohibitions of some incompatible uses. In addition, in Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, there are also some seasonal restrictions on other activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, participants generally expressed concerns regarding caribou calving grounds, key migration route and water crossings and supports the need of protection of those sensitive areas.</li> <li>• Community participants generally supports habitats base protections through the land use plan prohibitions of incompatible industrial uses such mineral exploration and development in Caribou Calving areas, Post Calving areas, Key access Corridors, Fresh water crossings, and Peary caribou habitats.  <i>A community participant stated: “Like other communities, we have caribou, mammals, walrus, whales. These are all essential food sources for Inuit people, and we want protection all around for each species that I have mentioned. Their habitat should be protected and are of paramount importance to us.  Too much disturbance is starting to happen to walrus haul-outs and caribou habitat. “(Mikidjuk K., Kimmirut, 21-160E, p. 71)</i>   <i>Another participant noted: “I just want to say and approve. Your Plan is completely approved to me. There are many areas that you have included, such as wildlife in all the sites of Baffin. We want to see this process coming to a conclusion. Caribou areas, when I was with the government, there were three ideas, and one of them is this that is now happening. (Johnny M., Pangnirtung, 21-160E, p.93)</i> </li> <li>• QIA noted the importance of protecting caribou habitat in the region. <i>“Their habitation and protection of caribou is very important. It is unlike mainland Nunavut. Baffin Island caribou, we find this inland. Their migration route is very short, unlike other regions. They travel</i></li> </ul>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*a short distance to calve and to other areas as well.” (QIA, 21-160E, p. 114)*

- QWB expressed support to the Limited Use designations on caribou habitats. *“Overall, we support the 2021 Draft Plan that limits development in important caribou habitats. For example, through Limited Use designation and prohibitions in areas such as mineral development. However, we do not believe that enough habitat has been proposed for protection.” (QWB, 21-160E, p. 114)*

- Many community representatives and other organisations such as QWB, and QIA noted that the 21 Draft Nunavut Land Plan is missing protection for some key caribou habitats in the region and committed to submit additional caribou areas in their written submission by January 10th, 2023 (21-160E, p. 72, 73, 74, 113, and 114).

*“Caribou: We feel there is not enough caribou habitat proposed for protection.” (QWB, 21-160E, p. 113)*

- In addition, QIA noted that one of their priorities within the scope of the Nunavut Land Use Plan was to make sure that enough caribou habitat is protected so that caribou can increase their numbers again.

*“The Qikiqtani Inuit Association and Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board have a shared interest in caribou and working together to ensure strong protection measures are included in the final Plan.” (QIA, 21-160E, p. 114)*

*“Our perspective is that all movement corridors should be considered together. Whenever caribou are crossing land or freshwater or ice, they are all corridors that support movement patterns of caribou. Movement of the corridors of the land are generally identified as Valued Ecosystem Components in the Qikiqtaaluk region. We recommend that at least some of the major corridors are protected as valued Limited Use with appropriate buffers on the other side.” (QIA, 21-160E, p 115)*

- NTI highlighted the need of protection for caribou habitats: *“Caribou habitats, ...we realize that they are important, and they are of concern in each region. There is concern of what might be happening to these species, especially in Baffin Island.... Despite that, we still expect that the caribou management will be a priority, and a solution should be found for further protection of these species in the future.” (NTI, 21-160E, p.177)*

- NTI representative added: *“We see as we start to conclude, the caribou are a major concern in the Baffin region. I, too, am concerned coming from Nunavut Tunngavik. The animals and their routes,*

*calving grounds, the post-calving grounds, the caribou are of concern. The habitat, the crossings, the post-calving, calving grounds have to be, or are they properly protected on Baffin Island.” (NTI, 21-160E, p.191)*

- The Government of Canada noted: *“We want to be clear: the Government of Canada supports protection of caribou. Nunavut includes important habitat for caribou and wildlife, which are critical to the wellbeing of people and the environment.” (NTI, 21-160E, p.208)*
- However, the GOC recommended exempting from prohibitions all existing mineral tenures and ancillary uses overlapping with caribou habitats Limited Use designations.
- While noting the lack of long-term telemetry data on Baffin Island, which limits its ability to accurately delineate caribou calving grounds in the region, the Government of Nunavut clarified that its confident delineated boundaries, when available, are generally accurate and is working closely with Hunters and Trappers Organizations, communities, and co-management partners to collect more scientific data and Inuit Qaujimaqatugangit. (GN, 21-160E, p. 257)
- The Government of Nunavut highlighted that Caribou are important to Nunavummiut because they are culturally significant, contribute to the economy, and provide a good local source of food. They have also noted that many herds are in decline, and their general support to the protection of caribou habitats. (GN, 21-160E, p. 257)  
*“The Government of Nunavut generally supports the protection of critical caribou habitat through land use designations and has faith in the robust regulatory system in Nunavut to help address impacts.” (GN, 21-160E, p. 257)*
- However, the Government of Nunavut does not consider large Limited Use Areas to be desirable in this first-generation Plan and recommended Conditional Use designation with seasonal restrictions for caribou calving, post calving, key access corridors and freshwater crossings areas to better achieve the balance between conservation and economic development. (GN, 21-60E, p. 257). \*Please note that the GN’s policy position on some caribou areas designations has changed post-hearings and their most recent position as presented in their written submission dated February 10, 2023 (21-192E) has been considered in the revision of the draft Nunavut Land Use Plan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baffinland presented that project-specific mitigation plans and monitoring programs can achieve good results in protecting Caribou habitats (Baffinland, 21-160E, p. 322)</li> <li>• De Beers recommended Valued Component designation for caribou sensitive habitats, and clarified the reasons of their preference of this approach over the Conditional Use designation recommended by the Government of Nunavut:  <i>“Conditional Use as I understand it would require potentially seasonal shutdowns of a mine that would be located within a Conditional Use Area. Those shutdowns can be very problematic for an operating mine, and potentially, depending on what exactly is required, they could be prohibitive for implementing a full mine and operating a mine. So, we would have concern about the categorization of the area as Conditional Use.” (De Beers, 21-160E, p. 345)</i> </li> <li>• WWF-Canada recommended 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, and argued that there is not convincing evidence that mobile measures could be effectively used as a land use planning tool to manage caribou habitat (WWF, 21-160E, p. 332)</li> <li>• WWF-Canada also commented that caribou calving grounds cannot be managed at the impact review board level, and explained that the Land Use Plan, is the first level to give a clear direction on how to handle caribou calving grounds. (WWF, 21-160E, p. 182).  <i>“Land use designations and the associated assessment of projects 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, so it is really important to take a larger scale look at caribou herds through a Land Use Plan to avoid those cumulative impacts from multiple disturbances across a range.” (WWF-Canada, 21-160E, p. 333)</i> </li> </ul>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.5.3 Caribou Sea Ice Crossing

<p>Designated Conditional Use areas within which, except as required for safe navigation, community resupply or emergency response, icebreaking activities are restricted during certain season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants support Conditional Use designation for caribou sea ice crossing, including seasonal restrictions on ice breaking.</li> <li>• QWB noted there some important caribou sea-ice crossings in the Qikiqtaaluk region that are missing from the 2021 Draft Plan and noted that an upcoming Qikiqtani Inuit Association and Qikiqtaaluk</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Wildlife Board's joint submission will include maps of additional areas that should be protected (21-160E, QWB, p 115).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government of Canada raised concerns regarding restrictions of icebreaking in Caribou Sea Ice Crossings and noted:  <i>"The Government of Canada is recommending for caribou crossings would be similar to the collaborative process for on-ice travel routes in the Draft Plan, which is itself similar to the model currently in place in the Kitikmeot region under the Proactive Vessel Management Initiative"</i> (GOC, 21-160E, p.209).</li> <li>• While they do not have scientific data on Caribou water crossings between Baffin Island and mainland, the GN, noted their support for protecting the areas identified by the communities:  <i>"We are not disputing what we are hearing from communities, especially in Igloodik and in those areas, people that hunt in Melville Peninsula or on the North Baffin that caribou are moving in that specific water crossing. From a purely wildlife management perspective, we would have no objection to NPC identifying that as a water crossing and protecting it as a water crossing, because the Traditional Knowledge is saying that is where the caribou are crossing."</i>(GN, 21-160E, p. 309)</li> <li>• WWF-Canada expressed their support of the Conditional use designation of Caribou Sea Ice Crossings including seasonal restrictions on icebreaking. (WWF-Canada, 21-160E, p. 334)</li> </ul>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.5.4 Polar Bear Denning areas

