

Master Comments from Nunavut Impact Review Board

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|---|
| NIRB-1 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | Working Together | | Clarification of NPC's role | The comments pertaining to the Working Together Document relate to clarification of NPC's role in the NSA and the role of each partner involved in the implementation of the NLUP. The NPC has identified itself as the authority responsible for reviewing all projects within the NSA within the Working Together document, though it remains unclear from our review whether the jurisdiction of the NLUP and the NPC's consideration of projects would extend into National Parks, historic places, or within established municipal boundaries. The document references "partners in the implementation" of the NLUP, however the roles that each partner would play in that implementation were not clear to our reviewers. It does not appear that the document describes how these partners would be involved in the monitoring of projects, or what, if any, their responsibility for reporting on the effectiveness of the NLUP would be and what the process for reporting would be. It is suggested that NPC provide further clarification on what it expects the role of each partner as identified in the Working Together Document would be, and how they would be involved with the implementation of the NLUP, including a discussion of the potential monitoring roles and responsibilities of agencies as applicable. | The Plan has been revised to clarify its application. The Implementation strategy has also been revised to more fully include the requirements of NUPPAA. The Implementation Strategy includes more details on the periodic review and monitoring of the plan. |
| NIRB-2 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP & Options and Recommendations | Definitions | Definitions | While a list of definitions was provided within the DNLUP, some of the terms as defined may be inconsistent with the working definitions of other agencies (e.g., Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit). Some terms used throughout the DNLUP and Options and Recommendations document were not included within the list of definitions. It is recommended that these be included, especially where working definitions may vary between organizations or may be open to interpretation. The NIRB recommends that the NPC include definitions for terms used within the NLUP and in supporting documents, and that it consider updating the definitions provided to reflect those definitions as may be currently utilized by other agencies. A table of definitions within the Options and Recommendations document would be a helpful reference tool and resource for readers. | Definitions have been updated. |
| NIRB-3 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | | Data gaps | The NPC has identified data gaps within the DNLUP, however it does not appear that any indication was provided regarding plans to address these gaps, nor any discussion of the application of the NLUP in the absence of known gaps. It is recommended that the NPC include a discussion on how data gaps will be treated by the NLUP and how the NPC and the NLUP may be prepared to compensate for known data gaps. Additionally, it is recommended that the NPC discuss its plans to obtain the information necessary to address these gaps as well as a timeline for these plans and any updates to the NLUP which may be required as a result. | The NPC has revised the Plan to include priority research areas that would support the future development of the Plan. |
| NIRB-4 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | 1.3.4 | Application of the DNLUP within Municipality Boundaries | As noted above, the applicability of the DNLUP within established municipal boundaries is not clear and it is recommended that this be further defined and described. Where section 1.3.4 of the DNLUP discusses application of the plan, it is recommended that this section include clarification regarding projects proposed within municipal boundaries, as it does not appear that the DNLUP discusses the management of developments within municipal boundaries. While community maps are provided as Appendix A to the DNLUP, it is not clear whether or how these maps were intended to assist with the consideration of potential land use activities within municipal boundaries, or in determining whether such developments conform with the DNLUP. It is recommended that the NPC provide further clarification regarding conformity requirements, if any, of proposals within municipal boundaries and also to discuss the intended use of community maps as presented in Appendix A. Including discussion of the overall applicability of the DNLUP within municipal boundaries would be a helpful addition to the Options and Recommendations document as well. | The definition of Project Proposal explains and more explanation has been provided in the Introduction section of the Plan. The Plan has also been revised to apply a Mixed Use Designation to allow land use within the municipal boundaries to be managed by the municipal plan where ever appropriate. |
| NIRB-5 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 4 | Community watersheds | It was noted that the Options and Recommendations document sets out a designation to permit all uses for land use within community watersheds. This option designation would also appear to apply to communities that have not considered development within their own watershed(s). It is recommended that the NPC consider providing a recommendation as part of the Options and Recommendations document or the DNLUP which applies to municipalities that have not accounted for development within their watershed(s) and to discuss whether the NPC may consider recommending that this be included within applicable municipal plans. | The municipal governments are responsible for preparing their own community plans. The NPC works closely with the GN and communities during the development of community plans and will be able to make those suggestions directly during development of the community plan. |
| NIRB-6 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | 4.4.4 | Aerodromes | The option designation to permit all uses was assigned to manage land uses for aerodromes within municipalities. It is unclear whether the DNLUP would apply to these lands in cases where aerodromes fall under federal jurisdiction and as such, the NIRB requests that the NPC clarify the selection of this option. | The revised DNLUP and ORD does not designate Aerodromes. Regulations are in place for all Nunavut airports and the land use plan does not need to duplicate restrictions. |

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| NIRB-7 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | | Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy | The DNLUP and Options and Recommendations documents do not appear to describe how Areas of Equal Use and Occupancy of the Inuit of Nunavut and Nunavik have been included within the land use planning process. In addition, the DNLUP does not appear to describe how areas where other Aboriginal groups (Athabasca Denesuline and the Manitoba Denesuline) with title claims that overlap with the NSA would be managed by the NLUP. No discussion was provided on whether or not these Aboriginal groups with title claims were consulted and it remains unclear whether these parties have been otherwise involved in the land use planning process. Furthermore, no discussion is provided regarding how these lands would be managed and accounted for within the NLUP nor whether any designations would be applied. It is suggested that the DNLUP and Options and Recommendations documents be updated to include relevant sections which provide further detail on how these areas would be managed, and which outline the NPC's planned approach to revisit these areas should the status of these lands change. | The Plan has been revised. Priorities and values are being implemented through the conformity determination process. As well land selected as part of the overlap negotiations have been protected under the Plan. |
