

**Subject:** Dawson land use plan

**From:** Jim Boyde <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** 2019-12-21, 1:10 p.m.

**To:** dawson@planyukon.ca

Morning:

Have already submitted my thoughts with respect to the Dawson Land Use Plan. I had not read supporting document too thoroughly and did a read this morning.

1. There does not seem to be much reference to the nursing capability and needs of the Yukon River water corridor and the watershed for young salmon returning from upstream spawning gravels and in the case of Chinook salmon hanging out in these water for as much as two years.

2. Related to this service provided by Yukon River watershed waters is the lack of specifics with respect to this service. For instance how many small salmon a pair of Kingfishers might take during their stay in Yukon and then the family they raise taking small fish. How many years have I paddled into Dawson and seen a pair of Pacific Loons at the mouth of the Klondike River and how many small salmon do they take in their time there? The same questions could be asked of Merganser small fish predation? We know that Grizzly and Black bears and wolves will take adult salmon but how many? River otters are also fish eaters as are ravens and Bald eagles and Cranes. To my knowledge the true value of the Yukon River watershed waters is not fully know and tends to be adult salmon and human species oriented.

3. The definition of sustainability as outlined in chapter 11 of the Umbrella Final agreement is not well known nor does it form the basis of Non-First Nation resource understanding and use. And should be.

4. Tourism events, whether by road, air or water provide local economic wealth but also have attendant increased carbon footprint. I would suggest management of these "opportunities" be closer tided to the UFA chapter 11 definition of sustainability. Thanks Jim Boyde

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Dawson Region Land Use Plan engagement....submission

**From:** Linda Cameron <[REDACTED]>

**Date:** 2020-01-06, 11:58 p.m.

**To:** Dawson Land Use Planning Commission <dawson@planyukon.ca>

January 6,2020

My submission is on behalf of myself. I have lived and worked in Whitehorse since 1983 and am now retired and living here.

Dawson Region Land Use Plan must begin with

- 1.Honouring of the Umbrella Final Agreement
- 2.Moratorium on staking and as well as other land dispositions. Not doing so will limit options in planning and put unnecessary pressure on the parties.

I support the submissions of the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society and the Yukon Conservation Society. The submissions as a whole and recommendations and supporting evidence.

Linda Cameron  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

My main concern for this next phase of the Dawson Land Use Plan is whether it's going to be a democratic process reflecting the needs all Yukoners that walk on the land. Will it recognize the need for responsible development alongside well-publicized conservation goals? Or, like other land use initiatives, both prior to the the YLUPC and since its establishment, is it going to be used to withdraw yet more land from development? And for what reason? And at what cost?

It is very difficult for any planning process to not have inherent bias. The earlier iteration of the Dawson plan was a good attempt; however, the evaluation of the different values and their sensitivity to various scenarios ignored the impact of rules and regulations that govern mineral activity on Crown land. This meant that all the natural values were deemed threatened unless an added level of protection was put in place.

Another subtle bias can be seen on the Engage Dawson page, where we are invited to choose between two alternatives. We have a choice between "*More land available for quartz mine staking*" vs "*Healthy tourism sector*". What if I think that healthy mining and healthy tourism are both compatible? If I don't want to chose between the two options, I can't proceed with the questionnaire.

I don't think the Dawson region needs more large land withdrawals. Yet it seems assumed that large conservation areas are needed. We seem to forget that Tombstone Park was established as part of Land Claims. It is very large. Its boundaries are even greater than what was defined as a study area. And, like the other Yukon land withdrawals, no compromise was made to acknowledge the mineral endowment and its potential benefits to the community.

I think that conservation goals can be met in many cases without land withdrawals and that we need to be honest about the risks of mineral development and creative with our conservation mechanisms. Large land withdrawals are damaging to the industry and when I say industry, I mean people, Yukoners that work on the land in search of minerals, a portion of this community. I'm not referring to an abstract impersonal corporate entity. I'm referring to me. My friends. My colleagues. Such withdrawals have taken a big toll on us. Claims became worthless as they couldn't be worked on any more, investments have been lost, yet no compensation was ever offered.

I hope the commission can inform themselves of the status and reach of current regulations; address actual risks, not imagined ones; and choose carefully its recommendations of conservation mechanisms.

