

Dawson Regional Planning Commission  
 Regular Board Meeting Minutes  
 Meeting #16 (2013/2014)  
 April 15-17, 2014  
 Alpine Bakery (Whitehorse, Yukon)

<b>In Attendance</b>		
<p><b><u>Dawson Regional Planning Commission (DRPC)</u></b></p> <p>Scott Casselman - Chair          Roger Ellis - Member          Chester Kelly - Member          Will Fellers - Member          Debbie Nagano – Member          Peter Jenkins – Member</p> <p>Monica Krieger –Senior Planner</p>	<p><b><u>Yukon Land Use Planning Council (YLUPC)</u></b></p> <p>Patrick Rouble – Chair, YLUPC          Ron Cruikshank – Planning Director          Sam Skinner - Senior Land Use Planner</p> <p><b><u>YLUPC Contractors:</u></b></p> <p>Rhoda Merkel – Recording Secretary          Shawn Francis – S. Francis Consulting (SKYPE)</p> <p><b><u>Yukon Government (YG)</u></b></p> <p>Gillian McKee – Senior Land Use Planner, EMR          Jim Bell – Manager, Regional Land Use Planning - EMR          Rene Mayes – Senior Land Use Planner - EMR</p>	<p><b><u>Invited Guests</u></b></p> <p>Allison Perrin – Northern Climate ExChange, Yukon College          Michael Draper &amp; Brenda Sproule – YG EMR, Land Management Branch          Rob Thomson/Lorraine Millar – YG EMR, Compliance Monitoring &amp; Inspection          Randy Lamb &amp; Jim Bell – YG EMR, Corporate Policy &amp; Planning          Chris McLeod – Natural Resources Policy Analyst /TH Land &amp; Resources          Bobbie Milnes &amp; Shelby Jordan – YESAB, Dawson Designated Office</p>
<p><b><u>Tr’ondëk Hwëch’in (TH)</u></b></p> <p>Bill Kendrick – Senior Land and Resources Officer/ Regional Planning Manager</p> <p><b><u>Vuntut Gwitchin Government (VGG)</u></b></p> <p>Rosa Brown -</p>	<p><b><u>Observers</u></b></p> <p>Scott Herron, Canadian Wildlife Service (Environment Canada)          John Mc Connell, Klondike Placer Mining Association          Myles Thorp, Yukon Wood Products          Al Doherty, President - Yukon Placer Mining          Carl Schultz – Chamber of Mines</p>	

**Other Acronyms:** CA – Conservation Area zone, CE – Cumulative Effects, IMA – Integrated Management Area zone, LDS – Land (Use) Designation System, LMU - Landscape Management Unit, PA – Protected Area zone, SLC – Senior Liaison Committee, TEA – Traditional Economy Area zone, TWG – Technical Working Group, VGFN – Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation, WRFN – White River First Nation, YESAB – Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Board, YRC – Yukon River Corridor

**Action Items: Status to be updated at next meeting.**

---

Meeting called to order at 9:10am by Scott Casselman, DRPC Chair



<p>Two letters were written:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To Randy Clarkson, Kluane Park Management Area – regarding the presentation he made at the DRPC meeting in March.</li> <li>2. To Helen Slama, Yukon Trappers Association - regarding YTA involvement as a stakeholder in the planning process, and reiterating how individual trappers can stay informed and involved.</li> </ol> <p>Correspondence on other topics is included under other tabs.</p>	
--	--