<p>Designated Conditional Use areas with seasonal requirements on certain uses. There are no prohibited uses. Requirements are that in identified polar bear denning areas during denning season (September 15th to April 15<sup>th</sup>), before conducting any activities involving earth or snow moving, like drilling, blasting, or using heavy equipment, proponents must first 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No participant has expressed concerns regarding the proposed Polar Denning areas designation and plan requirement at the hearing.</li> <li>• Some participants noted their support for the proposed land use policies for polar bear denning areas. (NTI, 21-160E, p. 177, GN, 21-160E, p.)</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 3.5.5 Walrus terrestrial Hall outs

Designated Limited Use area with year-round prohibitions on some industrial activities, as well as marine and aerial setbacks. No terrestrial walrus haul out has been identified in the 2021 DNLUP in the Kitikmeot region.

- Most participants supported the Limited Use designation for active terrestrial walrus haul-outs, as well as the setbacks.  
*“As I mentioned, our Cumberland Sound is teeming with mammals, whales, walruses, polar bears, and their calving areas. As even mentioned in these recommendations, we will accept what is written. We spoke of cruise ships coming in with their cameras and nothing else. They are the ones that we are really concerned with for interruptions. For tourism, nothing is really regulated, and sometimes this causes problems for the HTO in Pangnirtung.” (Johnny M., Pangnirtung, 21-160E, P. 96)*
- Some northern Quebec representatives expressed concerns regarding the impacts of some industrial developments:  
*“This is what you are going to face, as we have experienced it in our area, especially Inukjuak and great whale rivers nearby are really bad now [...] Where we used to hunt, the beluga and walruses have gone. If you allow that, you are going to see huge changes. We are speaking from experience, what we have seen affecting our area. Even the caribou migration will change.” (Aisa S., Puvimittuq, 21-160E, p. 109)*  
  
*“As the Ivujivik HTO, we were quite upset with this research going on without our knowledge. The planting of these tripods was troublesome to the walrus herd. We do not want any more of this activity near the walrus haul-outs...” (Paulusi T., Tujjaat, 21-160E, p. 158)*
- The Government of Canada expressed concerns regarding setbacks around walrus haul-outs, and noted that they should not prevent the delivery of services to communities. The government of Canada supports the exceptions in the provided in draft plan for community resupply, emergency activities and safe navigation and recommended to clarity of the wording “safe navigation.” (GOC, 21-160E, p. 208)
- A community representative expressed concerns regarding shipping near Nottingham and Salisbury Islands and recommended a marine setback of 5-10 miles from walrus haul outs. (Akulivik, 21-160E, p.235)
- WWF-Canada supports the 2021 draft plan designations, for active haul-outs, and recommended the addition of abandoned haul-outs as Valued Ecosystem Components with notice to proponents to voluntarily avoid these areas. (WWF-Canada, 21-160E, p. 334)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NTI noted their support to the 2021 DNLUP Walrus haul outs designation (NTI, 21-160E, p. 177)</li> </ul>
<h3>3.5.6 Whale Calving Areas</h3>	
<p>Some selected areas on Southampton Island and Clearwater Fjord Designated Limited use areas, and all other areas Valued component.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community participants generally requested protections of Whale habitats.  <i>“Like other communities, we have caribou, mammals, walrus, whales. These are all essential food sources for Inuit people, and we want protection all around for each species that I have mentioned. Their habitat should be protected and are of paramount importance to us. ... Migrating whales in spring and summer are important to us. We have very few animals that stay here year-round and at our floe edge.” (Mikidjuk, K., Kimmirut, 21-160E, p. 71).</i></li> <li>• <i>“Cruise ships are the problem. It should be regulated that the captain of the ship should be aware and told what the regulations are. We would like to see this as a regulated industry, something that can make work, a regulation with teeth.  The same thing with wildlife in our Cumberland Sound area: It was good, but now it is starting to have less and less whales. There was discussion on beluga whale. We totally agree what was mentioned yesterday, narwhal. Near Pangnirtung, Nunataq is what the place is called, there are areas where beluga whales gather in the spring. That area should be well protected.[...] It is a calving area.  There should be a protection area for that calving area and be understood by regulators what we are asking what we discuss.[...] They are not aware that it is a calving area. Here in the Plan, it is precise and clear. Pangnirtung populations depends much on beluga whales and other mammals.” (Johnny M., Pangnirtung, 21-160E, p. 95)</i></li> </ul>
<h3>3.5.7 Climate change</h3>	
	<p>Participants noted concerns regarding climate change and its impacts on wildlife core habitat and migration routes.</p>
<h3>3.5.8 On ice community travel routes</h3>	
<p>Designated Conditional Use areas within which, except as required for safe navigation, community resupply or emergency response, proponent are required to consult nearby communities before conducting any icebreaking activities during certain seasons</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants generally supported the Conditional Use designation for On-ice travel routes.</li> <li>• Baffinland noted that ice bridging requirements over on-ice travel routes may not be feasible in certain cases and recommended a more case by case approach developed by each proponent with the communities. (Baffinland, 21-160E, p 315, and p. 325)</li> </ul>

<b>3.5.9 Community Areas of Interest</b>	
Community Areas of interest have been assigned various designations including Limited Use designation for Hiukitak River, Nettling Lake, and for the terrestrial part of Boothia Peninsula	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community representatives confirmed their support to Limited Use designation in the 22021 DNLUP to protect their identified community areas of interests, including Nettling Lake and the Sanirajak areas (21-160E, p. 88, p. 94 p.100, p. 114). <i>“This area is also a valuable source of land to Cape Dorset. We both agreed at the time that we should say it is a valuable piece of land that is between Pang and Cape Dorset. Netsilik is a special area, and we want it preserved.” (Johnny M. Pangnirtung, 21-160E, p. 94)</i></li> </ul>
<b>3.5.10 Area Shared with Non-Nunavut Communities</b>	
Designated Mixed Use areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Salluit community representative noted the importance of the share used islands and would like to be fully included and their management regime. <i>“It is a good place for caribou feeding as a habitat. It is where we used to hunt caribou in the past. In our immediate vicinity, we don’t have too many islands, perhaps five. These two islands are our hunting, harvesting areas for polar bear, seal, fish, whale. They are all plentiful. They are on these islands. This is why we harvest and travel there. We want it to be recognized that we use these islands and would like to continue to do so. We would like to be full party in the joint management of these lands.” (Adamie S, 21-160E, p .160)</i></li> <li>Makivik noted their support to the land use planning process, and recommended a balance solution that protects the wildlife, with an option of possible plan amended in the future. <i>“We know these islands will be well protected by a conservation-minded organization. We don’t want too many conditions. We still go with Mixed Use conditions. We just don’t want this category to be ongoing. We know that the islands provide and sustain harvesting. For instance, cellphones and other technologies as they are used by the world and prospecting, we are pretty much against that because we need to have wildlife protection. If we can have an amended formula in the future, we don’t pretty much mind the category it is put in.” (Makivik, 21-160E, p. 166)</i></li> </ul>
<b>3.5.11 Community Drinking Water Supplies</b>	
Assigned Limited Use designations outside of municipal boundaries (except for Kugluktuk and Baker Lake), and Valued Component within municipal boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants generally supported the 2021 DNLUP various designations for community drinking water supplies, however the Government of Nunavut noted regarding secondary water sources:</li> </ul>

