

## Master Comments from Government of Canada

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-1	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Ch. 1, 7	Terminology	A general comment that applies to a number of sections of the DNLUP, and mostly Chapters 1 and 7, is the use of a number of terms that are either: i) not defined; ii) appear to be interchangeable; iii) not consistent with those used in the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act; or iv) are simply unclear as to their meaning and application within the plan. It is imperative that the use of these terms are consistent throughout the document and do not differ from those used in governing documents and legislation (the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA) and NUPPAA). For example, the DNLUP's use of "Project" is inconsistent with NUPPAA, which refers to "Project Proposals". "Terms" is defined as "the set of administrative requirements" but the "administrative requirements" are not defined nor presented in the DNLUP. "Criteria" seems to be interchangeable with "terms" or at least is confusing as to the use and meaning.	NPC has gone through and revised terminology to ensure consistency throughout the document as well as with the NLCA and NUPPAA.		
GOC-2	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	1.3.1	Purpose of Plan	AANDC supports the findings and recommendations of the Independent Review of the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan (Independent Review) confirming that the overall "vision" and the purpose of the plan, as well as its intended effect must be better defined (see pgs. 73 -74 of the Independent Review). AANDC considers this to be a critical first step for the plan's revision.	The Commission believes that the steps for advancing the in plan and planning process are identified in the Recommendations of the Independent Third Party Review. The Commission has implemented all of the Recommendations identified in the ITPR. We note however that the Vision was not one of those key Recommendations. Regardless Chapter 1 provides the content to explain: "why the plan is needed, what it intends to accomplish, and how it will make a difference" in accordance with the ITPR comment.	AANDC and other Federal departments and agencies would welcome the opportunity to discuss the topic of a "vision" for the NLUP with NPC.	In the absence of clear feedback, NPC has considered revisions to the vision statement.
GOC-3	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	1.3.2		1.3.2 Methodology The methodology section needs strengthening to assist in the comprehension of the plan. As per the suggestions made in the Independent Review (pgs. 74-75), the following are some topics that should be discussed in the DNLUP: 1. Plan development process 2. Plan's role in the integrated regulatory system 3. Input received and how this input has been incorporated 4. Plan's approach to Permitted and Prohibited Uses (7.8), Land Use Designations and Recommendations and Generally Permitted Uses, and 5. Processes to be used for plan implementation and periodic review	The Plan has been revised to address the suggestions. Chapter 1 provides a more thought discussions of the plan development process, an integrated regulatory system. The land use designations have been simplified to focus on key areas of concern. The Implementation Strategy has been revised to provide a fulsome outline of the processes used to implement the Plan.	AANDC would welcome the opportunity to discuss this topic further with NPC. As contemplated in NUPPAA, AANDC sees the NLUP as crucial to enhancing the existing integrated regulatory system in Nunavut by providing an effective and certain regulatory regime. The effectiveness of the NLUP is dependent on the plan's consistency with legislation, its ability to clearly describe and inform users of conformity requirements and adequately incorporating concerns and values of Nunavut residents and stakeholders. The NLUP should provide an early filter (conformity determination phase) on project applications. When projects are found to be out of conformity with the plan these applications are stopped before the project screening phase.	NPC has revised the plan to ensure consistency with legislation in the NLUP.
GOC-4	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	1.3.2.2	Consultations	The first two paragraphs of this section do not belong in a land use plan. They do not add value to the objectives, purpose and intended effect of the plan.	NPC has revised and removed the paragraphs.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission /or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-5	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	1.3.3	Plan Content	In AANDC's view, the section on plan content should provide more information on each chapter. Interpreting the plan would be clearer if a simpler framework for Land Use Designations was used. Current designation types (e.g., Protecting and Sustaining the Environment) contain variable levels of permitted and prohibited uses which add to the complexity of the draft plan. AANDC recommends simplifying Land Use Designations as much as possible by reducing the variability within each designation. This could be achieved through the regrouping of Land Use Designations by their permitted and prohibited uses, (see Section 2: Environment Canada). For the plan to be effective there is a clear requirement to introduce the Land Use Designations with an explanation that clearly and unambiguously describes the purpose, rationale, permitted and prohibited uses and any associated terms and conditions. The Independent Review provides considerable guidance that helps clarify the difference between NPC's zoning approach and those used in other northern regional plans. Considering that some of the eventual users of the NLUP are familiar with the other northern plans (particularly industry), further explanation in the DNLUP would result in a better understanding of the plan and its intended effect.	The land use designations have been revised to simplify and consistent. The Plan is specific to the NSA. The DNLUP is created in accordance with the NLCA and NUPPAA. The Commission staff have reviewed Plans from around the world. As you appreciate all Plans are as unique as the people's values that are intended to represent.	AANDC and other federal departments and agencies would welcome the opportunity to discuss this issue further with NPC. As the DNLUP is currently written the reader is not presented with a clear idea on what land use activities are allowed and prohibited for particular areas. There are several reasons for this confusion. For example, the use of land designations syntax is unique compared to other land use plans in Northern Canada. Therefore to understand the meaning of land designations requires additional effort and the plan as a whole is more complicated to use and less clear.	The NPC has simplified the Land Use Designations.
GOC-6	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	1.3.4	Terminology	The term "Project" should be replaced with "Project Proposal" in order to be consistent with the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act (NUPPAA), unless NPC's intention is to refer to existing projects only. What are the administrative requirements referred to in the definition of "Terms"? Since this section refers to Land Use Designations and terms being "legally binding", this needs to be clarified for the reader and the specific references in NUPPAA be incorporated.	The NUPPAA uses the Terms project and project proposal interchangeably as does the DNLUP. Both are defined in the Glossary of the Plan.		
GOC-7	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	1.3.5	Using the Plan	Step 3: Determine if Recommendations apply to location of Project Proposal -Recommendations are not conformity requirements, they are neither legally binding nor enforceable. Furthermore, "impacts" on the values identified in the DNLUP Recommendations are assessed through the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) environmental assessment processes as well as the subsequent governmental permitting processes.	Recommendations have been removed form the plan. The current priorities and values are integrated into the regulatory process and are now: managed by NIRB, NWB and other regulatory authorities. The will be both enforceable and legally binding and their implementation will be monitored annually.		
GOC-8	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.2.1	Transportation	This section should include proposed transportation corridors that are part of project proposals already put forward by proponents. These include: - the proposed 350 kilometer all weather access road and port for the Izok Corridor project; - BIPAR's proposed road corridor; - the Mary River railroad, as approved in the original Mary River project certificate; - the proposed winter road for the Back River gold project; - the previous extension of the Tibbitt-Contwoyto winter road into Nunavut to Lupin and Jericho; - the road option under consideration for the Kiggavik uranium project.	The section on transportation corridors has been updated in the Plan.	Yes, AANDC is recommending these proposed transportation corridors be assigned a Land Use Designation (BHC-1 - Building Healthier Communities) similar to other proposed corridors that have been put forward by proponents.	The Land Use Designations have been simplified. The revised DNLUP addresses proposed transportation corridors.
GOC-9	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Schedule A	Transportation	AANDC would suggest that one way to represent the proposed transportation corridors on Schedule A would be to indicate the corridors using dashed lines. The transportation corridor under consideration from Manitoba to several of the Kivalliq communities should not appear as an existing use, as it does on Schedule A. It has not yet been submitted as a proposed project. At best, dotted lines should be used for this corridor in order to differentiate it from existing and proposed corridors that have already been introduced into the Nunavut regulatory system (i.e. proposed project description, Draft Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS) or Final Environmental Impact Statements (FEIS) submitted for conformity or screening).	NPC acknowledges this as a reasonable way to deal with proposed Transportation Corridors. NPC requests confirmation from AANDC about this approach for existing (or future existing) corridors. If the corridors identified as "proposed" in the AANDC submission were to be developed in the future, should they remain dashed in the NLUP?	AANDC agrees that when the corridor is developed that its depiction in the plan should be changed from a dashed line to a solid line.	The NPC agrees with this suggestion for future roads.

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-10	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.4.3	Contaminated Sites	Among the acronyms listed on page 5, NCSP is defined as the National Contaminated Sites Program. It should read the Northern Contaminated Sites Program.	The acronym has been revised.		
GOC-11	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.4.2	Land Remediation	Upon examination of the text in 4.4.2 and Table 1 there is the potential for misunderstanding. In the text it clearly states that AANDC and DND have shared responsibility for the clean-up of the DEW line sites. In Table 1 under the description of "permitted/prohibited uses" there is only a reference to DND having use of "operations and activities" on these sites. AANDC should have full access to these sites as well.	The NPC would appreciate a coordinated response from DND and AANDC on what types of activities should be prohibited on all Northern Contaminated Sites and who should have access/jurisdiction over each site.	The Contaminated Sites Program (CSP) is working with DND to coordinate a response regarding this issue. The proposed approach would be to create a new BHC designation. This new designation would have sites that would have Permitted/Prohibited Uses by both AANDC as well as DND. BHC-9 and BHC-10 would remain solely with DND while new BHC would have all sites that are shared between DND and AANDC. This information will be provided at a later date as both parties are still determining which sites are shared. <b>See Annex B for information on DND sites.</b>	The revised DNLUP addresses this issue.
GOC-12	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1	Land Remediation	In addition, the list of sites is incomplete. The following sites are missing: CAM-F, FOXC and BAF-5 (as well as the other BAF sites however these are not under AANDC control).	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-13	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1	Land Remediation	As an additional consideration, it would be helpful to have all the sites listed in Table 1 grouped together (i.e. all FOX sites together, all CAM sites together, etc.). At the moment, they are in order of ID numbers.	The DNLUP has been revised.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-14	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.4.3	Contaminated Sites	From the point of view of the NCSP, BHC-8 and BHC-9 sites do not need to prohibit all other uses of the site. The NCSP as well as the AANDC's Nunavut Regional Office (NRO) encourages the open use of lands in Nunavut. While certain investments on site need to be protected, this does not preclude all other uses in the area. In some cases, there are no investments left on site and full access and use would be acceptable.	The NPC would like clarity on what is meant by "open use of lands in Nunavut." Does this apply to all lands in Nunavut or is it specific to NCSP sites?The NPC would request specific "cases" that would be considered appropriate for full access be identified in future submissions.	The concept of "open use of lands in Nunavut" is meant to have as few prohibited uses as possible. Once a site is remediated, it should not preclude other uses of the site however we would like to protect any investments left on site. For example, if a site has been remediated however there is a landfill remaining on site. This landfill is considered an investment by AANDC. We would not want to refuse the use of an entire area simply because there is a landfill on site. What we would request is that certain uses be prohibited on the landfill and a buffer area. For example, it would not be acceptable to build a camp on a landfill, as it would affect the integrity of the permafrost in the landfill and could cause a failure. On the other hand, if someone wanted to use the landfill as a helicopter landing pad, that would be acceptable as there would be no or very minimal impacts on the landfill. In addition, we would like to be assured that no additional contamination would be left at the site. Sites where full access should be granted are sites where the remediation has been completed and there are no remaining investments on the site. The reason CSP would like to still have the site listed is to identify that it was previously a contaminated site. An example of a site that falls within these conditions is PIN-E. This site has been remediated and should be noted as a remediated site however nothing is left at the site. AANDC can provide a list of all the sites that fall into each of the categories however it should be noted that it will need to be updated regularly with the advancement of the program.	The Land Use Designations have been simplified and will address this concern.
GOC-15	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.4.3	Contaminated Sites	An investment such as a landfill (hazardous or non-hazardous waste) requires certain protection in order to maintain its structural integrity. This means that any activity that could impact a landfill should be avoided, including direct drilling, setting up a camp or creating a large landing pad. However uses such as a small helicopter landing pad or a light storage area are acceptable.	The Plan is part of an integrated regulatory system and others need to ensure the project proposals do not impact the integrity of these areas. The identification and prioritization of waste clean-up requires future consideration as part of on-going regional and sub-regional planning.		
GOC-16	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Schedule A	Contaminated Sites	Upon examination of the community maps in Appendix A, several sites are marked as BHC-8 (239). This designation classifies the sites as part of the Northern Contaminated Sites Program. The majority of these sites are not NCSP sites. Many of the BHC-8 (239) sites appear to be smaller waste sites that may have been identified by the public. These sites have not been confirmed by the AANDC's Contaminated Sites Program and therefore it may be erroneous to have them identified on the maps in Appendix A. In addition, leaving them on the maps will make the DNLUP outdated as the status of sites change annually. It is extremely difficult to track smaller waste sites as any person or group may clean up the site without notification to the NPC or any other authority. It is unclear why all the sites have been identified on the map. The larger contaminated sites should be identified as it could impact land use. However, the smaller waste sites will not likely affect the use of the land as they are often abandoned barrel caches. Given the amount of information on the maps, this could lead to confusion rather than clarity. Additionally, identifying all the classes of sites misrepresents the territory having it appear more contaminated than it is. AANDC suggests that all small sites be removed or the maps should clearly distinguish between AANDC sites and other sites.	It would be useful for AANDC to identify the sites it considers as "larger contaminated sites" that may be useful for inclusion in the revised DNLUP as well as list of potentially prohibited uses on or around these sites.	<b>See Annex C - list of AANDC Contaminated Sites</b>	

