









<b>Agenda Tab 2: Administration and Finance</b>	
<b>Revised Workplan and Budget Submissions</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Monica has drafted a revised 2013-14 Interim Report, which covers the period from April 1 to August 31, 2013 and is a requirement under the funding agreement (mid-year report). This was originally submitted by Jeff in September 2013 but LCIS had numerous concerns (particularly with the workplan extending into 2014-15 fiscal year) and requested a revised version, which was not completed by the time of Jeff's departure. The 2013-14 funding agreement states that if money was required in 2014-15, a budget estimate was to be submitted by August 15, 2013 (this apparently did not occur).</p> <p>Monica also drafted a revised workplan schedule for 2014-15 and worked with Heidi on the budget. According to the funding agreement, this is normally due on December 15 but LCIS has agreed to an extension given the circumstances and the Commission meeting this week. Following submission of this Preliminary Draft, there is one more opportunity for revisions before the Final Recommended submission in early February. LCIS was clear in October that there is no additional federal funding available, and (because of concerns to date about lack of deliverables and constantly changing timelines) they require a detailed workplan and demonstrated progress from now until March 31 to make a "business case" for additional funding in the new fiscal year.</p> <p>All agreed the new schedule continues to look possible but highly ambitious, and the Commission suggested a cover letter be attached noting the risks associated with any unforeseen delays. Gillian commented that the amount of detail, clear steps and deliverables were exactly what LCIS is looking for.</p>	<p><b>Monica to complete and submit revised 2013-14 Interim Report + Preliminary Draft 2014-15 Workplan and Budget to LCIS and YLUPC as soon as possible after this meeting.</b></p>
<b>VGFN Update on Overlap Agreement</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Erika Tizya provided an update on the overlap agreement between TH and VGFN traditional territories, in the northern portion of the planning region. The Chiefs hope to have this completed soon. VGFN's primary interest is the Miner River and Whitestone River, and extending the Fishing Branch protected area. The north end of the Kandik basin would remain TH traditional territory, and both VGFN and TH recognize that some access may be required in the future for oil and gas development.</p> <p>Sam explained that the DRPC would still be responsible for planning those LMUs, but following the administrative process the LMUs would actually be "unglued" from the Dawson regional plan and "tacked on" to the North Yukon plan. Bill noted that the administrative process can take a long time, but for planning purposes it should be considered done (similar to overlap between TH and Na-cho Nyak Dun). To facilitate this, the Commission can ensure the LMU boundaries line up with the North Yukon LMUs, and use consistent zoning.</p>	

<b>Agenda Tab 3: Land Designation System (LDS)</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Monica gave an overview of the materials provided in the information package. These included various "planning toolbox" or strategy tables, copy of presentation by Shawn Francis on cumulative effects indicators, examples of LDS from other planning regions, the initial draft Dawson region LDS prepared by the Senior Planner in September 2013, and comments from the Parties on that draft.</p>	

<b>Agenda Tab 3: Land Designation System (LDS)</b>	
<p>Gillian, Bill and Rosa gave the Parties' perspectives on the joint technical meeting which took place in Dawson on December 3-4. All agreed it was a very productive meeting. Main outcomes included agreement to remove the categories of "Wilderness Area" and "Multi-Use Corridor" that were in the draft, consider the Yukon River Corridor as its own Landscape Management Unit, and forward the concept of Traditional Economy Area to the Commission for consideration. Withdrawal of subsurface mineral rights will likely be a contentious issue, and the Commission should consider other management tools available (e.g. access management, seasonal restrictions). The group discussed individual LMUs and summarized values, and created a spectrum of zones with differing management intent and management tools.</p> <p>The Commission also discussed potential new color schemes for the LDS, considering the assumptions behind "green is good, red is bad". Monica said Kathy had also noted that color-blind people find red and green difficult to distinguish.</p>	

<b>Agenda Tab 4: Landscape Management Units (LMUs)</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Sam said he has discovered that many of the LMU boundaries were not watershed-based, so he has changed some lines on the map to better reflect these ecological boundaries. The Commission decided on name changes for some LMUs, and discussed the Yukon River Corridor LMU and how management tools would be different in that zone. They also looked at the Dawson Forest Resources Management Plan and the units it uses.</p>	

<b>Agenda Tab 5: Adjacent Areas</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Monica gave an overview of the materials provided in the information package. These included adjacent LMUs from the North Yukon Regional Plan, the Peel Watershed Regional Plan (both the Commission's designations and YG's recent suggestions), and the Fortymile Subunit from the Eastern Interior Draft Resource Management Plan (Alaska). The purpose is not to restrict the Commission's decisions on how to zone individual LMUs, but to consider the values and management intent of areas adjacent to those LMUs.</p>	

<b>Agenda Tab 6: Conservation Priorities</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Monica gave an overview of the materials provided in the information package. These included protected areas adjacent to the planning region (Fishing Branch Habitat Protection Area and Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve), as well as Tombstone park within the region. Environment Yukon had also previously provided a preliminary Conservation Values Assessment for the region, with recommendations on types of landscape features and specific areas within the region that have high ecological significance. Sam presented some recent Marxan computer modeling results of "conflict areas", where conservation values and industrial values overlap.</p>	

<b>Agenda Tab 7: Round 2 Alternatives</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Monica and Sam briefly reviewed the Commission’s last round of alternatives, as well as the updated evaluation criteria and consequence table and initial comments on the alternatives from the YG Technical Support Group.</p> <p>Sam continues to work on refining the evaluation criteria (e.g. concept of a benchmark index or score that amalgamates several criteria like rare landscape features into one).</p>	

The Commission ended Day 1 by reviewing the agenda, format and goals for the Stakeholder Workshop the following day, and adjourned for the day at 5:00pm.

