Paul Davis
Whitehorse

· Should we concentrate development near current infrastructure or scatter it through the planning region?
· Consider the idea of concentrating industrial activity around Dawson, the far south and far north should be considered for protection.
· In the Plan Alternatives document the Conservation Area (CA) category is deceptive- it allows staking so should be renamed Integrated Management Area (IMA) or the description changed to withdraw these areas from mineral development
· on "Non-traditional economy Area". It could be a designation that promotes small scale sustainable activities such as smallholdings, small scale forestry, small scale agriculture like market gardens and greenhouse, hunting and gathering and eco-tourism.
· How can we promote non-consumptive use of the land, thus giving it value other than from mineral extraction?
· Yukon River Corridor: sub-regional plan be developed for this area. If so, should be withdrawn from staking until this plan is completed.
· The plan does not have to bow down before the interests of mineral development.

This lobby group seems to have convinced the government and several Commissioners that all existing mineral claims must be grandfathered and that roads be allowed to all of them even if they would be in Protected Areas (PAs).
As an artist, the wilderness landscapes and vistas are a world class resource, tailings ponds are not.

· Remember that the free entry system is on its way out (kicking and screaming), so draw your alternative with this future in mind. In future, claim staking will be directed to certain areas, similarly to how government already directs where oil and gas activities can take place. A constitutional challenge case pitting free entry versus constitutionally-entrenched land claims agreements is inevitable, as is the defeat of the free entry in such a case. Free-entry is not constitutionally entrenched.