| NIRB-8 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Table 1 | Land use designations | The DNLUP identifies certain areas with the "permitted use" status while identifying a "prohibited use" status for sites which already have "permitted use" status assigned. These land use designations are ambiguous, for instance, where a PSE-2 permitted use includes "tourism, research and recreation" but does not identify any specifically "prohibited use". Identifying such uses which may not be permitted would be helpful in further delineating restrictions or limitations to development activity in specific areas. While the DNLUP is helpful in identifying specific areas of importance in the NSA to be protected, it appears to lack clear guidance in establishing methods to protect areas that identify "permitted use" status by restricting activities. The DNLUP and Options and Recommendations document should clearly define what would be allowed in areas with a "permitted use" status when no specifically "prohibited use" is identified for the area. As noted, it would also be useful to provide an explanation of the types of land use that would be restricted where a "permitted use" was identified, a rationale provided on why no "prohibited use" was identified, and to possibly include a third option of potential other uses that could be permitted with a plan amendment. | The NPC has amended the Land Use Designations to clarify permitted and prohibited uses. |
| NIRB-9 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | Options and Recommendations | Chapter 3 | Hiukitak River -Selection of Options | The selection of options as described within the Options and Recommendation document is unclear as these relate to considerations of climate change and the Hiukitak River. The DNLUP states the NPC's objectives relating to climate change and outlines that in achieving its objective, the NPC's policy is to where appropriate, provide direction to the NIRB, regulators and Inuit land managers to manage climate change issues, including Greenhouse gas emissions. The NIRB also notes that the Commission considers climate change to be an important factor for all Project Proposals in the NSA. While the NIRB notes that the NPC has a policy to provide direction to the NIRB, the nature of such direction and circumstances under which it may be provided to the NIRB remains unclear; the NIRB recommends that the NPC provide further clarification within the NLUP and supporting documents, While the DNLUP assigns the entire NSA with a Recommendation to manage climate change, Option 2 that is put forth in the Options and Recommendations document encourages the Minister to advise the NIRB of potential issues or concerns regarding climate change to be considered during the review of project proposals. The NIRB agrees with the NPC's position that climate change is an important factor for all Project Proposals in the NSA, however, the NIRB's current understanding of the Option selected would involve the Minister providing advice to the NIRB only in the instance that it is undertaking a Review of a proposal pursuant to Part 5, Article 12 of the NLCA. The NIRB is not aware of the mechanism by which the Minister would provide the NIRB with advice regarding climate change in its consideration of project proposals which enter the regulatory regime and require only a screening level assessment in accordance with Part 4, Article 12 NLCA. The NIRB recommends that the NPC clarify the mechanism by which the Minister may provide such advice for screening level assessments, and whether or in which case further direction from the NPC may be warranted as pertaining to a consideration of climate change. The selection of Option 1 as a designation that permits all uses for the Hiukitak River appears to conflict with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association's directive to close Inuit Owned Lands (IOL) parcels in the area to mineral exploration. The Hiukitak River was identified as a special area of interest to the people of Bathurst Inlet and Umingmaktok. It is requested that the Options and Recommendations document provide additional justification for the selection of Option 1. The other options discussed restrict development in the area and appear to be more in line with the Kitikmeot Inuit Association's directive to close IOL parcels in the area to mineral exploration. | The Plan has been revised to address climate change as it relates to the board planning policies objectives and goals. The Hiukitak River has been designated as a Protected Area. NPC has revised the Plan so all General Terms take into account climate change. |
| NIRB-11 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 2 | Omissions | During its review of the DNLUP, the NIRB noted that some important considerations appear to have been omitted from the document. These include a consideration of marine shipping, muskox and polar bear habitat, protected marine areas, Species at Risk, areas of biological importance, Conservation Areas, areas of significance to Inuit, Areas of Interest, and areas adjacent to National and Territorial Parks. It is recommended that the NLUP include a section that discusses these key components or, if no discussion is to be provided, include a section which identifies these components as areas of data gaps and confirm whether these could be considered for inclusion as may be appropriate at some later date. A clear plan and timeline for any future consideration and/or inclusion should be provided. Further to this, the NIRB notes that habitat fragmentation may occur if areas of key importance are granted status as areas where all uses are permitted. It is suggested that areas of key importance, once identified in the NLUP, be considered for more restricted designations. | The NPC has revised the Plan to take into account these important considerations. |

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|--|--|
| NIRB-12 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 2 | Caribou | While the DNLUP recommends that project proposals located within historic calving grounds take into consideration impacts on caribou calving, post calving and migration routes, no specific land use designation was assigned to any caribou calving grounds within Nunavut. Further, this section of the DNLUP lists the general caribou calving period as occurring between May 15 and July 15 but does not appear to place any restrictions on land use activities during this period. It is recommended that the NPC clarify whether it had considered imposing "seasonal restrictions" for activities located in areas designated as recommended caribou calving grounds (PSE-R2). Further, page 18 of the Options and Recommendations document lists an option to assign a designation that provides seasonal restrictions (Caribou Protection Measures), however this option has not been contemplated further for inclusion within the DNLUP. The NIRB also notes that no discussion of caribou management objectives in regions neighboring the NSA was not provided, and suggests that the NLUP identify and discuss how caribou management objectives, policies, and individual measures in neighbouring jurisdictions have been contemplated within the DNLUP. | The DNLUP has been revised to take into consideration the calving and post calving areas based upon the information that was provided during the public review of the plan. The Commission had an Independent Public review of the planning process and plan completed in June 2012. One of the underlying themes of that review was the need for planning partners to maintain realistic expectations if there is desire to have a 1st generation land use plan in place in a timely manner. The comments are appreciated however only certain issues are being addressed at this time. The specific issues are outlined in the plan. |
