

<p>Designation System, and has started on numerous components of what will become the Plan Alternatives Information Package for the public review period. Kathy has been assisting with all aspects of this work and is also busy designing posters, mailout cards, and other communications materials for the public review period.</p>	
<p>Correspondence and Media</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>No new correspondence other than some YESAB notifications. Monica mentioned the form letter the Commission has been using to respond to YESAB applications in the region (basically says we are watching what is going on but not making specific comments at this time). At some point (likely around the Draft Plan stage and later) the Commission may want to make more substantial comments on specific projects, or note what type of zoning the Commission is considering for the area.</p>	

<p>AGENDA TAB 2: ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE</p>	
<p>Vice-Chair Selection</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Monica said in reviewing the Policies and Procedures, she noted the Commission is supposed to have a Vice-Chair and asked if one had ever been selected. Commission replied that it was Steve Taylor, and the intent was to have a Dawson member be the Vice-Chair (since the Chair lives in Whitehorse). Decision to defer selection of a new Vice-Chair until the sixth Commission member has been reappointed.</p>	<p>Selection of Vice-Chair to occur immediately upon full Commission being in place.</p>
<p>Review of Financial Statements</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>No issues or concerns were noted.</p>	
<p>Workplan and Budget Submissions, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Discussed in Agenda Tab 1, Acting Senior Planner's Report.</p>	
<p>December 18, 2013 Stakeholder Workshop Summary of Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Deferred as the summary is not yet completed.</p>	<p>Monica to complete and distribute this workshop summary as soon as possible.</p>

GENERAL MANAGEMENT DIRECTIONS	
Purpose and intent of General Management Directions in a land use plan	Action Items
<p>Monica gave a brief overview presentation of General Management Directions (GMDs) – these are included in land use plans as specific recommendations, strategies and/or best management practices that assist the Parties to meet plan goals and objectives. They can apply to the entire planning region or only to specific land use designations (e.g. only for IMA zones) or specific industries, or a combination of these. For example, the Atlin Taku Land Use Plan gives industry-specific recommendations for forestry, mineral exploration/mining, and recreation/tourism as well as more general ones that apply to all activities in the region (e.g. culture and heritage, aquatic habitat, wildlife habitat). She gave examples of typical recommendations from a variety of other plans. GMDs may be for: specific management strategies, policy changes, or future research; recommendations related to transboundary issues; priorities for conservation areas; and suggested monitoring indicators.</p> <p>The GMDs for the Dawson region will be an important part of the Draft Plan. Gillian noted that the GMDs should be concise, and it is not necessary to repeat things that are in the existing legislation and regulatory regime. They should identify regulatory gaps, where there is a need for changes, or where more detailed planning is required. Debbie noted it is important to recognize weaknesses in existing legislation (e.g. protection of heritage resources). Sam suggested different options could be explored through the alternatives (e.g. difference in outcome between using adaptive management or using more rigid GMDs).</p>	<p>Staff continue to research GMDs and prepare a draft for review as part of the Draft Plan.</p>

AGENDA TAB 3: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM (LDS)	
Review of previous information and comments received to date	Action Items
<p>Monica briefly reviewed the extensive material provided at the December Commission meeting on available management tools, cumulative effects indicators, examples of LDS from other planning regions, and Parties’ comments on the initial draft LDS prepared by the previous Senior Planner (September 2013). The joint Parties technical meeting (December 3-4) and comments from the Stakeholder Workshop (December 18) also produced valuable feedback and suggestions. It is critical that the Commission define this LDS prior to creating the last round of alternatives.</p>	
Review of latest draft LDS	Action Items
<p>Monica presented the latest draft of the LDS, following a highly productive another TWG meeting on January 9. She thanked Gillian, Bill, Sam and Rosa for their great efforts to work together and prepare this version for Commission review. It consists of eight possible zones with a description of management intent for each. There are different ways of distinguishing between the zones (e.g. Is there withdrawal of sub-surface rights? Are there seasonal considerations? What is the level of risk to ecological resources? What is the level of uncertainty about what’s in an LMU? Would cumulative effects indicators be used, and what would the levels be?) This helps provide rationale for selecting a certain zone over another. For the IMA zones (the “working landscape”), attempted to be consistent with the North Yukon plan and how IMA levels I through IV were defined. The higher the IMA level, the more development is occurring on the landscape and the more regulations and requirements would be in place. Lower IMA levels would still permit some activity to take place, but would be selected for more sensitive areas. Additional</p>	

<p>restrictions or requirements would apply (e.g. Class 1 notification, particular techniques or technologies to reduce landscape impact, seasonal restrictions, or enhanced/more stringent practices to ensure protection of other values).</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Discussion about North Yukon plan’s use of cumulative effects (CE) indicators and levels. Different amounts of surface disturbance (% of LMU) and linear density (km/km²) thresholds were set to distinguish between IMA zones. This strategy allows more flexibility (you can still have a working landscape while protecting other values), and is less prescriptive on types of activities (anything can happen, but depending on where you are there could be more or less restrictions). Sam noted the North Yukon plan stopped short of saying what happens when you near or cross the thresholds (YG and VGFN basically agreed they would “talk about when it happens”). Plans could recommend increased regulations or more stringent access provisions would apply, or increased monitoring would be required (an escalating series of actions when different thresholds are reached). Discussion about adequacy of existing regulatory regime, bonding and reclamation requirements, and when activities would be considered as adding to the overall amounts of surface disturbance (or being subtracted from).</p> <p>Discussion about recent legislative changes requiring notification of Class 1 mineral exploration in Ross River area. This may also apply in other areas of unsettled land claims, such as White River, and many people believe it will become mandatory throughout the Yukon in the next five years. Allowing only Class 1-type activities in a zone would not make sense – no one will invest if there is no possible option to develop whatever they find. Discussion about the “footprint” of mining activities – Class 1 early exploration needs big areas while defining mineral resources, but relatively low impact on landscape. Class 2-3-4 activities see the area get smaller but there is more intensive activity. Zoning an LMU as IMA-IV doesn’t necessarily mean the whole LMU would be covered in development – need to recognize evolution of a project and likelihood of smaller footprint in future.</p> <p>Discussion about Yukon River Corridor (YRC) and Traditional Economy Area (TEA) zones – staking withdrawal suggestion from TH (no new claims, existing claims are grandfathered). Concerned about placer operations running claims down to the river’s edge, for the purpose of access (barge landings) or for camps. Defining the zone differently would mean applications for access routes and camps would have to go through the land use permitting and YESAB process. Scott said he has no knowledge of any significant hard rock deposits in the YRC, and that allowing mining activities on claims but not barge landings or camps would create a 2-window approach to permitting and would be very contentious. Buffers could be used if visibility is a concern for tourism operators. Rosa reminded everyone that the stakeholder workshop clearly showed people recognize the YRC is a working landscape with lots of values and different activities, and that a balance of opportunities can be provided.</p> <p>Discussion about IMA-IV and whether that should be considered “business as usual” without any additional restrictions beyond existing legislation and regulations. Scott noted the definition of “business as usual” has changed over time with new requirements for permits, reclamation and closure policies, heritage resource assessments, effluent regulations, fish habitat management regime for placer operations, etc. It is important to recognize the changes in the last 20 years, and that increasing restrictions and paperwork means costs go up and project viability (from an investor’s or proponent’s point of view) goes down. Rosa added that the past 20 years has also seen the salmon population plummet and major changes in caribou populations.</p> <p>Discussion about protected areas and other conservation-focused zones. Other than those identified in First Nation Final</p>	

<p>Agreements, land use planning is the only avenue in the Yukon to identify protected areas. It is also the only opportunity to establish CE levels (otherwise just managing on project by project basis) and to identify improvements or recommend better practices (e.g. map staking vs. claim staking).</p>	
<p>Decisions</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>With some additional refinements to descriptions of each zone, the Commission decided on a range of eight possible zones to use in creating Round 3 Alternatives and to include as part of the information materials for the public review period. They also accepted the color scheme proposed by staff and TWG. Many questions still remain and CE indicators have not been refined, but the Commission wants to hear from the public and Parties about this whole range of possible options before they make any further decisions.</p>	

<p>AGENDA TAB 4: LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT UNITS (LMUs)</p>	
<p>Review of latest draft LMUs</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Sam reviewed the recent revisions made to the LMU boundaries and names following decisions at the December Commission meeting. LMUs in the north were changed to better match those in the North Yukon plan. He defined the YRC boundary as 3 km from the center line or the edge of the Boreal Low ecosystem. There are ecological reasons to make it wider in some areas of valley bottoms. Some LMU boundaries were changed slightly to recognize existing land use activities (e.g. bit of a non-watershed-based line between LMUs 8 and 9 due to existing mineral claims), and allow more options for different zoning. The Community Area is to recognize possible future expansion of Dawson City municipal boundaries, assuming no bridge is built across the Yukon River in the next 20-25 years.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Commission conducted a final review of LMU boundaries, numbering system, and names. Debbie thought there should be more use of Hän language on the maps, such as place names. Sam said he received most of the available place names information (from VGFN and TH) with the other heritage data, but needs to check it is the most up to date. Monica said she has already been compiling a list of things she will be requesting from TH and VGFN Heritage Departments for inclusion into the Draft Plan and Recommended Plan, including: latest place names info; Hän and Gwich'in names for the LMUs and the plan itself; Hän and Gwich'in names for wildlife species; any words or concepts similar to the Atlin Taku plan's "<i>kebustiyxh</i>" or Tlingit way of life; and legends or stories about special places, similar to the legend about Kuihenjik and the Fishing Branch area. Debbie suggested several names of people who could help with this, and also that White River First Nation should be asked for what they call the Scottie Creek area. She said there are many stories about hills, trails and landscapes. Gillian added it would be good to have translations for management intent as well.</p>	<p>Staff to make best efforts to ensure that First Nations language and culture are reflected in all planning products.</p>
<p>Decisions</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>The Commission agreed to accept the LMU boundaries, numbers and names as revised from the last meeting. These will be used to create Round 3 Alternatives and included as part of the information materials for the public review period.</p>	

AGENDA TABS 3-7 FROM DECEMBER MEETING: PLAN ALTERNATIVES	
Review of previous information and comments received to date	Action Items
<p>Monica reviewed the extensive information provided in Tabs 3-7 of the December 17 & 19 Commission meeting package on: river corridor ideas (Fortymile Wild and Scenic River designation in Alaska); Dawson Forest Resources Management Plan; adjacent planning regions and Alaska management of Fortymile region; adjacent protected areas (Fishing Branch, Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve) and Tombstone; conservation priorities presented by Brian Johnston (YG Parks); and technical comments on Round 2 Plan Alternatives.</p> <p>Commission also reviewed the performance of Round 2 Alternatives using the decision framework and short-listed evaluation criteria, and confirmed decisions from November meeting (and that no further changes would be made prior to public release of alternatives).</p>	
Creation of Round 3 Plan Alternatives	Action Items
<p>Commission agreed there would be no alternatives representing extremes (i.e. all protected or all high development) – these should be realistic alternatives that represent a balanced approach to land use, and link back to vision and goals (alternatives should help achieve them). Many questions and ideas discussed: What would maximum protection of caribou habitat look like? Difference between an alternative using more protected areas, vs. one that has more high development zones and uses GMDs or Special Management Considerations for particular LMUs? What are some options for managing the overlap between caribou habitat and potential oil & gas activity in the north, or between caribou habitat and placer activity in 40 Mile/60 Mile areas (seasonal management tools vs. more conservative zoning)? What about southern part of region (identified as potential ecological benchmark area but high uncertainty about other resources there)? What would a Traditional Economy priority alternative look like (emphasis on protecting trails, key wildlife species, trapping areas, heritage sites, important areas around Tombstone)? How to best deal with uncertainty – cautious approach (set it aside) or get out there (people and activities means more research and available info)? How to incorporate climate change considerations? Promote vs. maintain activities? How to ensure water is protected (lakes, wetlands, fish habitat)? How to consider spiritual and cultural values, well-being, way of life and recognize intrinsic value of places just “being there” (not just about going out and making a living from the land)?</p> <p>Commission used maps, written information, Resource Assessment Report data, and input from Parties to discuss individual LMUs and what valued resources they contain. Creation of alternatives and different combinations of zoning focused on the wide range of management tools/strategies/options that are available to address potential conflicts between different types of land use activities. Will suggested it would be useful to know the reasons why TH Settlement Land parcels were selected, to minimize potentially conflicting land use activities between Settlement and non-Settlement Land.</p>	<p>Bill to provide Monica with information on reasons/intent for TH Settlement Land parcel selections.</p>

Meeting adjourned for the day at 5:30pm.

Meeting reconvened on January 11 at 9:10am.

AGENDA TABS 3-7 FROM DECEMBER MEETING: PLAN ALTERNATIVES (continued)	
Creation of Round 3 Plan Alternatives (continued)	Action Items
The Commission continued creation of a series of new alternatives, trying a variety of different methods while maintaining focus on values in particular LMUs. Some “themes” were explored, including alternatives focused on: promoting the traditional economy and renewable resource industries; promoting the development of non-renewable resource industries; and protecting caribou habitat, relatively undisturbed natural landscapes (for climate change resilience), water, and fish habitat. As an experiment, the Commission also tried a “lightning round” approach where each of them took turns picking an LMU and deciding what to zone it. They also looked at some of the early alternatives created at the May stakeholder workshop, particularly the “balanced” option from consultant Tim Wilson’s group. Sam also reviewed the results using the Marxan computer modeling program, which showed key areas in the region where important values overlap (potential “conflict areas”).	
Decisions	Action Items
The Commission finalized and agreed on five alternatives that would be released to the public and Parties for comments and feedback (Alternatives A, B, C D, and E).	<p>Staff to use Alternatives A, B, C, D and E as basis for Plan Alternatives Information Package and public review period materials.</p> <p>Sam to generate new consequence table using these five alternatives.</p>

AGENDA TAB 8 FROM DECEMBER MEETING: PLAN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC RELEASE	
Review of draft communications strategy	Action Items
Kathy described the draft communications strategy she prepared (with Monica’s input) for the Plan Alternatives public release and one-month review period. This included key messages, advertising and media strategy, format of public events, and products and methods to be used during the public review period. The Commission also reviewed several draft communications materials (posters, mail-out postcards, information package layout, survey questions, etc.).	

Discussion	Action Items
<p>The Commission considered key messages and targeted questions based on: What are we asking people to do? What information could the public tell us that would be useful for our decision-making?</p> <p>Gillian asked whether White River First Nation (WRFN) was being contacted, as the last SLC meeting identified that the Commission should be keeping them “in the loop”. Monica said she has never received any written minutes, summaries of discussion, or specific direction to the Commission from any SLC meetings so far. It is imperative that if the SLC wants to give direction to the Commission, that they send official written direction and not expect that their messages will be passed to the Commission through TWG. She said WRFN is now on the list of stakeholders and receiving all updates, and she has spoken with Glenn Stephen (Lands Manager). WRFN was previously provided with a copy of the Resource Assessment Report, and are being kept informed about the planning process. There is a risk that if WRFN’s asserted traditional territory in the Dawson planning region becomes legally accepted, they could say they have not been adequately consulted on this plan, so the Commission needs to work now to make sure they stay informed. No additional direction has been received from YLUPC on this matter.</p> <p>Discussion about request at December stakeholder meeting (from almost all groups represented) that they receive the information package slightly earlier than when it’s released to the general public. Reason: staff from these organizations need time to review the material and prepare to answer questions from their membership.</p>	
Decisions	Action Items
<p>The Commission agreed staff should implement the communications strategy should be implemented, including scheduling and logistics for public meetings in Dawson and Whitehorse, and continue their current work on communications materials and the information package.</p>	<p>Staff implement communications strategy for public review period as written.</p> <p>Staff to make best efforts to release information package to stakeholders a few days before release to the general public.</p>

NEXT STEPS	
Plan Alternatives Public Review	Action Items
<p>The Commission discussed next steps towards public release of the plan alternatives, currently scheduled for January 31. A conference call will be scheduled around January 24 for the Commission to give their final approval on materials for public release. The review period will run from February 1 to March 2 – Commission members will attend the public meeting in their home community. Staff will attend both and TWG/YLUPC are also welcome to assist.</p>	
Other Activities	Action Items
<p>YLUPC recently notified the Commission about an upcoming conference, “Planning for Success”, on January 21-22 in Whitehorse. Scott has been asked to give a presentation updating people on DRPC work. Other Commission members may attend if available. Discussions have begun with Shawn Francis regarding a contract to develop potential cumulative effects indicators, and a conference call will be scheduled for later this month. The contract would be funded and administered by YLUPC.</p> <p>The next regular Commission meeting is scheduled for March 19-20, 2014 in Whitehorse.</p>	<p>Commission members to confirm availability for January 21-22 YLUPC conference.</p>

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.

Approval of Minutes for Regular Meeting #14 (January 10-11, 2014)

By Motion #2 at Regular Meeting #16 (April 15-17, 2014)



Chair



Acting Senior Planner

Date: April 15, 2014