

Wild Spaces, Protected Places

A Draft Protected Areas Strategy for the Yukon

**Summary Report of Public
Comments**

DRAFT IN PROGRESS
FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

October 7, 1998

Department of Renewable Resources
Government of Yukon

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>General Comments on the Strategy</i>	4
<i>Why Have Protected Areas?</i>	4
<i>Our first goal: to protect representative core areas within each ecoregion</i>	5
<i>Our second goal: to protect the special places</i>	5
<i>Conserving ecosystems on managed lands</i>	5
<i>Guiding principles of the Protected Areas Strategy</i>	5
<i>Protected Areas and First Nation Final Agreements</i>	6
<i>Roles and responsibilities</i>	6
<i>Process: getting the job done</i>	6
<i>Sustaining and diversifying our economy</i>	6
<i>The mining industry:</i>	6
<i>Managing industry uses</i>	7
<i>Managing recreational uses:</i>	7
<i>Technical Paper No. 1:</i>	9
<i>(Roles and Responsibilities for Implementation)</i>	
<i>Technical Paper No. 2:</i>	11
<i>(Types of Protected Areas and Criteria for Selection)</i>	
<i>Technical Paper No. 3:</i>	13
<i>(Planning and Establishing Protected Areas)</i>	
<i>Technical Paper No. 4:</i>	14
<i>(Protected Areas and Yukon First Nation Final Agreements)</i>	
<i>Technical Paper No. 5:</i>	15
<i>(Socio-economic Assessments of Protected Areas)</i>	
<i>Technical Paper No. 6:</i>	
<i>(Interim Protection and Third-Party Interests)</i>	16
<i>Technical Paper No. 7:</i>	
<i>(Work Plan)</i>	18
<i>Technical Paper No. 8:</i>	
<i>(Reviewing and Updating the Strategy)</i>	19
<i>APPENDIX 1:</i>	20
<i>(List of respondents who provided comments)</i>	

Introduction:

This report summarizes the public comments received by the Yukon Government on the draft *“Wild Spaces, Protected Places: A Draft Protected Areas Strategy for the Yukon”*

The draft was released to the public on July 16, 1998 for review, and the deadline for comments was September 28, 1998.

The draft was widely distributed throughout the Yukon. An initial direct mail out of over 300 copies was done to people and organizations that had expressed a previous interest in the strategy. In addition, over 250 copies were sent to individuals and organizations who requested them after the initial mail out. The draft was also available for pick up in all communities at various local and government outlets throughout the Yukon. A radio and newspaper advertising campaign was conducted to inform the public that it was available for review and comment.

Over 100 responses to the draft have been received to date. Eighty-four of the responses are in writing. There were also a number of verbal comments made by phone as well as during specific meetings held on the topic. These comments were noted and have been included in this summary.

In total, the responses represent a wide range of interests from different stakeholders, non-government organizations, governments, boards and councils, and the public at large.

This report provides an overview of the types of comments received. It organizes the comments according to the headings in the draft and they have been grouped into common themes.

The numbers in the left hand column record how many different respondents made the same or similar comment. It should be emphasized that these numbers should not be used for statistical purposes. To ensure anonymity on the particular issues raised, no comments are attributed to any one respondent.

A list of the respondents who provided written comments is included in Appendix 1.

General Comments on the Strategy:

Level of Support:

- 44 stated support for the strategy
- 7 stated opposition to the strategy

General Comments:

- 8 Draft is high quality re: writing, organization and content
- 8 YPAS has broad public support and will benefit all Yukoners
- 4 YPAS reflects what was heard in public input
- 4 Some inconsistencies between technical papers and summary document
- 3 YPAS needs to use more positive language
- 3 YPAS only supported by minority and will only benefit people outside the Yukon
- 1 Draft is poorly written
- 1 Content of summary document should be strengthened

Why Have Protected Areas?

