

## Memorandum

**To:** Bob Kuiper and Katie Hayhurst  
**CC:** Shirley Abercrombie, Jesse Duke  
**From:** Danièle Héon  
Economic Development / Mineral Assessment Geologist  
**Date:** 03/16/98  
**Re:** PAS Draft

---

Dear Bob and Katie,

Please find attached my editorial comments on the first draft of the PAS circulated to the working group since the February workshop. In addition, I want to share some thoughts I have on the unfolding of the process. I would like you to circulate this letter as feedback to the advisory and steering committees.

As a member of the working group, I am alarmed at the frantic pace set for the drafting of the strategy. I do believe that we are doing a disservice to the process by not providing sufficient time to develop a credible product. I have voiced this concern before and Bob has confirmed hearing the same concern from many people, including the advisory committee as well as the person responsible for developing the B.C. version of the strategy. Their feedback was that the timing was unrealistic. To receive a draft of the Strategy on a Tuesday and to be expected to comment on it at a working group meeting at 9:00 AM the following day is, to say the least, unrealistic.

This timing problem has repercussions at all levels of the development of the strategy.

- Not enough time was given to prepare for the February workshop. Consequently, research for several topics was inadequate<sup>1</sup> and the goal to distill several options to present to the public was not met. Much of the missing material wasn't even ready for this draft of the strategy we were given to review.
- Some of the presentations at the workshop didn't reflect the work done by the working group (Bob Kuiper, Roger Horner). Others, due to the volume of material to present, didn't have enough time to present the information in an adequate way (Angela Walkley, Katie Hayhurst). Despite efforts put out by the organizers, the focused discussion groups were actually quite unfocussed. As a result, only part of the information was

1- (compilation of process in other jurisdictions, establishment of criteria for protection, types of protected areas and relative level of protection)

presented or discussed. An important example is the fact that only "core"-type areas were discussed in the PROCESS group, leaving all other types of protected areas unaddressed. This oversight spills out in the document as, in most cases, all "protected areas" are treated as "core areas".

I bring up these shortcomings of the workshop to make the point that, in great part due to time constraints, the end product of the workshop did not meet expectations. The workshop was a good exercise in education and communication. But I think it is fair to say that the government's advertised goal of the workshop, "to develop the cookbook" for the implementation of a protected area network, was not met. The unfolding of the process should reflect that, timelines should be revised in light of the quality of the products. So much work remains.

Our department has been asking for definition of criteria for protection since the early stages of preparation for this workshop. During working group meetings, discussion of this topic got postponed from one session to another. The workshop took place without any criteria being proposed for discussion or defined. The issue wasn't even addressed in the discussion groups until, before the last round of discussion, it became clear that the pertinent discussion group wouldn't get around to it. In fact, it astounds me that there is still no definition or elaboration of criteria in this document that I was asked to review. How can we expect the population to endorse a process if we can't spell out the criteria that will trigger it? If we are not ready to establish criteria, we are not ready to release our Strategy. The accountability of the process is at stake.

I think the workshop was very successful as a forum for respectful listening and discussion from the part of various stakeholder groups. Representatives of both CPAWS and the mineral industry agreed upon some significant issues. I will mention them here, as they are not included in the draft of the Strategy or in the summary report of the workshop and should be if these documents are to reflect consultation:

- Map notation is an acceptable form of interim protection
- Only final candidate areas are to be withdrawn if withdrawal is required
- There will be cap on the amount of areas interim protected as well as a time limit on interim protection.

Other important points discussed by participants did not make it in the draft nor in the summary of workshop presented to the advisory committee. Again, this will have to be corrected if the documents are to reflect consultation.

We have, here in the Yukon, a unique opportunity to develop what could be the best system of protected areas, to suit our needs and our reality. We do not have the development pressures of the south, we have a lot of talent and good will, and we have a small population that gets along relatively well. Let us take the time to craft a Strategy that is truly accountable, credible and honorable.

Let's work with real deadlines that reflect the complexity of the process. Lets not shortchange ourselves by rushing to artificial timelines. I hope you can convince your superiors of the need to estimate realistically the requirements for developing a product that reflects all your efforts and those of everybody that is contributing to this process.

## Memorandum

**To:** Bob Kuiper and Katie Hayhurst  
**CC:** Shirley Abercrombie, Jesse Duke  
**From:** Danièle Héon  
Economic Development / Mineral Assessment Geologist  
**Date:** 03/16/98  
**Re:** PAS Draft

---

Dear Bob and Katie,

Please find attached my editorial comments on the first draft of the PAS circulated to the working group since the February workshop. In addition, I want to share some thoughts I have on the unfolding of the process. I would like you to circulate this letter as feedback to the advisory and steering committees.

As a member of the working group, I am alarmed at the frantic pace set for the drafting of the strategy. I do believe that we are doing a disservice to the process by not providing sufficient time to develop a credible product. I have voiced this concern before and Bob has confirmed hearing the same concern from many people, including the advisory committee as well as the person responsible for developing the B.C. version of the strategy. Their feedback was that the timing was unrealistic. To receive a draft of the Strategy on a Tuesday and to be expected to comment on it at a working group meeting at 9:00 AM the following day is, to say the least, unrealistic.

