



Beverly and Qamanirjuaq
Caribou Management Board

Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board

8 October 2021

Mr. Andrew Nakashuk
Chairperson
Nunavut Planning Commission
P. O. Box 1797
Iqaluit NU X0A 0H0

Via e-mail: submissions@nunavut.ca

Dear Mr. Nakashuk:

BQCMB Pre-hearing Comments on 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan

Comments from the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board (BQCMB) on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan (DNLUP) are attached. We regret that the BQCMB does not have the resources for translating this submission, and are providing the document in English only.

As indicated earlier this week, three BQCMB representatives are planning to participate in the Kivalliq Public Hearing November 1-7, with two individuals attending the hearing in-person (one each to the two locations) and a third participating virtually. More details were provided to your staff.

The 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan (DNLUP) and supporting Options and Recommendations document synthesize the results of a tremendous amount of work and many substantive consultations with Nunavummiut and others. The BQCMB commends the NPC and all parties who have contributed to the planning process.

Thank you for providing the BQCMB with the opportunity to participate in this review and to submit further input to support development of the first Nunavut Land Use Plan. We look forward to participating in the Public Hearing. If you have any questions about these comments, please contact BQCMB Executive Director Ross Thompson (rossthompson@mymts.net) or BQCMB Biologist Leslie Wakelyn (wakelyn@theedge.ca).

Sincerely,

Earl Evans
BQCMB Chairperson

Encl: BQCMB Comments on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan

NUNAVUT PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 2021 DRAFT NUNAVUT LAND USE PLAN

BEVERLY AND QAMANIRJUAQ CARIBOU MANAGEMENT BOARD

PRE-HEARING WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Filed by:

Leslie Wakelyn, BQCMB Biologist

wakelyn@theedge.ca

[9 October 2021]

BEVERLY AND QAMANIRJUAQ CARIBOU MANAGEMENT BOARD

Pre-hearing Submission on the 2021 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan

1 Background

The Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board (BQCMB) is a caribou co-management board established in 1982. For 40 years the Board has advised governments and communities on the conservation and management of the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou herds, which roam across portions of Nunavut, Northwest Territories, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan. Eight board members represent Inuit, Dene, Cree and Metis caribou harvesters from more than 20 communities that share the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq herds, and five members represent the governments of the two territories and two provinces and the federal government. All board members live and work in the North.

The Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou herds provide a valuable shared renewable resource for Indigenous peoples across a large portion of northern Canada who are well aware that decisions by the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) and other Nunavut organizations, and actions by Nunavummiut, will influence the fate of the caribou herds crucial to their culture and food security. Therefore the outcome of Nunavut's land use planning process is of great interest and relevance to all BQCMB members and the many communities they represent across the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou ranges.

The BQCMB has participated in the Nunavut land use planning process since August 2010. The Board submitted written comments to NPC on each Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan (DNLUP), including the 2010 Working Draft and the 2011/12, 2014 and 2016 versions of the DNLUP. The Board also participated in NPC technical meetings on the 2014 DNLUP in 2015 and 2016. The BQCMB Chair and Biologist both participated in the March 2016 Caribou Workshop. In addition, the BQCMB has contributed to the planning process over the years by providing information to NPC staff and contractors about Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou, caribou seasonal ranges, and the Board's position on the need for protection of important caribou habitats from incompatible land use activities.

2 General Comments

The BQCMB continues to encourage NPC to apply a precautionary approach and to consider risk management in land use planning for Nunavut. This is based on the need for minimizing the cumulative effects of commercial land use activities on caribou, and is particularly important in the current era of declining and highly vulnerable caribou herds, including most herds that occupy range in Nunavut for part or all of each year. The need for careful land use planning on caribou range in Nunavut is supported by the 2016 decision by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in

Canada (COSEWIC) that barren-ground caribou in Canada should be considered a “Threatened” species, the listing of the species under Northwest Territories species at risk legislation, and the current proposal by the federal government for listing the species under the federal *Species at Risk Act*.

We are encouraged that NPC has listened well to caribou harvesters and others who urged them to take the opportunity to be cautious and take care of caribou and crucial caribou habitats through actions led by and for the people of Nunavut, who are supported by caribou harvesters across the caribou ranges. But until a Plan is finalized and approved, the wishes repeatedly expressed by Nunavummiut and others for sound land use management will not be implemented. A finalized land use plan is needed to provide much-needed guidelines and a proactive process to address concerns and reduce conflicts, and to include opportunities for making changes in future using new information through amendments and periodic reviews. Decisions made now can and will be re-evaluated in future and revised if warranted.

We are hopeful that Nunavut’s first territory-wide land use plan will be finalized, approved and implemented as soon as possible following the upcoming regional public hearings.

3 Specific Comments and Recommendations

A summary of recommendations from the BQCMB is provided as Appendix A.

3.1 Caribou – Calving Areas, Post-Calving Areas, Key Access Corridors

Reference in DNLUP

2.2.1 Caribou Calving Areas (p. 17); Map A2; and Table 2, Map Table 2 (p. 55)

2.2.2 Caribou Post-Calving Areas (p. 18); Map A2; and Table 2, Map Table 2 (p. 55)

2.2.3 Caribou Key Access Corridors (p. 18); Map A2; and Table 2, Map Table 2 (p. 55)

Comment

The BQCMB supports the following recommendations outlined in the 2021 DNLUP for calving areas, post-calving areas and key access corridors:

- Limited Use designations
- Prohibitions of incompatible land uses
- Seasonal restrictions on land uses

We have recommended some additions and revisions (see below).

Prohibitions of incompatible land uses - At a minimum, prohibition of incompatible land uses from calving grounds, post-calving areas and key freshwater crossings should be maintained through the NLUP. (See related recommendations under “Existing Rights” below.)

However, there is a risk associated with attempting any list of specific types of prohibited land uses that may be recognized as potential threats to caribou habitat based on knowledge and experience at a given point in time, particularly since different types of commercial development will likely be proposed once Nunavut develops more infrastructure and greater accessibility to currently remote

areas, possibly facilitated by new roads or perhaps other development not yet contemplated seriously (e.g., airships). An example of potential development that would not be addressed by the current list of prohibited land uses would be facilities and infrastructure proposed in caribou calving and post-calving habitat or at a major caribou freshwater crossing to promote and support aurora tourism and/or wildlife viewing, which have occurred in other jurisdictions (e.g., national parks in southern Canada). We are also mindful that it may be more difficult to expand lists of prohibitions later (such as when NPC's first periodic review is started 7 years after the first plan is approved) to account for specific uses not currently recognized as potential threats to caribou, than to be more comprehensive in the first Plan.

Therefore we believe a more general prohibition should be added now to address additional potential threats to caribou habitat and reduce the need for additions of prohibitions on specific land uses in future.

Seasonal restrictions on land uses - We note that the time periods specified for seasonal restrictions for calving areas/key access corridors and post-calving areas overlap significantly, and that the end-dates for restrictions in these two types of seasonal ranges for each herd are identical. We understand that the dates have been determined through analysis of movements of collared caribou, and we assume they represent the "immediate post-calving period". The BQCMB defines the post-calving period for the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq herds much more broadly, meaning the Board's definition would extend several weeks later, into late July.

We urge NPC to consider the time periods shown as a minimum, and to not shorten the period during which seasonal restrictions would be applied.

Recommendations

The BQCMB recommends for calving areas, post-calving areas and key access corridors:

- Maintaining Limited Use designations.
- Including the prohibitions of incompatible land uses as described, with addition of prohibitions on the following uses: "permanent facilities and infrastructure other than those supporting research related to caribou conservation"
- Including the seasonal restrictions on land uses as indicated, with dates and geographic areas subject to updating at a minimum, for each 10-year Plan review. We urge NPC to consider the time periods shown for post-calving areas as a minimum, and not shorten the period during which seasonal restrictions would be applied.

3.2 Caribou - Freshwater Crossings

Reference in DNLUP

2.2.4 Caribou Freshwater Crossings (p. 18); Map A2

Comment

The BQCMB supports the following recommendations outlined in the 2021 DNLUP for caribou freshwater crossings:

- Limited Use designations for crossings identified on Map A
- Prohibitions of incompatible land uses

We have recommended some additions and revisions (see below).

We note several issues and inconsistencies related to freshwater crossings identified for caribou:

- Prohibitions will apply to only some freshwater crossings, namely those identified on Map A which are designated as Limited Use areas. In contrast, freshwater crossings identified on Map B will be VECs and not subject to prohibitions. However:
 - o there does not seem to be a rationale or criteria described for how decisions are made to determine in which category identified crossings are placed, and
 - o there is no map showing freshwater crossings identified as VECs provided in the 2021 DNLUP Map B appendix.
- Seasonal restrictions on land uses that are proposed for calving areas, post-calving areas and key access corridors are not included for freshwater crossings. Therefore these restrictions would not apply for projects when they are within 10 km of freshwater crossings identified on Map A. This is problematic for several reasons that include the following.
 - o This decision is not logical, given that freshwater crossings and the land within 10 km of those areas provide equally important habitat for caribou during calving and post-calving periods as the land surrounding them.
 - o When LU-designated crossings are part of or immediately next to areas shown as calving areas, post-calving areas and key access corridors on Map A2, a patchwork of restriction requirements will exist.

Recommendations

The BQCMB recommends for caribou freshwater crossings:

- a) For all freshwater crossings identified on Map A
 - Maintain Limited Use designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses
 - Add prohibitions on the following incompatible land use for crossings that are part of, or immediately adjacent to calving areas, post-calving areas and key access corridors: "permanent facilities and infrastructure other than those supporting research related to caribou conservation". (See rationale provided under Sec. 2.1 above.)
 - Add the same seasonal restrictions on land use as those proposed for calving areas, post-calving areas and key access corridors.
- b) For other identified freshwater crossings:
 - Describe the rationale for designating freshwater crossings as LU (Map A) vs. VEC (Map B).
 - Include a map showing crossings identified as VECs in the final 2021 NLUP

- Add specific minimum mitigation requirements that would apply as conformity requirements for crossings identified as VECs

3.3 Caribou – Other Seasonal Ranges

Reference in DNLUP

2.2.6 Other Seasonal Ranges (p. 19); Maps B1.2-1.5

Comment

The BQCMB is glad to see that caribou rutting areas, migration corridors, summer range and late summer range and winter range are all assigned a designation as VECs, and supports adding this information about caribou winter range so that project proponents and the NIRB are aware that these areas may be used by caribou during the winter period. The BQCMB supports this approach in principle but believes clearer and more detailed direction for managing land use activities and conformity requirements for project proposals located in these areas should be provided in the NLUP. We have recommended one addition (see below).

Recommendations

- Maintain designations of all 4 range types as VECs: rutting areas, migration corridors, summer and late summer areas, winter ranges
- Add specific minimal mitigation requirements in the NLUP that would apply as conformity requirements to project proposals located in seasonal habitats designated as VECs. NPC could work with NIRB and GN to develop these requirements.

3.4 Conservation Areas

Reference in DNLUP

3.2.1 Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary (p. 28); Map A2

3.2.2 Migratory Bird Sanctuaries - Queen Maud Gulf (p. 28); Map A2

3.2.5 National Historic Sites – Fall Caribou Crossing (p. 29); Map A2

3.2.7 Canadian Heritage Rivers – Thelon and Kazan (p. 30); Map A2

Comment

The BQCMB agrees with designating existing conservation areas as Limited Use Areas and supports designations for conservation areas that help to protect key Beverly and Qamanirjuaq caribou habitat from the negative impacts of land use activities. We have recommended one addition each for the Queen Maud Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary and the Fall Caribou Crossing National Historic Site to ensure better protection for additional key caribou seasonal range in that area (see below).

Recommendations

Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary - Maintain Limited Use designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses.

Queen Maud Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary

- Maintain Limited Use designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses.
- Extend Limited Use designation and prohibitions to additional caribou habitat identified as “key habitat site” to east of MBS as recommended by local Inuit in their request for conversion of the MBS to a National Wildlife Area.

Fall Caribou Crossing National Historic Site (Kazan River)

- Maintain Limited Use designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses.
- Add seasonal restrictions for most activities (similar to restrictions currently proposed for calving, post-calving and key access corridors) for a specified “fall” time period based on caribou telemetry data and Indigenous Knowledge.

Thelon and Kazan Canadian Heritage Rivers - Maintain Limited Use designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses for the areas identified in the heritage river management plans.

3.5 Mineral Potential

Reference in DNLUP

5.1 Mineral Potential (p. 40); Map B2.11

Comment

The BQCMB agrees that areas with evidence for mineral potential should be identified as Valued Socio-Economic Components in the NLUP.

Recommendation

The BQCMB recommends maintaining:

- identification of areas with evidence for mineral potential as Valued Socio-Economic Components
- Limited Use designation of calving grounds, post-calving areas, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings regardless of their known mineral potential.

3.6 Transportation and Communications

Reference in DNLUP

5.3.1 Terrestrial Linear Infrastructure (p. 41); Map A2; Map B2.13

5.3.1-1 Plan Requirements for Kivalliq-Manitoba Linear Infrastructure Corridor (p. 41)

Reference in O&R

5.3.2.1.6 Policy Options for Terrestrial Transportation and Communications (pp. 394-399)

5.3.2.1.7 NPC Recommendation – LU/VSEC (pp. 399-400)

Comment

The BQCMB disagrees with the proposed Kivalliq-Manitoba Linear Infrastructure Corridor (KMLIC) designation as a Limited Use (LU) area that takes priority over all other land use designations with which it overlaps, including LU designations proposed to protect caribou calving areas, post-calving areas, key access corridors and freshwater crossings. Our understanding is that NPC is proposing that through the NLUP the following land use activities, which are explicitly prohibited in LU areas for caribou calving areas, post-calving areas, key access corridors and freshwater crossings, would **not be prohibited** in the KMLIC where it overlaps with caribou LU areas:

- (c) quarries;
- (d) hydro-electrical and related infrastructure;
- (e) wind turbines for electrical generation that are over 15 m in height and related infrastructure;
- and
- (f) linear infrastructure.

Our interpretation is that when other linear infrastructure project proposals in areas of LU designated caribou habitat are submitted to NPC, they will need to apply for Plan amendments and fulfill extensive information requirements as detailed by NPC in Sec. 6.1.5.1 (p. 46). However, a project submitted within the KMLIC will not need to go through this process if the corridor is established as proposed and the project fulfills other conformity requirements. This does not appear to be transparent or in the best interests of caribou or Nunavummiut.

We note that:

- Direction that the KMLIC LU would over-ride LU prohibitions established to protect caribou in explicitly stated in the Options and Recommendations (O&R) document (pp. 399-400) but not in the 2021 DNLUP main document.
- It is unclear whether the seasonal restrictions for activities in LU areas designated for caribou calving areas, post-calving areas, and key access corridors would continue to apply within the KMLIC or not.
- The DNLUP provides no direction for any supplementary actions to be taken to protect caribou habitat in this proposed designated corridor.

What we believe this will mean for Qamanirjuaq calving area, post-calving areas and key access corridors, is that despite their LU designations intended to protect caribou habitat, areas of important and sensitive caribou habitat inside the corridor will have no protection through the NLUP from incompatible land use activities associated with whatever linear infrastructure project occurs there. This could include construction of roads and whatever other permanent facilities and infrastructure are required to support “the construction and use of the corridor” (O&R p. 400). We find this vague description concerning.

Community support for a linear infrastructure projects between Manitoba and Nunavut - The BQCMB acknowledges that some support has been indicated from Kivalliq communities for Kivalliq-Manitoba linear infrastructure project proposals, including the previous Manitoba-Kivalliq road project proposal and the Kivalliq Hydro Fibre Link currently being promoted by the Kivalliq Inuit Association.

BQCMB's understanding based on the information presented in the O&R document is that NPC's decision to include the KMLIC in the 2021 DNLUP is not based on comprehensive discussions about any specific project proposal with Kivalliq communities. As described in the O&R (p. 397):

"In 2020, Arviat, Whale Cove and Rankin Inlet residents generally indicated support for the Kivalliq-Manitoba Road irrespective of its route through caribou post-calving habitat, if special conditions were applied. These conditions were not specified."

We note that:

- the support cited by NPC is for a road, which is not the project currently being proposed;
- conditional support was indicated for the portion of the road corridor proposed in the southern Kivalliq, which would cross post-calving areas, but also key access corridors and fresh-water crossings; but no support has been indicated for the northern portion of the proposed road corridor, which would cross substantial portions of calving and post-calving habitat and major fresh-water crossings; and
- conditions for protecting caribou habitat apparently were not discussed or investigated further by NPC.

Regardless, this was used by the NPC in their rationale for their proposed land use designation for the KMLIC (O&R pp. 399-400):

". . .communities and participants demonstrated great support for the development of the Kivalliq-Manitoba linear infrastructure corridor. In order to achieve the supports for the road, the NPC recommends a LU designation for the corridor with prohibition of uses that may be incompatible with the development of the road. In addition, it is recommended that this LU designation take priority over other overlapping designations to meet community infrastructure requirements. . ."

It is not clear what "In order to achieve the supports for the road" means exactly.

The BQCMB has also heard from some Kivalliq community representatives, and they have indicated that their support for any linear infrastructure project crossing Qamanirjuaq caribou calving and post-calving areas would involve making sure that such a project does not harm caribou and other wildlife. BQCMB board members from other regions have also indicated that the communities they represent are concerned about potential impacts of such a project on caribou and other wildlife that are essential to maintenance of their Dene, Cree and Metis cultures. This is consistent with the message for conditional support that Kivalliq residents gave to NPC in 2020, and strongly suggests that more discussion is needed.

Existing vs. potential projects – We consider the KMLI Corridor to be a proposed designation without a project, or at best a designation for a *potential project* because:

- no detailed project description has been provided,
- a route assessment of the complete corridor from Manitoba to 5 Kivalliq communities based on current information, including caribou seasonal range use, has not been conducted,
- ways to minimize crossing of key calving and post-calving caribou habitat and mitigate potential project effects on caribou have not been presented or discussed publicly with all potentially affected communities (both inside and outside Nunavut), governments or the BQCMB, and
- not even a tentative plan for avoiding significant impacts and cumulative impacts on the

Qamanirjuaq caribou herd has been formulated to our knowledge.

BQCMB perspective - The BQCMB believes it is premature to indicate any corridor for either a road or a hydro-fibre line when neither project has been formally described or proposed. In general, the BQCMB believes it would be more practical and transparent to wait until the first Plan review to designate such a linear infrastructure corridor with greater certainty. We encourage NPC to identify the KMLIC as a Valued Socio-Economic Component along with other potential terrestrial infrastructure on Map B for the first NLUP. This would be consistent with the GN's 2016 recommendation for "proposed, conceptual corridors" (O&R 5.3.2.1.6.4, p. 399).

All potential linear infrastructure projects should be initially prohibited in LU areas designated for calving grounds, post-calving areas, key access corridors and freshwater crossings through the NLUP. If and when a proposed project with a realistic infrastructure corridor is ready for rigorous review in future, an application for a Plan amendment could be submitted, or a corridor could be added to the Plan following review of the first Plan, which is scheduled to begin 7 years after the first generation Plan is approved (Sec. 6.1.6, p. 47).

Based on the limited information provided in the DNLUP documents, it appears to the BQCMB that infrastructure development is being prioritized over caribou and other important related considerations (such as food security) for building healthy communities, prior to a comprehensive discussion with Kivalliq communities and others. The BQCMB does not believe this is consistent with the NPC's stated planning policies, objectives and goals.

If the NPC decides to proceed with inclusion of a KMLIC in the first NLUP, we encourage consideration of the following issues and inconsistencies:

- As stated in the DNLUP, "there is considerable uncertainty in predicting the most appropriate siting for linear infrastructure" (p. 41). There would be additional uncertainty associated with designating the KMLIC using a route that appears to be based on a different project (i.e., the Manitoba-Kivalliq road). Furthermore, the route indicated between Rankin Inlet and Baker Lake is particularly problematic, as does not appear to give consideration to Qamanirjuaq caribou or their crucial calving and post-calving habitat, but instead is a straight-line shortest distance route between these communities. We wonder how realistic that would be from many perspectives, including engineering and geomorphological.
- On Map A2, the proposed Kivalliq-Manitoba linear infrastructure corridor appears to be double the width of the Mary River-Milne Inlet infrastructure corridor, meaning greater area from which prohibitions for protection of key caribou habitat have been. What is the justification for that discrepancy?

