



## Discussion Summary Stakeholder Workshop May 13-14, 2013

The purpose of this workshop was to provide early and meaningful opportunity for stakeholder engagement, particularly in helping to establish decision scope and structure, objectives and performance measures, and to begin collaboratively developing alternatives.

### **Comments regarding expectations going into the workshop:**

- Cautious optimism and healthy skepticism regarding planning process (controversy with respect to previous planning processes – uncertainty over politicians approving and implementing the final recommendations)
- Looking for balance between economic and environmental sustainability
- Want the plan to also reflect traditional land management concepts, concern for future generations, tourism values, heritage values, and First Nations Final Agreements
- Hoping for the final plan to adequately inform other processes (e.g., YESAA)
- Interest in seeing how a structured framework helps to evaluate alternatives

### **Discussion on what is “In/Out of Scope”:**

- Even though some areas are out of scope because they are governed by other regulatory plans, the Dawson plan can still make recommendations with respect to those plans and areas
- Also, creation of new special management areas is “In” scope
- Cumulative effects management should be “In” scope, but how does cumulative effects management work with things that are “Out” of scope (e.g., mining activities on established claims in good standing)?
- Forestry management plans have to be consistent with regional plans

### **Discussion around Strategic Decision Making (SDM) process** (defining planning objectives, determining management strategies and assessing alternatives):

- Things like tourism, trapping and hunting are categorized under headings like “Traditional” or “Tourism” but should be recognized as economic and part of economic development mandates
- Yukon has a small population and we should recognize that there is not a lot of land knowledge, which can lead to misunderstandings and conflicts over the data used; need to show the uncertainty (i.e., be clear about the range in the data instead of using the mean only)
- Caution around using the term “preferred accessible area” as it is an economic term
- Concern around thinking about different values separately (i.e., silo effect) when they are inter-related
- Concern over how consensus is reached about what values and performance measures to use (response: through an iterative process using group collaboration)
- Confusion and concern around the selection of values, objectives and performance measures and the “more-or-less” direction-of-change concept



**Discussion around planning strategies** (i.e., tools for accomplishing planning tasks):

- Important to have dollar amounts attached to trade-offs so decision-makers can make better informed choices
- Suggestion for one alternative to have landscape management units based on those from the forestry management plan
- Plan needs to consider: activities already happening (e.g., gold fields), natural boundaries (e.g., watersheds), conservation activities (e.g., management plan for caribou), and the current range of uses within and adjacent to the planning region

**Discussion points regarding the values and objectives table are reflected in the revised table.**

**Closing comments:**

- Information package should be distributed at least one week prior to next workshop
- Provide link to Powerpoint presentations shown during workshop for stakeholders to reference
- Provide the outcomes from this workshop prior to next workshop, in particular, the scoped-in, simplified version of the values and objectives table – want to see how interests and values are incorporated into the next steps
- Present more than one alternative in next workshop with potential land management unit boundaries drawn
- For next workshop, focus more on the areas that represent conflict
- Desire for the final plan to reflect stakeholder concerns and to see approval bodies listen to the stakeholders when it comes time for plan approval and implementation
- SDM process was confusing and workshop was not as productive as was hoped, although it is clear that the SDM process shows that an attempt is being made to have transparent and effective decision-making
- General agreement that it is good to have the opportunity to meet with everyone and hear the different points of view, that the planning process is moving in the right direction, and that stakeholders are glad for the opportunity to provide input, but would like to be more productive in future sessions