

Dawson Regional Planning Commission
 Regular Board Meeting Minutes
 Meeting #18 (2013/2014)
 June 10-12, 2014
 (SOVA Lecture Room, Dawson City)

In Attendance					
<u>Dawson Regional Planning Commission (DRPC)</u> Scott Casselman - Chair Roger Ellis - Member Chester Kelly - Member Will Fellers – Member (Day 2,3) Debbie Nagano – Member Peter Jenkins - Member Monica Krieger - Acting Senior Planner Kathy Burden - Planning Technician	<u>Yukon Land Use Planning Council (YLUPC)</u> Sam Skinner - Senior Land Use Planner	<u>YLUPC Contractors</u> Shawn Francis (S. Francis Consulting Inc.) - Senior Planning Advisory Services Joanne Rice (Cabin Fever Office & Event Services)- Recording Secretary	<u>Yukon Government YG)</u> Gillian McKee – Senior Land Use Planner, EMR <u>Tr’ondëk Hwëch’in (TH)</u> Bill Kendrick – Senior Land and Resources Officer/ Regional Planning Manager <u>Vuntut Gwitchin Government (VGG)</u> Rosa Brown	<u>Delegations by Request</u> Don Reid – Wildlife Conservation Society Canada	<u>Observers</u> Al Doherty, Aurum Geological Consultants Bill Trerice Randy Clarkson, KPMA Darren Taylor Stuart Schmidt Mark Favron Heather Favron Peggy Kormendy

Other Acronyms: CE – Cumulative Effects, HPA - Habitat Protection Area, IMA – Integrated Management Area zone, LDS – Land (Use) Designation System, LMU - Landscape Management Unit, PA – Protected Area zone, REA – Renewable Economy Area zone, SLC – Senior Liaison Committee, TEA – Traditional Economy Area zone, TWG – Technical Working Group, WRFN – White River First Nation, YRC – Yukon River Corridor

Action Items: Status to be updated at next meeting.

Draft minutes prepared by Joanne Rice (Cabin Fever Office & Event Services). Final edits and revisions completed by Monica Krieger, Acting Senior Planner.

Meeting called to order at 9:09 am by Scott Casselman, Chair. It was noted that YLUPC has contracted Shawn Francis (S. Francis Consulting Inc.) to provide senior planning expertise and assistance for this meeting, based on his experience as Senior Planner for the North Yukon Regional Plan and many other projects. Shawn is also continuing work on his previous contract with YLUPC (futuring scenarios and potential development of cumulative effects indicators and levels for the Dawson plan).

AGENDA TAB I: THE BASICS – PART I	
Approval of Agenda	Action Items
Monica suggested that some of “The Basics-Part 2” items, which had been placed near the end of Day 3 to allow priority for	

Chair's Report	Action Items
<p>Scott said there is little new to report since it has been a short time since the last meeting. He attended the SLC meeting on June 3rd with Monica and Ron Cruikshank (YLUPC). Ron informed him that the Council has surplus funding that is not being currently used and is quite sizeable, and they are pursuing approval from YG to utilize that surplus to fund contracts for DRPC assistance (e.g. continued senior planning expertise from Shawn, as well as other consultants to assist with Draft Plan production).</p> <p>He noted this will be especially important since Kathy has submitted her resignation and will be leaving the Commission at the end of June. He thanked her for her excellent work and wished her well.</p>	
<p>Acting Senior Planner's Report</p>	
<p>Monica said it has been an extremely busy few weeks. Immediately following the May meeting, the Commission had a booth at the Dawson City Gold Show (May 16-17). She attended as well as Roger and Chester, who were a great help along with both of their wives. Scott and Ron were also there on the morning of the 16th. Kathy had ordered some promotional items (tote bags, mints, and can holders with the DRPC logo) and these were very popular, especially the bags. There was good attendance although a bit quieter than previous years. The Gold Show remains an excellent opportunity to provide updates on the Commission's work, discuss regional issues, and get more people interested in the process and signed up on our mailing list for updates.</p> <p>She has been working to get a contract set up between YLUPC and Carrie Breneman. Carrie is a Dawson resident with excellent technical and writing skills, and we want to have her write an Executive Summary of the Resource Assessment Report (will make this huge document more accessible to more people). This will be a stand-alone document, and it will also become the basis of Section 2 of the Draft Plan (Description of Region), with a few revisions required for organization and content. This is one piece of the Draft Plan that can be given to an independent contractor – other sections would be more difficult unless the person has been previously involved with the Commission's decision making and has a good understanding of all the information.</p> <p>She attended the SLC meeting on June 3rd, and organized two extensive conference calls with TWG and an additional one with Shawn to discuss format and agenda for this meeting as well as to prepare revised materials. She and Kathy used Skype to attend a lunchtime lecture offered by the Planning Institute of British Columbia (most senior-level planners in the Yukon, including Ron and previous DRPC Senior Planner Jeff Hamm, are certified through the PIBC as there is no Yukon organization). The topic was ideas for online engagement during community consultation processes, including the use of social media, websites, and online surveys (like the Survey Monkey program used for the Plan Alternatives review period). There were some new ideas that may be useful for the Draft Plan public review period.</p> <p>She also investigated options for the Planning Technician position now that Kathy is resigning. These will be discussed at the end of the meeting in "Next Steps", but essentially the Commission can choose whether to advertise/rehire for the employee position or use the allocated salary dollars to fund someone on a contract basis. She has checked with Kathleen Zimmer (YG) and it is possible to request a transfer of dollars between line items in the budget (i.e. from Salary to Planning Services).</p>	<p>Monica to work with Ron to finalize contract for Carrie Breneman (RAR Executive Summary/ Draft Plan Section 2).</p>

Update from Senior Liaison Committee (SLC) Meeting	
<p>Scott provided an update on the SLC meeting held in Whitehorse on June 3rd. He, Monica, Ron and Patrick Rouble (YLUPC Chair) attended and all the TWG members were present in person or by phone. The SLC had previously met on May 2 and May 8 but no one from the Commission was in attendance. Main topics that were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether all new access within the Yukon River Corridor and/or Traditional Economy Area zoned LMUs could be permitted through the Territorial Land Use Regulations (as suggested at the May meeting), vs. under the Mining Land Use Regulations for access created on mineral claims. SLC thought this was a creative idea that could solve a number of the concerns raised by TH in these areas, and they would investigate it further. The Commission does not have to get “permission” from the SLC to include this is a recommendation in the Draft Plan, but it would be useful to have Parties’ consensus that it would be considered acceptable. • Notification of Class 1 mineral exploration activities – this is in place now in Ross River Dena traditional territory as a result of the recent court ruling on consultation, and YG noted it will likely be a Yukon-wide requirement within a year. • Draft Plan release – SLC should have an opportunity for review and identification of any “red flag” issues prior to it being released to the public. Time for this will be incorporated into any DRPC workplan schedules going forward. • Potential for the Commission to have internal working sessions and in camera discussions – the Commission has the option to go in camera at any time, but in general has tried to keep meetings open to the public. Ron suggested the Commission may find it useful to have internal sessions if they are having difficulty making progress on key issues, if meeting observers are seen to be disrupting the discussions (although it is the role of the Chair to control this), or if Commission members state they would feel more comfortable speaking openly without observers in the room. • Communication between SLC and the Commission – reiterated willingness of Scott and/or Monica to attend meetings if requested, as it is an important opportunity to provide updates and to present questions or issues where the Commission requires direction. Clarification of roles of SLC (high level policy advice and direction) and TWG (technical support on a staff level), which are detailed in the Terms of Reference for DRPC. In their May 1 letter to the SLC, the Commission did express concern they were receiving updates about SLC meetings and Parties’ direction through TWG members and not directly. An email from Tim Gerberding this week provided further details – all four SLC representatives (Tim for TH, Erika Tizya for VGG, Shirley Abercrombie and Allan Koprowsky for YG) confer closely with their respective TWG members and are confident that the input TWG members provide to the Commission is consistent with their overall governments’ policy direction. 	

