

- I am uncomfortable that the first goal of the DRLUP is economic prosperity while there is no goal that places the preserving the environment upon which we all depend as its prime goal
- I am pleased to see a coherent outreach program to get community input. It is v ery late in the process, but better late than never.
- As of this date (February 12<sup>th</sup> 2014), there is one vacancy in the Commission. YG has two representatives from aspects of the mining industry. I trust the person appointed will represent an alternative view.
- If the Final Recommended Plan is rejected, does the clock start again or can the Parties write their own plan?
- The image on page 11 is very cool- can we get T shirts made?
- The RAR is referenced as an important input to the work thus far. The RAR while informative is less than complete. Local knowledge was not included to the extent that it could have been neither was the information reviewed by local scientists prior to publication.
- Generally, I am happy with the boundaries of the LMUs. Should the Henderson and Caribou Creek LMUs be incorporated into Goldfields, I would not object strenuously.
- LMUs should however, be based on physiographic boundaries, such as watersheds, rather than temporary economic boundaries such as claim blocks. Utilising claim blocks presuppose best uses for a land unit. Pleas define where economic values define LMU boundaries.
- I am cautiously optimistic about the TEA designation; it could be an innovative way through the balancing act of trading off small scale renewable resource development with full protection.
- I note that the level of protection in the TEA is higher than in the proposed RUWA in the YG version of the Peel plan or than in the Conservation Area designation of this plan.
- I support the concept of a YRC, and the development of a management plan subsequent to recommendations from the Commission.
- **The YRC is NOT analogous to an IMA 1.**
- I see no justifiable reason to omit IMA 1 as a designation
- Part of LMU 15 is set aside as Community Area. This does not mean the DRLUP should not apply here.
- Mineral exploration/staking in Conservation areas is not a logical activity in these LMUs.
- While I do not advocate expropriation of mineral claims in Pas, CAs and TEA, I do think the Commission should recommend the Parties actively work towards the voluntary relinquishment of these claims. The example of Tombstone Park is a useful precedent. All but one owner voluntarily gave up their claims.
- LMU 1, Kandik, is remote, has no access routes, contains no proven reserves of oil or gas and therefore should not be designated for industrial development. Assigning a focus of protection is more logical and would help raise the quantum of protected land closer to that of North Yukon. Allowing development in this remote and undeveloped area would encourage access routes from the Dempster across several LMUs designated for conservation or protection in most alternatives.
- The planning region can readily be divided into two sections; north and south of the line of the Yukon river from the north western boundary, through Dawson City and up the Klondike to the

boundary between LMUs 17 & 21. It is logical these regions be treated differently: Most of the northern part has little or no infrastructure or habitation. It is ecologically separate from the southern region. It contains protected areas (Tombstone) or abuts protected areas (Fishing Branch and Yukon Charlie). Therefore the emphasis for the northern region should be towards conservation.

- The Southern region contains the goldfields and the areas most likely to be developed for hardrock. Most of the roads are in the southern region. It is therefore logical that this region be accorded a higher level of development.
- Development should be concentrated into the most compact area possible.
- Assigning areas unlikely to be developed such as the Kandik to a high level of development will upset the conservation minded and not help the industrially inclined.
- It is not at all clear from your description of the categories the YRC is withdrawn from mineral staking.
- An LMU representing the Klondike Plateau should be recommended for protection.
- Recent developments have shown us that the entire region is utilised by caribou. The 40 Mile herd in particular has recolonized more of its historic range. Critical habitat must be identified and designated.
- Wetlands are rare, irreplaceable and threatened by development in the planning region. Wetlands should be designated at least to the level of HPA.
- Both 22 and 27 represent undeveloped and unique ecologies and should be accorded a high level of protection.
- Can the public have blank maps and crayons?

• Can the maps state the % of each LMU?  
(I can infer Tombstone is 5%)