	<p><i>“Recently, several communities have had to draw water from their secondary sources. The Government of Nunavut has identified two secondary water sources outside municipal boundaries and has supplied them to the Commission. 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 that secondary drinking water sources beyond municipal boundaries be designated Valued Components.” (GN, 21-160E, p. 260-261)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Iqaluit representatives requested that their secondary community drinking water be designated Limited Use areas with pruritions of number of industrial activities: <i>“We would be requesting Limited Use for that area as defined for a community watershed area with the restrictions proposed by ID 90.” (City of Iqaluit, 21-160E, p. 61)</i></li> </ul>
<h3>3.5.12 Contaminated Sites</h3>	
<p>Priority contaminated sites are designated Limited Use areas with prohibition on some incompatible uses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A participant noted the need to clean up contaminated sites across the territory. (City of Iqaluit, 21-160E, p. 60)</li> </ul>
<h3>3.5.13 Transportation and Communications Corridors</h3>	
<p>Linear infrastructures are permitted uses in mixed use and conditional areas; however, they are prohibited in most terrestrial based limited use areas. The Kivalliq-Manitoba LIC and the Mary River Milne inlet LIC are included as limited use designation area which prohibit uses incompatible with the development of the linear infrastructures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government of Nunavut reiterated their support to the Grays Bay Port and Road corridor and recommended its inclusion in the Land Use Plan with the same treatment as the Kivalliq-Manitoba transportation corridor. (GN, 21-160E, p 260)</li> </ul>
<p>Marine shipping - the draft plan does not include a specific designation for shipping corridors, however designations for some values include restrictions on shipping such as setbacks requirements, or seasonal restrictions on ice breaking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants generally support restrictions on marine shipping near specifics values.</li> <li>• Community participants expressed great concerns regarding shipping and tourism vessels passing near specific values and recommended the inclusion of greater marine setbacks.</li> <li>• Some participants noted concerns regarding ice-breaking restrictions.</li> <li>• The Government of Canada recommended that Plan requirements which restrict icebreaking include an exception for individual vessel movements when a vessel is transiting through but not stopping in the Nunavut Settlement Area. (GOC, 21-160E, p. 209)</li> </ul>

<b>3.5.14 Commercial Fisheries</b>	
The Cumberland Sound Turbot Management Area is designated Limited Use area, and char and turbot areas of abundance are designated Valued Component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants generally support the designations that support commercial fishery:  <i>“For those who buy the cod in Cumberland Sound, whenever they are shipped to America or elsewhere, they appreciate its delicacy. Because of that, this fishery is real to us. It is important we should protect the fishing industry.” (Johnny M. Pangnirtung, 21-160E, p. 96)</i></li> <li><i>“This Sound is real to us, especially with the fishery section. Chair, I gave you a brief description as the HTO in the Pangnirtung Community. The Cumberland Sound is important, not just part of it but the whole bay in general. What we allow into the Cumberland Sound will be important. We know what that is.” (Johnny M. Pangnirtung, 21-160E, p. 97)</i></li> </ul>
<b>3.5.15 Existing Mineral Rights</b>	
The Draft Plan identifies projects with existing mineral rights in Limited Use Areas in Appendix A. The listed projects are exempted from the prohibition in the Draft Plan on mineral exploration and development, but other plan requirements would continue to apply.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although participants generally support the idea of providing certainty to existing projects, some participants voiced concerns regarding the 2021 DNLUP existing rights approach.</li> <li>The Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, and Industry supported that all existing mineral rights should be protected, and that the issue of “stranded assets” addressed so that all existing rights projects can be developed without a Plan amendment to access them. (21-160E, p. 207, 208, 260,314, and 341)</li> </ul>
<b>3.5.16 Other Issues</b>	
<b>Inuit Owned Lands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>QIA stated that:  <i>“The Nunavut Planning Commission must also ensure that Limited Use designations do not apply to areas that are subject to the reasonably foreseeable future Inuit Impact Benefits Agreement negotiations, such as those applying to future parks and Class 1 migratory bird habitation sites.” (QIA, 21-160E, p 116)</i></li> <li>QIA also note that they want the land use decision-making role on Inuit Owned Lands to remain with them (QIA, 21-160E, p. 115, p. 116, p. 131)  <i>“The Qikiqtani Inuit Association recommends the Commission develop a unique approach to land use planning on Inuit Owned Lands that adequately respects and protects QIA’s right to manage and determine acceptable uses through the existing governing system.” (QIA, 21-160E, p. 115)</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NTI expressed concerns regarding land use designations in the 2021 draft plan on Inuit Owned Land which may be constraining NTI and the RIAs rights under the Nunavut Agreement. (NTI, 21-160E, p 177)</li> <li>• The Government of Canada noted their support to the importance to consider Inuit goals and objectives on Inuit Owned lands:  <i>“The Government of Canada has heard from and agrees with the Designated Inuit Organizations about the importance of considering Inuit goals and objectives with respect to Inuit Owned Lands and self-determination.” (GOC, 21-160E, 207)</i></li> </ul>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 4 SUMMARY

### 4.1 Key Issues Identified from Public Hearings

The Commission recognize and acknowledge that while there were numerous concerns and issues raised through the engagement and consultation process, there were a number of significant and dominant key issues related to the 2021 DNLUP that emerged from the evidence filed on the Public Registry, and the five public hearings’ (written and oral submissions) that were cross-cutting and impacting most the interests of the planning partners in this process. The following are the key issues that arose during the five public hearings and submissions to the Public Registry. There is no implied priority as many of these issues are interlinked.

- Land use designations
- Inuit Owned Lands
- Land use policy for future parks and conservation areas
- Caribou core habitat and land use designations
- Existing Rights, and mineral development opportunities
- Terrestrial Linear Infrastructures
- Marine shipping, and marine wildlife

### 4.2 NPC Rules of Procedure Considerations

Taking into account participants’ submissions and the comments heard during the five public hearings, and in keeping with the NPC Rules of Procedure for the conduct for Public Proceedings (Rule 28), the following matters were discussed with participants in attendance at the public hearings with a view to prepare all participants for the next stage of the revision of the DNLUP:

1. The Commission commitment to consider all the feedback received on the 2021 DNLUP, including all written submission and oral comments provided during public hearings.
2. Confirmation of the timeline to revise the 2021 DNLUP and provide a 2023 Recommended Nunavut Land Use Plan with a public hearings report and revised Options and Recommendations document that will be submitted to the Government of Canada, the

Government of Nunavut, and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. for consideration and approval, and made public.

3. The Commission agreement to extend the date of the close of record and submission of the Final written comments to February 10, 2023
4. Commitment to provide an additional 2-week period following the February 10th date for the sole purpose of providing comments on any written submissions received by February 10th.

Throughout the public hearings, participants shared their comments and concerns on a variety of topics pertaining to the DNLUP. As much as the focus of the public hearings was on the review of the 2021 DNLUP, the Commission will be considering and weighing all the evidence including Final written submissions and where necessary has incorporated feedback and made revisions as reflected in the 2023 RNLUP.

The Commission thanks all participants during the public hearings for their participation and contribution to conducting productive meetings under very challenging circumstances. The Commission also appreciates all the participants for their professional conduct and recognizes that in some cases they may have very strong feelings, including strong disagreement with other participants. The Commission looks forward to participants continuing to provide positive and respectful contributions to the land use planning process in Nunavut.

## 5 Appendix A: Agenda for the Regional Public Hearings

### FINAL AGENDA FOR THE REGIONAL PUBLIC HEARING IN CAMBRIDGE BAY, NU (SEPTEMBER 12-15, 2022)

**Location:** Luke Novoligak Community Hall, Cambridge Bay, NU

**Dates:** September 12-15, 2022

**Note:** *All presentations will be recorded and transcribed and may also be recorded by the media.*

**Morning Sessions: 9am to 12noon**

**Afternoon Sessions: 1:30pm to 4:30pm**

**Evening Sessions: 6pm to 9pm (if necessary)**

#### SUNDAY SEPTEMBER 11, 2022

#### COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES' ORIENTATION – (TIME: TBD)

The NPC will be holding a brief information meeting for representatives on the evening of Sunday, September 11, 2022, to provide a welcome package to community representatives and respond to any outstanding questions regarding their participation in the Public Hearing.

