

Survey ID# 691

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Mining

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

The Draft plan was presented for public comment.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

A better recognition of the importance of the Yukon's unique northern lifestyles.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Remove proposals influenced by Southern mentality.

Unique Northern lifestyles are being displaced by outsider attitudes.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

My family attempts to understand nature and respect it.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

Positive, pragmatic education is the way to go.

It can foster a counterbalance to the misguided "woke ,ecowarriors".

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

A chance for future generations to live a unique northern lifestyle.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

No

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

The proposals to remove large percentages of the area from future economic activity is not conducive to sustainable development ,and does not protect anything.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

The First Nations can decide that.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Mining only takes place where there are economic mineral deposits.

This only happens in a very small percentage of the total natural world.

And, mining though necessary is temporary unlike urban human activity which is based on unsustainable, permanent growth.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

When it comes to unsustainable development and overpopulation in the Yukon, the "elephant in the room" is obviously Whitehorse, not mining.

Southern outsiders are flooding there and displacing traditional Northern lifestyles.

The First Nations have suffered from this before, but this new wave will eventually destroy their connection with the land.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

Federal transfer payments are creating a Marxist economy in Whitehorse.

This ideology has been proven to always fail.

So, let's not also kill the private sector at the same time.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

If you have ever been in a northern swamp, you would know that it can look after itself.

As an amateur naturalist I have travelled in it with great difficulty for many years at minus 50C to plus 35 c. with mosquitos, and witnessed great beauty like orchids and nesting raptors.

But for humans, it is an extreme environment and it does not need artificial protection.

If you read the Sand County Almanac, Leopold describes what happens when a region is protected, becomes a park, and then becomes full of noise.

This whole wetlands symbolic hysteria is nonsense promoted by the David Suzuki and Jane Fonda hypocrites.

Urban human population growth is the overwhelming threat to the natural world.

Wetland symbolism is a diversion from the real problems of growth and greed.

Isn't it better to spread out in small family enterprises such as placer mines and sawmills than cluster in artificial city environments?

The bog and fen woke rallying cry is so pathetic.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Whitehorse sewage lagoons ,
Alaska Highway built in wetlands supplying
Whitehorse environmental hypocrites.
ETC.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Ducks Unlimited chartered an airplane for a ride over these two areas and declared them "Special"
Follow the money.
This is a foreign funded bird hunting organization (Monsanto /Roundup,Dow Chemical ,
Rockerfellers etc) .
Why are the bugs and songbirds disappearing in North America?
Could Yukon wetlands be a diversion?

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Whitehorse Walmart sloughs.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Development should be allowed to occur in fens (no limit).

Please explain your answer.

Is this a joke?

You know the traditional name for what grows in fens don't you?

Have you ever tried to walk through one?

It would be very funny to have a race of ecowarriors across a fen.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

Incredible amount of work

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

Remove the idea of protected areas.

Existing legislation already provides protection for nature .

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

No

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Please see above

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

Existing legislation already guarantees protection.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Don't cave into the woke narrative on wetlands .

Think of the children who will grow up into a world with no resource jobs ,and no opportunity , apart from government jobs.

Right now is the tipping point for the Yukon.

Pioneering Yukon families are under attack from many different proposed changes in legislation.

In the end ,we only leave memories.

Support your own people.

Survey ID# 690

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? mining ,forestry

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

the draft plan recognizes it has to improved and is not finial

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Common sense on where placer gold is found

The plan needs to be more flexible in side the management areas to allow for industry to work weather it is forestry, mining ,tourism etc. development should be allowed to proceed in area's where development is not allowed. it would have to maybe have different rules etc.

Compensation for the families and business this plan will put out of business if allowed to proceed as is.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

the thresholds that are in place to to squeeze out the little guy on the licence plate need to be flexible ,simpler in order to allow placer mining where the the gold is deposited . Similar to forstry, they need to log where the trees are.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I suspect everyone that gets there asses of the couch and has bin on the land is a steward in some sence.

I connect to the land with the idea of a land use plan in the sense that the land gives myself and family the ability to make a living. Year after Year which is sustainable . Having a vibrant community requires people to make a decent living as so they can support the community. I take care of the land by not polluting and respecting the wild life also useing the land. responsible placer mining is simply a land use that allows for one to make a honest living in order to support his family and community .

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

well it it turns out like the carbon tax it will be just a money grab.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

responsible and sustainable placer mining ,forestry ,tourism and most of all
Governments

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

No Mining has bin singled out yet once again .this has become a land protection plan not
a land use plan.

I dont see how placer mining ,forestry will be sustainable with this plan.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

**In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable
Development?** No

Please provide explanation

Guess it depends on what type of people the commission heard from the most as it
seems sustainable development means as long as you have a government job life is
sustainable .Sustainable development to me means to allow uses of the land in order to
have some what of an economy to support a vibrant community which can provide a
place for all types of people to live.

A thriving and responsible placer industry, forestry industry or tourism industry is how I
see sustainable developement working, along with the current rules and regs in place . I
beleive this plan will limit sustainable development and not to mention double up on
regs that are already in place

**Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the
Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondĖk HwĖch'in Final
Agreement.**

I hope those of you are reading the final agreement as a whole document and not
picking and choosing sections just to justify certain things

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

the economy of the area

1)forestry,placer mining ,tourism

Known culture events ,heritage areas.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area
road access has definetly helped for locals to get out and hunt . Also more people from down south ,but there are mechanisms in place to control hunting pressures.
Mining practises with no reclomation from years past created awesome habitat for moose ,geese, ducks and other bird life. Indian river around quartz is a good example.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

No

please define human development ? if you mean mining please come out and say that, if you mean forestry please say that, if you mean tourism please say that, if you mean outfitting please say that. These are the most regulated industries the yukon has . Is that the goal to regulate industry out of business

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

this is a tool the environmentalist have used very well as most of the Dawson area is wetlands. it is strict and will shut down placer mining where the gold is deposited. I mean jump over a couple valleys where there are no gold deposits you have all the wet lands to look at .

this is a tool that was not well thought out for the economy or sustainable development for Dawson City . Really the commission needs to change this as many families are working in or around wetlands. yes they get disturbed but look at what comes about after mining is done and the land has grown into something else that sustains all kinds habitat for other species.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

That reclamation is done in such a way other habitats can grow and prosperous to provide wildlife and such.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

well there are many people making a living on these claims in these areas. This area has been mined for years and it seems the environmentalists have picked their fight there. If the commission is going to jump in bed with them, shouldn't you be recommending compensation also.

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?
As a miner and someone who logs once in a while I don't go looking for wetlands. Most people would not know how to answer this question honestly

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Development should be allowed to occur in fens (no limit).

Please explain your answer.

Did the commission do their own studies or use the info from the government or the environmentalist. This plan is very complicated and when you look at the documentation I will guarantee you no one who works in the private industry has the time or the will to read through this.

this plan needs to be simplified and a higher end document for it to succeed.

How much of the region's Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

WOW glad I'm close to retirement as sustainable development has just been thrown out the window.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

where there are forestry values or mineral values this has to be seen as a positive value and set up that the land can be used to attain those values if it is sustainable to do so. the idea to protect 70 percent of the area from development is not sustainable.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

No

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

this sounds like the peel watershed plan. No two planning areas are the same .

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Well I think the commission has heard from certain vocal groups and certain vocal governments and government departments . Do you feel u have heard from the individuals of the industry and the businesses in the Yukon who depend on Placer mining? I personally went around and asked individuals who work for these businesses. Guess what not many even knew it was going on. Some of the owners did but said did you see how much info there is to read.

Bottom line is people in the private industry are not paid to deal with this type of thing. Many environmentalist and government people are. Many people in the private industry just want to work make an honest living go home to there families and enjoy . With that being said a lot of my friends are relying on the Commission to do the right thing and protect there right to make an honest sustainable living in the placer mining industry ,forestry industry and tourism industry, there are more then just those but they are the largest. Dont get me wrong there needs to be thresholds in place but they have to be workable ,flexible for industry.

There are a lot of people in Industry that you guys havent heard from but are expecting you guys to represent there views as well. That is why each commission member has to really know there community and how there decisions as a commission member will affect the community as whole.

Survey ID# 687

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes, seasonally

If so, what sector do you work in? Environment

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Ecological Expert"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

The draft plan is headed in the right direction, but there are a number of ways to make it stronger. Particularly, we like the promotion of stewardship as an influential step forward in land use planning. But, careful wording is needed to not confuse stewardship with management.

The plan also has good ideas for measuring cumulative impacts but needs to go further and include stressors like hunting pressure, traffic volume and wildfire risk.

SMA2s are a bit of a wild card. If the intention from the Commission is to protect the ecological and cultural values within these areas, then they are on the right track, but mineral withdrawals are then needed and a form of legal protection to honor TH's final agreements.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Climate change. We need to consider how climate change is reshaping our landscapes and plan for how to maintain wildlife and a healthy environment under these changing conditions. Overlooking climate change will leave us with a plan that quickly fails to protect the values it is supposed to sustain.

Need to understand how carbon is both collected and released by natural systems and look at huge net benefit of protecting areas like wetlands with critically important carbon storage functions. We can't afford to lose these important climate and ecological services.

Indigenous knowledge needs a more central role in adaptive stewardship efforts. This knowledge can help us better understand historic conditions, ways of animals and systems, and how to sustain them. The plan needs to better integrate this valuable source of knowledge.

To plan well, we need to recognize that it is not a balance between environment and economy that we need. It is recognition that our economy and society rely entirely on a healthy environment. We need to get this order right to get our planning right.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Special Management Areas deserve more than token protection efforts. Allowing mining exploration and development in SMA2s is a big problem if we want to make these areas ecologically meaningful. These areas need to be permanently withdrawn from mining activity under the plan and legally protected.

The Umbrella Final Agreement defines SMAs as "i) areas with high ecological and cultural values needing particular protection, and (ii) areas that require a management plan." We need to honor the objectives of Trondëk Hwëch's Final Agreement and provide significant legal protection designation to allow essential environmental and cultural integrity values continue.

UFA is clear that economic activities must not undermine ecological and social systems, but draft Dawson plan does not embrace this directive, instead favouring trade offs and "balancing." That's a REAL concern for a healthy Yukon.

Integrated Stewardship Areas are a good mechanism for limiting industrial activity and human access, and should be embraced in the plan, but thresholds for mining and other development need to be backed by traditional knowledge and science, rather than based on current disturbance levels.

Water and wetlands are another area where the plan needs stronger measures. Disturbance of water systems upstream affects everything downstream, including wetlands that appear to be undisturbed. These wetlands are largely in river valleys that are also the most impacted by placer mining. This is critical habitat for many species. Ridges alone cannot sustain landscape connections.

Salmon are going to need holistic conservation approaches that address everything from habitat conditions to climate warming and the plan needs to recognize that many small disturbances can have as big of an impact as one large one.

Placer mining can have huge water system effects that flow through watersheds and are not limited to direct area of disturbance. Placer mining should only be considered in the lower reaches of waterways.

Disturbance thresholds need to be linked to well established ecological limits, not just current levels of disturbance or human activity. Moose, caribou and grizzly have known limits to the levels of disturbance, particularly road density, they can tolerate. These should inform the plan.

Thinking about cumulative disturbance is important, but equally important is tracking the extent and spread of cumulative disturbance and linking the impacts to measurable values. The plan needs to flesh out how this can be done for the Dawson region.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

For me, living here is about getting out on the land and connecting through harvest and gathering or year-round recreation opportunities that provide mental/spiritual wellbeing. To continue to be a steward, we must protect a wide range of benefits that we all get from the land and water and ensure Yukon's wild species can still be found here in future.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

It's a good idea, but shouldn't be the focus of this plan. It can be part of implementation, but its important to get the land use designation right first.

When the plan is all over, Yukoners want to be proud of what has been achieved, similar to the Umbrella Final Agreement, conserving some of the last large populations of caribou, grizzly, moose for all Yukoners and the next 7 generations as our world continues to change.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Acknowledging that Trê™ondÄ«k HwÄ«chê™in recommended 60% of the area to be protected and only 3.8% is currently recommended for legal protection. To me, that is not right and goes against the objectives of Trê™ondÄ«k HwÄ«chê™inê™s Final Agreement to allow essential environmental and cultural integrity values to continue.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

Achieving representation of all ecoregions in the portfolio of protected areas is highly desirable. However, there is no mention of the Klondike Plateau ecoregion that currently has no representation, but almost 60% of which falls in this planning region. Is this an oversight?

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDËK HWËCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

The plan states that to ÆœAchieve sustainable development requires (1) sustaining ecosystem integrity, (2) sustaining communities and cultures, and (3) sustaining economic activities.Æ But ecology is not one of three equal contributing influences in achieving sustainability. Neither economy nor society can exist without ecology. Ecology is a more fundamental entity and all human activities are embedded in ecology, not separate entities from it. Trading-off ecology, and often society, for economy is a never-ending model for ecological deterioration. A more appropriate model would be to nest economy within society, which is in turn nested within ecology.

