

# Yukon Infrastructure Plan Public Consultation

## WHAT WE HEARD

Yukon Government

August 2009



# Table of Contents

<b>1.0 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 Background .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.0 Public Consultation Process.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4.0 Summary by Topic.....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 Drinking Water .....	5
4.2 Wastewater .....	6
4.3 Solid Waste.....	6
4.4 Roads .....	7
4.5 Green Energy .....	8
4.6 “Other” Eligible Spending Categories .....	9
4.7 Rating Criteria .....	9
4.8 Building Canada Fund Allocations.....	11
<b>5.0 Summary by Community .....</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1 Beaver Creek .....	13
5.2 Burwash Landing/Destruction Bay.....	14
5.3 Carmacks .....	15
5.4 Carcross .....	16
5.5 Dawson City .....	16
5.6 Faro.....	18
5.7 Haines Junction.....	19
5.8 Hootalinqua.....	20
5.9 Ibex Valley.....	21
5.10 Keno City.....	22
5.11 Marsh Lake .....	23
5.12 Mayo.....	24
5.13 Mount Lorne .....	25
5.14 Ross River.....	26
5.15 Tagish .....	27
5.16 Teslin/Johnson’s Crossing .....	28
5.17 Watson Lake .....	29
5.18 Whitehorse.....	30
<b>APPENDIX A. SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>APPENDIX B. PUBLIC QUESTIONNAIRE .....</b>	<b>35</b>

## **1.0 Introduction**

Even living in a relatively remote and undeveloped region of the world, the vast majority of Yukoners still depend on the provision of community infrastructure such as drinking water, roads and highways, and electricity to meet their basic day-to-day needs. With small population nodes distributed throughout a large geographic area, the Yukon poses a challenge with respect to creating and maintaining consistent levels of community infrastructure.

In the spring of 2009, the Yukon Government embarked on a territory-wide consultation tour to hear from Yukoners about the basic infrastructure gaps and needs in their communities and to generate feedback with respect to potential projects that could address those gaps.

What we heard through these consultations, in conjunction with the input received from municipalities, First Nations, and Local Advisory Councils, will form the basis for the development of a Yukon Infrastructure Plan (YIP) that will set out priorities and projects over the next 10-15 years. The YIP will also serve as the framework for the allocation of infrastructure funding under the Building Canada Fund from 2007-2014.

The following report attempts to capture the broad range of issues, comments, and ideas that were put forward by Yukoners during the course of the consultation. The input that we received is summarized as follows:

- By the major base infrastructure categories under consideration and overarching issues of how the Building Canada Fund could be allocated; and,
- By community.

## **2.0 Background**

Under “Building Canada”, Yukon will receive \$26.13 million dollars per year from 2007-2014 for priority infrastructure projects that are intended to help drive economic growth and productivity, achieve environmental goals, and build strong, competitive communities. This federal contribution represents 75% of the program. There are 19 categories, including the core national priorities of drinking water, wastewater, public transit, national highway system and green energy infrastructure.

Yukon is focusing the Building Canada funding towards projects related to five priority areas: drinking water, wastewater, solid waste, roads, and green energy. The fourteen other categories will be considered a secondary focus.

The Framework Agreement signed by the governments of Yukon and Canada in March 2008 requires the preparation of a long-term (10-15 year) Yukon Infrastructure Plan (YIP). The plan is intended to identify infrastructure gaps, needs, and priorities throughout the Yukon, including those within First Nation communities, municipalities, and unincorporated communities.

A three-member Plan Development Team comprised of representatives from the Department of Community Services and Department of Highways and Public Works is spearheading preparation of the YIP. As a preliminary step, a Situational Analysis report was developed to capture the current state of Yukon infrastructure related to the five priority funding categories.

With the Situational Analysis report used as a starting point for discussion, the Plan Development Team held 22 “technical” meetings with First Nations and municipalities throughout the Yukon from March 31-May 11, 2009. The purpose of the technical meetings was to confirm the accuracy and completeness of the report, identify any revisions or additions, and pinpoint key gaps/issues and potential projects related to the five priority funding categories.

After meeting with the First Nation and/or municipality in each community, the Plan Development Team hosted a public meeting to gather additional technical information and hear Yukoners’ views as to the most significant infrastructure priorities on a local, or Yukon-wide, level related to the five priority funding categories. In addition, the Team solicited feedback on the rating criteria that will ultimately be used to select which projects receive funding under “Building Canada”.

The Plan Development Team will draft the YIP in the fall of 2009 by applying the finalized rating criteria and incorporating the input received from First Nations, municipalities, Local Advisory Councils, and the general public. The YIP will provide the basis for the subsequent Annual Capital Plans that the Government of Yukon will prepare and submit over the seven years that the fund is in effect, outlining the proposed projects for that year. The first two years of funding (2007/08 and 2008/09) have been allocated to priority projects put forward by Yukon and approved by Canada that are intended to provide immediate economic stimulus for Yukon's economy and drive growth and productivity.

### 3.0 Consultation Process

Public meetings were scheduled in 19 communities throughout the Yukon between March 31 and May 11, 2009. In total, 18 meetings were held. Please refer to Table 1 for a summary of meetings and attendance figures. The Yukon Infrastructure Plan (YIP) consultations were held concurrently with two other related initiatives: the Yukon Solid Waste Strategy and the Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP) for rural Yukon.

In addition to the public meetings, 22 meetings were held with First Nations and municipalities throughout the Yukon. The objective of these meetings was to confirm that the Plan Development Team's information was correct and to identify priority concerns and potential projects. The five Local Advisory Councils (LACs) were consulted for the purposes of developing the rural Yukon ICSP; however, much of their feedback related directly to the YIP as well.

Two members of the three-member Plan Development Team were typically in attendance at the public meetings. A facilitator was contracted to develop the agenda, lead the discussion, and record the comments received. Most meetings followed a similar format. First, an overview of the Building Canada Fund was provided; second, the status of infrastructure and infrastructure-related issues specific to the host community was summarized; and last, potential projects were discussed and prioritized.

**Table 1. Schedule, Attendance and Response Received by Community**

Date	Location	Other Target Communities	Attendees	Questionnaires Received
March 31	Watson Lake	Upper Liard	7	n/a
April 1	Faro	n/a	7	5
April 2	Ross River	n/a	1	n/a
April 7	Marsh Lake	n/a	17	4
April 8	Mount Lorne	n/a	16	7
April 9	Whitehorse North	n/a	4	2
April 14	Ibex Valley	Mendenhall	4	2
April 15	Whitehorse Centre	n/a	13	1
April 16	Carmacks	n/a	25	7
April 21	Tagish	n/a	25	13
April 22	Carcross	n/a	22	11
April 23	Teslin	Johnson's Crossing	9	4
April 28	Beaver Creek	n/a	4	1
April 29	Burwash Landing	Destruction Bay	8	6
April 30	Haines Junction	see left	4	3
May 6	Mayo	Stewart Crossing	2	2
May 7	Keno City	Elsa	6	0
May 7	Pelly Crossing	n/a	0	n/a
May 11	Dawson City	n/a	8	5
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>182</b>	<b>73</b>

Participant feedback was solicited through a combination of open discussion and a questionnaire. In order to expedite information gathering at some meetings, residents were asked to indicate their project preferences through a "dotting" exercise instead of the questionnaire. Please refer to Table 1 for a summary of questionnaire responses received by the Team. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Community Services also hosted a website for the duration of the consultation (<http://www.infrastructure.gov.yk.ca/buildingcanada/index.html>). The public was invited to fill out questionnaires on-line or provide comments through a designated contact number and email address.

Based on the 45 meetings held, approximately 300 Yukoners participated in the consultation. Of these, 182 were considered members of the public-at-large.

The feedback received during the public meetings and via the questionnaires is the focus of this document. Minutes from the meetings with each First Nation and municipality were distributed to the meeting participants for verification of accuracy.

## 4.0 Summary by Topic

The following section provides an overview of the major themes that emerged during the public consultation for the Yukon Infrastructure Plan (YIP). These themes relate specifically to the five priority funding categories of drinking water, wastewater, solid waste, roads, and green energy infrastructure. In addition, the feedback the Team received with respect to the overarching issues of rating criteria and the allocation of the Building Canada Fund is highlighted.

### 4.1 Drinking Water

Residents in many Yukon communities identified drinking water as a high priority issue. Issues and concerns generally differed between incorporated and unincorporated communities, however.

Concerns from residents living in incorporated communities tended to focus on aging piped water distribution infrastructure. In Faro, Carmacks, and Haines Junction, residents expressed concerns about both aging infrastructure and the lack of formal infrastructure (Carmacks). The replacement of old water distribution system components and overall system upgrades were chosen as preferred infrastructure projects in these communities.