#### MONDAY SEPTEMBER 12, 2022

#### DAY 1

##### General Opening

- A. *Opening prayer*
- B. *Welcoming Remarks by the Mayor of Cambridge Bay (or Delegate)*
- C. *Qulliq lighting by Cambridge Bay Elder (10 minutes)*
- D. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson (30 minutes)*
  - i. *Housekeeping Items*
  - ii. *Purpose of the hearing and the scope of matters to be considered*
  - iii. *Introduction, overview of procedural history, structure of proceedings, etc.*
  - iv. *Introduction of the Commission Members and Staff*

v. *Identification and Introduction of the participants*

Public Hearing Sessions

- E. *Presentations of 2021 DNLUP & Maps by the Commission Staff*
- F. *Commission staff responses to pre-submitted questions*
- G. *Closing of Day 1*

**TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2022**

**DAY 2**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 1)

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*
- B. *Presentations from registered participants*
  - *Participants (except the Governments of Canada and Nunavut, and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.) are limited to 25 minutes each for their presentation, after which there is 20 minutes for questions and responses.*
  - *Canada, Nunavut, NTI are limited to 60 minutes each for their presentation, after which there is 30 minutes for questions and responses.*
    - i. *Hamlet of Cambridge Bay*
    - ii. *Ekaluktutiak Hunters & Trappers Organization*
    - iii. *Hamlet of Gjoa Haven*
    - iv. *Gjoa Haven Hunters and Trappers Association*
    - v. *Hamlet of Kugluktuk*
    - vi. *Kugluktuk Hunters & Trappers Organization*
    - vii. *Hamlet of Kugaaruk*
    - viii. *Kugaaruk Hunters and Trappers Association*
    - ix. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present*
- C. *Closing of Day 2*

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2022**

**DAY 3**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 2)

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*
- B. *Presentations from registered Participants (continued)*

- i. *Hamlet of Taloyoak*
- ii. *Spence Bay Hunters and Trappers Association*
- iii. *Kitikmeot Regional Wildlife Board*
- iv. *Kitikmeot Inuit Association*
- v. *Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated*
- vi. *Government of Canada (various departments)*
- vii. *Government of Nunavut*
- viii. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present*

*C. Closing of Day 3*

**THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2022**

**DAY 4**

*Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 3)*

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*
- B. *Oral comments, presentations, or feedback from registered Participants (continued)*
  - i. *Nunavut Impact Review Board*
  - ii. *Nunavut Water Board*
  - iii. *Nunavut Marine Council*
  - iv. *Agnico Eagle*
  - v. *Sabina Gold & Silver Corp*
  - vi. *Glencore*
  - vii. *World Wildlife Fund*
  - viii. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present*
- C. *Final closing statements by all parties (3 minutes each participant, except for Canada, Nunavut, NTI who each have 15 minutes)*
- D. *Closing remarks by the Chairperson*
- E. *Closing Prayers*

**FINAL AGENDA FOR THE REGIONAL PUBLIC HEARING IN  
RANKIN INLET, NU (SEPTEMBER 19-23, 2022)**

**Location:** Singiituuq Complex, Rankin Inlet, NU

**Dates:** September 19-23, 2022

**Note:** *All presentations will be recorded and transcribed and may also be recorded by the media.*

**Morning Sessions: 9am to 12noonAfternoon**

**Sessions: 1:30pm to 4:30pm Evening**

**Sessions: 6pm to 9pm (if necessary)**

**SUNDAY SEPTEMBER 18, 2022**

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE ORIENTATION – (TIME: TBD)**

The NPC will be holding a brief information meeting for representatives on the evening of Sunday, September 18, 2022, to provide a welcome package to community representatives and respond to any outstanding questions regarding their participation in the Public Hearing.

**MONDAY SEPTEMBER 19, 2022**

**DAY 1**

*General Opening*

- A. *Opening prayer*
- B. *Welcoming Remarks by the Mayor of Rankin Inlet (or Delegate)*
- C. *Qulliq lighting by Rankin Inlet Elder (10 minutes)*
- D. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson (30 minutes)*
  - i. *Housekeeping Items*
  - ii. *Purpose of the hearing and the scope of matters to be considered*
  - iii. *Introductions, overview of procedural history, structure of proceedings, etc.*
  - iv. *Introduction of the Commission Members and Staff*

v. *Identification and Introduction of the participants*

Public Hearing Sessions

- E. *Presentation of 2021 DNLUP and Maps by the Commission Staff*
- F. *Commission staff responses to pre-submitted questions*
- G. *Closing of Day 1*

**TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2022**

**DAY 2**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 1)

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*
- B. *Oral comments, and presentations from Registered Participants*
  - *Participants (except the Governments of Canada and Nunavut, and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.) are limited to 30 minutes each for their presentation, after which there is 20 minutes for questions and responses.*
  - *Canada, Nunavut, NTI are limited to 60 minutes each for their presentation, after which there is 30 minutes for questions and responses.*
    - i. *Hamlet of Arviat*
    - ii. *Arviat Hunters and Trappers Association*
    - iii. *Hamlet of Baker Lake*
    - iv. *Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Association*
    - v. *Hamlet of Chesterfield Inlet*
    - vi. *Chesterfield Inlet Hunters and Trappers Association*
    - vii. *Hamlet of Coral Harbour*
    - viii. *Coral Harbour Hunters and Trappers Association*
    - ix. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present.*
- C. *Closing of Day 2*

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2022**

**DAY 3**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 2)

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*

*B. Oral comments, and presentations from Registered Participants (continued)*

- ix. Hamlet of Naujaat*
- x. Naujaat Hunters and Trappers Association*
- xi. Hamlet of Rankin Inlet*
- xii. Rankin Inlet Hunters and Trappers Association*
- xiii. Hamlet of Whale Cove*
- xiv. Whale Cove Hunters and Trappers Association*
- xv. Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present.*

*C. Closing of Day 3*

**THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2022**

**DAY 4**

*Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 3)*

*A. Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*

*B. Oral comments, and presentations from Registered Participants (continued)*

- xvi. Kivalliq Wildlife Board*
- xvii. Kivalliq Inuit Association*
- xviii. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated*
- xix. Government of Canada (Various Departments)*
- xx. Government of Nunavut*
- xxi. Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present.*

*C. Closing of Day 4*

**FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2022**

**DAY 5**

*Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 4)*

*A. Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*

*B. Oral comments, and presentations from Registered Participants (continued)*

- xxii. Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board*

- xxiii. Nunavut Water Board*
- xxiv. Nunavut Marine Council*
- xxv. Agnico Eagle*
- xxvi. World Wildlife Fund*
- xxvii. Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present.*

*C. Final closing statements by all parties (3 minutes each participant, except for Canada, Nunavut, NTI who each have 15 minutes)*

*D. Closing remarks by the Chairperson*

*E. Closing Prayer*

## FINAL AGENDA FOR PUBLIC HEARING IN THOMPSON, MANITOBA (SEPTEMBER 26-27, 2022)

**Location:** Royal Canadian Legion, Thompson, MB

**Date:** September 26-27, 2022

- **Note:** All presentations will be recorded and transcribed and may also be recorded by the media.

**Morning Sessions: 9am to 12noonAfternoon**

**Sessions: 1:30pm to 4:30pm Evening**

**Sessions: 6pm to 9pm (If necessary)**

### SUNDAY SEPTEMBER 25, 2022

#### COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES' ORIENTATION (TIME: TBD)

The NPC will be holding a brief information meeting for representatives on the evening of Sunday, September 25, 2022, to provide a welcome package to community representatives and respond to any outstanding questions regarding their participation in the Public Hearing.