To ensure that development occurs with the intention of providing future generations with the wealth and abundance that the land currently provides, the Plan will need to

assess which economic activities will permanently compromise ecological and social values (unsustainable) and which activities can be followed by recovery within 7 generations (sustainable)â€¦. When the Plan allows unsustainable economic activities (e.g., placer mining, multi-generational tailings ponds, climate change, population growth), then it should provide explicit justification and an accounting for the breach of sustainability with explanation of how the values lost or put at risk might be left in place in sufficient extent elsewhere, sufficiently insured, and/or replaced.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

I commend the Commission and planners in all their hard work to date. It is not an easy task, but a very important one for all Yukoners, including the ones that can not speak (our wildlife, forests and future generations). Some things, like planning for climate change or limiting road access, are hard to do, but that doesnâ€™t mean we shouldnâ€™t try to do them. The plan needs to meet these challenges head on.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Values needs to be ecological and culturally driven, which include impacts to water, wildlife, fish and Trâ€™ondÃ«k HwÃ«châ€™in's vision, as it is their homeland and traditional territory that we are speaking of.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Roads are detrimental to the environment and wildlife that we rely on. By spreading cumulative effects across the landscape, we will likely lose the values that we most care about. I call on the Commission to select areas for development, but protect others to reduce the cumulative impacts to wide ranging species. The same argument goes for water. By developing headwaters, we risk water quality, quantity and the protection of fish and other species in the entire watershed as disturbance has downstream impacts to both rivers and wetlands.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

Without limiting human development, we risk losing the things that we most care about, like clean water, clean air, healthy wildlife populations, and our spiritual connection to the Yukon.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

By focusing so much on wetland thresholds, we are forgetting about the big picture, and that is the lack of protection for any wetland complex in the regional planning area. Protecting wetland areas such as Scottie Creek, Ladue River wetlands, White River wetlands, Upper Indian River wetlands, and Flat Creek wetlands, this would solidly address in mitigating the lower Indian River impacts of development, regardless of wetland classes.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

While the protection of bogs should be celebrated, it is important to note that bogs do not have firm boundaries and often the connection between wetlands like fens, marshes and bogs are overlooked. My biggest concern is the lack of knowledge portrayed in this plan when underestimating downstream effects of development in wetlands that are connected. My second biggest concern is that we often forget how important fens are for storing future carbon.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? [Agree](#)

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

I agree that Scottie Creek Wetlands and Upper Indian River Wetlands are both important, but would prefer to see them classified as SMA1s, because SMA2s allow continued mineral extraction from existing tenures. I would also like to see Flat creek wetlands

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]
Please explain your answer.

I did not answer the specific question about fens as I think it is flawed. Without acknowledging that fens are not linear, we risk impact on ground water hydrology and downstream wetlands. A better approach would be to limit the placer mining to the furthest downstream sections of the drainage, and then only upstream until some threshold of the rarest land cover type (perhaps fens) is reached, and leave the entire sections further upstream intact.

Fens are such a small proportion of the land base, yet so high in ecological and cultural values, that arguing about what proportion of them in a LMU needs protection is like arguing over who gets the last cake crumbs at a party.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

My first impression is that this map is far from the conservation priorities map that was submitted by Trâ€™ondâ€™k Hwâ€™châ€™in. I would like to see more alignment with the First Nations conservation priorities, including LMU1, LMU4, LMU7, LMU19, LMU22 becoming SMA1s. SMA2s as presently defined, can have no legitimate status as a protected area mainly because they will not be legalized (under Yukon or federal legislation), but also because they may well be â€œinterimâ€ with regard to any cap on proportion of land base in mineral claims. Because they will not be legalized, most of the proposed management direction associated with them is unlikely to occur because there will be no government body legally responsible for implementation of the management direction. Some of these SMA2 LMUs cannot ever be considered true protected areas because the proportion of their land base that is currently claimed is very high (e.g., LMU19 â€” Indian River). So, this provides specific argument to the Commission that, if they truly want strong conservation in SMA2s, these areas need legal designation and removal of any interim (replaced with permanent) status regarding future mineral tenures. Without solid protection in the SMA2s, wide-ranging species such as caribou and grizzly bears will be forced to navigate pockets of habitat surrounded by disturbances. SMA2s are also the heart of the Beringia in terms of endemic and rare species and any hope for salmon recovery because have the higher mountains with colder water.

LMU18 and LMU23 - If we are going to work collaboratively on the range expansion of the Fortymile caribou herd as stated in the draft plan, then this should be reflected in the map. What would happen if a bad fire year wiped out the entire LMU 18 (Matson Uplands, which is the Fortymileâ€™s fall and winter range?) â€” and development could surround this pocket of habitat. SMA1 LMU18 needs to be larger and provide connection

through LMU23 up to LMU1. We cannot just protect the ridges and not the valley bottoms for connectivity.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

I agree that the Yukon River Corridor and Klondike Highway Corridor require more detailed sub-regional land use plans.

The things I would change are...

Based on discussions at one of the community engagement sessions in Dawson on sub-regional planning, it was voiced that the Commission recognizes the importance of the Dempster Highway corridor being highly valued for ecological, cultural and recreational values as is outlined on page 52. So if the values are already well known for the Dempster Highway, why not include the Corridor as another LMU in the plan?

The Plan does not put forward any direct recommendations for Off-Road Vehicle Management Areas (ORVMA). Respectfully, I think this is an oversight. The text on the Top-of-the-World Highway repeatedly mentions the risk of ORVs to caribou and other values, but it only recommends further study. Some LMUs have high conservation emphasis, but this cannot be realized if ORV access is allowed. A specific example is LMU 18 (Matson Uplands), proposed as SMA1, with caribou as a key value. The surrounding LMU 23 (Forty Mile Caribou Corridor) is also of very high value to this species. Caribou are highly susceptible to disturbance by noise (e.g., from ORVs) that is sometimes associated with direct risk of being shot at. It seems that LMUs 18 & 23 should be recommended for ORVMA designation in this Plan. The other SMA1 in the Draft Plan (LMU 10 "Upper Klondike") should also be considered for ORVMA status. This Plan is missing an important opportunity to make caribou habitat more secure and effective for the caribou if it does not designate ORVMAs in some of the LMUs established for caribou conservation.

I also strongly encourage the Commission to reconsider the withdrawal of mineral staking opportunities from all SMA2 areas in order to increase the total area of protection to ensure that fish and wildlife populations and their habitats remain healthy and sustainable for the next 7 generations as listed under Chapter 11 of the Umbrella Final Agreement

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

The SMA2s are the heart for wide-ranging species such as caribou and grizzly bears. Without solid protection in these areas, they will be forced to navigate pockets of habitat surrounded by disturbances. SMA2s are also the heart of the Beringia in terms of

endemic and rare species and any hope for salmon recovery because have the higher mountains with colder water.

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

There is no clarity or certainty in the SMA2 LMUs.

How does SMA2 differ from Integrated Stewardship Area I (ISA1) or ISA2? The cumulative effects thresholds of ISA1 or ISA2 would apply in the SMA2 Land Management Units (LMUs). The difference between the two seems to be in the proposal that SMA2s would have no new mineral exploration and development, and no new road access. However, if the withdrawal of these areas from future exploration and development is not firmly embedded in this Plan (i.e. it is dependent on only an Order-in-Council instead of the Plan), then such withdrawal is subject only to political will at the time and not to the intent of the Planning Commission. The ending of a withdrawal of these LMUs from new exploration would effectively turn these SMA2s into ISA1s or ISA2s. The lesson is that the Plan has to permanently withdraw these areas; the decision cannot be left to decision-making outside the Plan. If the Plan keeps the ambivalent wording with respect to SMA2s that all other lands not currently holding mineral or other land use tenure should be withdrawn "on either an interim or permanent basis", then the Plan lacks the certainty for all land users that it is trying to achieve.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Be bold and make hard decisions honoring the UFA and TH's Final agreements, but also to chose protection over mining. Industry will adapt with whatever circumstances are thrown at them as that is what people and the economy does - they adapt. But wildlife and the environment are too sacred and fragile when asked to share with widespread disturbances.

Survey ID# 686

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region, Other...

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes, seasonally

If so, what sector do you work in? Quartz Mineral Exploration

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Industry Specialist"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

The ability for the general public to participate. Some attention has been made to incorporate mineral potential and mining activities in the draft plan.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

The regulatory and permitting regimes of quartz and placer mining and exploration need to be stressed. Geologic and mineral potential criteria need to be incorporated on an equal footing with environmental and biological criteria. Scientific criteria must be balanced, and not prioritized based on political considerations. Also missing are accommodations for access to claim blocks stranded in SMA's.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

A smaller percentage of land alienation from mining and exploration activities is recommended. We can honour environmental and wildlife considerations without

banning industrial activities. Also, guaranteed surface access to stranded claim blocks is strongly recommended.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Somewhat

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

By minimizing any industrial footprint and ensuring reclamation takes place.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

It may help the community understand resource extraction industries better.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

The ability to explore a maximum of land with a minimum of disturbance. You need a lot of land to find and develop a few advanced prospects.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

No. Although mining industries are addressed, and reflected in the LMU's, the dominant criteria appear to be environmental, particularly related to caribou.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Yes

Please provide explanation

I find "Sustainable Development" to be a vague term - this definition has changed from the original Brundtland Commission. b The definition, by definition, inhibits economic

growth, which is necessary for societal and political settings to remain stable. But under the circumstances provided in this survey, I answer "yes".

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

The objectives do not mandate large amounts of protection, nor does it prescribe any minimum amount.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Reclamation activities should also be taken into consideration, as these will mitigate cumulative effects.

If a project proposal is well prepared and considered adequate, but the project is turned down due to cumulative effects, and not by shortcomings of the proposal, the proponent should be compensated for expenses incurred during preparation of the proposal.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

No

The potential for large amounts of land to be negatively impacted by industrial development is minimal. The economic potential is limited to mining, tourism, wildlife and fish harvesting and traditional activities. Threats for further large-scale impacts are minimal.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

Strict policies here would be a significant detriment to further placer exploration. Only existing operations could continue, and may not be allowed to expand to their fullest potential.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

The Upper Indian River area has significant placer gold potential

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Limited development should be allowed to happen in fens.

Please explain your answer.

Some areas should be protected, but others may be exploitable.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? 55%

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

There is an excessive amount of land designated as ISA 1 and ISA 2, as well as the SMAs. Projects within the more pro-conservation ISAs will be very difficult to permit and receive investment.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The ISA 3 and ISA 4 areas do reflect mineral values.

The things I would change are...

Some areas in ISA 1's and ISA 2's and many SMA 2 areas have high mineral potential also.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Unsure

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

The main parameter appears to be caribou presence. Using this value, they probably do. Caribou management can be enhanced by limiting hunting, and curtailing activities if significant caribou movement occurs. Many exploration projects include records of wildlife sightings to improve understanding of caribou movement and activities.

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

The "key values" here obviously refer to wildlife and conservation values, rather than industrial values.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Value all aspects of science equally. Minimize political pressures as aspects to further develop the plan. In particular, any federal pressures to obtain 30% protection across Canada by 2030 should be resisted. There would be a disproportionate amount of protection in Yukon and Canada's North.

Survey ID# 684

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Government

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

The draft plan is a good stepping stone into achieving sustainable development in the Dawson region. I am incredibly appreciative of the effort and time put into the draft plan by the Commission. While I have concerns about the specific directions and designations provided in the draft plan, if I jump back and focus on the stated goals, objectives, and specific management intent statements of the draft plan, it is clear to me that they understand the unique complexity of values and needs of this area. As a long time resident of Dawson, reading these sections of the plan specifically, I see myself, and my own concerns, reflected back to me.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

I feel the draft plan misses a link between the vision and the recommendations. What was meant to be achieved is written in the vision, the goals, the objectives, and the management intent statements, but what is achieved through the land designations, the thresholds, and the recommendations, is not the same. The draft plan is missing a feedback loop system in which one can look back to see if the goals and objectives of the plan are being achieved. It would appear much of the plan is siloed into discrete parts, and there is a lack of flow around the overall purpose of the land use plan. As land use planning stems from chapter 11 of the UFA, there should be a discussion within the draft plan that addresses how the plan itself is meeting its own objectives under this important piece of legislation. In my view, this is a very key missing piece from the draft plan.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Specifically, I would change the land designation system to better reflect the overall intent for each area. It is true that SMA 2s put forward more conservation for highly valued areas than is currently offered with our existing management regime, however, there is little clarity around how long that protection will stay in place for, and will ultimately rely on a land withdrawal alone to ensure important areas remain in place. This is not adequate and will not meet the management intent the Commission has put forward for many of the SMA 2 areas. This designation offers very little comfort to those seeking to have these areas remain intact for generations to come. It is important that the Commission think about the long term horizon of the Dawson region, in particular as we face the very real threats of climate change.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I am accountable to the land that sustains me by respecting fully the things I take from it. As a berry picker, firewood harvester, moose hunter, and hiker, I appreciate every minute of the time I get to spend on the land, and offer my gratitude as often as possible. We can all take care of the land if we stop to think about what it is that the "land" (plants and animals) needs. I suspect if it could talk, it would say it needs time to breath, time to heal, and space to grow. Being a steward of the land means thinking about what the land needs over your own personal needs, but understanding that when and what you do need to take from the land, you will give back in kind.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

It is a fine idea, but in order to effectively promote stewardship as a principle of this plan the Commission should make more tangible efforts to ensure effective reclamation and land protection.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

A healthy landscape and future (clean water, vast intact landscapes, and sustainable wildlife populations) for those who have resided here for millenia, and for those who continue to reside here and raise their families. More broadly, what matters to me most is that my community is provided with the needs to create a self-sustainable economy and lifestyle.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

Yes.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

It would seem in this plan, and in most instances of how we look at "sustainable development", we are really talking about economic development is a environmentally sustainable way. However, sustainable development as defined by the UFA specifically uses the term "socio-economic change", which suggests a lesser focus on the economic development aspect of living. I do not think this plan achieves sustainable development as defined in the UFA because it has not afforded enough certainty to ensuring that the "ecological" systems upon which our community is dependent are not weakened. Rather, it allows for much room for development in the majority of the region, within areas of the region containing ecological systems upon which are social systems have been developed.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

It is a difficult question to ask without the Commission spending the time themselves to answer it. Does the Commission feel they have reached their objectives? Why or why not?