The Land Claims Agreements were not set up to turn the Yukon into a park. They were created to provide a framework for sustainable development in respectful co-management. Sustainable development does not mean "no development".

We must find tools that allow options to remain flexible as so many things can change in ten, twenty, fifty years. It is almost impossible to reverse a land withdrawal. It is possible to come up with flexible land management tools. This requires more effort, more creativity, more commitment to balance.

We live in a time of increasing polarization and its devastating effects are clearly seen worldwide. The Dawson LUPC is in a privileged position to guide land use planning towards the balance that we all need. I commend the commission for accepting this challenging task.

Respectfully,

Danièle Héon

Whitehorse



**Subject:** feedback

**From:** Troy Taylor [REDACTED]

**Date:** 2020-01-06, 8:17 p.m.

**To:** dawson@planyukon.ca

To Whom It May Concern,

As a third generation placer miner, I am concerned my industry could fade away as a result of placer ground being removed from development.

The YESAB process is not perfect but it provides for environmental assessment of all projects. Therefore, we do not need to simply remove large chunks of land from future placer development as was done with the Peel Land use plan.

The family based placer industry will not survive if placer potential areas are removed or restricted as a result of new land use plans. Also, placer potential areas must not be cut off by strategically placed wild life corridors or "protected areas".

The idea of a staking moratorium is not necessary and consensus must be reached on which areas to be protected.

Sincerely,

Troy Taylor

Placer miner, Duncan Creek, Mayo, Yukon  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



**Subject:** Dawson Regional Planning Commission Survey

**From:** Lulu Keating [REDACTED]

**Date:** 2020-01-08, 11:02 a.m.

**To:** dawson@planyukon.ca

Hello,

I was out of town for work this fall, and seemed to have missed the survey. Please record my recommendations, that are in line with those of the Yukon Conservation Society:

- The Yukon River corridor should be a Special Management Area (SMA). This means a special management plan for the river and the riparian areas and cliffs adjacent to the river.
- At least half the planning region should be set aside for conservation purposes.
- There should be a moratorium on mineral staking in the planning region while the plan is being developed, at the very least areas of high conservation values should be withdrawn from staking.
- The wilderness characteristics of most of the planning region should be maintained.

Sincerely, Lulu Keating

--

Lulu Keating  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Ron Berdahl

## **Considerations about Land Use Planning and the Dawson Regional Plan**

The Dawson Plan involves areas where many people work...or could potentially work....and that is what healthy communities need to exist...work, a sense of belonging and contributing.

First Nations, who have been struggling, rightly, to assert their rights over the land should consider that a LUP can become like a straight jacket to all including the FN members....let's try to be more forward thinking, more imaginative.

The reason many prospectors, independent prospectors out on their own prospect, is to simply walk in the unspoiled wilderness. In a perfect world it would be great to spend every day just exploring the country.....but folks need computers and houses and clothes and food and gifts to give their loved ones.....and every one of those things require mining...so we look for minerals on our walks. Prospectors have an understanding and cannot help but prospect (look at and consider rocks and landforms and what they mean) and understand and map them as they walk through the land, just as a biologist or herbalist can't help from noting, considering and understanding the wildlife the plants in the wilderness.

The main problem with mineral exploration and land use plans is this....you cannot plan for what you cannot see. You can count caribou (to some degree), trees, miles of trail, the amount of surface water, how many cabins are in an area, etc. but you cannot know where any mineral deposit might be....and you cannot find that source of beneficial pride, honest work, if the land isn't available to look at.

Less than 1% of the land contains ore bodies that could be economic to mine. Prospectors should be allowed to search all the land for those locations, and then move towards extracting the ore, in respectful and responsible ways, according to the laws.

So if we must plan, let's do it with love and imagination. Let's respect that each one of us needs a place in our community, we need to contribute, we need to work so we can do that. Instead of "locking up the land" let's figure out ways bring back the Fortymile caribou herd and other populations, restore the salmon runs (as much as we can as we cannot control the off shore harvest) and most importantly let people use the land. These goals are not opposing forces. They can co-exist. It is important that land use planners and others understand exploration is not the same as mining and can be integrated into the community to achieve goals, and be beneficial.



