

Dawson Regional Planning Commission  
 February 15 & 16, 2012  
 Regular Board Meeting Minutes  
**YLUPC Boardroom, Whitehorse, YT**  
 Meeting #04, 2011-2012

In Attendance				
<b>DRPC</b> Scott Casselman - Chair Steve Taylor - Member Roger Ellis - Member Chester Kelly - Member Will Fellers - Member Bill Bowie - Member Jeff Hamm - Senior Planner Monica Krieger - Land Use Planner	<b>YLUPC</b> Ron Cruikshank - Director Sam Skinner - Senior Planner	<b>Delegates/Guests:</b> Mike Kokiw - Chamber of Mines (Feb. 16 <sup>th</sup> AM) Allison Reed - Public (Feb. 16 <sup>th</sup> AM) Jody Inkster – Yukon River Inter-Tribal Watershed Council (Feb. 16 <sup>th</sup> PM) Scott Herron – Canadian Wildlife Service (Feb. 17 <sup>th</sup> )	<b>Yukon Government (YG)</b> Gillian McKee - EMR	<b>Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in (TH)</b> Bill Kendrick (absent Feb. 16 <sup>th</sup> AM)

Acronyms: TWG – Technical Working Group  
 SLC – Senior Liaison Committee

Action Items: Status indicated is as of next meeting date

Meeting called to order at 9:00AM by Scott Casselman

Agenda Item 1: Agenda	
Comment	
Change Item 3.0 on the Agenda from “Delegations” to “Discussion of YG News Release on Peel Watershed Regional Plan”.	
<b>MOTION # 1:</b>  To accept the Agenda for the February 15 & 16, 2012 Meeting #4 as amended.	
<b>Moved: Steve Taylor</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Roger Ellis</b>
<b>Passed by Consensus</b>	

Agenda Item 2: Meeting Minutes	
Comment	Action Items
Item 7.3 should read “Discussion around the necessary scope of the Plan <i>questioned whether</i> 50 years was an appropriate planning horizon”.	
<b>MOTION # 2:</b>  To accept the Minutes for the October 12 & 13, 2011 Meeting #3 as amended.	
<b>Moved: Will Fellers</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Chester Kelly</b>
<b>Passed by Consensus</b>	



<b>Agenda Item 6.0 Reports</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<b>6.1 Chair's Report</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	
<p>Scott C. indicated he is impressed with the Commission's accomplishments over the past year, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full round of community consultations;</li> <li>• Completed Issues &amp; Interests Report;</li> <li>• Successful planning conference in Dawson;</li> <li>• Completion of budgets and workplans; and</li> <li>• Set up of Dawson office and hiring of three staff.</li> </ul> <p>Scott especially thanked Jeff H. for his hard work over the past year, and for the input of Commission members and staff in Jeff's one-year performance review. The Chair looks forward to the Commission providing greater input and advice in the upcoming year.</p> <p>Scott C. noted the good working relationship with TWG members, and a good process established to get the information needed and on schedule.</p>	
<b>6.2 Senior Planner's Report</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	
<p>Jeff H. thanked everyone for the positive feedback on his performance evaluation.</p> <p>Most of December and January was busy with conference preparations. Work has begun on the Resource Assessment Report (RAR), with a first draft expected by June. A GIS technician will likely need to be hired over the next few months for mapping of resource values (John Bryant of Mammoth Mapping is on extended leave so will not be available).</p> <p>There will be a heavier workload in the upcoming year, and the Commission will be called upon for advice and participation, particularly for the RAR and in developing scenarios and planning approaches.</p> <p>Monica K. will attend the TH "Myth and Medium" workshop in Dawson February 21-23, to learn more about understanding heritage values through the medium of storytelling.</p>	
<b>6.3 Conference</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	
<p>Conference proceedings are on the DRPC website, including a link to key messages from the discussion groups (summarized by Ron C. on the YLUPC website). Scott C. said presenters provided some valuable tools for key issues like how to determine a workable balance and how to evaluate cumulative effects. Jeff reviewed the summarized points from workshop discussions.</p> <p>Monica K. stated there were over 80 registered participants despite the weather, and everyone seemed impressed by the overall organization and "extras" like conference packages, tote bags and excellent catering.</p> <p>Commission members agreed the small group sessions were very effective, and noted the importance of good facilitation. They found the consistency of messages between the various tables very interesting, especially the need to balance economic opportunities with conservation.</p>	