This timing problem has repercussions at all levels of the development of the strategy.

- Not enough time was given to prepare for the February workshop. Consequently, research for several topics was inadequate<sup>1</sup> and the goal to distill several options to present to the public was not met. Much of the missing material wasn't even ready for this draft of the strategy we were given to review.
- Some of the presentations at the workshop didn't reflect the work done by the working group (Bob Kuiper, Roger Horner). Others, due to the volume of material to present, didn't have enough time to present the information in an adequate way (Angela Walkley, Katie Hayhurst). Despite efforts put out by the organizers, the focused discussion groups were actually quite unfocussed. As a result, only part of the information was

1- (compilation of process in other jurisdictions, establishment of criteria for protection, types of protected areas and relative level of protection)

presented or discussed. An important example is the fact that only "core"-type areas were discussed in the PROCESS group, leaving all other types of protected areas unaddressed. This oversight spills out in the document as, in most cases, all "protected areas" are treated as "core areas".

I bring up these shortcomings of the workshop to make the point that, in great part due to time constraints, the end product of the workshop did not meet expectations. The workshop was a good exercise in education and communication. But I think it is fair to say that the government's advertised goal of the workshop, "to develop the cookbook" for the implementation of a protected area network, was not met. The unfolding of the process should reflect that, timelines should be revised in light of the quality of the products. So much work remains.

Our department has been asking for definition of criteria for protection since the early stages of preparation for this workshop. During working group meetings, discussion of this topic got postponed from one session to another. The workshop took place without any criteria being proposed for discussion or defined. The issue wasn't even addressed in the discussion groups until, before the last round of discussion, it became clear that the pertinent discussion group wouldn't get around to it. In fact, it astounds me that there is still no definition or elaboration of criteria in this document that I was asked to review. How can we expect the population to endorse a process if we can't spell out the criteria that will trigger it? If we are not ready to establish criteria, we are not ready to release our Strategy. The accountability of the process is at stake.

I think the workshop was very successful as a forum for respectful listening and discussion from the part of various stakeholder groups. Representatives of both CPAWS and the mineral industry agreed upon some significant issues. I will mention them here, as they are not included in the draft of the Strategy or in the summary report of the workshop and should be if these documents are to reflect consultation:

- Map notation is an acceptable form of interim protection
- Only final candidate areas are to be withdrawn if withdrawal is required
- There will be cap on the amount of areas interim protected as well as a time limit on interim protection.

Other important points discussed by participants did not make it in the draft nor in the summary of workshop presented to the advisory committee. Again, this will have to be corrected if the documents are to reflect consultation.

We have, here in the Yukon, a unique opportunity to develop what could be the best system of protected areas, to suit our needs and our reality. We do not have the development pressures of the south, we have a lot of talent and good will, and we have a small population that gets along relatively well. Let us take the time to craft a Strategy that is truly accountable, credible and honorable.

Let's work with real deadlines that reflect the complexity of the process. Lets not shortchange ourselves by rushing to artificial timelines. I hope you can convince your superiors of the need to estimate realistically the requirements for developing a product that reflects all your efforts and those of everybody that is contributing to this process.

Danièle Héon -Editorial comments of draft of PAS

Main comments:

- Most of document reads as if core-type is only option
- Outcome of workshop not sufficient to "write the cookbook"
- Timelines unrealistic, we're doing a rush job

(I've numbered the pages starting at p.1 at section 1.0 Overview)

p.2 *Benefits: provide outdoor rec* : Those recreation opportunities exist with or without the implemetation of PAs

*growth of tourism industry*: feedback from workshop: conservationists, industry AND First Nations considered tourism as form of development with potentially serious environmental impact, concern has been voiced that there should be mechanisms to adequately protect against that impact.

## Memorandum

**To:** Jesse  
**CC:** Jo-Anne  
**From:** Danièle Héon  
**Date:** 03/16/98  
**Re:** PAS Draft

---

Main issues arising from second draft:

Document incorporates and emphasizes points that were not discussed or approved at working group or workshop discussions. These include:

- Adding and emphasizing goal of completion of network by year 2000. Recognized by all as unrealistic. Should be deleted.
- Strong emphasis to the protection of cultural values. This emphasis is new. Should check for commitments in legislation , policies, etc.
- Still unclear about levels of designations. Incorporation of "large wilderness areas"; unclear if targeted for maximum representation, seems to bypass the main goal of ecological representation. Toss the wilderness idea out: subjective notion, goal of protecting wilderness will be achieved by protecting ecological values (core).
- Targeting areas for protection that are "at risk " from development. The ecological values of those areas should be proven to be at risk (endangered) in the first place.

Not up to this policy to promote tourism sector. RR are constantly trying to push the economic benefit side of this process when there has been agreement at the workshop that increase in tourism poses strong environmental stresses that need to be evaluated and controlled.

They switched the vision statement around. Used to say that we will have a network of protected areas... while allowing for sustainable development. Now they say that the protected areas will provide sustainable development. Very crafty.

Didn't incorporate the goals proposed by EcDev.