



<b>Agenda Item 2: Approval of Minutes</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p><b>MOTION # 2:</b></p> <p>To accept the Minutes for the May 16 &amp; 17, 2012 Meeting #1 as amended.</p> <p><b>Moved: Will Fellers                      2<sup>nd</sup> : Chester Kelly                      Passed by Consensus</b></p>	

<b>Agenda Item 3.0 Reports</b>	
<b>3.1 Chair's Report</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Scott C. reported that much has happened since the last meeting. The appendices for the RAR and the series of maps are coming together nicely. There have been several TWG meetings and he is looking forward to seeing the finished product.</p> <p>Scott C. stated that for those not involved in the Yukon River field trip it was a great tour. Dave Neufeld, a Parks Canada Historian, served as a wealth of experience and information. The group enjoyed beautiful country and good weather, saw some paddlers, viewed two barges transporting fuel and supplies, toured Will's property and visited Kaminak Gold's exploration project camp.</p>	<p>For next meeting Scott to write up report to give to Jeff for next meeting</p>
<b>3.2 Senior Planner's Report</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Jeff reported that he has had a number of meetings with different parties, including two meetings with YG, to provide an update about what the commission is doing, and to hear about YG projects. Jeff has suggested engaging the parties in a more hands on role when talking about scenarios.</p> <p>Jeff gave details about significant meetings coming up in October. In Dawson, the Yukon Forest Management Plan has an open house on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. YESAB is having a cumulative affects assessment practitioners workshop in Dawson on the 24 and 25<sup>th</sup>, bringing together people who are actively involved in reviewing development applications. Jeff will be giving a presentation about how cumulative affects will be considered in the planning process.</p> <p>Jeff requested the Commission's support in pursuit of professional certification through the Canadian Institute of Planners (PIBC). In order for him to receive professional accreditation as a planner and</p>	<p>Scott to review/approve</p>

**Agenda Item 3.0 Reports**

become a full MCIP member, he must take a four-day intensive training course and exam. Experience and knowledge must be kept up-to-date for continued certification.  
 Commission members agreed that it was a good idea, that it would add credibility to the Commission's work

Steve asked if there is money in the budget for training for Commission members. He referred Members to relevant 1-3 day courses at Yukon College.

- Scott C. asked if information about these courses could be sent around in an email.
- Monica presented some information to Steve about colleges courses that she had on hand to share.
- Steve will email members information about relevant courses scheduled at Yukon College

Jeff encouraged council members to attend the YESAB workshop in Dawson at the end of the month, as it is very relevant for DRPC. Bill K. will send along the agenda and would like some indication of who from the commission would like to attend.

expense claim for Jeff's MCIP exam.

Jeff to look into training budget and at professional development funds to see what training funds are available for training for Commission members

**Agenda Item 4.0 Resource Values and Land Use Conflicts**

**4.1 Review of Draft Resource Assessment Report**

**Comment**

Jeff described working on the RAR. Draft RAR is about 60% complete. The first section, a "regional profile", was distributed to the Commission for review. It is a high level description of the region, its natural environment, the communities and the economy of the Dawson planning region. The resource values are addressed in greater detail in the report, as well as on maps (some of which were displayed on the wall).

Jeff stated RAR and summary maps are the most significant deliverable for this year. He described how Commissions in the past have taken too comprehensive an approach to the RAR, but DRPC's will be similar to these but not the same. Want to place more onus on the parties to document their resource values, so the product doesn't require a whole lot of extra work to incorporate their concerns. Also, there is a comprehensive report from TH that documents their resource values. Scott suggested some information provided by the parties (e.g. wildlife summary) might be incorporated directly into RAR, with the rest of the background in the appendices.

## Agenda Item 4.0 Resource Values and Land Use Conflicts

### 4.1 Review of Draft Resource Assessment Report

TH's Lands Manager gave a presentation regarding a Traditional Economy Model. Bill K. described a Cultural Landscape in which all elements of resource and economic systems are interconnected with the landscape. Referring to TH's resource report, he noted that their goal is to maintain natural resources. Land based characteristics that should be incorporated include heritage trails, river routes, roads, fish/wildlife habitats, heritage sites and harvesting locations, such as fish camps or hunting area. Activities include harvest, fisheries, trapping hunting, timber harvest settlement development, monitoring. If a unique land use plan that incorporated all these things could be developed it would be an ideal rallying point for the economy of the region. Given TH's UFA and provisions for protection of wildlife and habitat, there are opportunities to uphold provisions. Bill K. noted that access is key for traditional economic activity. Upcoming TH workshops will be held with elders and citizens to discuss the traditional economy.

Scott asks what TH's source would be for data regarding wildlife habitat, if it would come from YG local knowledge studies or was gathered by TH from locals. Bill K responded that it was mainly from local sources.

