

Areas Proposed to be Withdrawn from New Oil and Gas and Mineral Development

Are there areas within the region you feel should be withdrawn from new mineral or oil and gas activities?

Inside Yukon = 37

All the areas should be removed from any further activities. Clean air and water are a necessity for the survival of the earth.

The area on the lower Wind, Snake and Bonnett Plume should be withdrawn. Such development crosses the landscape with seismic trails and changes the nature of access to the land, patterns of animal travel and potentially increases animal harassment potentials.

all areas should be removed from new mineral and oil and gas activities

The entire watershed should be withdrawn from further staking.

All of it.

The entire watershed should be withdrawn from new mineral and oil and gas activities. They should have been withdrawn when the planning started in 2003.

areas presently designated for withdrawal should remain so.

Yes, the whole watershed. The whole Peel watershed should be free from mineral, oil and gas activities even if that means to cancel existing claims.

Yes, all of it. Mineral extraction is NOT the best possible use of this land. In fact, it is the worst.

100% of the area should be off limits to any form of development, mineral or oil and gas activities. The Peel Watershed is a pristine environment that should be protected for future generations to enjoy. Any development or road access will result in eventual destruction of this pristine habitat.

All areas should be withdrawn. The region should be completely protected for its ecological value. As time progresses and the shortages of water and declines in biodiversity worldwide become more acute, the value of the Peel will grow exponentially if it is protected now from new mineral or oil and gas activities.

yes - the entire region

Yes.

Yes, I support the withdrawal of large portions of the watershed from new oil, gas and mineral activities.

I believe all IMA should be withdrawn from new mineral or oil and gas activities. I believe these activities should not be permitted anywhere within the Peel Watershed.

The entire area, according to any logical sense, had to be withdrawn from staking when this land use process began. Don't ruin this area forever for another stupid boom and bust cycle that will make a bunch of outsiders rich.

Yes, the whole watershed.

Yes. As per above the current IMA's in the plan should be SMAs with a new analysis of best use that excludes mineral, oil and gas exploration and development.

I think you need to use the system already in place (YESAB) to examine things that might occur case by case.

Only truly relevant First Nation lands of significants. Examples of these are religious sites or fish or hunting camps. This withdrawal would have to be very restricted in size.

All areas within the Peel watershed should be withdrawn from new mineral or oil and gas activities.

Yes, the entire watershed should be protected from new mineral and oil and gas activities. I believe that protecting the entire watershed from industrial use will benefit everyone in the Yukon and beyond. There is no way to guarantee that the waters and wildlife of this area would not be negatively impacted by exploration or industrial activities in the future. Areas along the Dempster that are currently slotted as IMAs also overlap possible caribou habitat: I believe this is unacceptable.

Yes - at least all of the SMAs identified, and possibly some of the IMAs.

I don't approve of any oil and gas activities at all. With all the recent oil spills, it seems to me that oil and gas company are pretty careless in the way they exploit and care less about the environment, and sloppy about investing in safe equipment and precautionary measures to prevent oil catastrophies. Regarding region being SMAs I feel that area #5, which is surrounded by several SMAs should also be an SMA because anything goes wrong in that area will affect all other SMAs surrounding it.

I'm trying to reconcile the idea that 80.6% of the area is supposedly protected in "SMA's" from future exploration while "existing oil and gas and mineral tenures may remain, subject to certain conditions of operation." Essentially, they are NOT withdrawn from exploration. It's a ll a matter for future interpretation what can and can't be done.

all

I feel the entire watershed should be withdrawn from new mineral and O&G activities

I trust the planners to tell me the answer to this, but I would like to see no mining along the river valleys.

All of them.

No. Oil, gas and minerals have already been found in the region and until the area's full potential is assessed, no special management areas should be designated

No I do not believe the majority of the areas within the region should be withdrawn. There may be a select number that are excluded from new exploration and development, however the exclusion of such a large area is reckless to the Yukon's economy.

I don't approve of any oil and gas activities at all. With all the recent oil spills, it seems to me that oil and gas company are pretty careless in the way they exploit and care less about the environment, and sloppy about investing in safe equipment and precautionary measures to prevent oil catastrophies. Regarding region being SMAs I feel that area #5, which is surrounded by several SMAs should also be an SMA because anything goes wrong in that area will affect all other SMAs surrounding it.

The whole of the Peel area should be open to all exploration for all minerals as well as oil and gas.

As requested by the First Nations, all of the region should be withdrawn from mineral and oil and gas activities.

All of them. There is much more gold above the ground than anybody ever will find digging for it out there, - if you can see it.

No, mitigation and permitting requirements should be based on sensitivity of a particular area. Some areas will require greater mitigative measures to ensure safe and environmentally responsible exploration and mining. Specific sites of archaeological and cultural importance must be respected.

Yes, see above.

Inside Canada = 6

yes. I think that all areas should be withdrawn.

I think there should be 100% protection from new oil and mineral development in this region. My understanding is that Yukon First Nations are asking for this 100% protection and I think their request should be respected.

No.

All regions should be withdrawn.

No, but perhaps small high value areas such as estuaries etc. may be considered upon a careful, scientific, fact based review.

The entire region should be free from all mineral or oil and gas activities.

Outside Canada = 5

No new mineral, oil or gas activities should be allowed in the whole of the Peel watershed

The whole area should be withdrawn. Do we need to drill in every valley? There is no amount of money that could be obtained that would compensate for developing this area. The choice comes down to more money or a pristine wilderness. Greed will not allow some to stop. There is an infinite amount of money to be obtained, we decide how and where to get it. The finite resource is disappearing wilderness.

There should be no new oil and gas extraction in the Peel watershed. It is fundamentally incompatible with preservation of the Peel, and directly undermines the tourism appeal of the watershed and neighboring Tombstone Mountains.

every single area should be withdrawn from mineral and oil activities

no, unless there is a acknowledged special concern , ie mineral lick, Archaeological site....

Do you have any other comments on this topic?

Inside Yukon = 17

I became a geologist because of my love for the wilderness and passion for the outdoors. I have a BSc and MSc in Earth Sciences. Mining and exploration can and must be done in a responsible manner. There are a lot of unfounded responses that I am reading. Many of the responses that are against mineral and oil and gas activities are highly emotional, defensive reactions without any real solid argument. How about providing some insightful solutions? How about some real facts. True fact, our lives depend on mineral resources. True fact, mineral resources don't just simply exist anywhere in the Yukon. Wouldn't it be ideal if we could simply mine in mud bogs that ecotourists may not find as aesthetically pleasing, or that may not fit the bill of how they define "pristine wilderness"? Complete a proper mineral resources assessment and let's present some real facts and valid arguments for discussion.

I believe the balance between Special Management Areas and Integrated Management Areas is acceptable in this plan. I support the restrictions on new access roads in IMA's. In restricting access roads, only developments that are serious in their undertaking will be able to go ahead. With restricted access to developing new roads, and a plan in place to decommission new roads when their use has ceased, there is a greater chance that areas designated as IMAs will be able to undergo sustainable development well into the future.

I entirely agree with the above comments about the importance of land being withdrawn from staking.

Yes, industry provides good paying jobs, helps train people to not just survive, but thrive through life. I have lived in Yukon my whole adult life. I worked in Can Tung from 76-86 and still go out there to prospect and hunt on the Yukon side. Game is still there, outfitters are still there and I notice more and more first nation hunters coming into that area to hunt. All of this with a mine near by and exploration all over the area. I catch fish, hunt moose, caribou, bear and sheep. The road, mine, prospecting, hunting, fishing, guiding and trapping all get along. We had many visitors this year at our camp. All friendly and amicable. All having a good hunt as we were having a good year prospecting. THIS PROVES IT CAN BE MULTI USE AND NOT HURT NATURE OR EACH OTHER.

I support the First Nations, and want 100% protection of the Peel Watershed.

It is a crime to lock up these highly mineralized areas from the benefit to future generations of Yukoners.

I commend the Yukon Government putting a land withdrawal in place to prevent further staking while the land use planning process is underway. This should have happened at the start of the process and this should be standard practice for all land use planning processes.

It was resource extraction and the associated job prospects that brought me to the Yukon and it is those same jobs that will keep my children and grandchildren living and working here. By bending to pressure from international conservation groups and other special interests groups to take more and more land out of the land base for exploration and development, their future may not be in the Yukon.

I came to the Yukon 20 years ago for a job, but eight years later the Federal Government determined that the greater interest of society (cutting the deficit) outweighed my "right" to doing the job I came to the Yukon to do. My choice was simple: I could remain in the Yukon and pursue a different career or I could continue my chosen career in a different part of the country. Some of my fellow employees chose to continue with their career and leave the Yukon, others chose to change their careers and remain in the Yukon. It was not pleasant having to have this choice forced upon us by society, but it was, and it was right that society could make choices that reflect their values. If society determines that no-one may do mineral exploration or extraction in the Peel watershed, (and if, for some reason, this means you can't do it at all in the Yukon - which to me is completely without foundation) then you and your children will have to decide if your desire to work in the mineral industry outweighs your desire to live in the Yukon. The choice is yours and theirs to make. As for me, I support the recommendations of the Peel Watershed Commission as a bare minimum. I would be happy to see the entire region being protected as fully as possible. The uniqueness of this area, being largely unspoiled and undeveloped, should remain as it is for our children and grandchildren. If we develop the region now, we deprive them of their right to decide what's best for them. There is too little unspoiled land left on the planet for us to waste. When there were millions of buffalo, hunters killed them just for the tongues, leaving the rest to waste. We would be as foolish as those hunters to despoil one of the last unspoiled treasures on this earth for the sake of a couple of mines. Just as I sympathise with, but reject, the argument that we need mining so our children can work in the Yukon, so do I reject the argument that if this area is protected, mining companies will not want to work in the Yukon. Canadian mining companies work in Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Indonesia, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela and many other countries that have many more and larger obstacles to mining than the creation of a protected zone in the Yukon. As long as mining companies can make a profit operating somewhere in the Yukon, they will do so. The argument that free entry is the law and must be continued is also specious. At one time the law prohibited women from owning property, the law prohibited First Nations people from voting and the law permitted people to own slaves. Societies change and laws change with them, laws are not immutable. The laws that permitted slavery and other abuses became outdated and, as far as I'm concerned, so has the law of free entry. The circumstances that, at one time, made it acceptable and perhaps even useful have changed. Michael Purves Whitehorse

Only 100% protection will save the Peel. Despite the mining / oil & gas industries assurances about best practices, accidents happens all the time.