| NIRB-13 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 2 | Cumulative Impacts | The DNLUP notes that the cumulative impacts of a project are an important component of managing land use in the NSA. However, no explanation regarding how cumulative impacts would be considered in land use planning was provided, nor were the steps that would be followed in making this consideration, or what the criteria or process would be for NPC to refer a project to the NIRB for screening on the basis of concern for cumulative impacts. The NIRB also notes that the NPC had previously indicated that the consideration of cumulative effects and referral of proposals to the NIRB on this basis may be removed from the DNLUP and would be dealt with in a separate framework. While it appears from our review that the consideration of cumulative effects has been included within the DNLUP at this stage, it appears that the relevant sections of the DNLUP and the Options and Recommendations document do not include a clear discussion of how the NLUP would address projects with the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts. It is recommended that the DNLUP and Operations and Recommendations document describe how cumulative impacts would be considered through land use planning, and discuss the management of any such impacts over time. | The DNLUP has been revised to describe how Cumulative Impacts will be addressed and a procedure has been developed. |
| NIRB-14 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 2 | Cumulative Impact thresholds | In addition, the DNLUP does not appear to contain information regarding the thresholds that would be used for considering potential cumulative impacts. The Options and Recommendations document does reference the fact that there are currently no agreed-upon thresholds, however the NIRB considers the development of thresholds for the consideration of cumulative impacts to be an essential component of this land use plan. It is suggested that NPC consider conducting extensive public consultation with land owners, environmental assessment practitioners and agencies like the NIRB, interest groups, and authorizing agencies to facilitate the development of agreed-upon thresholds for the consideration of potential cumulative impacts. | At this time the NPC is not coordinating the development of thresholds. 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. |
| NIRB-15 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 2 | Trans boundary, Great Bear Lake Watershed | With respect to the option assigned to Great Bear Lake Watershed, the DNLUP identifies the importance of the area and reflects the fact that management direction for the area in the Sahtu region of the Northwest Territories has yet to be finalized. The option also builds upon an existing planning policy framework but notes that it would become effective only at such time as the management direction for this area is agreed upon. The NIRB recommends that the NPC provide clarification with regard to how this designation would change once the management direction is approved and/or the Sahtu land use plan comes into effect. | The Sahtu Land Use Plan has been approved. The NPC will be reviewing the terms to determine appropriate management direction. Should the Sahtu Land Use Plan be amended in the future, the NLUP can be amended appropriately. |
| NIRB-16 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 2 | Transboundary, Heritage Rivers | It does not appear that transboundary considerations within the DNLUP include a discussion on the Heritage Rivers that flow across the Nunavut border to/from other jurisdictions including the Thelon, Kazan and Coppermine (nominated) rivers. These rivers, with the exception of the Coppermine River, are discussed in Chapter 3 of the DNLUP and are assigned land use designations based on the management plans of each Heritage River. The NIRB notes however, the importance of transboundary considerations for these rivers when dealing with land use issues. It is suggested that the DNLUP include a discussion on how transboundary considerations were considered for these areas. | The Plan has been revised to address transboundary matters and heritage rivers. |
| NIRB-17 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 2 | Transboundary, Caribou, linear infrastructure | The DLUP identifies oil and gas and hydroelectric development in neighboring jurisdictions in terms of considering developments having potential transboundary implications and possible impacts to the NSA. The NIRB suggests that the NPC consider revising this listing to include the potential development of linear infrastructure in jurisdictions adjacent to Nunavut which may have the potential to impact upon transboundary caribou herds and/or their habitat, as well as other species which are migratory in nature. Specifically related to caribou, the NIRB recognizes their importance as an essential species to Nunavummiut for subsistence and cultural purposes. Given this importance, development decisions and activities outside of the NSA which have the potential to impact upon caribou migration patterns, calving or post-calving areas and overall species health may be an important consideration for the NLUP and the planning process. Similarly, decisions to manage caribou in areas outside of the NSA (i.e. harvest quotas) may have implications for the species within Nunavut and the residents who depend upon them, as mentioned above. It is unclear whether this has been considered in the NPC's current DNLUP and supporting documentation and the NIRB recommends that any considerations or assumptions which are built into these materials which pertain to the consideration of transboundary impacts to caribou be clarified. | Harvesting quotas are not in the mandate of the NPC. NPC has looked at it's transboundary authority as set out by NUPPAA. The caribou section of the land use plan has been revised. Protected Areas and Special Management are use to protect the areas where there are no existing rights. Existing rights are protected under NUPPAA. Areas with existing rights or high mineral potential are designated Special Management. The DNLUP has been revised to address calving and post-calving areas. Changes were made to some of the recommendations to reduce fragmentation of calving and post calving areas when possible. |

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|--|--|
| NIRB-18 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 2 | Transboundary, consultation | It was unclear from the NIRB's review of the materials provided whether and to what extent the NPC may have consulted with government departments, other agencies and the general public within neighbouring jurisdictions. As the discussion relating to caribou and rivers provided above is similar, it may be useful to consider the various management, conservation, and development objectives developed and in place in neighboring jurisdictions when developing a Nunavut wide land use plan, especially where certain resources are transboundary by their very nature, and must be shared with other jurisdictions. The NIRB recommends that the NPC ensure those parties are informed and have had an opportunity to comment on the DNLUP. | Consultations have been conducted in accordance with Article 40. Revisions to the DNLUP have been made to reflect those consultations. Feedback has also been received from NWT First Nations, Métis groups and the GNWT. |
| NIRB-19 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 3 | Consistency with Article 9 - Conservation Areas | The NIRB recommends that the NPC confirm the list of areas and issues as identified within Chapter 3 and confirm whether it is meant to be consistent with the list identified in Article 9 of the NLCA for Conservation Areas, or if not, explain why this would be the case, and why certain conservation areas may not be represented within the DNLUP. | Chapter 3 is intended to be consistent with Articles 8 and 9 the Establishment of Parks and Conservation Areas through Legislation. The Plan is revised to note that the Plan is not a replacement of the NLCA or NUPPAA. |