*“Water is the most important element in life. It runs through our community – shouldn’t we use it effectively?” (Carmacks resident)*

In contrast, concerns from rural Yukoners were about access to safe drinking water and the effectiveness of community wells. Drinking water was among the major concerns heard in the rural communities of Burwash Landing/Destruction Bay, Hootalinqua, Ibex Valley, Johnson’s Crossing, Keno City, and Tagish. Backup or replacement wells and well protection were among the priority infrastructure projects chosen by residents in some of these areas.

Rural Yukoners who attended the meetings in Teslin and Haines Junction expressed interest in the government providing assistance with the installation, maintenance and testing of private wells and water systems. Several others viewed the Building Canada Fund as an ideal opportunity to implement major drinking water distribution infrastructure in communities currently lacking this amenity.

*“Our community is quite spread out due to the topography of the area. A water distribution and wastewater collection system will require a lot of capital to include the entire community. The capital would likely be impossible to have committed without such a fund as this.” (Carmacks resident)*

### 4.2 Wastewater

Wastewater did not emerge as a priority issue with the Yukon public during the consultation tour, with the exception of the communities of Dawson City, Carcross and Faro.

In Dawson, residents were concerned that the decision to allocate Building Canada funding towards a secondary wastewater treatment plant in the first two years of the program may affect their ability to access funding for other projects in the remaining years of the program; however, most did identify wastewater as a priority issue. Carcross residents viewed concerns about the effectiveness of their sewage lagoon and prioritized its rehabilitation and/or expansion. In Faro, residents chose the rehabilitation of aging pipes and a pump house as a preferred infrastructure project.

In most rural areas, residents reported that they treat their wastewater through private septic systems and there seemed to be no expectation for the government to assist with the installation and/or operation of these systems (as opposed to drinking water).

Again, a few residents living in communities lacking a piped wastewater collection system viewed the Building Canada Fund as an ideal opportunity to prepare their community for future growth and development.

*“Before Carcross experiences imminent commercial and residential development/redevelopment, YTG should strongly consider installing basic waste and wastewater services. Further road enhancements will have to have stormwater drainage. It is a given that further delays will incur an exponential increase in the cost of burying these services in the future. Carcross appears to be positioning itself to be a green community – thus it should have model water/wastewater infrastructure.”* (Carcross resident)

#### 4.3 Solid Waste

The issue of solid waste management dominated the agenda at many of the public meetings held throughout the Yukon, particularly in rural areas closer to Whitehorse. Many residents living in unincorporated communities expressed concerns about the health and environmental impacts of burning practices underway at their local solid waste facility and urged the government to cease these activities immediately.

*“Stop burning garbage at the dump – there are toxic fumes effects, especially birth defects and respiratory problems.”* (Burwash Landing resident)

Yukoners in both incorporated and unincorporated areas overwhelmingly voiced a willingness to “do the right thing” with respect to waste diversion. However, many communities reported a lack of adequate infrastructure and programming to achieve this. Some residents - particularly those living further away from Whitehorse – spoke about the challenges of implementing and maintaining local recycling services. In communities such as Mayo and Burwash Landing, facilities are cramped, the range of accepted materials is very limited, and the service is entirely dependent on volunteers. In communities such as Keno City and Beaver Creek, there is no formal recycling in place and some residents reported stockpiling at home.

In Carcross and Tagish, residents prioritized the replacement of their current solid waste facilities with transfer stations similar to those currently operating at Mount Lorne and Marsh Lake. The idea of a Southern Lakes transfer station “loop” was heard frequently from residents in Marsh Lake, Mount Lorne, Carcross, and Tagish. Residents in Marsh Lake and Mount Lorne also stressed the need for ongoing support from the government to maintain their current levels of service.

*“There is a real sense of urgency to deal immediately with the solid waste disposal in a safe and responsible manner.”* (Carcross resident)

*“We need a system we can agree on that is efficient, healthy and green, that encourages the 4Rs, provides public education and encourages compliance with the plan.”* (Tagish resident)

While transfer stations were not explicitly requested in other communities, residents did prioritize upgrades to their local facilities to achieve better waste segregation, including signage (Keno City), recycling facilities (Burwash Landing), and the installation of power onsite (Marsh Lake).



Solid waste management topped the list of priority issues even in Whitehorse, where residents have access to a comprehensive suite of waste diversion services. Representatives from Raven Recycling attended the public meeting and pitched the idea of constructing a territory-wide material recovery facility in Whitehorse to better meet the demands of residents both in the capital city and communities. This idea – along with satellite recycling depots throughout the City – emerged as the priority potential Building Canada project chosen by Whitehorse residents.

#### 4.4 Roads

Residents in some Yukon communities identified roads as a medium-to-high priority infrastructure issue. Roads received the highest priority from residents in Carmacks, Faro, and Keno City, but the topic was a prominent issue for residents of Beaver Creek, Johnson’s Crossing, and Tagish as well.

The condition of the Alaska Highway and Silver Trail was of greatest concern to residents of Beaver Creek and Keno City, respectively. Deteriorating community roads, inadequate maintenance, and poor drainage were cited as issues in Faro, Johnson’s Crossing, and Beaver Creek, respectively.

Carmacks residents who attended the public meeting appeared to be unanimous in their support for the creation of a bypass road for mining traffic. The bypass road was chosen as a priority infrastructure project accordingly.

*“With regard to the bypass road, this is the perfect time to push this project through and YTG should be willing to pay the 25% cost (it’s a lot better than paying 100%). We know mining is going to happen so please help us make our community ready for the inevitable.” (Carmacks resident)*

A few bridges were singled out for safety concerns, specifically the Takhini River Bridge north of Whitehorse, Nordenskiöld Bridge in Carmacks, and Tagish River Bridge. Residents of the Hootalinqua area chose safety upgrades to the Takhini River Bridge as a priority project, whereas Carmacks residents requested the full replacement of the Nordenskiöld River Bridge.

*“The bridge across the Nordenskiöld must not be done in exclusion of a bypass for mining/exploration. If you build the bridge, the big trucks will destroy it. If you build the bypass the old bridge will fall apart as it is unacceptable as is.” (Carmacks resident)*

A potential bridge over the Yukon River at Dawson City raised only minor interest with Dawsonites who attended the public meeting.

Public meeting attendees in several communities noted that the Yukon’s highways do not seem to be constructed and/or maintained to adequate standards. Residents of Ross River and rural Teslin commented that highway maintenance is inadequate in their areas. Several Dawsonites encouraged the Yukon government to closely investigate the long-term impacts of climate change on highway construction and maintenance and consider revising standards and construction specifications if necessary.

#### 4.5 Green Energy Infrastructure

The funding category of green energy infrastructure required a slightly different approach by the Plan Development Team. Since many Yukon communities have minimal existing green energy infrastructure to replace or upgrade, the Team presented a list of potential green energy-related projects to Yukoners as a starting point for discussion (please refer to Figure 1). The Team also highlighted energy retrofits to

public buildings (such as municipal or recreation facilities) as a potential project under “Building Canada”.

**Figure 1. List of Potential Green Energy Infrastructure Projects Presented to the Yukon Public**

<b>Potential Green Energy Projects (Yukon wide):</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Neighborhood-scale district heating or combined heat &amp; power system</li><li>• Pilot renewable energy project (biomass, wind, solar) in a community currently served by diesel-generated electricity</li><li>• Improved use of spilled hydro energy at the Whitehorse Dam (e.g., storage, district electrical heating for public and institutional buildings)</li><li>• New hydroelectric generation facilities connected to transmission grid (several small projects, one or two large ones)</li><li>• Integration of Yukon electricity transmission grid with BC or Alaska transmission grids</li><li>• Integration of Yukon electricity transmission grids (e.g., connection of the Whitehorse-Aishihik-Faro-Pelly grid with the Mayo-Dawson line)</li><li>• Mayo B hydroelectric project</li></ul>

Public interest in green energy initiatives seemed to directly correlate with the urgency of other local infrastructure-related issues, as well as whether or not a community was already on the Whitehorse-Aishihik-Faro-Pelly or Mayo-Dawson hydroelectric grid. In communities such as Marsh Lake, Mount Lorne and Dawson City, where solid waste infrastructure (for example) is at least partially addressed, residents expressed a high level of interest in green energy infrastructure. In other communities, green energy was seen as a lesser priority.

*“Green energy is probably a secondary concern for us with all of our other problems”.* (Carmacks resident)

Residents of Burwash Landing showed a high level of interest in harnessing local wind, water, and solar energy to provide power to their community. Haines Junction residents expressed interest in further tapping into their community’s proven geothermal resources. They, along with Yukoners in many other communities, urged the government to adopt policies and programs to allow Independent Power Producers (IPPs) to sell their excess power back to the grid.

*“Change regulations to allow small hydro projects and wind mills to sell excess back to the grid.”* (Haines Junction resident)

The security and maximization of conventional energy sources such as wood was raised as an issue in Mount Lorne and Dawson City. The harnessing of biomass potential as a community energy source and the creation of community woodlots were identified as potential projects in these communities.