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

what is allowed to happen on the land must consider first and foremost the levels of development that can happen before you start to see significant impacts of the values that matter most to people. At the end of the day this is all that matters - is the level of disturbance allowed to occur OK for a certain target wildlife species or human activity to continue to occur? To the previous question about sustainable development - what is allowed to happen on the land must fall back on what is sustainable - so, if the level of activities allowed to happen on the land undermines the ecological or social systems we depend on, it is too much.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area
additional roads and trails mean I am able to access farther on the land for harvesting, however more roads and trails also undermines the things I am going out to harvest, whether that is for berries or a moose. So, it is a balancing act that must be carefully managed. At the moment, the greater issue is that there is no system to track where all the roads are, and there is no regulatory system to reduce public road use, so we have a wild west of access roads in much of the southern Dawson region in which we know the increased access is having impacts of human use of the areas as well as local moose populations, but very little is being done to address the impacts. We need a better system to manage roads, and until that system is in place, following the precautionary principle would dictate that any new road development, even if it is sought after for the mineral and/or tourism opportunities it would provide, should not be allowed.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

Yes, of course it should be. That is our job as stewards of the land.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

no development in bogs and marshes, and reduced developed in fens, is good.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

At this point in time we must be considering all the tools we have in our tool box to both mitigate the impacts of climate change and/or adapt to our new reality. One way of doing that is to ensure all net carbon sinks remain intact and we have a significant opportunity in the Dawson region to do this. The short term gains of mining cannot overshadow the longer term gains of reducing the impacts of climate change. Sustainable development means allowing socio-economic change without undermining the ecological or social systems we depend on - we WILL depend on wetlands as a carbon sink now and into the future.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

The Flat Creek wetlands offer significant bird and moose habitat values and are relatively untouched.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Limited development should be allowed to happen in fens.

Please explain your answer.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? 25%

LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

The designation system is not complete.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

North (1) and Fifteen/ Chandindu (4) must be designated as SMA 1s. There is very little mining there and you can have mineral claims in SMA 1s, as the rights on existing claims are grandfathered. The Matson Uplands (18) should be made larger to better reflect the importance of that entire area for the 40 caribou herd. The Fortymile area (15) should be an SMA 2 as this area is very important for conservation. The Scottie Creek wetlands (22) should be made an SMA 1 to allow for a larger extent of wetlands to be protected.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Yes - the Commission has done a great job at identifying where conservation should be the focus in this region, but they just haven't backed that up with the right tool.

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

There is zero certainty attached to the conservation of the withdrawal areas within SMA 2s. While I understand it is something, it is not enough. Looking to the years long battle to get the current land withdrawal in place within the Dawson region, it is obvious that withdrawals alone are an incredibly political and one sided way to manage activities on the land. These areas are so important, as is clear from the Commission's descriptions of the SMA 2 areas, but there is no certainty in this plan that 1 year down the road from plan approval that a land withdrawal cannot be lifted when the political tides shift. What these areas need is a legislative tool to ensure protection in the longer term.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Be bold and true to your vision! Choose the right tools and technical expertise to make your vision for this region a reality, and be emboldened to step outside of the box.

Survey ID# 683

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I live in Dawson seasonally (e.g. sometimes for work), Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region, Other...

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes, seasonally

If so, what sector do you work in? department of environment, margins of agriculture and forestry

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

I like the diversity of the commissioners that I know and trust their expertise.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

specifics

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

the maps should be more detailed, we should be able to zoom way in!

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I really think that there are as many ways to connect to the land as there are land users out there. It is very personal. My family lives off grid on the land and our lives are dictated by the environment, what we can and can't do and even our moods! We connect directly and daily. The land provides our wealth and (we make a living from forest products (birch syrup, timber) and agriculture), we are totally dependent. Other work I do is contract for department of environment and depends on the land being intact as well, both for environmental monitoring and for tourism. My family and I are connected on many levels:

1. Physically, through the carbon cycle. We eat and drink off the land, and our waste goes back into it. It is a long game, compost takes 4 years up here.
2. Intellectually. We are always learning from the land, it has so many layers and a person can go deep into any of them - biology, geography, history, or using things for purposes, such as woodworking, or making snowshoes or tanning hides, or building soils for agriculture or whatever, the options for learning are endless!. There is so much to learn,
3. Emotionally. The land is rich in stories and memories of people who have passed, times that have passed, they remain alive in certain places. Also I am very grateful to live in a place that I love especially in these times of so much global displacement, and I feel like with that privilege comes a responsibility to take care of it.

In order to take care of it first of all we have to pay attention to how it is doing, with our finger on the pulse so to speak. This we do through monitoring (I conduct breeding bird surveys each spring and am part of a group that monitors other species (plants and pikas), and also informal observations we make while in the bush, how are things doing. These observations are made by everyone who is out there, and that is part of why it is important for people to get out on the land and pay attention. Different users will notice different things to be sure, and things are changing all the time! After observing we have to recognize what our impacts are and recognize weather they are detrimental or not. For example, animals change their travel routes to avoid us. On the other hand, many like to use our hard packed trails, and just avoid our camps that are in use! Or if we overgraze an area, native species have a hard time coming back, if we manage properly we can find the carrying capacity of the land and stay within that threshold and our use could actually sometimes enrich an ecosystem.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

I think so, stewardship is important and I would like to know more about this. To me proper stewardship will involve diverse partners.

There are so many layers to the landscape and when people look at it they see different things. Even with a small group, for example biologists, you may have one person who knows about birds and another butterflies and another insects and another large

mammals and they may not see the land the same way at all. When you add in other interests like geologists or foresters or farmers or traditional knowledge holders or wilderness tour operators, you will get what sometimes seem like conflicting views of the same place. I think as much as possible to find stewards who have the wellbeing of the land at heart and to have them work together with people who see things differently from them so that they can learn from each other is going to make an integrated stewardship program. To me the first step in training stewards would be to have them get out and spend time with all different kinds of land users. Land users often have in common that they care about the place where they are working, that it provides for them in some way and they value it. There are exceptions, and these operations need not be leaders in planning for the future of the land.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Functioning Ecosystems, with diversity and resilience, support life. Most important to allow these systems to function. Indicator species (top of the food chain, owls, hawks, falcons, wolves are good indicators of health). Mountain regions and headwaters need to be pristine. Wetlands and riparian zones are especially important for diversity and rejuvenation of the systems. We must be able to drink the water all over the Planning Area, that would be success.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

Bridge conflict and bring together different kinds of users, different people who care about the land in different ways. We need to find what we have in common and integrate different ways of knowing and being on the land. Learn from each other.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

I am not sure if the plan achieves sustainable development, I think there is lots of room for sustainable development to be expanded in the framework we have now. If the value of the land is recognized, we would see that there is a lot of waste happening now. For example, wood is not always or even often harvested before agriculture or mining develops a piece of land. At the same time there is a shortage of fuel wood in the

Dawson area and people are bringing in wood from Haines Junction! If mines were to clear green trees and they were stacked for firewood or used for lumber, this would make a lot of sense. It would require foresight and planning and different groups working together. Everything would take longer but we would collectively get more value out of a piece of land. Resources should not be wasted, that is clearly disrespectful. I do think that there are ways that placer mining can be sustainable, but I see a real difference between mines that have the best interest of the land in the long term as their guiding principle and ones that do not. We need a common best practice. And I believe that the scale of quartz mining puts it in another category and I am not sure if it can ever be sustainable.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

I am looking to the first nation for leadership. In living on the land I am looking for guidance. I am hoping to First Nations stewards working across this area, and really getting to know each other and the land together and seeing what we have to offer each other with the best interest of the land as our united goal.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

There is no single value that stands alone, so I guess main value to me is diverse functioning ecosystems. These are unique and different. I think that clean water is a very important in every system to the overall health of the environment.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

So much has changed in my lifetime in this area that I feel like at nearly 40 I am an old woman. I have watched the shrubs grow up into alpine areas that were meadows when I was young, shrubbification is happening across the north as the climate changes; I have seen sweetclover take over the ditches of the north klondike highway and have worked each July for 14 years to prevent it from spreading up the Dempster; I have been witness to the decrease in migratory songbirds, numbers and entire species are dropping off of my annual Breeding Bird Surveys on the Dempster Highway, I have noticed weird winter weather and seen push the birch sap run earlier into the spring.

These are mostly global changes that have affected this land. Local ones are more direct, new roads like the Vice Roy mine road opened up that country to lots of use, new neighbours that now share resources with us (fishing holes and berry patches are depleted faster), more hunters from Whitehorse coming up. Another change I have noticed since I was young is there are far fewer people living in the bush. I do feel that northerners are in a way more out of touch with the rhythms of the land than they were when I was young, as more people used to actually live in the bush than do now. I think this is a policy to reduce people's impact on the land and keep services efficiently in municipalities. The flip side is that there are fewer stewards directly on the land and fewer people who really are observing what is happening on the land.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

I hate to say yes to this question, if I could trust that everyone would act responsibly, I would want to encourage everyone to interact with the land. But history has shown that there are a lot of irresponsible opportunists who will abuse the opportunities that the natural environment up here offers. There need be measures to ensure that people will not impact the land irreparably but that still leave room for people to interact with the land in a meaningful way that does not compromise the functioning ecosystem in the long term.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

I like that Wetlands are recognized and people are talking about them for their important functions, this is new in the common conversation. I would like to see them and all riparian areas protected for the important role they serve as a special habitat and their potential for rejuvenating entire landscapes.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Water and the diversity of the entire system.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? [Have no opinion](#)

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?
wetlands should be mapped across the planning area and should be protected all across the area, small ones are often very important too!

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Limited development should be allowed to happen in fens.

Please explain your answer.

I would hate for you to decide that no development should occur in fens and then some future sustainable project come forward and be blocked. Everything should be context based, but managers should be careful to protect the integrity of the system.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

I know best the LMUs 5-10 and a little bit 11, in this area is all the different levels of designation of ISA and SMA. I did not manage to understand all the different kinds of SMA or ISA, just that ISA allows development and SMA allows less.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

It looks to me like Clear Creek and the Goldfeilds might be a sacrifice areas for mining to continue as it is

The things I would change are...

I would like Antimony Mountain Claims to be bought out so that area does not get new roads or large developments.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Yes

I think so but I am always hesitant to say all developments should be prohibited. There may be appropriate sustainable developments that we are not thinking about today.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

I did this survey several times, the first 3 were lost, so my answers have gotten choppy and short as I grew more frustrated! Maybe you have access to my first copies, I hit save but they seemed to disappear. Also sent 2 answers on email, disregard they are the same as what is here.

Survey ID# 682

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I live in Dawson seasonally (e.g. sometimes for work)

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Prospecting - Exploration

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

That your not blanket protecting the entire area like the Peel.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

A social economic impact study to what the impact is to Dawson with the cumulative effects of protecting so much land as a whole when considering the Tombstone Park lands and the Peel. This will alienate a big area, can we survive just on tourism.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I am a prospector that studies the land for minerals that our society has become so addicted to, without minerals we would not survive.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

A program that helps teach the youth that we need a balance, protection and development,

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

From a prospecting view we need access to the land that means land available to prospect and if anything is discovered a way to get to the resources

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

I have mining claims in your special management area 1 and 7. I need access to these claim that i have held since 2004, if I cant get access they become worthless. So access is very important.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

I really don't think the regional planning has taken into consideration the social economic impact for Dawson citizen or the Yukon as a whole in taking such a big area out of commission from a prospecting point of view.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Back to economics, whether its moose meat in the freezer that important so one doesn't have to buy meat, but we also need a way to pay for the gas that we use to get there, exploration that leads to mining helps to pay the bills so that we all can enjoy the land.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

I have been prospecting for over 25 years and I am amazed that i can still find new discoveries that no one has ever found, the land has hardly been explore or walk over. Discoveries take sometimes 50 years to turn into a mine (Casino as an example), if we are prevented from prospecting than future Casino's will never be found.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

No

That's a loaded question, what is acceptable limits. If I needed a job then a mine would be acceptable as I can then feed my family and enjoy the land, If I had a government job maybe I am not interested in the mine coming in and i want a park to camp in. Instead of limited it should read balance.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

There has to be a balance , economic value versus protection.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

The Wetland conflict only really arise with Placer Mining. If a economic placer deposit is outline then a good mining plan can be submitted with a balance of preservation of portions of the wetland.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Not decided

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

A large swamp that at the moment nobody really cares about from development would have been the Ladue river valley, it was drilled for placer in the early 80's with no success, so as piece of ground that holds a large area of swamp, peat and fens this might fit the bill with no conflict.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

I do not know (This is a hard question, please feel free to contact us if you want more information)

Please explain your answer.

