

From: [Leslie Wakelyn](#)
To: [Jonathan Savoy](#)
Cc: [Alana Vigna](#)
Subject: BQCMB questions for NPC Commissioners
Date: March 7, 2017 6:49:48 PM

Following is the BQCMB's response to direction for Participants to submit questions for Commissioners to ask Commission staff or other participants following presentations at the public hearings. We are recommending that these questions be asked of your staff and hearing participants following presentations at each of the public hearings, so the regional participants are aware of the questions and answers.

NPC Staff:

- 1) As NIRB has stated in its January 2017 submission to NPC, environmental assessment examines effects on caribou one project at a time, and land use planning is intended to provide guidance on regional issues such as protection of caribou habitat. If protection of caribou habitat is not included in the final land use plan, do you expect the plan will be effective in achieving its conservation objectives and goals?
- 2) According to NPC's internal procedures, there will be a periodic assessment of factors for determining whether there is a need to conduct a periodic review of the land use plan. Can you explain what type, amount and nature of new data on caribou will be required for assessing whether a review should be conducted? What process will NPC use to acquire that data, and will it be actively sought?

NTI:

- 1) Significant differences remain among the three regions of Nunavut concerning a number of key issues, including caribou habitat protection. Is it NTI's position that it is appropriate to use a single territory-wide land use plan to apply the same conservation tools in the same ways across all regions, or would a regional approach be more suitable and likely to meet the needs of Nunavummiut?
- 2) What are NTI's plans to address food security issues if caribou populations in Nunavut continue to decline and caribou become less accessible and available to Nunavummiut?

GN:

- 1) Can you explain the basis for GN's March 2016 reversal of position on protection of caribou calving and post-calving areas? How was input from GN-DOE and other staff and input from communities used to develop this new position? Were there consultation meetings held with the HTOs and regional wildlife boards who had previously made public statements and/or submitted their recommendations to Nunavut environmental assessment and land use planning processes in favour of protection of calving and/or post-calving areas?

- 2) If protected areas are not established through the land use plan for protecting the most important caribou habitats, such as core caribou calving grounds, will the GN recommend to the NIRB that no mineral exploration and mining activities be approved in these areas? If not, will the GN commit to investing substantial resources in developing a comprehensive system of mobile protection measures for exploration and mining projects across Nunavut?
- 3) If some form of mobile caribou protection measures are adopted as part of the land use plan or outside of the plan, will GN actively participate in further development of the measures, including testing their effectiveness? Does GN anticipate that it will have sufficient resources, both human and financial, to develop the caribou monitoring programs that would be required to establish effective mobile caribou protection measures across Nunavut?

GoC:

- 1) If protected areas are not established through the land use plan for protecting the most important caribou habitats, such as core caribou calving grounds, will INAC stop permitting mineral exploration and mining activities in these areas? If not, will thresholds be established for limiting disturbance to caribou and habitat in these areas?
- 2) If the first Nunavut land use plan does not incorporate any form of caribou protection measures, not even the original measures that are included in the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan, will INAC continue to include the original measures as conditions of federal land use permits? If so, what level of effort will be implemented for compliance monitoring and enforcement?
- 3) If some form of mobile caribou protection measures are adopted as part of the land use plan or outside of the plan, will government agencies and industry work together on further development of the measures, including testing their effectiveness? Who will pay for this work? Which agencies will be responsible for monitoring caribou distribution and compliance of industry with the measures as the caribou and mobile protection areas move between federal and Inuit-owned lands?

Kivalliq Inuit Association (may apply equally to Kitikmeot and Baffin regional associations):

- 1) If protected areas are not established through the land use plan for protecting the most important caribou habitats, such as core caribou calving grounds, will KIA stop permitting mineral exploration and mining activities in these areas? If not, will thresholds be established for limiting disturbance to caribou and habitat in these areas?

- 2) If the first Nunavut land use plan does not incorporate any form of caribou protection measures, not even the original measures that are included in the Keewatin Regional Land Use Plan, will KIA continue to include the original measures as conditions of land use licenses? What monitoring and enforcement will be used?
- 3) If mobile caribou protection measures similar to those you have proposed are adopted as part of the land use plan or outside of the plan, what level of monitoring and enforcement will be required at a minimum? What agencies will be responsible for further development of the measures, including testing their effectiveness, and for their enforcement? Will project proponents, KIA and INAC, and/or GN be responsible for caribou monitoring?

Kivalliq Wildlife Board, Kivalliq HTOs and Hamlets (may apply equally to Kitikmeot regional associations:

- 1) Is it true that some Kivalliq communities are worried that protected areas established in the first land use plan to protect post-calving areas for caribou may permanently stop development of key roads with no chance of further discussion or consideration (e.g., from northern Manitoba to Rankin Inlet)?
- 2) Do people know that after the first Nunavut land use plan is approved it can be reviewed periodically and changed? Do people know that communities and other parties can recommend amendments to the land use plan if there is major project like a road that they want to see developed but is not allowed by the first Plan?

NWT and Nunavut Chamber of Mines:

- 1) Can you explain what evidence has been used to develop the position that existing caribou protection measures that have been used by the mining industry in Nunavut and the NWT have been effective, particularly since the GNWT's monitoring program was discontinued in 1990? This position has been stated in Chamber submissions multiple times, including in "GN's recommended caribou protection measures: Technical review" (Feb. 2016).
- 2) If some form of mobile caribou protection measures are adopted as part of the land use plan or outside of the plan, will industry work together with government agencies and the RIAs on further development of the measures, including testing their effectiveness? Will industry be willing and able to contribute financially toward GN caribou monitoring programs required to implement mobile measures? Does the Chamber expect that the measures will apply similarly to exploration and development projects?

The BQCMB reserves the right to ask questions in person at the hearing or hearings the

Board's representatives are able to attend.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this response.

Thank you.

Leslie Wakelyn
For the BQCMB

Leslie Wakelyn
BQCMB Biologist
Yellowknife NWT
wakelyn@theedge.ca