### Monday September 26, 2022

#### General Opening

- A. Opening prayer
- B. Welcoming Remarks by the Mayor of Thompson (or Delegate)
- C. Opening Remarks by the Chairperson (30 minutes)
  - i. Housekeeping Items
  - ii. Purpose of the hearing and the scope of matters to be considered
  - iii. Introductions, overview of procedural history, structure of proceedings, etc.
  - iv. Introduction of the Commission Members and Staff
  - v. Identification and Introduction of the participants

#### Public Hearing Sessions

D. Presentation of 2021 DNLUP and Maps by the Commission Staff

E. Commission staff responses to pre-submitted questions

F. Oral comments, and presentations from Registered Participants

- Participants (except the Ghotelnene K'odtineh Dënesuᑭᑎé, Athabasca Dënesuᑭᑎé Governments of Canada and Nunavut, Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.) are limited to 30 minutes each for their presentation, after which there is 20 minutes for questions and responses.
- Ghotelnene K'odtineh Dënesuᑭᑎé, Athabasca Dënesuᑭᑎé Canada, Nunavut, NTI are limited to 40 minutes each for their presentation, after which there is 20 minutes for questions and responses.
  - i. Ghotelnene K'odtineh Dënesuᑭᑎé
  - ii. Athabasca Dënesuᑭᑎé
  - iii. Fond du Lac Dënesuᑭᑎé First Nation
  - iv. Black Lake Dënesuᑭᑎé First Nation
  - v. Hatchet Lake Dënesuᑭᑎé First Nation
  - vi. Lac Brochet Dënesuᑭᑎé First Nation
  - vii. Tadoule Lake Dënesuᑭᑎé First Nation
  - viii. Beverly and Qamanijuaq Caribou Management Board
  - ix. Seal River Watershed Alliance
  - x. Other Dënesuᑭᑎé community participants who wish to present evidence

G. Closing remarks by the Chairperson

H. Closing Prayer

**TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2022**

**DAY 2**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 1)

A. Opening Remarks by the Chairperson

B. Presentations from registered participants

- i. Government of Canada
- ii. Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated

- iii. *Government of Nunavut*
  - iv. *Nunavut Water Board*
  - v. *Agnico Eagle*
  - vi. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present.*
- C. *Final closing statements by all parties (5 minutes each participant, except for Canada, who has 15 minutes)*
  - D. *Closing remarks by the Chairperson*
  - E. *Closing Prayer*

**FINAL AGENDA FOR THE REGIONAL PUBLIC HEARING IN  
POND INLET, NU (OCTOBER 24-27, 2022)**

**Location:** Pond Inlet Community Hall, Pond Inlet, NU

**Dates:** October 24-27, 2022

**Note:** *All presentations will be recorded and transcribed and may also be recorded by the media.*

**Morning Sessions: 9am to 12noon**

**Afternoon**

**Sessions: 1:30pm to 4:30pm**

**Evening**

**Sessions: 6pm to 9pm (if necessary)**

The NPC will be holding a brief information meeting for representatives on the evening of Sunday, October 23, 2022, to provide a welcome package to community representatives and respond to any outstanding questions regarding their participation in the Public Hearing.

**MONDAY OCTOBER 24, 2022**

**DAY 1**

General Opening

- A. *Opening prayer*
- B. *Welcoming Remarks by the Mayor of Pond Inlet (or Delegate)*
- C. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson (30 minutes)*
  - i. *Housekeeping Items*
  - ii. *Purpose of the hearing and the scope of matters to be considered*
  - iii. *Introductions, overview of procedural history, structure of proceedings, etc.*
  - iv. *Introduction of the Commission Members and Staff*
  - v. *Identification and Introduction of the participants*

Public Hearing Sessions

- D. *Presentations of 2021 DNLUP & Maps by the Commission Staff*
- E. *Commission staff responses to pre-submitted questions*
- F. *Closing of Day 1*

**TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2022**

**DAY 2**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 1)

A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*

B. *Presentations from registered participants*

- *Participants (except the Governments of Canada and Nunavut, and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.) are limited to 30 minutes each for their presentation, after which there is 20 minutes for questions and responses.*
- *Canada, Nunavut, NTI are limited to 60 minutes each for their presentation, after which there is 30 minutes for questions and responses.*
  - i. *Hamlet of Grise Fiord*
  - ii. *Iviq Hunters & Trappers Organization*
  - iii. *Hamlet of Resolute Bay*
  - iv. *Resolute Bay Hunters & Trappers Organization*
  - v. *Hamlet of Arctic Bay*
  - vi. *Ikajutit Hunters & Trappers Organization*
  - vii. *Hamlet of Pond Inlet*
  - viii. *Mittimatalik Hunters & Trappers Organization*
  - ix. *Hamlet of Clyde River*
  - x. *Nangmoutaq Hunters & Trappers Organization*
  - xi. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present*

C. *Closing of Day 2*

**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2022**

**DAY 3**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 2)

A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*

B. *Presentations from registered Participants (continued)*

- i. *Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated*
- ii. *Qikiqtani Inuit Association*

- iii. *Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board*
- iv. *Government of Canada (various Departments)*
- v. *Government of Nunavut*
- vi. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present.*

*C. Closing of Day 3*

**THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022**

**DAY 4**

*Public Hearing session* (Continued from Day 3)

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*
- B. *Oral comments, presentations, or feedback from registered Participants (continued)*
  - i. *Nunavut Water Board*
  - ii. *Nunavut Marine Council*
  - iii. *World Wildlife Fund*
  - iv. *Baffinland*
  - v. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present.*
- C. *Final closing statements by all parties (3 minutes each participant, except for Canada, Nunavut, NTI who each have 15 minutes)*
- D. *Closing remarks by the Chairperson*
- E. *Closing Prayer*

**FINAL AGENDA FOR THE REGIONAL PUBLIC HEARING IN  
IQALUIT, NU (NOVEMBER 14-19, 2022)**

**Location:** Cadet Hall, Iqaluit, NU

**Dates:** November 14-19, 2022

**Note:** *All presentations will be recorded and transcribed and may also be recorded by the media.*

**Morning Sessions: 9 am to 11:45 am**

**Afternoon Sessions: 1:15 pm to 4:30pm**

**SUNDAY NOVEMBER 13, 2022**

**COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES' ORIENTATION – TIME: TBD**

The NPC will be holding a brief information meeting for representatives on the evening of Sunday, November 13, 2022, to provide a welcome package to community representatives and respond to any outstanding questions regarding their participation in the Public Hearing.

**MONDAY NOVEMBER 14, 2022**

**DAY 1**

General Opening

*Opening prayer*

*Welcoming Remarks by the Mayor of Iqaluit (or Delegate)*

*Opening Remarks by the Chairperson (30 minutes)*

- i. Housekeeping Items*
- ii. Purpose of the hearing and the scope of matters to be considered*
- iii. Introductions, overview of procedural history, structure of proceedings, etc.*
- iv. Introduction of the Commission Members and Staff*
- v. Identification and Introduction of the participants*

Public Hearing Sessions

- A. Presentations of 2021 DNLUP & Maps by the Commission Staff including Commission staff responses to pre-submitted questions*
- B. Closing of Day 1*

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2022**

**DAY 2**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 1)

A. Opening Remarks by the Chairperson

B. Presentations from registered participants

- Participants (except the Governments of Canada and Nunavut, and Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. and Makivik) are limited to **30 minutes** each for their presentation, after which there is **20 minutes** for questions and responses.
- Canada, Nunavut, NTI and Makivik are limited to **60 minutes** each for their presentation, after which there is **30 minutes** for questions and responses.
  - i. City of Iqaluit
  - ii. Amaruq Hunters & Trappers Organization
  - iii. Hamlet of Kimmirut
  - iv. Mayukalik Hunters and Trappers Association
  - v. Hamlet of Kingait
  - vi. Kingait Hunters & Trappers Organization
  - vii. Hamlet of Igloodik
  - viii. Igloodik Hunters and Trappers Association
  - ix. Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present