If a placer deposit is outline through drilling a mining plan can be work around known economic areas in such that they keep fen and Wetlands undisturbed, such as if a placer pay streak is only 30 meters wide in a valley that's 300 m wide then one can mine 30-50 wide zone and protect the other 250 m of Fen and Wetlands. Placer mining doesn't have to mine rim to rim.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

I own claim in all the Special Management areas, I am concern that the commission doesn't really understand the value in some of my claims and what the potential of the area has to offer from a mineral point of view. As indicated earlier Access is critical.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

That you are entertaining the idea of access to existing claims.

The things I would change are...

I would try to understand what the potential values that lie in the proposed special management areas, I would be glad to discuss as I have walk more of the ground as a Prospector than most people.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

No

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

No , the Tombstone park was a good call for protection and nobody disagreed to much as we thought or hope it would end there, but to protect for protection sake, the country is beautiful but that's one opinion , isn't all the land beautiful

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

What about the mineral potential Value, I understand that we need some protection from ourselves but understand that minerals are just as important to our society as fish and caribou, so by putting up so much protection against I still don't know what ? We need All (Fish, animals, plants and minerals) to survive as the society that we know today.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

To please understand that we need minerals for the future of our society. Prospecting and Exploration is really a science of studying the land, Its not about Mining, that comes later , if we alienated or discourage from exploring then discoveries will not be found. A discoverie can take 50 years plus from finding to development so the lag time is usually long, But it all starts with low impact prospecting.

Survey ID# 681

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? Yes, Other YFN

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes, seasonally

If so, what sector do you work in? Nonya

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"TH Elder"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

None, plan is unnecessary

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Plan is unnecessary

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Get rid of useless bureaucrats paid to come up with plans today

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

Manage my own private property

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

No

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

Unnecessary

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Peoples unrestricted access to the land

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

No the plan is unnecessary. Solving problems that don't exist

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

Nothing is sustainable about bureaucrats having more control of the land

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

No

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Weather or not you are a private property owner

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area
Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

No

Government is inept and unable to solve these issues

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

Bureaucrats are in control of the process

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Private property owners should have final say over what happens on their land

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

You are going out of your way to target the placer mining industry

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Yes there are. YTG should have no part in administering land use.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Please explain your answer.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

Like most thing puked from the special interests of the Yukon, looks like garbage

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

Land designations are unnecessary

The things I would change are...

Fire the useless parasites that are paid tax money to come up with this garbage

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

No

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Plan is unnecessary

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

See above Awnser

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Find value creating gainful employment

Survey ID# 680

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? No

If so, what sector do you work in?

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

That you are attempting one, even if it's 25 years late.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

I would include the Coffee Creek mining project in the RLUP; why is it not in the draft plan?

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

MAKE THIS RLUP FOR CARIBOU! Not people. Caribou are an excellent indicator of ecosystem health, as an umbrella spp. This would ensure a strong conservation plan. Protect the core range of the Fourty Mile Caribou Herd, including river corridors. Instead of calling us 'Users' of the land, call us "Stewards" of the land and waters. Make sure these are 'integrated stewardship areas'.

Make sure that the Scotty Creek Wetlands (comprising 10% of the planning area) are fully and permanently protected.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I teach Stewardship of the land and waters as an interpretive guide to people from around the world and The Yukon.

A lot of my food comes from foraging; berries, fungi, medicinal plants, water, air etc. This is VERY important to me to be able to do now, and for seventythousand+ generations of my offspring. I spend short and long periods of time on Yukon's land and waters. I am an expert in Yukon's natural history both professionally in the past, and as a teacher nowadays.

I use Yukon's land and waters as an anchor; to remind me what is true. Not the latest Covid-19 orders from un-elected and misguided medical folks, trained by a corrupt and profiteering pharmaceutical industry. I follow the advice from the land; advice which has been true for thousands of years.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

To be financed liberally by the mining industry now and far into the future.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

That mining is stopped in its tracks. Stop the Free Entry System in the Planning Region, Yukon and Canada. Change the Yukon Quartz and Placer mining acts to reflect conservation as the primary objective of this RLUP and beyond. Stop the construction, improvement and maintenance of publicly funded access roads to mining activities.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

No.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĚK HWĚCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

The plan does not ensure that the area's caribou are guaranteed optimal living conditions, including safe migration routes to other RLUP areas for genetic diversity. It does not guarantee that the resident caribou herds are able to regain historic numbers and ranges. This must be the guiding principle of this land use plan.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Only non-industrial human activities. Only human activities which do not diminish the quality of the region's land and water. No placer mining. No quartz mining. No mining roads. No mining exploration from the air. No cut lines. No fences or gates.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Mining exploration, development, operations, and poorly executed abandonment hurt the land and waters of the planning region and beyond. They especially hurt caribou habitat, caribou stress levels, increase predator access to caribou, air quality and exasperate climate change. Financial justice in the region and beyond (rich people are able to access our minerals without putting back, and leaving with the profits, and leaving behind a long-term environmental mess) is lacking. The local environments and humans do not profit from mining in the long term, and always are left with negative impacts while anonymous global 'investors' flee from an environmental mess. The rich get richer, and the rest are left with environmental liabilities.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

See previous answer.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

I like the first point, and not the rest. The last point is pointless! Wetland and marshes cannot be 'reclaimed' to their previous wild standards. So do not disturb them in the first place.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Carbon storage. Local and downstream water quality. Flood control. Habitat loss for various spp, including amphibians, bats, swallows, waterfowl, moose, etc.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

They are large and have many values. The Scottie Creek Wetland is part of the Fourty Mile Caribou Herd's migration route, and likely that of other herds.

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Wetlands have been destroyed all across Canada, especially in the Prairies. Let's stop the destruction of Yukon's wetlands now! They are ecologically extremely valuable; their damage and loss are felt up and downstream of them, and globally for millennia.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

See above.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

Too much industry.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

At least considering conservation.

The things I would change are...

Conservation.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Unsure

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Create a plan which is totally focused on the long term well being of caribou.

Survey ID# 677

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? No

If so, what sector do you work in?

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

I appreciate the Commission's vision to create a land use plan that sets out a sustainable future for the Dawson Region. I appreciate the good intent behind this plan, and some of the conservation measures (e.g. SMA Is) are strong tools to achieve the Commission's vision.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Insufficient protection for the Fortymile caribou herd outside the Matson Uplands

Strong protection is lacking in SMA IIs. Mining is still allowed on claims within these areas, and without management planning it would be much more difficult for co-management of these lands between TH and YG to happen.

I would like to see some sort of protected corridor established along the Indian River.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

All SMA IIs become SMA Is.

Entire core range of the Fortymile caribou herd (LMU 23 + NW corner of LMU 17) become an SMA I.

The development thresholds in ISA IIIs and IVs are very, very high. I think the current amount of disturbance within LMU 12 is somewhere in the 2-2.5% range, and the thresholds within the draft plan would allow this to be doubled. The thresholds are also calculated in a way that averages out disturbance across entire LMUs, which means development can get ramped up in areas of high mineral interest, and then these disturbances are averaged out by areas of low mineral interest, which in many cases are very different ecosystems to the ones being damaged. I'd advocate for measuring disturbance thresholds within much smaller areas, e.g. do a disturbance threshold separately for each major river and creek valley within areas of high development interest.

Clearer definitions of which wetlands are "undisturbed wetlands," or a framework for identifying these wetlands, so that there isn't ambiguity when YESAB and/or YG are presiding over future mining projects within wetlands.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I strive to be mindful and respectful when I am on these lands, and to know there are stories and relationships that exist between First Nations, wildlife and these lands. I stay mindful of my place. I share my appreciation of these lands with others, and also know that as a photographer, the messages that photos tell about lands can impact the land.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

I'm not especially familiar with this idea specifically. Broadly though, I know how important it is to have programs to strengthen connections between people and the land. I've had the privilege to go out on the land with young people from THFN (including canoeing down the Indian River in 2020) and I'm fully supportive of initiatives that can help make more things like this happen.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Healthy fish and wildlife populations, a landscape that fosters connections between TH citizens and the land, connected and resilient ecosystems, and a community in Dawson that thrives from the inspiration of the lands that surround it.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

Partly. I think the Commission has a very good intent, but some of the details of the plan need to be changed to align with this vision.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

It's hard for me to say fully yes or fully no. I appreciate that the Draft Plan speaks to stewardship and sustainability as key tenants of the plan, yet sustainability is much easier to include in a vision statement than achieve on the ground.

It's hard to say this is a draft that would achieve this vision, when less than 4% of the region is designated to become a new, fully protected area, or when the levels of development in some areas are so, so high.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

Development needs to stay within levels that ecosystems and wildlife can tolerate. This is a difficult matter to approach, and some wildlife have especially high ecological and cultural significance. It makes sense that thresholds on development should align with what these valued components can tolerate, and our understanding of what levels of development are too much for species like caribou, salmon and grizzly bears should shape how development thresholds are set.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

Shouldn't this read "no development in 'undisturbed' bog and marshes" etc.?

I support the approach here, though want to know more about which wetlands are undisturbed wetlands and which ones aren't. This merits much more detailed explanation in the plan, so that future decisions by YESAB/YG aren't foggy on the Commission's intention, and so that the public can assess what degree of the Region's wetlands the draft plan would protect.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Carbon storage is a big one... climate change can seem like such a daunting thing to address, but protecting wetlands and keeping carbon underground is a practical way that the Dawson Land Use Plan can contribute in a meaningful way to efforts to curb climate change.

I've heard TH citizens speak about feeling displaced from hunting among wetlands in places like the Indian River because of the amount of development, and this trend needs to be reversed.

I'm also a dedicated birdwatcher, and appreciate wetlands as fantastic bird habitat.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

These are both ecologically and culturally important wetlands, though the entire Indian River wetland complex is worthy of this distinction.

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?
See above.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

Climate change, climate change, climate change.

As explained above, it's critical to keep carbon sinks intact, and this is something the plan can do.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

Very few areas with full protection.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

SMA I Is is a great designation.

SMA II should be used very sparingly if at all.

ISA III and IV development thresholds are too high.

The things I would change are...

Make SMA IIs into SMA Is.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Critical areas for Dall Sheep, caribou, fish, migratory birds, outdoor recreation, carbon storage, etc. etc. The Dawson Region sits between the Peel Watershed and protected areas in Alaska and the Peel, and as such can be an important piece in the connectivity of northern ecosystems.

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

This designation would allow development to happen on claims, though obviously the feasibility of this is geography-dependent, and is much more feasible in places like LMU 19 than other SMA IIs.

It's problematic that mining claims gets to pre-empt land use planning decisions (e.g. if you've staked a claim you are allowed to disturb a land that otherwise would be protected). Most of this problem falls at the feet of YG, but the Commission should do what it feels is best for the land, and not let fears over mining claims water down stewardship and sustainability.

Secondly, without management planning it would be hard to have co-management in SMA IIs. Making these permanently protected areas would make them eligible to new federal funding opportunities, like through guardians programs

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

This is a very important job you have been tasked with! Keep in mind the reasons that brought you here, what makes you care about the lands and the communities here.

Survey ID# 676

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? mining

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

I recognize the extreme amount of pressure that is on the commission by all users of the land and by groups that are not users of the land but have a strong voice. I can see in the plan and in the maps how the interests of all have been thought about and reflected with in. I was and am very thankful for the time that has been taken and the effort that has went into the draft but also recognize this is a draft and will look forward to how the info is received and what the next version will look like.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

LMU 3 Yukon river. I do not completely agree with the commissions stance on this LMU and I believe that it should be planned in this plan and not recommended for a sub regional plan. By suggesting this LMU for a sub R plan would create myriad of problems. Currently the corridor is on a interim withdrawal and this probably would stay in place until the sub plan would be finished which would be how long? 5-10-15 years?? With leaving the ban in place industry would have no way to explore vast amounts of the region because access would be denied or restricted to only the current access points. You would also see controversy arise or build between all groups because they would be constantly using the lack of action on this plan in the future to attack the Yukon government. The Yukon Government is already a year over due on the beaver river plan and has 11? more regional plans to complete. They are at capacity, have limited money that is already allocated to the plans that are bound to them thru the UFA and will not be able to nor have the desire to try to figure out how to fit in another plan. this could therefore sit on a shelf for a decade or two quite easily, when we already have a commission, staff, offices, money and time to do it now.

With the suggestion of disturbance thresholds in the plan there also needs to be recognition that proper reclaimed lands need to be recognized and have the ability to be put back into the "pool" and removed from the disturbance numbers

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

LMU 19 has, since the draft has came out, shown a massive potential as one of the few areas left for the placer industry to advance into new ground that hasn't been explored much in the past. with the current draft and the amount of land that is being proposed to be in areas where the restrictions and limitations prohibit industry to explore or produce it does not seem like an executable balance to also be placing the upper Indian into a category that would also be too constrictive on the placer industry to allow for it to be properly explored and mined if needed.