If u create a WILDLIFE RESERVE , this will help the process of understanding , any MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT OR NOT ELIGIBLE IN THIS AREA .

Even with full protection of the Peel watershed the vast majority of Yukon is still available for mineral extraction. As it is, the mining industry is doing very well in Yukon. It is not mining that we need to worry about, it is the ongoing invasion and transformation of the few wild places left in this world by man and machine.

Much of the "rationale" behind the unnecessary levels of protection recommended by the Peel Watershed Land Use Plan is based on emotion, particularly hyperbole stating that mining and exploration will be highly destructive to the land. These fears are unfounded, as there is a plethora of regulatory and permitting requirements for any advanced or even mid-tier project. Public companies are strictly monitored by the securities commission that, among others, monitors the environmental conditions of exploration projects. You will find that the preservation movement will prefer to discredit the mining industry and its proponents, rather than provide factual data on aspects of the Peel. This is because it is a more effective method of influencing public opinion, not unlike negative ads during political campaigns. Earl Schulze, Whitehorse

It doesn't matter what anyone tells you there is no such thing as low or no impact exploration/development, it all has a big impact, and we end up flipping the bill for cleanup in some way. and there is no such thing as 100% remediation, its just not possible. the only way to have it the same is nto not touch it in the first place.

Exploration is a stock market game that, at best, creates a short boom and employment for, mostly, outsiders. We want real economics, that will allow wealth and income in perpetuity.

Mining in the Yukon is having a great year despite there being no exploration or mining occurring in the Peel Watershed. I do not believe it to be necessary to have mineral or oil and gas activities inside the Peel Watershed, nor do I support it.

There is no compromise between the lives and health of everyone and a handful of quick cash jobs.

Inside Canada = 6

How is it that a region that draws almost all of its significant economic benefits from mineral exploration can even be considered to be withdrawn from mineral exploration to me is bewildering. Have we gotten that far away from the facts and the realities to what actually happens out here in the bush? I am presently in an exploration camp just outside the proposed Peel area. The only people in the region are mineral exploration people, hunters and guide outfitters who are just packing up for the year. How did all these people get in here ? They drove on an " oil pipeline access road". The hunters drive quads, the guide outfitters bring their horses to the strip and road and they all benefit from the infrastructure. This area has seen exploration for at least 50 years and yet preservationists" consider it pristine- Well then the industry must have done a great job ! Even considering the poor regulations that all industry and people had a generation ago. Keep the area open for all to benefit, not just a few elite, wealthy foreigners.

Let us keep all of the Peel Watershed free of any new development and extricate this valuable (almost) wilderness area from current development. The impact of changing weather and climate conditions does not encourage 'steady-as-she-goes' responses. Oil, gas and mineral resources are not going to disappear if left untouched until we better understand the new Northern circumstances. Protect the Peel -- 100%.

Why do we need to develop these areas? How will we ensure that the development pressure stops once the areas designated for development are already mined? How will developing this watershed contribute to building sustainable systems so that we no longer need to systematically develop more and more land? Do we really need the oil, gas and minerals that would be extracted from here? What would they be used for? Who would benefit from this use? Who would be damaged by this use? What power dynamics are at play here? What need would this development fulfill in society? What other ways could this need be met? What if we decided to protect this entire watershed?

All the National Parks and protected areas in North America were protected in the face of opposition from those who wished to exploit them for a quick profit. Yet now in many areas they are the driving force of the entire economy of the region and we celebrate the vision of those who had the vision and courage to protect them. The Peel watershed is a unique resource, more unique than any minerals, gas or oil that may be found there. Protect all of it for the future, don't destroy it incrementally. Industrial development is not compatible with wilderness and so called "mitigation" is only used to make people feel better about destroying that which is priceless.

I am in support of the First Nations and their call to protect the Peel Watershed 100% from Oil, Gas and Mineral Development. Yukon is vast with lots of other areas to utilize for mining purposes. Let's at least keep this part of Yukon untouched.

How many mines do we create on this planet, and what do we do when they are all emptied?

Outside Canada = 2

There are few areas left with this kind of wilderness. To throw it away for "quick money" is a shame. What about the tourist industry, I'm sure that will suffer. This area will loose it's distinctness and be like any other developed area. There are alot of mineralized areas. Do we need to mine and drill in every valley. I think furture generations will benefit more from a preserved wilderness than another mine or oil well.

I'm behind First Nations in protecting 100% of the Peel Watershed. We have to save our wilderness areas as the rest of the world is or has destroyed theirs. Those who cry "jobs, jobs", well there are no jobs on a dead planet.

If so, where do you think these areas should be?

Inside Yukon = 17

All of the IMAs as above.

I have no suggestion of where these activities should occur except, not in the Peel Watershed.

The entire watershed of non-renewable industrial activity.

The entire region.

See response to first question.

100% protection means withdrawing the entire watershed from mineral development.

Up to the First Nations to negotiate their most important areas.

All the Peel Planning Region should be withdrawn from mineral and oil and gas activities. I recognize that we need to balance conservation and human use of an area, and that is why 100% of the Peel land use plan should be kept as a wilderness area with a complete land withdrawal. We need to consider reducing our consumption patterns before opening new places for exploration.

All the areas should be protected.

ALL OF IT!!!

The Recommended Plan's SMAs are the areas where withdrawal should occur.

Even if I have to say that a hundred times, the whole watershed should be protected from mineral, oil and gas activities. Therefore, there should be NO Integrated Management Areas in the Peel watershed. Existing claims should be canceled.

the entire Peel watershed Planning area

All the areas should be protected

see previous response

all

There is no doubt in my mind that there are some very pristine, unique environments in the area however those should be evaluated on a case by case consideration and if they are to be protected then it should be no one allowed access. Eco-tourism is not pristine in their methodology of land use so they should be under the same scrutiny as mining exploration and industry.

Inside Canada = 1

All areas should be withdrawn. Industrial activity destroys wilderness forever.

Why do you feel these areas should be withdrawn from new mineral or oil and gas activities?

Inside Yukon = 26

Mineral extraction overrides all other values, be they ecological or cultural. They cannot be mitigated or compensated for.

I feel the area needs full protection from these activities because of its pristine and ecologically sensitive qualities. There have been enough examples of contaminated and abandoned industrial sites across the Yukon to warrant ensuring that the same would not and could not happen in the Peel watershed.

They would harm the environment in a place where recovery could take centuries and, in some cases, not be possible at all.

Our life depends on it. Our children's lives depend on it. We can not compromise our future.

Mineral and oil and gas activities are incompatible with wilderness. The Peel watershed currently supports a whole suite of viable economic, recreational, and cultural activities and services that depend on wilderness (subsistence food resources, wilderness tourism, guide-outfitting, carbon storage, camps on the land). These activities are sustainable and viable within existing and proposed management under the Plan. The wilderness character of the Peel is a central pillar for the broader tourism industry in Yukon. There are many other regions within Yukon where viable mineral developments can occur; they should not occur everywhere. The Plan goes a long way to supporting the continuation of oil and gas exploration and development within high potential areas that generally fall in the IMAs.

This area equates incredible wealth to all Yukoners. It is valuable as a rare intact and pristine watershed. Mineral and oil and gas exploration will compromise this with no lasting return to us. There are lots of places to find gas, but almost no protected watersheds. A fully protected watershed will only increase in value as it becomes rarer. Oil and gas exploration will only become valueless as the resource is exported and sold for private profit with offensively low royalties paid to us. The value of the intact system will never return.

If there is truly relevance, we should listen and do what we can to accommodate. Having said that, I don't expect them to go out and surround existing mineral sites. It needs to bonifide.

We cannot mine without damaging the health of water, ecosystems, or wildlife. The same mining companies in Canada commit human rights and environmental atrocities in other countries with more lenient regulations. We need to reduce our consumption patterns and our behavior. We should not mine new places.

As stated before, unless the entire watershed is protected, we cannot expect this ecosystem to maintain its integrity for wildlife.

Mining, oil and gas industries have proven that they cannot co-exist with protection of a pristine region. The example of Chevron's mess is a good example. The giant company left oil barrels on the site. Some of those barrels are leaking. This is a proof that exploitation companies are not as environmentally strict as they like to say.

see above

Mining leaves an enormous environmental footprint on the land, particularly in fragile northern sub-alpine and tundra landscapes. It means the end of wilderness. In the best case scenario it legacy would be road access to the backcountry, the worst case scenarios can be found in Faro and Yellowknife. There must remain places in this land that can retain their wilderness character for the benefit of all that lives there.

Neither Canada nor Yukon will benefit in the long term from resource extraction in this area. Current mining practices take the resource from the land, put the profits in the hands of outside investors and leave the tax payers to clean up the mess and take care of the unemployed miners.

Because wilderness and mining is bad chemistry.

Mineral, oil and gas activities are not compatible with unspoiled wilderness.

See previous responses

to protect the wildlife and plant species that exist in the peel region, there are almost no more places like it in Canada that have been undisturbed.

Currently, the Yukon maintains that mineral extraction is legally the primary use of land. By removing an area like the Peel from staking and development we are ensuring that a portion of our territory will not be open to these activities. The vast majority of the territory is still open to non-renewable development, and we need to begin to develop a balance between the interests of these developers and future generations. Current development of non-renewable resources robs future generations of opportunity, and we need to work to wean ourselves off of these substances, and sourcing our current needs for minerals to existing waste, instead of increasing the yield from new sources.

See my answer to the first set of questions. Allowing development of this land for one-time mineral or oil & gas extraction will spoil its ongoing wilderness value. We would be sacrificing long term gain for short term gain.