Recommendations

Option 1 (Preferred):

- Remove LU designation for corridor from 2021 DNLUP
- Identify KMLIC with other potential linear infrastructure corridors as a VESC on Map B2.13

- If and when a project proposal is received by NPC, conduct conformity determination and determine that a Plan amendment is required prior to determination that project conforms to NLUP.

Option 2:

- Maintain a LU designation for a potential linear infrastructure but remove the provision allowing this corridor to over-ride the prohibition of linear infrastructure for caribou seasonal ranges with Limited Use designation without applying any measures for protection of caribou habitat to apply as conformity requirements.
- Add a requirement to change the corridor routing to avoid calving areas, post-calving areas, key access corridors and areas within 10 km of identified freshwater crossings as much as possible. Include in this requirement a rigorous route assessment for the portion of the routing from Rankin Inlet to Baker Lake for alternative routing farther north with intent to avoid calving areas and most post-calving habitat, with consideration given to a routing from Chesterfield Inlet to Baker Lake instead of Rankin Inlet-Baker Lake.
- Add specific minimum mitigation requirements that would apply as conformity requirements for any caribou seasonal range LU areas that a final selected corridor routing crosses.

3.7 Implementation – Existing Rights

Reference in DNLUP

6. 1.8 Existing Rights (p. 47-48); Appendix A

Comment

Our understanding of NPC’s proposal is that previously approved projects with existing mineral rights identified in an updated Appendix A to the finalized NLUP will be “exempt from prohibitions on mineral exploration and production in LU areas when the project undergoes significant modification . . . if the project remains within the same footprint.”

The BQCMB and the caribou harvesters it represents have consistently recommended, over many years, that mineral exploration and development activities in Nunavut be allowed only outside core calving grounds, post-calving areas and key water crossings. The Board believes it is reasonable to request that this position be accommodated through the Nunavut land use plan, since this approach would still allow these land use activities to occur across most of Nunavut.

The BQCMB is very concerned about the proposal to provide all existing rights for mineral exploration and development with an exemption from prohibitions otherwise applied through Limited Use designations for these sensitive caribou habitats. There is considerable uncertainty associated with this exemption as well, which we do not find appropriate for a land use plan meant to provide guidance and reduce land use conflicts. Sources of uncertainty for the BQCMB include:

- It is not clear whether this exemption would also apply to proposed seasonal restrictions on most land uses in these areas.
- The exemption from prohibitions appears to be proposed for all projects with existing rights, no matter what stage of the mining cycle they are currently in, what other alternatives might

be discussed (e.g., for projects with low investment or resource potential), or how much it might cost for compensation if it was possible to negotiate removal of those rights.

- It is stated that the rights that exist when the land use plan is approved will be recognized, but how information in the list and map in Appendix A will be incorporated into the final Plan up until that time is not described.
- Allowing rights to continue to be granted until some future unspecified date provides much uncertainty about how many new rights might be granted in the interim (especially with the on-line staking now available), which raises concern about what portion of caribou seasonal range LU areas on Map A which are theoretically protected for caribou will actually have prohibitions applied.
- A statement is made that Plan amendments may be conducted “from time to time to update Appendix A” (p. 48) because of the fluid nature of areas with existing rights. However, what threshold will be used for the amount of change required to initiate an amendment for this reason is not indicated.

As a result of this uncertainty and other related factors, the BQCMB will likely provide additional comments concerning this issue during and after the Public Hearing.

Recommendations

- Allowing for grandfathering of all mineral tenures to full mine development should not be implemented through the NLUP, and other approaches should continue to be investigated.
- NPC should specify deadlines for new tenures to be added to the list of “existing rights” in advance of finalizing the first and subsequent versions of the NLUP to ensure complete information is contained in approval plans, add certainty for all parties and reduce speculative applications for invalid reasons.