I would also plan the Yukon river corridor

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

I agree that a fund promoting stewardship in the area is a good idea, however with the ongoing Placer Mining Act modernization, I caution any duplication in funds, tax systems or other revenue structures until more is known.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

I think proper management, recognition of the modern mining methods and the regulations, policies and laws that govern them already and not comparing them to mining that happened 30-40-100 years ago. we need the ability to still go out on the land responsibly and continue having a successful, responsible placer industry

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

I believe there is a greater emphasis on how to mitigate mining, not on how to see it thrive responsibly. A thriving and responsible placer industry is how I see sustainable development

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĚK HWĚCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

This depends on what values are more important to the Commission. If development is to be sustainable, placer miners need access to areas to mine and reclaim the ground when they are done. The current Draft Plan does not make that easy for a miner, and is prohibitive of this kind of sustainable development. Placer miners need to see more support if it is determined ok to proceed.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Economy of the region is strongly tied to the placer industry

Reclamation of placer mined areas (current and historic) an important part of stewardship and sustainability

Placer mining creates unique and biodiverse habitat and does not negatively effect water quality, quantity and flow when mined responsibly. Landscape diversity, found in reclaimed areas, equals greater biodiversity.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Pretty much all the studies I have seen show that in reclaimed, and historical un reclaimed lands there is higher biodiversity, more moose. more birds, more of the rarest wetlands found in the region, more fish, more of everything pretty much but this does not seem to show up anywhere nor does it get recognized as a contributor to the environment. The Klondike gold fields not only support one of of not the highest moose harvest numbers but also supports the highest density of moose in the Yukon, therefore showing the best moose habitat and sustainable harvest numbers that rival anywhere else in the Yukon. This is solely because of what the placer industry leaves behind.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Not sure

I could agree with this if also the studies and surveys that show positive effects of properly reclaimed areas are used and recognized

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

I dislike the approach to wetlands. It values conservation over industry (when it is only in areas that placer mining occurs that this approach would be used) is too complex and is too strict to see industry succeed in the future. The current approach will seriously harm

industry, and will create massive negative cumulative effects on the community as a result: businesses shut down, less workers, less infrastructure into existing businesses as people and money leave the area. This will trickle down to other sectors in other parts of the Territory. Who will the public sector staff work for if there is no private sector left? The current wetlands strategy is too hard to meet and would be challenging to enforce.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

I think it is important to protect wetland complexes in areas where no mineral values exist, in LMUs 1 and 4 for example; but to allow for peat wetlands in LMU 12, 17 and 19 to be reclaimed to fully functioning mineral wetlands as a result of sustainable development through placer mining.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

There are several families working in these areas that need the ability to keep their businesses going – they do not cover all wetlands, but the area of special importance covers all operators. I believe there are better ways to protect wetlands and ecology than putting families out of business because of a map.

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Development should be allowed to occur in fens (no limit).

Please explain your answer.

I do not agree with the Commission's current threshold information. If I had to pick of course I would ask for the high range of 75%, however I know this information has been developed from the Yukon Government's interim approach to placer mining in wetlands, and that the numbers are arbitrary and not based on science or consequence of mining. It is also not a miner's intent to disturb wetlands arbitrarily, it is only to access the gold resource which tends to be found in valley bottoms. I believe that mining should be allowed in wetlands in certain LMUs (12 for example), regulated by

reclamation standards enforced by mining inspectors. The Draft Plan should be more high level and simple to read. The legislation and regulators can enforce about the details.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

That most of the planning area is off-limits for development, including areas that have current, existing work.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

LMUs 9, 19, 17, 20, and 23 have known placer interest and should have placer mining as a value to preserve, rather than seeing it as a negative impact. If we are not protected or at least encouraged through the Draft Plan, there will be no development to sustain.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Unsure

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

The Commission has done a good job making only the most important areas SMA1 areas and I support them in not protecting areas for money but for the values. I understand the funding that is available to the Environmental NGOs make it attractive to them to push for everything to be an SMA1. Instead, I think SMA2 areas should be integrated into the ISA framework, and allow for more diversity in guidelines on how the land should be managed in those areas.

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Unsure

I understand the words "special management area" have been borrowed from the Peel Plan, which is problematic to start with. It might be better to rename SMA2s as a Conservation Value Area instead. This should allow the Commission to protect certain values in certain areas, like moose, or development, as well as wetlands or caribou

(depending on the area). Ultimately, I would like to see SMA2 areas either designated as an SMA1 "park", or morphed into an ISA, allowing for future development.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Take into consideration the positive effects left behind from properly executed and reclaimed placer lands, the benefits we all live with from a prospering industry and also what kind of future is in this plan for placer mines and this community.

Survey ID# 674

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? No

If so, what sector do you work in?

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

Corridor Areas
Management Intent
Discussion Section

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

1. Disclosure of how destructive the placer mining industry is to the landscape. Quit calling them stewards or proponents exercising sustainable development...there's nothing 'sustainable' with placer mining
2. More information on the ALCES modeling methodology used to generate preliminary results which informed future land changes predictions

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

1. Special Management Area I definitions: "no new industrial land use or surface access is allowed.
2. Special Management Area II definitions: Restricted industrial land use is allowed for existing mineral rights. All other lands not currently holding mineral tenure or other land use tenure should be withdrawn on either an interim or permanent basis.
3. Integrated Stewardship Area is used to identify areas where higher levels of industrial and other development can occur.
4. Surface disturbance and linear density tracking:
5. Reference to changes made on how YESAB conducts assessments...this is industry trying to eliminate YESAB.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

- Respect my surroundings
- Harvest and cultivate only what I need
- Be fully aware and in the moment while out on the land

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Forty-mile Caribou Herd

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

Sure

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

1. I do not like the way 'sustainable development' is referenced as in the Plan. The use of this term is intended to characterize activities that are conducted in a renewable way and require limited resources (ecosystem services) to recreate. To include 'mining' as one of these economies is a travesty...they are extracting a finite mineral resource and negatively impacting many other valuable resources during the process of extracting. I am not anti-mining, just make sure you call it for what it is.
2. For these reasons, I think the Commission needs to re-look at its work on this section. I.e. for SMA I, the Commission has defined these areas to see the maximum level of environmental protection yet states no new mineral activity will occur. Ok, so the current practices can continue regardless of how destructive they are?
3. Rather, if the Commission wants to get anywhere near including mining into sustainable development, why not include recommendations such as placer miners will need to show proof of adopting new less destructive mining techniques, or annual successful reclamation efforts, or relinquishing a portion of tenure for ecological succession trials

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

No

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Hunting
Fishing
Nature
Travel
Water
Environment
Family

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area
Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

Yes, human development must be limited in the sense that we need to first better understand the full effects of human development on the landscape (collect the baseline), then we will use this to inform how/if development can proceed, and lastly, by encouraging the adoption of new technologies, development proponents could possibly enhance methods used with the same or smaller foot print or ecological effect.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

Like

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

The loss of wetlands or important ecosystem function

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Wetlands always serve a very important purpose. They are at the head waters of every creek/river and provide for a large number of wildlife species in the Yukon. These should be protected and I'm glad to see you will protect all wetlands throughout the pl

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

I can't remember specifics on location but I was up indian river road once. Any remaining wetland we came across should be protected. All wetlands in planning region should be protected.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

I'd be curious to see discussion notes on how these LMU polygons were drawn in. Seems to me they were mainly based on development interests with exception to corridor designations.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

I had higher expectations of the planning Commission to objectively develop a plan based on properly managing the remaining limited wilderness areas. Doesn't seem to have fixed the land-use issues we face in YG decision-making. In fact, the main thing achieved here for the mining industry (especially the KPMA members) is certainty.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Unsure

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Late submission didn't have time to review in level of detail warranted for an informed response

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Yes

Unsure how this definition pairs up to SMU 1? This one seems more protective than SMU 1 because you explicitly imply that no new staking will occur in these areas...only allow existing development. That to me makes sense but your definition for SMU 1 needs some serious revisions and significantly more variant to the SMU 2 definition.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Take a solid re-read through the draft plan to make sure that an objective lens was maintained throughout document drafting and really consider the thoughtful feedback you receive from all respondents. I typically feel the best survey feedback (and best advice) comes from individuals who speak out in the interests of many others from many

faucets of life/interests...those who are looking out for the best interests of their own will only give you bad advice.

Commission members and supports, thank you for all your hard work!

Survey ID# 672

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Born and raised here

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

Not much, more rules, more restrictions, less opportunity for people to enjoy the land and make a living. it also is feeding into the segregation of the people by creating go and no go areas for different demographics of people. miners here, no miners here, no orvs here (for NoN FN) no access here for non FN, access here for Non FN,

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Fair and equal treatment for all

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

There is too much Me against you in this plan. It is all about who gets to go where and who doesnt, not about a holistic approach that sees positives and negatives of all sides and works to manage them together. ie, mining disrupts the land and alters it for a period but in time it will all revert back. Fn hunt and kill animals, catch all the fish, drive quads over sensitive lands and have no harvest records to assist in management of species but get free reign.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

different then what? I eat what I harvest and only harvest what I need. grow a garden, pick berries and love to watch wildlife in everything they do. boat, fish , hunt, hike, bike, and snowmobile.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

WHere does the money come from and who gets to decide where it goes?

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Fairness and equality for the future, not division

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

one way or another they were, either taken away, restricted or made to feel like it can only occur in special areas. too much control.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĚK HWĚCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

If decisions are based on populations and harvest numbers then FN need to start providing harvest records, they have the ability to add this to there wildlife act and when they announced it years ago YG was so disappointed that all they did was create away to regulate non th hunters. time to start contributing instead of living in the past of the "stewards of the land" this was lost a long time ago and doesnt work with all the other pressures that are on the animals now.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area WOW, talk about a loaded question, its not the roads. mining or agriculture. its that our population has went from 29,000. to over 44,000 people. talk about a biased survey!!!

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

No

would be better to limit the amount of residence we allow in the territory instead.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

Blanket no development is too extreme, marshes are easily recreated and bogs might be able to be recreated in the near future so to blanket them in this is not management

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

are they really that important? or is this another tool being wielded by the environmentalists to stop industry? what about the studies that show the negative effects and carbon releases from wetlands? why does no one recognize these studies? because it doesnt follow the narrative being pushed

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

scottie creek yes, upper Indian is not that significant and with all the disturbance downstream what benefit is there to shutting it down? what about upper flat creek or the mouth of Stewart river?

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?
as in last question,, what about chandindu? Upper flat creek? Stewart river? all more significant then upper Indian, only difference is no activity there so no pressure from NGO's

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Development should be allowed to occur in fens (no limit).

Please explain your answer.

abundance of fens and they aren't as productive as they like to pretend. mostly all in permafrost and don't function like in the south because they are frozen all the time and maybe thaw about three to four inches in mid summer

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

based on presence of activity and no sign of projecting into the future.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

do future planning and plan for that and not for just where we are today.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

No

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

they are only designated this because of the lack of mineral activity within the emu

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Unsure

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

look at the bigger picture, IF the commission restricts 40-60% of the most active region in the Yukon what will the Yukon look like after all plans are completed? be fair, don't get caught listening to the lies.

Survey ID# 670

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Health Care

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Survey respondent"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

I found the layout of the Draft Plan document to be accessible, and the green pop-out boxes were useful for highlighting areas requiring public feedback.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

What is missing is deference to the spirit of the UFA which emphasizes the importance of traditional knowledge in land use planning. If TH recommended 60% protection of the area, 3.8% does not represent a compromise- it is an insult. Yukon First Nations gave up their land in exchange for shared input in land use planning. Industry and government have had their go at managing the land, calling the shots, for 120+ years. Please do more to elevate TH's voice and recommendations in this Plan.

Also, I don't think that there is much written about addressing the legacy of the last 120 years of largely unplanned land use. Could you add recommendations on remediation in industrially disturbed and polluted areas?

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Better, full protection for riparian zones. Better protection in areas that can sustain no further development without becoming permanent dead-zones (eg. Indian River wetlands). Plan seems very status quo in this regard, giving the highest protection to regions that would not have been developed industrially anyway (eg. LMU 18). Was disappointed in the low percentage of completely protected areas, especially given that TH requested substantially more protection than this Draft Plan delivers.

Also, I have concerns about the way the plan calculates disturbance thresholds by averaging disturbance over an entire area. It is riparian zones and valleys that sustain most disturbance from industrial activities, so please do more to limit ecological destruction in these zones. The averaging approach leaves these sensitive areas open to irreversible damage.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I try to minimize my disturbance when recreating in the Dawson area. I don't pollute, try to leave no trace, teach my kids the consequences of our actions when out on the land. I try to educate myself and my family about the flora and fauna where I live, pay attention to the world around me as a way of elevating the importance of the natural world on which we so depend.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

It is great, but we need to make sure the Plan itself has teeth, that it can protect land from development. Stewardship activities can help connect people to land, offer education, enhance/restore habitat etc, but overemphasizing the Stewardship Trust to me provides the potential for good PR opportunities without substantive change in land use practices.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Better protection for riparian zones. Better protection for caribou habitat and migration corridors. Food security for TH - protect the water, ensure that sufficiently large tracks of habitat, especially wetlands are fully protected, indefinitely. Identify and release agricultural land that people can actually grow food on in a sustainable manner (ie. that they are allowed to build homes and outbuildings on, where there is access to water, where there is not an expectation to clear 30+ acres of land when you can grow food on less than 10.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

The things I care about were mostly included, but not adequately addressed. I am disappointed mostly in the disparity between the Plan's recommendations for land protection and TH's recommendations.

**REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN
FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)**

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

The Draft Plan does not do enough to protect large tracks of uninterrupted land necessary for sustaining healthy wildlife populations indefinitely. Especially in a time of climate change and uncertainty as to how exactly our region will be affected, I would like to see more emphasis on preservation. The Draft Plan seems very status quo at a time when we should be doing everything we can to ensure that our region can sustain us into the future. Furthermore, what has happened in the past in the Klondike was not sustainable, it DID already undermine ecological and social systems upon which indigenous communities were dependent. The plan should acknowledge this and take steps toward rectifying it.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

I feel I have already answered that question. No.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Biodiverse healthy intact ecosystems, clean drinking water, berries, caribou, moose, grouse, salmon, grayling, burbot, hiking, fishing, timber for harvesting- firewood and building materials, mushrooms.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area
Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

I like that no development will be considered in bogs and marshes, but I understand that they make up a very small percentage of land in the Region.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Water purification, habitat for animals, water source during drought.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

I agree with the protection of any and all wetlands in the region.

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

Because they are highly sensitive to disturbance.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

That there are only two areas that are completely protected and one of them would never be developed anyway, so really not much of a compromise between "industry" and preservation. River corridors don't appear to have any particular protection.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

Not using green to represent areas open to high levels of development. (Haha. Joking-not joking.)

The things I would change are...

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

It still permits activities that are incompatible with habitat protection.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Consider that we are in a time of great uncertainty with climate change, the Chinook fishery is collapsed, the Chum fishery has been closed for two seasons now. There is more hunting pressure of here as southern Yukon hunters move north for their fall hunts. Please listen to TH's recommendations and move the Plan more towards a better balance between industrial development and conservation. I realize you have to consider current interests, but the status quo has not represented a balanced approach to land use planning. Please help restore the balance.

Survey ID# 669

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? No

If so, what sector do you work in?

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

The inclusion of land stewardship and the Precautionary Principle, despite the half-hearted application of these principles in the plan itself. Adaptive Management is also an attractive concept, but it is not presented with adequate support in the plan to be effectively implemented on an ongoing basis.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

The lack of explicit targets for conservation areas. A 30% rate, as set by the federal government, should be the bare minimum here. The disconnected nature of the small percentage of land that is actually protected in the current plan will limit their benefits, and the protection provided by the SMA 2 LMUs is very limited. I refer to the recommendations of the Yukon Conservation Society for further shortcomings of the draft plan.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Ensure at least 30% of the region is permanently protected by law, with protected lands sufficiently large, appropriately located, and interconnected to support healthy populations of critical species like caribou.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Somewhat

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

The majority of my free time, especially in the summer, is spent on the land. Whether it's exercised through hiking, biking, paddling, harvesting wild edibles, etc., I highly value my connection to the land. I have also devoted my career to protecting the environment through clean energy, so much of my personal life and professional life are focused on connecting to and protecting the land.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

While the creation of the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust sounds like it will have long-term benefits for the area and its occupants (including it's non-human occupants), it must not be treated as a replacement for sufficient legal permanent protection of 30+ percent of the region.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Ensuring the long-term protection of the Region's natural wilderness for future generations and supporting the ongoing prosperity of the Region's biodiversity.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

The draft plan has significant shortcomings. As presented, the draft plan fails Yukoners and would be a permanent scar in the history of conservation in the Yukon. Significant revisions are necessary for the plan to achieve its full potential in the balanced, sustainable protection of the Region.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĚK HWĚCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

The plan as drafted gives a clear priority to socio-economic development over ecological and social systems, with its extremely low percentage of adequately protected areas which are scattered throughout the Region and the intense level of development permitted in much of the Region. The development permitted by the draft plan would drastically undermine the ecological and social systems upon which communities and societies are dependent, which is in direct contradiction of the concept of sustainable development and therefore of the Final Agreement.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

The draft plan fails to incorporate the integrated, sustainable conservation of land, air, and water that is necessary to ensure the ongoing prosperity of the Region's biodiversity. The protection of this biodiversity is central to not only the survival of critical species like caribou but several social and cultural elements of life for Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in citizens in the Region.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Tracking of cumulative impacts of human activity, like the work being conducted by the Yukon Conservation Society, should be incorporated into the decision-making process for any human activities on the land. The Seven Generations principle would also be a valuable addition to this process; considering the long-term effects of the cumulative impacts of human activity - past, present, and future.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

The amount of pure wilderness in the Region, and throughout the Yukon, is a big part of why I fell in love with the Yukon. Permitting the intrusion of human activity into regions that were otherwise difficult to access and mostly untouched by human activity would destroy the pure wilderness of the affected regions forever. Avoiding the permanent damage caused by such activities, whether they're related to mining, tourism, or recreation, must be prioritized over the short-term benefits of the activities.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

My previous response serves as an explanation to this question as well. The Yukon Conservation Society's responses also mirror my values and priorities regarding conservation in the Region.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Both of these wetlands are worthy of the designation partly because they are at the headwaters of a watershed, and thus play a significant role in water storage and flow regulation. I agree with the Yukon Conservation Society's recommendation that other h

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

The limited nature of the inclusion of these two Wetlands leaves several sensitive wetland areas exposed to damage from human activity that cannot be resolved through remediation within a human-scale timeframe. Please refer to the Yukon Conservation Society's recommendations for other areas, including areas in LMU #11 and 21.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

The survey states why: fens contain significant amounts of naturally sequestered carbon and are nearly impossible to replace. Areas with significant amounts of naturally sequestered carbon, like fens, must not be disturbed so as to not further the acceleration of climate change. Furthermore, these sensitive ecosystems support several endangered species both within their boundaries and in adjacent areas of the same watershed. The short-term benefits of non-renewable resource extraction in these critical, sensitive ecosystems must not be valued over the long-term benefits of their protection.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

Permitting development in existing claims in SMU 2 areas erodes the level of protection afforded to these areas of high conservation value. Since they're of such high conservation value, development should be severely restricted.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

My friends and colleagues who work more directly in conservation were shocked by the low percentage of protected area in the drafted plan. Having discussed it with them, it is clear that the plan as-is would be a national embarrassment and a failure for future generations. The recommendations of community-based conservation groups like the Yukon Conservation Society should be seriously considered and, whenever at all possible, implemented fully. Please help us establish a legacy of long-term legally-binding

conservation and sustainable land stewardship, not one of destruction in the name of short-term benefits.

Survey ID# 668

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? No

If so, what sector do you work in?

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

Well, that land use planning is happening at all is great...

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

consideration of the cumulative impacts of development

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Restrict industrial activity on wetlands which cannot be re-created after the damage is done.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

Outdoor activities, harvesting, kayak, bike, foot, camping, wall-tenting, snowshoeing, nature observation. Participating in clean-up activities, and waste reduction.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

Seems to me like the Plan does not really want to deal with the long-term impacts of mining on wetlands and other sensitive habitat, nor its impact on the 40 Mile caribou herd.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Stop the destruction of wetlands by mining.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

hm.....

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

Everybody is tip-toeing around the placer miner's interests, many who moved from Alaska after their destructive practices were limited there.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Again, immense efforts have been made to grand-father in the practices of placer mining. Instead, the plan should not permit placer mining on wetlands and other sensitive parts of the eco-system.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Is the 40 Mile Caribou Herd back for good? If so, why? As well, what species are we losing under the existing Bandit Mining Regime, where fuel-handling barges are a foot shorter than the length that would make them inspected as commercial vessels, and include road tankers not running on roads, to further escape regulatory review and enforcement. Cumulatively, these risky practices lead to fuel oil spills---which may not be reported---which are devastating.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Have seen above on Yukon River, which is one not-street-legal tanker truck on a barge-a-foot-too-short to be commercially regulated away from a massive oil spill...

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

Its about respecting all the people and creatures around us.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

Reclaiming wetlands after mining is not possible. Why is this fiction in the plan?

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Wink nudge development, without permitting at all, 'pirate' activities where safety standards of the most basic level, such as is used in diesel fuel transport on the Yukon River, are ignored.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

We should not have to list the wetlands we want to protect. All wetlands should be protected.

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Development should be allowed to occur in fens (no limit).

Please explain your answer.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

SMA-2 is a gutless way to make it look like public lands are protected but still allow the industry to spoil them. ='flexibility'

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Remember that public lands belong to the public, and to First Nations under the UFA and modern treaties. These values come first, and must be maintained despite pressure from industry.

Survey ID# 666

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Food service

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

Climate change considerations - especially wetlands.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

More protection, stronger language.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I compost and make efforts to reduce my consumption of non-compostable materials. I support the leadership of Yukon First Nations above other levels of government and look to their long

term traditional ways of land management for guidance. I grow my own food and purchase as much locally grown food as possible. I educate myself about local land based issues and processes. I teach others about best harvesting practices and work to grow community around land stewardship through various online platforms.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

Would love to see even more investment in helping people (especially youth) make meaningful life-long connections to the land, local agricultural infrastructure/regulation.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

First nations land management, limited responsible resource extraction, local food production.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĚK HWĚCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development?

Please provide explanation

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Wetland health, caribou, moose, water quality, salmon populations.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Each season there are more people from southern Yukon hunting moose in the areas i normally hunt, causing increased traffic on the roads and rivers, more waste in remote areas, and less moose being harvested by local families.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

We should asses every action or development in terms of its long term affect on the land. We should prioritize the health of our forests and rivers in every single decision we make.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

I think it's a very good start but that given the importance of wetlands, we need to be braver and more firm in protecting them. We can't be afraid of special interests groups or making unpopular decisions, there is no going back once they are destroyed.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Carbon sequestering, forest fire management, and animal habitat.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

All wetlands are crucial to climate change mitigation and the long term health of the land and should be prioritized above all development, especially non-renewable resource extraction.

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Flat Creek wetlands, and all other identifiable wetlands in the region.

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

Carbon sequestering forests and other ecosystems all over the world are becoming carbon emitters due to development and fires, we need to keep as much carbon in the earth as possible.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

There seem to be more ISAs than SMAs.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

Large chunks of SMAs.

The things I would change are...

I don't think areas should be open for development simply because they have been historically. There is still a lot of land within the ISAs that could benefit from stronger protection, despite (or even because of) historical and modern mining activities.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

Why not permanent protection? We don't know what changes the next decades could bring, but we know they will be drastic and exponential, why not take some land off the table for development and allow more flexibility in future land use plans? We need to leave future generations something to work with, the land use planning process is ongoing as long as human inhabit this area.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Be brave. Listen to the people that are putting the land before their own interests, whether it be mining, tourism, or recreation.

Survey ID# 664

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes, seasonally

If so, what sector do you work in? professional consulting assist First Nation (TH), mining and Yukon Government

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Room for a reasonable amount of industrial development.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

The development thresholds are way to precautionary in all ISA zones. Planning was done to determine areas for protection and development, by adding such tight thresholds to the development areas the plan is preventing a reasonable amount of development in areas that were marked for that reason. The science used to select these numbers was very selective and there is much science available on caribou and other components that show higher levels are acceptable!

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I respect the land, I work and recreate on the land and value the various ecosystems in the region.
I believe in responsible development and feel it is possible to allow development and still sustain the ecological values in the region.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

Could be useful, will note that this may or may not be needed given there are many other funding sources available for this kind of thing.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Balance, draft plan does not achieve the balance (too much protection)

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

Doesn't provide room for development to occur. Sustainable development is achievable at higher thresholds.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

It is going too far. Any new project in any industrial area will have to prove that there won't be cumulative effects within the YESAA process so why does the plan does not have to be so conservative in nature.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Not sure

Yes to a point, but not as conservative as the plan indicates. Each project within the area will have to demonstrate during YESAB so having the plan be so conservative now is essentially limiting development to those who act quick, limiting opportunities for future generations.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

No, allow for each project to be evaluated on its own merit. Development in a bog may be ok if there is a plan to create alternative wetland habitat such as open water wetlands that could add more value to wildlife and fish.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Open water wetlands are very important to ecological function and wildlife species.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Not decided

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?
not sure

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Development should be allowed to occur in fens (no limit).

Please explain your answer.

Each project should be measured on its own merit through YESAA and the Water Board.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

Special management areas seem too high.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

#10 seems like it could be narrower and focused around the Klondike River. #7 could be smaller and more focused around the highway.

4 limits development could be smaller

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

No

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

#10 seems like it could be narrower and focused around the Klondike River. #7 could be smaller and more focused around the highway.

4 limits development could be smaller

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Yes

Provided the area is reduced, #10 seems like it could be narrower and focused around the Klondike River. #7 could be smaller and more focused around the highway. it is appropriate to have such areas.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Remember future generations care about many things including the ability to develop some areas. Following the plan, the various assessment and permitting requirements don't go away, proponents still have to prove that ecological thresholds will not be exceeded. Look at the North Yukon plan and Chance Petroleum who could not get through YESAA despite being well within thresholds set by the plan!

Survey ID# 663

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Carpenter, Commercial Fisher and Arts and Culture

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

It is attempting to address the difficult and sometimes contentious issues around land use, development and stewardship with an eye on how future generations will be impacted by the regulatory and legislative decisions resulting from this process. Good that "Stewardship" is a guiding principle of the Plan. Let's hope this also follows through when it comes time to ratify and implement the plan.

I have to admit that my past experience with the Peel Plan process and YG's litigiousness approach to accepting its recommendations has left me somewhat cynical about how this Commission's good work, and the considerable time and effort stakeholders have contributed, will play out within the corridors of power and bureaucracy when all is said and done. Despite this, I commend all of the people involved with this Plan for their dedication and work towards creating a balanced and progressive road map for the

betterment of the regional environment we, and future generations, all depend on for our existence.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Identify Environmental Full Costs Accounting (EFCA)/ True-Cost Accounting (TCA) practices within the wording of the plan as part of the Stewardship principles that guide the Plan and its eventual implementation.