C. Closing of Day 2

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2022**

**DAY 3**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 2)

A. Opening Remarks by the Chairperson

B. Presentations from registered Participants (continued)

- i. Hamlet of Sanirajak
- ii. Sanirajak Hunters and Trappers Association
- iii. Hamlet of Qikiqtarjuaq
- iv. Nattivak Hunters & Trappers Organization

- v. *Hamlet of Pangnirtung*
- vi. *Pangnirtung Hunters & Trappers Organization*
- vii. *Hamlet of Sanikiluaq*
- viii. *Sanikiluaq Hunters and Trappers Association*
- ix. *Mittimatalik Hunters & Trappers Organization*
- x. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present*

C. *Closing of Day 3*

**THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2022**

**DAY 4**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 3)

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*
- B. *Oral comments, presentations, or feedback from registered Participants (continued)*
  - i. *Northern Village of Puvirnituq (Quebec)*
  - ii. *Northern Village of Inukjuak (Quebec)*
  - iii. *Northern Village of Salluit (Quebec)*
  - iv. *Northern Village of Ivujivik (Quebec)*
  - v. *Northern Village of Akulivik (Quebec)*
  - vi. *Makaviik Corporation (Quebec)*
  - vii. *Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated*
  - viii. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present*

C. *Closing of Day 4*

**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2022**

**DAY 5**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 4)

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*
- B. *Oral comments, presentations, or feedback from registered Participants (continued)*
  - i. *Qikiqtani Inuit Association*
  - ii. *Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Regional Board*
  - iii. *Government of Canada (various Departments)*
  - iv. *Government of Nunavut*

- v. *Nunavik Marine Region Planning Commission (Quebec)*
- vi. *Nunavut Water Board*
- vii. *World Wildlife Fund*
- viii. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present*

C. *Closing of Day 5*

**SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2022**

**DAY 6**

Public Hearing session (Continued from Day 5)

- A. *Opening Remarks by the Chairperson*
- B. *Oral comments, presentations, or feedback from registered Participants (continued)*
  - i. *Nunavut Marine Council*
  - ii. *NWT & NU Chamber of Mines*
  - iii. *Baffinland*
  - iv. *Debeers*
  - v. *Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers*
  - vi. *Presentations by members of the public who have advised the Chairperson that they wish to present*
- C. *Final closing statements by all parties (3 minutes each participant, except for Canada, Nunavut, NTI who each have 15 minutes)*
- D. *Closing remarks by the Commission Executive Director and Chairperson*
- E. *Closing Prayer*

## 6 Appendix B: Summary Listings of Attendees at Regional Public Hearings

### 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 Ihakkaqaq	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

Glencore	
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

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

Chamber of Mines	
Scott Trusler	NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines

## RANKIN INLET Participants

Community Delegates & Kangiqtinig Hosts	
Harry Towntongie	Mayor of Rankin Inlet
Elder Tagak Curley	Esteemed Public Member Participant
Peter Alareak	Arviat Hamlet
Ludovik Issumatarjuak	Arviat Hamlet
Alex Ishalook	Arviat HTO
Kevin Kalluak	Arviat HTO
Richard Aksawnee	Mayor of Baker Lake
Paula Kigjugalik Hughson	Baker Lake Hamlet Councillor
Eva Elytook	Baker Lake HTO
Janice Aggark	Chesterfield Inlet Hamlet Councillor
Harry Aggark	Chesterfield Inlet HTO Chair
Barney Aggark	Chesterfield Inlet HTO
Willie Nakoolak	Mayor of Coral Harbour
Dannie Pee	Coral Harbour HTO Chair
Darcy Nakoolak	Coral Harbour HTO
Kevin Tegumia	Naujaat Hamlet Councillor
Annie Angotialok	Naujaat Hamlet Councillor
Paul Angutituar	Naujaat HTO Chair
Jon Ell Tinashlu	Naujaat HTO
Martha Hickee	Rankin Inlet Deputy Mayor
Lynn Rudd	Rankin Inlet Hamlet Councillor
Andre Aokaut	Rankin Inlet HTO Manager
Harriet Tatty	Rankin Inlet HTO
Percy Kabloona	Mayor of Whale Cove
Simon Enuapik	Whale Cove HTO
Lewis Voisey	Whale Cove
Diana Kriterdluk	Whale Cove

# Nunavut Planning Commission

NPC: Nunavut Planning Commission – Commissioners & Staff	
Andrew Nakashuk	Chairperson ( <i>Watching via Live Stream</i> )
Shawn Lester	Acting Chair, 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
Johnny Alareak	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
Bernadette Dean	Kangiqtinik Support Staff
Tracy Dion	Kangiqtinik Support Staff
Derrick Kussigak	Kangiqtinik Support Staff
Tyson Nester	Kangiqtinik Support Staff

## Signatory Parties

Government of Canada	
Terry Audla	Regional Director General, CIRNAC
Spencer Dewar	Director of Resource Management, CIRNAC

Jeff Hartty	Manager of Land Use Planning, CIRNAC
Michelle-Claire Roy	Environmental Policy Analyst, CIRNAC
Roxanne McGinnis	Department of National Defence
Anita Gudmundson	Regional Manager Env Services, Transport Canada
Jaideep Johar	Manager of Marine Safety – Transport Canada
Neil Modi	Justice Canada

Government of Nunavut	
Gabriel Karlik	Acting Assistant Deputy Minister of Economic Dev.
Henry Coman	Assistant Deputy Minister for Dept. of Environment
Daniel Haney	Manager of Land Use & Environment
Michele LeBlanc-Havard	Director of Environment
Robert Connelly	Director of Kivalliq Community Operations
Eamonn Carroll	Legal Counsel

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	
James Eetoolook	First Vice President
David Kunuk	Chief Operating Officer
Christopher Kalluk	Lands Administration, Planning & Management
Marie Belleau	Legal Counsel

## Registered Participants

Kivalliq Inuit Association	
Kono Tattuinee	President
David Kuksuk	Vice President
Luis Manzo	Director of Lands
Jeff Tulugak	Lands Inspector
Meredith Pilkington	COO
Sam Alagalar	Assistant COO
Jonathan Katz	Legal Counsel
Kim Poole	Consultant
Christina Blouw	Consultant
Matt McDougall	Prairie Scientific
Darcy Quinn	Kivalliq Hydro-Fibre

--

Kivalliq Wildlife Board	
Clayton Tartak	Research Coordinator

World Wildlife Fund Canada	
Paul Okalik	Lead Specialist, Arctic
Jason Harasimo	Arctic Species Conservation Fund, Iqaluit

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

Agnico Eagle	
Jamie Quesnel	Director of Permitting and Regulatory Affairs
Manon Turmel	Superintendent of Permitting and Regulatory Affairs
Greg Sharam	Consultant
Christine Kowbel	Legal Counsel