Appendix A. Summary of BQCMB Recommendations in Response to 2021 DNLUP¹

Geographic Area or Topic	Proposed Designation	BQCMB Recommendations
Seasonal Caribou Habitats		
2.2.1 Calving areas (Map A2 #25)	Limited Use	1) Maintain LU designation, year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses and condition for seasonal prohibitions of most activities as described ² with time periods specified by herd.
2.2.2 Post-calving areas (Map A2 #26)		2) Add year-round prohibition of "permanent facilities and infrastructure other than those supporting research related to caribou conservation".
2.2.3 Key access corridors (Map A2 #24)		3) Add requirement to regularly update time periods for seasonal restrictions with new telemetry data, and consider the time periods currently used for post-calving areas as a minimum.
2.2.4 Freshwater crossings (Map A2 #27)	Limited Use	1) Maintain LU designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses
		2) Add year-round prohibition of "permanent facilities and infrastructure other than those supporting research related to caribou conservation".
		3) Add seasonal restrictions for most activities (as per restrictions currently proposed for calving, post-calving and key access corridors).
2.2.4 Freshwater crossings (Map B?)	Valued Ecosystem Component	1) Describe rationale for designations for freshwater crossings as LU (Map A) vs. VEC (Map B).
		2) Include a map showing crossings identified as VECs in the final 2021 NLUP
		3) Add specific minimum mitigation requirements that would apply as conformity requirements for VECs
2.2.6 Other seasonal ranges (Maps B1.2 – B1.5)	Valued Ecosystem Component	1) Maintain identification of all 4 range types as VECs: rutting areas, migration corridors, summer and late summer areas, winter ranges
		2) Add specific minimum mitigation requirements that would apply as conformity requirements for VECs
Conservation Areas in Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Habitat		
3.2.1 Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary (Map A2 #51)	Limited Use	Maintain LU designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses
3.2.2 Queen Maud Gulf Migratory Bird Sanctuary	Limited Use	1) Maintain LU designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses
		2) Extend LU designation and prohibitions to additional caribou

¹ Please refer to main document for complete recommendations and their rationale.

² All uses except research and tourism related to caribou conservation.

Geographic Area or Topic	Proposed Designation	BQCMB Recommendations
<i>(Map A2 #58)</i>		habitat identified as “key habitat site” to east of MBS as recommended by local Inuit in their request for conversion of the MBS to a National Wildlife Area
3.2.5 Fall Caribou Crossing National Historic Site (Kazan River) <i>(Map A2 #69)</i>	Limited Use	<p>1) Maintain LU designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses</p> <p>2) Add seasonal restrictions for most activities (similar to restrictions currently proposed for calving, post-calving and key access corridors) for a specified “fall” time period based on caribou telemetry data and Indigenous Knowledge.</p>
3.2.7 Thelon and Kazan Canadian Heritage Rivers <i>(Map A2 #79)</i>	Limited Use	Maintain LU designation and year-round prohibition of 6 types of incompatible land uses
Other Considerations in Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Habitat		
5.1 Mineral Potential <i>(Map B2.11)</i>	Valued Socio-Economic Components	<p>1) Maintain identification of areas with evidence for mineral potential as VSECs.</p> <p>2) Maintain Limited Use designation of calving grounds, post-calving areas, key access corridors, and freshwater crossings regardless of their known mineral potential.</p>
5.3.1 Kivalliq-Manitoba linear infrastructure corridor <i>(Map A2 #93)</i>	Limited Use (with priority over all overlapping designations)	<p>Do NOT support LU designation that takes priority over all LU designations for caribou seasonal ranges where it overlaps</p> <p>EITHER:</p> <p>1) Remove LU designation for corridor, include KMLIC as VESC on Map B and conduct conformity determination when a project proposal is received OR</p> <p>2) Remove provision for over-riding all other designations and provide additional requirement for actions to be taken to protect caribou seasonal range LU areas</p>
6.1.8 Existing Mineral Rights <i>(Appendix A)</i>	Projects identified in Appendix A will be exempt from prohibitions in LU areas	<p>Do NOT support unmitigated exemption from prohibitions that applies generally in all cases in caribou seasonal ranges with LU designation</p> <p>1) Continue investigating options for more flexible management of this issue</p> <p>2) Specify deadlines for new tenures to be added to the list of “existing rights” in advance of finalizing the first and subsequent versions of the NLUP</p>