*“Much time has been lost in testing new energy sources and capabilities...the security of conventional energy sources must be taken much more seriously.”* (Dawson City resident)

The high operations and maintenance (O&M) costs for municipal and/or community buildings was raised as a concern in several communities, including Beaver Creek, Faro, and Dawson City. However, building retrofits topped the list of preferred infrastructure projects chosen by Yukoners only in Beaver Creek and Mount Lorne (where residents prioritized programming to retrofit private homes).

#### 4.6 “Other” Eligible Spending Categories

The Team emphasized that the 14 other eligible spending categories under “Building Canada” were a secondary focus for the Yukon; however, residents were encouraged to share their ideas.

Similar to green energy infrastructure, public interest in the “other” categories seemed to correlate with the relative urgency of other local infrastructure-related issues. Residents in Marsh Lake, Mount Lorne, Haines Junction and Dawson City shared a wide range of project ideas, primarily focused on tourism and/or economic development initiatives. Multi-use trails, an outdoor learning centre, and invasive species programming are a few examples of the ideas that were brought forward to the Team.

For the most part, the Team did not hear concerns about the emphasis on basic infrastructure to the potential exclusion of projects in other categories. A few residents in Whitehorse and Haines Junction commented that an opportunity for real community-building was being missed, however.

*“Would like to see the “other” categories get some attention as they can truly help build/enhance social capital!” (Whitehorse resident)*

#### 4.7 Rating Criteria

Yukoners were asked to share their thoughts on the rating criteria that the Plan Development Team will apply to the extensive list of potential infrastructure projects brought forward by municipalities, First Nations, Local Advisory Councils, and the public in order to determine what will receive funding. A draft list of rating criteria was provided in the questionnaire as a starting point for discussion. The list included the following criteria:

- Public health and safety;
- Regulatory requirements;
- Local or regional economic development;
- Carbon and/or environmental footprint; and,
- Impact on residents’ living expenses.

Yukoners were also encouraged to provide additional suggestions for rating criteria that the Team should consider.

Based on the questionnaire responses received, Yukoners place the highest priority on public health and safety, followed by environmental/carbon footprint and economic development. Meeting regulatory requirements was considered the least important criteria. Please refer to Tables 2 and 3 for the complete questionnaire results.

**Table 2. Preferred Rating Criteria by Community**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Address a public health &amp; safety need</b>	<b>Meet a regulatory requirement</b>	<b>Contribute to local or regional economic development</b>	<b>Reduce the community's carbon or environmental footprint</b>	<b>Reduce residents' monthly living expenses</b>
Faro	7 (5) <b>1.4</b>	21 (5) <b>4.2</b>	12 (5) <b>2.4</b>	21 (5) <b>4.2</b>	18 (4) <b>4.5</b>
Marsh Lake	3 (2) <b>1.5</b>	9 (2) <b>4.5</b>	5 (2) <b>2.5</b>	8 (2) <b>4</b>	5 (2) <b>2.5</b>
Mount Lorne	10 (5) <b>2</b>	17 (5) <b>3.4</b>	13 (4) <b>3.25</b>	11 (6) <b>1.8</b>	11 (3) <b>3.7</b>
Hootalinqua	2 (1) <b>2</b>	na	3 (1) <b>3</b>	Na	1 (1) <b>1</b>
Ibex Valley	1 (1) <b>1</b>	4 (1) <b>1</b>	3 (1) <b>3</b>	5 (1) <b>5</b>	3 (2) <b>1.5</b>
Whitehorse	1 (1) <b>1</b>	na	3 (1) <b>3</b>	2 (1) <b>2</b>	na
Carmacks	5 (4) <b>1.25</b>	3 (2) <b>1.5</b>	6 (3) <b>2</b>	na	1 (1) <b>1</b>
Tagish	24 (12) <b>2</b>	40 (10) <b>4</b>	33 (9) <b>3.7</b>	23 (13) <b>1.8</b>	34 (10) <b>3.4</b>
Carcross	19 (10) <b>1.9</b>	34 (8) <b>4.25</b>	32 (12) <b>2.7</b>	14 (11) <b>1.3</b>	34 (8) <b>4.25</b>
Teslin	5 (4) <b>1.25</b>	5 (2) <b>2.5</b>	8 (3) <b>2.7</b>	8 (3) <b>2.7</b>	6 (2) <b>3</b>
Beaver Creek	1 (1) <b>1</b>	na	1 (1) <b>1</b>	na	na
Burwash Landing	12 (6) <b>2</b>	14 (6) <b>2.3</b>	22 (6) <b>3.7</b>	17 (6) <b>2.8</b>	22 (6) <b>3.7</b>
Haines Junction	6 (3) <b>2</b>	11 (3) <b>3.7</b>	7 (3) <b>2.3</b>	13 (3) <b>4.3</b>	8 (3) <b>2.7</b>
Mayo	4 (2) <b>2</b>	9 (2) <b>4.5</b>	6 (2) <b>3</b>	3 (2) <b>1.5</b>	3 (1) <b>3</b>
Dawson	7 (4) <b>1.75</b>	10 (3) <b>3.3</b>	10 (4) <b>2.5</b>	19 (4) <b>4.75</b>	12 (4) <b>3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	107 (61)	177 (49)	164 (57)	144 (57)	158 (47)
<b>YUKON-WIDE AVERAGE</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>

Results to be read as follows: a (b) c: a = number of points based on ranking; b = number of responses; c = average ranking  
 NOTE: A LOWER SCORE INDICATES A HIGHER PRIORITY.

**Table 3. Additional Rating Criteria Suggestions by Community**

Recommended Criteria	Faro	Mount Lorne	Carmacks	Tagish	Teslin	Dawson
Promotes sustainable financial management i.e., O&M	4 (2) <b>2</b>		1 (1) <b>1</b>			
Compatibility with smaller contracts i.e., local hire emphasis	1 (1) <b>1</b>		1 (1) <b>1</b>			
Local employment			1 (1) <b>1</b>			
Environmental and social health			1 (1) <b>1</b>			
Contributes to community unity and cohesiveness		2 (1) <b>2</b>		1 (1) <b>1</b>		
Social health and wellness				4 (1) <b>4</b>		
Complimentarity with other initiatives					4 (1) <b>4</b>	
Multi-party/agency support					3 (1) <b>3</b>	
Promotes energy security						2 (1) <b>2</b>

Results to be read as follows: a (b) **c**: a = # of points based on ranking; b = # of responses; c = average ranking

Residents of Faro and Carmacks emphasized that the long-term O&M costs of projects should be considered prior to proceeding with capital investments. Social benefits and compatibility with local employment were also raised as suggested criteria.

*“There is no point in any infrastructure capital money unless our O&M costs are affordable and addressed well ahead of prioritizing projects.”* (Faro resident)

Residents in Dawson and Teslin urged the Team to take a broad view in determining which projects should receive funding. They suggested that a project’s compatibility with other initiatives, multi-party support, and overall benefits should be factored in.

*“Consider the overall benefit – projects that give best bang for the buck should come first.”* (Dawson resident)

#### 4.8 Building Canada Fund Allocations

Although the Plan Development Team did not solicit any specific feedback with respect to the broader topic of Building Canada fund allocations, some Yukoners took the opportunity to comment on this issue during the public meetings and through the questionnaire.

Several rural Yukon residents expressed concerns that the Building Canada Fund would be distributed inequitably between incorporated and unincorporated areas of the Yukon. Others commented that large-scale mega-projects would receive the majority of the funding; leaving the day-to-day infrastructure challenges facing smaller communities unaddressed.

*“No one is representing rural Yukon in the Building Canada funding discussions.”* (Haines Junction rural resident)

*“I’m concerned that bigger projects such as Mayo B will receive all the funding and leave smaller communities like ours out in the cold.”* (Tagish resident)

*“I’m finding out as a newer member to my community that YTG’s preference would be for us to cease to exist. However, as a smaller community with the same needs as most Yukoners, we could be used for pilot projects.”* (Destruction Bay resident)

Some Yukoners commented that the first two years of “Building Canada” funding allocations should have incorporated public input. Even in communities where projects are confirmed for funding, such as Dawson City, residents were concerned that they were now at a disadvantage in receiving funding during the remaining years of the program.

*“We do not feel it is fair that a long-standing need for a sewage treatment facility outweighs the need for other projects...”* (Dawson resident)

Other public meeting attendees expressed concern about the role of the Yukon government in determining which projects constitute a priority and the financial capacity of small communities to participate and/or contribute. One Haines Junction resident stressed that setting minimum funding allocations by community and/or region would serve to focus the priorities of both residents and local governments.

*“If the Yukon government is selecting the projects, they should be on the hook for the 25%, not the communities!”* (Carmacks resident)

*“Give people and communities an incentive through a minimum allocation of funds.”* (Haines Junction resident)

*“Communities should be able to contribute their portion through in-kind or other funding sources such as Gas Tax”.* (Faro resident)

With respect to timing, the Team heard conflicting views with respect to the pace at which infrastructure planning and projects should proceed. Some felt that regional planning should precede capital planning, while others commented that the government should focus on “doing” instead of planning.