Beverly Qaumanirjuaq Caribou Management Board	
Earl Evans	BQCMB Chair

Nunavut Marine Counsel	
Assol Kuveisinova	Representative of NMC

## THOMPSON Participants

Community Delegates & Thompson Hosts	
Andrew Proulx	City Council
Elder Joe Hyslop	Opening Prayer
Elder George St. Pierre:	Closing Prayer
Modeste Tessessage	Introduction to the Drum Ceremony
Chief Evan Yassie - <i>Regrets</i>	Tadoule Lake
Chief Negotiator Geoff Bussidor	Tadoule Lake
Susan Atkins	Tadoule Lake
Councillor Dylan Duck	Tadoule Lake
Stephanie Thorassie	Tadoule Lake
Chief Sion Denechezhe	Lac Brochet
Elder Joe Hyslop	Lac Brochet
Elder Simon Samuel	Lac Brochet
Chief Negotiator Benjamin Denechezhe	Lac Brochet
Councillor Modeste Tessessage	Lac Brochet
Councillor Joseph Danttouze	Lac Brochet
Councillor Tom Shaoullie	Lac Brochet
Chief Bart Tsannie	Hatchet Lake
Elder George St. Pierre	Hatchet Lake
Elder Louis Josie	Hatchet Lake
Councillor Peter Gazandcare	Hatchet Lake
Vincent Hogarth	Hatchet Lake
Paul Denechezhe	Hatchet Lake
Chief Coreen Sayazie	Black Lake
Elder John Echodh	Black Lake
Elder John Toutsaint	Black Lake
Chief Negotiator Ron Robillard	Black Lake
Councillor David Bigeye	Black Lake
Youth Ian Robillard	Black Lake
Chief Kevin Mercredi	Fond Du Lac
Elder Mervin Adam	Fond Du Lac
Elder Larent Noey	Fond Du Lac
Elder Alfred Naldzie	Fond Du Lac
Councillor Napoleon Pacquette	Fond Du Lac
Andrew Isadore	Fond Du Lake

## Nunavut Planning Commission

NPC: Nunavut Planning Commission – Commissioners & Staff	
Andrew Nakashuk	Chairperson, <i>Watching via Livestream</i>
Shawn Lester	Vice Chair, Acting Chair
Joshua Arreak	Commissioner
Patricia Enuapik	Commissioner
Dorothy Gibbons	Commissioner
Abraham Keenainak	Commissioner
Simeon 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
Flora Natamogam	Interpreter-Translator
Daniel Alphonse	Interpreter-Translator
Jimmy Thorassie	Interpreter-Translator
Nancy Pacquette	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

## Signatory Parties

Government of Canada	
Spencer Dewar	Director of Resource Management, CIRNAC
Jeff Hart	Manager of Land Use Planning
Kim Pawley	Manager of Environmental Assessment & Land Use Planning
Scott Kidd	Transport Canada
Simon Gruda-Dolbec	Department of Justice

Government of Nunavut	
Henry Coman	Assistant Deputy Minister for Dept. of Environment
Daniel Haney	Manager of Land Use & Environmental Assessment
Eamonn Carroll	Legal Counsel

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	
James Eetoolook	First Vice President
Burt Dean	Department of Wildlife and Environment
David Ningeongan	Chief Operating Officer
Marie Belleau	Legal Counsel, Lands Department

## Public Presentations

Public Presenters	
Susan Atkins	Tadoule Lake
Jessie Thomas	Tadoule Lake

## Registered Participants

Denesūliné Legal Counsel, Consultants & Technical Team	
Kelly Olson	Legal Counsel
Chris Werner	Consultant, Werner Consulting
Wayne Wysocki	Consultant, Symbion Consulting
Katie Rasmussen	Technical Team

Beverly Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board	
Tina Giroux-Robillard	Executive Director

Seal River Watershed Alliance	
Stephanie Thorassie	Tadoule Lake

### Nunavut Water Board

Assol Kubeisinova	Technical Advisor
Jesse O'Brien	Consultant

### Agnico Eagle

Jamie Quesnel	Director of Permitting & Regulatory Affairs
Manon Turmel	Superintendent of Permitting & Regulatory Affairs
Greg Sharam	Consultant
Christine Kowbell	Legal Counsel

### Representatives from Natural Resources & Northern Development

#### Kivalliq Inuit Association – Observer Status

Hunter Tootoo	Executive Assistant
Jeff Tulugak	Lands Inspector

## Pond Inlet Participants

### Community Delegates & Mittimatalik Hosts

Joshua Arreak	Mayor of Mittimatalik
David Stockley	SAO
Jayko Allooloo	Elder Pond Inlet
Caleb Sangoya	Elder Pond Inlet
Adrian Arnauyumayoq	Arctic Bay
Sakiasee Qaunaq	Arctic Bay
Susanna Barnabas	Arctic Bay
Olayuk Naqitarvik	Arctic Bay
Joavee Etuangal	Clyde River
Limeekie Palluq	Clyde River
Nysana Qillaq	Clyde River
Jaysie Tigullaraq	Clyde River
Larry Audlauk	Grise Fjord
Jimmy Qaapik	Grise Fjord
Marty Kuluguqtuk	Grise Fjord
Lisa Ningiuk	Grise Fjord

Moses Koonark	Pond Inlet
Charlie Inuarak	Pond Inlet
David Qamaniq	Pond Inlet
Elijah Panipakoochoo	Pond Inlet
Namen Inuarak	Pond Inlet
Joshua Idlout	Pond inlet
Mark Aamarualik	Resolute Bay
Kantisse Idlout	Resolute Bay
Phillip Manik Sr.	Resolute Bay
Jazlin Salluvig	Resolute Bay

## Nunavut Planning Commission

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 - <i>Regrets</i>
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
Maxence Jaillet	Interpreter-Translator
Rhoda Katsak	Interpreter-Translator
Morgan	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
Agnowyak Kilukishak	Mittimatalik Support Staff
Scott Kilukishak	Mittimatalik Support Staff
Jedidah Merkosak	Mittimatalik Support Staff
Mark Pewatualuk	Mittimatalik Support Staff

## Signatory Parties

Government of Canada	
Terry Audla	Regional Director General, CIRNAC
Kim Pawley	Manger, CIRNAC
Spencer Dewar	Director of Resource Management, CIRNAC
Jeff Hart	Manager of Land Use Planning, CIRNAC
Janice Traynor	Policy Coordinator Sustainable Development, CIRNAC
Michelle-Claire Roy	Environmental Policy Analyst, CIRNAC
Anita Gudmundson	Regional Manager Env Services, Transport Canada
Scott Kidd	Transport Canada
Simon Gruda-Dolbec	Justice Canada

Government of Nunavut	
Henry Coman	Assistant Deputy Minister for Dept. of Environment
Daniel Haney	Manager of Land Use & Environment
Diane Lapierre	Manager of Environmental Assessment & Regulation
Michele LeBlanc-Havard	Director of Environment
John Ringrose	Wildlife Biologist, Department of Environment
Eamonn Carroll	Legal Counsel

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	
Aluki Kotierk	President
David Ningeongan	Executive Director
Paul Irngaut	Director of Wildlife and Environment
Hannah Uniuqsaraq	Director of Self Determination
Naida Gonzalez	Consultant
Marie Belleau	Legal Counsel

## Registered Participants

Qikiqtani Inuit Association	
Levi Barnabas	Secretary-Treasurer & Vice President
Solomon Awa	Director of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit and Engagement
Richard Paton	Senior Director of Projects

Baffinland	
Megan Lord-Hoyle	Vice President of Sustainable Development
Lou Kamermans	Senior Director of Sustainable Development
Mike Settington	Wildlife Biologist, Environmental Dynamics Inc.