I support the withdrawal of these areas from mineral or oil and gas activities both because of the negative impact of these activities themselves on the ecosystem and because they typically open up the area to further degradation (e.g., by facilitating ATV access).

Because as we have seen in the last few years, there are more and more catastrophies with oil and gas development and companies don't want to seriously invest in equipment safe for the environment. Mineral companies have left messes in every part of the Yukon and there is no monitoring by the government of activities on the land to enforce regulations.

Because non-renewable resource activity does not belong in a protected area.

The main reason is the protection of the complete watershed from the irreversible impacts of exploration and development. There are two types of environmental damage - slow/incremental/ small impacts and sudden/catastrophic impacts. Mining and oil and gas exploration and development have caused the slow and incremental impacts to some extent already. All the environmental permitting and good intentions for prevention cannot stop the inevitable failure of people and their systems.

The Peel is not economical for mining development and likely never will be. Further exploration there is pointless. Oil and gas exploration and development have a tendency to expand geometrically in an area. The neighbouring Arctic Refuge has been withdrawn because the impacts of such activities have an unpredictable cumulative effect - the same should be done for the Peel.

New mineral or oil and gas activities will result detrimental impacts on the traditional, cultural and environment values in this area. The short term benefits from mineral or oil and gas activities do not come close to equaling the long term benefits gained by keeping these activities out of the Peel Watershed.

The Peel watershed is too valuable to be the site of mining or oil and gas activity.

Inside Canada = 3

Mineral and oil and gas activities are not compatible with wilderness, wildlife, biodiversity, recreational, and traditional values

I think that the long term damages to society from mining, oil and gas activities are devastating. We have landfills full of precious metals and minerals - and yet we continue to systematically mine virgin landscapes. As a society, our addiction to oil is causing tremendous damage to ecological systems, and we need to fundamentally change the way we meet our energy needs. I only support development that is building systems that will function over the long term - without requiring more and more development over time. The organizations that want to develop this land should be asked some tough questions. How much are they investing in metal recycling and reclamation? What are some sources of metal within society that they could mine / refine / recapture and use? How are they contributing to building clean, renewable and sustainable energy systems? If it is not contributing to building a sustainable future, then I do not support any development of this land. The sooner we invest our resources into creating sustainable systems, the more chance we have of surviving (and thriving) over the long term. The Peel watershed is a special place - and I would like to see the vision for sustainable development in the region extend to questioning the very purpose of any development that takes place. With firm policies regarding the long term sustainability of any development, both within the watershed, and within the larger systems that this development is part of.

Mineral, oil and gas activities are not compatible with unspoiled wilderness and guarantee the extirpation of grizzlies and caribou and other species who need large tracts of wilderness to survive. Mining practices and poor government oversight result in public land being destroyed for quick profits for investors while ordinary Canadian taxpayers are left with long term pollution, destruction of the wilderness and unemployed workers. We need truly sustainable development, not more of the failed policies of the past. Protect the entire Peel.

Would you change any of the areas that the Recommended Plan designates as either Special Management Areas or Integrated Management Areas? If so, how?

Inside Yukon = 29

I would definitely change the area #5 from SMA to IMA just because it is surrounded by different IMA, there is no road access and any pollution to that area would affect the surrounding areas.

The entire area should be protected from development/exploration

I say give the entire area the highest level of protection against industrial development

Leave all of the area open to exploration until a complete audit of resources is complete

I think that some of the integrated management areas will spread out to include areas that already have road access. We have not been successful at decommissioning any of these roads

I believe that the entire area can function as, at most, an Integrated Management Area, with surface road access allowed but restricted to mining/ exploration personnel and activities only. The entire area has undergone significant mineral exploration since at least the early 1960s; yet it is still considered to be among the world's last pristine wilderness areas. That speaks extremely well for the mining and exploration industry, including its activities from the relatively unregulated 1960s and early 1970s.

I would give the entire area the highest level of protection.

The whole of the Peel drainage should be SMAs.

No form of human exploitation should be allowed in the Peel. Neither Canada nor the Yukon would benefit from industrial development in the Peel. Mineral extraction is a destructive, short term process that strips the land of resources and leaves ghost towns. Not a wise investment in the future.

Yes, I would like to see the highest degree of protection for entire watershed. We ask the Americans to protect ANWR, and rightly so, but we also need to protect the caribou in their winter habitat.

Any level of development in the entire area would be suicide to our children grandchildren. Nothing short of 100% protection is acceptable in such an unspoiled area.

no they should remain as designated.

The First Nations are calling for 100% protection of the watershed. Their voice should be the dominant one in this discussion. They are backed up by tourism operators and what appears to be the majority of Yukoners. This plan deals only with one portion of the Yukon- one of the rare large wilderness areas in the world. It is much more valuable to us if it remains undeveloped. Carl Shulze continues to claim that mining and pristine wilderness can co-exist in the Peel since exploration has gone on there since the 1960's. Yet, the exploration has in fact left a mess there. Though I have never been in the area I have heard this clearly from journalists, paddlers and people working in the area. Mining activity has never taken off there and they have still managed to leave a mess.

I would make the whole area yellow and allow all users the same access.

The changes I would make would be to have complete protection from resource extraction and from any other activities that have the potential to damage the ecosystem for all of this area.

The only integrated management areas should be those that already have road access. I notice there is a big chunk in the north central part. How is access going to happen?

I would designate 100% of the watershed as Special Management Areas. There would be no Integrated Management Areas.

NO

100% SMA. Most of those claims in the SMAs are there because the government refused to put a moratorium on staking while this process was going on. They knew full well the risk they were taking in staking there, and their licences must not be renewed.

I would definitely change the area #5 from SMA to IMA just because it is surrounded by different IMA, there is no road access and any pollution to that area would affect the surrounding areas.

No, I am in general agreement with the zoning in the Recommended Plan

All areas should be protected, there is plenty of space with minerals and oil and gas in the rest of the Yukon that are not as important to protect as the Peel or more easily accessed, and where access would be less damaging

I would change all IMAs to SMAs and remove them from exploration and industrial development.

I'd get rid of the integrated management areas and turn them into protected areas. Just because areas are near the Dempster or have been highlighted by resource extraction companies does not mean they have ecological and cultural values that can be bulldozed over.

Yes, with 100% protection, there will be no need to think we need to manage the area. The value of such a vast expanse of wild land is so far beyond the short-term \$ a few may gain, it can't be compared. The Yukon can be leaders in investing in the health and well-being of its people and wildlife and set the standard for others to follow. Exploration and development is not the way to ensure a future for your citizens -- having clean water, air and thriving food chain is.

Yes, we would like to see the Integrated Management Areas changed to Special Management Areas. We would like all areas to be designated as one type of protected area for ease of implementation and management.

Both the Special Management Areas and Integrated Management areas should be changed to Protected areas. To allow for existing claims in the SMAs, as well as new and existing industrial activity in the IMAs is a problem. Any type of development or industrial activity will affect the ecological integrity of the area.

I would change IMA 1,3,4, and 5 to SMA. IMA 2 does not have to be designated SMA however, a different LU designation should be created that will allow the Dempster corridor to remain as a method of transportation, but is otherwise protected.

I would ask that you reconsider access for all stakeholders whether they be eco-tourism, First Nations, environmentalists or miners, prospectors, exploration companies or anyone else. We should re-examine this whole plan to make it more equitable for all, not merely an invitation for eco-tourism ventures, environmentalist interests and no one else's interests.

September 30, 2010
 Peel Watershed Planning Commission
 Government of Yukon
 P.O. Box 2703
 Whitehorse, Yukon
 Y1A 2C6
 Submitted online via <http://www.peelconsultation.ca/Discussions/General.aspx>

Re: Areas Proposed to be Withdrawn from New Oil and Gas and Mineral Development

On behalf of the 300 corporate and 4,000 individual members of the Association for Mineral Exploration British Columbia (AME BC), I welcome the opportunity to comment on the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan. Even though AME BC is clearly a BC based association, we have many members that live in Yukon and/or are actively exploring for mineral deposits in Yukon. As such, AME BC has serious concerns regarding the recommendations of the Plan, primarily due to the proposed removal of 80% of lands open to new mineral or oil and gas activities. Removing such a vast area will negatively affect the mineral exploration and development sector both in Yukon and throughout the rest of Canada, including your neighbours in BC. AME BC works with governments, communities, and stakeholders to maintain access to land for mineral exploration that benefits everyone. Minerals are a hidden resource. Our association believes that the unknown value of mineral potential should be properly evaluated and should always form part of an informed discussion about land access and use. The proposed restrictions in the Plan pose several challenges for our members. AME BC is particularly concerned that the amount of land that may be closed to claim staking in Yukon will increase from 14.5% to 25.8% if the recommendations in the Plan are adopted and that an area the size of Nova Scotia will be removed from staking in the Peel watershed. There are at minimum 219 known mineral occurrences and 13 known mineral deposits in the Peel watershed that are currently underexplored. Although the Plan protects existing mining claims in Special Management Areas (SMAs) and allows new mineral claims in Integrated Management Areas, the conditions of operation and removal of new surface access in SMAs as proposed will render the majority of these claims unworkable. The Plan suggests alternatives to ground and airstrip access for industrial development; however, the reality of the industry is that should a mineral deposit proceed to development, ground access will be required to transport materials and people to and from the mine site, particularly if no new airstrips are permitted. Furthermore, the proposed ban on uranium development throughout the Plan area is based on subjective public opinion, and is not based in science. Mineral claim holders that are no longer able to work their claims due to restrictions of either an access or mineral nature will seek compensation from government, and the issue of compensation must be considered fairly in any land use planning exercise that restricts or bans activity. AME BC supports and promotes a safe, modern, environmentally responsible mineral exploration and mine development sector that co-exists with other land uses. We support land use plans that engage First Nations, communities, and stakeholders and build certainty on where mineral exploration and mine development can occur. Given that there are six land use plans to follow the Peel Watershed Planning process in Yukon and considering the removal of 16 out of 21 Landscape Management Units from new mineral exploration and mine development in the Peel plan, we are very concerned that this plan does not accommodate all stakeholders and may set a precedent for exceedingly high levels of protection in Yukon. If principles in the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan are carried over to other regions in Yukon, these could threaten the sustainability of the mineral exploration and development industry, which now contributes \$200 million annually to the Yukon economy after years of struggling to re-establish itself in such a high mineral potential jurisdiction. Land use planning can build certainty for First Nations, communities, and stakeholders, but such planning should be balanced with the federal and territorial legislation already in place to ensure the integrity of the Peel watershed. Furthermore, should a mineral exploration project proceed to development, the Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Board is legislated to review projects and ensure that they proceed in a socially, environmentally, and economically responsible manner. AME BC proposes that integrated land management, that allows both ground and air access, should take precedence in the plan and that the large majority of the Peel watershed should remain open to mineral exploration and potentially mining. Thank you for your serious consideration of AME BC's recommendation to continue to allow new mineral exploration and mine development, and required access, throughout Yukon's Peel watershed.