For example, "methane" appears once in the entire Draft Plan - at the top of page 101. It is contextualized as a greenhouse gas emitted as part of the natural process of decay within a wetland. No mention is made of how dangerous a contributor to anthropocentric climate change this gas is when released through industrial and agricultural activity in not only wetlands, but also in areas of permafrost. Methane has a global warming potential (GWP) 84 times greater than CO₂ in a 20-year time frame.

When conducting a cost/ benefits analysis through an EFCA or TCA model one would account for the current and future deficits and/ or liabilities of releasing methane as a byproduct of industrial or agricultural activities that negatively impact wetlands and/ or thaw large areas of permafrost as part of their process. A good example of this is a placer operation clearing large areas of overburden to intentionally melt permafrost so as to access pay dirt. The methane released from the permafrost has a cost to the environment and future generations through its impacts as a powerful greenhouse gas. From a "Stewardship" perspective this is a real cost, which needs to be factored into any costs/ benefits assessment, or impacts analysis, related to activities impacting the Land.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Good to read that LMU 3: YUKON RIVER "CHU KON DĀK is being recommended to have its own sub-regional plan, but shouldn't there be some designation of how much land on either side of the river is designated as a buffer/ setback zone (say 100 meters, except where there is preexisting development/ infrastructure?). This may already exist, but I couldn't find reference to this in the draft plan.

Also consider including all salmon spawning rivers/ tributaries of the Yukon/ Chu-Kon Dek within this sub-regional plan (including riparian buffer zones), as this would meet the plan's stated goal a "...management approach for the corridor should be holistic." Within the disastrous context of the current Yukon River salmon crisis, every effort should be made to ensure minimal impacts on the waterways and riparian zones that are essential to keeping salmon within our environment.

An "holistic" management regime also needs to acknowledge and speak to the critical role of salmon not only within a food source and cultural context, but also how important they are to the health and well being of the ecosystems they inhabit. Salmon leave the spawning grounds as tiny fry and return as carriers of massive quantities of nutrients acquired in the ocean, which both the aquatic and land based plants and

animals of the river's ecosystems need to sustain their health and growth. Without salmon returning in sustainable numbers I fear for the future of those ecosystems that depend on salmon for their health and well being. The scientific and traditional knowledge to back this up is immense and needs to be integrated into this management plan.

Salmon are an indicator species and should be recognized as such within the plan as huge parts of the land covered within it are dependent on them for their very existence.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

Living a life that acknowledges the need to respect and honour the lands and their ecosystems that I'm dependent on for my health and existence. I live in a manner which keeps my consumption of energy, goods and resources to a minimum. I source much of my food locally and spend time on the land and the river whenever possible.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

I think the wording of its intended mandate shouldn't shy away from giving the Trust direction in regards to things like addressing Climate Change/ Emergency, species extinction, food security, etc. These are pressing issues impacting us currently and will have potentially increased negative impacts on future generations if they are not addressed now. Mentioning industry innovation, reclamation and educational/ research opportunities is great, but stating more detailed/ specific outcomes needs to happen before I could judge whether or not I would support it.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Irresponsible, inefficient and wasteful exploitation of resources with the bulk of the economic benefits being exported from the region. Concurrent with this is the burden of

dealing with the environmental and social impacts being foisted upon the community to deal with after the fact.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

50/50. We'll see what happens to the plan once it's recommendations are submitted to the political powers that be. If YG's past attitudes and response to these types of publicly driven planning models is any indication I'm not holding my breath for a positive outcome in favour for the things that matter most to me....

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

Not to put too fine a point on it, but if the Plan is intended to address Sustainable Development within the region "...that does not undermine the ecological and social systems upon which communities and societies are dependent.", then no mining or conventional tourism industries (as currently practiced) would be allowed to take place here. Both of these industries are incredibly hydrocarbon consumption heavy and carbon/ methane polluting, leading factors in the global climate crisis we find ourselves in. This "crisis" is already proving to have substantial negative impacts that "undermine" regional ecosystems - as if the local changes we are witnessing seasonally aren't evidence enough, the Plan itself points out that "...from 1955 to 2004 at weather stations in Dawson and Mayo reflect a warming trend of approximately 6Â°C per century." There is good reason for alarms to be going off across the regions ecosystems - the global consensus that anything above a 1.5 degree rise in mean temperature is reason to be concerned for our "comfort", let alone the sustainability of our current ecosystem. 6Â°C is a factor of four above that upper limit, that puts us in the realm of Dante's Inferno.....

I'm not looking to shut down mining or tourism, but I do think the Draft Plan needs to be more honest, realistic and pragmatic, if in language alone, about being in the midst of a Climate Crisis whose impacts are far reaching and potentially disastrous for the "ecological and social systems" we are currently dependent on. Potentially dramatic and drastic environmental and ecological changes are coming and I don't think this Plan goes far enough to address how we might adapt to the change, let alone do our part to mitigate it.

I understand and appreciate that this land use plan could serve as an excellent tool/ mechanism towards addressing some of the concerns I raise, but I hope you can further

that potential by being more direct and clear about how this plan will address the current and evolving Climate Crisis we find ourselves in. One suggestion towards this is to include an "Outcomes" section at the end of the plan, which includes outcomes to address the Climate Crisis.

I think that a list of outcomes would also help summarize and make clear the main points of the Plan. The current format and language of the summary, partial and full draft plan (all of which I looked at) is incredibly confusing and onerous, even to someone like myself who is well versed in this kind of document and language.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Clean water, salmon on spawning grounds, healthy local and migratory bird populations, habitat diversity and health, connected intact ecosystems for animal movement and migration, properly reclaimed/ restored exploration and mine sites (hard rock and placer), on the land educational opportunities, land stewardship training and education opportunities for all resource industry workers (one day course at start of season should be mandatory, possibly offered in partnership between TH and EMR?) - everyone who interacts with the land should consider themselves Stewards and learn how to do that to the best of their abilities/

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

-Trail systems help people, local and visitors, experience and learn about the land who might not otherwise.

-Look to already disturbed or cleared land for agriculture and don't clear forested areas when there are already large tracts of agricultural land not being utilized (e.g. Sunnydale, Indian River farm, etc.)

- Don't let mining and exploration camps burn garbage (some of it highly toxic substances) on site. If they have the means to ship it in then they have the means to ship it out! I've seen far too much burning of highly toxic waste out at camps I've worked in

and around. This is a ridiculous and shameful practice when almost every vehicle/ aircraft going back to town, sometimes daily, goes empty. I've witnessed entire appliances, 5 gallon buckets full of waste and tons of domestic waste full of plastics and other toxic substances either burned or buried - "Outta sight, outta mind." is an attitude who's time has passed and EMR should be doing more to ensure that sites are managed from a stewardship perspective and not an anything goes out here approach. Addressing ongoing polluting of the land by industry needs to be part of the Plan.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

- Because I'm not the only living thing on this planet.
- Because greed tends to trump (no pun intended) wisdom, knowledge and grace 10 out of 10 times, so we need to limit it if we're to survive together.
- Because there are limits to all aspects of existence and when they involve the "Commons" we should all be looking towards what we are passing on to future generations, and how our choices and decisions now will impact theirs during their time.
- Because our freedoms come with serious responsibilities, and those include responsibility for both our fellow human beings and the well being of our environments and all living things within them. That is the definition of "Stewardship" I live by.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

Should include buffer zones/ setbacks along waterways, especially rivers, but including major creeks and lakes.

Otherwise I support this approach.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

clean water, wildlife habitat, carbon sequestering, biodiversity.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Having first-hand experience and knowledge of the impacts and destruction of wetlands in the lower Indian River, I think it's time to preserve what's left of this important ecosystem for the animals and plants that depend on it. Loads of gold has already

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

They also help mitigate flooding and slow the spread of wildfires. The wildfire issue alone is reason enough we should leave these areas undeveloped, but flooding may also become a prescient issue in certain zones in the future. we need to be thinking beyond the immediate economic benefits of our relationship to our environment and set limits that engage with values beyond personal wealth accumulation. We won't get these back once they are gone, and we're only now starting to understand how important they are to the health and sustainability of our environment.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

Confusing.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Yes

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Yes

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

I think you are heading in the right direction with all of this (a difficult task indeed) and I'd like to pass along my thanks to the people involved for sticking with it and hearing all sides of the debates. While I appreciate that this will, to a certain extent, be a "living document", I would like you to give more consideration to what the coming impacts of the climate crisis will be, and how dramatically they will change the way we live within our community, and the limitations we'll experience regarding how we conduct ourselves economically.

We can't know when specific changes will come, nor what form they'll take, but we can err on the side of caution and plan and prepare for the worse, while hoping for the best. Some people will inevitable feel hard done by, offended and ignored, but you aren't going to satisfy everyone, nor should you try. You are tasked with the job of laying out the framework of how we shall conduct ourselves economically, ecologically and socially as a community in the near and distant future - this is an enormously important responsibility and the proof of the wisdom of your decisions will only be apparent in generations to come. I hope you think first and foremost of what shape you want to leave your home in for them to occupy and enjoy as you have.

Survey ID# 662

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Construction

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

concern for wetlands and caribou.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

sufficient protection of land.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

I would change the SMA 2 areas to SMA 1 areas.

I would put more protection into land south east and west of Dawson where our water comes from.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Somewhat

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I'm an avid hiker, canoer, fisher and hunter. I take care not to pollute or disturb the land and water. I pass my respect on to my kids.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

What matters most to me is protection and conservation of our pristine wilderness.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

No, I feel conservation is addressed but protection is not addressed nearly enough.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Yes

Please provide explanation

Virtually all the land is given very limited protection in order to (it seems) protect the notion of sustainable development. In my opinion, industry has far too large a say in the land use.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

I would like the land to remain intact pristine wilderness. I value the abundance of moose, caribou and berries. I value clean water above everything.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

I worry about contamination, spills and pollution from mining upstream from Dawson. Development and caribou do not go together.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

I like that wetlands are being recognized as very valuable natural features.

I think that wetlands, bogs, marshes and fens should be given a much higher degree of protection throughout the dawson region not just in special management areas.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

fish and wildlife habitat

carbon sink

water filtration

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Agree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

All wetlands are important so the fact that these two are given importance is great. The fact that only two were singled out, not so great.

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

I think the very heavy industrial activity and very limited wilderness protection directly south of Dawson is insane. All that industry will drain in the water directly to Dawson. I would not be surprised if there is a higher incidence of some cancers in Dawson compared to other places.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

More protection to the west for the 40 mile caribou herd.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Unsure

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

I'm not sure what conservation value they have or if they just have very little mineral or industrial value.

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

They should be just taken out and protected.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

The mining lobby is strong, but a pristine wilderness is worth far more in the long run for the health of the people and land.

Survey ID# 661

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Mining

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Local business owner/operator"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

I recognize the challenges in making a plan to suit everyone and I appreciate the effort and open mindedness of the commission in listening to everyone's needs.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Reclamation is missing from the Plan, as is the ability to have reclaimed mining "go back into the pot" for surface disturbance. Also, placer mining interests (as well as access to claims) in Land Management Unit 19, or LMU19 (Upper Indian River Wetlands), and LMU22 (Scottie Creek) exist for several families. The family businesses that have been in these areas for years will not be able to stay if the Plan is adopted as is.

LMU3, the Yukon River, is currently on-hold as an SMA2 waiting for "future planning". This will have significant negative effects in the interim if it cannot be considered for small-scale development of things like barge access points, especially to access the high mineral prospective areas on the west side of the River in LMUs 17 and 20, which are designated as ISA3s.

The Plan needs to be more flexible and high-level so industry is not limited by misrepresented directions in future permitting processes.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

I would combine LMU19 (Upper Indian River Wetlands) into LMU12 as it is highly valued placer area that has active work. I would change the thresholds or eliminate them altogether in favour of a simpler system that relies on the fact that placer mining does not use chemicals and that legislation and policy are making reclamation practices better and better. There is little risk if placer mining is acceptable to work with good reclamation practices.

