

NUNAVUT PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 2016 DRAFT NUNAVUT LAND USE PLAN



PRE-HEARING WRITTEN SUBMISSION

Filed by:
Marla Limousin, Senior Administrative Officer
January 13th, 2017

Submission for the Public Hearing on the 2016 Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan

1/13/2017

1 Background and Objectives

This submission is based on the discussions of Cambridge Bay attendees that took place during the pre-hearing meetings of the NPC in the community of Cambridge Bay. The submission is based on the collective information that has been obtained through the comments of the Municipal Council and the HTO.

2 General Comments and Recommendations

The group realizes that the task of developing a Nunavut Land Use Plan is challenging work. The desire to create a “made in Nunavut” plan that would respond to a large geographical area with multiple stakeholders and differing opinions is a daunting task and the group commends the NPC for creating a the foundation for a sound document.

In addition, the group would like to comment that they recognize that it is an incredibly challenging task to create a Plan that is balanced. The challenge to preserve renewable resources but allow development in a resource rich territory with little current opportunity for employment is daunting and challenging.

With respect to the document, the DNLUP is a well-structured, clear and concise plan.

3 Quality of the Planning Process

The group indicated that the timeline for providing input after the Pre Hearing was too short and that the January 13, 2017 deadline was not enough time to allow for Community Consultation. Since the Plan had major changes between the 2014 and 2016 versions, when the Plan was presented at the Pre Hearing to the community, there was not enough time to really reach a consensus. When asked at the Pre Hearing if the deadline could be changed, the NPC insisted that there was no other choice and that the January 13, 2017 deadline would have to be met.

In cases where a community, community organization or community participant were unable to provide a written submission to NPC, this should not preclude their ability to provide oral comments at the public hearing as a participant. At the Regional Pre Hearing, several members were of the impression that they were there to provide comment, but when doing so, they were told these comments would have to be submitted in a formal document. Currently, the Rules of Procedure for Public Hearings and Public Reviews (Rules) and the Direction on Procedure distributed on October 7th are unclear on whether community participants that do not provide written submissions can make oral submissions at the final hearing on any topic. The ability for Inuit to provide oral submissions without constraint is a key obligation for the public hearing in the Nunavut Agreement. Many communities do not have the capacity to orchestrate such a

response and it should have remained in the mandate of the NPC to allow for alternative methods of responding outside of a very formal process.

At the Cambridge Bay session, it was clear that NPC's expectations of the five community participants from each community were that the NPC expects these participants to organize community meetings, facilitate the community and provide NPC with a written submission of community views. It would also expect the group to provide a final written submission to NPC by January 13, 2017 in four languages. Of course with no resources to assist us we are not able to meet that requirement.

The comments we present in Section 3 are the summary of comments that were gathered while around the table at the Pre Hearing with the 5 participant, gathered during Hamlet Council discussions regarding the NLUP and a final follow up with the participants to confirm that the issues in this document are in fact correct.

3 Specific Comments and Recommendations

- Issue 1 It is believed that the NLUP does not provide a balance between Economic Development opportunity, Conservation and Environmental Protection.
- Issue 2 The NLUP could be considered a blanket Land Use Plan. There is no accounting for the individuality of the Regional needs and priorities. Because of this, it is believed that the NLUP would have long term negative effect on the community residents and community development.
- Issue 3 Sometime between 2014 and 2016, the NLUP changed the designation of caribou habitat from "Special Management Areas" to "Prohibited and Protected". The data for the Plan does not include any scientific evidence that links caribou decline with resource development when development is done correctly. This would be compromising the potential for development of other opportunities while not contributing to better caribou management measures.
- Issue 4 The caribou migration route of caribou is not a consistent route. Request that maps are changed to reflect the new migration route as expressed at the Breakout session of the Cambridge Bay Pre Hearing.
- Issue 5 In the Kitikmeot Region, the Gray's Bay Road Project has extraordinary potential to create sound economic development for the residents. Under this NLUP, the Grays Bay Project would not conform and would not be able to proceed without a request for exemption and Ministerial intervention.
- Issue 6 The protocols on marine transportation are already a solid process under Transport Canada, Northern Marine Services. Transport Canada has the expertise in this regard and should be the lead agency for marine traffic in the north.

- Issue 7 Restrictions on marine shipping and activity are subject to seasons and locations. Emergency responses from entities such as Coast Guard or Search and Rescue could be jeopardized.
- Issue 8 The concept of a bridge over the ice breaker route, to facilitate the movement of mammal and man, does not seem a likely concept for our changing environment.
- Issue 9 We recognize that the NLUP is a living document as a Plan always is. Within the framework, there needs to be a mechanism that creates a process for timely review and updates to respond to the changing and evolving Territory.

In light of our comments and in light of the Regional vision for our community, we cannot support the document as it stands at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our Issues. We look forward to more consultation and resolution in the next draft.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Municipality of Cambridge Bay and the Hunter Trappers Organization

Marla Limousin
Senior Administrative Officer