Jeff H. noted that an important element of Bill K's presentation is that TH have provided an integrated description about all the resources that are important in their landscape. This provides a model for considering how resources are related and how other uses of resources affects TH cultural values. A diversity of economic activities is what the Commission has indicated they want to achieve in the plan.

Jeff led the Commission Members thru a series of questions to reveal knowledge about the various resource values and cultural activities of the region. These exercises enabled each member to contribute input on each value described in the RAR:

- What do you want to achieve for this value?
- What issues need to be addressed?
- What would other stakeholders want to know about this resource?
- What would you consider to be a great future for this resource?
- Why would this represent a good outcome?
- What would be a terrible future?
- Why would it be a terrible future?
- What barriers must be overcome to achieve a good outcome?

The members answered these questions regarding water, wildlife, fisheries, forestry, minerals, energy, agriculture and access. Monica K will compile the Commission member's responses to the questions. The information gathered will help the planners to round out their understanding of the values of

<b>Agenda Item 4.0 Resource Values and Land Use Conflicts</b>	
<b>4.1 Review of Draft Resource Assessment Report</b>	
resources and help the Commission formulate objectives.	
With respect to forestry, Bill B. described the Forestry Management Plan’s contribution to the RAR, and discussion turned to access and economic activities not addressed by the FMP, in particular consideration of non-forest economic values. Jeff stated he plans to attend the Forest Management Plan meeting Tuesday evening. He will be using as much information from the Forest Management Plan in the RAR as possible.	
With regard to Energy resources, the Commission discussed historical projects, such as the North Fork Hydro project. Jeff was not certain how this project fit into Yukon Energy’s plan. Jeff will look for additional documentation on potential for hydro sites in the region.	
<b>Adjournment</b>	
Proceedings were adjourned for the day at 4:00 PM.	

Meeting called to order at 9:15 AM (NOTE: Chair Scott C. was delayed. Steve Taylor assumes the chair in his absence)

<b>Agenda Item 5.0: Principles and Outcomes for Regional Planning</b>	
<b>5.1 Vision and Goal Statement</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
Scott C. arrived at 9:18 and resumed as Chair for the meeting.	
Jeff reviewed the Commission’s Vision and Goal Statements. The purpose of the Vision Statements, Goal Statements and Principles is to serve as high-level indications of how the Commission intends to approach decision making around land and resource values. For example, “Active Management” is an adaptive management approach that suggests a process of making decisions that considers alternatives, consequences and necessary trade offs before decisions are made.	

<b>Agenda Item 5.0: Principles and Outcomes for Regional Planning</b>	
<b>5.2 Guiding Principles</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>At the last meeting Commission members took part in discussion regarding DRPC`s planning principles. Jeff has reduced these down into a draft set of principles. Jeff described draft Guiding Principles, which in addition to principles established by the UFA are central to how decisions are made about all resources and land uses. Discussion followed on proposed principles developed at the previous meeting: Fairness, sustainability, balance, efficiency and integrity.</p>	
<b>5.3 Plan Objectives</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Jeff described how Plan objectives may be grouped according to the Goals and Resource Values that have already been identified; now the Commission must consider how to measure progress towards goals in each of the value areas.</p> <p>From the discussion of the previous day, Jeff identified a number of issues that Commission members hoped the plan would address. These included: water quality issues, habitat issues, information requirements, baseline monitoring, access to resources, value of wildlife, economic balance, community capacity, community housing and social issues. Jeff asked the Commission to keep in mind the issues discussed on the previous day and more completely describe the problems they are hoping to address in the land use plan</p> <p>Jeff displayed a table matrix of Values/Interest areas and Goals. The table will be used to develop Plan objectives that address the identified issues. To help clarify desirable objectives, Jeff noted that problem statements regarding the Issues and Interests need to be: forward looking, explicit, and not focused on trying to find a solution. Jeff led the Commission members in an exercise to help staff refine regional issue statements for: mining and mineral exploration; economic balance; conservation of wildlife and habitats; and the Yukon River Corridor. His approach posed the following questions: Why do problems need to be addressed; what kind of decision are expected; what are the key assumptions and constraints; and who needs to be involved.</p> <p>The Commission had a lengthy discussion regarding access, exploring positive and negative aspects associated with access. Jeff explained how access is a common theme for all resource values.</p>	