| NIRB-20 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 3 | Proposed Parks | The DNLUP has not identified any lands slated for withdrawal in the Bluenose Lake Area to be considered for a park, though the "Permitted Uses - Tourism, Recreation and Research" designation has been assigned. The DNLUP also refers to two other natural regions (Southampton Plain and Ungava Tundra Plateau) within Nunavut that are important but which have no formal park status ascribed to them. As no designation was assigned to the land use for these two regions, the NIRB recommends that the DNLUP and/or Options and Recommendations document provide a discussion as to how future proposed parks would be designated within the NLUP. Specifically, the NIRB recommends that the NPC confirm whether the designation under the NLUP for the Bluenose Lake Area would be subject to change if there were a land withdrawal, and whether the NPC would consider designations for the other two natural regions that are mentioned in the DNLUP? | The Bluenose Lake area is not currently withdrawn. As well, future parks are not withdrawn at this time for Southampton Plain and Ungava Tundra Plateau. Regarding the establishment of national parks the DNLUP only supports those proposals which are defined. The NPC would consider amendments to the Land Use Plan as proposals develop. |
| NIRB-21 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 3 | Parks Status clarification | The NIRB noted that the status or designation ascribed to 'National Parks Awaiting Full Establishment' and 'Proposed Parks' is unclear from our review of the DNLUP. It is recommended that the NPC provide clarification with respect to the difference between these two land descriptions and provide for the inclusion of each in the Definitions section of the document. | The NPC has considered clarifying the wording to provide an explanation of the two terms. |
| NIRB-22 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 3 | Heritage Rivers | This section does not provide a description of land use management for "Heritage Rivers Awaiting Designation (or nominated rivers)". As an example, no discussion appears to be provided regarding the management of the Coppermine River prior to a potential future designation as a Heritage River. It is recommended that a section be included in Chapter 3 of the NLUP that describes how rivers nominated for heritage status would be managed until such time as the status is granted, and discuss whether the NPC considered assigning a similar designation as would be provided for formal Heritage Rivers. | The NPC received no information in regards to Heritage Rivers awaiting full establishment. Consideration will be given should this information be provided in the future. The Plan can be amended to consider new proposals. |
| NIRB-23 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 5 | Outdated Mineral Exploration designation criteria | The Analysis and Recommendation for Mineral Exploration and Production section within the Options and Recommendations document focused on 8 potential mines that were identified in the Government of Nunavut's 2010 Nunavut Economic Outlook document. This information may be outdated as compared to projects currently undergoing assessment by the NIRB. The NIRB would be happy to provide updated information regarding ongoing assessments to the NPC for inclusion within a future NLUP and associated documents. Furthermore, the NPC may wish to consider including within the list of mines presented within the Options and Recommendations document, other advanced exploration sites, and mines currently undergoing assessment by the NIRB. The NIRB also recommends that the NLUP and Options and Recommendations document describe how the NPC may consider the assessment and/or approval of new major project developments, or significant amendments to previously approved major projects in terms of the NLUP and associated materials. | AANDC provided updated information regarding mineral potential. The plan has been revised accordingly. Despite numerous requests we were under to get consensus on the use of advanced exploration so the concept had to be abandoned as part of the revision. |
| NIRB-24 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 5 | Updates to Mineral Exploration designation criteria | In order to ensure the NLUP maintains current and up to date information, the NIRB recommends that the NLUP or Options and Recommendations document provide a list of criteria that would identify whether or not a proposal would be considered under the Mineral Exploration and Productions section of the NLUP and which identifies whether or not the NPC would then assign the Encouraging Sustainable Economic Development (ESED-1) Land Use Designation to a specific proposal. | The revised DNLUP will include simplified Land Designations that should address the concern. Project proposals can straddle land use designations as long the uses are not prohibited. |
| NIRB-25 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 5 | Keewatin Oil and Gas Moratorium | The Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan makes mention of a moratorium on oil and gas exploration around Southampton Island, yet this does not appear to have been carried over into the DNLUP or discussed as part of the considered information when developing the options for managing oil and gas exploration and production. Reference was made to the North Baffin Regional Land Use Plan within the Options and Recommendations document as identifying oil and gas as influencing the regional mixed economy. It is recommended that NPC provide clarification regarding the exclusion of the moratorium on oil and gas in the Kivalliq region around the Southampton Island from the DNLUP, and indicate whether consultation has been conducted or is being considered regarding oil and gas exploration throughout any regions in Nunavut. | The Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan supported a moratorium that was put in place by NRCan. That moratorium has since been removed. As well, the Hamlet of Coral Harbour and Kivalliq Inuit Association have asked to not continue the moratorium. |
| NIRB-26 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 5 | Oil and Gas Potential | The NIRB also recommends that the NPC provide a discussion regarding the consideration of potential future development of oil and gas resources as well as exploration activities. | The Plan has been revised to expand the discussion. |

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| NIRB-27 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP | Chapter 6 | Mixed Use Designation | This chapter discusses areas that can support a diverse mix of land uses to promote the well-being of communities; however in Table 1 of the DNLUP where mixed use (MU) is defined, it states that 'all uses are permitted'. It is unclear to the NIRB whether or how proposals would be assessed in a 'mixed use' region where potentially conflicting activities might occur, if all uses are to be permitted. It is recommended that the NPC more clearly describe this particular land use designation and provide clarification on how proposals would be assessed in a mixed use region. Further, the mixed use designation does not appear to be discussed within the Options and Recommendations document; the NIRB requests that the NPC confirm whether and which sections of the document may describe mixed uses and the consideration of land use activities within these areas. | Mixed use is common way of designating areas so as not to impede any potential land use in the future. The revised DNLUP will include General Terms, values and future regional and sub regional land use planning initiatives will further address the concern. |