AGENDA TAB 2: DRAFT PLAN – TABLE OF CONTENTS	
Overview	Action Items
Monica reviewed the anticipated Table of Contents and current status for each section of the Draft Plan, including: Foreword; Section 1 – Introduction; Section 2 – Description of Planning Region; Section 3 – Plan Concepts and Tools/Strategies; Section 4-	

<p>General Management Direction; Section 5 – Landscape Management Units; Section 6 – Plan Implementation and Revision; Section 7 – References; and Appendices. For sections not yet completed, she included examples from the North Yukon and Peel Watershed land use plans to give the Commission a sense of what information they will eventually contain. The new Planning Technician will work on options for overall layout and design, color scheme, etc. that the Commission can choose from.</p> <p>Discussion about the various pieces of the Foreword section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About the Commission – mandate, membership, description of logo and slogan • Letter of Transmittal – two or three page message, typically from the Senior Planner on behalf of the Commission, describing how the plan was prepared and providing details on the public review period and associated consultation activities • Acknowledgements - who the Commission wants to thank for their assistance in producing the Draft Plan • Executive Summary or Highlights – short version of the plan, typically five or six pages long. Monica and Kathy also planned to design this into a colorful brochure or newsletter format, to be mailed out and distributed at public meetings. This would be in addition to the Draft Plan itself (typically 300+ pages with maps and appendices) and a Draft Plan Summary (about 30 pages), to provide a good range of consultation products with varying amounts of detail • Table of Contents • Message from the Chair or Commission – what the Commission wants to say to people reading the Draft Plan • Understanding the Plan – for implementation purposes (charts or diagrams showing how to determine what activities can occur throughout the region, and whether a proposed project is in conformity) <p>Monica asked about the story behind the DRPC logo as this was prior to her work with the Commission. Several options were presented to them by Egli Design in early 2011. The chosen logo represents the importance of the mountains, Yukon River, and salmon to the region and the round design is meant to symbolize a gold pan (and the importance of gold mining to the region both historically and today). The Hän translation for “moving forward” (Nän kāk ndä tr’ädäl), which became the Commission’s slogan, was provided by Gerald Isaac. Chester said that Ron presented a description of the logo at the YLUPC conference last January.</p> <p>Discussion about the Acknowledgements section. Monica reviewed the typical list which includes the Parties, other government agencies (e.g. Canadian Wildlife Service), TWG, SLC, Commission staff (current and former), YLUPC, technical support people (e.g. Mammoth Mapping), individuals or organizations who provided data or information (e.g. all the guest speakers who have spoken at Commission meetings), involved community members who attend meetings, stakeholder groups (non-government and industry organizations) who have participated in workshops and meetings, consultants (Carrie Breneman, Shawn Francis, minute takers) and members of the public. Individual names are usually noted for each organization – e.g. Klondike Placer Miners Association (special thanks to Randy Clarkson). Debbie said the community of Dawson City in general should be thanked, as well as Elders for their vision and guidance (this planning process is implementing the vision that elders and negotiators had), and the two Commission members who passed away (Steve Taylor and Bill Bowie) should be acknowledged. Scott suggested a</p>	<p>Monica to work on draft Acknowledgements section for Commission review.</p> <p>Scott to work on draft Message from the Chair for review by other members.</p> <p>Members and staff to compile any photos that could be useful for the Draft Plan.</p>
--	--

<p>qualifier also be added, such as “we apologize to anyone we may have overlooked”.</p> <p>Monica described how the North Yukon Plan had a one-page Message from the Chair that was fairly general and straightforward, whereas the Peel Watershed Plan had a three-page Message from the Commission that described in great detail all the difficult issues and challenges the Commission faced while creating the plan, and the reasons for their decisions. DRPC members agreed they would like to have the message come from the Chair, but on behalf of the entire Commission. It should describe the input received from various groups and individuals (as well as the Parties) throughout the process, how this input was used to make decisions, and the Commission’s hopes for what the plan will accomplish. It should clearly reflect that the Commission is confident in the product, be written in plain language, and note where people can get more information if they have questions.</p> <p>Section 2 will be completed after Carrie Breneman is finished the Resource Assessment Report summary. Sections 3, 4 and 5 are key concepts and direction that the Commission still needs to make final decisions about including the zoning system, what each Landscape Management Unit (LMU) will be zoned (and why), and any additional direction or considerations for land use in the region. Kathy already completed most of the LMU descriptions but we need final decisions on zoning and special management considerations, and Monica has started the General Management Direction section. Section 6 on plan implementation/revision is usually fairly short but important – it contains any directions or recommendations to the Parties, and describes how/when changes can be made to the plan. Shawn will discuss some pieces of Section 1, and Section 7 will likely be finished last. Appendices will include summary maps, tables summarizing key recommendations, existing legislation and management plans, best management practices, list of acronyms, summary of the futuring scenarios work done by Shawn and Sam and how the Commission used it to make decisions, etc.</p> <p>The Draft Plan does not need to have everything figured out – if the Commission gets stuck on an issue or can’t come to consensus, options can be presented. Both the North Yukon and Peel Draft Plans did this, e.g. proposing a protected area and asking for people’s feedback on boundaries and type.</p>	
--	--

<p>PLAN VISION, GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES</p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Shawn gave an overview presentation of previous work done on this topic (February and May 2013 stakeholder workshops as well as Commission direction from meetings to date), which requires formalization by the Commission. He also emphasized the importance of both this section of the plan and the Foreword section that Monica discussed – these may seem minor compared to the zoning system and LMU descriptions, but they come first for a reason. These concepts represent general agreement on what the plan is about, identify the major planning issues, and set the tone for the rest of the plan.</p> <p>Shawn presented a draft chart showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals – broad statements of what we want to achieve, the desirable long-term condition (e.g. maintain integrity of wildlife 	

<p>habitat)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives – more specific statements noting desired outcomes, or conditions that contribute to achieving the goal (e.g. minimize habitat loss and fragmentation) • Strategies – actions we will take to achieve the objective, or recommended approaches (e.g. reduce the size, intensity and duration of surface disturbance) • Indicators – how we will measure whether we are achieving our goals and objectives (e.g. amount of linear density and surface disturbance on the landscape) • Indicator Levels – cautionary and critical levels at which additional actions need to take place <p>Shawn suggested the Commission’s Vision Statement and Goals developed earlier in the process should be renamed Vision Statement and Plan Principles. He said the current statements about stewardship, economic prosperity, equitable balance, and active management are more appropriately called “principles” as they refer to what the plan is trying to achieve. Goals are more specific than that. For example, active management is not a goal or end in itself, it is a means to achieve a goal such as sustainable development. The Commission agreed this change was acceptable.</p> <p>The major planning issues (what the plan needs to resolve) that have been identified to the Commission include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unplanned and unregulated surface access (roads and trails) • Land use management in the Yukon River corridor • Disturbance to riparian ecosystems, wetlands and aquatic life from placer mining (noted that this was the reason for the fish habitat management system now in place) • Effect of free entry mineral tenure/staking regime on other land uses, environmental and cultural values • Cumulative landscape disturbance resulting from historical, current and future land use activities • Land use around Dawson City area – spot land applications, expanding population, community areas <p>The “planning toolbox” (available management tools and strategies) can be used to find the best ways to achieve the plan goals and objectives. Shawn reviewed the “objectives hierarchy” prepared by previous Senior Planner Jeff Hamm and Tim Wilson (Compass Resource Management Ltd.) for the May 2013 stakeholder workshop, which was based on outcomes from the previous workshop in February.</p>	<p>Staff to change future versions of the document to read Vision Statement and Plan Principles.</p>
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Debbie said the plan needs to address concerns over the declining salmon populations, make recommendations to increase monitoring of harvest numbers for moose, and ensure the 40 Mile caribou herd continues to recover. She added that salmon monitoring took place for years and there was existing legislation in place to protect salmon, but it didn’t prevent the population crash from happening. More needs to be done such as restoring or enhancing habitat and recommending recovery strategies, and encouraging different groups and agencies to work together and share information. She doesn’t want the same thing to happen with moose, caribou, lynx, marten, and all the other things that make the Dawson region what it is. Shawn said the plan can</p>	