General Comments:

- 5 The rationale for creating protected areas needs to be elaborated
- 4 Protected areas status can bring unwanted attention to an area. Sometimes the best way to protect something is to leave it alone.
- 3 Our desire to enjoy our homeland should take priority over protecting areas for the rich and scientific
- 3 There needs to be stronger reference to the intrinsic value of conservation and wilderness.
- 2 Needs stronger reference to the global and national context for establishing protected areas
- 3 Needs reference to mining industry's commitments to protected areas in the Whitehorse Mining Initiative
- 2 Needs stronger reference to cultural, spiritual and aesthetic values
- 1 The term "values" needs to be better defined

Comments on specific values being protected:

- 10 Wilderness is being threatened, protected areas are needed to conserve wilderness
- 8 Protected areas are important to our quality of life
- 4 Protected areas are needed to conserve ecosystems
- 4 Wilderness is not being threatened, there is no need for protection

Our first goal: to protect representative core areas within each ecoregion

See comments on Technical Paper No.2: Types of Protected Areas and Criteria for Selection

Our second goal: to protect the special places

See comments on Technical Paper No.2: Types of Protected Areas and Criteria for Selection

Conserving ecosystems on managed lands:

General Comments:

- 4 Current land use regulations do not adequately address the need for ecosystem management or ecosystem conservation.
- 3 The linkage between protected areas and land management on adjacent lands needs to be strengthened
- 3 The concept of core, buffers and corridors needs elaboration
- 2 Existing regulations are adequate to address environmental concerns
- 1 Revise diagram on page 6 to get away from the "protected areas as islands" idea

Guiding principles of the Protected Areas Strategy

General Comments:

- 6 Support for the principles as described in the draft

Comments on specific principles:

Ecological integrity

- 1 Principle does not link up with Goal 2 areas, protecting special places

Public participation

- 2 Public participation is particularly important

Partnerships:

- 1 Clarify if and how these principles apply to federal processes

Quality of information:

- 2 Best available information may not be sufficient. A commitment to filling data gaps to ensure sufficient information should also be made.
- 1 Use traditional knowledge wherever possible

Respecting all values:

- 1 Respecting all values should include aesthetic, spiritual, and intrinsic values.

Recognizing economic interests:

- 1 PAS must not be industry driven
- 1 Local long term interests should be given priority over outside short term mining interests.
- 1 PAS should strengthen commitment to respecting economic interests

Protected Areas and First Nation Final Agreements

See comments on Technical Paper No. 4: Protected Areas and First Nation Final Agreements

Roles and responsibilities

See comments on Technical Paper No. 1: Roles and Responsibilities for Implementation

Process: getting the job done

See comments for Technical Paper No. 3: Planning and Establishing Protected Areas

Sustaining and diversifying our economy

General comments:

- 7 Protected areas will contribute to sustainable economic development
- 6 Protected areas will contribute to the local and regional economy
- 2 We need balance of development and conservation
- 1 Too much protection in an area can limit economic growth
- 1 Need to make decisions quickly so that uncertainty doesn't go on too long

The mining industry:

- 10 The mining industry does not need, nor should it have, access to the entire land base to be successful. In Alaska, 35% of the land base is protected and the mining industry is still healthy.
- 8 Protected areas will take away from the available land base and threaten the mining industry and the Yukon economy. Mining activity will go elsewhere.
- 2 World metal prices have more influence on mining activity than protected areas
- 3 Mining is too unstable and does not always benefit the local people or economy
- 1 With proper management, mining and parks can co-exist

The tourism industry:

- 5 Protected areas are important to the tourism industry
- 3 Tourism can help diversify the economy of an area
- 1 Tourists are interested in seeing mining operations, they can be compatible with protected areas

Managing industry uses

General comments:

- 2 Responsible mining produces only temporary disturbance to the land
- 1 All projects will be reviewed by DAP
- 1 It is usually the non industrial use of industry roads that creates an impact on the environment. Industrial roads should be managed and decommissioned to reduce impacts.