<b>6.4 YESAB Project Tracking</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	
<p>Monica K. presented a summary of new project applications to YESAB from January 1, 2010 to present including statistics compiled from YG-Mining Recorder reports for the Dawson Mining District (2006-2012). The summary clearly shows an increase in mineral claim staking (particularly quartz) over the past few years. However, a corresponding increase in the number of YESAB applications for exploration programs is not apparent; in fact placer mining (not quartz) comprises the majority of new projects. Non-assessable activities such as those associated with Class 1 exploration permits (staking, line cutting, soil sampling, associated camps, and overflights) clearly have an additional impact on the landscape but the extent is difficult to determine.</p> <p>The Commission agreed it would be extremely useful to map project applications relative to the ground that has been staked recently, and that there is value in continuing to track applications within the region.</p>	<p><b>Monica K. to continue tracking YESAB applications within the Dawson region, including geographic coordinates.</b></p>

<b>Agenda Item 7.0 Resource Assessment Report</b>	
<b>7.1 Review Table of Contents</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Jeff H. noted that previous Commissions did good work on Resource Assessment Reports (RARs) but probably too much (e.g. the North Yukon RAR has over 50 maps). These RARs were a comprehensive data inventory, but are not being <u>used</u> effectively in decision-making. The DRPC has neither the resources nor time to do a comprehensive study, so will be more selective with information but examine it more thoroughly.</p> <p>DRPC has requested that information submissions be more than just raw data. They should “tell a story” about the resource values now and in the future. Jeff H. gave an example to illustrate the difference between a map with dots showing sites of palaeontological discoveries vs. a narrative with details on why those sites are important, what has been found and its significance, or why in those locations and not others.</p> <p>Jeff presented the current draft Table of Contents (TOC), which was revised based on comments received but is still a work in progress. The RAR will contain “Strategic Planning Considerations” for each resource value to indicate how they interact with and/or conflict with other values. Gillian M. suggested an overall “Strategic Planning Considerations” chapter at the end would be useful, consolidating all the information from individual chapters.</p> <p>A working draft of the RAR will be discussed at the next Commission meeting in May, and a Draft RAR provided to Parties by June. Jeff emphasized the Commission’s role will be to help think about possible futures, develop realistic scenarios and planning alternatives, and provide guidance on a planning horizon (e.g. 50 years) so the plan does not lose relevance.</p>	<p><b>Prepare draft of RAR for review at next Commission meeting</b></p>
<b>7.2 Review of Data Inventory</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Jeff H. reviewed YG’s information submission table, which notes the data currently available or anticipated completion dates. Two key products, to be presented at the next Commission meeting, will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial data on linear features, including informal trails, to help understand the current disturbance footprint; and</li> <li>• Ecological land classification, which relies on satellite information to determine vegetation types and, by extension, habitat types and suitability for various species.</li> </ul>	

<b>7.3 Proposal for Stakeholder Workshops</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
Workshops will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to provide more information and input on resource values, land use conflicts and planning approaches. Community/stakeholder workshops on elements of the Resource Assessment Report will be scheduled for spring (May). Fall workshops on Plan Scenarios are anticipated in October.	
<b>Adjournment</b>	
Proceedings were adjourned for the day at 4:30 PM.	

**DAY 2**

**Meeting called to order at 9:00AM by Scott Casselman**

<b>Agenda Item 8.0 Plan Vision</b>	
<b>8.1 Visioning Overview</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	
<p>Jeff H. provided a presentation on the purpose and process for establishing a vision of a desirable future for the region.</p> <p>A Vision Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generates a common goal, hope, and encouragement;</li> <li>• Offers a possibility for fundamental change;</li> <li>• Gives people a sense of control;</li> <li>• Gives a group something to move toward; and</li> <li>• Generates creative thinking and passion.</li> </ul> <p>A vision statement should be prepared that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive, present-tense;</li> <li>• Provides a feeling for the region's uniqueness;</li> <li>• Is inclusive of all stakeholders;</li> <li>• Sets a high standard;</li> <li>• Focused on people and quality of life; and</li> <li>• States a time period</li> </ul>	
<b>8.2 Plan Vision</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	
<p>Jeff H. led the Commission members through a visioning exercise to help prepare them for the drafting of a vision statement. The members were asked to imagine a future in which all the desired plan outcomes had been achieved. The Commission members were asked to envision, then describe that future state. The Commission members were asked to create vision statements, which were then passed around in a consensus building approach. By reviewing the various statements, the Commission identified and described some common elements of a shared vision. Several whiteboards full of key words were recorded prior to the lunch break.</p>	<p><b>Jeff H. to refine and distribute a Vision and Goal statement for consensus approval of the Commission</b></p>