<p>ensure that salmon habitat in streams and rivers is there for when they return (this is the intent of the placer regime/fish habitat management system). Land use plans typically focus more on habitat than populations (which are more the responsibility of YG biologists, Renewable Resource Councils, etc.), although population status and any risks obviously need to be considered when deciding what measures might be required for habitat management.</p> <p>Chester said there is not enough known about the 40 Mile herd, and continued hunting restrictions are a good thing as the herd continues to grow. He feels there is pretty low cumulative disturbance in mining areas right now, but ongoing monitoring is important to keep an eye on things. Restoration of placer mining areas has attracted all kinds of wildlife, it has shown amazing results and has created better wetlands habitat for moose and other species.</p> <p>The Commission reviewed the draft list of goals and objectives and offered suggestions, additions and changes. Some draft examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and enhance the integrity of aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems/habitat in a condition that will continue to support/sustain healthy regional fish and wildlife populations. • Recognize/conserves/preserve and promote the heritage and cultural resources/values/places/traditional land use practices of Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in, other affected First Nations and the Yukon. • Facilitate existing and future economic development opportunities and activities that result in socio-economic benefits to the community of Dawson City and the Yukon as a whole. • Provide land use certainty and minimize land use conflicts throughout the region, to the extent practicable. • Recognize and maintain valued landscapes in a condition that will continue to support cultural practices and renewable/traditional economic opportunities. <p>Discussions were based on what values exist on the landscape (e.g. riparian and wetland ecosystems), what are the potential land use issues or situations where those values could be impacted, what are the objectives for those values, and what are some key strategies or recommendations the Commission can make to ensure those objectives are met. Environmental values discussed included riparian and wetland ecosystems, moose, raptors, thimblehorn sheep, caribou, and general ecological integrity (related to cumulative effects). Heritage and cultural values discussed included Yukon River corridor, Klondike Gold Rush heritage interpretation, TH heritage and culture, and archaeological and palaeontological resources. Economic values discussed included the community of Dawson and surrounding area, placer mining, quartz mining, oil and gas, tourism, recreation, transportation (air/surface/ water), agriculture, aggregates, forestry, traditional economy, trapping, and guide outfitting. It was recognized that many of these values could be classified under multiple categories (e.g. the Yukon River corridor has environmental, heritage, and economic value) but the purpose is to simplify it for plan implementation.</p> <p>Discussion about valued landscapes – Shawn said it is a term used in other land use plans to refer to a place that is important for a number of values. It has more of a cultural/social meaning and does not necessarily refer to “wilderness”. Monica added that the concept of “cultural landscapes” was explored in the Resource Assessment Report’s chapter on Heritage Resources, based on information provided by TH. It is also an internationally recognized concept (e.g. it is one of the criteria on which World</p>	<p>Shawn to do further work on wording for Plan Goals, Objectives and Strategies using other plans, previous Commission work such as the Resource Assessment Report and Issues & Interests Report, stakeholder workshop outcomes, wording from the Final Agreement, and input from the Commission at this meeting for guidance.</p>
---	---

<p>Heritage Sites can be designated).</p> <p>For some species like moose, it is difficult to identify specific locations of key habitat areas (e.g. rutting or calving could occur anywhere on the landscape). Scott said they installed wildlife cameras at Casino which helped identify mineral licks that were visited by moose, bears, and wolverine. Discussion about how forest fires can drastically change the location and quality of wildlife habitat, and a reminder that WCSC comments on the Plan Alternatives noted some ideas for changes to the fire suppression regime. Wetlands are rare in the planning region, but there is no specific wetlands policy in the Yukon to provide guidance.</p> <p>Discussion about Klondike Valley Land Use Plan (KVLUP) and the “Community Area” identified in the Plan Alternatives for potential future expansion. Gillian said the KVLUP study area initially went beyond the Dempster corner. The plan identified different areas where Local Area Plans would be developed (e.g. West Dawson/Sunnydale, Callison) and made several recommendations about further development in the Klondike Valley (e.g. no further residential development east of Henderson Corner because of concerns about impacting the lynx populations). Kathy has been reviewing the KVLUP and is working on a summary of key recommendations the Commission could consider for specific LMUs.</p> <p>Gillian noted YG has previously informed the Commission they would like to see recommendations and identification of areas where planned residential subdivisions would be suitable or preferred, vs. continued spot land applications outside of Dawson municipal boundaries. Scott said that according to the Commission’s Terms of Reference, areas that are subject to local area planning are to be excluded from the regional plan. West Dawson/Sunnydale is currently excluded as it is in the process of being planned, but what about all the other areas identified in the KVLUP? Monica questioned why this was not specifically noted in the Terms of Reference as it was an obvious question (and apparent inconsistency) that the Commission would have to deal with.</p> <p>Planned agricultural areas could also be identified as preferable to the existing system, and the Commission could make recommendations for legislation changes (e.g. no domestic sheep as they can pose a disease risk to wild sheep populations). Increased agriculture in the region is questionable – available irrigation is an issue and there is a limited market (mostly local and difficult to expand), but the region has some of the most productive soils in the Yukon. Monica also noted the local survey referenced in that chapter of the Resource Assessment Report, which clearly showed that demand for local produce and other farm products greatly exceeded current supply.</p> <p>Sam mentioned the Tombstone Corridor Management Plan, which was drafted but never adopted and which he has recently received a copy of. The Commission also needs to consider the Dempster Highway corridor, which has been recommended for sub-regional planning in both the North Yukon and Peel Watershed plans.</p> <p>Discussion about the ORV Management Area option, as well as previous comments received by the Commission about the impact such restrictions could potentially have on local guide outfitting operations which use ORVs to transport meat and equipment between outpost camps and main camps.</p>	<p>Gillian to request an official YG position on the issue of how the Commission is to deal with the area identified in the KVLUP as subject to local area planning. Clarification should also be sought from YLUPC.</p>
--	--

AGENDA TAB 3: DELEGATION – DON REID (Wildlife Conservation Society Canada)	
Overview	Action Items
<p>Don requested to speak to the Commission about considerations for the Draft Plan. In particular, he felt that recent work completed by the Wildlife Conservation Society Canada (WCSC) on approaches to conserving wildlife and wildlife habitat in Integrated Management Areas, using tools such as spatial buffers and timing windows to reduce and manage the risk of disturbance, would be useful to the Commission.</p> <p>Don described the recent literature review (April 2014) completed by WCSC (available on DRPC website) to summarize current scientific thinking on the use of spatial buffers and timing windows. Studies referenced were drawn from Nevada to Alaska, and from the eastern slopes of Alberta to the west coast. Main species referenced were sheep (thinhorn and bighorn), mountain goats, caribou, and raptors. Spatial buffers establish a certain distance around mapped key habitat areas, within which disturbance is prevented or minimized. Timing windows recognize there are certain times of year within which wildlife is more sensitive to disturbance (e.g. sheep lambing or bald eagle nesting), and human activities or disturbances are prevented or minimized.</p> <p>Don gave a Power Point presentation (available on DRPC website) describing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Management Areas as the working landscape, with a mixture of land uses and the challenge of maintaining healthy wildlife populations and habitats while permitting industrial development. Some negative impacts on wildlife are inevitable, but there are tools and strategies to minimize and manage that impact. • Reasons why uncontrolled ground access is a concern – more widespread and increased harvesting of fish and wildlife, more widespread disturbance by vehicle and foot traffic, and more road kills. • Charts showing most sensitive times of year for different wildlife species, as well as recommended buffers to prevent potential disturbance from aircraft and ground-based activities. • Recommendations on how the use of spatial buffers and timing windows could be implemented. <p>Three main approaches to mitigating potential impacts of human activity on wildlife are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit density of developments – as in the North Yukon plan, where caps/limits/thresholds are set (e.g. density of roads or % of land disturbed) which are not exceeded or which trigger additional action. This strategy is best when the human footprint is large and fairly evenly distributed across the landscape, such as with oil and gas development or forest harvesting using clearcuts. It is less applicable to the Dawson planning region, which has less widespread disturbance and less of “spider web” network of roads. It would also be difficult to choose the value for which thresholds would be set, since there is not enough research in the Dawson region to justifiably set levels. • Avoid key habitats that strongly influence population size and health. This approach applies to backcountry recreation impacts as well as industrial camps, roads, aircraft disturbance, etc. Good road layout is the primary tool to avoid key habitats, and use spatial buffers and timing windows where they cannot be avoided. This strategy works best with smaller 	

<p>and repeatedly used habitats (e.g. migratory bird stopover areas). Don recommended the Commission consider these as General Management Directions for the plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control access – using strategies such as private roads and traffic controls. Don noted that with the 2013 amendments to the Territorial Lands (Yukon) Act, the Commission could also recommend Off-Road Vehicle Management Areas. 	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Don said for sheep and goats, there is less information in the literature about ground disturbance than aircraft disturbance. Peter asked how the Commission could make recommendations regarding aviation when it is under federal jurisdiction. Don replied they could specify as a General Management Direction that best management practices for flying in sheep/caribou habitat be encouraged. In other jurisdictions such as BC, there are compliance tools such as onboard GPS to monitor flight paths but these are voluntary agreements between industry and government (e.g. for backcountry heli-skiing).</p> <p>The possibility of habituation needs to be considered, but habituation requires stable, non-threatening and repeated activity which is not likely in a backcountry setting. In the Yukon, several guide-outfitters have made complaints regarding aircraft activity (particularly during the staking rush) disturbing sheep and other wildlife. Don said there have been many studies which purposely tested how animals reacted to different types of disturbances. Scott said he is aware of studies showing that the sounds of different types of helicopter engines (piston vs. turbine) cause different reactions, and Don added there are also differences between reactions to helicopters vs. fixed wing aircraft. A vertical buffer is the simplest, i.e. stay above a certain altitude, and would avoid much of the potential disturbance.</p> <p>For implementation purposes, the plan would need to state specific direction to avoid key habitats, and more inventory and mapping of key habitat areas would likely be needed. This approach could also be considered for the Yukon River Corridor, where there are lots of site-specific values (barge landings, campsites, raptor nests, heritage sites) where buffers or timing windows could be useful in mitigating potential land use conflicts. Although mineral staking activity has decreased substantially in the last couple years, there are still other uses of helicopters (e.g. backcountry recreation) that need to be considered. Shawn said the key is understanding where values are on the landscape, and the land use plan is an opportunity to expand on the existing Wildlife Key Areas database. Don agreed and said the current database has geographic gaps which need to be filled as well as making the definitions more consistent.</p> <p>Controlling access by making industrial roads private is difficult logistically to implement unless there are few links to public roads (i.e. where you could gate and enforce without people finding ways to get in from elsewhere). Avoiding roads going close to lakes reduces the potential impact of increased fishing pressure. Don believes that research on traffic control measures for species of concern in the Dawson planning region could be done fairly quickly. There is a new option to create Off-Road Vehicle Management Areas and draft regulations will be out for public review this summer, although they only apply to wheeled vehicles and not snowmobiles. Don said the land use plan is the best context to identify these areas and provide strategic direction (e.g. exclusion zones within watersheds, certain habitat types, or with a seasonality component). These approaches are a way forward to truly integrating land use activities and multiple values.</p>	