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-17	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1: Land Use Designations	Contaminated Sites	Further to the points discussed above, the NCSP does see value in keeping record of identified potential contaminated sites. Furthermore, since the status of sites changes on an annual basis, having it reflected in a future approved NLUP would make the plan outdated within a year of its coming into effect. A reference to the Federal Contaminated Sites Inventory ( <a href="http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/fcsi-rscf/home-accueil-eng.aspx">http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/fcsi-rscf/home-accueil-eng.aspx</a> ) within the land use plan would offer a detailed list of sites that are under federal responsibility. This inventory is updated annually and will give the current status of the site.	Please clarify if AANDC would prefer larger sites included, or no sites included.	AANDC CSP can only supply sites for which it is responsible. There are sites with other Federal custodians (Department of National Defense, Environment Canada, Royal Mounted Police, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and Parks Canada are known custodians) as well as Government of Nunavut (GN) custodians which have sites. Here are some options for a path forward: a) For all federal contaminated sites, you can reference the Federal Contaminated Sites Inventory ( <a href="http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/fcsi-rscf/home-accueil-eng.aspx">http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/fcsi-rscf/home-accueil-eng.aspx</a> ) a. Pro: This lists ALL federal sites (small and large) and is updated by Environment Canada annually. This would also include all AANDC sites. You would not have to provide a map as the sites can easily be found on the website with their coordinates. b. Con: This only has federal sites, this would not have GN sites. You would need to consult the GN on their sites. Unfortunately this website includes all sites in the inventory, including suspected sites which have not yet been confirmed. b) CSP would recommend having a minimum standard for having a site on the map (i.e. confirmed significant contamination) to avoid having many small waste sites on the map. Having all types of sites on the map would misrepresent the state of the territory, having it appear more contaminated than it is.	
GOC-18	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	5.1.1	Mining	Understanding the geosciences context of a deposit means knowing what lies beyond its boundaries. Very often discoveries are made beyond the boundaries of the deposit because favorable indicators were identified first (sometimes many kilometres away). The number of exploration sites that eventually become mineral deposits that could be mined is quite small. If a land use plan attempts to pre-determine where exploration or mining can take place and where not, the net effect is to discourage exploration and decrease investment. Fewer discoveries will be made as a consequence.	An area of 6% identified by AANDC as having high mineral potential is under special management and prohibits the establishment of Parks and Conservation Areas. 15% of the NSA is under a Protected Area designation. 67% is Mixed use. 80% of the NSA allows non-renewable resource development.		
GOC-19	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013		5.1.1 and Chapter 6	Mining	In order to indicate the level of activity the mining sector is likely to bring to the territory and for NPC to signal to industry through the land use plan what kind of potential resource economy can be developed, it should be made clear both in Section 5.1.1 and Chapter 6: Mixed Use, that all areas outside of community boundaries, parks, bird sanctuaries and critical wildlife habitat are open to exploration and potential resource development.	Is this statement generally referring to Mixed Use areas being open for exploration and potential resource development, or is it suggesting specifically that areas outside community boundaries, parks, bird sanctuaries and critical wildlife habitat should be open for development (potential resource development should not be prohibited)? Further, could AANDC please define areas that are "critical wildlife areas"?	We were of the understanding that the Mixed Use area is all of the area outside community boundaries, parks, bird sanctuaries, critical wildlife habitat, and other ecologically important areas. The question asked indicates that the Mixed Use areas will be smaller. We strongly recommend that all areas in Nunavut, with the exception of communities, parks, protected bird sanctuaries, critical wildlife habitat, and other ecologically important areas, be open for exploration or open to some limited extent. As such, we will adjust the language in our revised text to reflect that and not make reference to Mixed use, since this is a smaller subset of the area available. See Annex A Comments on Chapter 5: Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development with Figure 1: Draft Map of Potential Areas of Exploration Leading to Mining Activity Proposed under the Land Use Classes Designated for Mining and Mineral Development.	



Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-20	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Chapter 5	Mining	It is also important to understand that geosciences knowledge of the territory is far too incomplete for the mineral potential to be known and a definitive "map" to be made of the cycle of resource exploration, evaluation and exploitation. As a start for formulating a Land Use Designation in the DNLUP for mining, four categories are proposed under an ESED Land Use Designation: i) exploration activity; ii) past mines; iii) current operating mines; and, iv) projects in the permitting process. Currently, there is only one Land Use Designation ESED -1 that encompasses both Existing Mines and Advanced Stage of Exploration. In an attempt to highlight what land area in the Territory can be considered of greatest likelihood for mineral resource exploration, evaluation and exploitation, AANDC has provided the accompanying maps (Figures 1 and 2) on the following pages. For the purpose of these illustrations, the symbols of the point data and the colors of the areas outlined and even their size are unimportant. The maps should be looked at as clusters where our existing knowledge of favorable geology and history of exploration activity is concentrated. One can immediately recognize corridors or groupings of higher 7 frequency interest <sup>1</sup> . Combined with geophysical and geological maps, a first order set of "exploration leading to mining activity" areas could be outlined. AANDC suggests that such a selection approach, and a clearer statement about exploration in other areas, would provide more decisive input into the DNLUP. The level of detail presented in Figure 1 below is rough (subject to change and revision) and is only presented to illustrate the concept and rationale that AANDC is putting forward.	NPC greatly appreciates this information and finds it very useful; however, it is noted that it is in draft and is provided in concept only.NPC would greatly appreciate that future submissions contain more definitive data and potential terms/prohibited uses in these areas.	We believe that the task and decisions for creating land use classes for Nunavut is the purview of the Nunavut Planning Commission. To assist NPC, we have provided a revised version of this map. The effort to create it involved much more definitive data, however we advise NPC to consult other sources and stakeholders to add to this designated land use class. We have consulted with NRCan and received feedback on the map. It remains as a suggested starting point for this land use class. The map (ESRI SHP file to be sent separately) provided should be considered a minimum area to consider in this class.In the text, we have added qualifiers which outline the types of compatible and incompatible activities that can be associated with Mineral Development and Mining Land use class. <b>See Annex A Comments on Chapter 5: Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development with Figure 1: Draft Map of Potential Areas of Exploration Leading to Mining Activity Proposed under the Land Use Classes Designated for Mining and Mineral Development.</b>	
GOC-21	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1 and Schedule A	Mining	Finally, Table 1, Land Use Designations and Schedule A, appear to be missing certain ESED-1 mining and exploration sites. Please add Doris, which is an existing mine and different from Hope Bay. Sabina should also be added in ESED-1 as Advanced Stage of Exploration. Jericho and Lupin should be under an ESED designation as mines in care and maintenance.	The land use designations have been changed to simplify application. Existing mines are considered to conform to the land use plan in all designations.		
GOC-22	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013		5.1.2	Oil and Gas	5.1.2 Oil and Gas Exploration and Production Note that the Significant Discovery Licence (SDL) specifically referenced here is only one of three types of oil and gas licence. The production licence (PL) is required for a company to produce and this would generally be issued congruent with or within the boundaries of a SDL. Although there are currently no production licenses in Nunavut, the text of ESED-2 should recognize that a production licence would be issued to replace a SDL in all or in part once all necessary permitting requirements have been met.	The DNLUP has been revised. The land use designations have been simplify application.		
GOC-23	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013		5.1.2	Oil and Gas	Significant Discovery Licenses are only issued for discoveries which have been proved by drilling a well. Exploration to locate drilling locations is much more extensive than the resulting significant discoveries and will occur either on exploration licenses and/or more broadly still at a basin scale. It is this kind of exploration which has presented Nunavut with an inventory of discovered oil and gas resources, opportunity for employment and benefits in the exploration phase, has stimulated research and helped developed infrastructure. To ensure transparency, it is in our view important to be clear in the DNLUP that oil and gas development does not occur without exploration, that such exploration is necessarily extensive, involving geophysical methods and exploratory drilling, all of which are fully regulated and subject to environmental screening/assessment.	General comment noted.		
GOC-24	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013		5.1.2	Oil and Gas	Exploration Licenses (ELs) are issued pursuant to regional calls for nominations where areas excluded from the call are clearly indicated, and a subsequent call for bids on a specific block. Although there are currently no exploration licenses in Nunavut - there is a current call for nominations - the text of ESED-2 (Page 43) should recognize that an exploration licence(s) is issued to encourage exploration in parts of Nunavut with oil and gas potential. It might also be noted that a significant discovery area can increase or reduce in size with new information about the extent of a field.	General comment noted.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-25	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	5.1.2	Oil and Gas	The SDL077 at Romulus (near Eureka) appears to have been omitted from the map. This area saw some drilling in the 1970s which demonstrated oil and gas resources and potential. This area is part of the Sverdrup Basin, recognized in the plan as has having 'the potential to be one of the most lucrative economic activities in Nunavut'. It is suggested that the map indicate the Romulus SDL.	<a href="#">This would be why it was dropped from earlier versions of the plan. We will note it in the Options document as being there, and will not change the designation</a>		
GOC-26	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	5.1.2	Oil and Gas	AANDC is concerned with the absence of greater discussion of areas of oil and gas potential. While commercial fishing is considered as a potential economic activity, it is unclear why oil and gas is not treated in a similar manner. To improve balance across the range of potential economic activities, the discussion of areas of oil and gas potential could be framed as follows: "Project proponents should collaborate with conservation interests to ensure that optimal best practices are used to optimize economic potential and conservation interests".	The preferred approach for the NPC at this time is to identify areas of importance, prohibit certain activities that could detract from the qualities or importance of the area and provide a recommendation to other regulators.  NPC would appreciate discussing uses that may be inappropriate in areas with oil and gas potential (if any) and better defining recommendations to other regulators.	In areas of potential importance for future economic activities such as petroleum exploration, it is recommended by AANDC that zoning which excludes exploration activities be used sparingly in the expectation that proponents can mitigate for environmental risks to the extent that is reasonably practical.	General comment noted.
GOC-27	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Schedule A & B	Mapping	There appears to be inconsistencies with regard to the mapping of commercial fishing areas and bird habitat areas. Note that commercial fishing areas are mapped outside the NSA and Outer Land Fast Ice Zone whereas PSE designations for bird habitat are clipped along the NSA boundary. It would be useful to see the adjoining areas of important bird habitat which lie seaward of the NSA boundary be defined as well.	Data will not be clipped, because there is a trans boundary obligation under NUPPAA.		
GOC-28	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Schedule A	Lancaster Sound National Marine Conservation Area	AANDC is also concerned with the designation of slivers of PSE adjoining the area of interest for the Lancaster Sound National Marine Conservation Areas (NMCA). The final boundary decision of the NMCA will take into account conservation and economic development factors. Designation of a sliver of PSE seaward of the illustrated boundary of the potential Lancaster Sound NCMA appears to ignore the process and rationale behind the park establishment. Values for conservation within the NCMA would be fully considered in this process and therefore would require a justification for protecting these adjoining areas.	NPC has reviewed the area based on the new Environment Canada data.	We would note that commercial fishing and petroleum exploration activities can coexist through cooperation and information exchange. Similarly, petroleum exploration activities are often of short duration and seasonal. To the extent that is reasonably practical they can be planned to avoid specific areas at specific times of year.	
GOC-29	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	General	Definitions	Finally, it is suggested that the definitions of: "Research", "Marine Communications" and "Electrical cable" be elaborated upon for greater clarity for potential project proponents. It would also be of assistance if NPC's concerns, if any, for not permitting other types of cable such as fiber optics where explained.	Marine communications and electrical cables meant to be read together. i.e. "communications cables" would include fibre optics cables.		
GOC-30	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7	Implementation Strategy	A Nunavut Land Use Plan needs to be a standalone document that contains the necessary information required by Inuit, government (federal and territorial), Designated Inuit Organizations (DIOs), Institutes of Public Governance (IPGs), project proponents and other stakeholders to fully understand the plan. The DNLUP is the only document subject to the approvals process under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement (NLCA 11.5.5 through 11.5.9) and the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act (NUPPAA s.53 through s.55). Supporting documents while part of the planning process are not part of the plan.	The Plan and its implementation strategy are stand alone documents and all that is required to be approved.		
GOC-31	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.1	Conformity	The term "criteria" is misused in this section and should not be appear in a section on conformity determination. A conformity determination is based on the permitted and prohibited uses and the associated terms and conditions of a Land Use Designation.	The Plan is revised.		
GOC-32	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.1	Conformity	The DNLUP should clearly confirm that Recommendations are not conformity requirements.	Land use designations are revised and the manner in which Recommendations has been modified along with the implementation strategy to address the concern.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-33	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.2	Cumulative Impacts	The GoC suggests that NPC work closely with NIRB and NWB to develop a process for the referral of projects normally exempt from screening but where there is a concern for cumulative impacts. This framework should be made available to project proponents before they submit their project descriptions. Proponents need to understand how and why their proposed project, normally exempt from NIRB screening, may be impacted by NPC concerns for cumulative impacts.	The NIRB and NWB are cooperate on implementation of this opportunity. As time and resources permit more work will be undertaken. The Implementation Strategy has been revised to address areas of potential cumulative impacts concerns that have been identified during the consultations.		
GOC-34	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.4	Plan Amendment	The Commission must consider all plan amendment requests (NLCA 11.6.2; NUPPAA s. 59 and s. 61). NPC does not have the discretionary authority to make any exceptions, even in the case of prohibited uses as suggested in this section.	The Implementation Strategy, Plan Amendment section has been revised.		
GOC-35	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.5	Monitoring	The Nunavut General Monitoring Plan is another multi-stakeholder forum where socioeconomic and ecosystemic information will be generated. Among other uses, this information could contribute to the monitoring of the NLUP.	The Plan has been revised to identify priority research activities that will benefit the key planning issues that are being addressed in this iteration of the Plan.		
GOC-36	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.6	Periodic Review	A more specific period for Plan Review should be determined for the first generation land use plan. It was suggested in the "Government of Canada, Priority Expectations for a First Generation Land Use Plan" document that a period of 5 years would be an appropriate interval for the review of a first generation plan.	The NPC has implemented the periodic review consistent with NUPPAA. However a timeline is proposed within the Implementation Strategy that would be implemented within the approved budget of the Commission.		
GOC-37	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.7	Project proposals	It would be more useful if this section begins the chapter. A statement that the Commission is the entry point in the Nunavut regulatory regime would provide the clarity necessary for project proponents, regulators and other stakeholders about the process.	The Implementation Strategy has been revised to include a more fulsome discussion on the role of the NPC as gatekeeper.		
GOC-38	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.8	Permitted and Prohibited Uses	Many of the participating federal government departments have concerns regarding the lack of specificity of the proposed permitted and prohibited uses in the various Land Use Designations. For example, Tourism, Recreation and Research are permitted uses in several Land Use Designations. These terms are not defined in the DNLUP; there are neither particular spatial nor temporal restrictions identified that may be appropriate nor any other terms and conditions associated with the Land Use Designation. As referenced elsewhere in this document, Land Use Designations are not complete without the listing of both permitted and prohibited uses for any given designation. These and any associated conditions are what determines a proposed project's conformity. The current DNLUP is confusing in this regard as several designation types do not include this information. If a use is not listed as being prohibited, then all uses are permitted.	The DNLUP has been revised to clarify the land use designations. NUPPAA 48(2) reads "A land use plan may contain descriptions of permitted, subject to any terms and conditions that the plan sets out, and prohibited uses of land. Where appropriate permitted and/or prohibited project proposals are identified in the Plan.		
GOC-39	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.9	Legal Non-Conforming Uses	The DNLUP should include a statement on the five year time limit on the cessation of legal non-conforming uses, as well as other conditions related to "rights preserved", (NUPPAA s. 207 and 208).	The Implementation strategy has been updated to include Existing Rights to reflect NUPPAA requirements.		
GOC-40	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.10.	Land Use Designations and Recommendations	What is an administrative requirement? This should be defined and the use explained in the DNLUP. Once again, Recommendations are neither legally binding nor enforceable. They do not constitute conformity requirements.	Text of the Plan has been revised. Comment regarding use of recommendations is addressed above.		



Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-41	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	11/04/2014	DNLUP	Table 1: Land Use Designations	Permitted and Prohibited Uses	Permitted/Prohibited Uses: Land designation description and identification of zones need to include permitted or prohibited uses and this information is required within the Plan document to allow users to determine conformity without needing to refer to other associated documents. The Plan document itself will be reviewed and approved by Ministers; therefore this document needs to stand alone as a complete land use plan which includes clear reference to minimum requirements that will enable a conformity determination decision. Secondary background information can and should be located in associated documents but should not be required to understand the basic land zones and designations identified in the plan.	The GoC comment that the land use designations “need to include permitted and prohibited uses” is addressed above. The Plan complies with NUPPAA. NLCA 11.4.4 (k) states that the NPC shall determine whether a project proposal is in conformity with a land use plan. In addition, 11.5.10 establishes the NPC’s role in further determining the conformity of project proposals to the Land Use Plan. There needs to be acknowledgement that it is the NPC’s role to implement the Land Use Plan and determine conformity with it. Questions of compliance should be directed to the NPC.		
GOC-42	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	12/04/2014	DNLUP	Table 1: Land Use Designations	Land Use Designations	Types of Zones: The current approach to zoning (as proposed in the current Draft Land Use Plan) is simply too complex and/or unclear to meet the needs of users of the plan who should be able to quickly locate their area of interest and determine the zoning that applies to that land. Although it is recognized that Nunavut is a uniquely large land mass for which there are continuing data gaps which make zone identification challenging, the current approach presented in the Draft Land Use Plan is not addressing the need for clarity nor is it addressing overlapping interests in conservation and resource/economic development in some key areas. Specific attention should be paid to these areas in developing the next draft of the plan.	The land use designations are simplified. The DNLUP has been revised to include clarified Land Use Designations and to address competing interests where adequate data and information has been provided to the NPC.		
GOC-43	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	13/04/2014	DNLUP	General	Mapping	Geographic information: Although it is again recognized as challenging for such a large land mass as Nunavut, clear maps are required for users of the Plan to determine locations of interest and relative proximity of geographic information describe in the land use plan. All maps-index map(s) with referenced sub maps - should be within the Plan document itself, as should the description of each area and its particular value components and permitted or prohibited uses. There should be a clear legend defining and numbering the zones so that they are easily understood and referenced.	General comment noted, however consideration must be again given to the scale of the Plan. Underlying theme of the Independent Review is that expectations of what is achievable need to be realistic. The Plan has been updated to suggestions where appropriate.		
GOC-44	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	14/04/2014	DNLUP	5	Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development	<p>It is somewhat difficult to clarify comments on this chapter given that some of the basic premises put forth and terminology used by Nunavut Planning Commission (NPC) in the Draft Nunavut Land Use Plan (DNLUP) are not shared by AANDC. For example on page 30, the DNLUP states:</p> <p>“The following areas and issues have been identified to support the goal of encouraging sustainable economic development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mineral exploration and production;</li> <li>• Oil and gas exploration and production; and</li> <li>• Commercial fisheries</li> </ul> <p>These areas and issues are managed through Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development (ESED) Land Use Designations and/or Recommendations that support the Objectives and Policies identified below. The criteria for the Land Use Designations and Recommendations are contained in Chapter 7 and Schedules A and B.”</p> <p>AANDC does not equate the activities and type of land use involved with “mineral exploration” to “production”, which perhaps is mining activity under the singular existing category of ESED-1. Much larger areas, with open access are required to sustain an exploration sector. This does not imply that all areas within the available land class will ever be fully used or developed since it is not certain where eventual economic discoveries will be made.</p>	The Land Use Designations have been revised to clarify this matter. Over 80% of the NSA is open to mineral exploration and development. The Plan does not differentiate between different stage of mining. The staking a mineral claim is done in hopes of developing a mine. As such the Plan focuses on the central activity of mining.		
GOC-45	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	15/04/2014	DNLUP	Schedule A	Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development	In Schedule A, the ESED-1 land use class is limited to existing advanced exploration projects and does not reflect the nature of current exploration activity in the territory.	Experts in the field have been unable to advise the NPC on a suitable threshold for applying a ESED designation to individual mineral projects. As such the concept has been removed from the Plan and replaced with the high potential mineral map AANDC provided.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-46	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	16/04/2014	DNLUP	Schedule B	Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development	The recommendations illustrated in Schedule B are far too restrictive and mineral exploration under ESED is completely absent there.	Recommendations have been removed from the plan. The current priorities and values are integrated into the regulatory process and are now: managed by NIRB, NWB and other regulatory authorities. These will be both enforceable and legally binding.		
GOC-47	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	17/04/2014	DNLUP	5	Mineral Exploration and Production	Understanding the geosciences context of a deposit means knowing what lies beyond its boundaries. Very often discoveries are made beyond the boundaries of the deposit because favorable indicators were identified first in places sometimes many kilometres away. The level of geosciences knowledge known for the territory, brought out through geological mapping and exploration programs, is poor in comparison to what is known in other provinces and territories in Canada and many places around the world. For that reason Nunavut is both an attractive place to invest, because of its unknown potential for large discoveries, and a deterrent to investment because of the uncertainty. The number of exploration sites that eventually become mineral deposits that could be mined economically is quite small. If a land use plan attempts to pre-determine where exploration or mining can take place and where not, the net effect is to discourage exploration and decrease investment. With less investment, fewer discoveries will result and economic benefits to the territory will be diminished as a consequence. Exploration activities on land are of short duration, often only a few years, and are not permanent developments. Over time, and for certain commodities, some areas become more favorable for exploration than others. It is also important to note that areas where one commodity, such as gold, may be favorable to explore in are not necessarily the same areas of interest for another commodity.	General comment noted.		
GOC-48	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	18/04/2014	DNLUP	5.1.1	Mineral Exploration and Production	In order to indicate the level of economic activity the mining sector is likely to bring to the territory and for NPC to signal to industry, through the land use plan, what kind of potential resource economy can be developed, it must be explicitly stated both in Section 5.1.1 and in sections and chapters elsewhere, that all areas outside of communities, parks, bird sanctuaries, critical wildlife habitat, and other designated protected/conserved areas shall be open to mineral exploration activities. In some cases, significant exploration discoveries may lead to more resource development work or mining projects. Under circumstances where future exploration efforts occur outside of the proposed Mineral Development Leading to Mining Activity land use class, re-zoning of these significant areas to this class must be considered a priority under subsequent revisions to the land use plan. If the NLUP is seen as fixed or the revision process too complex or too lengthy, then economic activity where mineral exploration is concerned will be deemed too risky and investment in the territory will plummet. To instill confidence and certainty in the application of the NLUP, a clear commitment and a defined process to revisions and re-zoning must be articulated in the NLUP.	The Implementation Strategy sections regarding "Periodic Review and Monitoring" and "Land Use Designations and Terms" has been revised to address the concern. Where the foot print or study area of a project proposal occurs in more than one Land Use Designation it will be considered to conform as long as all aspects of the project are considered to conform with the requirements of each Designation as such plan amendments would not be required as suggested by the GoC comment.		
GOC-49	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	19/04/2014	DNLUP	5		As a start for formulating a Land Use Designation in the DNLUP for mining, two categories are proposed under an ESED Land Use Designation: (1) Mineral Development Leading to Mining Activity and (2) Areas Open to Mineral Exploration. These two categories divide the territorial land mass into two parts, as shown in Figure 1.	Land Use Designations have been clarified in the revised DNLUP.		
GOC-50	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	20/04/2014	DNLUP	5		1. Mineral Development Leading to Mining Activity This proposed land use class can be considered as having identified the most likely places where mining activity may take place in the short to medium term. It encompasses existing sub-classes that have been described in earlier communications. These are areas of (i) active and important historic exploration activity; (ii) past-producing mines; (iii) current operating mine(s); and, (iv) projects in the permitting process. Currently, there is only one Land Use Designation, ESED -1, which encompasses (ii) and (iii). Some of (iv) is included, but a significant area of interest, (i), is not represented at all.	Land Use Designations have been clarified in the revised DNLUP. 80% of the area is open to mineral development.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-51	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	21/04/2014	DNLUP	5		It is also important to understand that geosciences knowledge of the territory is far too incomplete for the mineral potential to be known or a definitive "map" as such to be made. For the first iteration of the NLUP, in consultation with Natural Resources Canada, AANDC proposes a "Mineral Development Leading to Mining Activity" land class category in an attempt to highlight what land area in the Territory can be considered of greatest likelihood for mineral resource exploration, evaluation and exploitation. AANDC provides the accompanying map as Figure 1. In this preliminary map, we have identified 28 separate areas (with about equal distribution in each of the three regions), representing about 13% of the territory. The areas are given at a low level of cartographic precision (approximately 1:2,000,000 or less) and was arrived at by using the locations of selected mineral occurrences, an examination of historical mineral tenure held in the territory, the extent of favourable geological units based on limited mapping, locations of past-producing mines (and current mine), locations of advanced exploration projects, and those projects currently in the review and permitting stages.	Land Use Designations have been clarified in the revised DNLUP. Comment addressed above.		
GOC-52	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	22/04/2014	DNLUP	5		To reiterate, we currently believe it is within these areas where the highest probability exists for potential mines to be operating or where advanced exploration may continue over the next 5-10 years. It is naive to believe that accurate forecasting as presented in this land use class is possible. Thus AANDC advises caution to NPC in using this information as a tool to guide or restrict mineral exploration and mining development to only these areas. The level of detail presented in Figure 1 is approximate (subject to change and revision) and is presented to illustrate the concept and rationale that AANDC is putting forward.	Land Use Designations have been clarified in the revised DNLUP. The area of high mineral potential is part of area that is exclusive to mining.		
GOC-53	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	23/04/2014	DNLUP	5		For these reasons, a second land use class is required and we propose "Areas Open to Mineral Exploration", discussed under 2. below. Whereas other activities such as tourism and recreation may be possible in areas away from mines, but within the same land class, the uncertainty associated with speculative behaviour and challenges to mineral development projects under NLUP clauses dictate that these and all other activities incompatible with mineral development should be prohibited. Types of activities permitted could include exploration, research, roads, railways, utilities and corridors, infrastructure, and remediation and reclamation.	Land Use Designations have been clarified in the revised DNLUP.		
GOC-54	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	24/04/2014	DNLUP	5		2. Areas Open to Mineral Exploration New and significant investment is likely to occur within considerably larger areas of the territory, beyond the existing exploration districts outlined in Figure 1 as the Mineral Development Leading to Mining Activity land use class. What is thus required is a second land use class as "Areas Open to Mineral Exploration", which is illustrated in Figure 1. We recognize that this area represents the remainder of the territory and over laps with obvious restricted areas, such as (a) Territorial and National Parks, (b) communities and (c) wildlife sanctuaries, (d) reserves, and e) other areas identified as ecologically important. The withdrawal of these areas from this land class is expected; however the remainder of the territorial land mass should permit mineral exploration activity and remain open to the possibility of future mineral development leading to mining. This proposed land use class may represent all of the Mixed Use land class, but it also includes other land use classes such as PSE-2.	This comment has been addressed above.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-55	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC)	25/04/2014	DNLUP	5		<p>Allowance for transit corridors: Implications for other land use classes in the DNLUP.</p> <p>Whereas many prospective mineral exploration districts are isolated from communities and logistical staging points, most land use classes in the NLUP use must allow for overland and marine transportation. The known and proposed terrestrial transportation and supply corridors to support exploration and mineral development activity are noted in Figure 1. AANDC proposes that explicit allowance for this type of activity be included in the land use classes that these corridors cross. The transit corridors illustrated are of two types: i) engineered, year-round roads and ii) seasonal right-of-way for temporary use as winter routes. The seasonal corridors can be (but need not be) defined as a separate land class, but should be recognized within the land classes they cross as being part of that land class description as a permitted activity. The constructed roads with year-round use are transportation corridors that should be identified on the NLUP map as a distinct land use class.</p>	Land Use Designations have been clarified in the revised DNLUP. The DNLUP identifies transportation corridors that are for public use and are intended to be long term as opposed to be for temporary private use. The section on transportation has been updated.		
GOC-56	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	General	Land Use Designations	<p>Clarity in visual representation of zoning It is critical that the visual representation of the DNLUP accommodate the cultural prominence of 'oral and visual' means for processing information by the majority of Nunavummiut. If information critical to understanding the practical application of the Land Use Designations can only be gained by closely reading map legends, or by a careful read of the corresponding text in a series of accompanying documents, there is a risk that a high proportion of the general population will make incorrect assumptions about how areas of interest to them are designated (i.e. it is possible people will assume that all areas in what are 'green' zones in the current draft plan, will receive similar treatment, not realizing that there is a significant difference in the level of restriction associated with a PSE-1 versus a PSE-R).Confusion regarding application of the Land Use Designations could be minimized by 'colour-coding' zones based on the restrictions associated with them (e.g. PSE-1 andECP-1 have similar restrictions and should be colour coded similarly, etc.).</p>	The Plan is a tool to manage resources as part of an integrated regulatory system. The land use designations have been simplified. The implementation of the Plan will be automated prior to its approval allowing interested persons to rely on the on-line automated system to make them aware of the requirements of the Plan.		
GOC-57	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	Definitions	<p>Definitions of tourism; recreation; research</p> <p>In June 2010 EC presented NPC with a list of migratory bird key habitat sites that should be considered for restricted access or special management zoning through the land use plan (letter attached). It seems that most of EC's proposed 'restricted access' sites are addressed in the migratory birds PSE and ECP zones in the draft plan.</p> <p>EC suggests that the land use plan must be clear that prohibitions and authorizations associated with the zones do not apply to activities for which Inuit Beneficiaries do not require any form of lease, permit, or other authorization pursuant to the NLCA (and it would be helpful to the reader to list them).</p> <p>In order to achieve the intent of these zones, EC has concern that the terms 'tourism' 'recreation', and 'research' have not been defined.</p>	The Plan only applies to Project Proposals which are defined. General statements are made throughout the plan to limit confusion. Term tourism is defined. The land use designations have been simplified. The use of recreation is removed from the old designation. When the term Research is used in the Plan it is defined.		
GOC-58	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	Definitions	<p>In all Migratory Birds PSE and ECP zones, "Research" that would be consistent with EC's intent for those areas would be research that contributes to wildlife and/or habitat conservation;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>is neutral with respect to conservation and does not cause long-term or repeated disturbance or significant alteration of wildlife habitat;</p>	The Land Use Designations have been revised. When specific use of the term research requires definition it is addressed.		
GOC-59	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	Definitions	<p>In all Migratory Birds PSE and ECP zones, "Tourism" that would be consistent with EC's intent for those areas would be tourism that does not cause long-term or repeated disturbance of wildlife or significant alteration of wildlife habitat;</p>	The Land Use Designations have been revised to exclude specific uses deemed to be incompatible with the values.		
GOC-60	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	Definitions	<p>In all Migratory Birds PSE and ECP zones, "Recreation" that would be consistent with EC's intent for those areas would be recreation that does not cause long-term or repeated disturbance of wildlife or significant alteration of wildlife habitat.</p>	The Land Use Designations have been revised to exclude specific uses deemed to be incompatible with the values.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-61	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3	Migratory Bird Sanctuaries	In Migratory Bird Sanctuaries and National Wildlife Areas, activities must not be inconsistent with the purpose of the protected area and must be consistent with its most recent management plan, where a management plan exists;	The Land Use Designations have been revised to exclude specific uses deemed to be incompatible with the values.		
GOC-62	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3	Migratory Bird Sanctuaries	In Migratory Bird Sanctuaries and National Wildlife Areas, conformity requirements must be consistent with the terms of the Inuit Impact and Benefits Agreement for Migratory Bird Sanctuaries and National Wildlife Areas in the Nunavut Settlement Area.	It is an objective under Goal 1. of the Commission's broad planning policies, objectives and goals that processes not be duplicated as such an site specific management plan should be compatible with the Land Use Plan. Typically management plans would be as restrictive or more restrictive then the Plan.		
GOC-63	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	Options and Recommendations	2	Migratory Bird Habitats	1. Special management terms and conditions for certain key migratory bird habitat sites EC notes that provision has not been made for special management of certain key migratory bird key habitat sites, as advised in its June 2010 letter to NPC. Instead these sites are represented in areas where only recommendations apply. EC advises that these sites would be better managed for migratory birds if the current 'recommended' zoning were changed to a 'special management' designation that had mandatory conformity requirements. In June 2013, EC provided a detailed explanation to NPC of the process it followed to collect and analyze the data used to develop detailed technical advice for key migratory bird habitat sites. EC will summarize this site-specific advice in a map book of sites. The map book will be delivered to NPC in the fall of 2014.	The Plan has been revised to address the concerns whenever possible. Special Management Areas and Protected Areas are now used to manage project proposals in areas that are highly and moderately intolerant to human disturbance.		
GOC-64	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	General	Land Use Plan	2. Subject areas addressed by first generation plan A first generation plan zoning scheme must address these resources: -Migratory birds -Terrestrial species of economic and cultural importance -Marine mammals -Key areas of biodiversity - Key community areas of importance - Key areas of known economic potential -Transportation corridors	The Commission's broad planning policies, objectives and goals outline the parameters requirements of the plan content. All of the matters identified are included within the NLCA 11.4.1(a) requirement. The content of the Plan is further defined by feedback from residents and validity of data sources if any that could support a land use planning decision. The themes identified are addressed accordingly under the 5 broad goals.		
GOC-65	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	2.4	Climate Change	A first generation land use plan must acknowledge the reality of climate change and use zoning to identify areas where climate change-specific risks may manifest, and where mitigation measures for certain activities are recommended. It is predicted that some areas of Nunavut will be susceptible to significant biophysical and geophysical change related to climate warming. Other areas will be more resilient and will undergo relatively little change. It is prudent to account for degree of susceptibility to climate-induced change in the land use planning process. Planning for future change should include discouraging development in areas where climate change effects (e.g. coastal erosion, permafrost loss/slumping, drying of ponds, lakes, and wetlands, etc.) is most likely to have significant negative effects on infrastructure. This determination should be made in the context of community planning (where to extend community residential areas) as well as for industrial developments (e.g. mining waste management practices that depend on intact or consistent permafrost would be discouraged in areas likely to experience permafrost loss). Future planning should also support conservation of biological "resilience" in Arctic ecosystems -by safeguarding areas that are least likely to experience significant ecosystem change (indicators of change could include species composition, moisture regimes, etc.) due to climate warming. These resilient areas will, in time, take on a relatively higher level of importance to conservation of Arctic species, as baseline ecosystem conditions change.	The NPC request that EC provide the location of the areas discussed in a future submission on the Plan or as a future plan amendment. The NPC would require GIS shapefiles to support the accurate identification of these areas. An analysis of the landscape change predicted will support the development of criteria to manage impacts on these areas. Also not at present the Commission's objective on climate change is specific and is addressed through a Term that provides direction to Regulatory Agencies.	From the context of community planning, Climate Change Adaptation Plans (Government of Nunavut) may be useful sources of information concerning impacts of climate change for the NLUP. For further detailed information from NRCAN and for links to relevant research and mapping that has been conducted, please refer to Annex D "Sources of Information Relevant to Development of Nunavut Land Use Plan". As we become aware of further information sources on this topic we will endeavor to make these known the NPC. The Arctic Council, through its Arctic Climate Adaptations project (AACA-C), is doing a pilot project in the Baffin Bay-Davis Strait region. That exercise might prove informative for the land use plan. The contact person is Russ Shearer, AANDC (Russell.Shearer@aandc.gc.ca)	General information noted. Future planning will continue to consider climate change.



Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-66	Environment Canada	18/07/2013	Working Together	4	Cumulative Impacts	<p>The only LUP in the north to date that has tried to use thresholds is the North Yukon LUP. It has worked so far, though much of the planning area is withdrawn from development and there have been no large scale proposals in the remainder. EC feels that the approach NPC is proposing a reasonable starting point with respect to an approach for flagging cumulative impact concerns (i.e. a checklist of questions for staff for run through when reviewing project descriptions that have been submitted to the NPC for conformity determination). The NPC's role is not to determine cumulative impacts; it is to flag projects where NPC has concern for cumulative impact issues for projects not subject to NIRB screening.</p> <p>Some of the guiding questions that are in the implementation guidance document (Appendix 2 of "Working Together to Implement the Nunavut Land Use Plan") are applicable; some need to be better thought through and reworded. Recognizing that the issue of identifying and responding to cumulative impact concerns is one that requires collaboration between NPC and other relevant Institutes of Public Government (e.g. NIRB, NWMB, and NWB), EC suggests that it would be useful to have a more complete set of guiding questions articulated in the implementation guidance document. EC suggests, for example, that the implementation chapter of the DNLUP should contain a clear description of the purpose of the cumulative impacts assessment (as per our second paragraph, above); a clear description of factors to be considered in determining the potential for cumulative impacts; and the questions NPC intends to consider in its review.</p>	The Commission's broad planning policies, objectives and goals require the NPC to implement thresholds and indicators developed by government and other IPGs. The Plan has been revised to identify in which specific situations the NPC may refer a project for cumulative impact concerns. The Plan also identifies the need for government experts to develop and seek stakeholder on appropriate thresholds and indicators. Once this is achieved the NPC would be able to consider a plan amendment to implement the findings.		
GOC-67	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP		Cod Lakes	<p>Section 3: Fisheries and Oceans CanadaA. Exploratory/ Commercial Fisheries and Subsistence FisheriesExploratory/ Commercial FisheriesNeed for Additional Details on Permitted ActivitiesWhile recognizing the need for flexibility in permitted and prohibited uses and that thelisted uses are not exhaustive, Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) is concerned that greaterclarity is needed in some circumstances. DFO notes that on page 38 of the DNLUP,Table 1, under the Protecting and Sustaining the Environment (PSE) land usedesignations, the PSE-2, ID 73, Cod Lakes, that there is currently an exploratory fisheryfor Arctic Char on Qasigialiminiq Lake, with the Pangnirtung Hunting and TrappersOrganization (HTO) as the license holder. The PSE-2 designation states that permitteduses are "Tourism, Recreation, and Research" and lists no prohibited uses. DFOassumes that the DNLUP allows for the continuation of this exploratory fishery, as wellas the possible future commercial fishery for Arctic Char that might follow theexploratory fishery.The above comments may also apply to page 38 of the DNLUP in Table 1, PSE-2, ID74, Cod Lakes - Tariujarusiq Lake. This site may also be an exploratory fishery forArctic Char, with Pangnirtung HTO as the license holder. The uncertainty may be due tosome confusion about the name of the lake, as this name has also been used to refer toa lake near Kimmirut, which also reportedly has cod. If this refers to the lake nearPangnirtung, there is also an exploratory fishery for Arctic Char and a possible futurecommercial fishery DFO therefore strongly suggests that the Land Use Designationinclude exploratory and commercial fisheries as permitted uses for the two Cod Lakes.</p>	<p>The DNLUP does not identify commercial fisheries to be a permitted use in the identified Atlantic Cod Lakes. However, if there is an existing exploratory licence, the use would likely be a legal non-conforming use discussed in Section 7.9 on the DNLUP.</p> <p>Can DFO explain why commercial fisheries are an appropriate use in these small lakes if the Atlantic Cod in them are being considered for listing under the Species at Risk Act? Yes, Tariujarusiq Lake is near Pangnirtung.</p>	For further detailed information from NRCAN and for links to relevant research and mapping that has been conducted, please refer to Annex D "Sources of Information Relevant to Development of Nunavut Land Use Plan".	
GOC-68	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	2.1.3	Atlantic Cod Lakes	<p>The PSE-2 designation for the Cod Lakes lists permitted uses as "Tourism, Recreation, and Research". The draft NLUP defines "Tourism" as meaning "all land uses related to tourism, such as tourism facilities or outfitting." DFO is concerned about the breadth of the definition for "Tourism". With respect to "tourism" and "recreation" permitted uses, as both could include sports fishing, it is important that additional angling pressure not comprise the cod, which may become listed under the Species at Risk Act. DFO is also concerned with respect to the parameters of the permitted use of "research", which is not defined in the DNLUP, and as to whether research might extend to exploratory industrial activity.</p>	<p>The SARA designation was not advanced to justify managing Cod Lakes. Atlantic. Cod lakes have been removed from the DNLUP as there is no longer justification to provide special Terms to manage the species.</p>		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-69	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1	National Parks Awaiting Full Establishment	At page 39 of the DNLUP, Table 1: ECP-1, ID 76, National Parks Awaiting Full Establishment - Ukkusiksalik, listed permitted uses include "Tourism, Recreation, and Research" and prohibited uses are "All other uses". Please note that Wager Bay is a Schedule V water body identified in the NWT Fishery Regulations that might have commercial fishing, and there may be others. DFO recommends that "existing commercial fisheries" be added to the listed permitted uses until such time as Ukkusiksalik National Park, already an operating park, is formally legislated under the Canada National Parks Act. Afterward, commercial fishing will be guided by the NLCA which limits commercial fishing opportunities to beneficiaries of the agreement, by any applicable legislation and regulations and by the IIBA for Ukkusiksalik National Park.	The land use designations have been simplified to provide clarity. The Plan only identifies prohibited uses.	As we become aware of further information sources on this topic we will endeavor to make these known the NPC.	General comment noted.
GOC-70	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	5.1.3	Commercial Fisheries	Include "Shrimp" in Referenced Commercial Fisheries DFO suggests modifying the sentence on page 31, s.5.1.3 of the DNLUP, which presently states "Commercial fisheries are an emerging sector in Nunavut's economy, with turbot and char currently being harvested" to refer instead to "turbot, char and shrimp" (add "shrimp", which is currently being harvested).	Shrimp have been included to the text of the Plan.		
GOC-71	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	5.1.3	Commercial Fisheries	Consider Protecting Commercial Fishing Areas by Land Use Designation. The DNLUP plan identifies most important char and Greenland halibut (turbot) commercial fishing areas, but they are only assigned a recommendation and not a Land Use Designation. Since recommendations are not conformity requirements and therefore are neither legally binding nor enforceable, DFO strongly suggests protecting the following commercial fishing areas through a Land Use Designation: · The Cumberland Sound Turbot Management Area · Inshore Areas DFO notes that there has been a lot of interest, and some exploratory fisheries, in the inshore areas around Qikiqtarjuaq and Clyde River for Greenland Halibut (turbot), and a lot of recent interest in doing an exploratory fishery for Greenland Halibut (turbot) in Jones Sound near Grise Fiord. There has also been both past and recent interest in exploratory Greenland Halibut (turbot) fisheries from the community of Pond Inlet. · NAFO Divisions OA and OB. DFO notes that Nunavut has substantial Greenland Halibut (turbot) allocations in these areas, encompassing both the offshore in Davis Strait and Baffin Bay (identified as Zone 1 in Article 15 of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement) and the inshore inside the Nunavut Settlement Area Boundary. Please see Figure 3 for a map showing NAFO Divisions OA and OB.	Can DFO provide advice on how a Land Use Designation could protect commercial/exploratory/subsistence fishing areas? Are there particular uses that should be prohibited? It should also be noted that commercial fisheries would be a permitted use in all Mixed Use areas of the DNLUP.	DFO is concerned about the uncertainty that would remain if the DNLUP does not identify commercial fisheries to be a permitted use in the identified Atlantic Cod Lakes. The indication that NPC "would likely" consider existing exploratory licensed fisheries to be legal non-conforming uses under Section 7.9 of the draft NLUP leaves uncertainty and the categorization of those exploratory licensed fisheries as "legal non-conforming uses" does not reflect that they are initiatives by local communities. As well, if the science is available to make this management decision, exploratory fishing will lead to commercial opportunities. Both Qasigialiminiq and Tariujarusiq Lakes (located adjacent to Cumberland Sound) have active exploratory fisheries for Arctic Char. (Oak Lake is located in the southern portion of Frobisher Bay, and does not have an exploratory fishery.) Inuit organizations have sought to create economic opportunities to support communities through the development of fisheries. In order for a fishery to show commercial viability, sustained effort over a 5 year period is required through the exploratory licence phase to allow for proper assessment towards a commercial fishery status/ operation. It is important to enable economic opportunities on these lakes as science and traditional knowledge information becomes available. Given the current draft NLUP designation of "PSE", and considering that legal rights of a non-conforming use terminate when that use ceases, relying on a "non-conforming use" does not provide an indication to DFO or to the licence holders (such as Pangnirtung Hunting and Trappers Organization for Qasigialiminiq Lake exploratory fishery) that the NPC would allow the "non-conforming use" to change from an exploratory fishery to a commercial fishery. On NPC's question as to why commercial fisheries are an appropriate use in these small lakes if the Atlantic Cod in them are being considered for	SARA designation has not gone forward Atlantic. Cod lakes have been removed from the DNLUP.