Sincerely,
 Gavin C. Dirom
 President & Chief Executive Officer
 Association for Mineral Exploration British Columbia
 Yukon Chamber of Mines
 AME BC Board of Directors

I would designate the entire area as a Protected area, with the restrictions that Special Management Areas provide (no new roads, no development, no new oil and gas or mineral staking). I would change the Integrated Management areas to Special management areas - and call the entire watershed a protected area.

The entire area should be withdrawn from new mineral or oil and gas activities. There should be no industrial development of any kind in the Peel watershed.

I believe the whole watershed should be protected from further exploration or development of mineral, oil or gas resources. We should be developing other sources of energy instead of more dependence on fossil fuels. Exploration is damaging to the environment and "fuels" the oil companies investment on new sources of fuels instead of investment in safety and careful planning in areas already developed.

I would prefer the entire area be protected, as to responses concerning the activities of mining and exploration from the 1960's until now being almost unnoticed that is no excuse to let it continue. Even in "special" managed areas there is no controlling the systems of nature that move and pull its resources (ie water) in depths and reaches we cannot control (ie run-off, seepage and rain), which means industry pollution cannot be controlled either.

It's crazy to withdraw such a massive area of the Yukon from exploration before even an audit of resources is completed. The wealth we have and the high standard of living that we enjoy is only sustainable if we can access the resources of the Earth.

I would allow continued access to the entire region for mineral and oil/gas exploration and production with perhaps only stricter guidelines in some of the more sensitive areas.

Outside Canada = 2

I wouldn't deny resource extraction from any of the area, SMAs should only be in SPECIAL areas not a blanket on the entire region.

Protect the area from all development. The mining industry has a lot of power and political backing. To sell this area for "quick money" would be a mistake. When companies develop an area like this, a few get richer, the average person gains nothing except degraded land and less wildlife.

Conservation Focus

Are there areas in the region where you feel both industrial (e.g. mining) and nonindustrial (e.g. wilderness tourism) land uses are compatible? If so, where?

Inside Yukon = 38

I do not believe that there are any industrial activities that would be conducive to safe nonindustrial uses. I think that, no matter how many safety measures are put in place, industrial pursuits cause more harm than good. Although industry such as mining is an important part of Yukon, there are places where the land/environment should not be breached. If we continue to strip the land of its resources with no thought to the future, then we will have no future. Nonindustrial activities such as wilderness tourism is educational and helps people appreciate the landscape, without a negative environmental impact.

No. These aren't compatible.

nope i went to germany and went on a tour of what ever they had for a forest which is only 14km by 14km and there was mines all around it and it was not pretty

No, I think the Peel watershed represents a rare and fleeting opportunity to preserve a watershed in its wilderness state and industrial use is not compatible with the unique wilderness tourism values which are available in the Peel watershed.

All of these regions are compatible. With strict monitoring and regulation industrial activities can coexist with other land uses.

i don't beleive that the two are compatable at all

You confuse mining with mineral exploration. Total mining in the Yukon is, and unlikely will, cover an area bigger than the present area of the City of Whitehorse. Mineral exploration requires a huge land base and leaves a very small foot print at the end of the day. However, it provides investment, hundreds of jobs for Yukoners, and helps to pay the taxes to keep government agencies working. Kill mineral exploration incentives in the Yukon today, you can expect government layoffs tomorrow.

Regions bordering the Dempster highway should be considered for industrial uses as well as non-industrial.

No. These are really conflicting at the landscape level but transportation corridors can and should be used by both.

No.

No. Mining, oil and gas and their foot prints - infrastructure, noise, pollution would completely destroy the reasons for wilderness tourism and big game outfitting.

Industrial development and wilderness tourism are incompatible. The IMAs in the Recommended Plan provide a land base for compatible industrial and non-industrial uses, where non-industrial uses are not wilderness based (e.g., some forms of subsistence food harvesting, road-based and amenity-based tourism).

Hell NO! Go mine in Dawson or Faro. This place is in good shape - leave it that way.

no

The IMAs do have the potential to allow for industrial development (renewable resources) to coincide with nonindustrial if the local communities support the effort, however I do not support any industrial development that includes the extraction of non-renewable resources.

I don't think mining should be allowed. As for wilderness tourism, I think there needs to be more discussion on the subject with F.N. so it might be developed without the least disruption possible on the land. I also do not believe in trophy hunting. Hunting should be for subsistence.

No. The area should be free from any industrial activities and 100% of the watershed should be protected.

Industrial land uses are not compatible anywhere in the Peel watershed

No. It's a pristine environment. It's a rare bit of untouched land on the planet and it's in our territory. It is our responsibility to protect it all and that means no industrial development in the entire watershed.

No, not really. Industrial and nonindustrial land uses are incompatible. I mean, who goes to Fort McMurray for the fishing or the hiking or the wilderness tourism? They are just not compatible.

No.

No. While mining is a significant part of the history of the Yukon, it is reduce extraction for short term gain, and given that we live in one of the richest, healthiest countries in the world, with a disproportionate allocation of natural resources, I would suggest we have an international responsibility to be leaders in findiing ways of valuing (economy) this landscape that don't require short-term gain via non-renewable extractions.

No

no. non-industrial only should be allowed

No, the watershed should be left pristine, and the watershed should be withdrawn from and further mineral staking.

No.

All areas are compatible with mining, tourism, first nations, recreation, oil and gas and so on.

No. My goal is to preserve the wilderness of the area. Industrial and nonindustrial uses are not compatible. Any industrial use will compromise the integrity of the ecosystem.

I can't think of an area in the world where I would want to be participating in "wilderness tourism" and have industrial in the same area. I would not pay or even visit the area (if offered a free trip) if industrial activity is occurring. That would completely ruin the experience for me. The answer is no.

I feel almost all of the area is capable of both industrial (eg mining) and non-industrial (wilderness tourism) land uses are compatible as indicated by the past 110 years of the development in the Yukon.

NO! NONE!! Mining is simply not compatible with wilderness tourism.. The level of mining exploration activity in the Peel watershed up until this past summer has been problematical at times..This is why I, as a wilderness tourism outfitter, have cancelled trips to the wind river due to Cash minerals activities in that vicinity. This is also why you do not see wilderness tour operators taking their guest into the parts of the territory that are being mined or extensively explored.

No.

There are no areas where I feel industry is compatible with non industrial uses.

No. Industrial activities will have far reaching impacts.

No - The mining industry has shown itself, despite promises to the contrary, to irresponsible and destructive. In addition the road necessary to support mining open the region to stupid people on motorized vehicles that then create more destruction in pristine areas.

No! There are so many sites in the Yukon that have been used for industrial purposes, and are now industrial waste lands. This cannot be seen as compatible with wilderness tourism.

No. Nowhere. These two activities are not compatible in this region.

No.

Inside Canada = 4

NO, any industrial activity in any part of this region would give the impression of leniency and industry will keep trying to lay claim to parts of the region, plus industry activity in one part of the region means all parts are at risk of being affected by pollution, especially since it is obvious that monitoring systems that are in place now are disorganized and negligent.

No! We have canoed on the Yukon River six times since 1994 (from Whitehorse to Circle, Alaska) with our last trip in 2009. Although enjoyable, it is not wilderness. Each trip we have noticed more development. This is in great contrast to our canoe trip on the Snake in 1997 and other wilderness river we have canoed with friends (Nahanni, Horton, Thelon). Mining and wilderness are not compatible!

I do not feel that industrial land use is appropriate in this area. I do not think that it is compatible with wilderness tourism, or the long term integrity of the region's wildlife.

no

Outside Canada = 1

Yes, the entire region if done correctly and follow proper guidelines.

Do these categories of emphasis (designations) make sense to you? If not, what categories would you propose?

Inside Yukon = 28

It seems like a lot of thought went into the creation of the categories of designation. However, taking something that is whole and dissecting it into parts is like taking the human body and trying to separate it into pieces. The human body could not be expected to function properly if it was dissected into pieces. Nor can the Peel Watershed be broken into pieces and expected to still be a viable ecosystem. When we start to break the land into categories, we stop seeing how all of the pieces need each other in order to function. It also becomes easier to negotiate with perhaps 'heritage' or 'fish and wildlife' if those categories are not seen as essential. I believe that the entire watershed needs one category and that category should be 'protection'.

I agree with Bob sharp's comments.

Yes, these are useful and appropriate categories

I agree with the designation of LMUs as they allow for more manageable and specific planning for different areas. That said, I think it is important to recognise that allowing a certain type of access for a certain group at this time will most likely permit for expansion of access in the future. We have not seen examples of government successfully limiting access to a point where minimal environmental damage is caused while maintaining a minimal amount of access to support certain stakeholder groups.

One Category, complete protection.

By being specific on the type of protection the MLU need, I can see that there has been a lot of discussion and consultation with First Nation and people who are knowledgeable about the landscape and that is very good. However I think that regardless of what we want protection for (fish and wildlife, heritage etc...), the whole of the Peel Watershed needs to be protected against mining, exploration and oil and gas development and left alone to remain as is, untouched.