<p>Current best management practices are not specific enough for timing windows and spatial buffers. “Flying in Sheep Country” and “Flying in Caribou Country” were produced several years ago by YG Environment, and are currently being reviewed for updates.</p> <p>Peter asked for more information about WCSC. Don replied their mandate is to bring academic/research information to decision making bodies and processes, so it is being used and does not just exist within academic journals. In the past few months, he has presented these same findings to the Renewable Resource Councils, Yukon Outfitters Association, Yukon Fish & Game Association, Yukon Fish & Wildlife Management Board, YESAB, and others.</p> <p>Don thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak with them, and encouraged them to contact him anytime if they have questions or need more information. Monica also noted the full literature review is available for Commission members to read if they are interested.</p>	
--	--

Meeting adjourned for the day at 4:54 pm.

Meeting reconvened on June 11th at 9:12am.

DRAFT PLAN – LAND USE DESIGNATION SYSTEM	
Overview	Action Items
<p>The Commission’s task is to consider: the vision, plan principles, goals, objectives, and strategies for the plan; all available strategies in the “planning toolbox” including General Management Directions and LMU-specific Special Management Considerations; the LDS used for the Plan Alternatives phase; comments and feedback received on the LDS during the Plan Alternatives public review; and the results of the “futuring” scenarios completed for the cumulative effects project. They need to decide what kinds of zones are needed in the Draft Plan to help them achieve the goals and objectives.</p> <p>Shawn reviewed the purpose of the Land (Use) Designation System (LDS), or what could be considered design criteria. A good LDS should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist in achieving the goal of land use certainty and minimize land use conflicts • Be easy to understand (the colors mean something) • Be consistent with other planning regions • Illustrate where “business as usual” is acceptable, and where a “higher level of care” is required • Convey the future vision for the area <p>The LDS can be focused on mitigation, management intent, and/or future vision (what level of change is acceptable). It can also use overlay zones (e.g. Dempster Highway Corridor, Major River Corridor) where certain requirements apply. Shawn said the fish</p>	

<p>habitat classification system for the placer mining regime is an overlay for aquatic systems, and the Wildlife Key Area database is an overlay for wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Bill Kendrick presented the Commission with a new one-page document outlining TH's position on the zone called Traditional Economy Area (TEA) in the Plan Alternatives phase. TH recognizes that the name appears to have caused confusion and misinterpretation (based on the feedback received), and so they are suggesting it be renamed Renewable Economy Area (REA) to better reflect the zone's intent. TH sees it as a zone where economic development is the focus, but there is an interim withdrawal of new sub-surface rights during which additional planning can take place to better ensure that other values are not negatively impacted. This represents a compromise vs. a full Protected Area or a permanent withdrawal, and only three or four LMUs were zoned TEA in the Plan Alternatives. It was never defined as a zone in which TH use would be exclusive.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Discussion about cumulative effects indicators and levels, used in the North Yukon plan to differentiate between the IMA zones and were specifically developed to address potential land use conflicts between oil and gas development and caribou in Eagle Plains. Shawn emphasized those levels were never meant to be applied across the Yukon. According to the futuring scenarios work, a large portion of the Dawson planning region would currently fit into what were the criteria for IMA-II, but other areas like the Goldfields are already beyond what was set for IMA-IV. The North Yukon's IMA-I was used for specific wetland complexes only.</p> <p>Many comments on the Plan Alternatives noted confusion about the differences between IMA-I, IMA-II, Conservation Area, and Traditional Economy Area (TEA). Scott said he does not feel that cumulative effects are currently an issue in the region, and he would prefer a more simplified LDS (perhaps two IMA zones, Yukon River Corridor, and Protected Area) with mitigations and Special Management Considerations applied on an LMU-specific basis depending on what values are present. He added that feedback strongly suggested the Conservation Area zone did not achieve its intended goals, it was not a true Protected Area and it duplicated the intent behind lower level IMA zones, so it is not necessary. He also felt the TEA zone as currently defined would still be a working landscape, so it would be very similar to lower level IMA zones as well. Chester noted that with the Conservation Area zone, they were trying to capture ways to protect the grizzly bear and sheep habitat in the northern part of the region without making it a full Protected Area. Will suggested that the values in each LMU would help define what was needed – more values and more potential land use conflicts would require more rules or limits on activity. He also thought that promoting the traditional economy could easily become a General Management Direction. Shawn pointed out that a purely mitigation-based approach doesn't address cumulative effects concerns or identify when the level of activity would cause us concern or when something different should happen. Monica said the zones, whatever they end up being, must be distinctly different from each other (currently they are not), and the Commission will need to provide solid rationale for the zones they choose and how they are applied to the LMUs.</p> <p>Roger suggested some consistency across international borders would be a good idea (e.g. the planning region is adjacent to Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve on the Alaska side). Gillian said consistency in concepts and management intent,</p>	<p>Staff to add Traditional Economy Considerations, Access Considerations, and Seasonal Considerations as main headings in the LMU descriptions.</p> <p>Staff to move Special Management Considerations to the top of LMU descriptions, right after the listing of what zone is being applied and the rationale.</p>

<p>particularly in the working landscape area, is important. IMA-IV in the Dawson region needs to mean the same thing as IMA-IV elsewhere in the Yukon, and having consistent colours would reduce confusion. She added that not having set numbers or cumulative effects indicator levels does not mean the Commission is not considering potential cumulative effects – monitoring and communication of results can be built into the plan in a different way (the Yukon State of the Environment Reports are an example of this).</p> <p>Bill noted the Dawson Forest Resources Management Plan was approved with a commitment by the Parties (and designated funding) to conduct monitoring, on both Settlement Land and non-Settlement Land. He suggested that Timber Harvest Plans could be used as a mechanism to accomplish the more detailed planning called for in the REA zone. These are joint planning processes, where roads and infrastructure could be identified and more landscape-level planning could take place. Tourism potential and heritage resources would also be considered, and the interim staking withdrawal would be lifted once that level of planning had occurred. Gillian said a staking withdrawal could not be implemented under the Forest Resources Act – solid rationale would have to be provided, and the need to complete Timber Harvest Plans would not be sufficient. Shawn said what Bill is suggesting is the same as what TH envisions for the Yukon River Corridor – barge landings, viewscapes for tourists, important heritage sites, and key ecological features would be mapped and documented and there would be specific recommendations to reduce potential conflict between all these important aspects. This is not an uncommon approach and has been done in many other land use plans. The point of contention between YG and TH is whether an interim staking withdrawal is required while that happens. The Yukon River Corridor is likely distinct enough to remain its own zone in the LDS, and will likely require a more detailed level of planning and coordination of activities to minimize potential conflicts. The boundaries will need to be fine-tuned.</p> <p>Discussion about far northern portion of planning region – the Commission was informed this area comprises part of the overlap agreement between TH and VGG, and it is likely these LMUs will become amalgamated into the North Yukon Regional Plan. For this reason, it is important to think about consistency with the zones used in the North Yukon.</p> <p>It was noted for the public meetings during the Draft Plan review period, it will be important to have GIS/mapping work available and the ability to turn various layers on/off (key resource values, LMU boundaries, zoning colors, etc.).</p>	<p>Monica to obtain further information from Mark Pedersen (YG Forest Operations) about how Timber Harvest Plan processes could be used to address some of the potential land use conflicts in portions of the region.</p> <p>Staff to ensure Draft Plan has a clear definition and description of “traditional economy”.</p>
--	---

The following sections are a continuation of discussions from the May 13-15 meeting, where several LMUs with similar values and/or land use activities were grouped into “clusters” in an attempt to facilitate more efficient Commission discussions and decision making. For each of the clusters, the Commission reviewed draft LMU descriptions with summaries of key values, current and potential future land use activities, overlaps in values and potential conflicts, key issues for consideration based on feedback received during the Plan Alternatives public review period, and what they had zoned each of the LMUs in the various Plan Alternatives and why (see May meeting minutes, **available on the DRPC website**, for a more detailed description of this process and expected outcomes). Clusters #1 through #4 were discussed in May. At this meeting, Cluster #5 was discussed out of order (i.e. on Day 3, June 12th) in order to ensure participation by the Technical Working Group member for VGG.