At the very least I would like to see the wording changed from "no disturbance in wetlands" to "no unreclaimable disturbance". This opens up the opportunity for development in reclamation methods and doesn't completely shut down the industry

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

My business and family and the families of my 12 employees are supported directly by the mining industry. We consult with miners to help develop more sustainable mining plans. We provide reliable drilling and resources estimates that ensures that only economic land is disturbed

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

I would love to see something like this fund research projects for reclamation and sustainable mining methods

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Finding a way to allow responsible mining operations to continue to operate and support the local economy while appeasing the needs of all other stake holders

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

I believe there is a greater emphasis on how to mitigate mining, not on how to see it thrive responsibly. A thriving and responsible placer industry is how I see â€œsustainable developmentâ€ working in action. It, too, is based in conservation.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĚK HWĚCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

This depends on what values are more important to the Commission. If development is to be sustainable, placer miners need access to areas to mine and reclaim the ground when they are done. The current Draft Plan does not make that easy for a miner, and is prohibitive of this kind of sustainable development. Placer miners need to see more support if it is determined ok to proceed.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'onděk Hwěch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

• Economy of the region is strongly tied to the placer industry

• Reclamation of placer mined areas (current and historic) an important part of stewardship and sustainability

• Placer mining creates unique and biodiverse habitat and does not negatively effect water quality, quantity and flow when mined responsibly. Landscape diversity, found in reclaimed areas, equals greater biodiversity.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

Roads bias the perceptive of the mining industry as most roads are through legacy mine sites that were done when reclamation wasn't required. When you drive the roads all you see is the mess from previous generations. These provide good foundations for roads and no additional disturbance. As result when you drive the mine field roads you don't see that the majority of the area in undisturbed or reclaimed.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

It depends on the area, as values change. Development should be limited in areas where no mining has or will exist, to protect that landscape as "wild". Likewise in historic and current areas that have a lot of mining, any responsible development should be able to continue, like in the gold fields and Sixtymile areas for example. Fens, in ISA areas that value mineral development, should not be protected as they are in this version of the Plan.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

I dislike the approach to wetlands. It values conservation over industry (when it is only in areas that placer mining occurs that this approach would be used) is too complex and is too strict to see industry succeed in the future. The current approach will seriously harm industry, and will create massive negative cumulative effects on the community as a result: businesses shut down, less workers, less infrastructure into existing businesses as people and money leave the area. This will trickle down to other sectors in other parts of the Territory. Who will the public sector staff work for if there is no private sector left? The current wetlands strategy is too hard to meet and would be challenging to enforce.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

I think it is important to protect wetland complexes in areas where no mineral values exist, in LMUs 1 and 4 for example; but to allow for peat wetlands in LMU 12, 17 and 19 to be reclaimed to fully functioning mineral wetlands as a result of sustainable development through placer mining.

Also, it is important to consider that reason peat wetland are considered to impossible to reclaim is because the peat needs to be replaced. Placer mining does not destroy the peat or release the carbon stored. They only relocate it and often it remains frozen throughout this process. It is even possible to return it to its original location and maintain a surface water table. This essentially reclaims functional peat wetlands. This has been done before and could be further evolved meet even the highest environmental standards

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Lmu 19 has significant proven mineral deposits. The amount of disturbance needed to extract these is minimal and could be offset ten fold by equally functional wetlands in other areas currently not in a SMU

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Development should be allowed to occur in fens (no limit).

Please explain your answer.

The peat in fens is not sold or removed or lost in anyway. The carbon storage is retained along with the peat. It does not need to be recreated in order to reclaim the fen, it just need to be returned to it's original location, it remains frozen throughout this process.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

It is very restrictive to growth

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

Designations make it easier to make areas that have high cultural interest (like LMU10) or no mineral interests (like LMU1 and 4) into protected areas.

The things I would change are...

LMUs 9, 19, 17, 20, and 23 have known placer interest and should have placer mining as a value to preserve, rather than seeing it as a negative impact. If we are not protected or at least encouraged through the Draft Plan, there will be no development to sustain.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Please consider the affects on the placer industry and the cascading affects on the local economy. This current plan would essentially end the placer industry within 5 years.

Survey ID# 659

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I live in Dawson seasonally (e.g. sometimes for work)

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes, seasonally

If so, what sector do you work in? Mining

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Local business owner/operator"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

| |
|--|
| The things I <u>like</u> about the Draft Plan are... |
| The things that are <u>missing</u> from the Draft Plan are... |
| The things I would <u>change</u> in the Draft Plan are... I do not trust the government workers who will be implementing the final plan, most especially in ISA "low development area 2" 15, 16 & 23. We have been mining and exploring there for over 120 years. Somebody in the future (YESAB for example) is going to interpret that completely differently and put a cap on development. Maybe we won't be allowed to even stake there anymore let alone mine a historically mined creek. Our reclamation is good, we aren't hurting the ecosystem or environment. |

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I'm a trapper and a miner. I live on the land almost year round. The land provides me, my First Nations family and many employees a living. I need the land, I do not work in an office or in town. I have to treat the land properly in order to continue living on the land.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

This could be dangerous... people in the future may interpret this completely different than the way you are proposing it to us right now.

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Being able to make a living on the land without somebody telling me how.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

Yes, in a negative way. You are giving more office and government workers control over me and my children in the future who do not understand how we live and make a living.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

You have closed off enough area with this draft and left the option open to close more mining in the future. Mining will always be picked on first when figuring out cumulative effects.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area
Unfair question. Look at everybody's answers and you will see that mining will be blamed.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

No

Not in LMU 15,16 & 23. You have this wrong. All three should be down graded one ISA level. You are taking away many people's living including my children's future.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

ISA 4 should be allowed to continue development as it always has with reclamation to a high standard.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

ISA 4 should be allowed to continue development as it always has with reclamation to a high standard.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Not decided

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Limited development should be allowed to happen in fens.

Please explain your answer.

There is a lot of Fens in the whole region, they are everywhere. IAS 2, 3 & 4 should be allowed 75%

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? 75%

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

LMU 15, 16 and 23 need to be downgraded 1 ISA level respectively. This is historic mining areas that somebody in an office will abuse in the future and take away my children's future living.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

Probably most of it.

The things I would change are...

LMU 15, 16 and 23 need to be downgraded 1 ISA level respectively.

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Unsure

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Yes

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

LMU 15, 16 and 23 need to be downgraded 1 ISA level respectively. They are historical mining areas that will slowly be closed to my children by an office worker's opinion of what low or lowest development should look like in the future. You may have good intentions now, but somebody is going to abuse these designations in the future.

Survey ID# 657

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Asset Management

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Dawson Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

The Special Management Areas (1 & 2) which seek to offer protection of the land from future development

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

I think SMA1 should be more than 3.8% of the region

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Increase the coverage of SMA1. While SMA2 covers alot of the region, it leaves open the possibility of future development. I would prefer to see it protected permanently.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

I enjoy hiking, boating, canoeing, berry picking. I spent lots of time on the river, especially downriver from Dawson. This is where I feel most connected to the land.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Yes

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Permanent protection from industrial development

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

Somewhat, although only 3.8% of the region is permanently protected. I would prefer to see this percentage increase.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? Not sure

Please provide explanation

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

Salmon, caribou, ability to harvest, ability to hunt. No noise pollution from vehicles or helicopters

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

I enjoy the silence of being on the land. Hearing a helicopter searching for mineral deposits upsets me.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

More human development reduces the comfort I feel on the land. I prefer to be relatively alone knowing that what is around me will stay that way forever. Knowing a road or mine might affect the area disappoints me

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

I appreciate the consideration for the protection of wetlands. I feel that reclamation sounds good on paper, but is really difficult in practice. The best way to protect a wetland is to leave it alone completely.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Migratory birds not using the area any more. Damage to the water system.

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Not decided

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

No development should occur in fens anywhere in the region.

Please explain your answer.

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

Not enough SMA 1 area.

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

Reading the document makes me feel like conservation is high priority however, more land needs to be permanently protected (SMA1)

The things I would change are...

Create more permanently protected area

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

No

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

No

There is still room to develop areas within this area. I would prefer to see no development allowed.

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Protect more area permanently

Survey ID# 656

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a full time resident

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? Yes

If so, what sector do you work in? Tourism and mining

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Local business owner/operator"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

| |
|---|
| The things I <u>like</u> about the Draft Plan are... |
| The things that are <u>missing</u> from the Draft Plan are... |
| There needs to be a way what position bodies to be able to to consider Reclamation in wetland areas |
| The things I would <u>change</u> in the Draft Plan are... |

STEWARDSHIP

| |
|---|
| I see myself as a steward of the land Yes |
| The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are.... |
| I spent up to six months a year living out on the land I see first hand how the land can come back from disruption and do my best to help it. |

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

No

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

I believe that these are things that should be happening on a on going basis but not run by trust

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Responsible small scale mining and tourism be able to continue.

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

It does not give a enough consideration 2 to reclamation and small-scale mining

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

I don't believe the plan considers have devastating it will be the Dawson City economy if plan goes through as is

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

I think your example is a very poor one because it is based on assumptions and opinions not facts

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

The things you say in the example are true but I believe they are happening mostly because the number of people living and moving into the area not because of access roads or hiking Trail

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

No

I believe that the decision bodies need to be able to have more flexibility and able to look at each individual case instead of being covered by a blanket

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

It leaves no room for decision bodies to look at individual cases it is very short-sighted and does not consider any reclamation nor do I believe it is based on all the science

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Environment and economy

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? Disagree

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

I don't believe this areas were picked for scientific value

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

Limited development should be allowed to happen in fens.

Please explain your answer.

Again decision body should be able to look at individual cases

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? %

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

No

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

I believe that different types of areas need to be protected but I believe that they already are (over 20% of the Yukon is already protected)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

Unsure

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?

Make sure they give enough power to decision bodies to be able to make decisions

Survey ID# 653

Section 1: Survey Introduction

GETTING TO KNOW YOU

Are you familiar with the Dawson Region? Yes, I am a regular visitor to the Dawson Region

If not, where do you live?

Are you a member of a Yukon First Nation? No

Do you work in the Dawson Region? No

If so, what sector do you work in?

If you prefer that we keep your comments and/ or any other information confidential, please let us know by checking here.

My comments can be public

How would you like to be identified in this survey? (for example "Quoted from a ...")
"Yukon Resident"

Section 2: Draft Plan Concepts and Principles

PLAN FAMILIARITY

The things I like about the Draft Plan are...

There is a wide cross-section of areas of concern which address the issues of many different groups. Glad to see that the Draft plan isn't final and recognition that it needs more work.

The things that are missing from the Draft Plan are...

Where is the reclamation? And how is reclaimed land classified once completed, shouldn't it go back into the mix or pot?
More flexibility, less micro-detail to allow future permitting processes for industry to be unconstrained by misrepresented directions.

The things I would change in the Draft Plan are...

Combine LMU19 & LMU12. Placer mining has marginal risk if good reclamation plans and practices are in place.

STEWARDSHIP

I see myself as a steward of the land Yes

The different ways that I take care of or connect to the land are....

Hiking, camping, overnight river river trips. Exploring, berry harvesting.

DAWSON LAND STEWARDSHIP TRUST

Do you support the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust recommendation proposed in the Draft Plan?

Not sure

Please tell us your thoughts and ideas on the Dawson Land Stewardship Trust

Idea of trust is great but need to ensure there aren't duplication of revenue systems - more information needed

ARE YOUR CONCERNS/INTERESTS ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN?

Please tell us briefly what matters to you most in the Region?

Sustainable & responsible placer mining, with reclamation plans

Do you feel that most of the things that matter to you were included in the plan?

I think its important to have healthy growing economy and responsible environmental management and conservation. This plan seems to want to reduce/curb mining without looking at how both those outcomes can be achieved successfully.

REGIONAL PLANNING UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE TR'ONDĖK HWĖCH'IN FINAL AGREEMENT (THFA)

In your opinion, does the Draft Plan achieve the objective of Sustainable Development? No

Please provide explanation

Development implies that placer miners would have access to areas to mine and reclaim once completed, this plan makes it very difficult for the placer industry to do that. Hardly fits definition of sustainable development.

Do you have any other comments on whether the Draft Plan is meeting the Chapter 11 Objectives and / or the spirit and intent of the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Final Agreement.

Section 3 Key Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Please share with us values you feel should be included in helping to make decisions about what is allowed to happen on the land.

The Yukon is huge, there is plenty of room for responsible sustainable development and conservation with good planning in place. We need to support our economy with reasonable balanced decisions on the environment with strong consideration to reclamation and how powerful that can be when done correctly.

Please share your experience / knowledge with the Commission about how the amount of some human activities or infrastructure (i.e. roads, mining, agriculture, tourism) on the land affect the things that you value or care about (land, water, community, access to hunting grounds, etc.) Feel free to be specific to an area

I have enjoyed the many old mining roads that allow me access to hike into places i normally would never get to. Understand that new roads may be unwelcome, but there are obvious ways to restrict public access to them if it's a concern.

Do you feel that the amount of human development should be limited to help maintain the things you value?

Yes

That's why we need sustainable plans which have been well developed and thoughtfully implemented.

WETLANDS

What do you like or dislike about this the approach to wetlands?

No balance between conservation and industry.

When considering development in wetlands, what impacts to your values are you most concerned about?

Separate wetlands that have value to industry from those that don't. Unclear how enforcement of this strategy would be managed?

The Commission have highlighted two wetland areas as of special importance, **Scottie Creek Wetlands** and the **Upper Indian River Wetlands**.

Do you agree or disagree with the choice of these two wetlands? [Disagree](#)

Please tell us why you agree or disagree

[Families working in area will lose their livelihoods.](#)

Are there other areas of wetlands in the region that you feel are of equal or greater importance that should receive a similar level of protection? If so, where are those wetlands (Use LMU # if possible) and why are they of high value to you?

[No,](#)

Please tell us what you think about development in fens [choose one]

[Limited development should be allowed to happen in fens.](#)

Please explain your answer.

[It should be allowed based on scientific information informed by reclamation success data.](#)

How much of the regions Fens should be allowed to be developed? [50%](#)

: LAND DESIGNATION SYSTEM

What are your first impressions of this map and the land designation system?

The things I feel the Commission got right about the land designations are...

The things I would change are...

Special Management Area 2 (SMA 2):

As you review the areas we have designated as SMA 2, do you agree that these are areas of high conservation value?

Please explain your answer (use locations where possible)

Is the SMA2 designation appropriate to protect key values? Please explain your answer

What advice do you have for the Commission as they develop the Recommended Plan?