I don't think it's wise for us, with our wealth of natural resources, yet so few that can be considered wilderness, to divide remaining wilderness into management units that are designed to focus on only one aspect of conservation: we know better than that, as there are endless examples of management challenges that we saddle upon ourselves natural spaces where the health of the whole is not considered. e.g. National Parks where the area boundary supports only half the ranges of the grizzly bears that use it, as in Waterton. Why not err on the side of caution, and protect an internationally valuable resource, as a holistic unit? It can't be done the other way around.

I agree with the categories but worry about ATV's.

The categories make sense, but I would prefer to see more complete protection.

No these categories don't make sense. As was said during a consultation meeting, the fish and wildlife LMUs is not THE only places where fish and wildlife are found. The Porcupine caribou herd uses the area marked as Integrated Management Area.

No, because you are leaving industry out of most of the area. Mines are where you find them. Do not restrict access to industry.

Agree with the categories and emphasis. They are consistent with the goals of the plan and the founding documents, principally the UFA and related agreements. This area is different from the other planning regions in the Yukon - and this is reflected in the emphasis on conservation.

Total protection of the entire area is necessary to preserve what is there and to ensure the survival of generations to come.

In the northern part, areas of industrial integration and protection look remarkably fragmented. Continuity of protection is very important.

Yes the categories make sense to me. There may need to be adjustments made to the actual designation under certain legislation is the best fit.

I agree with the categories of response, but worry about our capacity to manage off road vehicles as a function of any management plan.

No, the entire region should be designated as heritage/preservation. This amazing region should be protected for future generations of Canadians. Perhaps the area should be Canada's next National Park

Yes.

The following categories of emphasis make sense: Fish and Wildlife, Heritage, Protection, Watershed Management. It is important to identify these values because the Peel Watershed is a vast and complex area. It requires more than one category that emphasizes on protection. The planning Commission did well in identifying the SMA listed above. The Integrated Management Area DOES NOT make sense. I understand the commission needed to include a designation that would allow for exploration, mining and other industrial activity, but naming it Integrated Management seems to imply that it will manage mining, industry, traditional, cultural and environmental values all within one area. This is not possible. I do not believe the IMA should exist in this plan however, if it must for the sake of taking all views into perspective, then it should be named what it is: Industrial management Area

The categories make sense to me, as far as all worthy of protection..However I feel this approach is too piecemeal, too many designations,, and will not accomplish a goal of preserving the integrity of the entire watershed.. Personally I think it would be far better to protect the entire watershed as Territorial Park. As a park it would protect Fish and Wildlife, watershed as well as heritage values.

yes they do

No development. No road access.

Yes

The categories do make sense, but I rather see the whole area getting park/heritage status. As much as possible motorized transport should be avoided here.

The integrated Management Areas are habitat for Porcupine caribou and the headwaters of the watershed. I think these areas should be designated as SMAs (conservation areas)

No, there should just be one overall designation for protection. This would make it much easier to implement and manage.

Sort of. It is a bit hard to understand what degree of protection 'integrated management' means. How can one possibly integrate existing ecological and cultural values with industrial activity such as mining and fossil fuel development? Integration in that sense means destroying the surface of the land in order to allow mineral extraction to exist. That isn't integrated management - it's industrial development.

I understand the different designations, but unfortunately do not agree with them because I feel the entire area should be designated as full protection from extractive industries and road development. Using the precautionary principle, I believe that if you want to protect something you need to protect it 100% to avoid slow erosion of the value being protected. For example, if somebody wanted to buy my house, but I didn't want to sell it to them, but to appease them I sold them just one brick. Well, through time if they ask me enough times and each time I appease them with one brick, eventually I will have sold away my home through appeasement....."one brick at a time." Industry and human development has changed the face of the planet, easily visible from space, and it has done not in massive moments of upheaval but rather, one rock.....one tree, one drained pond, one small road at a time. Are there no places which we value enough to say not even one road.....not even 1% left unprotected in unacceptable? The peel is one of the few watersheds left in the world where we actually have a chance to demand 100%.

Inside Canada = 5

I do not support any areas being designated as "Integrated Management Areas", in which industrial activities are permitted. I would have two categories only, ecological reserve and sustainable non-commercial use areas, e.g. hunting, fishing, and gathering.

You know everyone usually just focuses on the resource and forgets that there have been first nations people living of the land for centuries before governments came and just took resources without permission. Most first nations people are left out and life goes on for big corporations. Once resources are gone, corporations disappear as do the promises. But bottom line is that first nations people will be there even through the here after. Question here is First Nations Culture opposed to Corporate Culture.

I believe the entire region deserves 100% protection as First Nations have called for. Once you begin to fragment an area and allow industrial development, roads, ATVs and snow machines you guarantee the eventual destruction of the entire ecosystem. The land needs to remain untouched for us and for future generations. Just to know it is there is a source of hope.

No, I would like to see 100% of the region be designated as a site for ecological and heritage conservation. Governments should put a great emphasis and effort towards protecting regions such as this for future generations to explore, appreciate and learn from.

I don't fully understand the subtleties of the differences between the Special management areas. I would prefer a title of Protected area - and then subtitle with a specific focus. I would like to see the names very clearly indicate that no development is allowable, no new staking is happening, and that the area is intended to be only used for renewable and sustainable activities. I don't like the term Integrated management unit. It sounds like a euphemism - though I do want very strong regulations in place if any land is to be developed, so maybe it is the right term. (I also don't think that any of this land should be developed). I would like to see the entire planning region designated as a protected area, with no new roads, no mineral, oil or gas development - and an emphasis on sustainable and renewable economic activities.

Do you have any other comments on this topic?

Inside Yukon = 15

Implementation is critical. A management plan developed by First Nations, the government and the public needs to be worked out to ensure the goals of protection are achieved.

the peel river watershed is one of the few untouched places in Canada maybe even in the world so we have to protect it not only for us but all the children that are growing up right now and for the elders that have their life stories from growing up in the watershed region as I said in the comments above this was the best trip I have ever been on going down the Snake River

The Peel watershed should be withdrawn from any further mineral staking immediately.

Conservation should be held as paramount in this area for the present but be subject to review in the natural life history of the plan and its successors - every generation must be able to reconsider all such matters for itself.

We have such a small amount of unspoiled wilderness in the world that it is important for the life of the planet to protect what we have left rather than polluting it like what has been done in other places.

I believe the Peel Watershed region should be entirely considered a protected area. No mining or industrial activity should take place in that region.

A conservation focus is appropriate for this region at this time. Government currently has limited ability and few tools to manage development other than by the status quo where free entry mining exists. There really is no point to a land use plan if the area is open to all forms of development.

Mining is not an activity that can co-exist with environment conservation. It hasn't worked in ecosystems that are among the most productive and diverse on the planet. It certainly wouldn't work in the harsh climatic and pedological conditions that exist here in the Yukon.

Mining of any sort anywhere in this area is a "worst use" approach. Don't do it - it's too far out there to make money anyway, and I'm sick of paying taxes to subsidize mining exploration and speculative gimmicks on the stock market.

It is time to listen to the wishes of the First Nations' whose traditional territories lie within this region. They request that 100% of the Peel Watershed be protected and this should be done, for the sake of the ecosystem, ourselves and future generations.

With over 80% of the Yukon Territory already accessible to exploration and mining, I feel that the entire Peel watershed should be protected and maintained as an undeveloped natural habitat.

Think stewardship, think foresight, think smart.

I am concerned that any industrial exploration and development in this area has the potential to become the thin edge of the wedge; for example, roads for industrial access are then used for other motorized access with the risk (likelihood) of further environmental degradation.

If we here in the Yukon cannot protect the Peel Watershed, we cannot expect anybody anywhere to protect anything

Many First Nations and Yukoners suffer with addictions to alcohol and drugs. Jobs create opportunity and self respect. There is nothing more satisfying than working hard, earning a good pay cheque and providing a good living for your family. If you sit around unemployed you spiral down, get depressed, start drinking or using drugs and eventually end up in trouble with the law. This results in a strain on our already costly Health and Social Services and Justice Systems. I don't think any other user group you are putting forward can match the real wealth and jobs that mining creates. To me, this is a good part of the root cause for our system problems in Yukon and the best way to eradicate them.

Inside Canada = 2

There are so many other areas of the Yukon open to industrial development. I believe that the entire Peel watershed should be protected and maintained as an intact ecosystem.

We have for the most part, destroyed our natural heritage on this planet, and created unsustainable industrial societies. The Peel Watershed is an opportunity to maintain ecological integrity and sustainable use.

How can this Land Use Plan guide the management of both traditional uses and other land uses?

Inside Yukon = 27

If the Land Use Plan is a guide, it should respect the concept of 80% protection. If the Land Use Plan is to reflect the concerns being heard during the current round of consultations, it should be a guide to 100% protection.

A co-management team with First Nations, such as the type of collaborative team represented by First Nations and parks staff that used manages Nahanni National Park.

It has the potential to be a strong statement of how highly we in the Yukon value the Peel's wealth of natural resources as a locally, nationally, and internationally significant wilderness. The land use plan can collaborate with and build from the Agreements with first Nations, in maintaining a healthy ecosystem. If we use this document to assert this vision, then we will be caring for the land that we rely on for our survival, and the generations after us, who will have much less nature and wilderness to protect, will thank us for our foresight.

This is the crux of planning - keeping the document off the shelf. The Parties could convene an annual review of activities in the region compared to guidelines in the plan. YESAB must render this plan into a working document for staff and insert automatic links between it and any proposed human uses for the area. Traditional uses should also be vetted through YESAB as fair play - in terms of erecting structures and building/renewing trails etc. For the past 10 years Selkirk First Nation has held a May Gathering where everyone comes to discuss the status of wildlife in their traditional territory. The Parties should host an annual or biennial Peel gathering for everyone to attend, learn and discuss the management of the area. An annual state of the Peel (with report card) should be produced and presentations made to all relevant bodies FNs, YFWMB, RRCs.