**Subject:** Dawson Regional Planning Commission

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Date:** 2019-12-23, 11:07 a.m.

**To:** "dawson@planyukon.ca" <dawson@planyukon.ca>

Hello,

I am writing here as I attempted to complete the survey but I was unable to as it was long and at times felt overwhelming in language.

I would like to commend the commission in its structure of the consultation process which included community meetings and a survey but I would add that, I believe it would be beneficial to write the survey maybe using Plain Language or at least a Plain Language Summary, so that a greater cross section of the population might engage. Just a thought.

*Having said that, I would like the commission to consider my email as being in support of the recommendations put forth by the Yukon Conservation Society.*

I would also like to suggest, and I'm not sure if this is the appropriate place for this, that hunting of big game animals in this region be limited to local harvest. I feel that there has been an increase in the out of community and out of territory hunting in this region and this, I do not believe, is sustainable.

Thank you for the work being done in planning ahead and ensuring that our region is developed in an environmentally sustainable manner.

Kind regards,

Marjorie



**Subject:** Comments On Methods Of Consensus Building and Suggestions For LUP Implementation | kingopayne@gmail.com | engagedawson.planyukon.ca

**From:** Sean Payne [REDACTED]

**Date:** 2020-01-05, 9:16 p.m.

**To:** dawson@planyukon.ca

**Name:** Sean Payne

**Email:** [REDACTED]

**Message:** To: LUP Commission Membership

From: Sean Payne

Date: Jan 5, 2020

With respect to the methods used by the LUP Commission, I would like to make the following observations:

It appears that much time and money was invested in preparing graphics and printed materials for the meetings. I personally would rather see those funds being spent informing the public of the events, and beyond informing them, convincing them that it was in their best interests to attend.

It seems to me that the meetings are designed for impressing the few that do show up, and am of the cynical opinion that it is in the best interests of the corporate sponsorship (government and partners) to convince the local population that they had a say in the allocation of resources when in fact this will be a predetermined outcome.

That said, in the event there is any chance that public comments will be able to influence outcomes, I would like to point out the following:

Restricting access to local resources to entities capable of putting up large deposits is likely to mean that few locals will be able to participate gainfully in local resource extraction. It is more likely that a large percentage of revenues generated by small, local operators will make their way through the local economy, than the small fraction that will flow through the wages of locals employed by large outfits. The distribution of revenues generated by locals, through the local economy, would generate more taxes by the time the money left the territory than those generated by large operators based outside of the region.

Although I haven't previously been exposed to the following concept, I believe it is generally a good idea to generate new approaches whenever possible, so I will put this forward: I am of the opinion that in lieu of a system of deposits, a combination of education and environmental

monitoring and data collection on the part of all parties accessing local resources might be cost effective and acceptable to wildlife biologists and ecologists.

It is unfortunate that myself, as well as many other locals interested in accessing local resources, are busy pursuing employment to put food on the table, and using our free time to meet our other needs. We are neither educated regarding the possibilities and challenges involved in creating a framework for public participation in the safeguarding and allocation of local resources, nor do we have the time to bring ourselves to such a state or participate in the implementation of such, given the economic pressures we find *ourselves subject to.*

It was suggested to me, when I mentioned my interest in this process, that I should also put forward the desire for more economical access to the land for habitation. I understand that the trend is towards ending urban sprawl while encouraging high density living in existing population centres. I would like to point out two factors that indicate this isn't as urgent an agenda as commonly understood. 1. Populations in the '1st World' were in decline in the 90's and would continue to be so if not for increases due to immigration. 2. Increases in immigration are said to be necessary due to the 'demographic cliff', which is a fallacy, given the drop in costs due to increases in technological efficiencies. The elephant in the room is the cooperation between government, corporations, and the banks to make sure those profits were not realized by the general public. If the '3rd world' were given the chance to get on their feet via education and infrastructure, they too would go through a population boom followed by a decline, but this doesn't seem to be the path our governments are interested in pursuing. Consumerism and war (aka peacekeeping and regime change) seem to be the agendas, meetings such as these--LUP--a method of placating local populations while we continue with business as usual.