CLUSTER #6: South Klondike, Flat Creek and Stewart River (LMUs 17, 21 and 26)	
Overview	Action Items
<p>Sam provided an overview of the key values in these LMUs using mapped data, as well as summaries of the Plan Alternatives zoning. Kathy presented the draft LMU Descriptions as well as a list of key considerations for this cluster based on Plan Alternatives feedback. The Commission was also reminded to consider the plan goals and objectives tables and all the options available in the “planning toolbox”.</p> <p>This cluster contains a large concentration of wetlands (rare in the region) along the Tintina Trench in LMU 21, which is important for migratory birds. Both the Hart and Clear Creek caribou herds occur in this cluster, and along with the Klondike River and Stewart River there are other small tributaries ranked high for salmon habitat. Mineral potential is very high in LMUs 17 and 26, although the slope and coarseness of the material in the Clear Creek area makes it more difficult to mine. Outfitting is significant in LMU 17 (sheep habitat), and tourism potential occurs along the rivers as well as in Clear Creek (horseback riding). Traditional economy is very important in Settlement Land parcel R-22A (“Land of Plenty”) in LMU 17 – cultural camps, youth programs, fuelwood harvesting, berry picking, hunting areas, trail networks, and other values occur here. LMU 21 is also important because it contains about 20% of TH land selections and is an accessible area for hunting, fishing and fuelwood harvesting. LMU 26 contains part of the Stewart River corridor, one the most broad floodplain rivers in the Yukon with productive forests (big trees), lots of off-channel habitat (wetlands), and good moose habitat.</p> <p>LMU 17 was zoned IMA (variety of levels) in all the Plan Alternatives because it was a multi-use zone, with high mineral potential as well as high wildlife values and high cultural values. LMU 21 was zoned IMA-II or IMA-III, and LMU 26 was zoned IMA-III or IMA-IV.</p>	
Discussion	Action Items
<p>Peter said at one time there was discussion about a rail line route going through the Tintina Trench to Alaska. He also expressed concern that not enough weight was given to the mineral potential in this cluster, and it was misleading to suggest there are areas of high tourism and recreation value along these corridors and rivers. He said the Commission needs to be careful about the wording used in the plan because YESAB will use the information when considering conditions for proponents.</p> <p>Discussion about potentially splitting some LMUs, suggested by some in the Plan Alternatives feedback to allow the Commission more flexibility in zoning and the ability to accommodate different types of land uses. For example, in LMU 26 the western portion has a lot of placer mining activity but the eastern portion does not. Scott also suggested the southern portion of LMU 21 could be joined with LMU 26 to recognize existing placer operations and future potential along the Stewart River, but LMU 21 contains part of the Tintina Trench flyway and LMU 26 does not.</p> <p>Bill suggested the boundaries for LMU 21 should remain consistent with the Forest Resources Management Plan, in order to “piggyback” on the monitoring programs for forest health, water quality, etc. The forestry plan didn’t follow the watershed</p>	<p>Staff to ensure LMU Descriptions have more detail on TH Settlement Land parcels (e.g. R-2A is at the mouth of the river and is # ha).</p> <p>Sam to ensure that Settlement Land parcels are shown on the inset maps for each LMU</p>

<p>boundary because the highway seemed more logical.</p> <p>The futuring scenarios work suggested there might be a need for additional access in the Stewart and Maisy Mae areas – for example, an overland road from the White Gold area connecting with existing roads in the Goldfields (YG Mineral Resources suggested this). There may also be a need for a bridge or ferry across the Stewart River, with connections to Casino and Kaminak. Will added there is also a road coming up from the south already, from Pelly to Scroggie Creek.</p>	<p>Description.</p>
<p>Decisions</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>LMU 17: Recommend that additional research be conducted to identify sheep lambing area prior to additional development. Also site-specific mitigations and the use of seasonal timing windows required to avoid disturbance to lambing locations.</p> <p>LMU 17: Recommend that existing roads (Clear Creek, Brewery Creek, and Hart River) be used whenever possible instead of creating new roads.</p> <p>LMU 21: Leave boundaries as currently drawn – there is enough significantly different from LMU 26 to keep it separate. Needs specific recommendations regarding the importance of Tintina Trench as a migratory bird flyway, and the associated wetlands as a key habitat area.</p> <p>Recommendations for additional mapping of wetlands, with priority areas for research.</p> <p>Recommendations for Stewart River corridor as an important river within the region – intent is not to plan it to same degree as Yukon River, just to stress its importance for multiple values. Potentially consider Major River Corridor overlay.</p>	

<p>CLUSTER #7: White River and Ladue River (LMUs 22, 23, 27 and 28)</p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>LMU 27 has been suggested to the Commission for potential designation as an ecological benchmark, due to its relatively pristine nature (winter roads only and little current human activity). LMUs 23, 27 and 28 represent the largest area of land in the region with these characteristics. As well, LMU 27 contains the headwaters of the Scottie Creek wetland complex, which extends to the south of the planning region and into White River First Nation traditional territory. Scott Herron (Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada) previously informed the Commission the Scottie Creek wetlands were identified during WRFN negotiations as a potential Special Management Area (Ducks Unlimited Canada also noted it in their submission on the Plan Alternatives), and it would establish connectivity with the future Kluane Planning Region.</p> <p>Not a lot of disturbance along the Ladue River, (LMU 22) but there is potential for future placer expansion. Randy Clarkson (meeting observer) noted there is an existing trail to Matson Creek and an offshoot road, as well as old Cat trails, and the area has</p>	

<p>been staked on and off for quite some time. Wetlands are a key value here as well, and some tourism and recreation potential along the river. There is high value salmon habitat in the White River drainage, but not so much at Ladue. Old growth forest in the north of this LMU and high unglaciated areas which typically have rare plant species.</p> <p>LMU 23 (lower White River) contains important sheep habitat on south-facing slopes (year round). These same slopes also contain some unique landscape features (unglaciated areas) and potentially some rare plants. There is not a lot of industrial activity but there are some quartz claims.</p> <p>Identified heritage route (Dawson-Tetlin trail) through this cluster. Bill said the routes identified in the Final Agreement signify main travel routes but not necessarily an exact line on the map. The identified routes and surrounding areas should be considered to have higher potential for heritage resources.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Peter noted the planning region already has Tombstone Territorial Park, a very large protected area, and there is also Kluane National Park to the south. Shawn explained that ecological benchmark areas are meant to be reference sites for the detection of change in ecosystems relative to human activity. They are also important as reference sites for restoration projects in similar ecosystems, as places to increase our understanding of ecosystem processes and the range of variation within natural systems, and to use in adaptive management systems. In order to accomplish this, a benchmark area needs to have similar landscape and ecology as what you're comparing it to, so Kluane wouldn't be a good benchmark for the Dawson region. Will asked whether the idea behind benchmarks in the Yukon is one per planning region, or one per ecoregion? Shawn replied it is the latter – the Dawson planning region contains both the Boreal Cordillera ecozone and the Taiga Cordillera ecozone, and Tombstone would represent the Taiga although it was not designed as a benchmark so may not meet all the essential criteria. For example, the ideal ecological benchmark is larger than the largest estimated natural disturbance (in the Dawson region, that would be fire and the area would have to be huge).</p> <p>Discussion about the validity of a benchmark area if it is supposed to represent natural ecosystems functioning without any human disturbance, but some human activities would be allowed (e.g. First Nations harvesting, research projects, possibly tourism and recreation). Also, if the Commission is going to identify a protected area, perhaps there are other places in the region with important values (e.g. Miner River watershed) that would be easier to justify.</p> <p>Discussion about Protected Areas (PAs) – feedback on the Plan Alternatives noted that a true protected area would have no grandfathering of existing claims, since exploration and mining activities would be incompatible with the intent of the protected area. Monica also suggested that these activities would similarly undermine or diminish the area's suitability as a benchmark. Scott suggested the mineral claims in the northwestern corner of LMU 27 could be “carved off” to enable designation of the remainder as a PA. Will also suggested the wetland complex in the southwestern corner could become a Habitat Protection Area or have additional special considerations. Chester and Roger agreed this seemed a better option. Shawn agreed that other land use plans have identified more site-specific PAs vs. designating an entire LMU as one, but there is also value in landscape-level</p>	