<p><b>Agenda Item 6.0 Exploring Alternative Planning Strategies</b></p>	
<p><b>6.1 Scenario Evaluation Framework</b></p>	
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	
<p>Though the RAR is not finished, work has started on the scenarios. The goal is to complete documentation of resource values, tie everything together with the scenarios, and prepare a Final Scenarios Report by March. Monica has been collecting scenarios case studies. Public meetings will likely occur in mid to late winter.</p> <p>Jeff explained that one of the products in the work package this year is a Scenario Evaluation Framework, and one of the important components of this is defining problems and measuring success. This approach is useful for telling the parties, the Commission and ultimately the public how DRPC is going to go about evaluating alternative strategies. Jeff has distributed the framework to TH and YG to develop an understanding of how scenarios can help in the planning process.</p> <p>Gillian pointed out that on the list of values and interests the word tourism doesn't show up. Also, she suggested that the Commission get specific on objectives to by using maps to look spatially look at issues, and where they show up, to identify spatial land use issues in the region.</p>	
<p><b>6.2 Plan Scenarios: Case Study</b></p>	
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	
<p>Monica has created a 2-page plain language summary for each of numerous case studies on scenarios and potential evaluation criteria - regional, provincial, national and international level planning exercises and looked at how they have used planning scenarios. Jeff distributed only the spreadsheet summary list of these to Commission and explained that DRPC will be using a combination of different scenario tools, including computer modelling tools and choice exercises to get feedback.</p> <p>Gillian asked, with case studies, if they were used as a tool to decide on methodology. Jeff responded that the case studies are something to draw from as we design our own methodology. The scenario evaluation framework is part of our methodology, defining objectives is part of that structured approach to look into scenarios.</p>	
<p><b>6.3 Alternative Planning Scenarios</b></p>	
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	
<p>Jeff described how Alternative Planning Scenarios may be used to engage with the public and stakeholders to gather their input on acceptable plan outcomes. The process will begin by asking how to evaluate success when comparing alternative outcomes.</p>	

<b>Agenda Item 7.0 Correspondence &amp; Media</b>	
<b>7.1 For period 2012.04.02 – 2012.10.10</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Jeff H. discussed letters surrounding the audit and financial review, and a letter from Council with respect to the implications of the Peel and YLUPC members. He stated that they had typical correspondence with respect to YESAB applications, continue to identify that the plan is in progress and there is nothing specific that we have to add yet, we`re still at a point where we could not make any different recommendation, we don`t have any draft policies on the table, continue to stay aware of applications, they are sent to us specifically because there is a land use planning preparation, so we receive a form letter directly from YESAB and DRPC replies.</p> <p>Jeff stated that there was follow up since the last meeting regarding the SLC. The Council wrote a letter to the minister asking to speed up the process of appointing SLC members and the minister has sent a letter to TH but DRPC has yet to be advised about who those member might be.</p>	
<b>Agenda Item 8.0 Finance</b>	
<b>8.1 Approval of Audited 2011/2012 Financial Statements</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>As a result of the 2011-2012 audit, a report was produced that must be approved by the Commission and forwarded to the parties. As a result of the audit there were a number of entries that were required to the GL to bring it into a proper position at year end. YLUPC completed all of these entries and there books were balanced at the end of the 2011-12 fiscal year and have been balanced from that point forward.</p> <p><b>MOTION # 3:</b></p> <p>To accept the Audited Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 2011/2012, as prepared by Mackay LLP</p> <p><b>Moved : Roger Ellis                      2<sup>nd</sup> : Will Fellers                      Passed by Consensus</b></p>	



<p><b>Agenda Item 9.0 Policies and Procedures</b></p>	
<p><b>9.1 Financial Review and Recommendations</b></p>	
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	
<p>Jeff H. addressed the annual audit and the decision by LCIS to withhold progress payments. He and Scott C. have been in numerous meetings with Planning Council, EMR and LCIS to better understand their concerns and come up with a plan to move forward and restore funding once again. Jeff introduced Kathleen Z. (LCIS), who had visited DRPC’s office to review the financial records and prepared a report and recommendations, which she had been invited to deliver. Kathleen handed out a copy of the Auditor’s “Management Letter”, noting the Auditor’s concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G.S.T. was not properly expensed</li> <li>• Missing receipts</li> <li>• Minor capital asset, which went in as an expense (however, as she is aware that a policy exists this is minor)</li> <li>• A cheque written after year end but which was recorded as being written sooner</li> </ul> <p>Kathleen stated that of greatest concern were that the financials, including the bank reconciliation, were not accurate; late payments were made to CRA for payroll tax deductions resulting in fines and that the financial files were disorganized.</p> <p>Her recommendations included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receive interim book keeping from YLUPC</li> <li>• Change of authorization for travel expense claims to the chair (for Commission members and the Senior Planner).</li> <li>• Review policies to make sure they are following them or develop best practice.</li> </ul> <p>Funding will be reinstated as soon as the Commission resolves financial administration handled to the satisfaction of LCIS. If the Commission chooses not to use YLUPC’s admin help, need to demonstrate competence to their satisfaction. Kathleen stated that as of the meeting, the Auditor’s recommendations had already been met. She recommended that, if the process with YLUPC is going well, that the Commission should continue with them and have a good audit year.</p> <p>Jeff acknowledged that people with administration skills are difficult to come by in small communities. Jeff expressed the need for an administration manual. Another commission may need an administration manual that outlines required financial procedures and is more specific than generally accepted accounting practice.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the vacant administration position at the office in Dawson. Having a local as a third member of the team helped establish a local presence. By moving finance to YLUPC, they were removing a half time job from the community.</p>	<p>Jeff to post the position by Monday Or Tuesday October 22-23</p>