That said, I have hope that all involved in this process of resource allocation will eventually begin to put pressure upwards within the bureaucracies to represent the Canadian people and residents where politicians are not. It is hoped by many that we may return to, and surpass a state of trickle down economics to replace the steady trickle 'up' of funds and resources that seems to be the accelerating trend of the last hundred years.

A last comment I would like to make is regarding my desire to see direct-democracy begin to become a reality in my lifetime. We have the technology to give the public a steady range of choices to vote on, from resource allocation to infrastructure investments, via smart phones and internet connected computers, and a move in this direction would be of great value in regaining public faith in the beneficence of government.

I wish the best to all involved and hope my comments are relevant and well received.



Sean Payne,  
Dawson City

**Accepted Terms, Privacy/GDPR: No**

**Sender IP:** [REDACTED]

████████████████████

Julie Frisch

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Y1A 3H4

Comments for the Dawson Region Planning Commission  
Re: Issues and Interests for the Dawson Region Land Use Plan  
By email: [dawson@planyukon.ca](mailto:dawson@planyukon.ca)

January 7, 2020

I am not very familiar with the Dawson Land Use Planning Region south of the Tintina Trench so I will not attempt to address issues and interests in that area.

What I am familiar with and wish to comment on is the portion of the planning region that lies to the north of the Tintina Trench and especially the land the Dempster Highway cuts through. I have lived and worked on the Dempster for almost fifty years. During those years I have 'explored', studied and researched the natural and cultural history of the area. During those years I have talked to thousands of people who have ventured north to see and learn about the wilderness, to discover and reconnect with nature. As the global population soars and the pace of daily life speeds up the number of people who will look to the Yukon to experience what has been lost in so much of the world will continue to grow.

So as biodiversity plummets and natural environments disappear; as a warming climate is ringing alarm bells and changing everything we simply must do all we can to protect what we have left of our natural world. The Dawson Planning Commission has, right now, the opportunity to play a role in this effort. It can recommend that the portion of the planning region north of the Tintina Trench be designated as a *Conservation Area*. This part of the planning region includes a variety of habitats, the western edge of Canada's boreal forest, the subarctic landscape of the Blackstone Uplands, the alpine summits of the Ogilvie Mountains and the eastern limits of Beringia. Each of these habitats has unique characteristics and each is part of the whole. This northern portion of the planning region is still more wilderness than not; can still provide the large intact expanse that flora and fauna alike need if they are to survive the loss of habitat elsewhere and the stress of a changing climate.

I confess that I have not actually gone to the mining records office to look at maps but those in the Dawson Regional Assessment Report indicate that currently in this northern portion of the planning region there does not seem to be much mineral activity, either exploration or production, aside from gold mining operations in the Clear Creek area on the eastern edge. Also, east of the Dempster Highway, there is the continuing promise of a resurrection at 'Brewery Creek' and endless activity up on Antimony Mountain. To the west of the highway is the quiet presence of the Monster Claims in the Ogilvie Mountains north of Seela Pass and then there is that 'bite' out of the western border of Tombstone Park. However the richest mineral deposits, gold or otherwise, seem to be within Tombstone Park - out of the picture - for now. (Except, of course, those festering Horn Claims.)

So in terms of the non-renewable resources in the northern portion of the planning region that leaves the oil and gas potential in the Kandik Basin. However with no infrastructure in place, with the Yukon Government moratorium on 'fracking' and with scientists telling us we must "leave it in the ground" and move to renewable sources of energy it seems reasonable to suggest that leases for oil and gas exploration in the planning region should be withdrawn.

Conservation scientists are urging countries to strive to protect at least half of ~~what is left of the~~ natural world. The Dawson Land Use Planning Region is roughly divided in half by the Tintina Trench. Given that the northern portion of the region still contains vast and vibrant ecosystems that not only continue to support the flora and fauna that have evolved there but will perhaps become a refuge for them - I request that the Dawson Region Planning Commission ask the Yukon Government to put an immediate moratorium on staking in the region and that the Commission recommend the portion of the planning region north of the Tintina Trench be designated as a *Conservation Area*.

of what is left of the

divided in  
half by the  
Tintina

Thank you for taking on this important work,  
Julie Frisch