Managing recreational uses:

General comments:

- 2 Visitor activities and access can be an important part of educating the public about the land and wilderness.
- 2 Visitor activities should not be secondary considerations for managing protected areas.
- 1 YPAS should ensure that the areas are selected for the benefit of the majority of Yukoners
- 1 Protected areas should not be used as a way for individuals to get their private recreation area at public expense
- 1 If wilderness tourism operators need some protection of land for their private operations, this should be achieved through some type of lease or tenure.
- 1 YTG tourism marketing needs to be better informed of the value of protected areas and wildlife viewing

Managing tourism and recreation use:

- 4 Some areas should be off limits to any kind of human activity
- 3 Management objectives should determine what types of activities are allowed
- 1 Methods for controlling visitor impacts should be noted in the main document
- 1 Tourism must be closely regulated
- 1 Some areas should be closed off to tourism
- 1 Some areas should be off limits to any commercial activity
- 1 Standards of operation should be widely publicized in many languages
- 1 Zones should not have prohibitive fees for visitors
- 1 Protection should not mean prohibition
- 1 How will the Trans Canada Trail be managed?

Impacts of tourism and recreation:

- 3 Designation with special status will mean increased visitor use and degradation of the area
- 3 Tourism is very difficult to control and can lead to the loss of important values
- 1 Tourism can have negative impacts on traditional ways and lifestyles
- 1 How will the impacts of proposed protection and tourism on the ecosystem be evaluated?

Technical Paper No. 1: **Roles and Responsibilities for Implementation:**

General Comments:

- 3 Coordination amongst players and agencies will be critical
- 2 Public participation in YPAS should also include people from outside the region
- 1 A schematic diagram of all involved would be useful
- 1 Tourism stakeholders need to be involved
- 1 The regional private sector should be involved to undertake technical research
- 1 Government should lead and coordinate the process. The process should be accountable to elected politicians

Local Planning Teams (LPT):

General comments:

- 6 Support for the LPT as described
- 5 Need to clarify who selects or appoints the LPT reps
- 2 LPTs need to ensure a balance of interests, including local and territorial
- 1 Need to clarify who develops the Terms of Reference for the LPTs
- 1 Public must have opportunity to participate in LPT meetings
- 1 It will be difficult for Secretariat to co-chair the LPTs
- 1 We don't need an LPT. UFA provides enough mechanisms to do planning.
- 1 "local" needs to be defined
- 1 Local should mean "residing in the region"

Membership:

- 8 Municipal governments
- 4 RRCs (participate on and co-chair)
- 3 a rep from the appropriate Regional Land Use Planning Commission
- 3 Affected stakeholders
- 2 Non Government Organizations (usually, but not always, from the region)
- 2 an elder
- 1 a youth rep
- 1 an independent mining consultant
- 1 a DAP person
- 1 as described in the draft, the LPT is too loaded with government bureaucrats

Linkage with Land Use Planning:

- 8 Regional Land Use Planning Commissions should not take over the YPAS process
- 6 Linkage between protected areas planning and land use planning needs to be clarified
- 5 LPTs should be linked with the Land Use Planning process, but "stand alone"
- 3 Coordination between LPTs and RLUPCs is needed

- 2 Could include the option of a Regional Land Use Planning Commissions taking on the role of the LPT.

Secretariat:

Membership:

- 1 staff from all 3 levels of government

Expertise required:

- 1 Must have staff which are professional and impartial
- 1 Must have expertise in conservation biology

Role:

- 1 Provide technical support to the LPTs.
- 1 Promote protected area design and establishment
- 1 Data collection and analysis (this may take the majority of its resources)
- 1 Inform stakeholders of any developments that may affect them
- 1 Maintain formal contacts with industry groups
- 1 Maintain formal contact with AYC

Yukon First Nations (YFN):

- 7 YFN roles need to be clearer and stronger
- 1 YFN must be in partnership role
- 1 Ongoing contact with FN governments will be key
- 1 Clarify what government to government relationship with YFNs means

Mandated Boards and Councils:

- 2 The WMAC(North Slope) and the Inuvialuit Game Council need to be referenced
- 1 Boards and councils should be involved in the areas that affect them
- 1 RRC members are appointed by government. RRCs do not always accurately represent local views.
- 1 The mandated role of RRCs should be clarified.
- 1 There should be a stronger role for boards and councils which focus on the economy