By limiting the type of access and use for different areas, and giving legal grounds for the priority of certain uses/users, including future generations.

With ecological (thus economic) sustainability as the foremost consideration.

By protecting the Peel Watershed from roads and industrial activity so that traditional and sustainable land uses can occur in the area for generations.

Having a plan that has a precautionary principle as a key part can guide all land uses that I see appropriate as mentioned above .

Let the historic wisdom of the first nation's people guide the traditional uses and other land uses through the principle of conservation for future generations and accept the only truly viable recommendation - 100% protection.

First of all, I hope this land use Plan will not be put on the shelf to collect dust. I commend the hard work that went into it and I hope it will be taken seriously. Although it does not go as far as recommending 100% protection, it is a good working document. From this point, I think the only thing the Plan could ask for is 100% protection or for the Peel Watershed to be officially designated as Heritage site or National Park. That in my opinion would make it truly protected whether it be at 80% or 100%. I also think that if it goes as is, the plan could guide the management by proposing ways to monitor and enforce regulations because this is the key to managing any kind of development.

Ask the First Nations involved about how they want to see non-industrial activities going on in the watershed. As I said earlier, no industrial activities should take place in the watershed.

ongoing communication/discussion with the First Nations, government, and permitted recreational/wilderness tourism stakeholders

If you are unwilling to give equal opportunity to all stakeholders then only First Nations traditional use (no joint ventures) should be allowed. Close the area completely or make it accessible, it's not a them or us situation - it's democracy or no democracy.

Traditional uses involve hunting.. Hunting practices are usually not compatible with wilderness tourism (except by hunting tourists with the Outfitters). Fortunately this plan does not allow for new road development into the watershed, as roads exacerbate this conflict.. The Dempster is a good example..The Dempster corridor needs to be managed so that it accommodates wildlife viewers. The decimation of caribou along the highway is a prime example of how roads lead to detrimental hunting pressures.. Fortunately the lack of roads into the vast majority of this watershed decreases the potential for conflict between traditional users and recreators/tourism clients.. A management plan for a protected area can delineate appropriate limits for the outfitters... Personally I feel that certain species of wildlife are being overhunted by some of the outfitters in the region. And certain outfitters are more scrupulous than others. Both hunting outfitting and wilderness tourism can have deleterious effects on wildlife populations or on the quality of the wilderness experience of travellers in the watershed if these industries are not regulated and managed. A management plan can set the guidelines for such regulation.

Consult with First Nations, actually listen to them and do what they are telling us and protect 100% of the area. Doing so might be a first for government but is the right thing to do.

Man has existed in the Yukon ecosystem for about 11,000 years. We have not have not had motorized access for any more than 100 years, yet the impact is staggering. Allow traditional uses by all means, as long as they are not aided by too much modern technology. Completely eliminate industrial uses in the area so that one area actually exists where traditional activities can occur.

Grant National Park protection status.

Provides a framework for further discussions.

There can't be a cast in concrete management plan. It should be administered by the First Nations, and the Federal Government. I'd like to see it designated an International Heritage Site.

The primary way the Plan does this is by identifying zones (LMUs) of particular value for traditional uses, and identifying these as heritage designations or fish and wildlife designations. This zoning provides direction to the legal designations that will need to be attributed to these SMAs, and to the more detailed management planning and operations within these legally designated SMAs. The Plan also recognizes the ongoing need to monitor and control levels of use, traditional and other, through tools such as harvest restrictions and quotas on visitor numbers. However, it is not within the mandate of this Plan to address the details of some of these management issues, and the Plan acknowledges the jurisdiction of other agencies (e.g. the Porcupine Caribou Management Board; YESAB).

Ongoing meaningful consultation with the First Nations

The great thing about traditional land use (First Nations) is that it does not typically involve intense modification of the land. First Nation traditional uses of the land do not negatively impact the wilderness tourism industry in my opinion. Wilderness tourism and First Nation tradition land use can co-exist quite handily. My experience with tourists indicates that many are keenly interested in traditional lifestyles and harvesting practices of First Nations People and I believe if First Nations so desired, there is great potential for them to develop their own tourism products and industry. However, I don't think that extractive industries and First Nation traditional uses are compatible and certainly the international attraction of the Peel Watershed will be dramatically and irreversibly damaged if extractive industry is allowed, even in 20 % of the area. Make it 100% protected.....make it a Park.....make it something.....but don't give it away 20% at a time!

The Plan speaks for itself.

The plan can include all persons and industry. If there are truly sacred sites and traditional fishing places then we can stay back from them within reason.

what bob scott said it doesnt matter how far away from any sacred place or fishing spots it will eventually come into all the places that we as natives use all year it might not be in this generation but it will destroy the traditional life for our next generation

Required ongoing consultation. Political and social commitments to the basic underlying conservation principles.

It could best guide the management of this land by inviting the Federal Government to make the area a national park protected against exploitation.

Inside Canada = 2

Consult with First Nations and protect 100% of the landscape. Canada's newest National Park was developed in consultation with First Nations and allows for traditional activities. I would like to see the entire region become a National Park to ensure its protection for all time.

A balance must be established between traditional uses by natives and use by non-natives.

What land use activities and uses do you see as appropriate within the LMUs?

Inside Yukon = 30

If you are not willing to give equal access to all people who have a vested interest then close it to everyone except First Nations Traditional use with no joint venture for making money.

Mineral exploration and development is not appropriate within the SMAs. More detailed management planning for legally designated SMAs will have to address quotas on wilderness visitor and guide-outfitting traffic.

Watershed: activities that promote erosion, exposure of the subsurface, and the potential for polluted runoff should not be permitted. Any camps etc must be held to high standards to prevent pollution of waterbodies. Fish & Wildlife: harvest management needs to be a priority in these areas to ensure populations are used sustainably, including reporting by all users. Activities that negatively affect habitat should be minimised and access by motorised vehicles carefully limited. Heritage: FN recommendations should be followed in these areas. Protection: Harvest and access should be limited. MA: I do not support mineral development in these areas. Renewable Resource development should be permitted in consultation with communities and stakeholders.

Definitely no non-renewable industrial activities, but more work would need to be done to figure out what other uses would be acceptable.

all say , again , NO TO ANY MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT ACCESS , because this will open the door to other potential destruction of the land . Tx for your understanding..

first nations traditional use, minimal impact wilderness tourism, limited motorized activities (ie aircraft access)

No motorized equipment, no impact/leave no trace activities.

Current levels of traditional harvesting of fauna and flora, managed tourism (hiking, river trips etc.), regulated outfitting, vehicle traffic only along the Dempster, basically anything that does threaten the concept of 100% protection.

wilderness tourism, big game outfitting, There should never be exclusive permits for wilderness tourism as they become financial assets for business. If there is a need to limit access it should be via lottery and anyone who would like to offer trips within the Peel would have equal opportunity.

First Nations traditional uses, low-impact ecotourism. Definitely no mineral, oil and gas exploration and exploitation should be allowed.

No development. No road access.

Areas of hunting and outfitting could be compatible, but no road, railroad, quad trail, etc. access. Keep it old school and low impact.

I see all Yukoners working and playing together. I see mining exploration that will hopefully lead to mines and good paying jobs. I see potential for oil and gas wells. I see First Nations, recreationists and outfitters all using the land equally, respecting each other. If you are going to ban industry then to have a truly pristine area you will have to ban all users.

I do not see the use of ATVs as appropriate within the Peel watershed.

Generally, I think that traditional hunting, fishing, trapping could occur anywhere using current regulations for these activities. Wilderness tourism, big game outfitting should continue where they do not conflict. Other sorts of tourism could possibly be allowed in some areas - access - probably by float plane. No roads, airstrips or other major infrastructure should be allowed.

tourism and traditional use I'm guessing that the people that want to mine the peel watershed never went down just for a trip Well I went down with my class a few years ago and I'll say that it was the best trip of my life

Wilderness tourism and FN hunting and gathering activities and continued monitoring of the landscape.

only wilderness tourism/tourism in the less protected areas

Hunting, fishing, controlled wilderness tourism. No ATV use.

Wilderness tourism if it is minimal impact. Traditional FN activities. Designated float plane access points.

 Traditional hunting and fishing and minimal impact wilderness tourism

I do not support any development of any kind of mining, exploration or oil and gas. Everywhere in the Yukon where there has been mining, there is garbage left behind that doesn't get cleaned up and governments do not enforce regulations that do require clean-up. Mining companies have money to bring equipment they need to mine but never have money to clean-up after themselves when they leave. I support people who want to travel the land to experience the beauty of it in a respectful way, I think the F.N. people should be consulted on how this can be done since this is their traditional territories.

Wilderness tourism, first nations' traditional use, limited outfitting.

For all LMU's, I see the following activities as appropriate: traditional harvesting and cultural activities of First Nations, wilderness/backcountry travel opportunities (hiking, canoeing), existing outfitter operations and scientific research.

Appropriate land uses are those which have no damaging impact on flora, fauna, or the land itself. To my mind that includes primarily sustainable harvesting and limited and responsible wilderness tourism.

wilderness tourism, big game outfitting, There should never be exclusive permits for wilderness tourism as they become financial assets for business. If there is a need to limit access it should be via lottery and anyone who would like to offer trips within the Peel would have equal opportunity

eco-tourism, education, responsible scientific research and traditional activities are the only appropriate activities within these LMUs. These activities are only appropriate if they are done in a manner that does not jeopardize the integrity of the main value associated with the LMU. Ex: Research being done to monitor the northward migration of Boreal Forest in the Hart River SMA (Fish and Wildlife) but in a manner that does not produce detrimental effects to fish and wildlife

I think that the Commission has identified all relevant activities and uses.

Traditional First Nations activities and zero footprint tourism with perhaps a few access points off of the Dempster Highway.

Within the Land Management Units (LMUs), the cultural activities that are now allowed should continue to be allowed. These include: hunting, fishing, tourism, and traditional activities. Traditional activities include: berry picking, educational activities, and cultural gatherings. All of these activities have low impacts on the environment and are beneficial to all people.