| NIRB-28 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | Working Together | | Process map | The NPC previously indicated that it continues to assess the value of process maps and while it recognized the NIRB's assistance in the creation of these maps, the NPC did not indicate whether or which of these maps would be included within the DNLUP. The current versions of the DNLUP and supporting documents do not clearly describe the NPC's process of receiving and considering project proposals submitted for a conformity determination against the NLUP, nor any details regarding the referral of those project proposals which conform, to the NIRB or other regulatory agencies. It is again recommended that the NPC provide within the NLUP or supporting documents, details or process mapping which outlines the current approach to conformity with the DNLUP. Further to the NIRB's prior submission and recognizing the timing for the NPC's finalization of the NLUP, the NIRB would also request that the NPC clarify its intended process for potentially revisiting the NLUP or its processes to reflect the coming into force of the Nunavut Project Planning and Assessment Act, should such revisions be required. | The Implementation strategy has been revised to include the conformity determination process. The process map has been included in the revised DNLUP. |
| NIRB-29 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | Working Together | 1.1.3 | NLUP Procedures | This section has been removed from the previous working draft of the NLUP and now is referred to in Section 1.1.3 of the "Working Together" document. As part of the NPC's response to the NIRB's 2010 comments, it indicated that specific details regarding procedures and rules the Commission may use to assess land use applications were being developed outside of the NLUP. While no timeline was provided as to when the NPC anticipated these would be made available to the public, the NIRB notes that this information has not yet been provided. The NIRB again notes that the rules and procedures which are developed by the NPC remain of specific interest to the NIRB and are central to the provisions of NIRB's comments on the NLUP. | The Implementation strategy has been revised to include the relevant details related to implementation of the land use plan. |
| NIRB-30 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/2014 | DNLUP & Options and Recs | | Ministerial Exemptions and Minor Variance | From the NIRB's review, it did not appear that either of the DNLUP or the Options and Recommendations document address the potential for Ministerial exemptions as per NLCA Section 11.5.11 for a project proposal. It is suggested that Chapter 7 of the DNLUP include a discussion of this possibility and any relation to, or processes involved for minor variances. | The revised DNLUP includes a general discussion on Ministerial exemptions, minor variances or a Plan amendment. |
| NIRB-31 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Options and Recommendations | 2 | | The NIRB did not refuse coal exploration but recommended to the Minister that as the potential adverse impacts of the proposal were so unacceptable, that the proposal should be modified or abandoned. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest rewording the section to indicate that the NIRB makes recommendations but it is the Minister that makes the final decision on project proposal within the NSA. | The ORD has been revised to address this concern. |
| NIRB-32 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Options and Recommendations | 2 | Great Bear Lake Watershed | Justification for option assigned to Great Bear Lake Watershed identifies importance of area and reflects management direction for area in Sahtu region yet to be agreed upon and builds on existing planning policy framework. What would happen once the management direction for this area has been agreed upon? Request clarification from NPC on how this designation would change if and when management direction or Sahtu land use plan comes into effect. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest providing a discussion on how the designation would change based on when direction and/or plans are approved. | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-33 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Options and Recommendations | 2 | Climate Change | The selection of Option 2 for climate change does appears inconsistent with NPC's objectives for climate change in the NLUP. Option 2 encourages Minister to advise NIRB of potential issues or concerns regarding climate change to be considered during review of proposals; while NPC's objectives state: control and minimize greenhouse gas emissions, monitor climate change impact, encourage the development and adoption of adaptation strategies, and considers issues relating to changes in the landscapes due to climate change. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest Options and Recommendations document be updated to include a discussion on how NPC would implement these objectives. | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-34 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Options and Recommendations | 3 | Tourism, Recreation and Research | Are there any restricted uses/activities under the following Option: Assign a designation that permits tourism, recreation and research? As some of the future conservation areas are potential or known significant areas for various cultural and environmental reasons, (e.g., potential calving grounds), and there is limited data available on these areas, it may be prudent to identify limitations of land use for each conservation area. Recommendation/Suggestion: To include a list of options or explanation/clarification on the types of land uses that may be restricted under this option. | The NPC has revised the Land Use Designations to provide more clarification. |

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| NIRB-35 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Options and Recommendations | Chapter 4 | Community Drinking Water Supplies | Communities that have not considered development within their watershed(s) get an automatic Option 1 - a designation that permits all uses. Could the NPC make a recommendation to municipalities that have not considered this in their municipal plans to think about it for future revisions? Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest that NPC consider providing a provision as part of the NLUP for municipalities that may not have accounted for development within their watershed(s) that these consider including this within municipal planning. | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-36 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Options and Recommendations | 4 | Aerodromes | Aerodromes - Option 1 have been assigned that permits all development. Airports where federal government has jurisdiction - clarify whether NLUP applies to this type of land tenure. Recommendation/Suggestion: Request clarification on Option 1 selection for Aerodromes. | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-37 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Options and Recommendations | 5 | Mineral Exploration and Production | The Analysis and Recommendation for Mineral Exploration and Production only focused on the 8 potential mines identified in the 2010 Nunavut Economic Outlook document. This document may be outdated. The list of mines presented within the NLUP does not consider other exploration sites that are in the advanced exploration stage or currently undergoing review by the NIRB. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest that section that describes "Considered information" on page 44 include mine and other major developments that are currently being assessed by the NIRB. This would include Sabina's Back River proposal and TMAC Resources Inc.'s Phase 2 Hope Bay Belt. Further, a description should be provided on how the NLUP would deal with future major projects that undergo assessment or reconsideration. | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-38 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 1.1.3 | | It would be useful if a reference is included on where the forms, directives and by-laws can be found. Recommendation/Suggestion: The documents identified are separate documents from the NLUP and a reference should be provided on where they can be obtained. | The documents will be provided as part of the NPC on-line public registry once NUPPAA is enacted. In the interim the Implementation Strategy contains relevant information and feedback compiled will inform those formal technical guides. |