<p>PAs (e.g. for migrating caribou herds) and intrinsic value in having a network of PAs that represent diverse ecosystems.</p> <p>Discussion about potentially splitting LMU 28. Debbie noted that although the majority of the White River is in LMU 28, the mouth is in LMU 23 and salmon need to be considered.</p> <p>Questions about the tourism and recreation values map from the Resource Assessment Report (provided by YG Tourism and Culture). High value features are identified in many areas based on mapped geological features alone (e.g. a nice ridgeline that could be a good place for hiking), but are highly unlikely to be used in reality. Commission needs to be cautious about how they interpret and use the information. Will echo Peter's earlier concern that noting areas of "high recreation potential" could make YESAB recommend restrictions on projects to protect viewsapes, even when nobody is likely to go there. Scott said they have to consider it the same way as the other mapped data such as mineral potential and fish habitat suitability – it doesn't mean those values are definitely there.</p>	
<p>Decisions</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Potential recommendations for better mapping and identification of traditional trails, for protection from potential damage and/or for improvement and use in regional transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>Recommendations regarding additional mapping of wetlands and identification of priority research areas.</p> <p>Draft Plan should better describe the mapped "unique and special landscape features" – for example, why unglaciated dolomite and limestone areas important.</p> <p>Draft Plan should describe how uncertainty around any mapped "potential" data was dealt with.</p>	<p>Kathy to provide Shawn and Sam with the document supplied by TH re: identified heritage routes and their purpose.</p>

<p>CLUSTER #8: Yukon River and White River (LMUs 24, 26 and 29)</p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>LMU 29 contains Kaminak's Coffee Creek project. Futuring scenarios work also anticipated there could be more placer mining in the benches above the creeks, although there is no activity there now. Some titled land, an airstrip, and identified archaeological sites as well as traditional use sites. An old military plane (WWII bomber) on a search and rescue mission also ran out of fuel and crashed in the area in 1929.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Scroggie Creek is well known for its high mineral potential, but the hot spot is in LMU 29. If Kaminak is to proceed, the access road would likely come off the Casino road (could potentially operate by barge to a certain point, but during production would require an all-season road). Scott said that preliminary economic assessments are positive, but there are still 3-5 years of</p>	

<p>engineering studies needed plus another 3-5 years of YESAB review if they decide to go ahead.</p> <p>There was insufficient time to discuss the remainder of this cluster. Further work on potential management considerations will be done by staff and presented at the next meeting.</p>	
Decisions	Action Items
LMU 29: higher development IMA zone due to Coffee Creek project and future mineral potential	

Meeting adjourned for the day at 5:05 pm.

Meeting reconvened on June 12th at 9:10am.

CLUSTER #5: Tatonduk, Miner and Whitestone River Watersheds (LMUs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8)	
Overview	Action Items
<p>This cluster has important salmon spawning habitat and high value wildlife habitat (sheep, Porcupine caribou, grizzly bears, etc.). There are numerous traplines, a large outfitting concession, and numerous traditional use sites and heritage resources as well as unique landscape features. There are no placer or quartz claims, but there is high oil and gas potential in LMUs 1 and 6, recognized by the Commission in their Plan Alternatives. However, these are frontier basins with no established access currently and no anticipated work in the near future, particularly for LMU 1. LMU 8 is adjacent to Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve in Alaska. There is an old winter trail that hauled fuel to Rusty Springs project.</p> <p>Rosa described how important this area is to Vuntut Gwitchin people. Both the North Yukon plan and the Ni'iinli'njik (Fishing Branch) Territorial Park management plan envisioned that the entire Miner River watershed would eventually have some type of protection, in order to achieve the intent of the park. There is an important caribou migration route in the northeastern corner of this cluster (LMU 6), and VGG is concerned that overharvest could happen if roads are developed. VGG documented numerous other issues, concerns and suggestions in their comments on the Plan Alternatives (March 2014, available on DRPC website).</p> <p>Rosa discussed the Northern Cross 3-D seismic project conducted in Eagle Plains, and the issues surrounding the company's initial proposed application (conformity check showed they would have exceeded cumulative effects levels for that LMU). Shawn said the high growth futuring scenario conducted for the Dawson region has concentrated activity in LMU 6, expanding from the current activity at Eagle Plains (winter only). Shawn and Sam showed pictures and examples of different types of seismic activity and winter roads.</p> <p>Sam conducts the conformity checks for the North Yukon plan as part of his job with YLUPC. He said the Northern Cross project area is quite large (30 x 15 km) – the company applied for a large area to give them the flexibility to go where drilling</p>	

<p>results were positive. Discussion of how project activities get added to or subtracted from the CE limits. Roads, trails or seismic lines <1.5 m don't count towards the linear density because natural revegetation would occur within a couple years (not lasting linear features on the landscape). Northern Cross is required to do year-end reporting including the GPS location of each seismic line. Sam said a major fire could actually reset disturbance levels (winter roads don't cause a deep disturbance to the soil so a fire would "erase" any surface traces).</p> <p>Shawn described how the CE levels were derived for the North Yukon. The planners worked with biologists and community members to develop a CE model - at what level of surface disturbance and linear density does winter caribou habitat start to decline? Cautionary and critical levels were set for certain percentages of that maximum (e.g. cautionary at 75%), with the intent to maintain overall integrity or to balance a reasonable amount of activity with a reasonable amount of risk. The numbers were never intended to transfer to other regions, and were specific to the relationship between caribou habitat and oil and gas development. The levels are restrictive but they are to ensure low risk to Porcupine caribou, and companies can use techniques such as smaller seismic lines to enable more work to happen. When cautionary or critical indicator levels are reached, it triggers additional discussions between the Parties but it doesn't mean all activity stops. Much of the concern about linear features is that people use them – if there is a high level of traffic on a road, often caribou will avoid that area so the habitat isn't as effective as it was.</p> <p>Rosa gave an update on the TH-VGG overlap agreement and the likely amalgamation of most LMUs in this cluster with the North Yukon Regional Land Use Plan. Discussions are ongoing and they will continue to provide updates, but the Commission is expected to proceed with planning and recommendations for these LMUs.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Discussion about potential recommendation for Habitat Protection Area (HPA), expanding on the existing HPA adjacent to Fishing Branch Territorial Park to encompass the Miner River watershed, and where the boundary might be. Rosa and Gillian suggested that if the Commission is contemplating a Habitat Protection Area (expanding on the existing HPA), they should define the boundary as well as possible to prevent lots of additional work required afterwards. Will noted that the feedback on the Plan Alternatives from many groups, including mining organizations, assumed there might be a potential protected area in the northern part of the region and no major objections were noted.</p> <p>The Commission talked about how they should plan for this cluster, knowing these LMUs will likely become attached to the North Yukon plan – use the same Land Designation System (and CE indicator levels) as the North Yukon but just for those LMUs? This would make sense because those LMUs contain similar values as the ecosystems in the North Yukon planning region, and the main issue is again the potential impact of oil and gas development on caribou. For example, LMUs 1 and 6 could have linear density levels set at 1 km/km², LMU 3 could be at 0.5 km/km² (this is how IMA-III was defined in the Peel plan), and LMUs 4, 5 and 7 could be at 0.2 km/km². This would give a clear signal that activity is allowed (it is zoned IMA) but there would be lots of special management considerations to ensure other important values are not impacted. Potential to join LMUs 4 and 5 into one? It was noted the line between LMUs 4 and 5 is massive mountains, and many other areas are above treeline. It's</p>	<p>Sam to create some mapped options for potential HPA boundaries in the Miner River watershed, for Commission discussion at the next meeting.</p>

<p>difficult to monitor CE in these areas if you are using km² of trees removed as a measure of surface disturbance.</p> <p>LMU 8 has a lot of important sheep habitat and other key wildlife values, but spatial buffers and timing windows such as discussed by Don Reid could be used to reduce potential impact of activities. It is important to recognize Dan Reynolds' outfitting concession here, and he has identified some key ridges and slopes for sheep as well as migratory corridors and mineral licks. There is also high tourism and recreation potential (YG comments on the Plan Alternatives specifically addressed increased access here and increasing visitors). LMU 8 was also suggested in some of the Plan Alternatives feedback as a potential ecological benchmark area, as it would be a good representative for the Taiga Cordillera ecozone and would establish connectivity to the adjacent Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve.</p> <p>Even though there are no current quartz or placer claims in this cluster, the mapped data shows high mineral potential in some of them. Scott suggested anything found would likely be similar to Rusty Springs (moderate), and that if these LMUs are zoned IMA, low-level mineral exploration could occur in the future and would not surpass the CE levels.</p> <p>Debbie emphasized this area is very important, and the plan needs to ensure there are firm (not vague) recommendations regarding the caribou, moose, salmon, grizzly bears, and water.</p> <p>Bill said there is TH Category A Settlement Land in LMU 6 that was selected specifically for its economic potential.</p>	
<p>Decisions</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Recommendations on access provisions, including potential recommendation on routes for future all-season roads to access oil and gas basins (if required) – e.g. route that would go through LMU 7 rather than LMUs 4 and 5, to get to LMU 1</p> <p>Recommendations to identify/protect sheep lambing and wintering areas, salmon spawning habitat, grizzly bear habitat.</p>	