World Wildlife Fund Canada	
Paul Okalik	Lead Specialist, Arctic
Jason Harasimo	Arctic Species Conservation Fund, Iqaluit

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

Nunavut Marine Counsel	
Assol Kubeisinova	Representative of NMC

Friends of Land Use Planning	
Paul Crowley	Representative of Friends of Land Use Planning, Iqaluit

# Iqaluit Participants

## Community Delegates

Solomon Awa, Mayor	City of Iqaluit	Loasie Alikatuktuk	Qikiqtarjuaq
Kyle Sheppard, D.M.	City of Iqaluit	Ahmie Nauyavik	Qikiqtarjuaq
Paul Quassa	City of Iqaluit	Juilie Koksiak	Qikiqtarjuaq
Jetaloo Kakee	Amaruq HTO	Lizzie Natsiapik	Qikiqtarjuaq
Ben Kovic	Amaruq HTO	Jonah Keyootak	Qikiqtarjuaq
Noah Alookie	Amaruq HTO		
Archie Angnakak	Amaruq HTO	Johnny Mike	Pangnirtung
		Jamie Evic	Pangnirtung
Maliktoo Lyta	Kimmirut Hamlet	Lazarusie Ishulutaq	Pangnirtung
Mary Lyta	Kimmirut Hamlet	Jaco Ishulautak	Pangnirtung
Mikidjuk Kolola	Kimmirut HTO		
Jawlie Akavak	Kimmirut HTO	Eli Kavik	Sanikiluaq
		Alex Ippak	Sanikiluaq
Ejetsiak Ejetsiak	Kinngait Hamlet	Lucy Appaqqaq	Sanikiluaq
Kumaarjuk Pii	Kinngait Hamlet	Dinah Kittosuk	Sanikiluaq
Adamie Numa	Kinngait HTO		
Simigak Suvega	Kinngait HTO	Jackusie Ittukallak	Puvirnituk
Oqituq Ashoona	Kinngait HTO	Adamie Angiyou	Puvirnituk
		Aisa Surusilak	Puvirnituk
George Auksaq	Iglolik Hamlet	Simon Irqumia	Puvirnituk
Lloyd Idlout	Iglolik HTO		
Natalino Piugattuk	Iglolik HTO	Simiunie Ohaituk	Inukjuak
Jacobie Malliki	Iglolik HTO	Anna Ohaituk	Inukjuak
		Shaomik Inukpuk	Inukjuak
Jopie Kaerner.	Sanirajak Hamlet	Johnny Kasudluak	Inukjuak
Ammie Kipsagak	Sanirajak HTO		
Abraham Qammaniq	Sanirajak HTO	Adamie Saviadjuk	Salluit
		Adamie Kaitak	Salluit
Eli Angiyou	Akulivik Mayor	Adamie Kenuajuak	Salluit
Eli Aullaluk	Akulivik Council	George Kakajuk	Salluit
Jusi Aliqu	Akulivik Council		
Adamie Alayco	Akulivik HTO	Adamie Mangluk	Ivujivik
		Ali Qavavauk	Ivujivik
		Paulusi Tarriasuk	Ivujivik

## Nunavut Planning Commission

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
Charlie Arngak	Commissioner - Makavik
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
Audrey Mainville	HR Officer
Annie Ollie	Interpreter-Translator & Regional Planner
Tommy Owljoot	Interpreter-Translator
Maxence Jaillet	Interpreter-Translator
Natalie Labossiere	Interpreter-Translator
Jacob Peter	Interpreter-Translator
Abraham Tagalik	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
Leena Evic	Iqaluit Support Staff
Brad Aliqatuqtuq	Iqaluit Support Staff
Darren Arreak	Iqaluit Support Staff
Kevin Kullaalik	Iqaluit Support Staff

## Signatory Parties

Government of Canada	
Terry Audla	Regional Director General, CIRNAC
Kim Pawley	Manger, CIRNAC
Spencer Dewar	Director of Resource Management, CIRNAC
Jeff Hart	Manager of Land Use Planning, CIRNAC
Janice Traynor	Policy Coordinator Sustainable Development, CIRNAC
Michelle-Claire Roy	Environmental Policy Analyst, CIRNAC
Nathalie Lowry	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Abby Menendez	Environment and Climate Change Canada
Anita Gudmundson	Transport Canada
Jaideep Johar	Transport Canada
Karen Petkau	Parks Canada
Greg Matthews	Department of National Defence
Neil Modi	Justice Canada
Simon Gruda-Dolbec	Justice Canada

Government of Nunavut	
Henry Coman	Assistant Deputy Minister for Dept. of Environment
Daniel Haney	Manager of Land Use & Environment
Diane Lapierre	Manager of Environmental Assessment & Regulation
Michele LeBlanc-Havard	Director of Environment
Drikus Gissing	Director, Wildlife Management
John Ringrose	Wildlife Biologist, Department of Environment
Annie Cyr-Parent	Department of Ec. Development & Transportation
Eamonn Carroll	Legal Counsel

Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated	
Aluki Kotierk	President
James Eetoolook	Former Vice President
David Ningeongan	Executive Director
Paul Irngaut	Vice President
Chris Kalluk	Land Administration Planning & Management
Burt Dean	Department of Wildlife and Environment
Hannah Uniuqsaraq	Director of Self Determination
Naida Gonzalez	Consultant
Marie Belleau	Legal Counsel

## Registered Participants & Other Guests

Esteemed Guests & Nunavummiut Participants	
P.J. Akeeagok	Premier
David Akeeagok	Minister of the Environment
Lori Idlout	Member of Parliament
Meeka Mike	City of Iqaluit
Olayuk Akshuk	Cape Dorset
Paul Idlout	Igloodik HTO
Ian Imakpa	Elder

Qikiqtani Inuit Association	
Levi Barnabas	Secretary-Treasurer & Vice President
Solomon Awa	Director of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit and Engagement
Rosanne D'Orazio	Assistant Executive Director, Operations and Benefits
Leo Maktar	QIA Registered Participant

Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board	
James Qillaq	Chairman
Kolola Pitiulak	Executive Director
Mike Ferguson	Senior Advisor, Wildlife Management

Makavik Corporation	
Adamie Alaku	Vice President
Laurie Beaupré	Assistant Director

Baffinland	
Lou Kamermans	Senior Director of Sustainable Development
Mike Settington	Wildlife Biologist, Environmental Dynamics Inc.

De Beers	
Sarah McLean	Environment and Permitting Manager

Mark Lincoln	Project Manager, Chidliak & Diamond FutureSmart Initiative
--------------	------------------------------------------------------------

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

NWT & Nunavut Chamber of Mines	
Priya Sharma	General Manager

Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers	
Paul Barnes	Director, Atlantic Canada and Arctic

Friends of Land Use Planning	
Paul Crowley	Representative of Friends of Land Use Planning, Iqaluit

Nunavut Water Board	
Assol Kubeisinova	Technical Advisor
Sergey Kuflevskiy	Technical Services

Nunavut Marine Council	
Colleen Parker	Representative of NMC







ᓄᓇ ᐅᓄᓄᓄ ᐸᓄᓄᓄᓄᓄᓄ  
Nunavunmi Parnaiyit  
Nunavut Planning Commission  
Commission d'Aménagement du Nunavut

## AVIS DES AUDIENCES PUBLIQUES RÉGIONALES ÉBAUCHE DU PLAN D'AMÉNAGEMENT DU NUNAVUT 2021

La Commission d'Aménagement du Nunavut (la Commission) a prévu des Audiences Publiques Régionales en personne en ce qui concerne l'Ébauche du Plan d'Aménagement du Nunavut (PAN) de 2021. L'Audience Publique fait partie du processus de la Commission qui vise l'élaboration d'un Plan d'Aménagement du Nunavut conformément à l'Article 11, Paragraphe 11.5.4 de l'Accord du Nunavut et à l'article 51 (1) de la LATEPN. Voir ci-dessous les détails concernant les audiences à venir :

Localité	Lieu	Date de la Rencontre
Cambridge Bay	Salle Communautaire Luke Novoligak	12-15 septembre 2022
Rankin Inlet	Complexe Singiituuq	19-23 septembre 2022
Thompson, MB	Légion Royale Canadienne	26-27 septembre 2022
Pond Inlet	Salle Communautaire	24-27 octobre 2022
Iqaluit	Salle des Cadets	14-19 novembre 2022

### Pour plus d'information

L'Ébauche du Plan et le Calendrier des Prochaines Audiences Publiques sont Disponibles à l'adresse [www.nunavut.ca](http://www.nunavut.ca) et sur Notre Page Facebook.

**Téléphone : 867-983-4625**

**Adresse courriel :**  
**[submissions@nunavut.ca](mailto:submissions@nunavut.ca)**  
**[samuno@nunavut.ca](mailto:samuno@nunavut.ca)**

Tous les participants présents en personne peuvent être tenus de présenter une preuve de vaccination et de porter des masques non médicaux.