| NIRB-39 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 1.3.2 | | The statement that NPC is the authority responsible for reviewing all proposals in the NSA is not complete Projects proposed within a park or a historic place must be submitted to the responsible authority for conformity (Section 164 of NuPPAA). Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest that this section be expanded to confirm that any project that is to be carried out within a National Park or historic place is not reviewed by the NPC for conformity against the NLUP but that it is the responsible authority (Parks Canada Agency) that determines conformity with the specific requirements of the park. Noted that these may still be subject to screening by the NIRB. | The NPC does not manage land use within established Parks. The revised DNLUP contains clarity on this topic. |
| NIRB-40 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 1.3.2 | Reference to Section 4.3 | Recommendation/Suggestion: Include reference to section 4.3 at end of the sentence "The process is referred to as the Conformity Determination process" (see Section 4.3). | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-41 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 2.2.1 | | The number of factors were not defined. Factors should be included in this document or as a separate document. Recommendation/Suggestion: Provide the factors that would make implementation successful and suggest that this be provided in a separate document. | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-42 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 2.2.1(a) | Partner Roles | Clarification from NPC regarding the roles of each partner in the implementation of the NLUP. Not clear what the roles of each partner are with respect to the implementation of the NLUP. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest that the document identify the roles of each partner in the implementation of the NLUP. Potential that this could be discussed under section 3. | The DNLUP has been revised to provide clarity on the roles and the integrated regulatory process. |
| NIRB-43 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 2.2.1(d) | Monitoring | The point is not clear on how effective monitoring would occur and who the partners are. Not all partners are involved in monitoring of projects and this should be clarified in this point. Further, would the partners be responsible for reporting to NPC on the ability of the NLUP to deal with land use issues in Nunavut? Recommendation/Suggestion: Point needs to be clarified to indicate who the partners are expected to be, and how monitoring of the NLUP would be conducted. A strategy should be included on the ability of the NLUP to deal with land use issues in Nunavut. Potential for a separate guide to be created to explain or discuss further. | 11.4.4(l) in the NLCA establishes the NPC's obligation to monitor projects to ensure that they are in conformity with Land Use Plans. The Implementation Strategy has been revised to more fully explain monitoring and periodic review of the Plan. |
| NIRB-44 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 2.2.1(e) | | Recommendation/Suggestion: Not clear what is meant by commitment and who is supported? Reword point to clarify the statement. | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-45 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 3.2 | | Recommendation/Suggestion: Some of the descriptions of the institutions could be more detailed. Update NIRB section to be more descriptive. | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-46 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 3.3 | Organization Names | Incomplete text - definitions not given for KitlA or KivlA. Section is incomplete. Recommendation/Suggestion: Add description of the two RIA's in 3.3.3. | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-47 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 3.4 | Organization Names | Missing Government of Canada organizations in the list. Consider including Natural Resources Canada (NRCan), Environment Canada (EC) and Canadian Coast Guard. Recommendation/Suggestion: Include a section for Natural Resources Canada (NRCan), Environment Canada (EC) and Canadian Coast Guard | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-48 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 3.4.3-3.4.6 | Organization Names | Section is incomplete. Incomplete text - no definitions for PC, TC, DFO or DND. | General comment noted. |

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| NIRB-49 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 3.5 | Organization Names | Missing Government of Nunavut organizations in the list. Consider including Culture & Heritage. Recommendation/Suggestion: Include a section for Culture and Heritage. | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-50 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 4.2.4 | | Acronym NUPPAA used in the document without either footnote reference or definition of the acronym. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest providing reference and/or table of acronyms in the document. This could be provided at the end of the document as an appendix. | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-51 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 4.3.10 | | Consider updating this section to be reflective of NuPPAA. Recommendation/Suggestion: A project is exempt from screening...set out in Schedule 12-1 of the NLCA and does not belong to a class of non-exempt works or activities prescribed by regulations. | The revised DNLUP has the updated section reflective of NUPPAA. |
| NIRB-52 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 4.3.11 | | Clarification of term. This bullet uses 'board' to refer to the NIRB, however several boards are defined earlier in the document, and this point does not make clear which board is being referenced. Recommendation/Suggestion: Replace the use of board with the appropriate board name. In this case, suggest replacing 'board' with NIRB. | The Plan has been revised. |
| NIRB-53 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 4.4.3 | | Current wording unclear. Condition of minor variance being considered is based on effects assessment criteria when a proposal has not yet received an effects assessment? Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest other criteria than "negative effects" for satisfying this condition such as "project would not interfere with" or "have unacceptable effects". Section 4.5.8 d) b) on page 17 may have better wording to be used "b) result in an incompatible or obnoxious land use when viewed in the context of surrounding uses or interests;" | The Plan has been revised. |
| NIRB-54 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 5.6.2 | | The NIRB does not have a mandate to monitor all projects and is not funded to do so. Requiring that planning partners have the capacity to monitor projects may prove problematic if it is not part of their individual mandate. Point requests a commitment and capacity for the Planning Partners to monitor projects when it may not be in the individual organizations mandates to monitor all projects. In addition, it would be impossible to determine the commitment and capacity to which the NPC is referring due to the lack of definition of monitoring or the criteria which will be assessed as part of the function. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest rewording this point to perhaps coordinate monitoring efforts. | The revised DNLUP provides clarity that monitoring refers to conformity with Land Use Plans. |
| NIRB-55 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | 5.6.2 | | Second sentence is unclear about "reviewing project proposals" as it is NPC's responsibility alone to make the conformity determination. This statement is unclear as it could make reference to the NIRB's Review Process under Part 5 or 6 of the NLCA, or the NPC's review of a proposal in order to make a conformity determination, two very different processes. Recommendation/Suggestion: Clarify or reword the underlined part of the sentence for clarity: "Working together in monitoring and reviewing project proposals is critical to the success and effectiveness of the NLUP." | The Plan does not speak to NIRBs Review process. The Plan is intended to outline the NPC's processes. |