*“Broader planning should happen first, then the nuts and bolts infrastructure planning.”* (Teslin rural resident)

*“We have become so immersed in planning and consulting and seeking ever elusive consensus that we have forgotten about “doing”.* (Dawson resident)

## 5.0 Summary by Community

The following section provides a summary of the key issues, potential projects, and priority projects that the Plan Development Team discussed with the Yukon public during the consultation for the Yukon Infrastructure Plan. Many of the key issues and/or potential projects listed originated with the information in the Situational Analysis report for each community and/or the feedback provided during the technical meetings with municipalities and/or First Nations. Preferred projects are those identified by Yukoners in their response to Question 3 of the questionnaire (please see Appendix B) or – in some cases - during a group “dotting” exercise. *(Please note that project ideas that may not be eligible for funding were nonetheless incorporated into the meeting records and are included here.)*

### 5.1 Beaver Creek

Road issues and the high cost of operations and maintenance (O&M) at community facilities were key topics of discussion at the meeting in Beaver Creek. A pilot waste heat project to reduce heating costs at the school and community centre, road and drainage improvements within the community, and highway upgrades between Beaver Creek and Destruction Bay were selected as preferred projects.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- pipes frequently freeze up</li> <li>- buildup/precipitate since installation of piped system</li> </ul>	NONE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- waste heat project with YECL for community centre and school to reduce heating costs and environmental impact</li> <li>- road improvements within community</li> <li>- highway upgrade between Beaver Creek and Destruction Bay</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- problems with sumps in a few former government houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- piped collection system/lagoon</li> <li>- minor repairs to discharge culvert and installation of new discharge bib</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- burning and poor waste segregation at landfill</li> <li>- burning vessel is oriented improperly</li> <li>- hazardous substances entering vessel</li> <li>- freight service to backhaul recyclables has ended</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- proper signage at solid waste facility*</li> <li>- reuse/free store at solid waste facility</li> <li>- education programs*</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- poor condition of Alaska Highway</li> <li>- poor drainage in key locations, including school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- general drainage improvements throughout Beaver Creek</li> <li>- Alaska Highway upgrade</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high O&amp;M costs for the community centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- energy retrofit for community centre</li> <li>- waste heat project with YECL generator for community club/school</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

## 5.2 Burwash Landing/Destruction Bay

Drinking water safety and security, access to drinking water, solid waste management, and interest in green energy emerged as the primary issues and interests of residents of Burwash Landing and Destruction Bay who attended the public meeting. The potential projects that received majority support from participants included wellhead protection in Burwash Landing, a recycling depot at the solid waste facility, an upgrade to the Burwash Landing lagoon, and green energy incentive programs.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- boil water advisories at Kluane Lake Athletic Association building and firehall</li> <li>- limited public access to drinking water (D Bay)</li> <li>- lack of wellhead protection (Burwash)</li> <li>- aesthetic issues (D Bay)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wellhead protection (Burwash)</li> <li>- community well (D Bay)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>wellhead protection (Burwash)</b></li> <li>- <b>upgrade the lagoon (Burwash)</b></li> <li>- <b>recycling depot at the dump</b></li> <li>- <b>green energy incentive programs*</b></li> <li>- solar power retrofits</li> <li>- alternative energy</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lagoon freezes up in winter (Burwash)</li> <li>- septic field having problems with possible impacts on lake (D Bay)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upgrade the lagoon for year-round operations (Burwash)</li> <li>- review/assess current septic field design and how to mitigate any environmental impacts (D Bay)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- road upgrades</li> <li>- micro hydro</li> <li>- active transportation routes (Burwash)</li> </ul>
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- burning and poor waste segregation at landfill</li> <li>- smoke negatively impacts nearby Copper Joe subdivision</li> <li>- lodges and camps don't recycle</li> <li>- recycling isn't always convenient</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- government should extend refund to more products to encourage recycling*</li> <li>- government should make recycling mandatory*</li> <li>- recycling depot at the dump</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not enough road maintenance (Burwash)</li> <li>- poor road conditions "downtown" (Burwash)</li> <li>- new areas need BST and non-motorized access (Burwash)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- build paved trail between Copper Joe subdivision and "downtown" Burwash</li> <li>- resurface Sedata Street (Burwash)</li> <li>- BST road to Copper Joe subdivision (Burwash)</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- some homes have no backup heat source (Burwash)</li> <li>- government policies lag behind other jurisdictions</li> <li>- no incentive programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- install solar power on public buildings (Burwash)</li> <li>- micro hydro project (Burwash)</li> <li>- district heating system (Burwash)</li> <li>- geothermal project at Kluane Lake</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents



### 5.3 Carmacks

Carmacks residents were consistent in the identification of the key infrastructure gaps and issues in their community, namely drinking water and roads. Drinking water system improvements, the need for a bypass road around Carmacks for mining industry traffic, and a new Nordenskiöld River Bridge topped the list of preferred projects for a majority of attendees.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no fire hydrants</li> <li>- concerns about cross-contamination of wells from septic systems and dump leachates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- community well, filtration system and piped distribution system</li> <li>- more groundwater testing*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>drinking water system improvements</b></li> <li>- <b>bypass road</b></li> <li>- <b>replacement of Nordenskiöld River Bridge</b></li> <li>- wastewater system upgrades</li> <li>- relocate landfill*</li> <li>- cheaper electrical rates*</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no sewage collection outside of core</li> <li>- aging treatment infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- replace sewer mains</li> <li>- expand collection system</li> <li>- <u>new mechanical treatment plant</u></li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- concerns about impacts of dump on groundwater in town</li> <li>- no ability to handle hazardous waste</li> <li>- not enough diversion of non-refundables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- move the landfill to another location*</li> <li>- implement hazardous waste handling program*</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Nordenskiöld River Bridge is aging</li> <li>- trucks driving through town pose a safety and road maintenance concern</li> <li>- no transitions at Yukon River Bridge approaches</li> <li>- poor road drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- replace the Nordenskiöld River Bridge with a two lane bridge</li> <li>- build the bypass road around Carmacks</li> <li>- install lighting and bike path on River Road</li> <li>- several key roads require upgrade from gravel to BST (Guder Drive/Lepage Road loop)</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no ability for IPPs to sell back to grid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IPP policy*</li> <li>- harness burning coal mines for energy</li> <li>- <u>geothermal heat pump technology</u></li> </ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inadequate investment in local children</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- railway to central Yukon</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering indicates projects that were identified by a majority of questionnaire respondents; underlining indicates projects already confirmed for funding

#### 5.4 Carcross

Carcross residents focused on solid waste as their community’s priority concern and a transfer station as the corresponding first choice for potential Building Canada project funding. The effectiveness of the local lagoon was raised as a concern by some and accordingly made it to the priority list as well.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- surface water is only source</li> <li>- no piped distribution system</li> <li>- upgrades needed for arsenic treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- piped distribution system</li> <li>- backup well</li> <li>- <u>upgrades for arsenic treatment</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>replace current solid waste facility with a transfer station (recycling, reuse structure, composting, etc.)*</b></li> <li>- <b>lagoon upgrades</b></li> <li>- new emergency services building*</li> <li>- new community club/hall*</li> <li>- Choutla hydro proposal</li> <li>- green energy initiatives</li> <li>- piped wastewater collection system</li> <li>- piped water delivery</li> <li>- pedestrian/bike/horse trails</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lagoon may have inadequate capacity</li> <li>- potential impacts on adjacent vegetation</li> <li>- hazardous waste entering into lagoon system</li> <li>- local septic systems are failing, some adjacent to water bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sludge drying beds</li> <li>- piped collection system</li> <li>- additional lagoon cell</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- open trench burning and poor waste segregation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- replace current solid waste facility with a transfer station*</li> <li>- build a re-use structure</li> <li>- purchase chippers and other mechanical equipment to reduce waste volumes</li> <li>- <u>community composting facility</u></li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- gravel and BST roads are in poor condition</li> <li>- drainage problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upgrade/surface roads around Carcross</li> <li>- upgrade road to the solid waste facility</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	NONE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wind power feasibility study</li> </ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inadequate community and emergency services facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new emergency services building*</li> <li>- new community club/hall*</li> <li>- pedestrian/bike/horse trails</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering indicates projects that were identified by a majority of questionnaire respondents; underlining indicates projects already confirmed for funding