**AGENDA TAB 2: ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE**

<b>Review of Financial Statements</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Financial Statements to the end of February 2014 were reviewed. To date the Commission has under spent by \$10,000. The Commission asked if the change to the staff salary would be retroactive to the end of February. Monica said it was not possible due to monies owed and paid out for bank and overtime pay. The new salary amounts will be in effect beginning April 1, 2014.</p>	
<b>2014 – 2015 Workplan/Budget and Funding Agreement</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p><b>Workplan Schedule:</b> The schedule for product completion is behind. The ‘What We Heard’ Report took longer than planned. All the comments came on the due date and a process for recording and compiling comments thoroughly and completely had to be created and implemented.</p> <p>The completion date for the Method Report – Part 1 had to be moved to the end of April.</p> <p>The Draft Plan is scheduled to be released by the end of June 2014.</p> <p>Comments on the DP will close in September. Over the summer the staff will prepare for shutting the office in Dawson down, filing, and completion of outstanding smaller projects.</p> <p>The Final Recommended Plan is scheduled to be released December 31, 2014.</p> <p>Monika is available until the end of January 2015.</p> <p>The DRPC Workplan/Budget was approved by the YLUPC and is attached to YLUPC’s submission to the YG.</p> <p>In the future, the Commission recommended a review of the workplan &amp; budget process.</p> <p>Now the DRPC W/P goes to YLUPC for review then back to DRPC then back to YLUPC then to the YG then back to the Commission for revisions then to YLUPC for final approval then back to YG.</p> <p>The Commission recommended that the W/P’s go to both the YLUPC and to the YG in the first round of approval then back to Commission for revisions then to YLUPC for approval then to YG.</p> <p>***No formal decision for action for this recommendation was made.</p>	
<b>2014-2015 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with YLUPC</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>The MOU describes the assistance YLUPC will provide to DRPC. Ron &amp; Monica met to discuss the DRPC needs and how YLUPC could assist. An MOU will be drafted and presented to Council for approval.</p> <p>YLUPC will pay for the DRPC 2013/14 Audit; ½ time financial administration, 2/3 time Senior Planner and Contract for Services as needed. They are paying for the minute taker for these and future DRPC meetings and for S. Francis land designation work. A report examining other regional plans in areas where placer mining occurs and compile potential</p>	<p><b>YLUPC:</b> Look for a contractor to write the plain language version of the Draft Plan.</p>

<p>recommendations is being prepared by Gerald Isaac and will be completed in May. The Council will look for a contractor to write the plain language version of the Final Recommended Plan, starting with the writer of the North Yukon Land Use Plan Plain Language Version writer.</p> <p>Scott thanked YLUPC for their support, he said, “we couldn’t have done without you”.</p>	
<p><b>Update on status of sixth Commission member appointment</b></p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>On Day Two, Peter Jenkins presented himself as the sixth Commission member for the DRPC. The YG appointed Peter to this position. Scott and the other members introduced themselves and welcomed him to the table.</p>	

<p><b>AGENDA TAB 3: Review of Commissions Mandate &amp; Procedures for Decision Making</b></p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>When the original six Commission members were appointed an orientation session was delivered. Now, with two new members, the need to review and remind members what the process for decision making is as referenced in Chapter 11 of TH Final Agreement, the DRPC Terms of Reference, and in the DRPC Policies and Procedures, Section 4 is required. The Commission will be making difficult decisions when they meet to decide the details of the draft land use plan, it is imperative they understand how to work within a consensus decision making process.</p> <p>The DRPC asked YLUPC for assistance, how did other Commissions work through consensus decision making? Ron Cruikshank, YLUPC Planning Director said they would bring in a professional facilitator who specialized in group dynamic issues. Three contractors they hired were: Angela Walkley, Gay Hanson and Mel Malik. He also referred to their TOR – Protocols for Decision Making – Appendix 2 and said the land claim agreements do speak to using a consensus decision making process.</p> <p>With North Yukon reached consensus on all topics, they never had to vote. In Teslin, The Commission had two co-chairs, and found reaching consensus using this method more difficult.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Decisions</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>N/A</p>	

<p><b>AGENDA TAB 4: Guest Speaker: Alison Perrin – Climate Change Information Analyst - Northern Climate ExChange, Yukon Research Centre, Yukon College</b></p>
---

Overview	Action Items
<p>A PowerPoint presentation called “Dawson Land Use Planning: Managing Lands for Changing Climate’ was presented. It explained the mission of the Northern Climate Exchange (NCE) and what they provide for services. NCE has provided a range of climate change services to Yukon since 2000, related to: adaptation, mitigation, education and outreach and climate change information and mainstreaming program.</p> <p>The challenges, barriers and opportunities for land use planning include: changes in ecosystem stability, flooding/erosion, in developing effective monitoring systems, in the fact that uncertainty is inherent and in the loss of ability to attenuate existing or future impacts.</p> <p>Alison provided projections using maps and charts for air temperature, precipitation, growing seasons, permafrost, and permafrost temperatures; she said NCE could provide the Commission with numbers for any topic they are interested in. (Natural Resources Canada was cited as a reference)</p> <p>The projected impacts and opportunities projected for the Dawson area are: Permafrost thaw, increased forest fires, increase intensity of spring freshets, species distribution and in economic opportunities.</p> <p>For more information their website address is: <a href="http://www.yukoncollege">www.yukoncollege</a></p> <p>In conclusion she asked the Commission to consider climate change when thinking about protected areas, how climate change could affect caribou calving migration, and overtime how vegetation will change.</p> <p>Climate change will affect the land more than people.</p>	
Discussion	Action Items
<p>The Commission asked in general what the changes were over the past 100 years.</p> <p>Answer: Records have been kept since 1850; it is now 3 degrees warmer (globally is 1.7 degrees warmer). The north is melting quickly, different regions are impacted differently. It is forecasted to be 20% warmer in 2050.</p> <p>She invited the Commission to workshop in the fall in Dawson about how to make decisions using climate change.</p>	

AGENDA TAB 5: Michael Draper and Brenda Sproule – YG-EMR, Land Management Branch	
Overview	Action Items
<p>The YG EMR - Land Management Branch (LMB) was invited to speak to Commission about three things: Land Use Permitting Regime, Resource Road Initiatives and Off Road Vehicle Initiatives</p> <p>*Land Use Permitting: Michael gave an overview of how tenures are issued for land activities. He said land use activities are subject to YESAB screening; their response determines whether mitigation is required.</p> <p>*Resource Road Initiatives: it is Brenda’s job to issue land use permits for roads. The permit covers the whole period, from the opening to the closing of it. It is their commitment to provide policy for construction, maintenance, enforcement of spills, signage, gates for private roads, and road closure. Road use is determined and user agreements are provided for roads that have more than one user... i.e.: Proponent A made the road but Proponent B also needs and uses the road for a different use.</p> <p>YG-EMR-LMB would like the Commission to consider the roads when writing the plan so they provided them with a copy of an information booklet called ‘Resource Access Roads Framework’ to reference</p> <p>*Off Road Access Initiatives: A discussion paper was released in the summer/2013 outlining key issues and policy issues</p>	

about how to manage off road use. The process is complaint driven and initiated based proposals and recommendations; it is not a blanket act. The nature of the review is to seek advice, LMB deals with damage to the land not conflict. The Off-Road Vehicle act outlines use and can be found on the YG website. Policy and facts sheets are also on the Land Management YG website. Mike Draper is the main contact if the Commission has any questions.	
Discussion	Action Items
The Commission thanked Mike & Brenda for their presentation; they said it was timely because they will be considering access management extensively in their planning.	
<b>AGENDA TAB 5: Lorrain Millar/Rob Thomson – Natural Resource Officer – Dawson Region</b>	
Overview	Action Items
Discussion	Action Items
Decisions	Action Items
<b>AGENDA TAB 5: Randy Lamb and Jim Bell – YG-EMR Corporate Policy &amp; Planning Rosa Brown - VGFN</b>	
Overview	Action Items
Discussion	Action Items
Decisions	Action Items
<b>AGENDA TAB 5: Gillian McKee – YG EMR Summary of Existing YG regulatory tools &amp; status on other YG initiatives</b>	
Overview	Action Items
Discussion	Action Items

Decisions	Action Items
<b>AGENDA TAB 6: Chris McLeod – Natural Resources Policy Analyst (TH Land &amp; Resource Department)</b>	
Overview	Action Items
Discussion	Action Items
Decisions	Action Items

Meeting adjourned for the day at 4:30pm.

Meeting reconvened on April 16 at 9:10am.

<b>AGENDA TABS 7: Bobbie Milnes &amp; Shelby Jordan – Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Board (YESAB), Dawson Designated Office</b>	
Overview	Action Items
<p><u>YESAB Recommendations: Culture &amp; Heritage</u>                  YESAB uses TH Final Agreement (FA) and the Umbrella Final Agreement (UFA) as the reference for definitions when making recommendations. Heritage Resources are a high priority. YESAB prefers to make recommendations before the project rather than later. HRIA or Heritage Resource Impact Assessments are an on the land study; HROA or Heritage Resource Overview Assessment is a desk top study using maps. The assessment will have considered effects to heritage resources as a valued component with this understanding. If a significant adverse effect on HR was determined and a term and condition was recommended (i.e. HROA) it would be specific to THAT definition of HR. Therefore implied that an HROA would need to take into account the all-encompassing definition of HROA – meaning the proponent would be required to include and engage TH (in this case) when performing this work BEFORE THE activity is undertaken.                  The purposes of the Act provide direction for assessments, these purposes mirror if not closely resemble the Objectives outlined in Chapter 12 of the UFA.                  As for our current practice when a Proposal is received; the following matters are taken into consideration by the assessors and used to help determine whether requesting additional heritage resources information from proponents is necessary during an adequacy review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the project is to occur in an area where there is the presence of previously recorded heritage resource</li> <li>• If the project is located within or adjacent to an area that has high cultural or archaeological value including the landscape features recognized as a contributing factor of that value?</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the project will occur on Category A settlement lands</li> <li>• If the area of the project (i.e. claim block) or the area for proposed activities (e.g. trenching, mine cuts, roads, etc) has not been previously disturbed</li> <li>• If the proposed project involves the following high-impact activities:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Access development</li> <li>○ Surface clearing - stripping and clearing of vegetation</li> <li>○ Excavation of soils</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The most commonly referred to valued components tend to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wildlife and their habitats</li> <li>○ Environmental Quality – This we tend to break down to water quality/soils and vegetation/ overall integrity, etc.</li> <li>○ Heritage Resources</li> <li>○ Aquatic Resources / Fish and Fish Habitat</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>potential 'gaps' in the legislative framework,</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Definition of Heritage Resources</li> <li>○ Conformity checks (commission vs. council)</li> <li>○ Some feedback on how the NYLUP has fit into our assessment process thus far.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Because of capacity issues TH assists YESAB with IA and OA assessments. Heritage Resources are addressed according to the FA, the Umbrella Final Agreement (UFA) and by what and how TH defines their HR. YESAB's mandate is outlined in Chapter 12 of the UFA, it is broad. Bobbie explained the process when a heritage item is found on settlement land verses non-settlement land. YESAB has on-line maps – some are secure, available to staff only, others are available on their website. Recommendations are improving with feedback; it is a work in progress. YESAB does recommend looking at Best Management Practices. Other priorities are wildlife and water. YESAB is interested in cumulative effects; they will refer to the report being prepared by Shawn Francis.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p><b>Q?</b> Conformity checks? YG and VGFN are wondering if it is YLUPC's mandate to complete conformity checks for recommend plans?  <b>A=</b> YLUPC is looking at this; it may need to be a new job position the Council will need to create.          Sam is using old data to complete conformity checks for NY. EMR is trying to get a handle on what the disturbances are in the NY. Mandatory reporting by mining companies must indicate if they did what they said they would do.  <b>Q?</b> In the NY it was asked if YESAB only looks at the CE or if they consider other indicators?  <b>A=</b> They said they also consider linear disturbance.  <b>Q?</b> The Commission asked what helps YESAB make recommendations in the last two land use plans (NY &amp; Peel)  <b>A=</b> In the NY – ALCES is working. Overall, having clear definitions about i.e.: What is linear disturbance and surface disturbance.... In the NY this is defined in IMA-Level 4. YESAB has not worked with the Peel plan yet.  <b>Q?</b> How many recommendations are accepted or rejected and is this information reported in your Annual Reports?</p>	



<p><b>A=</b> Yes it is. This information is also online.</p> <p><b>Q?</b> How does YESAB monitor CE on the 40 Mile Caribou Herd? And how do they consider Alaska' rules?</p> <p><b>A=</b> With Alaska, there is no mitigation we can make to change activity across the border.</p> <p>When monitoring CE, we use on-line mapping that is color coded and can be pulled up, it also shows accepted and rejected applications. YESAB looks at preserving habitat. We research existing information like the Resource Assessment Report released by the DRPC, or other resources like the Mayo Renewable Resource Council's information about the 40 Mile Caribou herd, we never make a recommendation that reflects exiting regulatory requirements. Once we make our recommendation we assume they are being conformed to. .</p> <p><b>Q?</b> How do you deal with Best Management Practices? (BMP)</p> <p><b>A=</b> We do refer to BMP's; we do make them apart of our mitigations and apart of the terms of reference.</p> <p><b>Q?</b> If there are 50 conditions that the proponent has to follow, are all 50 written into their Terms of Reference?</p> <p><b>A=</b> We work at ensuring they are recognized. If comment is necessary, it is identified and repeated if we see it is not being recognized.</p> <p><b>Q?</b> How will we, the Commission, be able to identify our concerns with fly zones, and how they affect the sheep population? The Commission expressed concern regarding helicopters flying too low and disturbing wildlife and wondered if they could address this in the land use plan.</p> <p><b>A=</b> it is the inspectors job to enforce recommendations. The Federal Aviation Act regulates air traffic, and does have a recommendation for wildlife. Scott asked Gillian to check if there is a clause in the Federal Aviation Act to address this concern.</p>	<p><b>YG:</b> check if Federal Aviation Act has a clause to address disturbance to wildlife</p>
--	---

<p><b>AGENDA: Mark Peterson – Forest Management Branch</b></p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>A copy of the Dawson Forest Resources Management Plan prepared by the Dawson Forest Management Planning Team (DFMPT) was distributed to each Commission member. The DFMPT would like the DRPC to consider the plan when planning; it provides an excellent level of detail and will help the Commission meet their goals and objectives. Key issues are listed in Section 5 on page 24.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p><b>Q?</b> Is there a map that shows how much area was cleared in the Gold Rush era?</p> <p><b>A=</b> No, but that would be interesting to know.</p> <p><b>Q?</b> Are economic benefits considered?</p> <p><b>A=</b> Yes, it does take that into account. There is a guidance document but some things are very specific like cutting and this plan has a timber supply review process in it. The YG has an inventory but the analysis is not done yet and implementation of how it is going to be done is in the process.</p>	

**AGENDA TABS 8: Mineral staking during Dawson plan development (continued from last meeting)**

Overview	Action Items
<p>Correspondence between TH &amp; YG was included in the Commissions information binder for review.                      DECISION required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the Commission want to take an official position and write a letter on the issue raised by TH to request the YG put an interim staking withdrawal in the DRP region?</li> <li>2. Does the Commission feel that an interim staking withdrawal would help them achieve their goals and objectives?</li> <li>3. Which LMU's would be affected?</li> <li>4. When would the Commission request that an interim staking withdrawal take affect.....immediately, at the Final or at the Draft Plan stage?</li> </ol>	
Discussion	Action Items
<p><b>Q?</b> <u>How did other planning commissions handle this question?</u>  <b>A=</b> Ron: The Council recommended that the Commission not spend too much time on this, the TOR does allow for other initiative to work concurrently during the planning process and added that the YESAB process was put in place to handle these concerns. An interim staking withdrawal was requested by the Peel with the Final Recommended Plan, the YG did grant this request. This was a major topic of concern with the NY, Peel and now with the DRPC, a clearer definition in the TOR could eliminate this concern in the future.  <b>Q?</b> <u>The Commission wanted to know why TH is asking for this withdrawal now.</u>  <b>A=</b> Bill answered, They are concerned with the time frame it takes governments to implement changes, they would like to see a staking withdrawal in effect for the 2014 summer season and they are concerned that staking could impact plan options.  <b>Q?</b> <u>Is this an issue for the Commission?</u>  <b>A=</b> The Commission considered it's perception to the public and agreed that taking an official position is necessary.  <b>Q?</b> <u>What are the issues affecting this decision?</u>  <b>A=</b> Nuisance staking: Will the release of the Plan Options paper lead to increased staking in areas that the LUP is considering as PA or other designations that would restrict staking/mining? The mining industry observers thought this would not be an issue noting that two years ago nuisance staking was an issue and has now subsided.</p>	<p>Write letter to YG</p>
Decisions	Action Items
<p>The Commission agreed they will approve beforehand, a letter to the YG requesting an interim staking withdrawal that will be attached to the DR draft LUP.</p>	