<p>REVIEW AND CONFIRM: DECISIONS AND DIRECTION FOR DRAFT PLAN</p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Shawn reviewed the discussion over the last couple days, summarized by LMU. For most LMUs, the Commission has given general direction whether they think it should be zoned IMA “High” or IMA “Low” or “Moderate” (more special considerations are needed given multiple values). There are also a few LMUs that are being discussed for a REA or REA-like concept, and the Yukon River Corridor will likely stay its own zone. LMU 12 obviously stays a Protected Area (Tombstone), and there are some possibilities for Habitat Protection Areas (Scottie Creek wetlands, Miner River watershed). Other major rivers in the region might require a Major River Corridor overlay or similar concept. There were good discussions at this meeting but there are still a number of outstanding questions, in particular how to differentiate the IMA zones if not using CE levels, or whether there should</p>	

<p>be just one “Enhanced Management” zone instead of REA and YRC. Final decisions on what to zone each LMU cannot be made until the choices of zones (and what they mean) are finalized.</p> <p>Additional meetings are obviously required to come to consensus, and the release of the Draft Plan will obviously not happen in June/July as scheduled in the workplan. Monica will talk more about this in “Next Steps”. Some time left at this meeting to revisit any previous discussions or talk more about specific LMUs.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Further discussion about LMU 11, suggested as a potential Renewable Economy Area (REA), previously called Traditional Economy Area (TEA). Some ideas were presented in May about modifying the LMU boundary to capture the Settlement Land selections and give greater flexibility for zoning around them. There are many values in LMU 11 that are very important to TH – Moosehide, camps, trails, traditional economy opportunities, cultural teachings, and part of the area that may potentially become a World Heritage Site. The Yukon Ditch has high historical and tourism value, there are three trapping concessions as well as hunting, and the LMU is reasonably accessible from Dawson. Access planning would be an important part of the REA concept – TH has suggested an interim staking withdrawal, which would be lifted once the detailed work was completed.</p> <p>Scott said it would be difficult to plan roads if you don’t know the intent or locations – mineral exploration would need to be allowed in order to determine this. Peter said that when Tombstone was created, the issue of access was discussed. It is unlikely that all exploration could be done via airborne-only geophysics. Bill clarified the additional planning would not be just to identify access, but also key locations for tourism, cultural landscapes, and forestry potential. Scott said he understood the desire to not have access development occur haphazardly in the area, but there is little desire for new access there right now and questioned why a staking withdrawal would be necessary. Debbie disagreed and said now is the time to plan on the landscape level, not later when project-specific applications start coming in. The opportunity would be to identify areas where roads are not desired.</p> <p>Potential discussed at May meeting to divide LMU 11 into two (northern and southern) portions, because most of the current mineral claims and activity are in the north and most of the south contains TH Settlement Land. The southern portion could be zoned REA and the north IMA. Will questioned how this “southern” REA zone would benefit non-First Nation residents of the region for agriculture or forestry purposes, if about 90% of it is First Nations land selections. Bill replied that non-First Nations can apply to TH for a land lease, development lease or timber lease.</p> <p>Discussion about potential to join the northern half of LMU 15 with the southern part of LMU 11, or to combine LMU 10 with the northern part of LMU 11. LMU 15 contains part of the Community Area identified in the Plan Alternatives, and there are opportunities for forestry here. Would zoning it REA create more restrictions and no room to grow (e.g. if Arctic Inland would require an all-season road)? Bill said with proper planning, larger-scale forestry could occur in the area because the majority of roads would be winter only. The idea behind the mineral staking withdrawal was to provide certainty for other industries such as forestry (mineral tenure would not automatically take precedence). Intelligent planning at this LMUs scale would help minimize potential land use conflicts, and provide more opportunities for education and training. Some of the feedback expressed confusion about the difference between TEA (now REA) and a lower IMA zone. The difference is the management intent – the</p>	<p>Sam to prepare visual mapped options for various LMUs as discussed at this meeting, using colors for preliminary zoning decisions.</p> <p>Shawn to prepare summary of LMUs with general zoning and main issues for consideration, based on discussion at this meeting.</p> <p>Gillian to notify Shirley Abercrombie (YG SLC member) the Commission is still pursuing the REA concept, and the SLC should further discuss it as well (e.g. could mining access be permitted under Land Use Regulations).</p>

goal of IMA zones are to promote or maximize renewable and non-renewable resource development, vs. the REA is focused solely on renewable. Shawn emphasized the importance of always looking back to the goals and objectives for the plan – the zones should help you achieve those goals, or maintain and enhance those values.

Discussion about LMUs 15 and 16 where TH has expressed a similar desire for more detailed access planning and other considerations. There are concerns about access roads off the Dempster Highway, although development permits are required, and there are spot land applications from people wanting to build houses or cabins. Some Commission members expressed they were still confused about the TEA (now REA) zone and what it's meant to accomplish. Bill said TH is planning another traditional economy workshop in the fall, as a follow up to the one earlier this year, to further develop this concept and present ideas. Some Commission members expressed concern they do not have time to wait for this, TH presented this idea to the Commission initially for consideration in the Plan Alternatives and they need to clearly define the concept so the Commission can make decisions. LMUs 15, 16 and 17 will need recommendations regarding the Dempster Highway corridor and spot land applications.

Further discussion about Klondike Valley Land Use Plan and the Community Area (see page 9 of these minutes). Questions about applicability of that plan or its recommendations (was completed in the 1980s).

Discussion about Cluster #7 again and possible boundary changes for LMUs. Potential to join LMU 28 east of the White River with LMU 29, or to join LMU 28 west of the White River with LMU 27. Also potential to zone LMU 27 a Protected Area with the mineral claims in the north removed, or to delineate wetlands features as site-specific Protected Areas.

Discussion about Yukon River Corridor (LMU 30) – will likely require more detailed planning, similar to the TEA/REA concept. Questions again about whether YRC needs to be its own LMU and its own zone – couldn't the LMU be zoned TEA/REA? Bill raised the possibility of having new access or camps on mining claims in the YRC requiring approval under the Territorial Lands (Yukon) Regulations, vs. the Mining Land Use Regulations. Gillian said the draft regulations under the Resource Access Road Framework are out for public consultation now, and were meant to address some of these issues. Suggestion that “hot spots” (areas of multiple values or with a high risk of land use conflicts) in the corridor could be mapped and special considerations noted in the plan. For example, islands are important for moose calving, are used for camping, and have potential for agriculture and forestry. Heritage sites, key viewscape spots for tourism, and barge landings would be others. Discussion about the corridor boundary – it is currently drawn as an ecological break between Boreal Low and Boreal High ecozones, sometimes going up to capture the steep cliffs (based on the peregrine falcon nesting model).

LMU	LUD	COMMENTS	LMU	LUD	COMMENTS
✓ 1	IMA HIGH	CE Indicators IMA Zone IV - oil + gas + PCH	16	OPTIONS	- SPOT LAND - DEMPSTER - DEVELOP OPTIONS
✓ 2	HPA (PA)	Extension of FB - Bndy delineation	17	IMA ?	BREWERY CRK + HIGH PLATER - CARIBOU
✓ 3	IMA MOD	CE IMA Zone III - oil + gas + PCH	18	IMA HIGH	FORM MILE + PLACER / ROADS (TOP OF WORLD HWY)
✓ 4 * x	IMA LOW	CE - IMA Zone II *	19	IMA HIGH ?	IMA LOW ?
✓ 5 * +	IMA LOW	CE - IMA Zone II *	20	IMA HIGH	HIGH ++ ?
✓ 6	IMA HIGH	CE = IMA Zone IV - oil + gas + PCH	21	IMA HIGH ?	- HIGHWAY - WETLANDS + FLYWAY - CLEAR CRK
✓ 7 * x	IMA LOW	CE = IMA Zone II * - Preferred road corridor	22	IMA LOW ?	- WETLANDS
✓ 8	IMA LOW	Site specific mitigation	23 *	?	POSSIBLE MERGE TO 29 (SOUTH WHITE R.)
✓ 9 * ↓	IMA LOW +	? } Combine ? + 6	24	IMA HIGH	
✓ 10 **	IMA LOW +	? } ↑	25	IMA HIGH	
✓ 11	'REA' IMAL	COMBINE (NORTH) SOUTH 11 + 15	26	IMA HIGH	
✓ 12	PA	CORRIDOR PLAN	27	?	PA OF WETLAND HPA ↳ MIDDLE BNDY
13	IMA HIGH	TOP-OF-WORLD HWY	28 *	?	POSSIBLE MERGE TO 29 (EAST WHITE R.)
14	IMA HIGH	REA ?	29 *	IMA HIGH	
15	REA ✓	SPOT LAND - DEMPSTER	30	? IMA	YUKON RIVER CORRIDOR