#### 5.5 Dawson City

Dawson residents had a wide range of issues and interests to bring to the Team. While several of the meeting attendees expressed displeasure with the allocation of Building Canada funds to the Dawson City sewage treatment plant, the majority still identified wastewater treatment as an

infrastructure priority. Green energy and energy security also topped the list of priority issues for Dawson attendees.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no backup well</li> <li>- chlorination system requires GUDI upgrades</li> <li>- no remote monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- well redundancy</li> <li>- upgrade chlorination system for GUDI</li> <li>- remote well monitoring</li> <li>- feasibility study to determine overall system upgrades required</li> </ul>	<p>Most questionnaire respondents indicated their priority infrastructure categories, as opposed to specific projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>green energy (energy security/supply)</b></li> <li>- <b>wastewater</b></li> <li>- highway infrastructure</li> <li>- drinking water</li> <li>- Yukon River Bridge</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- primary treatment plant needs replacement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>new mechanical secondary treatment plant</u></li> <li>- collection system upgrades</li> <li>- septage receiving facility</li> <li>- address water system waste (reduce input into sewer system)</li> <li>- upgrade local landfill to accept sewage</li> <li>- feasibility study for grey water recycling for public buildings</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- insufficient space at the recycling depot</li> <li>- improvements needed for handling of hazardous materials</li> <li>- backhauling is inefficient</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new recycling depot</li> <li>- expansion of composting program</li> <li>- residential bins to encourage household recycling</li> <li>- shredder and baler to compact paper/cardboard</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- primarily gravel roads, some in poor condition</li> <li>- significant wear and tear on local roads due to extreme climatic conditions</li> <li>- concerns about effectiveness of highway design and construction methods</li> <li>- Dome Road and Top of the World Highway need attention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- build the Yukon River Bridge</li> <li>- upgrade Dome Road</li> <li>- upgrade Top of the World Highway</li> <li>- upgrade mining roads for improved safety and tourism use</li> <li>- feasibility study into climate change impacts on highway design/construction*</li> <li>- review road construction standards and materials*</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- energy dependence</li> <li>- public buildings have high O&amp;M costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- district heat/wood boiler</li> <li>- retrofit public buildings</li> <li>- improve efficiency of water heating system (municipal)</li> <li>- pilot project with electric vehicles*</li> </ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dawson streets can be a barrier to the physically challenged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improve access for physically challenged*</li> <li>- revitalize heritage trails*</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering indicates projects that were identified by a majority of questionnaire respondents; underlining indicates projects already confirmed for funding

5.6 Faro

Faro residents demonstrated a high level of awareness about the condition of their base community infrastructure. Aging drinking water distribution and wastewater collection infrastructure were key concerns for meeting attendees, and upgrades to these systems were chosen as project priorities accordingly. Community road upgrades was also identified as a preferred project by a majority of participants.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- aging distribution/collection system (i.e. pumphouse, etc.)</li> <li>- water/sewer pipes composed of old materials</li> <li>- water storage near capacity</li> <li>- only one supply line from source</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- replace pump house</li> <li>- twin supply lines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>upgrades to drinking water system</b></li> <li>- <b>upgrades to wastewater system</b></li> <li>- <b>road upgrades</b></li> <li>- retrofits to community buildings</li> <li>- address excess housing and building stock*</li> <li>- develop residential/commercial infrastructure plan*</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- collection system has permafrost influence for several hundred meters</li> <li>- sewage lagoon walls are at maximum</li> <li>- aging collection system (i.e., pumphouse, etc.)</li> <li>- water/sewer pipes composed of old materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- replace problem sewer lines</li> <li>- rebuild lagoon cells</li> <li>- replace pump house</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- abuse of landfill by industry</li> <li>- limited capacity to implement diversion programs</li> <li>- excess housing and building stock</li> <li>- potential impacts of facility on groundwater/soil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- address excess housing and building stock*</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- generally poor condition throughout town</li> <li>- no BST on some Campbell Hwy sections</li> <li>- road to Faro very poor near old airport access road</li> <li>- no nearby crush source and no trucks to haul it for maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upgrade roads in Faro</li> <li>- upgrade road into Faro</li> <li>- <u>complete non-BST sections of Campbell Hwy</u></li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high heating and energy costs for municipal buildings such as firehall and arena</li> <li>- energy dependence/little use of renewables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- energy retrofits for municipal buildings</li> </ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lack of residential/commercial infrastructure plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- develop residential/commercial infrastructure plan*</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering indicates projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents; underlining indicates projects already confirmed for funding

5.7 Haines Junction

No particular issue or project dominated the discussion at the public meeting in Haines Junction; rather, residents indicated an interest in a variety of issues and potential projects. Meeting attendees did concur on water system efficiency improvements as a potential Building Canada Fund project.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- water supply challenges and need for system redundancy</li> <li>- water wasted via bleeders, etc.</li> <li>- water bleeders are failing due to heat tape issues</li> <li>- piped system is old</li> <li>- no fire hydrants</li> <li>- newer residential areas lacking services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>increase well capacity</u></li> <li>- upgrade water system to increase efficiency</li> <li>- water metering</li> <li>- fire hydrants and water main upgrades</li> <li>- new water storage reservoir</li> <li>- upgraded pump and piping in Pumphouse #2</li> <li>- expand water and sewer system</li> <li>- implement water testing program for rural residents*</li> <li>- <u>water treatment upgrades for arsenic</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>upgrade water system to increase efficiency</b></li> <li>- drinking water infrastructure for rural areas</li> <li>- 4-season/tourism trail*</li> <li>- geothermal energy</li> <li>- water treatment</li> <li>- IPP policy*</li> <li>- reduce diesel use*</li> <li>- relocate landfill site*</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new residential areas currently unserviced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- expand water and sewer system</li> <li>- aeration for lagoon and addition of 4<sup>th</sup> cell</li> <li>- increase water conservation to reduce lagoon use</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- current landfill too close to residential areas</li> <li>- landfill has a limited lifespan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- baler/compactor and housing structure for landfill</li> <li>- community greenhouse and compost</li> <li>- relocate landfill site*</li> </ul>	
Roads	NONE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- extension of paved trail to Pine Lake</li> <li>- pave dump access road</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IPPs can't sell back to grid</li> <li>- high O&amp;M costs for municipal buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- policy to allow IPPs to sell back to grid*</li> <li>- increase efficiency of municipal buildings</li> <li>- retrofit heating system in arena</li> <li>- utilize waste heat from ice plant to heat buildings</li> <li>- geothermal district heat</li> <li>- geothermal heating for convention centre</li> </ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- power outages on WAFP grid</li> <li>- jobs and economic development center around Whitehorse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- surge protector subsidy*</li> <li>- power adaptor/electrical generator subsidy*</li> <li>- four season/tourism trail*</li> <li>- 9 hole golf course*</li> <li>- outdoors/mountain learning centre (Yukon College partnership)*</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering indicates projects that were identified by a majority of questionnaire respondents; underlining indicates projects already confirmed for funding

5.8 Hootalinqua

Residents of the Hootalinqua region north of Whitehorse agreed on three priority issues: safety improvements at the Takhini River Bridge, a community well, and a program or policy to encourage Independent Power Producers (IPPs) to sell back to the grid. Please refer to Table 11 for a complete list of issues and ideas.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	- high cost of water delivery - low yielding well at firehall	- community well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>community well</b></li> <li>- <b>Takhini River Bridge safety improvements</b></li> <li>- <b>program to allow IPPs to sell back to grid*</b></li> </ul>
Wastewater	NONE	NONE	
Solid Waste	- illegal dumping at Deep Creek due to Whitehorse tipping fees - uncontrolled access	NONE	
Roads	- poor sight distance at Takhini River Bridge - potholes and inadequate shoulder on Hotsprings Road a deterrent to cyclists	- create multi-use/bike path along Hotsprings Road - <u>widen or otherwise improve Takhini Hotsprings Road</u> - signage or widening at Takhini River Bridge	
Green Energy	- IPPs can't sell back to grid	- program to allow IPPs to sell back to grid*	
Other	NONE	NONE	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

### 5.9 Ibx Valley

Drinking water and roads were the major topics of discussion at the Ibx Valley public meeting. The low yielding well at the firehall – and corresponding impacts on fire suppression capacity - emerged as the key concern for attendees. A new community well and additional water storage were put forth as preferred projects.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- low yielding well (Ibex)</li> <li>- insufficient recharge/storage capacity for fire trucks (Ibex)</li> <li>- cost and access to water delivery (Ibex)</li> <li>- Mendenhall well closed due to uranium concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high yield community well (Ibex)</li> <li>- additional water storage at firehall (Ibex)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>community well (Ibex)</b></li> <li>- lot identification (Ibex)*</li> <li>- Echo Lane upgrades</li> <li>- addition to firehall to facilitate extra water storage</li> </ul>
Wastewater	NONE	NONE	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- burning and poor waste segregation at Champagne dump (i.e. Mendenhall)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- community compost (Ibex)</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rough sections of Alaska Highway (Ibex)</li> <li>- rough sections on maintained part of Scout Lake Road</li> <li>- overgrowth on old Alaska Hwy, Echo Valley and Echo Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lot identification for emergency purposes* (Ibex)</li> <li>- resurface Echo Valley and Echo Lane roads</li> <li>- brush local road right-of-ways*</li> <li>- upgrade maintained section of Scout Lake Road</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no backup electricity source for emergencies during blackout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- green backup electricity source for emergency purposes</li> </ul>	
Other	NONE	NONE	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