<b>Agenda Item 9.0 Goal Statements</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<b>9.1 Plan Goals</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	
Following the lunch break, Scott C. and Jeff H. led further group discussion to clarify the words used to describe the vision. Whiteboard and Flipchart notes resulting from the visioning exercise were retained so Jeff H. could refine the vision statement following the meeting. A Vision and Goal statement must be completed by March 31, 2012.	<b>Goal Statements to be finalized by March 31, 2012</b>
<b>Agenda Item 10.0 Workplan and Budget Review</b>	
<b>10.1 Conservation Assessment Priorities</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Jeff H. presented a proposed workplan for the identification of potential conservation areas. The workplan would entail a working alliance with the Department of Environment and Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). WCS provide guidance on methodology. The Commission would provide GIS support, while identification of conservation values would be led by Yukon Parks.</p> <p>This joint project would identify “hot spots” for conservation, areas with a high concentration of values and/or conservation potential. The Commission will prioritize those areas (i.e. use science-based tools but value-based decisions will be made by the Commission).</p> <p>Scott H. stated that Canadian Wildlife Service (Environment Canada) would also be interested in participating in this project, and may have some additional resources to contribute. Gillian M. noted that the details of YG-Environment’s involvement are still being discussed.</p>	<b>Jeff H. to follow up with Yukon Environment and EMR to clarify roles and outcomes for a Conservation Assessment report.</b>
<b>10.2 Scenario Analysis</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Jeff H. reviewed the process for preparation of Plan Scenarios to assist the Commission to reach consensus on desirable outcomes for the Regional Plan. Workshops will be conducted with the Planning Partners to explore alternative possible and plausible future states of the region, in terms of economic, social and ecological outcomes. Evaluation criteria for the scenarios will be prepared so that different Plan options can be systematically compared.</p> <p>Scenarios will be further developed over the Summer of 2012, with additional workshops to discuss findings in Fall 2012.</p> <p>A Draft Scenarios Paper is to be completed by Dec 31, 2012.</p> <p>A Final Scenarios Paper is to be completed by Mar 31, 2013.</p>	

<b>10.3 Draft Plan</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Jeff H. indicated that preparation of a Draft Plan will begin in January 2013, following release of the Draft Scenarios Report.</p> <p>The Draft Land Use Plan is expected to be available for public review by Fall 2013.</p> <p>The last phase of the planning process will be to develop the Final Recommended Land Use Plan by December 2013.</p>	
<b>10.4 Field Trip Planning</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>The Commission discussed logistics for Summer Field Trips to familiarize the members with values and activities occurring in the region.</p> <p>The field trip(s) may include any or all of the following destinations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thistle Creek/Kaminak/White Gold area – fixed wing overflights of goldfields area south of Dawson, and/or a boat trip back for the Yukon River corridor.</li> <li>2. Dempster road trip - Travel by vehicle up Dempster Highway with stops at Arctic Inland Resources timber operations, TH settlement land, Brewery Creek. This option could be undertaken as part of the next Commission meeting in May.</li> <li>3. Fixed wing overflight of the northern part of the region, as part of a north-south loop.</li> <li>4. Yukon River trip – Travel by boat upriver to 40 Mile and 60 Mile, boat back or arrange for a vehicle to drive back (stop at Clinton Creek).</li> </ol> <p>Some options will be more expensive and/or require more time than others. It was noted that Dan Reynolds has an airstrip associated with his outfitting business, as well as much information about the region, and may be willing to assist with coordinating trips. Scott H. also suggested that “virtual tours” using GIS or Google Earth could be a way to visualize the landscape before or after the field trips, possibly to recreate the Commission’s tour for others.</p> <p>Detailed cost and time estimates for the various field trip options will be prepared by staff. The Commission will decide on options that are in line with the recommended budget.</p>	<p><b>Staff to research various options and costs for Commission field trips for review at next Commission meeting.</b></p>