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
								<p>listing under the Species at Risk Act, we advise as follows. On June 11, 2012, the Nunavut Wildlife Management board (NWMB) declined to approve the proposed listing of Atlantic Cod (Arctic Lakes' populations) under SARA. On November 30, 2012, the Minister of Environment (after consultation with the DFO Minister) accepted the NWMB's position and stated that he would be recommending to the Governor in Council that this species not be SARA-listed.</p> <p>Even if the Atlantic Cod, Arctic Lakes' populations, were listed, the listings would be as "Special Concern", where prohibitions against killing, etc. do not apply. Also, our information indicates that very few, if any, Atlantic Cod are caught as by catch during the Arctic char fishery. (There have been no reports of Atlantic Cod by catch during the last 5 years.) Additionally, with respect to the exploratory fishery at Tariujarusiq Lake, there is a specific licence condition limiting the amount of Atlantic Cod by catch.</p>	
GOC-72	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	5.1.3	Commercial Fisheries	Consider Protecting Commercial Fishing Areas by Land Use Designation. The Schedule V of the Northwest Territories Fishery Regulations list of water bodies that can be fished for commercial purposes in Nunavut Schedule V of the Northwest Territories Fishery Regulations <a href="http://lawslois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,c.847/page-13.html#-14">http://lawslois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/C.R.C.,c.847/page-13.html#-14</a> includes a list of water bodies that can be fished for commercial purposes in Nunavut. Specifically, for Nunavut refer to the water bodies and their details that are listed for Regions IV, V, and VI.	There are several hundred water bodies identified in the regulations Shapefiles identifying these water bodies would be required. Goal 1 of the broad planning policies objectives and goals require that the Plan recognize jurisdictional responsibilities and not duplicate other regulatory processes.		
GOC-73	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	5.1.3	Commercial Fisheries	Consider Protecting Commercial Fishing Areas by Land Use Designation. Shrimp Fishing Areas (SFAs) DFO notes that Nunavut has allocations in the SFAs (see Figure 4 and 5). There have been changes to boundaries of Shrimp Fishing Areas, which are being implemented for 2013. The attached slide shows SFAs Davis Strait, Nunavut and Nunavik (former SFAs 2 and 3). (Although this slide is entitled "Proposed SFAs", these new SFAs have now been approved.)	Consideration has been given on how to mitigate impacts on commercial fisheries and the plan undated accordingly.		
GOC-74	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	2	Fisheries	Consider Protecting Exploratory Fisheries by Land Use Designation DFO strongly suggests protecting the following exploratory fishing areas through Land Use Designation: Exploratory Arctic Char Fisheries [specific sites near Pangnirtung, Coral Harbour, Qikiqtarjuaq, Bathurst Inlet]	Can DFO provide advice on how a Land Use Designation could protect commercial/exploratory/subsistence fishing areas? Are there particular uses that should be prohibited?	It is important to ensure that Subsistence, Exploratory, Commercial and Not yet developed Emerging Fisheries (or fishing opportunities) be afford Land Use Designations and/or specified as permitted uses. Inuit representatives have underlined the reliance of beneficiaries under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement on natural resources to maintain and enhance community development, including reliance on current Commercial Greenland Halibut and Shrimp fisheries.	Consideration has been given on how to mitigate impacts on commercial fisheries.