<p><b>Agenda Item 9.0 Policies and Procedures</b></p> <p>Scott noted that when the Commission got started the Parties wanted to allow them to plan, so if YLUPC can take over administrative duties it would save money and allow the Commission to focus on planning. Scott noted that they are mandated with creating a land use plan, and that the money that would have gone into hiring a bookkeeper now can go into land use planning. Scott asked if they could find someone from Dawson to partially fill the administrative role, but have book keeping done by YLUPC</p> <p>The Commission reached consensus to repost the administrative position in the DRPC office. Jeff recommended that as they already have a job description for the financial administration position, and that he will post it as soon as possible and will know by the end of November if there are qualified candidates. Contracting the position is a second option. They will proceed to the selection process, a hiring committee will be formed and Commission members will be selected to sit on it.</p> <p>Ron suggested that if a suitable candidate cannot be found, Council will enter into longer term arrangement with YLUPC to take on DRPC financial administration.</p>	<p>Scott to relay DRPC's response to LCIS</p>
<p><b>9.2 Revision of Policies and Procedures</b></p>	
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	
<p>YLUPC Director indicated that there were two policy changes recommended by YG in their September Financial Review.</p> <p><b>MOTION # 5:</b>  DRPC Policies and Procedures 4.6.2 f) and 5.2.5 (b), c) and g) are hereby amended as follows</p> <p>4.6.2 Travel</p> <p>f) All travel by Commission members and Senior Planner will be authorized by the Chair or, if the travel is for the chair, another commission member. The Senior Planner will authorize travel for other staff members.</p> <p>5.2.5 Signing Authority</p> <p>b) All commission members, the Senior Planner, and the DRPC office Administrator (or designated) will have signing authority. The signing authority limit of the Senior Planner is \$10,000, and the office Administrators (or designate) signing limit is \$2,500;</p> <p>c) YLUPC Council members, Planning Director, and Senior Financial Administrator will retain</p>	

<b>Agenda Item 9.0 Policies and Procedures</b>		
<p>signing authority but will only use this authority if the expense involves penalties for late payments and the Commission members or senior planner are not available before the payments are deemed late (see 5.2.5 g) The council will also use this authority in the event that the Commission cannot make financial decisions.</p> <p>g) All cheques are to be signed either by two Commission members, or by one Commission member and the Senior Planner. The Office Administrator (or designate) may sign cheques if Commission members or the Senior Planner are not available. This should only occur for expenses that are time sensitive (e.g. Revenue Canada payments).</p>		
<b>Moved: Will Fellers</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> : Steve Taylor</b>	<b>Passed by Consensus</b>

<b>Agenda Item 10.0 2013-2014 Workplan and Budget</b>		
<b>10.1 Review of preliminary Workplan and Budget</b>		
<b>Comment</b>		
<p>Jeff H. stated that one thing to discuss in regards to the Workplan is the willingness of the parties to fund through the fiscal year until March 2014, as he anticipates it will take three months to receive feedback on the draft recommendations and recommended plan. There will be two more public opportunities, one before mid-December and one before mid-February. At the first public meeting scenarios will be discussed and the second will be a planned public consultation. Jeff H. expressed his concern that the parties have yet to identify SLC members. However, YG has sent a letter to TH in an attempt to find out which names have been put forth.</p> <p>Jeff explained that the draft budget is submitted to council mid-November and then have opportunity to refine it. On Nov 15<sup>th</sup> it goes to TH for comment and on Nov 30 or Dec 15<sup>th</sup> it is submitted to the Council.</p>		<b>Action Items</b>

<b>Agenda Item 11.0: Next Meeting</b>		
<b>11.1 Draft Budget and Workplan Review (teleconference)</b>		
<b>Comment</b>		
<p>The next meeting, a conference call, must be held before November 15<sup>th</sup>, to enable Jeff to forward the work plan and draft budget to TH and BGFN by that time.</p>		<p>Jeff to email details about next meeting, including calling instructions.</p>

<b>Agenda Item 11.0: Next Meeting</b>	
The next meeting of the Commission will be held via teleconference at 12:00 PM, November 14, 2012.	
<b>Adjournment</b>	
Proceedings were adjourned for the day at 4:46 PM.	

Approval of Minutes of Regular Board Meeting #06- 2012/13 – Oct 17 & 18, 2012  
By Motion #2, at Regular Board Meeting #08 -2012/13 - February 13, 2013

  
Chair

  
Senior Planner

February 13, 2013  
Date: