

Dawson Regional Planning Commission
Regular Board Meeting Minutes
Meeting #15 (2013/2014)
March 19-20, 2014
Downtown Hotel Boardroom (Dawson City)

In Attendance					
<u>Dawson Regional Planning Commission (DRPC)</u> Scott Casselman - Chair (via Facetime) Roger Ellis - Member Chester Kelly - Member Will Fellers - Member Debbie Nagano - Member Monica Krieger – Acting Senior Planner Kathy Burden - Planning Technician	<u>Yukon Land Use Planning Council (YLUPC)</u> Sam Skinner - Senior Land Use Planner (via conference call)	<u>Yukon Government (YG)</u> Gillian McKee – Senior Land Use Planner, EMR <u>Tr’ondëk Hwëch’in (TH)</u> Bill Kendrick – Senior Land and Resources Officer/ Regional Planning Manager <u>Vuntut Gwitchin Government (VGG)</u> None	<u>Invited Guests</u> Janet Bell-MacDonald, Mining Recorder (YG-Energy Mines & Resources) Mike Sutor, Northern Regional Biologist (YG-Environment) Torrie Hunter, Manager-Field Operations (YG-Environment)	<u>Delegations by Request</u> Scott Herron, Canadian Wildlife Service (Environment Canada) Randy Clarkson, Klondike Placer Miners Association	<u>Observers</u> At various times throughout the meeting, at least eight different local Dawson residents were noted in attendance. TH staff also attended portions of the meeting.

Other Acronyms: CA – Conservation Area zone, CE – Cumulative Effects, IMA – Integrated Management Area zone, LDS – Land (Use) Designation System, LMU - Landscape Management Unit, PA – Protected Area zone, SLC – Senior Liaison Committee, TEA – Traditional Economy Area zone, TWG – Technical Working Group, VGG – Vuntut Gwitchin Government, YESAB – Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Board, YRC – Yukon River Corridor

Action Items: Status to be updated at next meeting.

Minutes prepared by: Monica Krieger, Acting Senior Planner

Will Fellers appointed Acting Chair for this meeting as Scott Casselman is joining via Facetime, and Internet connection may not be reliable.

Meeting called to order at 9:10am by Will Fellers, Acting Chair.

AGENDA TAB 1: THE BASICS	
Approval of Agenda	Action Items
Monica noted several changes to the draft agenda to accommodate guest speakers’ schedules. Janet Bell-MacDonald has agreed to postpone her March 19 presentation from 9:30am to 10:30am so that others flying in this morning can attend. YESAB (March	

<p>organizing guest speakers and other information for this meeting. She also continued work on the Final Recommended 2014-2015 Workplan and Budget (see agenda item in Tab 2).</p>	
<p>Reports from Commission Members</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Monica asked Commission members who attended the YLUPC “Planning for Success” conference (January 21-22 in Whitehorse) to provide an update on the proceedings. YLUPC has not yet finished the summary of discussion. The conference theme was how to improve regional land use planning in the Yukon. Scott gave a presentation on the Dawson planning process and the Commission’s experiences so far. Roger said there were very interesting small group discussions. Many First Nations were represented, including some who have unsettled land claims (e.g. White River First Nation and Ross River Dena Council) where it is unclear how they are to participate in regional planning. Debbie added that the YG announcement about approving their modified version of the Peel Watershed plan came on the second day of the conference, and was a major topic of discussion. Bill added the conference also emphasized how YLUPC could help improve the process.</p> <p>Several Commission members also attended the “Traditional Economy and Land Use Planning” workshop (March 4-5 in Dawson). This is discussed under Tab 7.</p>	
<p>Correspondence and Media</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>All correspondence in this tab is related to the Plan Alternatives public review period (wide variety of advertising and promotional materials, mailout cards, posters, interviews published in newspapers, radio interviews, and other media coverage). Several of the newspaper articles were misleading or contained errors in information (e.g. suggesting this was the Draft Plan), and corrections will be submitted to the editors and/or clarified in further press releases about the What We Heard report.</p> <p>Other correspondence consists of e-mails regarding communications with trappers in the region. There has been extensive discussion via e-mail and phone by Commission, staff and TWG on this topic. Monica has researched to the best of her ability why the Yukon Trappers Association (YTA) was on the initial invitation list for stakeholder workshops but later removed, and will note this in a letter. YTA has been added back on the stakeholder list and will be invited to future workshops, but the Commission cannot resolve issues around why people choose to be members (or not) of particular stakeholder organizations. The Commission feels they have made extensive communications efforts recently, and individual trappers who are not members of the YTA still have many opportunities to be involved in the process as a member of the public (some trappers submitted feedback on the plan alternatives in this way). Monica has requested contact information for trappers in the region from Helen Slama (YG-Fur Industry Specialist), but it is protected under the Privacy Act and can only be released if they give Helen permission. Any contacts received will be added to the DRPC mailing list to receive future updates.</p> <p>Correspondence on other topics is included under other tabs.</p>	<p>Monica to write letter(s) to Yukon Trappers Association and other appropriate individuals regarding YTA involvement as stakeholders in the planning process, and reiterating how individual trappers can stay informed and involved.</p>

<p>staff as well as additional contract support) would be required to help DRPC staff. The budget also noted that YLUPC would pay for the costs for the DRPC 2013-2014 audit, and continue to provide full financial administration services through Heidi Faults.</p>	<p>contract support.</p>
<p>Update on status of sixth Commission member appointment</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Discussion about February 11th letter (confidential) from Chief Eddie Taylor (TH) to Minister Scott Kent (YG) regarding the proposed YG nominee for the sixth Commission member. TH was not in agreement with YG’s suggested nominee. According to Chapter 11, Parties are to attempt to reach consensus on prospective nominees. Bill added that a second name had now been proposed by YG, and TH was in the process of responding.</p>	

<p>GUEST SPEAKER: JANET BELL-MACDONALD (Dawson Mining Recorder, YG-Energy Mines & Resources)</p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Janet was invited to speak to the Commission about the existing regulatory regime for placer and quartz mining, and new changes such as notification of Class 1 activities and Special Operating Area provisions. She gave a series of Power Point presentations and handouts (available on DRPC website) on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 1 of Quartz Mining Act and Part 1 of Placer Mining Act • Part 2 of Quartz Mining Act and Part 2 of Placer Mining Act • Class 1 Notification – recent amendments to Quartz and Placer Mining Acts • Placer operations class criteria and operating conditions • Quartz operations class criteria and operating conditions <p>Janet noted this is a very brief overview of the legislation she works with every day, and that it generally takes about two years for new staff to really learn and become familiar with it. Both the Quartz Mining Act (QMA) and Placer Mining Act (PMA) have been in place for about 100 years. Part 1 of both Acts are the original parts, and deal with how to obtain mineral title and keep it in good standing. Part 2 of both Acts became effective in December 1998, and applies environmental (and to some extent socio-economic) standards and reclamation requirements. For the classes of operations, Class 2 is not used much anymore. It allowed more work to take place than in Class 1 but still had confidentiality. With YESAB, all projects except Class 1 became public so this became less of an issue. Placer operations up to Class 3 cover anything that does not require a water licence. The operating conditions give you an understanding of what activities can happen under different classes and what is required. She emphasized that every operation requires reclamation, no matter what the class.</p> <p>The only quartz leases in the Dawson Planning Region are at Brewery Creek. Early stages of quartz exploration involve staking of large areas, but not all are being worked. As the project evolves, the level of intensity increases but the footprint decreases, and there is a substantial investment in infrastructure. Water licences for placer and quartz operations are issued by the Yukon Water Board. The PMA is very specific that <u>any</u> discharge of waste requires a licence, where the QMA is more lenient.</p> <p>YG’s Department of Energy Mines & Resources, Mineral Resources Branch is responsible for development of legislation, serving as decision bodies for YESAB project assessments, and issuing Mining Land Use approvals. The Yukon Water Board has jurisdiction for Class 4 placer operations. YG’s Department of Client Services & Inspections (now called Compliance,</p>	

<p>Monitoring & Inspections) is responsible for enforcement of terms and conditions of mining licences and permits, and is also delegated to deal with requirements under the federal Fisheries Act and Yukon Environment Act and Heritage Resources Act.</p> <p>Janet explained the new amendments to the QMA and PMA as a result of the Ross River Dena Council court case, where it is now mandatory to provide notification of Class 1 activities. This became effective December 20, 2013 so is still very new legislation and only two projects so far have gone through the process. The amendments also provide YG the authority to designate areas where notification would be required, to establish special operating areas through regulations, and to require security on Class 1 projects. This may apply in some areas of the Peel region (e.g. grandfathered rights that are now within a protected area), and could be used as a management tool in the Dawson plan (e.g. additional restrictions on when things can happen or reclamation requirements).</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	
<p>Clarification about some terms in the legislation, such as “curtilage” - this refers to the used area of a dwelling (mowed lawn, sheds, fenced areas, etc.). Discussion about what happens when someone is not in compliance – a sliding scale of enforcement is used (education, encouragement, enforcement). There are no summary convictions under the Acts – this means there are no tickets or fines issued, it goes directly to pressing charges and into the courts.</p> <p>Discussion of Class 1 notification - goes to First Nations and YG departments of Tourism, Heritage and Environment. It could be thought of as “YESAA lite” – there is no public review but it generates the same kind of comments. There is a 25-day notification period that can be extended by the Chief of Mining Land Use (generally thought this would happen in response to First Nations concerns). Janet noted that this does represent additional workload for current staff. Because it is still new, they have been able to handle it, but YG-Compliance, Monitoring & Inspections will need greater capacity as the number of projects with these conditions increases.</p> <p>Janet thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak with them, and encouraged them to contact her anytime if they have questions or need more information.</p>	

<p>AGENDA TAB 3: PLAN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC REVIEW: WHAT WE HEARD (GENERAL REFLECTIONS)</p>	
<p>General reflections on public review period</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Monica asked the Commission and TWG members for their general thoughts on the Plan Alternatives public review period (Feb 2-Mar 3, 2014), including effectiveness of communications strategies and any recommendations on changes for the Draft Plan public review period. Staff noted that all the feedback received was well thought out and very useful, and will be helpful for decision-making. The feedback also showed very disparate views, from one end of the spectrum to the other. Some people said all the alternatives were too conservation-focused, others said they were too development-focused. Lots of feedback focused on the proposed zones, and many said it was difficult to provide specific comments or opinions when things weren’t well defined yet. Wide range of communications materials and formats were used and will be documented in the What We Heard report. Format of public meetings was unique (10am-8pm, with scheduled presentations at 12, 5 and 7pm followed by recorded question &</p>	

<p>answer sessions; rest of the time was open house-style format). Good turnout at both meetings in Whitehorse and Dawson. People mostly came at the scheduled presentation times, but people uncomfortable with public speaking and microphones also appreciated the opportunity to talk one-on-one with staff and Commission. Kathy noted responses to online survey question: top two ways people heard about the review period were “word of mouth” and “from an organization I belong to”. Staff efforts to work with stakeholder organizations to get the word out to larger groups were successful and are ongoing, and all people who submitted comments are now on our regular mailing list for updates.</p> <p>Specific ideas and suggested improvements for the Draft Plan stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand on “word of mouth” opportunities, particularly use of Facebook and local contacts to help spread the word. • Longer review period (Monica confirmed that it will be at least two months for the Draft Plan). • Posters and newspaper ads were throughout Dawson and Whitehorse, and mailout cards went in every Dawson mailbox (as well as stacks of cards in key locations around Whitehorse); suggestion that mailout cards could go to every Whitehorse mailbox as well, or if limited funds at least mail to TH citizens living outside of Dawson. List could be obtained from TH. • People liked the information package, particularly its plain language and visual materials, but it was still an overwhelming amount of information to process in a short time and then provide comments. Debbie suggested that more focus be placed on radio and other audio forms of communicating the content, vs. printed reading materials. • Kathy suggested the public meetings should be held at the beginning of the review period, providing more time for people to digest the information and ask questions before the deadline for comments. • Newsletters or brochures could be distributed to mailboxes and around town with highlights of the Draft Plan. Monica said that the Dawson Chamber of Commerce and the Yukon Chamber of Mines also included notices about the review period in their newsletters – other organizations could be approached to do this as well (e.g. local MLA, YG depts.). • Fact sheets and/or larger posters showing where the regional land use planning process comes from (i.e. expand on “Why We Were Created” section that was in the Plan Alternatives package, highlight Chapter 11 of Final Agreements). • Keep combination format for public meetings, and possibly schedule an additional presentation at 3pm. Also noted the possibility that more people will be interested in the Draft Plan, so the meetings could be busier. Monica noted there will also be a public meeting in Old Crow for the Draft Plan stage. • Recording of public meetings was a good idea and should continue, as those unable to attend can read the transcripts. One observer also noted it was an important way to accurately record the oral testimony of elders (e.g. much was said by elders throughout the Peel planning process but never recorded). • More media coverage – there was a press release, several radio interviews, and several newspaper articles but this could be expanded upon through focused interviews. Also should request to review the draft article before it is released, to avoid errors and misleading information (e.g. some articles stated the Plan Alternatives were actually the Draft Plan). 	
<p>Overview of What We Heard report</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Monica presented an outline of the Plan Alternatives: What We Heard report. It will again be a plain-language and highly visual document, targeting the general public audience and stakeholder organizations. It will be organized into five main sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background (how we got to the Plan Alternatives, why we asked people for feedback, purpose of report, where we’re at 	<p>Staff to continue work on the Plan Alternatives: What We Heard report as</p>

<p>in the planning process, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What We Did (document all communications efforts during the official review period and immediately before & after; how we told people we wanted their feedback; all the different ways people could get their feedback to us) • What We Heard (summary of all responses received through online survey forms, written survey forms, letters from individuals, letters from organizations, comments recorded at public meetings, comments recorded at the elders’ meeting, and comments noted by staff from people who came to the office, called or e-mailed). Description of how we analyzed and organized the data (e.g. the survey responses will be organized by question, and the other letters that didn’t follow the survey question outline will be organized by topic). • Next Steps (how the Commission will use this feedback; when the Draft Plan will be done and what it will look like; future opportunities for feedback and how people can stay involved in the process; remaining steps in the planning process) • Appendices (all feedback submissions received, unless we were asked to keep it confidential; transcripts from both public meetings; additional notes from staff) 	<p>outlined.</p>
--	------------------

<p>AGENDA TAB 4: LAND USE DESIGNATION SYSTEM – CUMULATIVE EFFECTS INDICATORS AND LEVELS</p>	
<p>Review of contract between YLUPC and Shawn Francis + work to date</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Sam Skinner (Senior Planner, YLUPC) gave a PowerPoint presentation (available on the DRPC website) summarizing the contract between YLUPC and Shawn Francis (S. Francis Consulting Inc.) to develop futuring scenarios and possible cumulative effects (CE) indicator levels for the Dawson planning region. Shawn was the Senior Planner for the North Yukon Regional Land Use Plan, and was also involved in the latter stages of the Peel Watershed process. Sam is working closely with Shawn on this project.</p> <p>Sam gave an overview of the role of cumulative effects indicators and levels in other regional plans, such as the North Yukon where it was used to differentiate between the Integrated Management Area zones (IMA-I to IMA-IV). In particular, cumulative effects monitoring and management establishes landscape-level management objectives and manages effects of multiple projects. It is integrated with individual project assessments conducted by YESAB through the use of conformity checks (does a project “conform” to the management objectives and levels of activity established in the regional plan?).</p> <p>Land use designation systems (the zones) are a general expression of management intent. Zones can be prescriptive (list activities allowed and not allowed); flexibly prescriptive (all activities are allowed provided they meet specific objectives, or a “tiered” approach where additional restrictions kick in after some CE level is exceeded); or more vague (existing legislation and regulations apply but no additional conditions). Sam noted that a prescriptive approach is simpler but doesn’t address CE concerns, and may introduce restrictions in some places where they are unnecessary.</p> <p>A wide variety of ecological and socio-economic CE indicators are available (e.g. amount of habitat or surface disturbance). Human feature mapping is the basis for most habitat-related indicators and approaches. Population-related indicators (e.g. caribou herd counts) are challenging and expensive to monitor. For the North Yukon plan, CE indicators were used to describe</p>	

<p>disturbance or development limits for each of the IMA zones. They were developed by modeling potential future oil and gas activity in Eagle Plains and considering the risk to caribou, moose and socio-economic objectives. Surface disturbance (measured as %) is the amount of the LMU disturbed, such as by clearing trees. Linear density (measured as # km per km²) is how many kilometers of roads, seismic lines, and other linear features are present in the LMU. **Important note: the North Yukon indicator levels were never intended to be used across all Yukon planning regions.</p> <p>For the Dawson plan, Shawn and Sam will build “futuring” scenarios for the four main industries in the region that have the potential to cause major landscape changes – placer, hard rock, forestry, and oil & gas (transportation considerations will be incorporated into each). The scenarios will look about 20 years into the future, and ask for “expert opinion” (YG staff and key stakeholder group representatives) about plausible developments that could happen in the Dawson region – what could happen and where. A low, medium and high growth scenario will be developed for each industry. Maps will be developed showing high and low growth scenarios for each sector, and overlaid on top of key values such as caribou habitat to examine potential impacts of cumulative future land use. “Packages” of CE indicator levels will be developed for the Commission to consider, with the risks and benefits described for each.</p> <p>The scenario-building work is underway. Shawn and Sam held technical sessions with YG staff (March 12-13) and will now circulate the results to representatives from the Klondike Placer Miners Association, Yukon Chamber of Mines, Yukon Prospectors Association, Yukon Wood Products Association and other key individuals for their input.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Discussion about what makes a “good” CE indicator – caribou were used as an example, because they are very sensitive to CE and landscape disturbance, and because we have good mapped habitat data throughout the region (vs. grizzly bears, for example, which are also sensitive to disturbance but less or inconsistent mapping of key habitat areas).</p> <p>Question about whether the size of the LMU makes a difference when calculating surface disturbance – Sam replied that using % of LMU compensates for the range of LMU sizes. For example, a 1% limit in a 1000 km² LMU would be 10 km² of surface disturbance allowed, vs. a 1% limit in a 100 km² LMU would be 1 km². Larger LMUs give you more flexibility – the disturbance could be concentrated in one corner or more spread throughout. The Commission could also merge adjacent LMUs that end up with the same designation.</p> <p>Discussion about how reclamation and natural disturbances such as forest fires are factored into CE calculations. For example, YG-Forest Management Branch raised the issue that regeneration and harvesting methods can emulate natural disturbance, and reclamation for placer mining could be seen the same way.</p>	

GUEST SPEAKER: TORRIE HUNTER (Manager, Field Operations-North, YG-Dept. of Environment)	
Overview	Action Items
<p>The local Conservation Officer Services Branch was invited to speak to the Commission about the existing legislation and regulatory regime that they work with, management tools and strategies, monitoring and reporting requirements, and current enforcement capacity in the Dawson region. As well, the Commission asked to hear about the department’s experience implementing provisions of other management plans, and any other suggestions or ideas for the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Torrie Hunter introduced himself as the Senior Conservation Officer who has been in Dawson for over 20 years. He and his staff are responsible for enforcing the Wildlife Act, Environment Act, some federal regulations around fish and wildlife, and some Lands Act provisions. He gave an overview of the Dempster Highway Development Area Regulations, which apply to a corridor 8km on either side of the highway from Km 68 to the NWT border. Any development or use of motorized vehicles (except snowmobiles) requires an authorization under the Area Development Act (Deputy Minister of Environment has authority). That Act has weak powers of inspection and seizure, and the maximum fine for a violation is \$200. It was created in 1978 and never amended. It does apply to the entire Yukon and could be used in other areas to manage land use (the Executive Council Office can designate areas as Development Areas).</p> <p>The Wildlife Act also has some vehicle restrictions, but they are related directly to hunting (e.g. the Cultus Bay Road in Kluane country, where ATV hunters can only go so far on the road but miners or other non-hunters can keep going). There are provisions for closures for sheep habitat protection reasons, although these closures don’t apply to trappers. Other access provisions are primarily related to concerns about ATV access into alpine areas, and there is the potential for Yukon-wide off-road vehicle legislation (Dan Reynolds noted that the Yukon Outfitters Association is working with YG to draft these regulations).</p>	
Discussion	Action Items
<p>Question regarding mining roads as access points for hunters, and potential solutions to reduce that concern - Torrie replied that corridors can be put in place where no hunting is allowed within a set distance from the road. Some roads can be gated and the proponent has the mandate to limit access. Specific areas could be closed to hunting if the concern is overharvesting. Several people noted that most access roads in the Dawson region have been around for years, and the bigger concern is new roads into undeveloped areas.</p> <p>Question whether the management provisions for the Dempster Highway are successful in managing wildlife habitat and harvesting – Torrie replied there is an extra layer of permitting involved (need permits from the Area Development Officer), and there is pressure to make any egress points off the highway public roads (to decrease hunting pressure right along the highway). For example, the Hart River road has more pressure now and is starting to see more environmental degradation. Another example is the development of the road into Madsen Creek, where hunting restrictions were put in place to protect moose, but there were so many other access points into the area it was later found to be unnecessary. Areas such as the Canol Road where there is only one access route can lead to locally extirpated wildlife populations. The department encourages changes to hunter behavior, e.g. flying out for moose hunting.</p>	

<p>Question whether the enforcement capacity is sufficient – Torrie replied there are limited funds (about \$30,000 annual flying budget for the entire Yukon), and there is limited ability to patrol remote areas although they do get out using boats and ATVs. The Conservation Officers go where people go, and they often rely on outfitters to provide them with information for the more remote areas. The anonymous Turn in Poachers and Polluters (T.I.P.P.) line is also a good source of information.</p> <p>Torrie thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak with them, and encouraged them to contact him anytime if they have questions or need more information.</p>	
--	--

AGENDA TAB 5: DELEGATION - SCOTT HERRON (Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada)	
Overview	Action Items
<p>Scott requested to speak to the Commission about the Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) submission for the Plan Alternatives public review (available on the DRPC website), as well as to offer additional suggestions and considerations for the Draft Plan. Scott has been highly involved in the DRPC process and often attends Commission meetings, and CWS is on the Commission’s list of key stakeholders for workshops and other events.</p> <p>To develop the CWS submission, Scott held an internal workshop to look at the Commission’s alternatives. He found it interesting that a lot of people were not well aware of the Commission’s mandate or the history of regional land use planning in the Yukon. The group looked at maps of values in the region, and went through a similar exercise that the Commission did when creating its alternatives. The CWS “recommended alternative” ended up being very balanced, and Scott said there was more recognition of economic values than he was expecting from people who worked for a conservation organization. The workshop was four hours long, and was very valuable in teaching people how difficult it is to create a balanced plan, and what regional land use plans can and can’t do. He suggested there is real potential in using this type of exercise for future Commissions (or this one). The CWS submission put forward the “best possible” alternative they’d like to see, rather than taking the more positional stance that is typical of the Parties. Some self-censorship is therefore built into this compromise option – which areas would we be prepared to “give up”? Flexibility is also built in by offering several suggestions for splitting LMUs.</p> <p>The CWS submission noted that the Dawson planning region falls within Environment Canada’s Bird Conservation Region #4 (BCR4), Northwestern Interior Forest. CWS released a bird conservation strategy for BCR4 in March 2013 which identifies “priority species” and “priority habitats”. In the Dawson planning region, the priority habitats for wetlands, lakes, lowland riparian spruce, subalpine shrub, flood plains, and gravel bars. Wetlands, and riparian areas in general, are important seasonally for migratory birds as well as year-round habitat for many species (as well as having ecological values).</p> <p>Scott noted there is a discrepancy in YG standards regarding management in riparian areas – forestry has a shorter term impact, and there is no transfer of land title (management authority is retained by YG) vs. agriculture and residential activities which are permanent dispositions. He feels it is important to have a consistent approach, and forestry standards should be the minimum or benchmark. The Commission can play a role in “evening the playing field” across all sectors.</p> <p>CWS also feels that protected areas are the only real way to provide certainty on what will happen after the planning process, and</p>	

<p>any areas the Commission identifies should be places where they feel strongly that legislative certainty is required, and can provide a legitimate rationale for why that area needs protection. The Commission can also recommend specific types of protected areas.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	
<p>Question whether the BCR is the equivalent of a federal management plan – Scott replied no, it is meant as an overview and then the partners are expected to work together.</p> <p>Randy Clarkson (KPMA) noted that forestry regulations wouldn't necessarily work with the placer industry, because the resource is usually located right near riparian areas (vs. forest operations which can “move over”). He also asked whether the CWS group understood the reclamation requirements for the placer industry, that IMA-IV doesn't necessarily mean it becomes a “moonscape”. Scott replied yes, and that many of their staff also had involvement in the development of best management practices for various industries.</p> <p>Scott Casselman thanked Scott and CWS for the comprehensive and useful information in their submission, and noted the Commission appreciates the attempt to find a “balanced” approach. He also said the plan will recommend best management practices for activities in all riparian areas.</p> <p>Scott thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak with them, and encouraged them to contact him anytime if they have questions or need more information.</p>	

<p>GENERAL DISCUSSION</p>	
	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Gillian gave a demonstration of some recent work (still in development) by YG to overlay maps of values in the Dawson planning region, using satellite images as the base layer. The Commission agreed this was a very useful visual tool, and liked the ability to turn different layers on and off. Monica said it is very similar to what Sam has been developing with the YLUPC Planning Atlas, and allows the Commission to view the most up-to-date information (e.g. current quartz claims). It was agreed that more refined versions of this GIS mapping tool will be available to use at future Commission meetings. It was noted there is still lots of uncertainty (e.g. big deposits have been found where there was no previous activity).</p> <p>Dan Reynolds (meeting observer) stated that overlaps between staking activity and sheep habitat are critical – most work is being done in April and May, right when sheep are calving and most sensitive to disturbance. Seasonal closures would put everyone under the same rules-you wouldn't have people trying to “beat” somebody else to it by going out in the spring instead of the summer. Staking can happen 365 days a year, and it is better to use management tools than make areas off limits entirely. Protected areas force you to choose “most important” habitat vs. habitat elsewhere which gets no protection, whereas seasonal closures or other tools (e.g. special operating conditions for projects in identified areas) can better protect species across their entire range. YG has no authority to enforce air restrictions, it is Transport Canada jurisdiction. For considerations around off-road vehicle restrictions, need to understand that outfitters often need ATVs to get the meat out from remote camps or hunting</p>	

sites. Concerns re: ATVs could be addressed with licenses/permits/monitoring, rather than making areas completely off limits.	
---	--

AGENDA TAB 3: PLAN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC REVIEW: WHAT WE HEARD (DECISION FRAMEWORK AND EVALUATION CRITERIA)	
	Action Items
Monica suggested that in the interests of time, this item could be combined with the discussion after Randy Clarkson’s presentation on the morning of Day 2. A large portion of the KPMA submission on the Plan Alternatives focused on technical issues and concerns about the methodology used for the decision framework and evaluation criteria. The Commission agreed.	

Meeting adjourned for the day at 5:00pm.

Meeting reconvened on March 20th at 9:05am.

DELEGATION: RANDY CLARKSON (Klondike Placer Miners Association)	
Overview	Action Items
<p>Randy requested to speak to the Commission about the Klondike Placer Miners Association (KPMA) submission for the Plan Alternatives public review, as well as to offer additional suggestions and considerations for the Draft Plan. He gave a Power Point presentation (available on DRPC website) that highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History of KPMA and who it represents • Differences between historical mining practices and the modern placer mining industry (particularly the extensive legislation and regulations which now apply) • Examples and pictures of reclaimed placer mines, restored stream diversions, and enhanced wetlands • Why the Dawson regional plan will have a dramatic impact on the placer industry • Specific comments and concerns about the Plan Alternatives, draft Land Use Designation System, and decision framework/evaluation criteria released for public review in February <p>Randy emphasized that placer mining is an important part of the Yukon identity, particularly in the Dawson region, and the outcomes of the regional plan are very important. Placer mines are the “family farm of the north”, and have been the most reliable generator of wealth and employment for over 130 years. Placer mining has come a long way since the dredging era and operations in the 1970s-80s (e.g. there has been a 90% reduction in sediment to streams and 97% compliance with water licenses). It is already a heavily regulated and heavily inspected industry, and has demonstrated successful reclamation practices (mined areas aren’t “write-offs”, and with active reclamation and natural succession they can have productive or even enhanced wildlife habitat again).</p> <p>It’s difficult to know where future placer deposits will be located, so the plan needs to allow for expansion opportunities. For the past 100 years, the same ground or extensions of it have been mined, but the industry needs to move to new areas to stay alive.</p>	

<p>For example, the White Gold deposit wasn't known 10 years ago. The Yukon River Corridor is an essential highway, and miners report that tourists are using barge landings and old cabin sites along the river for campgrounds. The river corridor should remain open for development with minor buffers (50m) to protect viewsapes for canoeists. Additional restrictions on staking will lead to a further reduction in investor confidence in the Yukon mining industry (international companies don't differentiate between staking withdrawals in the Ross River area and the entire Yukon). The placer industry has a very short season and often cannot operate with timing or seasonal limitations.</p> <p>Randy praised the Commission for its use of the structured decision framework process. It has excellent potential to provide a fairer, more realistic and balanced approach to land use planning and could be very useful for future Commissions as well. However, many resource and values maps have incomplete mapped data, and he has concerns with the weighting that was applied for certain land use designations (e.g. a high development area doesn't necessarily mean there is zero wildlife habitat). He suggested that the evaluation needs to be redone with more realistic ranking measures applied, to ensure the Commission can confidently compare the performance of alternatives across all the criteria.</p> <p>Randy acknowledged the hard work so far by the Commission and its staff, the opportunities for input and feedback to the process, as well as the difficult decisions that need to be made. KPMA feels that additional time should be given to the planning process, given the huge implications of the decisions that are being made.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	
<p>Discussion about KPMA's concerns with the ranking factors used in the decision framework. Will noted it is a useless tool if it doesn't accurately reflect the differences between alternatives, which was its purpose. Staff noted that Sam has had extensive discussions with Randy and others regarding the methodology that he used for the calculations. The concerns are not incorrect, but it's important to remember that the tool measures the <u>relative</u> performance of alternatives compared to each other, and was never designed to be a completely accurate calculation of how much caribou habitat would be impacted in an LMU zoned IMA-IV, for example. Sam and staff do recognize there are opportunities for improvement, and will be revisiting it before the Draft Plan. Debbie emphasized it was always just one tool the Commission could use, but was not the only way they were going to make their decisions. Sebastian Jones (meeting observer) noted this was a very thought-provoking presentation, and asked if it could be posted on the DRPC website for others to see. He also noted that the Land Designation System in land use plans states the priority for particular LMUs, not everything that will or won't occur on the landscape.</p> <p>Gillian asked about examples of wildlife timing windows and how they could impact mining operations. Randy replied there are no-fly zones for raptor nesting areas, temporary stop work orders for when caribou are passing through an area, etc. Sometimes these measures are plausible, other times they mean a diversion of work or a complete shutdown of operations. Depending on how long they last, they can mean a project becomes non-economical.</p> <p>Questions regarding inspections, enforcement and compliance – Randy stated there is a very high percentage for compliance within the industry. The 3-step enforcement system described earlier by Janet Bell-MacDonald (education, encouragement, enforcement) is very good. Water licenses are so complex, many operators don't do their own applications so don't understand what licenses say is allowed or not. The Yukon is the most heavily inspected area he knows about (vs. Alaska which is mostly</p>	<p>Staff to post all guest speaker presentations on the website along with meeting minutes when completed.</p>

<p>complaint-driven and fly-over only). Will Fellers and Neil Favron (meeting observer) agreed that for their placer operations, inspections occur at least once a month. There are also unscheduled inspections, where the Natural Resource Officers “stop in” if they happen to be on the road looking at something else. Randy added some legislation and regulations don’t fulfill their purpose – for example, the Migratory Birds Act is actually counter-productive. You can’t clear after May because it’s possible seasonal bird habitat, so people actually clear more before May just in case they need it.</p> <p>Randy thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak to them, and everyone agreed this was a very useful discussion.</p>	
---	--

<p>TH “TRADITIONAL ECONOMY AND LAND USE PLANNING” WORKSHOP (MARCH 4-5, 2014)</p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Discussion about the recent TH workshop that several Commission members attended, including main outcomes and specific recommendations. A large portion of the feedback received on the Plan Alternatives had comments about the proposed Traditional Economy Area (TEA) zone, and the Commission hoped this conference would give them additional ideas about how to incorporate Traditional Economy concepts and considerations into the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Bill stated that the summary of discussion was not completed yet, but did play a CBC News clip about the conference for those who weren’t in attendance. Monica asked Commission members who were there to give their thoughts on the conference.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Scott said he has a better understanding of traditional values and traditional pursuits, and that the concept is applicable to both First Nations and non-First Nations (e.g. hunting, trapping, berry picking, traveling on the land, etc.). He also emphasized that it’s about modernizing traditional pursuits, by bringing them into the modern economy through tourism, forestry and agricultural pursuits. He added that agriculture is a bit contentious, and the focus would have to be better defined (i.e. only small-scale, no major applications or land dispositions). There is a strong desire for less roads and no mining activity within areas that would be designated TEA (e.g. winter trails only for forestry, use of existing trails and roads vs. creation of new ones), and the conference emphasized the importance of passing traditional skills on to youth and the next generation. He noted that traditional pursuits are possible throughout the planning region, and would not be restricted even if there is no TEA zone.</p> <p>Debbie said there were about 30 participants, and five facilitators for the small group discussions. Chester added there were elders from Dawson and Mayo, and it was important to hear their perspectives about the history and values on the land that need to be kept. This knowledge is being lost with the passing of elders. Bill clarified that the conference was designed as an introduction to the topic and also involved lands staff and planners from various First Nations. Traditional Economy is not just about renewable resource harvest, there is a social component (particularly for areas close to town), and TH is planning a broader workshop with stakeholders and the public in the fall. Bill Trerice has been researching stewardship, how it was done in the past, and the impacts of disease on traditional practices and was one of the main speakers at the conference.</p>	

AGENDA TAB 3: PLAN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC REVIEW: WHAT WE HEARD (LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM)	
Overview	Action Items
<p>Monica asked the Commission for their current thoughts on the Land Designation System (LDS), given the specific comments and feedback received about it for the Plan Alternatives as well as the TE conference and the expected results from the CE work.</p>	
Discussion	Action Items
<p>Scott said his preference is to make the LDS simpler, perhaps with an Integrated Management Area (IMA) zone where it is business as usual, and a second IMA zone with additional restrictions based on the values in some LMUs. Will agreed, saying there are too many shades of gray and we need to consider consistency with the zones of other Yukon planning regions. Chester noted the differences between zones need to be better defined, and some LMUs boundaries should also be reconsidered for things like viewscapes.</p> <p>Much of the feedback focused on the Traditional Economy Area (TEA) zone. Some people seemed to think the name implied that it was a new type of Settlement Land where the First Nation would have authority over land use, and all non-First Nations land users would be excluded. The word “traditional” seemed to be key with this misconception (e.g. people associate it with Traditional Territory, Traditional Knowledge, etc.). Others noted that placer mining could be considered a “traditional” activity in the Dawson region too. Changing the name to Renewable Resource Area would not really be accurate either, because it doesn’t capture the infrastructure and stewardship components of the Traditional Economy the way TH has defined it. A suggestion was that land use within a TEA zone could be considered similar to a trapping concession, i.e. temporary and conditional lease vs. titled land, which tends to keep activities small-scale. Debbie said more emphasis needs to go towards teaching people the meaning of “traditional” vs. focusing on the negative. Many people saw a TEA zone as unnecessary, or were unclear what it was supposed to accomplish (e.g. if it is for habitat protection, it doesn’t make sense if forestry and agriculture are allowed).</p> <p>Numerous respondents commented it was difficult to distinguish the differences between TEA, Conservation Area, and IMA-II zones, the management intent seemed to be similar. The IMA zones has too big of a range, many people said the simpler, the better. The Commission should recognize that even in IMA-IV (highest development), some conservation can occur because of existing legislation, regulations, best management practices, and corporate social responsibility. IMA-IV zones should not be discounted as “wastelands”. The Community Area requires better definition, both the boundaries and the intent. Some conservation organizations noted their preference for a true Protected Area vs. a Conservation Area. This is important if the area is meant to serve as an ecological benchmark. Smaller areas zoned PA with a compelling reason for protection may be a preferable option vs. entire LMUs.</p> <p>Discussion about potential for sub-regional planning in the multi-use Yukon River Corridor – Gillian said the level of detail and information required might be too much for the Commission mandate. Would need to consider viewscapes, provisions for landings and access routes, conservation of the Boreal Low ecosystem, areas with high potential for cultural and heritage values, wildlife timing windows (e.g. bird nesting locations), etc. Discussion whether a sub-regional plan could be done for the entire Yukon River, with sections completed after each regional plan, or would one large planning process for the river make more</p>	

<p>sense? Consistency would be important along the entire river corridor (e.g. limits on number of canoes, landings, etc. couldn't change from one planning region to the other as people were floating down the river). The Commission could also recommend that a sub-regional plan be completed, with interim measures and recommendations in place until finished. Scott noted that recommendations regarding riparian zones are already included as typical terms and conditions of land use permits and placer authorizations. Also, there are requirements for heritage resource assessments in areas with high potential for heritage sites, and other provisions within existing legislation to address concerns about potential damage of sites.</p> <p>Will stated that the reasons for TH selection of settlement land parcels would be useful to help the Commission decide on zoning, and he believed this information had been requested at the last meeting.</p>	
<p>General Discussion re: Cumulative Effects (CE)</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>The remainder of the discussion focused on CE, and how CE indicators and levels could potentially be used to differentiate between the IMA zones. Monica noted this contract was delayed getting started, so the results would not be available for Commission consideration until May, which has implications for Commission decisions (this was noted in the 2014-14 Final Recommended Workplan and Budget cover letter). Debbie said the Commission should be more involved in the CE work, not just provided with the results. Gillian said she had some concerns with the methodology, as CE assessment and monitoring is not just about mapping the physical footprint (surface disturbance). Additional discussions with TWG would be useful. Scott noted that Shawn would not be telling the Commission what to do with the information, and there is no “cut & dry” method for doing CE work.</p> <p>The “futuring” scenarios look at what to expect 20 years from now based on current knowledge. For example, the average population growth in the Yukon is about 2%. For Dawson that would mean a growth in population from ~1300 to ~2000 in 20 years. Would that increase the pressure on the environment? Some people asked why caribou are the indicators used – why not grizzly bear or sheep? Caribou seem to be most affected by cumulative effects and the most CE research has been done on caribou (but mostly for woodland caribou in Alberta and barren ground caribou in the NWT). Scott Herron noted that during the North Yukon planning process, a working group was established with various agencies (monies originally allocated for the Kaska traditional territory, looking at ecological and socio-economic components, were available as the project had fallen through). Caribou were chosen as the valued ecological component for that study. The work of Fiona Schmiegelow (University of Alberta and Yukon College instructor) was noted as potentially useful.</p> <p>Gillian emphasized that developing CE indicators and levels for the Dawson plan would be based on the assumption that CE is a concern in the region, and that it needs to be measured and limited. If the “futuring” scenarios show otherwise, using CE indicators and levels might not be the best way to differentiate between the zones. The Commission could still make recommendations for more research to develop better CE indicators and have ongoing monitoring in case the situation changed. She also questioned whether natural disturbance (e.g. forest fires or beetle kill) would count as functional disturbance (the same as anthropogenic clearing through forest industry activity). Scott C. also questioned when an area would be considered reclaimed enough to be subtracted or “come off” the total amount of surface disturbance.</p> <p>Will said that if the 20-year projections for some industries in the region are so low (e.g. less than 2% additional surface</p>	

<p>disturbance expected), perhaps CE levels will not be necessary. Other management tools and strategies might suffice. He suggested that visual presentations of past and present land use and landscape change might also be useful to explain CE concepts.</p>	
---	--

<p>GUEST SPEAKER: MIKE SUITOR (Northern Regional Biologist, YG-Department of Environment)</p>	
<p>Overview</p>	<p>Action Items</p>
<p>Mike was invited to speak to the Commission about the existing legislation and regulatory regime, management tools and strategies, and wildlife monitoring and reporting requirements in the Dawson region. He was also asked to provide any recommendations for addressing concerns about the potential impacts of land use activities on important wildlife habitat, and to discuss his experience implementing provisions of other regional plans or management plans (including any suggestions for improving implementation).</p> <p>Mike introduced himself as the Regional Biologist for the past 1 ½ years. He gave a PowerPoint presentation (available on DRPC website) about the historical and current movements and habitat of the 40 Mile caribou herd. There was a spectacular population crash in 1960s-70s due mostly to poor harvest management on the Alaska side. International recovery planning efforts began in the mid-1990s, initiated by then-TH Chief Steve Taylor. Current population estimates are about 50-52,000 but a census will take place in Alaska this summer. YG staff are working more with Alaska managers now because of the recent movement back into the Yukon, they are in contact every couple of weeks and satellite collars are in place. The whole herd was in the Yukon in fall 2013, and a hunting closure was implemented on the Dempster Highway. Mike’s presentation showed maps of herd distribution from October to December 2013. Caribou were at Cache Creek, Blackstone uplands, Brewery Creek mine site, and other groups were in the South Klondike and Dawson Range. February 2014 they spent most of the winter here in South Tatonduk, Blackstone Uplands, South Klondike, Chandindu, Kaminak/Thistle Creek, and Ladue River area. The Nelchina caribou herd also pushed into the Yukon in big numbers the last couple years in similar locations. One caribou overwintered at Swede Creek last year, and others were at 60 Mile and Madsen Creek.</p> <p>Interviews with local people were conducted in the 1990s by previous Regional Biologist Dorothy Cooley and Janet MacDonald. They documented the historical locations of the 40 Mile herd back to the 1920s-30s. Stewart River and Dawson Range were preferred in the 1920s-30s, still there in the 1940s but also in the Goldfields, and later narrowed to 60 Mile/40 Mile area. The 40 Mile herd is probably the most important for Alaskans, they did comparable work and have a good idea of the big picture. The herd now seems to be moving back into many areas that it historically used. It is conceivable that the population could increase to ~80,000 if habitat requirements were met. Draft Habitat Management Measures from the 40 Mile Caribou Working Group (created out of TH Final Agreement) are still under review, but some reports are available such as existing disturbance footprint and a habitat layer. The harvest question will likely need public consultation in the future. Main drivers of change for the 40 Mile herd will be population numbers and “outgrowing” available habitat (especially with the Nelchina herd using the same winter habitat), they will eventually have to find new areas.</p>	
<p>Discussion</p>	

Discussion about collars – there are about 150 radio collars (when flying, can only listen to one frequency at a time so may miss some) and now about 30 satellite collars (were only 5 until this fall). There is some mixing with the Porcupine herd but fairly small numbers. More resources will be required in 2014 – last year the unexpected movement of the herd into the Yukon meant weekly flights for about 6 weeks to cover the exceptional situation (it is not usual to have this amount of money). Increased satellite collars will help in future, you get lots of information for much cheaper costs. Collars are usually put on “short yearlings” (born the previous June), and recaptured at about 4 years old to replace collar. To the best knowledge, collars do not affect behavior. Collars today are much smaller and lighter than in the past, battery technology has improved and you can get about 5 years worth of data now. Collars are used mostly to see distribution of herd, not population numbers, but there is a strong relationship between the number of collars and the total number of animals.

Questions re: YESAA tools such as seasonal or timing restrictions on activities. Mike said they do work with regulators, decision bodies, and often the developer directly with major projects or on specific issues (e.g. when there’s a mineral lick in the project area). Fish and wildlife mitigation measures tend to be included in a management plan or add-on, which makes them unenforceable. They have to rely on the good intentions of developers and the Natural Resource Officers who enforce the licenses and permits to help deal with issues. Mike also noted that the project-specific nature of YESAB assessments does not deal with the bigger picture (cumulative effects), and regional plans are a good opportunity to think about this on a landscape level and over a longer time period.

Discussion re: harvest management in the region and its effectiveness – YG can manage the licensed harvest through seasons, bag limits, permits and other restrictions. Usually if a fish/wildlife population is not doing well, they work together with First Nations. The Dempster Highway regulations specify no hunting for 8km on either side, but off-road vehicle restrictions are key to reduce the loss of habitat and to concentrate harvest. The Wildlife Act does permit specific land withdrawals for areas with significant wildlife habitat (e.g. in the Southern Lakes area there are restrictions on residential development because of caribou habitat), but this is rarely implemented. Other strategies include access management, but gates or signs are not usually effective (needs to serve its intended purpose). Seasonal restrictions may not be an option, as the entire Dawson planning region is now winter range for caribou. Mike emphasized that they have limited ability to manage livestock, which can have a huge impact on wildlife populations. Species like domestic sheep and goats can come into contact with wild populations, and disease transfer is a major concern. Regulators are usually careful with agricultural dispositions in areas where there is potential for this contact to occur.

Mike was asked about caribou as indicator species for CE. He said caribou were definitely useful for this purpose – they are wide ranging and sensitive to disturbance. Sheep are also a good indicator but they have a limited distribution in the region – for sheep things like timing windows, particularly in the spring and late winter, would be more effective. However, sheep habitat should be considered very critical – they have a limited range available, and they can’t just move somewhere else. Differences between woodland caribou and barren ground caribou – they eat the same foods and use the same types of habitat, but they act differently from a population standpoint. Wolves don’t limit barren ground populations as much as woodland. There are limited amounts of scientific information re: CE on barren ground herds, and most researchers begin with woodland caribou literature regarding development impacts. Gillian asked about CE work in the NWT with the Bathurst herd, whether that might be relevant to the Yukon. Mike and Monica replied that those studies are related to localized high intensity projects (e.g. diamond mines) vs. the Yukon situation which is lots of small projects. Some work has also been done for the Central Arctic herd and Prudhoe Bay.

<p>Mike was asked about grizzly bear distribution in the region – based on local knowledge the 40 Mile, Eagle Creek, 60 Mile, and Tatonduk are important habitat areas.</p> <p>Questions regarding anthropogenic (human-caused) disturbance vs. natural disturbance on the landscape and on caribou habitat. Mike replied that with fire, there are varying levels of intensity within a burn area, so it is not all a write-off for caribou habitat. A major consideration for CE work is how to incorporate natural disturbances into the overall footprint calculation, as well as when things are taken off the total (e.g. when is an area considered reclaimed).</p> <p>Questions regarding potential impacts of climate change – Mike replied it could mean an encroaching treeline on subalpine and alpine regions, and increased shrubs like willow and birch. Increased fire is likely, so less spruce forests. Mushrooms are a key food for caribou (calves born in years with a good mushroom crop survive better over the winter) – Don Russell did some research on this with the Porcupine Caribou Management Board. The summer range for the 40 Mile herd is extremely limited – there is some in the Dawson range and other alpine areas such as Tatonduk, Blackstone Uplands, upper 60 Mile, Madsen Creek, etc. Calving occurs in the high country (mostly on the Alaska side), and they hang out in the high country (subalpine and alpine) until August. Seasonal restrictions to protect key caribou habitat could be included as terms and conditions of licenses and permits (similar to defining seasons for winter roads), making them enforceable and not just best management practices or a recommended measure.</p> <p>Mike thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak with them, and encouraged them to contact him anytime if they have questions or need more information.</p>	
---	--

AGENDA TAB 3: PLAN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC REVIEW: WHAT WE HEARD (FIVE ALTERNATIVES)	
Overview	Action Items
Specific comments and feedback re: Alternatives A, B, C, D and E plus other options for alternatives submitted during or after the public review period. This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting due to a lack of remaining time.	

AGENDA TAB 3: PLAN ALTERNATIVES PUBLIC REVIEW: WHAT WE HEARD (OTHER COMMENTS)	
Overview	Action Items
Specific comments and feedback received re: particular Landscape Management Units, the Commission’s approach to the planning process, and other general comments to consider for the Draft Plan. This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting due to a lack of remaining time.	

AGENDA TAB 8: REVIEW COMMISSION MANDATE AND PROCEDURES FOR DECISION-MAKING	
Overview	Action Items
Review of Chapter 11 TH Final Agreement, DRPC Terms of Reference, and DRPC Policies and Procedures Section 4 re: consensus decision making. This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting due to a lack of remaining time.	

AGENDA TAB 9: MINERAL STAKING WITHDRAWAL DURING DAWSON PLAN DEVELOPMENT	
Overview	Action Items
Review initial TH request (25 Sep 2013), YG response (15 Oct 2013), TH follow-up letter (15 Jan 2014), and YG response (24 Feb 2014). This agenda item was deferred to the next meeting due to a lack of remaining time.	

NEXT STEPS	
Discussion	Action Items
Review of scheduled workplan tasks for the next couple months, as the Commission moves towards the Draft Plan. Next regular Commission meetings are scheduled for April 15-17, 2014 in Whitehorse and May 13-15, 2014 in Dawson. The Commission will also have a booth at the Dawson Gold Show, May 16-17.	

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Approval of Minutes for Regular Meeting #15 (March 19-20, 2014)

By Motion #7 at Regular Meeting #19 (October 28-29, 2014)



Chair



Acting Senior Planner

October 29, 2014

Date