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-75	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.1.2	Fisheries	<p>Expand Statement on Subsistence Harvesting; Ensure "Cultural Value" is understood to include the Harvesting of Fish and Marine Mammals.</p> <p>Chapter 4.1.2, Community Land Use, states: "Nunavummiut rely on migrating species for subsistence, and as a result, have a long established history of land use across much of the NSA. The Commission has been working to map this history, within living memory. Areas of importance to communities have been identified based on patterns of community land use. To manage impacts on areas of traditional land use, they are only assigned a Recommendation (BHC-R2)." "Migrating species" are not defined in the DNLUP, and may not be understood to include fish and marine mammals. DFO suggests that the statement be amended to read "...Nunavummiut rely on migrating species, including fish and marine mammals for subsistence".</p>	Plan has been revised, General comment noted.		
GOC-76	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.1.2	Fisheries	<p>DFO also strongly suggests that, after consultation with communities, consideration be given to protecting important subsistence fisheries through a Land Use Designation, rather than by a recommendation, which is neither legally binding nor enforceable. Another example, the BHC-R2 Recommendation given to areas of traditional land use is "Project Proposals located in areas of traditional land use should take into account impacts on the cultural value of the area." "Cultural value" is not defined and may not be understood by all to include subsistence harvesting. DFO suggests that consideration be given to defining "Cultural value" and indicating that subsistence harvesting of fish and marine mammals is included as part of "cultural value".</p>	It should also be noted that commercial fisheries would be a permitted use in all Mixed Use areas of the DNLUP. The land use designations have been revised to include priorities and values that address cultural values.		
GOC-77	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.1.2/5.1.3	Fisheries	<p>Commercial/Exploratory and Subsistence Fisheries Should Be Given Land Use Designations</p> <p>DFO strongly suggests that commercial/exploratory and important subsistence fisheries are given Land Use Designations. While the designations of commercial and subsistence fishing areas may overlap, it is recommended that important subsistence char fishing areas be explicitly protected.</p>	It should also be noted that commercial fisheries would be a permitted use in all Mixed Use areas of the DNLUP. Consideration has been given to how to mitigate impacts on commercial fisheries and subsistence fisheries. At present the land use plan prohibits activities.		
GOC-78	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP, Working Together	7	Implementation	<p>Clarify Implementation Process and Include Information about "Regulatory Authorities" in Implementation</p> <p>At page 35 of the DNLUP, under "Implementation Strategy", "Conformity Determination" states that "A Conformity Determination is a review of a Project Proposal to determine if it complies with the criteria of the Plan." It goes on to state that NPC shall receive and consider all Project Proposals, determine if they conform to the Plan, forward proposals with determinations and any recommendations to "the appropriate federal and territorial agencies" and for project proposals that are not exempt from screening by NIRB, forward same to the NIRB with determination/ recommendations for the NIRB to screen.</p>	The Implementation Strategy has been updated to closely reflect NUPPAA.		
GOC-79	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	2.2	Cumulative Impacts	<p>A project under DFO's Strategic Program for Ecosystem-Based Research and Advice (SPERA) will produce a heat map of cumulative shipping impacts on walrus in the Foxe Basin/ Hudson Strait complex. Jason Hamilton is the principal investigator of this project. (DFO will provide this map to the NPC when completed, as an example of a tool that can be used to assess cumulative impacts.)</p>	General comment noted. The information can be introduced at the public hearing on the Plan or through future plan amendment.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-80	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3.1.1.3	Application of plan	Application of Plan to National Marine Conservation Areas (NMCAs) DFO suggests that the wording of passages that discuss the application of the draft NLUP to NMCAs be modified to provide greater consistency and address the following concern. The draft states at page 14, 1.3.4, "Application of the Plan": "The Plan does not apply within established National Parks, National Marine Conservation Areas..." At page 2, 3.1.1.3, "National Marine Conservation Areas" the draft Plan again indicates that "land use plans developed by the Commission do not apply within established NMCA's". Page 16, 2.1 sets out that the Commission's Objectives include to "manage land use in and around areas of biological importance, Conservation Areas..." and to "address the requirements for conservation, management and protection of aquatic resources, their habitats and ecosystems." DFO suggests that the objectives statement make it clear that the objective is not to manage land in Conservation Areas (as currently stated), so that the objectives are consistent with the stated application of the Plan.	To clarify, the plan will apply to "Conservation Areas" as defined under Article 9 of the NLCA (this list does not include NMCAs). NUPPAA clarifies that the plan will not apply to established NMCAs. The objectives were developed under 11.4.1(a) and cannot be modified at this point. General comment noted and when the 11.4.1(a) document is revisited the point of clarity can be addressed.	With respect to NPC's clarification that the plan will apply to Conservation Areas as defined under article 9 of the NLCA, and will not apply to established NMCAs, DFO notes that Marine Protected Areas can be established under the Oceans Act. While national parks and NMCAs are specifically exempt from the draft NLUP, an Oceans Act Marine Protected Area (MPA) created in the Nunavut Settlement Area is not specifically exempt from the draft NLUP.	NPC agrees with this response. Should an MPA be proposed the Land Use Plan can support its establishment and management.
GOC-81	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	2	PSE	Page 16 lists areas and issues that have been identified to support the goal of protecting and sustaining the environment. DFO suggests that "key fish and/or marine mammal habitat areas" be added to the bulleted list.  DFO suggests clarification to make it clear that the Protecting and Sustaining the Environment designation persists in a scenario where, for example, an interest - a marine mammal or fish - may no longer exist/be present in an area, but is a Species at Risk and the area is part of a recovery plan for that species.	General comment noted.		
GOC-82	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.2		Page 25, 4.2, DFO suggests that the Commission's policy to "identify methods to manage ship traffic, ship to shore activities and routes in marine areas of Nunavut" state that the Commission will achieve this objective in consultation with the Government of Nunavut and relevant GoC departments.	Policies are from 11.4.1(a) and have been removed from the DNLUP as they are specific to the operations of the NPC and not appropriate in the Plan.		
GOC-83	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1	PSE-3 Permitted and Prohibited Uses	Marine Infrastructure At page 38, Land Use Designation PSE-3 lists permitted uses as "Tourism, Recreation, Research, Marine Infrastructure, Marine Communications and Electrical Cables". This designation encompasses the Belcher Island Polynyas, the North Water Polynya and several Marine Conservation Areas (MCAs). Marine Infrastructure is defined as meaning "ports or other infrastructure needed to support the coming and going of marine vessels to land and communities." As polynyas, MCAs and Marine Protected Areas (MPA) are all highly sensitive areas, DFO strongly suggests that the impact of human activities on these environments be as minimal as possible. DFO strongly suggests that marine shipping activities and infrastructure in these polynyas not be a permitted use and that a PSE-2 designation should be considered for any area containing a Polynya, MPA or MCA.	The NPC has revised the plan to include these important marine habitats.		
GOC-84	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1	ECP -1 Permitted and Prohibited Uses	Research Page 39, ECP-1 Designation lists permitted uses as: "Tourism, Recreation, and Research". DFO has the same concerns with the scope of these permitted uses with respect to the proposed Lancaster Sound National Marine Conservation Area as stated in the preceding paragraph regarding the PSE 2 and 3 designations and the meaning of these terms.	The Land Use Designations have been simplified in the revised DNLUP. Research when managed is specifically defined.		
GOC-85	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1	ESED -1 Corridors	Page 43, ESED-1 Designation lists the permitted uses as: "Mining, Remediation and Reclamation Activities, Roads, Railways, Utilities and Corridors." "Utility Corridor" is defined in the DNLUP to mean "an area that is intended to be used for electrical, utility or communications infrastructure." DFO is concerned that shipping intensity and periodicity by way of a corridor not be a permitted ESED-1 use, and suggests that this designation be clarified with respect to what type of "Corridors" is permitted.	The Land Use Designations have been simplified in the revised DNLUP. The intent of land use designations that support the ESED Goal of the plan is intended to promote economic development. Economic Development requires infrastructure to transport materials to global markets. The Plan explains the limitations to establishing transportation corridors at this time.		



Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-86	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Appendix A	Community Maps	DFO suggests that the Community Maps appended to the draft NLUP be revised to more clearly illustrate the Land Use Designations and to make the maps easier to utilize and avoid the need for the user to repeatedly refer back and forth between the maps and the Land Use Designation Tables. For example, the map on page 46 of the draft NLUP contains several overlapping Land Use Designations, including Building Healthy Communities, Protecting and Sustaining the Environment, Encouraging Conservation Planning and Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development. DFO also suggests modifications to ensure that no designated area is hidden beneath another and that measures such as putting the Land Use Designations on each page for ease of reference be considered. To improve the flow of the draft Plan and the Options and Recommendations document, DFO also recommends creating a better link between the maps and the Land Use Designations.	Community Maps have been removed from the DNLUP. It is ok if Land use designations overlap. The implementation of the Plan will be automated once NUPPAA is enacted. The NPC is the authority on advising regulatory authorities and proponents on the requirements of the land use plan. This is achieved through the issuance of conformity determinations. If clarity is required the NPC would encourage you to contact our office directly.		
GOC-87	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Schedule A	Lancaster Sound National Marine Conservation Area	The ECP-1 Proposed Lancaster Sound Conservation Area under a large opaque polygon (shapefile) does not demonstrate to the reader that this is marine habitat and it is overlain by the ESED designation which, as it will allow for marine shipping, gives conflicting information.	The Land Use Designations have been simplified in the revised DNLUP. The map has been revised to more clearly reflect the requirements of the various land use designations and terms applicable within the proposed Lancaster Sound Marine Conservation Area.		
GOC-88	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Appendix A	Permitted and Prohibited Uses	DFO also suggests revisions to the map on Page 68, the Sanikiluaq Community Map, PSE-3 (36) Belcher Island Polynya. PSE-3 (36) is referenced as Key Bird Habitat (P.38 Table 1), which is somewhat consistent with the information reported in the DFO document "Conversations with Nunavut Communities on Areas of Ecological Importance" (at p. 131) , however this DFO document also elaborates with much greater detail on important habitat of several other species and notes an additional Polynya (at page130). PSE-3 Land Use Designation lists permitted uses as "Tourism, Recreation, Research, Marine Infrastructure, Marine Communications and Electrical Cables". "Marine infrastructure" is defined as "ports or other infrastructure needed to support the coming and going of marine vessels to land and communities". DFO suggests that permitting the "marine infrastructure" be reconsidered, as it does not promote the intent of the PSE designation.	The NPC has revised the plan to include these important marine habitats.		
GOC-89	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	General	Information and Map Scale	DFO suggests that NPC use the information relied on to create the maps in 'Conversations with Nunavut Communities on Areas of Ecological Importance - Fisheries and Oceans 2011' (see Appendix), as those maps clearly identify communities, and reference polynyas, fish, wildlife and marine mammal habitat at map scale which better conveys information such as how shipping activity might be referenced to a particular land location. DFO also suggests consideration of including additional detail in the Tables to document fish and fish habitat (including marine mammals) as well as birds and caribou, available in the information in the 2011 DFO document 'Conversations with Nunavut Communities on Areas of Ecological Importance'.	General comment noted.		
GOC-90	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	General	Data Layers and Shape Files	DFO suggests including the following DFO data layers into the draft NLUP:• Land locked Cod Lakes;• Arctic Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs);• Arctic Marine Workshop, Areas of High Biological Importance (HBI);• Traditional Knowledge; and• Foxe Basin Area of InterestPlease see the Annex at the end of this chapter for information as to how to access the data layers and shapefiles	It would be beneficial if DFO could advise the Commission on how these areas may need to be managed.	DFO is reviewing EBSAs in the Nunavut Settlement Area with a view to possibly identifying areas of heightened ecological importance. Further information on the EBSAs may be submitted to NPC for its consideration under the 'Protecting and Sustaining the Environment' designation. Information that will inform how these areas may need to be managed may also follow.	

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-91	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP		Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs)	Arctic Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs) DFO strongly suggests that the draft NLUP reference all of the EBSAs identified in the recent Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat (CSAS) process. (Please refer to <a href="http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/SAR-AS/2011/2011_055-eng.pdf">http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/SAR-AS/2011/2011_055-eng.pdf</a> .) The EBSAs are identified through a scientific and technical process, combining the best available scientific and traditional knowledge. They are evaluated against a specific set of criteria, including: uniqueness; aggregation; fitness consequence; resilience and naturalness. The EBSA maps show policy makers and managers which criteria were met to make the area an EBSA. Policy guidance on management of EBSAs is limited to 'areas where a higher degree of risk aversion is needed'. . Most of the important marine mammal areas would be noted if the plan identified EBSAs.. In the future, as available science and traditional knowledge about these areas expands, DFO may be able to provide additional information to NPC to assist with consideration of these areas.	NPC has taken this information into account and EBSA are incorporated into the Plan.		
GOC-92	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP		Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs)	Arctic Marine Workshop - Areas of High Biological Importance (HBI) These Areas of HBI are referenced in the options and recommendations section where they overlap with key bird habitat sites. If the above EBSA data is included, please remove the references to the Areas of HBI because they overlap.	The HBI information has been replaced by EBSA data.		
GOC-93	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP		Traditional Knowledge	Traditional Knowledge layers in the DFO shapefiles (see Annex) were collected by the DFO Oceans Program in 2011. The layers include valuable ecological and biological information, and were collected for marine planning purposes (under the MPA Network Initiative). These layers were included in the development of the EBSAs.	General comment noted.		
GOC-94	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP		Foxe Basin Area of Interest (AOI)	DFO recommends that NPC use the information in the shapefile with respect to the Foxe Basin AOI as it sees fit. An AIO for a Marine Protected Area (MPA) was identified in the Foxe Basin marine area. Nunavut agencies and communities, government departments and other stakeholders were consulted and expressed interest in establishing a MPA in the Foxe Basin marine area. The Foxe Basin marine area is a major entrance/exit migratory route for bowhead whales and narwhal through Fury and Hecla Strait. It is also a central aggregation area for walrus. A small Polynya provides highly productive habitat for a wide variety of marine life. The boundary of the AOI was identified through community consultations and science meetings. The MPA process was postponed.	This information has been used in the revised DNLUP to manage project proposals within the Foxe Basin Marine Area of importance.		
GOC-95	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP		Shapefiles	The above comments for the draft Nunavut Land Use Plan include recommendations to include/consider three additional shapefiles. Please see the Annex for directions to these shapefiles.	General comment noted.		
GOC-96	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Acronyms	CFS	The word Services is incorrect. DND does not have CF Services and this term could be misleading for the general public. DND/CAF has only one station in the North which is CFS Alert. <b>Recommend:</b> Recommend to replace the word Services with Station.	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-97	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Acronyms	DND	The acronym listed only says DND although both Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces are listed. <b>Recommend:</b> To change to DND/CAF to reflect both Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-98	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	Definition of Land	The definition could be more inclusive by using the NUPPAA definition. <b>Recommend:</b> Using/referring to the definition from NUPPAA: "Land" includes land covered by water, whether in onshore or offshore, waters and resources, including wildlife"	The NPC has revised the definition to ensure consistency with the NUPPAA definition.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-99	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	Definition of Land Use Designation	<p>Land Use Designation This definition could be expanded to explain the purpose of Land Use Designations and its role. Land Use Designations are geographic-specific categories with associated sets of land use and management policies associated to them.</p> <p><b>Recommend:</b> Suggest that the definition of Land Use Designation should include the purpose and role of Land Use Designations.</p>	The revised DNLUP includes this information.		
GOC-100	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	New Definition - Permitted Uses	<p><b>Permitted Use:</b> The definition of Prohibited uses is defined but not Permitted uses.</p> <p><b>Recommend:</b> Adding the definition of permitted uses. NUPPAA under 48(2) provides: "a land use plan may contain descriptions of permitted, subject to any terms and conditions that the plan sets out, and prohibited uses of land."</p>	The NPC has revised the definition to ensure consistency with the NUPPAA definition.		
GOC-101	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	Definition - Transportation Corridor	<p>Clarification question: The word "intended" within the definition implies that the term transportation corridor only refers to new or proposed routes not those that already exist. This is not clear. If it is referring to all transportation corridors, existing and future then the definition should reflect this.</p> <p><b>Recommend:</b> To clarify the meaning of the definition to existing or new or both.</p>	The NPC has taken this into consideration.		
GOC-102	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	1.3.4	Terminology	Last paragraph - Final sentence and throughout the document Term Project and Project Proposal "...as they relate to the management and regulation of project proposals." Project proposals and projects seem to be interchangeable within the Plan which creates a lot of confusion. In this case it seems as though the sentence is referring to projects not project proposals. The Plan either needs to distinguish between the two and ensure they are used in the correct context throughout or only use one of the terms. Recommend: To clarify the use of project and project proposal in the Plan.	The NPC has taken this into consideration. Note: NUPPAA uses either Term.		
GOC-103	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	2.1		First bullet The sentence contains two different tenses and should be reworded. Suggest deleting the "s" on provides Recommend: Deleting the "s" on provides.	Revised.		
GOC-104	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	2.1	Definitions	<p>Second bullet Areas of Significance to Inuit This term is mentioned within bullet two, is this the same as areas of interest as defined within the definitions section, or does this have a different meaning? If it is different this meaning should be provided in the definitions section.</p> <p>Recommend: Defining in glossary section, areas of significance to Inuit and Areas of Interest need found in para. 2.1, second bullet to help the reader understand the difference between both terms.</p>	The definitions have the same meaning. The Areas of Significance to Inuit are the Areas of Interest that were identified by Inuit.		
GOC-105	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.4.2	Land Remediation	<p>"The Former Distant Early Warning (DEW) was" ... add "a" after was.</p> <p>Also - the areas should be replaced by the sites. Recommend: 1st sentence in para 4.4.2 : Add "a" between the word was and system.</p> <p>"The Former Distant Early Warning (DEW) was a system of radar stations built in 1954 across the Arctic as the primary line of air defense warning for the North American Continent."</p> <p>2nd sentence in para 4.4.2: Recommend replacing the word areas with the word 'sites' has it is the correct term to refer to the NWS Establishments.</p> <p>The areas are either administered by the Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada....</p>	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-106	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.4.2	Land Remediation -Editorial	<p>Last Paragraph Sentence should be reworded so that it does not indicate DND directly requested the 300m set back.</p> <p><b>Recommended:</b> "A 300m setback will be applied to areas under the administrative control of the Department of National Defence."</p>	Can DND clarify which sentence needs rewording?	See Annex B.	Annex B does not address that setback issue and is not addressed in the revised DNLUP.