Federal Government:

- 2 The federal government needs a stronger role, as it is the land owner and resource manager
- 1 The federal government should participate in discussions on priority ecoregions for planning
- 1 Coordination is required with the federal government re: protection of the foreshore and the offshore on the Yukon North Slope

Technical Paper No. 2: **Types of Protected Areas and Criteria for Selection**

General comments:

- 5 Need to establish criteria to determine when adequate protection is achieved
- 4 Protected areas are not islands, they must interconnect to conserve biological diversity
- 4 Clarify what the limit will be to the total area to be protected.
- 2 Clarify the meaning and relevance of the 23 identified ecoregions
- 2 Include marine natural regions into the regions that require representation
- 1 The rationale for core areas in 23 ecoregions is not adequately explained
- 1 Clarify the term “core protected area”
- 1 Conserving biological diversity should be Goal 1
- 1 Also consider Alaska, BC and NWT in assessing needs for representation
- 1 Need a minimum of 12% of the land base protected as core, preferably more
- 1 This goal needs to be discussed in more detail

Goal 1: to protect representative core areas within each ecoregion

Criteria for selection of Goal 1 areas:

- 7 Goal 1 areas must be large and ecologically sustainable in the long term
- 5 Should allow for more than 1 or 2 core areas per ecoregion
- 3 Protecting wilderness and intact ecosystems should be a top priority
- 2 Need to elaborate on criteria for representation
- 2 Add marine protected areas as a type of core protected area
- 1 Representation of core areas should be balanced. Don't over represent one area at the expense of under representing another area.

Types of activities allowed in Goal 1 areas:

- 5 No industrial development in core areas
- 3 Core areas must be allowed to remain ecologically intact and natural
- 3 Allow mining in all but most sensitive parts of protected areas. Explore use of sequential mining
- 2 Outfitting should not be allowed
- 2 Non First Nation subsistence hunting should be allowed
- 1 No hunting except for First Nation subsistence hunting
- 1 Limits should be placed on all hunting which may threaten ecosystems
- 1 Outfitting should be allowed
- 1 No motorized activities
- 1 No multiple recreation use
- 1 Tourism operators should have reasonable access to protected areas

Goal 2: to protect the special places

General comments:

- 1 Need to elaborate on the process for creating goal 2 areas

Important vegetation, fish and wildlife habitats

- 2 Reference should be made to the need for coastal zone management and conservation needs on the north coast
- 1 Protected areas need to ensure viability of habitat
- 1 Important habitats for sensitive northern furbearers should be protected
- 1 The need for Kluane Game Sanctuary should be re-evaluated.

Uncommon landforms and natural features

- 2 Specific reference should be made to completing a network of ecological reserves
- 1 Areas such as the Carcross dunes should be protected

Areas of high value for outdoor recreation and tourism

- 2 Wilderness tourism operators should be allowed in areas for outdoor recreation
- 1 Development of the Trans Canada Trail must be done with public consultation
- 1 What provision is there for meeting the long term (500 yrs+) demands for recreation

Wilderness

- 4 Wilderness seems to be already covered in Goal 1
- 1 Wilderness should not be used to attract tourists
- 1 The provisions for Wilderness Management Areas under the Environment Act seem obsolete.
- 1 Wilderness Management Areas should be legislatively protected

Other:

- 2 Areas for scientific research, monitoring and education should be considered for protection
- 1 Consider protecting areas for multipurpose economic development
- 1 Heritage rivers are not protected areas
- 1 Protection of privately owned lands should be explored

Activities to be allowed in Goal 2 areas:

- 2 Should examine multi use and sequential use approach to wilderness areas
- 3 Should make allowances for some mining in Goal 2 protected areas
- 1 Should clarify what types of activities are allowed in areas which are not core
- 1 All protected areas should have as strong a level of protection as possible

Technical Paper No. 3: **Planning and Establishing Protected Areas**

General comments:

- 3 The 2-3 year timeframe for completion of planning process seems unrealistically short
- 2 The process should be flexible enough to move more quickly in areas where information is available and parties are prepared to do so
- 1 The process should clarify how and when data gaps will be addressed
- 1 Throughout the process, LPTs will have to clearly communicate standard criteria for the selection and evaluation of proposed protected areas.
- 1 Clarify how trans boundary coordination will be done
- 1 Clarify how the process will respond to public opposition to a proposal
- 1 Clarify how frivolous proposals or interventions will be screened out

Linkage with land use planning:

- 4 The process should be coordinated with land use planning where possible
- 3 The process should not be held up by land use planning
- 1 Land use planning should have YPAS goals as a priority

Public and stakeholder input:

- 3 Support for broad stakeholder and public participation
- 1 Need consultation with YFNs
- 1 Need consultation with industry

Steps in the planning and establishment process:

Selecting priority regions for planning:

- 3 Areas at risk of being disrupted should be given priority
- 1 Areas with a land use planning process in place should be given priority

Identifying areas of interest:

- 5 NGOs and the public should be able to propose areas of interest at the outset
- 1 Some public consultation will be required in identifying initial areas of interest

Government Reviews:

- 1 What mechanism is in place to ensure Cabinet approvals?

DAP Review:

- 7 Linkages with DAP need to be clarified re: scope and timing
- 2 Protected area proposals should not be reviewed by DAP

Management Planning:

- 1 The outline of the management plan should be done early in the process
- 1 May need to consider doing management plans prior to final approvals and protected areas designations

Technical Paper No. 4: **Protected Areas and Yukon First Nation Final Agreements**

General Comments:

- 4 Clarify references to the land claims agreements of the Inuvialuit and Tetlit G'wichin people that affect the Yukon
- 2 Negotiated SMAs through the claims process are a better way to create protected areas
- 2 Ch. 10 of First Nation Final Agreements provides a proper mechanism for creating SMAs once agreements are in effect. YPAS is not needed
- 1 There is public support for SMAs as negotiated through claims
- 1 Clarify the difference between negotiated SMAs and protected areas under YPAS.
- 1 Government should complete SMA negotiations with all YFNs before starting YPAS
- 1 Any proposed protected area under YPAS will affect the rights of the FN within that traditional territory and will require a negotiated agreement with the affected FN.

Technical Paper No. 5: **Socio-economic Assessments of Protected Areas**

General comments:

- 2 Recognize that healthy ecosystems contribute to healthy, sustainable communities
- 1 Clarify the values being referred to.
- 1 Socio economic assessments should be extensive
- 1 The assessment process as described is extensive. The same standard of assessment should be applied to other forms of development, otherwise it is unfair.
- 1 Assessments should be done for all types of protected areas, not just core areas

What should be assessed:

- 5 Economic value of maintaining ecosystem processes
- 4 Mineral assessments
- 2 Balanced assessment of ecological, mineral and other resource values
- 2 Resource assessments
- 1 Mineral assessments do not work and are not credible with the mining industry
- 1 Identification of existing protected areas and lands where development is already restricted
- 1 Items requiring assessment as per Yukon First Nations Final Agreements
- 1 Impact on wind power and other “green” power sources.

Process for assessment:

- 6 The assessment process should be coordinated with DAP
- 3 All information on assessments should be easily understood and made available to the public
- 2 Multiple accounts analysis approach is good but the method should be elaborated
- 2 The land use planning process should play a role in the assessments
- 1 Staff conducting assessments will have to be professional and impartial
- 1 Affected stakeholders should be included
- 1 Assessments should be subject to peer review

How the assessments should be used:

- 7 Remove the implication that protected areas will not be established where other resource values are high. Ecological criteria should be the determining factor
- 5 Protected areas should be avoided in areas of high mineral potential
- 2 Mineral and conservation values should be considered on an equal footing
- 1 PAS should be dissociated from evaluations of economic costs or benefits
- 1 Clarify that governments will make the final decisions re: what values take precedence