| NIRB-56 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | | Working Together | none | | Table of Contents. Document usability. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest providing table of contents for document | General comment noted. |
| NIRB-57 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/14 | DNLUP | Definitions | | Definition of IQ is inconsistent with those of the NIRB and QIA. Would be helpful if all agencies work with the same definition if possible. Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest reconsidering the working definition. | The definition is from the NPC's broad planning policies, objectives and goals which was developed in consultation with the Government of Canada, Government of Nunavut and the NTL. |
| NIRB-58 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/15 | DNLUP | Definitions | Screening | Screening definition is not complete. Screening definition needs to include "significant ecosystemic and socio-economic impact potential." Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest updating screening definition to read as follows: "means a process undertaken by the Nunavut Impact Review Board to determine if a Project Proposal has significant ecosystemic and socio-economic impact potential. | The revisions have been included in the revised DNLUP. |
| NIRB-59 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/16 | DNLUP | 1 | | Not clear how data gaps will be addressed by the NLUP. There is no clear discussion on how data gaps identified (caribou, muskox, etc.) will be addressed by the current NLUP or the NPC in the future? Recommendation/Suggestion: The NLUP should include a discussion on how data gaps would be treated. Suggest adding a section to the NLUP. | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-60 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/17 | DNLUP | 1.3.2 | Athabasca and Manitoba Denesuline | It is unclear whether consideration of the Athabasca Denesuline and the Manitoba Denesuline were included in the DLUP for the areas that their title claims overlap with the NSA. Beneficial to mention whether and which Aboriginal groups with title claims that overlap with the NSA were involved in the land use planning process. Recommendation/Suggestion: Identify whether and which other Aboriginal groups with title claims overlapping with the NSA were included in the land use planning process. | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-61 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/18 | DNLUP | 1.3.2 | | The level of government involved in the draft of the NLUP is not stated. It is unclear at first glance if this means the territorial and/or federal governments. Recommendation/Suggestion: Recommend the NLUP is clear regarding the level of government being referenced. | The revised DNLUP specifies government to mean the Government of Canada and the Government of Nunavut. |

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|--|--|
| NIRB-62 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/19 | DNLUP | 1.3.4 | Municipal Boundaries | <p>Section 1.3.4 discusses application of the DNLUP - would be helpful to include clarification on projects within municipal boundaries in this particular section of the report. No specific section of the DNLUP clearly outlines the management of developments within municipal boundaries. Unclear whether community maps in Appendix A are intended to assist with understanding some of the potential land use activities within municipal boundaries.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Request clarification regarding proposals within municipal boundaries the intended use of community maps in Appendix A. Municipal Boundaries do not appear to be discussed in Options and Recommendations document.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-63 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/20 | DNLUP | 2 | Polar Bears | <p>How were Polar Bears and other SARA listed species accounted for in the plan? Not apparent that SARA listed species and their habitat requirements were addressed.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Habitat fragmentation may occur if areas of importance are permitted as areas where all uses are permitted. Request NPC clarify whether it considered these areas to be subject to other designations?</p> | The NPC relies on Government experts to provide advice on this regard. The Plan reflects the feedback that was provided. |
| NIRB-64 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/21 | DNLUP | 2 | | <p>Appears to be missing discussion of marine shipping, muskox areas, polar bear habitat, protected marine areas, Species at Risk, areas of biological importance, Conservation Areas, areas of significance to Inuit, Areas of Interest, or areas adjacent to National and Territorial Parks. The NLUP should give consideration to marine shipping, muskox areas, polar bear habitat, protected marine areas, Species at Risk, areas of biological importance, Conservation Areas, areas of significance to Inuit, Areas of Interest, or areas adjacent to National and Territorial Parks. NLUP should also identify that these areas are part of the data gaps and would be looked at later.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest that the list of areas and issues be expanded to include the items as listed and discuss how data gaps will be addressed.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-65 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/22 | DNLUP | 2 | Caribou | <p>No land use designation was assigned to caribou calving grounds. Rationale should be provided on why no PSE were assigned to caribou calving grounds.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest a discussion be included in the NLUP.</p> | The caribou section of the land use plan has been revised. Protected Areas and Special Management are use to protect the areas where there are no existing rights. Existing rights are protected under NUPPAA. Areas with existing rights or high mineral potential are designated Special Management. The DNLUP has been revised to address calving and post-calving areas. Changes were made to some of the recommendations to reduce fragmentation of calving and post calving areas when possible. |
| NIRB-66 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/23 | DNLUP | 2.1.2 | | <p>Land use designations seem to be ambiguous The NLUP contains 'Permitted and Prohibited Maps' for each of the 5 land use designations that identify areas in the NSA where it is recommended that impacts to caribou calving grounds be considered in the assessment of project proposals (PSE-R2). NPC has identified areas of importance to be protected (e.g., the Fosheim Peninsula is designated as PSE-2: key bird habitat site); however, resulting land use designations may present ambiguity in their implementation as PSE-2 permitted uses include tourism, research and recreation and do not prohibit any specific uses or activities from being carried out.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: While the DNLUP is helpful in identifying specific areas in the NSA of importance to be protected, request NPC provide clear guidance in establishing methods to protect such areas (e.g. by restricting certain activities) and clarify whether any activities will be prohibited where PSE-2 designations are provided.</p> | The revised DNLUP has clarified the Land Use Designations. |