5.10 Keno City

The deteriorating condition of the Silver Trail and Duncan Creek Road was the dominant issue at the Keno public meeting. The need for drinking water system redundancy and filtration, as well as improvements to the local solid waste facility to encourage better waste segregation, were other topics of interest to Keno residents.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no backup well</li> <li>- challenges maintaining residual chlorine level</li> <li>- concerns about potential contamination of groundwater from dump/exfiltration pit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- pre-filter for water system</li> <li>- backup well</li> </ul>	Note: questionnaires were not received. Based on the discussion, the priority issues in Keno were roads, drinking water, and solid waste.
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- concerns about exfiltration sewage pit location/safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- relocate/decommission exfiltration pit</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- burning at facility with poor waste segregation</li> <li>- no local recycling capability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- recycling depot at dump</li> <li>- signage at dump to encourage segregation *</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Duncan Creek Road and Silver Trail in poor condition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upgrade Duncan Creek Road</li> <li>- upgrade Silver Trail</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

5.11 Marsh Lake



Marsh Lake residents did not single out any specific infrastructure need in their area, rather communicating a wide range of interests, particularly related to the green energy category. The idea of a Southern Lakes transfer station “loop” and installing power at the solid waste site made it to the top of the list of preferred projects.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Judas Creek system needs improvements (chlorine monitoring/wellhead protection)</li> <li>- 2<sup>nd</sup> supply point needed at north end of lake</li> <li>- aesthetic issues at Community Centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improvements to Judas Creek system</li> <li>- <u>2<sup>nd</sup> supply point at North end</u></li> <li>- new well for Community Centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>use right-of-way clearing for fuel*</b></li> <li>- <b>pilot carbon sequestration project focusing on agriculture*</b></li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sewage lagoon isn't secure enough</li> <li>- no local RV dump</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- study alternate solutions for wastewater treatment*</li> <li>- create designated RV dumpsite</li> <li>- review/assess current lagoon design to mitigate any environmental impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>develop more local services*</b></li> <li>- <b>install power at the landfill*</b></li> <li>- <b>create a Southern Lakes transfer station “loop”*</b></li> </ul>
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no power supply at dump</li> <li>- abuse of dump by others</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- install power at solid waste facility*</li> <li>- composting &amp; garbage pickup service*</li> <li>- create a Southern Lakes transfer station “loop”*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- solar panels at landfill</li> <li>- encourage local agriculture &amp; mobile abattoir*</li> <li>- IPP policy*</li> </ul>
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Army Beach road flood-prone/wear &amp; tear</li> <li>- calcium chloride impacts on water/vegetation</li> <li>- New Constabulary Road is soft</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create public transportation</li> <li>- upgrade New Constabulary Road</li> <li>- upgrade Army Beach Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create public transportation</li> <li>- study alternate solutions for wastewater treatment*</li> </ul>
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- commuting: high carbon footprint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- use right-of-way clearing for fuel*</li> <li>- gasification at landfill</li> <li>- IPP policy to sell back to grid*</li> <li>- pilot carbon sequestration project: agriculture*</li> <li>- investigate geothermal potential</li> <li>- solar panels at landfill</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- composting &amp; garbage pickup service*</li> <li>- create designated RV dumpsite</li> <li>- improvements to Judas Creek system</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inability to respond adequately to disasters and emergencies</li> <li>- rink needs roof</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- disaster/emergency preparedness planning and education*</li> <li>- develop more local services*</li> <li>- encourage local agriculture &amp; mobile abattoir*</li> <li>- roof for rink*</li> <li>- flood control plan and erosion control plan activated</li> <li>- firehall at Army Beach*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new well for Community Centre</li> <li>- flood control plan and erosion control plan activated</li> <li>- firehall at Army Beach*</li> </ul>

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering indicates projects that were identified by a majority of questionnaire respondents; underlining indicates projects already confirmed for funding

5.12 Mayo

With few residents in attendance at the Mayo meeting, no specific issue or potential project came to the forefront.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- aging water distribution infrastructure on 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, NND residential area, 1<sup>st</sup> Ave</li> <li>- no backup well</li> <li>- no system for C-6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- backup community well</li> <li>- upgrade water distribution infrastructure on 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, NND residential area, 1<sup>st</sup> Ave</li> <li>- community water supply well, treatment facility, piped distribution system and fire protection system for C-6</li> </ul>	<p>Questionnaire respondents indicated their priority infrastructure categories in addition to specific projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- drinking water</li> <li>- solid waste</li> <li>- green energy</li> <li>- new recycling center</li> <li>- storm drains</li> <li>- improve drainage in downtown areas</li> <li>- upgrade road into community from Silver Trail</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- aging collection infrastructure on 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, NND residential area, 1<sup>st</sup> Ave</li> <li>- no sewer collection at C-6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upgrade collection infrastructure on 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, NND residential area, 1<sup>st</sup> Ave</li> <li>- piped collection system from C-6 housing, Government House and central services building to lagoon</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- recycling depot is under capacity</li> <li>- recycling is limited</li> <li>- no hazardous waste capability</li> <li>- some burning still occurring at dump</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new recycling center with more storage, hazardous waste capability, running water, washroom</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- poor drainage in some downtown areas</li> <li>- road into community from Silver Trail in poor condition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improve drainage in downtown areas</li> <li>- upgrade road into community from Silver Trail</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high O&amp;M costs for municipal buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- community energy system – geothermal or other renewable energy sources e.g. biomass</li> <li>- use waste heat from ice plant to heat recreation complex</li> <li>- install solar panels to heat pool in summer and arena in winter</li> </ul>	
Other	NONE	NONE	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

5.13 Mount Lorne

Mount Lorne residents expressed an interest in a wide range of infrastructure-related topics rather than any one particular issue. Residents who attended the meeting preferred initiatives aimed at improving active transportation and energy efficiency.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no communal water source</li> <li>- arsenic in some private wells</li> <li>- Cowley Lake levels dropping</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- community well</li> <li>- education/subsidies to address arsenic in private wells*</li> <li>- testing of local wells*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>programs to raise awareness and action around invasive species*</b></li> <li>- <b>create community woodlots*</b></li> <li>- <b>retrofit homes to reduce GHGs*</b></li> <li>- <b>bike lane from Rat Lake to Carcross corner</b></li> <li>- IPP program*</li> <li>- government should operate transfer stations*</li> <li>- more passing lanes on South Klondike Highway</li> <li>- community well</li> <li>- improvements to transfer station</li> <li>- local graveyard*</li> <li>- permanent ongoing funding for transfer station*</li> </ul>
Wastewater	NONE	NONE	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- composting at transfer station out of service due to garbage inflow</li> <li>- not enough benefits for staff at transfer station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- compactor for transfer station</li> <li>- create Southern Lakes “loop” of transfer stations*</li> <li>- government should operate transfer stations*</li> <li>- improve bin placement at transfer station</li> <li>- create pilot project to create better metrics around diversion, waste reduction and transfer station effectiveness*</li> <li>- permanent ongoing funding*</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- South Klondike Hwy not safe enough for cyclists</li> <li>- commuting: carbon footprint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- carpooling program*</li> <li>- additional passing lanes to Carcross corner</li> <li>- convert White Pass line to rails-to-trails*</li> <li>- expand City bus service to Carcross corner</li> <li>- commuter train from Carcross to Whitehorse*</li> <li>- bike lane from Rat Lake to Alaska Hwy</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- decreasing firewood access</li> <li>- no ability to sell excess power back to grid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create community woodlots for local employment and local firewood supply*</li> <li>- retrofit homes to reduce GHGs*</li> <li>- focus on programs to reduce energy consumption*</li> <li>- create IPP process/policy*</li> <li>- create concentrated hub for green energy project*</li> <li>- Takhini Hotsprings geothermal/agriculture project*</li> </ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- invasive exotic plant species</li> <li>- no local graveyard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- programs to raise awareness and action around invasive species*</li> <li>- create local graveyard*</li> <li>- subsidy for individuals/communities*</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

5.14 Ross River

Public attendance was very low in Ross River, resulting in a limited number of topics being discussed and no project preferences.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	- iron and manganese issues - no piped water distribution system	- community well - <u>water treatment upgrades for arsenic</u>	Note: questionnaires were not received. Priority issues and/or preferred projects were not identified.
Wastewater	- no piped collection system	- new sewage lagoon and community-wide piped system - install cluster style sewage tanks (to ultimately connect to piped system in long-term)	
Solid Waste	- burning and poor waste segregation at solid waste facility - very limited recycling	- start landfilling garbage*	
Roads	- North Canol in poor condition - Robert Campbell Highway sections in poor condition - grader operators are inexperienced and damage the roads	- upgrade North Canol - upgrade Robert Campbell Highway problem areas	
Green Energy	NONE	NONE	
Other	- local capacity to maintain infrastructure is severely limited - permafrost threatens long-term viability of infrastructure	NONE	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering indicates projects that were identified by a majority of questionnaire respondents; underlining indicates projects already confirmed for funding