Inside Canada = 6

well-regulated and sustainable recreation, hunting, fishing, gathering, with strict limits on commercial activities and motorized vehicles; all in specific areas, with ecological integrity and conservation of biological diversity top priority

Traditional First Nations' use of the land, minimal impact wilderness tourism (canoeing, hiking, horseback riding, photography, etc.) NO motorized access with the exception of some float plane landings and emergency helicopter evacuation in the event of accident or illness.

In the entire watershed, I think that motorized vehicle use should be limited. Appropriate land use activities include: hunting, fishing, wilderness tourism (carried out responsibly and without degrading the land) and other renewable activities that can be carried out in a sustainable and responsible way.

Zero Footprint Tourism aimed at teaching the fundamentals of conservation and land preservation and the traditional First Nations use of land for hunting, gathering, teaching and medicine.

I believe that the peel watershed should be protected from ALL development.

I believe that the peel watershed should be protected from ALL development.

Outside Canada = 2

all

The only land use activity I support is eco-tourism, such as leave no trace camping

Conservation Principles

Do you agree with the conservation principles and values in the plan?

Inside Yukon = 25

yes this will provide a great future for the wildlife & nature.

Yes

Yes, great values.....too bad the Peel Watershed is being treated like a pie that can be chopped up, instead of an intact ecosystem and watershed.

yes

Yes, but they should cover the entire watershed, including the integrated management areas.

Yes I do.

Yes. We believe the Peel planning commission has done its work. It spent years collecting information, conducting research and talking to stakeholders and others involved. The process has worked and it has been decided the conservation is the highest priority.

Yes--I commend the conservation principles that have guided the creation of the plan.

Yes, but they should extend to the entire region.

yes the document is well written. However, this is not about words on paper, but about implementation and monitoring.

I agree with the principles however I do not agree with the application being using in this plan.

Yes.

Yes but they need to embrace the entire watershed

Yes. The Peel is unique in that despite having been explored and considered for mineral extraction since the 1970s, it is still mostly intact as inaccessible and unchanged wilderness. Conservation of all the area's characteristics should be the priority. If our children or their descendants decide that taking what metals are there from the ground and shipping them as quickly as possible overseas is in their best interest, let them make that choice. The conservation values of the plan at least allow our descendants a choice in the matter.

Yes. My concern is that they are not applied to the whole area. A secondary concern is that they will be given only lip-service for political reasons.

yes

Yes, however, I am worried that those conservation principles don't apply to the whole watershed.

No, they are too exclusional. There is no need when the existing regulatory regime and industries ability and willingness to protect areas from damage. (Please note that damage is poisoning the environment, causing excessive erosion, it is not taking into account the footprint of a mine or the roads etc.)

yes

With regard to Industrial Activities, I strongly support that new surface access in SMAs should be prohibited, it should be recommended to withdraw of lands from all non-renewable resources, no structures should be permitted which may alter or impede natural level and variability of water flow, to not allow aggregate mining or mining of any type to occur anywhere in the Peel Watershed and that climate change should be considered in land management.

Yes I do. These principles form the basis to the conservation strategies within the plan. These are the essentials and they need to be subscribed to by all level of government. There are those that would see some potential opportunity to "make money" for developments in the region, but I think these individual or corporate interests need to take a back see to the environmental principles embodied within the plan.

Yes. They provide a solid foundation for the policy and research recommendations.

Yes.

Yes. It is a land use plan (as others have pointed out) and not a conservation plan, however, the values in conservation are significant, much more so than in mining. Many people have pointed out that the conservation values are world class because of the large undisturbed and intact areas. We have seen before that planners and decision makers felt that a world class mining deposit must often be left in the ground when the effects of mining could disrupt significant conservation values ie Windy Craggy Copper deposit. Here there is a very large, but totally uneconomic, mineral deposit (not world class) in the middle of this natural landscape that has the potential to be an international jewel in the future. Other potential mining activities have dangerous waste stream issues (radioactive wastes from uranium mining) and infrastructure needs that completely compromise the conservation values. The decision for the policy makers should be easy. Do not fragment what is whole (ecological integrity).

Overall, these principles are well thought out and appropriate.

Inside Canada = 4

Yes, but they should be applied to the entire watershed.

yes

yes

yes these kind of principles and values should be applied to the whole watershed

Do you feel that some principles and values may have been overlooked, and require further consideration?

Inside Yukon = 15

Planning should be done not only for ourselves, but for future generations. It's not about what the next fiscal quarter will bring, it's about what will be left for those yet to be born.

No.

Yes, what about jobs for Yukoners, what about good paying jobs and fair treatment of all Yukoners. For me Yukoners includes all industries.

no

Yes, principles and values must be re-examined in a reasonable and democratic approach to end-use or need.

Not that I'm aware of.

No

It is not about principles being overlooked. The words look good on paper but how is the monitoring going to be implemented? Who is going to be the watch dog to make sure that the principles are followed?

No. After years of research and meetings and submissions, the plan has managed to capture the values and the priority Yukoners place on them.

What about water quality, air quality, and the importance of biodiversity that is strong enough to adapt to changing climate and large enough to survive isolation in an era of catastrophic planetary extinctions. The world may depend on the Peel watershed for repopulation just as North America was repopulated from Beringia after the glacial era.

Possible some of historical, archeological values.

I believe the Peel Watershed is a tremendous opportunity for responsible educational and research purposes. There are few other places in the world where we can study such a large continuous and undisturbed range of ecosystems. It would be a mistake to not consider this as a potential educational and research resource in this planning process.

The only principles or values that I feel are overlooked, are how industry is a major threat to these principles. In the current plan, there still seems to be a tension between the need to protect the land, and the need to cater to the conservative/pro-mining stance of the Yukon Party. I know that the commission is trying to protect the watershed while still being open to some industrial activity, but I really think that the principles of conservation must outweigh the political leanings from the Yukon Govt.

I believe the commission and its planners have done taken into account the science and the First Nations local knowledge and advice, except, of course, not recommending that the whole watershed be protected.

no

Inside Canada = 1

No.

Do you have any other comments on this topic?

Inside Yukon = 5

When considering the conservation of a watershed, it is important to remember that, by definition, any area within the Peel Watershed, drains into one location. 80% of the Watershed could be managed with proper conservation principles the water quality, and health of all who use it, could be compromised because of the 15% where conservation is not practiced. This is important to keep in mind when considering the areas designated as IMA.

Fish in the Athabaska River are showing very unusual disfigurement such as cancerous lumps and curved spines. This is due to contamination from oil development in the watershed. The Elders there will no longer eat fish from the river.

☐

Let's not let that happen here. The First Nations in the area are telling us to protect 100% of the area. Lets listen to what the people who will be most affected are saying.

Yes, I don't believe your science because of the biases involved. Neither should anyone else.

I think that the peel watershed should be a 100% conservation area. No exploration or exploitation should be allowed in the futur leaving this area pristine.

I support 100% protection of the Peel Watershed.

Inside Canada = 1

This type of consultation only represents the few people with special interests and is NO WAY representative of the Yukon population. While your website is very nice, and sure you spent a lot of money on it - it is NOT research and should not be used to make decisions - under the false pretense you are hearing the options of Yukoners. One comprehensive study was done by CPAWS/TIAY/YCS and that should be used. How come YTG didn't do a study of their own too? Too bad. I am hopeful though that the CPAWS/TIAY/YCS study will be considered the most reliable source of Yukoner's options.

Should conservation principles and values be the paramount consideration in land use planning for the Peel Watershed? Please explain the reasons for your answer.

Inside Yukon = 27

There are so few places left where these values can be placed as paramount.....don't we owe it to the planet to make conservation the priority where it is still a possibility?

Yes, large-scale protection is important to effectively protect an area. There are other areas in the Yukon where mineral exploration can occur. It doesn't have to be everywhere, and especially in the Peel watershed where the environment is fairly intact. Furthermore, if IMA are allowed at the start of the Watershed, protecting the rest of the Watershed is almost useless. Why protect 80%, when we can "scrap" the whole watershed from the 20% that are non-protected? The whole watershed must be protected.

Yes. This area is truly unique in the Yukon, Canada and the world and should be recognized as such.

Yes. See my previous answers. Yukon should conserve a much larger proportion of its land than it has so far protected.

☒

While there are obvious economic benefits to Yukon from mining and other industrial development activities, such activities need not and should not be unrestricted. Large tracts of unspoiled wilderness have great economic value to Yukon not only in the form of wilderness tourism but also as the basis for an international reputation that draws people from around the world, including those who may never venture into regions such as the Peel Watershed but still value the fact that it exists. It also contributes to sustainable development, by ensuring that increasingly endangered wildlife can survive in such areas and that some portion of the boreal forest, along with all the life that it sustains, is protected.

Yes. Development cannot be "undone". This area deserves full protection not only for its own inherent value, but also to provide an ongoing opportunity to learn from a fully functioning ecosystem. So much that may one day be crucial to our survival is lost when we distort all the natural processes around us by developing or "managing" them.

Absolutely! This is what the most of the debate is all about! If people were not worried about the conservation values in the area, then there would be no worry about mining and road construction and everything else. However, when you consider all of the valuable wildlife habitat, the sheer rugged beauty of the land, the key critical watershed, the essential ecosystems in the Peel watershed, and the First Nations cultural heritage, then conservation principles and values have to be the paramount consideration.

definitely!

Yes. As area this large that remains relatively untouched is unique in the world and should be protected as fully as possible. We are running out of truly wild places and we owe it to future generations to have and appreciate this special area. As Joni Mitchell said, "You don't know what you've lost till it's gone."

Yes. The value of this land is dependent upon the conservation of its wilderness.

Yes. The value of this area is still to revealed. Keep it protected for our grandkids.

Yes absolutely. The Peel watershed is an increasingly rare piece of land which should be protected for its own sake as well as for the many animals which call it home. In order to protect the Peel for ourselves too, now and in the future, we need to refrain from destructive industrial activities in the area.

