



15th. The Commission subsequently agreed to amend their agenda to allow a discussion by the TWG on the workplan on the afternoon of Day One, and Commission discussion of Plan Alternatives on Day Two.

## Agenda Item 2: Finance

Ron C. apprised the Commission of the status of the review of the Commission's mid-year finances and workplan. In comparison to previous Commissions, he considered that DRPC was probably 1 to 1 ½ years from completion. The Commission's current workplan is very optimistic, considering the Peel Commission spent about 9 months on the Alternatives and another 9 months on the Draft Land Use Plan. The Commission's workplan does not provide adequate opportunity for Party review and public participation opportunities are limited. However, the Commission is "running out of time and money", as no additional funds are forthcoming from Canada for this Commission.

Bill K. observed that the time spent on plan options for the Peel Plan was too short, and not enough time was spent developing the Draft Land Use Plan.

Ron C. explained that previous Commissions had no limits placed on either time or money. However, YLUPC are concerned that the execution of the workplan is continually not meeting expected timeframes.

Will asked if the Council had any suggestions for how the Commission might stay on its workplan. Ron said no, but that more detailed project management would identify where inadequate time had been allocated to complete tasks, particularly those involving a response from the Parties. Will suggested that the Commission was being held to an unreasonable timeframe, that it could not possibly produce a Recommended Plan in the required timeframe. Ron C. responded that the Commission might consider reducing the scope of the workplan (i.e. only getting to the Recommended Plan stage and not the Final Recommended Plan as in the Terms of Reference) as a possible option.

Will invited Kathleen Zimmer to provide perspectives from Yukon LCIS about the Commission's workplan. Kathleen concurred that shifting timelines and delays in delivery of products are a concern, that the Commission is expected to meet the workplan objective for the current year, and that a sound business case would be required for the Commission to continue beyond the end of the current fiscal year (Mar 31). Kathleen also mentioned that the DRPC needs a detailed workplan and good project management. The DRPC must adhere to the approved workplan and budget.

Gillian M. noted that the most recent workplan submitted is a schedule of dates, but lacks detail on the tasks and steps required to get to a Recommended Plan, particularly when the Structured Decision Making approach emphasizes an iterative process of refinement, with several rounds of evaluation before the final decision. YG made a number of other comments on the workplan, including suggestions for more streamlined products. A more collaborative effort on the workplan would help address other issues, such as ensuring adequate time for Parties review and technical input. There should also be more frequent SLC meetings.

The Commission noted that too much time is being spent discussing the Workplan/Budget, but are concerned about being forced into a timeframe too short to complete a quality land use plan.

On the afternoon of Day One Ron C. and TWG met with Jeff H. to assist in creating a realistic workplan and schedule for completion of the Recommended Plan.

## Day Two

<b>Agenda Item 2.0 Finance</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Based on the outcome of the previous afternoon’s meeting, suggestions from TWG and YLUPC include one less “round” of alternatives and a tighter working schedule with the Parties. Will F. reiterated that the schedule and suggested changes are still not realistic as there is no room for unexpected delays. Any delay will mean the Commission is again not in compliance with the approved workplan.</p>	<p>Jeff H. to complete a revised workplan and budget for submission to LCIS and YLUPC.</p>

<b>Agenda Item 3.0 Plan Alternatives</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>The Commission discussed the previous round of alternatives and evaluation criteria. Bill K. noted that the categories into which some evaluation criteria are grouped are not consistent (e.g. many are economic but are listed as cultural and ecological). Jeff H. noted the categories will be dropped in subsequent versions of the consequence table.</p> <p>For the alternatives, possible changes and suggestions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Describing shortcomings and vulnerabilities</li> <li>-Potential for RUWA zone (used in YG Peel plan) to address wilderness concepts</li> <li>-Lessening the number of LMUs</li> <li>-Use and rank values (cultural, economic, etc.)</li> <li>-Rank LMUs</li> <li>-Analysis of cumulative effects thresholds</li> <li>-One or more mining scenarios</li> <li>-Off road vehicle regulations</li> <li>-Special Management Areas, not whole watershed</li> </ul>	

<b>Date and Location of Next Meeting</b>	
<p>The next meeting of the Commission will be held on Dec 17-19, 2013 in Whitehorse.</p>	

<b>Adjournment</b>		
The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.		
Approval of Minutes for Regular Board Meeting #11- 2013/14 – Oct 16-17, 2013 By Motion #2 at Regular Board Meeting #14 (January 10-11, 2014)		
		January 10, 2014
_____	_____	_____
Chair	Acting Senior Planner	Date: