

Summer 2007 Communication Log

Date	Contact	Organization	Results / Decision
Sept. 5/07	Robert Chapple	CGS, GN	Emailed him to establish contact to discuss planning issues, working together, request plans and contacts. He responded and we set up a call for Friday Sept. 7.
Sept. 7/07	Robert Chapple	CGS, GN	<p>Bob forwarded 2 documents giving the status of community plans and bylaws, as well as their current distribution list. He later followed up with a list of people from his department he wants us to keep in contact with (at my request). He requested a copy of our distribution list when we're done so we are talking to the same people. Some of their plans are older. They are in the process of reviewing and prioritizing work. Baffin plans are moving as they have consultants and some planning techs working on them. Cheryl Selig is the new community planner for the Kitikmeot region in Cambridge Bay. David Boyle is the Kivalliq community planner in Rankin Inlet. The Baffin planners are Adule Chris (community planner) and Terry Girouard (planning technician) in Cape Dorset. Small communities (400-600 people) have "Land Use Plans". They are adopted by resolution and serve as guidelines for community development. Larger communities have Community Plans, which are adopted as a formal by-law with legal force. Bob will forward a few updated plans or bring some with him on his next visit.</p> <p>NPC and CGS have historically had an understanding that where CGS is planning for activities within municipal areas that affect lands outside community boundaries they would consult us and vice versa. They drafted language about that for legislation talks. We are both happy with this. I told him about recent changes to 11.4.1(a) requested by GN to remove this wording. He will follow up with GN as this should stand.</p> <p>I asked about Nanisivik. There is no plan and no municipal boundary defined there. Nothing has been happening so it hasn't been a big deal. Land ownership/responsibility is very unclear – there is a block land transfer (GN), mine site under lease to the company, road (INAC responsibility). This may be an issue with federal plans to build a deep sea port there.</p> <p>Many of the communities have lots of room for expansion within municipal boundaries but it's not all developable land, and their expansion room is limited by water (all coastal communities). In some cases the developable land is outside community boundaries. To use it requires setting up "satellite communities" with new costs for infrastructure, etc. Not easily done. Issues for us are more related to building "roads to nowhere" outside community boundaries, sewage and other infrastructure. They rely on the community engineers to identify these locations. Kivalliq region have identified plans to connect all the communities by road (Dept. of transportation). Mining will also affect them. E.g. around Baker Lake, they want a road from the mine site to the community, if the mine site is within BLT, then it's a lease, impacts on</p>

Summer 2007 Communication Log

			<p>community infrastructure, etc. Another issue is that current hamlets may be working off a different vision than that presented in current plans (as councils change, they tend to change community priorities) so hamlets may have different plans than are reflected in current community plans.</p> <p>I asked about getting community boundary information. Bob has a pdf he can send me. Otherwise the cadastral data for BLTs, municipal boundaries comes from NRCAN in YK (autocad). There are 8 communities where the BLTs do not match the municipal boundaries. Some mun. boundaries include crown land, IOL, some BLTs are bigger than municipal boundaries. Contacts are Andrew Bredner, Travis Sandeski and Bill Cruise (main contacts), and Lauren McNeese (Head of Division). Once land is surveyed, it transfers from commissioners land to hamlet jurisdiction, except reserve lands (water and 100 ft buffer) which is still federal. Small "puddles" have presented a problem because they are federal lands and lots of red tape, even though they may be man made from culverts.</p> <p>I outlined our process and our needs to collect input on issues, vision and goals. For them, that means things affecting lands outside community boundaries. We don't need to see all the plans, we just need to be informed about those things outside communities, identifying which communities need more expansion room, which have infrastructure needs, etc.</p> <p>Bob is coming to Cam Bay Sept. 19-21. We will set up a meeting for the afternoon of Sept. 19, with me and Mike Townsend, Bob and Cheryl. We can go through a few plans and identify the best way to get this information into our planning process. I forwarded him a copy of our scoping document.</p> <p>I called John. He has no questions or comments yet. He hasn't read through the scoping document fully yet but will get back to me when he has. He's travelling next week and will contact me when he's back. He asked about the fall workshop. Their AGM is the third week of October. I told him we'd be scheduling the workshop for late November or December to avoid conflict with that.</p>
Sept. 20/07	Bob Chapple and Cheryl Selig	CGS, GN	<p>Mike Townsend and I met with Bob and Cheryl to discuss how to get information regarding activities or plans within municipal boundaries that will affect us. We looked at a few municipal boundaries and they are huge in comparison to the built-up area so there is plenty of room for expansion and to access the resources they need. All the areas within municipal boundaries outside the built up areas are just zoned as hinterland. Bob gave us a CD (to Mike) of BLTs and community boundaries in relation to current built-up areas. There are also IOLs within BLTs in some cases (e.g. Gjoa Haven). Cheryl or Bob will forward the website link to Mike where he can get the data he needs. Bob said the NLCA was all about community empowerment so they were</p>

Summer 2007 Communication Log

			<p>given access to large amounts of land and resources to empower them to manage themselves. There are a few areas to look for overlap – 12-1 exemption list and cumulative effects, water lakes, roads to nowhere, gravel resources, airports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Lakes: In Repulse Bay, the water lake is way outside the built-up area but still inside the municipal boundaries. Some communities may have to go outside their boundaries in the future for new water lakes. • Sewage lagoons, while inside boundaries, may impact lands outside municipal boundaries. • Roads: Coral Harbour has a road outside municipal boundaries and they keep adding to it. • Parks: Kimmirut has lands close to or within the built up area that were supposed to be established as a territorial park within 3 years of the signing of the NLCA or they revert to IOL. So NTI owns those lands which complicates things for them (not really relevant for us). • Gravel: Kugluktuk is looking for granular resources outside their boundaries. There are quarry sites everywhere, and they have not necessarily been well managed. One of CGS' projects is to identify quarry sites for communities but this hasn't happened yet. Bob Chapple will follow up on this. Discussed Coral Harbour's question on charging levies on gravel. Bob said this comes under the Commissioners Land Act but communities shouldn't charge for gravel – it just makes community development (like building houses) more expensive so less houses and infrastructure gets built. • Airports – Kimmirut and Pangnirtung want to move and expand their airports, but this should still be within municipal boundaries. Potential impacts from overflights? • Community Expansion: Pangnirtung is an example of a community with no building room as they are within a fjord. May have to go further to get what they need, but should still be within community boundaries, just outside built-up area. <p>Bob will enquire with his regional staff if there are any activities or plans within their municipal areas that will affect lands outside municipal boundaries that we need to be aware of and will forward a response to us. He'll also look at quarry sites to see if there is anything there we need to be aware of.</p> <p>Bob feels our main areas of coordination are consultations between us and them for activities within each other's jurisdiction as we've previously agreed to. They have the wording of our agreement in each of the community plans. This was developed with Michelle Bertol when she was with NPC. If activities come up that affect us, they are more than happy to forward that information to NPC and NIRB to ensure it is done properly.</p>
--	--	--	---

Summer 2007 Communication Log

			<p>They have agreement with NIRB with respect to exemptions and cumulative effects under Schedule 12-1. Bob will forward me all the related correspondence on this. I mentioned that we are transitioning that work between NIRB and Brian Aglukark at NPC so that NPC does that screening in the future.</p> <p>Bob asked us to keep him in the loop as the GN often overlooks CGS participation in planning. I followed up with him RE: action items by email.</p>
Sept. 28/07	Bob Chapple	CGS, GN	Received email providing feedback on CCCM website (data for Mike), info on climate change workshop, correspondence with NIRB on industrial activities and 12-1 exemptions, initiating work to identify quarry sites and other activities near or outside community boundaries that we need to address, converting community plans to pdf and will forward those to us when complete.
Oct. 2/07	Bob Chapple	CGS-GN	Emailed info from Baffin Community Planner. The only communities in the Baffin with development near community boundaries are Arctic Bay (existing road to Nanisivik but nothing new planned); and Clyde River (proposed road and bridge to Cape Christian Site).
Oct. 12/07	Bob Chapple	CGS, GN	Email from Bob Chapple (from Cheryl Selig originally) indicating that the only community with projects close to the boundaries is Kugluktuk, with quarry sites identified outside the community boundaries. A pdf map was included.