| NIRB-67 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/24 | DNLUP | 2.1.2 | Caribou | <p>This Section lists the general caribou calving period as occurring between May 15-July 15 but the DNLUP does not appear to place any restrictions on land use activities during this period.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Request that NPC clarify whether 'seasonal restrictions' were considered for activities located in regions designated as recommended caribou calving grounds (PSE-R2). Further, the Options and Recommendations Document (page 18) list an option to assign designation that provides seasonal restrictions (Caribou Protection Measures) but this option was not considered - request justification.</p> | The revised DNLUP addresses the caribou calving and post-calving grounds. Caribou protection measures are implemented by AANDC and DIOs. They are also outdated and cannot be applied consistently. |
| NIRB-68 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/25 | DNLUP | 2 | Cumulative Impacts | <p>No information provided on the type of thresholds that would be used for cumulative impacts. Information should be provided on the thresholds that would be used. The Options and Recommendations document indicates that there are no agreed upon threshold. The development of thresholds for cumulative impacts is an essential component of the NLUP.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest that NPC consider public engagement to develop thresholds for cumulative impacts.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-69 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/26 | DNLUP | 2 | Cumulative Impacts | <p>No discussion provided on how cumulative impacts would be considered in land use planning, the steps that would be followed and when/how NPC would refer a project to the NIRB for screening on this basis. The NLUP refers to cumulative impacts of a project as being an important component of managing land use in the NSA. Further discussion should be provided on how this would be considered as part of the NLUP. This section and the Options and Recommendation document do not describe how the NLUP would handle projects with potential cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Recommend the NLUP or Options and Recommendations document provide a description of the consideration given to cumulative impacts as part of the conformity determination process.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |

| Comment ID | Organization Name | Date of Submission | Document Referenced | Section Referenced | Theme of submission or Location /ID# Referenced | Comments | NPC Response |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| NIRB-70 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/27 | DNLUP | 2 | Heritage Rivers | <p>Transboundary considerations do not include Heritage Rivers such as Thelon, Kazan and Coppermine (nominated) rivers. These rivers would be would have designations as heritage rivers (Coppermine has been nominated) but it is also important to consider transboundary issues for these rivers.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Include designations for other areas that might be affected by transboundary issues.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-71 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/28 | DNLUP | 3 | Conservation Areas | <p>The list of areas and issues identified by NPC is not complete and appears inconsistent with the Conservation Areas identified by Article 9 of the NLCA.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest document includes the other conservation areas as identified in Article 9 of the NLCA or provide a discussion on why these conservation areas are not being identified within the NLUP</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-72 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/29 | DNLUP | 3 | Parks | <p>The difference between National Parks awaiting Full Establishment and Proposed National Parks in unclear.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest NPC provide clarification on the difference contemplated between the two types of parks either in the DNLUP or Options and Recommendations document.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-73 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/30 | DNLUP | 3 | Bluenose Lake Area | <p>What would happen when there is a land withdrawn for the Bluenose Lake Area? Will the land use designation change? What about the two other natural regions mentioned? No discussion provided on when new parks are proposed and/or lands are withdrawn to be put in place as a Park.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest providing a discussion on future proposed parks and how they would be treated within the LUP.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-74 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/31 | DNLUP | 4 | | <p>Encourage the NIRB, NWB, Inuit land managers and government regulators to identify and reduce impacts to humans and environmental health, especially community water sources, that may occur as a result of land use. This seems in contradiction to NPC's key component to building healthy communities. If this is important, it is the NIRB's recommendation that some protection be placed around communities waters if they haven't done so/communities should be advised to look at their water sources and make appropriate motions to ensure their water is protected.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest the NPC make a recommendation to municipalities that haven't accounted for this in their community plans to think about it for future revisions.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-75 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/32 | DNLUP | 6 | | <p>Section 6 of the DNLUP discusses areas that can support a diverse mix of land uses to promote the well-being of communities; however in Table 1 where mixed use (MU) is defined, it states that 'all uses are permitted', which may be ambiguous where potentially conflicting activities might occur, where all uses being permitted. Request the NPC discuss its approach to managing uses for this particular designation. Also request that mixed use designation be discussed within the Options and Recommendations document.</p> | Response has been provided in previous comment. |
| NIRB-76 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/33 | DNLUP | 7.6 - Table 1 | | <p>Will the periodic review include discussions with the NIRB? By conducting Screenings and Reviews, the NIRB would be able to provide valuable information on the impacts of activities in the various planning zones.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: To add a section in the Options and Recommendations document detailing how the Periodic Reviews will be conducted, which Parties will be asked to provide information and how the process to retrieve this information will be conducted.</p> | The Implementation Strategy section regarding Periodic Review and Monitoring has been revised to address the concern. |
| NIRB-77 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/34 | DNLUP | 7 - Table 1 | | <p>The table identifies "permitted use" and for some sites "prohibited use". Further clarification required for sites that only have "permitted use" identified. Does this mean that any other use is not permitted by the LUP or will it be decided on a case by case basis? Need this to be identified in the table or in chapter 7.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Table needs some further clarification on sites that only have permitted use and describe how other uses would be treated under the NLUP.</p> | The revised DNLUP addresses this concern with clarified Land Use Designations. Uses that are prohibited would not conform to the plan. Conversely project proposals that are considered to conform to the plan would be sent along for further review by regulatory authorities. |
| NIRB-78 | Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB) | 14/02/35 | DNLUP | 7 | | <p>List of sites identified under ESED not complete. List does not include Back River that is currently being reviewed by the NIRB.</p> <p>Recommendation/Suggestion: Suggest NPC revise list in consolation with the NIRB to include up to date list of advanced exploration and reasonably foreseeable projects.</p> | The revised DNLUP addresses this concern with clarified Land Use Designations. The designation has caused confusion and required a change to the requirements. |