**Day 2 – December 18<sup>th</sup>**

The Commission met with representatives from key stakeholder groups at the Alpine Bakery in Whitehorse. A separate summary of discussion has been prepared for that meeting.

**Day 3 – December 19<sup>th</sup>**

The meeting recommenced at 9:15am.

<b>Reflections on Stakeholder Meeting</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Round table discussion about the previous day’s meeting. Small group format was a good way to hear diverse perspectives, although ½ hour per topic seemed too short. Other constructive criticism: some people felt the space was too small, lunch should have been provided, and sometimes facilitators could have done a better job keeping groups on topic.</p> <p>The ending comments from participants: an overwhelmingly positive response from stakeholders, felt they were being heard and felt like participants in the planning process rather than having to defend their position. People felt “ownership” of the planning process, and the group was a key cross-section of organizations and people with interests in the Dawson region. Some participants who expressed concerns at the beginning did not feel the same by the end, and appreciated Monica’s straight answers. All felt it was important to keep bringing this group back together, to show them how their feedback has been incorporated.</p>	

<b>Alternatives Round 3</b>	
	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>Utilizing all background information provided, all feedback received to date, and their own knowledge of the region, Commission members began creation of a new set of alternatives.</p>	

### Alternatives Round 3

Brian Johnston (YG Parks) gave an overview of a document he provided on conservation priority areas within the region. He noted that regional planning is the only opportunity in the Yukon to identify new protected areas (other than those identified in land claim agreements), and is the place for high-level strategic recommendations. The Commission can consider a wide spectrum of types of protected areas, and should also consider size and scale to allow for ecological function and variation, as well as connectivity (consider consistency with adjacent areas).

YG Parks' definition of "Protected Areas" is true protection – subsurface rights withdrawal, legal designation and long-term certainty. The Commission is encouraged to identify potential boundaries for protected areas, and if possible suggest the type of protected areas that would best fit with the values present. Brian said he would be happy to work with the Commission on identifying priority areas, defining boundaries, and discussing the different types of protected areas. No desirable percentages of region protected ("land quantum") have been presented by the Parties, and it is more important to provide rationale for the values that need protection. Benchmark areas are important to consider for climate change resiliency.

Bill noted the importance of consistency with the Dawson Forest Resources Management Plan. "Hinterland" or working landscape areas in that plan already have a suite of indicators to collect information on, and it would be easier from an implementation standpoint.

The Commission discussed several "easy win" LMUs where they were unanimous on the type of designation. Also discussed some LMUs with potential conflicts may actually be separated by season or geography. For example, in LMU 13 winter habitat is critical for the 40 Mile caribou herd and there are placer operations, but placer operates only in the summer and in the valley bottoms. Some members noted that many issues are already being addressed in the existing regulatory regime.

There was extensive discussion about the proposed Traditional Economy Area (TEA) designation, which promotes renewable resource activity, has interim withdrawal of mineral rights, and has numerous access restrictions. Existing rights would need to be grandfathered with "reasonable" access, and the proposed width of allowed trails and winter roads may need to increase to allow forestry to go ahead.

Gillian discussed the spectrum of LDS from the joint technical meeting. TEA and River Corridor designations focus more on specific conservation values, while Integrated Management Area zones keep the priority on development (while still achieving some conservation "in the matrix"). There was discussion about the evolution of mineral exploration and mining, where new exploration projects cover a large area but are relatively low impact. As the resource becomes more defined, development becomes more intense but over a smaller footprint. Some LMUs could be zoned "business as usual" but with more restrictions or considerations of key values such as raptor nests or sheep habitat.

**Agenda Tab 8: Alternatives Public Release**

	<b>Action Items</b>
<p>The Commission discussed next steps in the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next regular Commission meeting January 10-11 in Dawson to finalize Round 3 Alternatives</li> <li>• Overall goal is to release Plan Alternatives to the public by the end of January.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sam redraw LMU boundaries and revise names.</b></p> <p><b>Monica complete workplan/budget submissions, create agenda and strategy for January.</b></p> <p><b>Kathy finish draft communications materials for presentation in January.</b></p>

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

**Approval of Minutes of Regular Board Meeting #13 (December 17 & 19, 2013)**

**By Motion #3 at Regular Board Meeting #14 (January 10 & 11, 2014)**



Chair



Acting Senior Planner

Date: January 10, 2014