<p><b>AGENDA TAB 11: Land Designation System: Cumulative Effects Indicators and Levels</b>  <b>Guest Speaker: Shawn Francis (S. Francis Consulting Inc.) via Skype</b></p>	
Overview	Action Items
<p>Shawn was the Senior Land Use Planner for the NY, and assisted with the Peel and now with the Dawson land use plan. His focus is on CE and how to manage it, regional land planning is an important cog in this.                      He said regional planning is about the future, the plan exercise is to make recommendations for actions. What is the goal and vision for the future?                      Shawn, with the assistance of Sam Skinner, presented a PowerPoint presentation about CE and how they fit into the DRLUP.</p>	

<p>We are asking: what is plausible (things likely to happen) and what is possible (broad view)? In this project we are modeling linear disturbance.</p> <p>Main points included:          This Integrated Land Use Management framework has a project assessment track (YESAB) and a CE management track to base assessments on.</p> <p>Land Designation Systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CE indicators are a way to identify specific, measurable objectives while maintaining flexibility for regulators to exercise operational-level decision-making.</li> <li>• CE indicators can 'define' the difference between zones (high level of activity, low level of activity).</li> </ul> <p>"General expression of "Management Intent"          Different types of designation systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>Prescriptive</b> (detailed lists of allowable activities and rules)...e.g., RUWA in Peel Plan</li> <li>– <b>Flexibly prescriptive</b> (all activities allowable, provided they meet <u>specific objectives</u>)</li> <li>– <b>"vague"</b>... anything goes, no rules other than existing regulations and maybe highest use</li> </ul> <p>Future land use scenario's have 'Landscape Drivers', for the Dawson region they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mining (Quartz and Placer)</li> <li>• Forestry</li> <li>• Transportation</li> <li>• Oil and Gas (in localized areas?)</li> </ul> <p>With each driver we must determine future land use scenarios and what the values will be.          The presentation concluded with an example of how this process was applied in a 'Woodland Caribou Risk Analysis'.</p> <p>YG is asking the DRPC to use the same designation system as the NY. It was understood that CE indicators could only be used for some areas of the plan.          Shawn will bring the modeling work with the numbers to the next Commission Meeting.</p>	
<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p><b>Action Items</b></p>
<p>Q? Where do you get your data from?          Q? Is there a focus on economic benefits of resources that are hard to extract verses CE?          A= We want to consider the economic benefits but we are not in a position to model it. Various modeling tools are being considered to use in for this assessment.</p>	

<p><b>AGENDA TAB 9 &amp; 10: Plan Alternatives Public Review: What We Heard Report (Overview)</b></p>	
<p><b>Overview</b></p>	<p><b>Action Items</b></p>
<p>A summary of 'What We Heard' Report was prepared for the Commission to review. The document combed through comments received from the 'Plan Alternatives' report released by the Commission, each issue or concern was listed categorically. All the comments received before the deadlines are in the report; comments after the report will be included in an appendix and are available on the DRP website. We used a questionnaire as a guide, responses were received from: Survey Monkey, Email, by stopping by the office, and from notes and transcripts from public meetings. A complete list of the consultation process is included. The goal is to be transparent. Comments are available to read unless indicated otherwise. One submission stated clearly that they did not want their submission made public, this lead the question of whether anyone</p>	<p>Can YLUPC contract someone to compile Draft Plan comments</p>

