

## Written Questions to the Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC)

March 7, 2017

### Submitted by Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. (NTI), Kitikmeot Inuit Association, Kivalliq Inuit Association and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association

1. Inuit have always stressed the importance of consultation throughout the entire land use planning process. NTI and the Regional Inuit Associations (RIAs) have repeatedly asked that the DNLUP 2016 be brought back to communities for their review and feedback. The Regional Sessions in the Fall of 2016 were a start to consultations. However, as community participants were not provided further financial or logistical supports, in many cases, community participants were unable to disseminate information about the DNLUP 2016 in their communities. Pertaining to this issue, NTI and the RIAs have the following questions:
  - What evidence does NPC have that community participants who attended the Regional Sessions were able to disseminate information on the DNLUP 2016 in their communities after the Regional Sessions?
  - What evidence does NPC have that communities understand the content of the DNLUP 2016 and the implications of proposed designations on their Inuit Owned Lands (IOLs) and surrounding lands affecting their communities?
  - What evidence does NPC have that Inuit and residents from each community support the proposed designations adjacent to their communities?
  - In cases where communities do not have an adequate understanding of the content of the DNLUP 2016 or the proposed designations to provide informed feedback, what steps will NPC take to correct this situation?
2. Can community participants ask questions of NPC at the regional hearings regarding the content of the DNLUP 2016, or the land use planning process, regardless of whether they have provided those questions in writing to NPC in advance?
3. Can NPC assure participants that the Nunavut Land Use Plan (NLUP) will include a commitment by NPC to complete a public review of the NLUP between five to ten years from the time the NLUP first comes into effect? If not, what are NPC's concerns regarding providing this commitment?

4. Has NPC inadvertently included subsurface IOL parcels in Migratory Bird Protected Area designations that are intended to be marine designations? The question is specific to the following Migratory Bird Protected Areas:
  - #2 Bathurst/Elu Inlets
  - #18 Belcher Islands Polynyas
  - #19 Buchan Gulf
  - #20 Cape Searle/Reid Bay
  - #33 Markham Bay
  
5. Can NPC provide evidence of community support for the new proposed Migratory Bird Protected Areas? The transcripts of the Regional Community Meetings that took place in the Fall of 2016 do not show that communities provided any feedback on the proposed designations.
  
6. Can NPC further elaborate on the reasoning for not establishing Special Management Area for polar bear denning areas with terms and conditions to protect denning sites? Can NPC explain why the Government of Nunavut submission (2016) and the joint submission of NTI and the RIAs (2016) regarding the establishment of Special Management Areas for polar bear denning areas were omitted from the Options and Recommendations document?
  
7. As documented by Qikiqtaaluk Wildlife Board in its January 2017 submission, there is existing information (Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit) on important caribou areas in the Qikiqtani. What steps will NPC take to create designations for significant caribou areas in the Qikiqtani region based on available information?
  
8. Can NPC provide the rationale for a 10 km year round buffer for caribou fresh water crossings? NPC's Options and Recommendations document does not mention or discuss the appropriate distance of buffers for caribou fresh water crossings or seasonal requirements?
  
9. Can NPC provide the rationalization for excluding all vessels at any time of the year within 5 km of walrus haul-out protected areas? More information is needed on the rationalization for a year round prohibition of vessels in the Options and Recommendations document.

10. Can NPC provide evidence of community support for the Historic Site Protected Areas?  
The transcripts of the Regional Community Meetings that took place in the Fall of 2016 do not show that communities provided any feedback on the proposed designations.
11. Can the NPC provide a further explanation for not including Corbett Inlet and the two Naujaat Areas as Community Areas of Interest? Corbett Inlet was proposed within the Kivalliq Wildlife Board submission and the Naujaat areas were proposed by the Arviq HTO?
12. Can NPC explain the rationalization for proposing that Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy be designated as Protected Areas when Makivik Corporation, NTI and QIA have indicated that this designation is premature and that it is unclear whether this designation is supported by the communities? Can the Options and Recommendations document be updated to include the designation preferences and reasoning of the Makivik Corporation, NTI and QIA?
13. Can NPC explain the rationalization for not creating Special Management Areas for linear infrastructure corridors? Additionally, why does the Options and Recommendations document at Sections 5.5 and 5.5.1 on Transportation Corridors not reflect submissions from the Kivalliq Inuit Association, NTI, the Government of Canada and other participants regarding linear infrastructure?
14. For waste sites and north warning system sites (#83-98 and #106-135 Schedule A, Table 1) that specify a reduction in the land area once sites are cleaned-up or remediated, what does NPC propose as the process to reduce the size of these Special Management Areas once sites are deemed to be cleaned-up? Will government departments responsible for sites be requested to inform NPC and other interested parties in writing when sites are cleaned-up?
15. What are the next steps in the land use planning process envisioned by NPC after the regional hearings? Please specify all steps from closing the hearing(s) to the expected acceptance of the final plan.