Technical Paper No. 6: **Interim Protection and Third-Party Interests**

General comments:

- 7 Support for interim protection as described in the draft
- 2 Need to prevent speculative land use permit and nuisance staking on areas of interest
- 1 Opposed to interim protection
- 1 Strengthen provisions for interim protection
- 1 Interim protection does change the use of the land
- 1 Limit the number of areas under interim protection at any one time
- 1 Don't limit the amount of interim protection
- 1 Clarify the status of oil and gas interests

Type and extent of interim protection:

- 3 Map notations can be effective and increase the transparency of the process
- 2 Interim protection must include subsurface withdrawal
- 2 Interim protection must include the entire study area being considered for protection
- 1 Map notations are not effective
- 1 Surface withdrawal may not always be needed

Timing:

- 5 The process for approving and implementing interim protection should be quicker
- 2 Interim should be maximum of 3 yrs
- 1 Interim protection should not be longer than 1 yr.
- 1 Incorporate specific timelines so that temporary doesn't become permanent

The process for interim protection:

- 1 The interim protection process should establish clear timelines and funding for research
- 1 Clarify the role of public input into the interim protection process
- 1 The public should be consulted prior to interim protection
- 1 Government should implement interim protection prior to informing the public of it's intentions, to avoid the problem of nuisance staking
- 1 Interim protection should be done only after socio economic assessments have been completed.
- 1 Clarify what happens if the fed gov't refuses a YTG request for interim protection

Third-party interests

- 4 Compensation policy needs to be clarified
- 2 Clarify how interim protection will affect existing property rights or other third party interests and renewal or sale of same
- 2 Must include compensation at fair market value for expropriation

- 1 Third parties should only be compensated for costs actually incurred rather than purported potential values.
- 1 Will existing mining interests be allowed to continue in core areas
- 1 Federal responsibilities and obligations still need to be clarified.
- 1 Concerns regarding existing third party interests should not dissuade governments from locating PAs in the best possible areas to achieve conservation objectives.

Technical Paper No. 7: **Work Plan**

Timing of implementation:

- 18 Move ahead with implementation as soon as possible
- 11 The pace of implementation is too slow. It should be speeded up
- 7 Should have clear year 2000 targets including establishment of several LPTs and study areas with interim protection in place
- 6 Wetlands strategy should be implemented more quickly with actual designations in place by the year 2000
- 3 9 new areas should be established by the year 2000
- 2 Need to move more quickly to protect critical areas
- 1 Strategy should be delayed to allow for more input

General comments:

- 3 Need to establish a process for managing and collecting information and creating multi agency data base.
- 3 Need more public education and information as part of implementation.
- 1 Cooperation from the federal and FN governments will be required to meet the implementation targets
- 1 Amend the Yukon *Parks Act* to ensure stronger protection
- 1 Should include development of habitat protection regulations
- 1 Clarify how the Wetlands strategy fits in

Specific on the ground projects:

- 7 Should specifically support a feasibility study for Wolf Lake
- 4 Need stronger commitment to on the ground progress
- 1 Tombstone boundary should be determined by March 1999

Implementation Costs:

- 5 How will YTG fund RRCs, YFNs and NGOs for their participation?
- 4 YTG will need to put significant additional resources to YPAS to meet the implementation agenda.
- 1 Implementation should be cost effective.

Technical Paper No. 8:
Reviewing and Updating the Strategy

- 2 There should be an accounting of the costs involved in implementation
- 2 A workplan review every 12 months may be too onerous. Every 18 months should be considered
- 1 All reviews and reports should be made available to the public
- 1 Protected areas should be monitored to assess whether or not they are meeting conservation objectives
- 1 The review and updating of the strategy should be on a web site to make it a transparent process

APPENDIX 1:

List of respondents who provided comments:

1. John Ferbey, Chairperson, Yukon Heritage Resources Board
2. John Peter Ross, Resident of Yukon, Whitehorse
3. Rhonda Rosie, Watson Lake
4. Brent Liddle, Kluane Ecotours/The Cabin B&B, Haines Junction
5. Rob Moore, Haines Junction
6. Darielle Talarico, Go Wild Tours!, Whitehorse
7. Juri Peepre, CPAWS, Yukon Chapter
8. Garry Umbrich
9. Dennis O. Kuch, Whitehorse
10. Duke Connelly, AYC & PAS rep., Whitehorse
11. Lindsay Staple, Chair, WMAC(NS), Whitehorse
12. David Dickson, Dickson Outfitters
13. Alan Dennis, Whitehorse
14. Bob Johnson, Chief, Kluane First Nation
15. Christine S. Stewart, Minister of the Environment, Ottawa
16. Gerry Couture, Chair, YFWMB
17. William Mann, Whitehorse
18. Ian D. Robertson, President, Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce
19. Bruce Amos, Director General, National Parks Directorate, Hull
20. Arno Springer/Cindy Breitkreutz, Whitehorse
21. Jessica Simon, Log Cabin Adventures, Whitehorse
22. Mike Power, President, Amerok Geosciences Ltd., Whitehorse
23. Gary White, President, GV White Resources Ltd.
24. Glen Everitt, Mayor, City of Dawson
25. W.J. Wolfe, General Manager, Canadian Exploration, Cominco, Vcr.
26. James S. Dodge, P.Eng., Whitehorse
27. Rosa Brown, Yukon Conservation Society
28. Mike Stammers, Geologist,, Pamicon Developments Ltd., Vcr.
29. Robert McIntyre, Yukon C. of Mines/Mike McDougall, KPMA
- 30. Joe Tetlich, Chair, Porcupine Caribou Management Board**
31. Town of Faro
32. Village of Haines Junction

33. Ron Berdahl, Whitehorse
34. Juliane Frisch, Whitehorse (summers, Dawson City)
35. Gerald Carlson, LA Teko Resources, Vcr.
36. Yukon Trappers Association, Guenther Muller, President
37. Priscilla Clarkin
38. Bob Jickling, Whitehorse
39. Eve D'Aeth
40. Tim & Jan Mervyn, Whitehorse
41. Don Trudeau/Fred Green, Selkirk First Nation
42. Gillian McDougall, Amerok Geosciences Ltd., Whitehorse
43. Heidi Istchenko, Ex. Sec., Alsek Renewable Resources Council
44. Eamer/Janowicz/Pomeroy/Wolf Creek Research Basin Steering Committee
45. Environment Canada
46. Daniele Heon
47. Little Salmon Carmacks First Nation
48. David Love
49. Teslin Renewable Resources Council
50. YTG, Policy & Planning (Karen Hougen-Bell)
51. Scott Gillbert, Haines Junction
52. Jack Woledge, Mistaya Holdings, Tagish
53. Gordon Allison, Haines Junction
54. James Thorbourne, Yukon Land Use Planning Council
55. Richard Mueller, Carmacks Resident
56. Terry Sewell, DIAND
57. Tr'ondek Hwech'in First Nation (Dawson City)
58. Anne Landry
59. Alejandro Friday Marten Berkman
60. Laurel Jenkins
61. Paul Davis
62. Ray & Lousie Breneman
63. Richard D'Aeth
64. Jennifer Staniforth
65. Tanya Handley
66. Gordon MacRae
67. Laurent Dick (Alaska)
68. Bruce McLean
69. Environmental Mining Council, Alan Young

70. Ecosummer Yukon Expeditions/Sila Sojourns
71. Kluane Country Visitors Association
72. Champagne and Aishihik First nations
73. Ken Madsen
74. Angela Walkley
75. Kevin O'Reilly
76. Rhonda Markel
77. Sally Wright
78. Walden's Guiding & Outfitting
79. Judy Forrest and Bruce Barrett
80. Natural Resources Canada
81. Haines Junction YPAS Public Meeting Notes
82. YPAS Working Group Meeting Notes
83. Mayo YPAS (RRC/FNs/MUNICIPAL COUNCIL REPS.) Meeting Notes
84. WMAC(NS) YPAS Meeting Notes

Murphy