AGENDA TAB 1: THE BASICS – PART 2	
Correspondence and Media	Action Items
<p>Monica said there has been no incoming or outgoing correspondence since the last meeting. As per the decision at the April meeting and an action item at the May meeting, she was directed to prepare a draft letter from the Commission to YG requesting an interim staking withdrawal until the planning process is concluded. This letter would be sent with the Draft Plan, and explains the reason for the request to preserve planning options, provide certainty, minimize potential land use conflicts, and maintain public confidence in the process. The withdrawal would apply only to those LMUs the Commission was proposing as Protected Areas, or another designation where subsurface rights withdrawal was part of the definition, and would not apply to existing claims. The draft letter also notes the Senior Liaison Committee (SLC) will have an opportunity to review the Draft Plan prior its public release, to identify any “red flag” issues or major concerns. The letter also suggests that if the withdrawal does not happen at the Draft Plan stage, it is strongly suggested to occur at the Recommended Plan stage.</p>	
Discussion	Action Items
<p>Questions about timing of the letter – would it be sent at the same time the Draft Plan is released to the public? This doesn’t really make sense if the Commission recognizes an Order-in-Council takes some time to implement (Peter suggested 3 to 6 months), and the idea is to prevent speculative staking. Debbie reiterated her concerns from the April meeting that the letter should have gone out months ago, so the OIC could be in place when the Draft Plan is ready. Reminder that YG responses to TH letters regarding this issue said they would not start the OIC process until they had a better idea what exactly the withdrawal would apply to, which means they need to see the completed Draft Plan first.</p>	
Decisions	Action Items
<p>Letter will be sent to Shirley Abercrombie (YG SLC member) just prior to release of the Draft Plan, when the SLC is given the opportunity to review it and identify any major concerns. Final revisions will still be required by staff after the SLC review, so YG will be aware of what the Commission is proposing (specific LMUs to which the withdrawal would apply) and will have some time to get the process started.</p> <p>Letter should be short and simple. The Commission will have an opportunity to conduct a final review and approve the letter before it is sent.</p>	
AGENDA TAB 5: ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE	
2014-2015 Funding Agreement	Action Items
<p>Monica said they now have the officially approved 2014-2015 Transfer Payment Funding Agreement in place. It is based on the Final Recommended Workplan and Budget that she prepared (and the Commission reviewed and approved) in February/March.</p>	

<p>more writing for the middle sections as well as revise the “Next Steps” section. She said the report should be done by the end of next week and ready for the Commission’s final review. Kathy only has two more weeks of work remaining and she will likely be using up her vacation days for the latter part.</p>	<p>Alternatives: What We Heard report.</p>
<p>2014-2015 DRPC-YLUPC Memorandum of Understanding – Status Update</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Monica said as per the discussion at the May meeting, an MOU is supposed to be in place between the Commission and the Council. The previous one expired December 31, 2013. Ron provided Monica with a new draft on May 8th and she sent comments and suggested revisions back to him on June 12th. Ron is to prepare a finalized version for Scott’s signature.</p>	
<p>Planning Technician Resignation – Implications and Options</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Kathy Burden (Planning Technician) submitted her one month’s notice of resignation on June 2, 2014. Monica gave a background presentation on the Commission’s human resources situation. She reminded the Commission that in late 2011 they had three full-time staff (Senior Planner, Land Use Planner, and Financial Administrator). The financial duties were transferred to Heidi Faulds at YLUPC in summer 2012. The third position was reclassified as Planning Technician and hiring took place in spring 2013. The Senior Planner resigned in November 2013, and Monica was appointed Acting Senior Planner in December. She also reminded them that their decision at the December 2013 meeting not to rehire for another Senior Planner was made on the basis that senior planning assistance would be provided by YLUPC on a contract basis, and that the approved 2014-2015 Workplan and Budget clearly states this assumption. Since December YLUPC has funded some administrative support contracts (minute takers and meeting facilitation), the cumulative effects/futuring scenarios work by Shawn Francis, Carrie Breneman’s contract for the Resource Assessment Report summary, and Shawn’s assistance as senior planning advisor at this meeting.</p> <p>Monica presented the Commission with several options for the Planning Technician position – they can either advertise and rehire, make up for lost skills through a series of contracts, or a combination of these (e.g. part-time employee + contracts). She reviewed what Kathy could realistically finish before her departure, main duties of the position, help that could be provided by YLUPC staff, and potential contract assistance between June and December 2014. She noted that the top priority for contract work continues to be Senior Planner advisory services as she is not qualified at that level, and that the Planning Technician position was intended to be full-time (Kathy’s contract specified reduced hours). Money for additional contracts could come from the remaining funds allocated for Planning Technician salary, YLUPC surplus funding (Ron has indicated there is no additional money for “technical support” but using the surplus funds is a possibility), and/or the Commission could identify the need for additional funding and time in September when the Interim Report is submitted to YG and YLUPC. This report’s purpose is to identify any changes to the proposed workplan and budget, and project what will be needed for the remainder of the fiscal year.</p> <p>The Commission discussed these various options, and decided they want to rehire another Planning Technician to have more assistance in the Dawson office on a daily basis. The job description needs to be updated, and the position should be advertised (for at least two weeks) as full-time until December 31. No funds are available for relocation assistance. They also want to identify contracts for additional people to help them complete the Draft Plan, including continued assistance from Shawn Francis.</p>	<p>Monica to revise the job description and advertise for a full-time Planning Technician employee position, as well as overall coordination of the interview and hiring process.</p> <p>Monica to provide YLUPC with list of specific contracts that would assist in Draft Plan production, with a fixed dollar value.</p>

--	--

NEXT STEPS	
Overview	Action Items
<p>Monica reviewed the current workplan schedule outlined in the funding agreement, which says the Draft Plan will be released by mid-June. Given the number of major decisions that remain to be made by the Commission, this is no longer realistic. Monica, Shawn and Sam recommended that the Commission postpone their next meeting until mid-September. This would provide staff and contractors with enough time to do substantial work on writing the Draft Plan over the summer months (having only a few weeks in between Commission meetings has not really facilitated this), and they could bring back a real draft of the Draft Plan for Commission review and final decisions. As well, most Commission members are very busy during the summer with their own employment and may not be available for meetings, and it would give time for Monica to rehire for the Planning Technician position and get the new person up to speed. Time also needs to be built in for a final review of the Draft Plan by the Parties (TWG and SLC) before the public release.</p>	
Discussion and Decisions	Action Items
<p>The Commission agreed on a tentative revised schedule, based on continued assistance from Shawn Francis as senior planning advisor throughout the summer months and continued technical/planning support from Sam Skinner. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference call end of July to approve audit • Next Commission meeting: mid-September to review draft Draft Plan and finalize key decisions • Commission meeting first week of October to review revisions and give final direction • Final version of Draft Plan circulated by email in mid-October, followed by conference call to approve distribution • Draft Plan sent to SLC for review – one week review may be too optimistic, although Shawn suggested a presentation of the material to them would be very useful • Final revisions and public release by end of October • Public review period: November and December • Summarizing feedback: January • Commission meetings to review feedback starting in February, although depending on the volume of submissions compiling the feedback could take longer than a month. Suggestion that instead of a separate What We Heard document, which takes a substantial amount of time, perhaps the Recommended Plan could have a table (~10 pages) showing main points of feedback and how the Commission has addressed them. • Work towards the Recommended Plan – timeline more unclear but looking like spring 2015 release <p>Monica also reminded them that as per her notice provided at the March meeting, she has made other commitments and is unable to extend her contract past December 31. Discussion about whether the office would be needed past December, once the public</p>	<p>Shawn to prepare summaries of all discussions from this meeting and (pending a new contract with YLUPC) continue work on the Draft Plan until the September meeting.</p> <p>Monica and Scott to notify YLUPC of the projected changes to the timeline and budget at the Council meeting on June 16.</p> <p>Monica to start work on a revised workplan and budget for the</p>

review period is completed.	Interim Report in September.
-----------------------------	------------------------------

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Approval of Minutes of Regular Board Meeting #18 (June 10-12, 2014)

By Motion #5 at Regular Board Meeting #20 (December 17, 2014)



Sara Wray Enns – Planning Technician

December 22, 2014

Date



Scott Casselman – Chair

December 22, 2014

Date