5.15 Tagish

Drinking water access and solid waste management were the major topics of discussion during the public meeting with Tagish residents. Residents expressed concerns about the health and environmental impacts of current burning practices at their solid waste facility and overwhelmingly indicated a preference for a transfer station with recycling and composting capabilities. Many Tagish residents also favored a new community well.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CTFN wells are private</li> <li>- iron and manganese issues</li> <li>- very hard water</li> <li>- -additional storage needed for water tank, backflow prevention and remote chlorine monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- additional water storage for residential purposes</li> <li>- backflow prevention and chlorine monitoring</li> <li>- additional water storage for fire suppression</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>transfer station (recycling depot, composting, etc.)</b></li> <li>- <b>new community well</b></li> <li>- road improvements</li> <li>- green energy initiatives</li> <li>- walking/biking/skiing trails*</li> <li>- waste reduction strategy*</li> </ul>
Wastewater	NONE	NONE	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- burning and poor waste segregation</li> <li>- no recycling program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- community compost facility</li> <li>- transfer station and recycling depot</li> <li>- waste reduction strategy*</li> <li>- public education about 3Rs*</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tagish roads are more akin to community streets, not rural roads</li> <li>- road surface and drainage problems</li> <li>- gravel roads only</li> <li>- cars speed approaching the bridge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- traffic calming at bridge</li> <li>- chipseal Taku subdivision</li> <li>- road widening/brushing throughout Tagish</li> <li>- road maintenance program*</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IPPs can't sell back to grid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Choutla micro hydro project</li> <li>- IPP policy*</li> <li>- net metering</li> </ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emergency Measures and Highways not working together on emergency response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- house/lot numbering program*</li> <li>- additional parking at firehall (plug ins too)*</li> <li>- walking/biking/skiing trails*</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

5.16 Teslin/Johnson's Crossing

At least half of the attendees at the Teslin public meeting lived outside of the municipal boundaries or in Johnson's Crossing. Accordingly, rural issues figured prominently in the discussion. Johnson's Crossing residents attended the meeting to forward their concerns about drinking water supply and the poor road conditions in their area. In general, drinking water and rural road conditions were the key concerns of meeting attendees.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no secondary water supply</li> <li>- wellhead protection needed</li> <li>- untreated surface water sole source (Johnson's Crossing)</li> <li>- no support for water testing of private/rural systems</li> <li>- local creeks may be unsafe for drinking</li> <li>- wells may not be deep enough in Teslin</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- secondary water supply and filtration if needed</li> <li>- wellhead protection</li> <li>- community well (Johnson's Crossing)</li> <li>- <u>water treatment upgrades for arsenic</u></li> <li>- support for private water systems*</li> </ul>	<p>Questionnaire respondents indicated their priority infrastructure categories in addition to specific projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>drinking water</b></li> <li>- <b>roads</b></li> <li>- wastewater</li> <li>- solid waste</li> <li>- composting on-site at landfill</li> <li>- micro hydro projects with ability to sell back to grid</li> <li>- testing/quality assurance program for drinking water*</li> </ul>
Wastewater	NONE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sewage lagoon aeration system to promote microbial action</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increased dumping at Johnson's Crossing due to Teslin tipping fees</li> <li>- no composting program in Teslin</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- municipal compost program in Teslin</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- North Canol Road is rapidly deteriorating posing a safety hazard and missed tourism opportunity</li> <li>- inadequate road maintenance in rural areas i.e. Cottage lots, Johnson's Crossing</li> <li>- resurface Nisutlin Drive</li> <li>- upgrade TTC building intersection</li> <li>- drainage issues around arena</li> <li>- drainage issues – TTC lands</li> <li>- poor road condition in downtown</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upgrade North Canol Road</li> <li>- brush/upgrade Johnson's Crossing road</li> <li>- resurface Teslin roads</li> <li>- fix arena drainage issues</li> <li>- fix TTC land drainage issues</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high O&amp;M costs for municipal buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- biomass heat (wood) and geothermal energy feasibility study</li> <li>- energy retrofits to Recreation Centre</li> <li>- micro hydro project</li> </ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- trucks placed at South Canol intersection are an eyesore</li> <li>- not enough outhouses at the JC boat launch</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- additional outhouses at Johnson's Crossing boat launch*</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

5.17 Watson Lake

Solid waste dominated the agenda at the public meeting in Watson Lake. A group of local high school students gave a presentation on the health and environmental risks of burning garbage, asking that the practice be stopped in their community. A wide range of other infrastructure issues was discussed; however, no specific project preferences or priorities resulted.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- high levels of iron and manganese</li> <li>- wellhead protection needed for two wells</li> <li>- pumphouse needs backup power supply, larger holding tank</li> <li>- water reservoir needs to be enlarged</li> <li>- aging distribution and collection system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- additional filtration</li> <li>- wellhead protection</li> <li>- pumphouse upgrades</li> <li>- water reservoir improvements</li> <li>- upgrade parts of distribution/collection system</li> </ul>	<p>Note: Questionnaires were not distributed. Based on the discussion, the priority issue in Watson Lake appeared to be solid waste.</p>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wet well operating at capacity</li> <li>- suspected infiltration/inflow problems</li> <li>- no emergency power for lift stations</li> <li>- aging collection system</li> <li>- adjacent areas not included in collection system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wet well upgrades</li> <li>- emergency standby power</li> <li>- upgrade collection system</li> <li>- investigate/address infiltration &amp; inflow issues</li> </ul>	
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- burning and poor waste segregation at solid waste facility</li> <li>- new landfill site needed</li> <li>- limited diversion capability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new landfill*</li> <li>- solid waste processing and recycling facility</li> </ul>	
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- minimal curb and gutter in downtown</li> <li>- stormwater discharged via ditches and culverts to surface waters</li> <li>- some poor road surfaces in downtown/Watson Lake subdivision</li> <li>- mining access roads not receiving enough maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upgrade 9<sup>th</sup> Street</li> <li>- BST in Watson Lake subdivision</li> <li>- mining “roads to resources” program*</li> </ul>	
Green Energy	NONE	NONE	
Other	NONE	NONE	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

5.18 Whitehorse

The Whitehorse meeting was as much an information exchange about the City’s infrastructure as it was an opportunity for residents to voice specific infrastructure-related concerns. Several representatives from Raven Recycling presented a case for a Yukon-wide material recovery facility – essentially, a large-scale expansion of current operations that would better accommodate the demand of both Whitehorse and rural Yukon residents. Overall, recycling-related initiatives garnered the majority of attendees’ votes, with road and active transportation improvements the secondary preference.

Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Drinking Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- aging and/or inadequate infrastructure in certain areas</li> <li>- no incentive to conserve water</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selkirk Street pump house upgrade</li> <li>- Porter Creek and reservoir upgrades</li> <li>- new truck fill at firehall</li> <li>- water sampling stations</li> <li>- water meters for residential users</li> <li>- water distribution system upgrades (Downtown, Marwell, Takhini North, Hillcrest)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Yukon-wide material recovery facility</b></li> <li>- <b>satellite recycling stations/depots in neighbourhoods</b></li> <li>- demand-side meters during times of peak energy use/diesel</li> <li>- district heating system</li> <li>- development of air emissions standards/regulations*</li> <li>- landfill upgrades*</li> <li>- levy on imported goods as potential revenue stream for recycling*</li> </ul>
Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sewer main acting as storm drain in Hillcrest</li> <li>- downtown curb and gutter (sidewalks)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sewer main repair/replacement</li> <li>- pump house and small lift station upgrade</li> <li>- fix sewer main/storm drain issue in Hillcrest and other areas (if applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- convert 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue to one-way traffic</li> <li>- rebuild Marwell roads</li> <li>- upgrade sidewalks in Downtown/Marwell</li> <li>- improve trail connections for commuting</li> <li>- fix bike path on north side of Two Mile Hill</li> <li>- 4-lane freeway and clover leaf interchange at Alaska Highway &amp; Two Mile Hill</li> </ul>
Solid Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- concerns about City compost safety/quality</li> <li>- Raven Recycling running at full capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- landfill upgrades*</li> <li>- upgrade/enlarge compost facility at landfill</li> <li>- expand compost collection to commercial/condos</li> <li>- curbside recycling program</li> <li>- Yukon-wide material recovery facility</li> <li>- satellite recycling stations/depots in neighbourhoods</li> <li>- levy on imported goods as potential revenue stream for recycling*</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents



Eligible Spending Category	Key Issues	Potential Projects	Preferred Projects
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no sidewalks in Downtown</li> <li>- Robert Campbell bridge too narrow</li> <li>- sections of Alaska Highway require upgrade</li> <li>- poor condition of rural roads</li> <li>- Downtown, Marwell, Takhini North, Hillcrest roads in poor condition</li> <li>- Hospital Road/Lewes Boulevard intersection dangerous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rebuild roads – Marwell, Takhini North, Hillcrest, Downtown</li> <li>- rebuild 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue</li> <li>- sidewalk upgrades in Downtown/Marwell</li> <li>- sidewalk upgrades on Lewes Boulevard</li> <li>- apply BST to country residential areas</li> <li>- rebuild urban roads</li> <li>- improve trail connections for commuters</li> <li>- fix bike path on north side of Two Mile Hill</li> <li>- upgrade lighting standards to decrease light pollution</li> <li>- 4-lane freeway and clover leaf interchange at Alaska Highway &amp; Two Mile Hill</li> <li>- convert 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue to one-way traffic</li> <li>- repair deck/widen Robert Campbell Bridge</li> <li>- pave landfill access road</li> <li>- improve Hospital Road/Lewes Boulevard intersection</li> </ul>	<p><i>Repeated from previous page:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Yukon-wide material recovery facility</b></li> <li>- <b>satellite recycling stations/depots in neighbourhoods</b></li> <li>- demand-side meters during times of peak energy use/diesel</li> <li>- district heating system</li> <li>- development of air emissions standards/regulations*</li> <li>- landfill upgrades*</li> <li>- levy on imported goods as potential revenue stream for recycling*</li> <li>- convert 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue to one-way traffic</li> </ul>
Green Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- efficiency and conservation initiatives lacking</li> <li>- no IPP policy</li> <li>- public buildings expensive and inefficient to heat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upgrade building standards more frequently (5 years)*</li> <li>- landfill gas production feasibility study</li> <li>- increase heat reclamation at Canada Games Centre</li> <li>- build new City Municipal Services Building to LEED</li> <li>- upgrade public safety buildings to LEED standards</li> <li>- energy upgrades at Takhini Arena</li> <li>- upgrade heating system at City Hall</li> <li>- City to investigate biomass and expansion of wind/solar capability</li> <li>- investigate district waste heat system from sanitary system</li> <li>- district heating system</li> <li>- demand-side meters during times of peak energy use/diesel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rebuild Marwell roads</li> <li>- upgrade sidewalks in Downtown/Marwell</li> <li>- improve trail connections for commuting</li> <li>- fix bike path on north side of Two Mile Hill</li> <li>- 4-lane freeway and clover leaf interchange at Alaska Highway &amp; Two Mile Hill</li> </ul>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no air emissions standards i.e. solid waste facilities/burning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- development of air emissions standards/regulations*</li> </ul>	

\* denotes a project that may be ineligible for funding under Building Canada

Note: **bold** lettering identifies those projects that were identified as a priority by a majority of questionnaire respondents

**APPENDIX A**  
**SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS**

**Building Canada/Solid Waste Management Strategy/Integrated Community Sustainability Plan**  
Public Meeting Schedule – Spring 2009

<b>Community</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Venue</b>
Watson Lake & Upper Liard	Tuesday, March 31	7:00 pm	Watson Lake Recreation Centre Mezzanine
Faro	Wednesday, April 1	7:00 pm	Sportsman's Lounge
Ross River	Thursday, April 2	7:00 pm	Ross River Community School
Marsh Lake	Tuesday, April 7	7:00 pm	Marsh Lake Community Centre
Mount Lorne	Wednesday, April 8	7:00 pm	Mount Lorne Community Centre
Whitehorse North	Thursday, April 9	7:00 pm	Hootalinqua Fire Hall
Ibex Valley	Tuesday, April 14	7:00 pm	Ibex Valley Fire Hall
Whitehorse	Wednesday, April 15	7:00 pm	Canada Games Centre Meeting Room #2
Carmacks	Thursday, April 16	7:00 pm	Carmacks Recreation Centre
Tagish	Tuesday, April 21	7:00 pm	Tagish Community Centre
Carcross	Wednesday, April 22	7:00 pm	Ghuch Tla Community School
Teslin	Thursday, April 23	7:00 pm	Teslin Recreation Centre
Beaver Creek	Tuesday, April 28	7:00 pm	Beaver Creek Community Centre
Burwash Landing & Destruction Bay	Wednesday, April 29	7:00 pm	Jacquot Building
Haines Junction	Thursday, April 30	7:00 pm	Dezadeash Room, St. Elias Convention Centre
Mayo/Stewart Crossing	Wednesday, May 6	7:30 pm	Mayo Recreation Centre
Keno/Elsa	Thursday, May 7	9:00 am	Keno Library
Pelly Crossing	Thursday, May 7	7:00 pm	Pelly Crossing Community Hall
Dawson City	Monday, May 11	7:00 pm	Odd Fellows Hall

\*At the request of the Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation, a public meeting was not held in Old Crow.

**APPENDIX B**  
**PUBLIC QUESTIONNAIRE**



Your Community: \_\_\_\_\_

### Section I. Building Canada Fund

*Under Building Canada, Yukon will receive \$183 million dollars from 2007-2014 for infrastructure projects focusing on the five key categories of **drinking water, wastewater, solid waste, roads and green energy**. The Government of Yukon is developing a Yukon Infrastructure Plan that will prioritize projects for funding based on the input received from municipalities, First Nations and the public.*

1. How important do you feel the following objectives are in determining what projects should receive funding? (Please rank in order of importance, with #1 being most important).

- \_\_\_ Address a public health & safety need
- \_\_\_ Meet a regulatory requirement
- \_\_\_ Contribute to local or regional economic development
- \_\_\_ Reduce the community's carbon and/or environmental footprint
- \_\_\_ Reduce residents' monthly living and/or utilities expenses
- \_\_\_ Other? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ Other? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ Other? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ Other? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ Other? \_\_\_\_\_

2. With respect to the five key funding categories, what do you think are the most critical infrastructure "gaps" and/or project needs in your community? (Choose one or more).

- Drinking water \_\_\_\_\_
- Wastewater \_\_\_\_\_
- Roads \_\_\_\_\_
- Solid waste \_\_\_\_\_
- Green energy \_\_\_\_\_

3. With respect to the five key funding categories, what infrastructure projects should receive priority for funding in your community? (Please indicate your “top three”).

- 1. \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. \_\_\_\_\_

4. Do you have any other comments about infrastructure needs in your community and/or the Building Canada Fund?

---

---

---

---

## Section II. Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP)

*Under the Canada-Yukon Gas Tax Agreement, Yukon is required to complete an Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP) for all unincorporated (rural) Yukon communities in order to access \$6.825 million dollars in funding until 2014. The goal of the funding is to develop environmentally sustainability community infrastructure that leads to cleaner air and water and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.*

*The categories for funding under the Gas Tax Fund are similar to Building Canada - drinking water, wastewater, solid waste, roads and green energy, with capacity building, public transit, active transportation and building system improvements also eligible.*

**NOTE: THIS SECTION IS INTENDED FOR RESIDENTS OF RURAL YUKON ONLY!**

5. On a scale of 1 to 5, do you agree with the following definitions of “sustainability” with respect to rural Yukon? (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree)

1 2 3 4 5 Human populations and infrastructure are maintained through local funding.

1 2 3 4 5 Cultural identity is preserved and/or enhanced.

1 2 3 4 5 Natural environment and biodiversity are preserved and/or enhanced.

1 2 3 4 5 Basic needs of residents are met.

1 2 3 4 5 Opportunities for economic growth are nurtured.

1 2 3 4 5 Opportunities for social health and well-being are nurtured.

1 2 3 4 5 Other? \_\_\_\_\_

1 2 3 4 5 Other? \_\_\_\_\_



6. How should the Gas Tax funding for unincorporated Yukon be distributed?

- Fund a few “larger” projects that could take place in a couple of unincorporated Yukon communities.
- Fund numerous “small” projects that could be undertaken in a greater number of unincorporated Yukon communities e.g., building system improvements, capacity building, municipal building retrofits, etc.
- Fund a single project or limited number of projects that would have the broadest benefit geographically i.e., road upgrade, transmission line, etc.
- Provide “top-up” funding to other projects to help them meet or exceed sustainability goals e.g., add a bike lane to a road or a renewable energy component to a public building
- Other? \_\_\_\_\_

7. Do you have any suggestions for potential Gas Tax projects in rural Yukon (either located in your area or elsewhere)?

---

---

---

---

8. Do you have any other comments about the ICSP for rural Yukon and/or the Gas Tax Fund?

---

---

---

---

**PLEASE SEND YOUR COMMENTS BY MAY 22, 2009 TO:**

Department of Community Services (C-9)  
Government of Yukon  
PO Box 2703  
Whitehorse, YT Y1A 2C6  
Fax: (867) 393-6258  
e-mail: [buildingcanada@gov.yk.ca](mailto:buildingcanada@gov.yk.ca)

You can also access this questionnaire on-line at:  
<http://www.infrastructure.gov.yk.ca/buildingcanada/index.html>