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-107	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.5.1	Department of National Defence Sites - Editorial	Please change the title of this section from Canadian Forces Stations to Department of National Defence Establishments DND/CF only owns one Canadian Forces Stations in Nunavut (CFS Alert) and the information could be misleading to the general public. <b>Recommend:</b> Change the title by removing the word "Stations" and replacing it with "Establishments" as per the definition in the National Defence Act (NDA) "Defence Establishments".	The NPC has revised the title.		
GOC-108	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.5.1.1	Canadian Forces Stations - Editorial	<b>Recommend:</b> Replace the word airport with the term 'aerodrome'. There are no airport facilities in Eureka and the information could be misleading to the general public. Replace the current wording with the following paragraph: Eureka is a site shared by multiple Federal Departments such as Environmental Canada, Natural Resources Canada and Department of National Defence. The aerodrome is administered by Environment Canada. Fort Eureka (accommodation building located beside the aerodrome) is maintained by DND, a number of other buildings are located on the site and maintained by Environmental Canada such as the Weather station.	The NPC has revised the wording in the paragraph as well as the title of airport to aerodrome.		
GOC-109	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.5.1.1	Canadian Forces Stations - Editorial	Canadian Forces Stations 2nd paragraph <b>Recommend:</b> Rewriting and shortening the 3rd para in section 4.5.1.1 as follows: "Nanisivik is the future site of the deep-water naval facility and helipad located on Baffin Island, 40 km from the community of Arctic Bay in Nunavut. Once complete, the naval facility will support the Royal Canadian Navy and other Government of Canada operations."	The NPC has revised the 3rd paragraph to match that recommended by DND.		
GOC-110	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	7.10.	Land Use Designations, Terms and Recommendations - Editorial	7.10 Land Use Designations, Terms and Recommendations <b>Recommend:</b> Removing "the Commission believes that..."	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-111	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 1	Editorial	Table 1 BHC-9 CFS Eureka to be replaced by DND Establishments Recommend: Amending to: DND Establishment instead of CFS Eureka	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-112	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 3.3	Editorial	Table 3.3 Remove "CFS" Eureka and insert Fort Eureka (DND Accommodation building) <b>Recommend:</b> In Table 1, page 41, item 203 should read "Eureka" and not 'Canadian Forces Station Eureka' as this site does not belong to DND. We only own a few structures on the site.	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-113	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Table 3.3	Editorial	Table 3.3 Remove "CFS" in front of Nanisivik and replace by Nanisivik Naval Facility <b>Recommend:</b> In Table 1, page 41, item 204 should read "Nanisivik Naval Facility" and not Canadian Forces Station Nanisivik.	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-114	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Ref A	The whole document	References to CF (Canadian Forces) must now be changed to CAF (Canadian Armed Forces).	The DNLUP has been revised.		
GOC-115	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Definitions	DND Establishment	DND Establishments. DND/CAF would like to insert the following definition in your Definition Section of the DNLUP. <b>Definition:</b> DND Establishments: as an installation together with its personnel and major equipment, organized as an operating entity.	The DNLUP has been revised to include this definition.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-116	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	4.5	Sovereignty	<p>DND/CAF supports the implementation of the GoC Northern Strategy. The GoC has given CAF three roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Defending Canada</li> <li>o Defending North America</li> <li>o Contributing to International Peace and Security</li> </ul> <p>In the Arctic, CAF must have the capacity to exercise control over and defend Canada's sovereignty. As activities and development on land and waters increases in Northern regions, the military will play a vital role in demonstrating a visible Canadian presence and helping other government agencies to respond to any threats which may arise. Specifically CAF will maintain the capacity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide surveillance of Canadian territory and air and maritime approaches;</li> <li>- Maintain search and rescue response capabilities that are able to reach those in distress anywhere in Canada on a 24/7 basis;</li> <li>- Assist civil authorities in responding to a wide range of threats from natural disasters to terrorist attacks.</li> </ul> <p>In support of our role and mandate, we believe that DND Establishments and sites should be included in another Land Use Designation and not in the Building Healthier Communities. After reviewing the NPC Broad Planning Policies, Objectives and Goals (1) we suggest that DND/CAF would be best located within the first Goal 1: Strengthening Partnership and Institutions. This Land Use Designation would be a new one added to the Draft Plan.</p> <p>(1) Source: Nunavut Planning Commission Broad Planning Policies, Objectives and Goals, 10 November 2007, Cambridge Bay, NU. According, the Commission's Objective is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o promotes an integrated approach that acknowledges the roles and supports the continued implementation of cooperative management processes of all departments and agencies with responsibility for air quality, land, water and resource management, as well as traditional land users. It avoids duplication and maximizes available resources. This Land Use Designation would better represent DND/CAF role in the North.</li> </ul>	The broad planning policies, objectives and goals of the NPC set out five broad areas and issues. To maintain consistency with the original DNLUP the chapters have not been changed however, the Land Use Designations within these chapter headings have been revised. DND Establishments have been designated as Special Management Areas (SMA).		
GOC-117	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Ref B		<p>Ref statement: AANDC should have full access to Northern Contaminated Sites.</p> <p>DND/CAF agrees that AANDC should have access to Northern Contaminated Sites which they are responsible for under the MOU between both departments (DND/AANDC), dated 1984.</p> <p>As the 6 sites listed below are co-located with active North Warning System sites, we recommend that the permitted access by restricted to the DEW line remediation areas and not to the North Warning System site and installations.</p> <p>Recommend the following wording for the following 6 sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BAF- 5 Resolution Island</li> <li>- CAM-B Hat Island</li> <li>- CAM-D Simpson Lake</li> <li>- FOX-A Bray Island</li> <li>- FOX-B Nadluardjuk Lake</li> <li>- FOX-1 Rowley Island</li> </ul> <p>- Permitted Uses: Remediation and Reclamation Activities, DND Operations and Activities, AANDC Remediation Activities</p>	The Plan has been revised to allow Federal Government operations. We believe the GoC can manage /appropriate activities at these sites in accordance with jurisdictional interests.	PCA recommends that the NLUP does not prohibit the establishment of NPs or NMCAs or the designation of NHSs anywhere in the NSA subject to meeting all relevant requirements set out in the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement and the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act and respecting relevant Government of Canada policies. The comment that the NLUP should "not prevent advancing new Park or Conservation Area proposals within the Nunavut Settlement Area and Outer Land Fast Ice Zone, nor amendments to the boundaries." was provided as a joint comment from EC, PCA and DFO on September 16, 2010. The comment was reiterated in 2013 because it is unclear how it is being addressed in the draft NLUP. The definition of "Conservation Area" is that found in the NLCA and NUPPAA.	NPC is aware of the concern and has taken it into consideration in the revised DNLUP.



Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-118	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Ref A	BHC -9 Designation	The following sites listed are Distant Early Warning System sites.We suggest adding the site names as well as code name for ease of reference especially with the residents and communities of the NSA. Recommend removing the existing list and replacing with the following list:- PIN-2 Cape Young- PIN-3 Lady Franklin Point- PIN-4 Byron Bay- CAM-M Cambridge Bay- CAM-1 Jenny Lind Island- CAM-2 Gladman Point- CAM-3 Shepperd Bay- CAM-4 Pelly Bay- CAM-5 Mackar Inlet- FOX-M Hall Beach- FOX-1 Rowley Island- FOX-2 Longstaff Bluff- FOX-3 Dewar Lakes- FOX-4 Cape Hooper- FOX-5 Broughton Island- DYE-M Cape DyerThe wording for permitted and prohibited uses should remain as listed in the document:- Permitted uses: Remediation and Reclamation Activities, DND Operations and Activities- Prohibited uses: All other uses	The Plan is updated.		
GOC-119	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Ref A	BHC-10 Designation	<p>The following sites listed in this section are active North Warning System sites which are part of the North American Air Defence Modernization Project. We suggest adding the site names as well as code name for ease of reference especially with the residents and communities of the NSA. Recommend removing the existing list and replacing with the following list:</p> <p>Zone 1 - Inuvik  PIN-1BG Croker River</p> <p>Zone 2 - Cambridge Bay  PIN-2A Harding River  PIN-3 Lady Franklin Point  PIN-DA Edinburgh Island  PIN-EB Cape Peel West  CAM-M Cambridge Bay  CAM-A3A Sturt Point North  CAM-1A Jenny Lind Island  CAM-B Hat Island *  CAM-2 Gladman Point  CAM-CB Gjoa Haven  CAM-3 Shepherd Bay  CAM-D Simpson Lake *</p> <p>Zone 3 - Hall Beach  CAM-4 Pelly Bay  CAM-5A Cape McLoughlin  CAM-FA Lailor River  FOX-M Hall Beach  FOX-1 Rowley Island *  FOX-A Bray Island *  FOX-2 Longstaff Bluff  FOX-B Nadluardjuk Lake *  FOX-3 Dewar Lakes  FOX-CA Langok Fiord</p> <p>Zone 4 - Iqaluit  FOX-4 Cape Hooper  FOX-5 Broughton Island  DYE-M Cape Dyer  BAF-2 Cape Mercy  BAF-3 Brevoort Island  BAF-4A Loks Land  BAF-5 Resolution Island *</p> <p>The wording for permitted and prohibited uses should remain as listed in the document except for those annotated by an * (they have been described above in para 4).</p> <p>- Permitted uses: DND Operations and Activities  - Prohibited uses: All other uses</p>	The DNLUP has been revised to contain the list provided.	The comment that the NLUP should “not prevent advancing new Park or Conservation Area proposals within the Nunavut Settlement Area and Outer Land Fast Ice Zone, nor amendments to the boundaries.” was provided as a joint comment from EC, PCA and DFO on September 16, 2010. The comment was reiterated in 2013 because it is unclear how it is being addressed in the draft NLUP. The definition of “Conservation Area” is that found in the NLCA and NUPPAA.	

