



STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT #7

February 20, 2023 Meeting



Credit: P. Greenlaw/YG

Prepared by



GROUNDWELL
PLANNING

February 2023

BACKGROUND

In March 2020, Government of Yukon (YG) and Kwanlin Dün First Nation (KDFN) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to work jointly towards a local area plan for the Łu Zil Män (Fish Lake) area. A Steering Committee comprised of three representatives of each government was appointed in Fall 2021. The Committee held its seventh meeting at the Gold Rush Inn on February 20 from 5:00 -8:30 pm.

ATTENDEES

Kathy Elliot (YG member)

Jane Koepke (Facilitator)

Jocelyne Leblanc (YG member)

Bengt Pettersson (YG member)

Joseph Petch (YG staff)

Steven Shorty (KDFN member)

Margaret McKay (KDFN member)

Roy Neilson (KDFN staff)

Regrets

Jasmine Bill (KDFN member)

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Revisit and resolve outstanding Committee process-related issues from Phase 1;
2. Make final changes and approve “old” deliverables from Phase 1 (background, What We Heard reports);
3. Present the latest version of the most recent Phase 1 deliverable (Vision & Values report);
4. Seek Committee approval in principle on a schedule and workplan for Phase 2; and
5. Plan and schedule the next Committee meeting to formally launch Phase 2.

DISCUSSION

October 18th Meeting Minutes

Minutes were reviewed. Kathy motioned to adopt the minutes without changes and Margaret seconded. Bengt commented that remembering the specifics of meetings from several months ago was challenging. Staff and Committee members agreed that, moving forward, minutes would be circulated and approved online if meetings are scheduled several months (or more) apart.

Background Report Review

Joseph shared that, from YG’s perspective, the public engagement did not result in any substantive feedback that warranted changes to the background report. The Background Report and Summary Report will now be finalized, incorporating editorial recommendations submitted by the Steering Committee in March 2022.

Land Applications

Roy presented the discussion paper he had previously prepared and circulated to Committee members outlining the context for how the governments intend to deal with land applications during the planning process and options for Committee involvement. He explained that the governments applied “lessons learned” from previous processes and agreed to administering only relatively minor land application requests while planning is underway. The specific types of applications are set out in the LZM Memorandum of Understanding between the two governments. The three options outlined in the discussion paper ranged from full Committee review and formulation of consensus recommendations to Committee notification only. Regardless of option, it was reiterated that the Committee is not a decision body.

Committee members discussed the pros and cons of the options. There was general agreement that the time required to develop consensus recommendations could divert valuable time away from the planning process itself and compromise Committee neutrality. At the same time, there were concerns that government staff making decisions may not have sufficient knowledge of the area, or that substantive decisions could be made without Committee guidance. In the end, Committee members voted unanimously for Option #1: to be informed of applications only.

What We Heard Report

Although the first version of the report had been circulated to the Committee in November, this was the first time the report had been tabled at a meeting. Jane showed Committee members the outline of the report. Joseph shared the highlights of a submission received from the Jackson Lake Community Association (JCLA) in early January. Roy shared KDFN’s comments from its initial review of the draft report. It was agreed that the JCLA submission would be included in an updated draft version and Roy and Joseph would circulate the report again to Committee members for a two-week review period.

Non-Member Participation at Meetings

Joseph presented the discussion paper he had previously prepared and circulated to Committee members outlining the context for who can attend Committee meetings and how the MOU envisioned the Committee engaging with external (third) parties. He shared that several organizations have requested an opportunity to meet with the Committee thus far.

The Committee discussed the desire to create an open, transparent process while recognizing the time implications of third party involvement and the need to prioritize Committee interpersonal dynamics to successfully navigate challenging planning topics in the months to come. In the end, Committee members decided that:

- Third parties can present to the Committee for 15 minutes;
- A maximum of one presentation will be scheduled per Committee meeting;
- YG and KDFN staff will work with third parties to understand the nature of the request and ensure that a Committee presentation is the most suitable avenue for both Committee and third party;

- Third parties making presentations will be asked to conduct themselves in a respectful manner;
- KDFN and YG staff will provide a brief to Committee members in advance of any presentations to give them background context and allow them to prepare questions as needed;
- KDFN and YG staff will advise the Committee if a “backlog” of presentation requests is occurring and seek direction on how to address it via other means (e.g., written submissions, “batching” multiple requests, etc.)
- Except for third party presentation time, Committee meetings will be held in camera, with the meeting minutes fulfilling the need for transparency with the public and interested parties. The MOU provides for Ta’an Kwäch’än Council attendance at meetings, while City of Whitehorse attendance was agreed to by the Parties.

Vision and Values Report

Jane explained that the Committee’s work from the Vision and Values workshop in December had been packaged into a draft final report for review by both governments. KDFN provided its comments and feedback and YG is in the final stages of doing so. The final draft version of the report will be presented at the next Committee meeting and Committee members will have a final opportunity to comment and make changes at that point.

Phase Two - Planning

The Committee was given an update on the status of Phase 2 of the planning process, including:

- Joseph confirmed that Groundswell Planning was the sole successful proponent and that the Committee waived the interview based on the lack of competition and the Committee’s familiarity with the proponent from its work on Phase 1 of the process;
- Jane shared the highlights of the Committee online survey around scheduling. Committee members strongly support having some meetings at Fish Lake and prefer back-to-back shorter evening meetings to very long one-day meetings.
- Jane indicated that some Committee scheduling challenges lay ahead and the draft project schedule tried to minimize member absences from key discussions.
- Jane suggested that Committee review and approval of the Phase 2 schedule and workplan could be moved to the first Phase 2 meeting in March.

NEXT STEPS

Next Meeting

The next Committee meeting – the first of Phase 2 - is tentatively scheduled for March 20 and 21. YG and KDFN staff will follow up with Committee members to confirm availability.

Action Items

Action Items generated during the meeting include:

- Circulate meeting minutes for approval via email if meetings are scheduled far apart (Roy/Joseph);
- Revise the current draft of the What We Heard report to incorporate new submissions and YG/KDFN comments to date and then re-circulate to the Committee for a two-week review period and final reporting back at the March meeting (Jane/Joseph/Roy);
- Finalize the background and summary reports (Roy/Joseph);
- Schedule the next Committee meetings for final week or two of March (Joseph/Roy);
- Draft a community newsletter/update for Committee review (Roy/Joseph – discussed after the meeting as a follow-up to October 18th action item that was still pending)