<p>else had this concern. Everyone who made a submission was contacted to verify if they wanted their submission to be made public, we blacked out the names of people we could not reach. Monica would like a similar report compiled with the Draft Plan comments, and asked if YLUPC could fund this. To assist in preparations for the May meeting an overview of areas the Commission needs to consider was reviewed:</p>	
<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p><b>Action Items</b></p>
<p><u>The Commission discussed the hatched area in the region.</u> 1. Will the Commission consider a residential subdivision in this area? Currently the YG is using a spot land application process which can impede the planning process, but most of these applications are issued in a community planning region. Boundaries within the town of Dawson about where a subdivision would be planned was debated, although the DRPC does not have planning jurisdiction in a community planning region it did agree that it could make suggestions based areas adjacent to the DRP, but not until after the meeting in May. 2. The map shows a 5km radius on either side of the road. The Commission thought this could be reduced. <u>Watershed Boundaries:</u> Comments received from the plan alternatives suggested changing the boundaries in the lower LMD to reflect the watershed. The Commission looked at the map and discussed the various boundary possibilities, using the White River as a boundary was the main option. Currently the boundaries used reflected the Forest Management Plan. It would be helpful to have overlays to compare. <u>Preparation for the May meeting:</u> For the May Meeting: Should a two page summary be prepared for each LMU to help the Commission with decision making: The commission agreed that this would help. Ask EMR-YG (Jim Bell) NY &amp; Peel maps as a reference for consistency in language, in LMU definitions and in assisting with land designations. <u>Unsettled First Nations:</u> White River First Nation was added as a stakeholder as there is land adjacent to the Dawson region. They are not a Party because they are a do not have a land claim agreement, but they did request to be kept informed. YLUPC is asking how to work with 'unsettled' First Nations. <u>Amalgamation of the North LMU's</u> VGFN provided suggestions for amalgamating based on the NY plan and habitat concerns in their response to the plan alternatives. Rosa provided background information (mainly for Peter who is a new member) and explained the rationale for the request to the Commission. The Commission agreed that land designations would need to be determined before the land could be amalgamated. <u>Zoning</u> The Commission will need to decide how many Zones to put into the plan. The NY &amp; Peel plan and the Atlin Land Use Plan were referred to for examples of zones. Zones should be distinctly different, the comments received stated that the zones being used in the plan alternatives were unclear and some were unnecessary. TWG will work on clarifying zone options. YLUPC and YG support consistency within all the regional land use plans. In the future this will help readability. The Zones in the plan alternative were discussed; the Commission will need to decide on how to define each zone and whether to keep or combine the zones they presented in the plan alternatives. CE will need to be defined in each zone to identify and maintain values. The T-Zone was created so TH's concerns could be acknowledged. The Commission suggested they could look at the values on a map that did not identify the LMU boundaries and the numbers and see what they come up with.</p>	<p>Write a two page summary for each LMU for the May meeting.  Obtain NY &amp; Peel maps from EMR for May meeting.  Have map overlays for comparisons  TWG: clarify Zone options  Suggestion: Have a map with no LMU boundaries and #'s so the Commission can only focus on the values.</p>

Dawson Regional Planning Commission Regular Meeting #16 – April 15 – 17, 2014

<p><b>Yukon River Corridors:</b>                  Keep as its own Zone or add it to the adjacent zone. The Yukon River is a prominent feature in the planning region the question of whether its own zone or not was discussed. Ron said that the Mackenzie River did not become a separate zone but sensitive areas along the river were identified to eliminate conflict. In the NY the Porcupine River did not become a separate zone.</p>	
<p><b>Decisions</b></p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>The Commission decided to leave the LMU's as they are and make changes at their May meeting where clear directions for writing the draft plan will be available to them.</p>	

Meeting adjourned for the day at 4:30pm.

Meeting reconvened on April 17 at 9:10am.

<p><b>NEXT STEPS</b></p>
<p>YLUPC: Training &amp; Orientation of new commission members</p> <p>Preparation for May Meeting (Final directions on LDS (zones) - Final decisions on LMU zoning and rationale - Review draft GMD's - Approval of Draft Plan format, layout)</p> <p>Gold Show – Friday, May 15: Hours 11 – 5                  Saturday May 16: Hours 11 – 5</p> <p>Draft Plan review meeting: June 10 – 13, 2014 in Dawson (tentative)                  Draft Plan Release Date: June 16<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup>?</p>
<p><b>Other Activities</b></p>
<p>The next regular Commission meeting is scheduled for May 13 - 15, 2014 in Dawson.</p>

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.



\_\_\_\_\_  
 Scott Casselman – Chair

October 28, 2014  
 Date