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-120	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Ref A - new	DND Establishment	<p>Gascoyne Inlet located on Devon Island.</p> <p>DND/CAF site which should be included in the NLUP.</p> <p>A ArcGIS Shapefile of the site has been provided to your GIS Staff.</p> <p>This site is used for Science and Research personnel at DND. The camp includes accommodation facilities, storage buildings and airstrip, This site is also been used for several exercises by the Canadian Rangers and for sovereignty operations.</p> <p>Recommend the following wording:</p> <p>- Permitted uses: DND Operations and Activities</p> <p>- Prohibited uses: All other uses</p>	The DNLUP has been revised to include this site.		
GOC-121	Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces	18/07/2013	DNLUP	Ref A - new		<p>High Arctic Data Communications Systems (HADCS) sites.</p> <p>DND/CAF sites which should be included in the NLUP. The High Arctic Data Communication System is a chain of six microwave repeaters sites link used for communication purposes.</p> <p>ArcGIS Shapefiles of each site have been provided to your GIS Staff.</p> <p>Hurricane Microwave System - GRANT</p> <p>Hurricane Microwave System - VICTOR</p> <p>Hurricane Microwave System - WHISKEY</p> <p>Hurricane Microwave System - YANKEE</p> <p>Hurricane Microwave System - IDA</p> <p>Hurricane Microwave System - BLACK TOP RIDGE</p> <p>Recommend the following wording:</p> <p>- Permitted uses: DND Operations and Activities</p> <p>- Prohibited uses: All other uses</p>	The DNLUP has been revised to include these sites.	<p>Comments were provided by PCA to NPC on that issue in 2010 and these comments are still valid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• June 15, 2010 email from Maryse Mahy to Jonathan Savoy and Adrian Boyd: "Please also note that, further to our discussion of informal notification zones around national historic sites, the proposed 25km notification zone may change for some sites as a result of future NHS-IIBA negotiations on these national historic sites."</li> <li>• June 8, 2010 email from Maryse Mahy to Jonathan Savoy and Adrian Boyd: "NPC proposal: As suggested in your February 23, 2010 email, an "informal notification zone" can also be used for National Historic Sites, similar to the proposal for National Parks. We propose the notification area be 25 km. Notification can be given for all projects, or for a list of activities chosen by Parks Canada. Please let me know Parks Canada's preference for the size of the notification area and the type of activities to be referred. Note that this is not an official zone that will be included on the Plan, but an informal administrative tool used by the NPC to inform Parks Canada of activities near National Historic Sites.</li> </ul> <p>PCA Comment: Thank you. The proposed notification approach (25 Km notification zone) seems to address our concerns. At this point, we would appreciate being notified of any project that NPC assesses for conformity, whether or not it is sent to NIRB for review, because we are currently unsure of the scope of NPC's conformity assessments. We also would like to know if it will be possible to adjust this later (possibly by identifying types of projects about which we would like to be notified) if we realize that being notified of any project assessed by NPC for conformity is unnecessary."</p> <p>"Please also note that, further to our discussion of informal notification zones around national historic sites, the proposed 25km notification zone may change for some sites as a result of future NHS-IIBA negotiations on these national historic sites."</p>	It is NPC's intention to have a mechanism to provide notifications through an online tool.

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-122	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3.1	Editorial	Legal ComplianceGoC Expectation: The planning process and resulting DNLUP shall be compliant with the NLCA and NUPPAA. • Section 3.1 of the 2011/2012 DNLUP refers to existing parks as well as future parks and should clearly indicate under a subheading that the NLUP does not apply to or within Auyuittuq, Quttinirpaaq, and Sirmilik national parks of Canada (section 8.2.9 of the NLCA) nor within new national parks (for example, Ukkusiksalik, Qausuittuq/Bathurst Island) once established (section 8.2.10 of the NLCA) under the Canada National Parks Act.	Revised.		
GOC-123	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3.1.1.3	Editorial	It should also be clearly stated that the NLUP will not apply to or within any NMCA once established (section 8.2.10 of the NLCA) or to National Historic Sites when administered by Parks Canada (section 9.3.5) although no National Historic Sites are administered by Parks Canada at the time of development of this DNLUP.	Wording in sections 3.1.1.3 and 3.1.2.4 address this comment.	June 15, 2010 email from Maryse Mahy to Jonathan Savoy and Adrian Boyd.	
GOC-124	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3.1.1.2		Policy Consistency GoC Expectation: the DNLUP must be consistent with federal department and agency mandates, authorities, commitments and policies, including international conventions and agreements. • The area east of the proposed Qausuittuq NP boundary (currently covered by a land withdrawal) should be protected from development as decided by the Senior MERA Committee in 2002 (moratorium on mineral exploration and development until the Peary caribou recover and/or their fate is otherwise determined.)	The Plan has been revised to address this concern regarding the protection of Perry Caribou.	Please see DFO's suggestion that EBSAs be identified. Information on this topic can be found via the Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat (CSAS) process. (Please refer to <a href="http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/SAR-AS/2011/2011_055-eng.pdf">http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/SAR-AS/2011/2011_055-eng.pdf</a> .)	EBSAs have been included in the revised DNLUP.
GOC-125	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3	Permitted and Prohibited Uses	The NLUP should not prevent advancing new Park or Conservation Area proposals within the Nunavut Settlement Area and Outer Land Fast Ice Zone, nor amendments to the boundaries of the currently proposed protected areas that are indicated in the land use plan, subject to meeting all relevant requirements set out in the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement and the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act and respecting relevant Government of Canada policies. (Comment made in GoC comments from September 2010)	In response to other planning partner feedback approximately 6% of the NSA prohibits the establishment of new parks and conservation areas because it has been identified as having high mineral potential by AANDC. National Historic Parks administered by PCA are considered to be conforming in any land use designation including the area exclusive to mineral exploration.		
GOC-126	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3.1.1.3	National Marine Conservation Areas	The NLUP should not prevent other planning processes including those for federal/ territorial marine and terrestrial protected area networks, integrated management and establishing marine environmental quality standards. (Comment made in GoC comments from September 2010). Parks and Conservation Areas (as defined in the NLCA, i.e., including national parks, national marine conservation areas and national historic sites) will be established in the future in areas of Nunavut that had not yet been precisely identified when this DNLUP was being developed. In particular, the GoC has committed in its National Marine Conservation Areas System Plan to establish national marine conservation areas in all marine regions that are partly or entirely within the Nunavut Settlement Area. In addition to the Lancaster Sound region, areas of interest have been identified in all remaining marine regions within the NSA (Arctic Basin, Arctic Archipelago, Queen Maud Gulf, Baffin Island Shelf, Foxe Basin, Hudson Bay, James Bay and Hudson Strait). Preferred NMCA candidates have been confirmed in two of these marine regions (Hudson Bay and James Bay). Information on these future national marine conservation area proposals may only become available after the approval of a first generation NLUP. (Comment made in GoC comments from September 2010) The GoC has also made commitments to establish national parks in natural regions within the Nunavut Settlement Areas that are not yet represented. National historic sites can be found in almost any setting, from urban or industrial locales to wilderness environments. It is imperative that the land use plan recognizes the need for flexibility in incorporating National Historic Sites (NHS) in all zones and allowing for the preservation of their heritage value. Most national historic sites are relatively small in size, often commemorating a single structure, however, some sites, such as the Fall Caribou Crossing, may consist of large tracts of land.	NPC is aware of the concern and has taken it into consideration in the revised DNLUP. Less than 6% of the Territorial restricts the establishment of Parks and Conservation Areas. This special management of the NSA applies to the areas AANDC identified as potentially having high mineral potential. The Plan allows for National Historic Parks administered by parks Canada to be established in any land use designation.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-127	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP		Permitted and Prohibited Uses	Clarity and Conformity Determinations GoC Expectations: - The DNLUP must be clear and understandable to all users. - Conformity determinations are expected to be based on objective and clear conformity requirements. • As indicated in comments provided by PCA in the past along with other GoC comments, for proposed national parks that have a land withdrawal in place the Territorial Lands Act requirements should be respected in the definition of permitted/prohibited uses in the NLUP, i.e., the affected land requires special management consistent with the prevention of new third party interests in these lands, the affected land cannot be disposed by lease or licence of occupation; these areas also require special management to ensure that the cultural and ecological integrity and heritage values of future park resources are preserved.	General comment noted.		
GOC-128	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3.1.1.3	Permitted and Prohibited Uses	• As indicated in comments provided by the GoC before, the NLUP should recognize/support interim protection of the area within the proposed Lancaster Sound NMCA boundary through a conformity requirement prohibiting the exploration for or development of petroleum resources within Canada's proposed NMCA boundary. Note that the proposed ECP-1 designation for the proposed NMCA would not be consistent with the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act, which allows marine navigation and fishing to continue within the conditions set out in a NMCA management plan and zoning. Therefore, ECP-1 as presently proposed is not an appropriate designation for Lancaster Sound within the DNLUP. The only outright prohibitions in NMCAs under the Act are mineral and petroleum exploration and development, and ocean dumping; the extent and nature of other uses will be set out in the Lancaster Sound NMCA zoning and management plan. ECP-2 as presently defined would appear to be a better designation.	The Plan has been revised reflect the feedback received.		
GOC-129	Parks Canada	18/07/2013			Notification	• PCA has in the past discussed the idea with NPC of a "notification zone" around existing national parks, national marine conservation areas and national historic sites to inform PCA of proposed projects outside of these Parks and Conservation Areas that could affect them. It is not clear currently how this concept is being integrated in the DNLUP.	The NPC is developing an automated system to implement the land use plan. Interested parties will be able to sign up to be notified when project proposals are received.		
GOC-130	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	3.1	Existing and Proposed Parks and Conservation Areas	• The DNLUPs have not clearly addressed the following interests to date: o The NLUP should not prevent advancing new Park or Conservation Area (As defined in the NLCA, i.e., including national parks, national marine conservation areas and national historic sites) proposals within the Nunavut Settlement Area and Outer Land Fast Ice Zone, nor amendments to the boundaries of the currently proposed protected areas that are indicated in the land use plan, subject to meeting all relevant requirements set out in the NLCA and NUPPAA and to respecting relevant GoC policies. (Comment made in GoC comments from September 2010) o The NLUP should not prevent other planning processes including federal/ territorial marine and terrestrial protected area networks, integrated management and establishing marine environmental quality standards. o National historic sites can be found in almost any setting, from urban or industrial locales to wilderness environments. It is imperative that the land use plan recognizes the need for flexibility in incorporating NHSs in all zones and allowing for the preservation of their heritage value. Most national historic sites are relatively small in size, often commemorating a single structure, however, some sites, such as the Fall Caribou Crossing, may consist of large tracts of land. Clarity on how these interests will be met in the NLUP is important.	The revised DNLUP has addressed these concerns.		

Comment ID	Organization Name	Date of Submission	Document Referenced	Section Referenced	Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced	Comment	NPC Response	Comment #2	NPC Response #2
GOC-131	Parks Canada	Hiukitak River	DNLUP	3.1.1.2	Parks	Updates on status of park establishment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The national park proposed on Bathurst Island is now referred to as the proposed Qausuittuq National Park.</li> <li>Updated shapefile for boundaries of Ukkusiksalik NP: It will include the Inuit Owned Lands now known as RE-32 once the exchange process is fully completed. An Order in Council (PC2012-0786) was made in June 2012 to authorize the exchange; the last step with the Land Titles Office is waiting to be completed. (<a href="http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/oic-ddc.asp?lang=eng&amp;Page=secretariats&amp;txtOICID=2012-786&amp;txtFromDate=&amp;txtToDate=&amp;txtPrecis=&amp;txtDepartment=&amp;txtAct=&amp;txtChapterNo=&amp;txtChapterYear=&amp;txtBillNo=&amp;rdoComingIntoForce=&amp;DoSearch=Search+%2F+List&amp;viewattach=26211&amp;blnDisplayFlg=1">http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/oic-ddc.asp?lang=eng&amp;Page=secretariats&amp;txtOICID=2012-786&amp;txtFromDate=&amp;txtToDate=&amp;txtPrecis=&amp;txtDepartment=&amp;txtAct=&amp;txtChapterNo=&amp;txtChapterYear=&amp;txtBillNo=&amp;rdoComingIntoForce=&amp;DoSearch=Search+%2F+List&amp;viewattach=26211&amp;blnDisplayFlg=1</a>). The shapefile will be provided to NPC shortly.</li> </ul>	NPC has revised the DNLUP to reflect the new name and shapefile.		
GOC-132	Parks Canada	18/07/2013	DNLUP	2	Polynyas	The DNLUP does not identify polynyas either generally (except in the second bullet under "to achieve these Objectives..." on page 16, or by reference to particular ones requiring protection under the PSE designation (aside for the North Water Polynya and Belcher Island Polynyas, proposed as key bird areas with PSE-3 zoning). This is in strong contrast to categories such as "key bird habitat sites" and "caribou habitat" that are afforded that recognition. Similarly, no reference is made to key marine mammal habitats akin to that made for key bird habitats. Several such areas are well known, such as Koluktoo Bay, Cunningham Inlet and Creswell Bay to name but three, although the last of these does have a PSE-3 designation that appears to be related to the bay being a key bird habitat. PCA suggests that NPC takes this information into consideration when making further land use decisions.	the Plan has been revised to include polynyas.		
GOC-133	Parks Canada	11/04/2014	DNLUP	3.1.1.3	Lancaster Sound National Marine Conservation Area	Update on Lancaster Sound NMCA Feasibility Study Parks Canada, the Government of Nunavut and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association participated in 2 consultations sessions (summer 2012 and fall 2013) with 5 communities (Pond Inlet, Grise Fiord, Arctic Bay, Resolute, Clyde River) to inform them of the Lancaster Sound NMCA feasibility study project, present study results and consult them on a proposed boundary. The recommended boundaries will be presented in a feasibility report that will be prepared by the PCA-GN-QIA Lancaster Sound NMCA Steering Committee. Any modifications on proposed boundaries will be provided to the NPC as soon as possible.	General comment noted.		
GOC-134	NRCAN	25/04/2014	DNLUP	General		Annex D - Sources of Information Relevant to Development of Nunavut Land Use Plan (Information on discouraging development in areas that are likely to experience permafrost loss)	General comments noted.		
GOC-135		25/04/2014	DNLUP	General	Contaminated Sites	Annex C - List of Contaminated Sites (recommended Land Use Designation recommendations)	The DNLUP has been revised to incorporate this information.		