Absolutely. Conservation principles and values are the underlying principles that will ensure the state of the Peel Watershed remains intact and healthy for future generations.

Yes - the Peel watershed is valuable in its own right and as a treasured resource for its nations traditional activities.

Yes. The Peel watershed is a rare place of unspoiled wilderness. It is a complex ecosystem that can not simply be washed off and reassembled once all of the "value" has been ripped from the ground and the bulldozers have been left to rust. Conservation principles should be of paramount consideration bc we've only got one shot at getting it right. Once developed always developed. There would be no going back as we know from countless examples from across this country where long term sustainability was abandoned for short term gain.

Yes - because by placing other principles (eg: short-term economic benefits) first, these values are pre-empted, as are the opportunities for current and future generations to utilise renewable resources. By ensuring that conservation values receive priority, the precautionary principle is used and other interests may be considered along side in a balanced perspective.

Yes. I lived in this area for many years and write novels set in the Ogilvies. We humans are just one of so many species with an interest there. Our values should not simply be 'humancentric'; our decision to limit our impact in this huge area will be made only by us but may alter the habitats for caribou, moose, grizzlies, black bears, foxes, hares, sheep, fish, insects, shrews, marten, weasels, wolverine, pika, marmots, many birds, plants and on and on...

Yes, when conservation includes the continuation of wilderness characteristics as well as natural ecosystems. Conservation is the cornerstone of sustaining the existing economic activity in the planning region, - guide-outfitting, subsistence use and harvesting of wildlife and plants, wilderness tourism, First Nations cultural identity, recreational hunting and wilderness tripping. Northern ecosystems function at very large spatial scales with migrations, movements between seasonal ranges, forest fires and full watershed processes. Their conservation requires large tracts of land and intact watersheds. There are few sufficiently large areas left in Yukon that are not already heavily influenced by off-road vehicle trails, mineral claims developments and other land uses, so few true wilderness areas. Much of the Peel is still wilderness, and deserves to remain in that state.

Yes. They are consistent with the intent of maintaining the present character of the region and are also consistent with First Nation values for the area.

Yes! Conservation principles and values are the only way to maintain the integrity of the Peel watershed. As stated before, political will to dance to the tune of the mining industry means that the land could be sold to the highest bidder. Especially due to the current fiscal state of the Yukon government, I do not trust that industrial activity is in the best interest of the land. Conservation is the safest way to navigate the tendency to open up this area to activities that will harm the ecological integrity of the land. In this, we have to listen to the First Nations call to protect the entire watershed.

Yes. The Peel Watershed is one of the few areas left in North America, if not the planet, that is relatively untouched by industrial development, supports healthy traditional use, and is breathtakingly beautiful.

Yes I do. At this time government has little ability to manage development in a controlled manner. If the area is open to exploration and development it will be very difficult to limit access or control the pace of development.

Yes - The Peel is one of the few remaining pieces of virgin land in this vast country of ours. We should preserve this amazing place for posterity.

Yes

yes

Yes I do. "Our limited understanding of the effects of different land uses on other resources in the North makes this especially important."

Yes. As per my response to question 1.

I do not like the planning commissions emphasis on the conservation principles when the original purpose of the whole program was to be looking at land use - I emphasize land use - and withdrawing 80% is not a reasonable reflection of fair land use.

Inside Canada = 5

Yes. The short term economic gain from resource extraction is nothing compared to the long term benefits of having large, intact areas of wilderness. Wilderness is a rare commodity now and will be more valuable in the future.

Yes, the Peel is unique in a planet where natural ecosystems are rapidly being destroyed. We need to protect it for the future. We constantly devalue the biodiversity of the earth and its natural services at our peril.

I feel that the Peel Watershed should be managed with conservation principles and values as the paramount consideration. It is a vital natural area that is unique to the world and significant in the future of our planet's survival

Yes, these areas must be protected 100% from all harmful industry activity, allowing the natural processes of nature to live in protected harmony and should be preserved for future generations not only to enjoy but to learn what should be valued as we are all dependent on nature for survival

Yes, This region is one of the few places on earth that remains relatively unsullied by industrial development and overuse.

Outside Canada = 1

No, it is not a "conservation plan" it is a "land use plan" so all factors of use must be considered and managed not denied.

Overview of Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan

Do you have any other comments on this topic?

Inside Yukon = 42

The Yukon territorial government needs to implement a compensation scheme so that the conservation agenda required in the Peel can be fully implemented, and the mineral industry can move forward. More fundamentally the government needs to review the free entry mineral staking policy: speed up land use planning so that all interests have greater certainty as to what land uses are allowed, and /or put some interim geographical limits to the free entry system until land use planning is done.

This needs to be addressed as an election issue. Talk to friends.

I've been guiding canoe trips on the many rivers in the Peel watershed for more than 20 years. It is a truly unique wilderness destination - not only in the Yukon but also in Canada and the world. I have guests who return year after year to do another one of the Peel tributaries. They don't just come for the great paddling, they also come for the wilderness and the wildlife. There is something magical about travelling through a landscape that has remained untouched for thousands of years. This is extremely rare and its value should not be underestimated. If the Peel is protected, companies like ours will be able to offer wilderness trips and make a living off the land forever. It is truly sustainable if done properly and it really would provide for future generations. The Peel commission has done its work and the land use planning process has worked as it should. Conservation has been identified as the highest value. The message from the First Nations, tourism groups, environmental organizations and most of the public is clear - protect the Peel.

Make it happen. Total protection. We can do it. The courage this government will show in completely protecting this watershed will be greatly respected and appreciated by yukoners, by the land, by the world.

Hi I am from Aklavik, NT. I am in support of the plan, but because we drink the water from the Peel River I would recommend 100 protection from development. The Peel River is our only source of water right now and if contaminants gets in the water, we end up drinking it. Thanks

100 % protection from industry for at least the next 50 years

I am in favour of large scale protection of the Peel Watershed. I am in favour of no roads and no industrial development. The mining industry in the Yukon is already a great success without development in this area and projections suggest this trend will continue. Wildlife depend on the undeveloped nature of this area. I am in support of the First Nations who wish to have 100% protection of this land.

I have paddled the wind and peel river. It is a very powerful place whose wilderness should be left intact. I recognize that we need to balance wilderness with development, but this is not the place. We need to keep this watershed free from mining and oil and gas. Instead of opening remote road free places for development, we should be considering how to reduce our consumption patterns. This watershed, with clean drinking water and amazing wildlife is that I want to leave as a legacy for future generations. The planning commission is very brave in choosing a plan with 80% protection and I commend them for their hard work. I'd hope to see my government take leadership and protect 100%.

Some people know the price of everything and the value of nothing. To open up the Peel watershed area for mining exploration, compares to selling the Mona Lisa for \$20.00

The document in general is a good document with well thought out policy and a good foundation in protection however, I strongly urge 100% protection. Mining is not a sustainable activity by nature. You can't put the mineral back in the earth. Once its gone, its gone, and there remains no motivation to remain and little motivation to clean up. Especially in an area so remote.

I fully support the First Nations desire to have 100% of the Peel watershed protected. we have to think towards the future - a minimum of 7 generations for our children and their children's children. We need to have strong policies, regulations and accountability. Land-use plans should not be amended by politicians trying to gain favour from their constituencies as politicians are responsible to all - not just industry.

I want my name or a vote or support for the entire Peel watershed be devoid of mining thank you

I have travelled on the Bonnet Plume River three years ago. I have never experienced more natural beauty and more ecological health ever before. I believe there should be no road construction, mining development, and other natural habitat disturbing humane processes and developments. This is one of the regions of the world that which is still complete and healthy and grand in scale. It can't be that foreign and national companies come and develop their mining/oil/gas businesses in our beautiful North. I 100% support the First Nations to protect the Peel Watershed a 100%. This is our land and the value of it's wholesomeness is not measurable in economic terms only. I would really like to be able to share this beauty with my grandchildren and I am not a mother yet.

Honestly i believe its ridiculous, the area does not need to be touched, dug up, destroyed. I have been there personally it is amazing. why would any one want to take the beauty of peel watershed away? It's also a national park, as far as i know national parks are pretty and DO NOT have any sort of development on them.

I think if all the First Nations are in agreement to protect the Peel Watershed, then we should really listen to that. I have canoed the Hart, Snake, Bonnet Plume and Blackstone and they are my favorite rivers. You just have to go and see it and be there to really understand the beauty of the place, it's just stunning! Wow!!

Canadian First Nations and North American Conservationists are now becoming a very powerfull lobby in the Yukon and Canada in general. If Canadian provincial and territorial governments are going to bow to all their huge protected area demands, then these governments have a duty to inform the oil, mining and exploration industries immediately, so these industries can take their jobs and their investments to other countries who want development.

The Plan recommendations will bring future success to the Yukon. Their endorsement would be a very intelligent decision.

I support 100% protection for the Peel watershed. I feel that the government hasn't played fair by allowing new claims to be staked while there was discussion about a land use Plan and I don't trust that they will honor the plan as proposed let alone protect it even more. I don't believe that this area should be sold for short term fast cash. We don't have to develop every inch of this planet. Fish and wildlife also need a place to live.

100% protection of this watershed is the only ethical and economically wise choice that will provide a legacy for the future.

I think Yukon needs a profitable industry and we can't keep taking from money from Canada without contributing like everyone else. It is unfair to enjoy our lifestyles as Yukoners on the backs of other fellow Canadians. I support the current plan and its future goals for development. Yes there where large environmental disasters in Yukon and everyone wants to avoid. But from those, Yukon developed strict environmental policies which and I don't think quoting Faro is fair. The point to take away from this is if we want to live in the Yukon then we have to generate money and have an industry (especially in the times we are living in) those are the basic principles of economy. If Yukoners are extremely against adding new infrastructure then we should stick to our guns and abandon Yukon and let nature reclaim our cities and communities because we can't have it both ways.

Stating that protection from mineral development preserves the Peel Watershed for future generations of Yukoners is misleading at best. Other than First Nations peoples, the watershed will be accessible only to clients of high-priced wilderness tourism and outfitting businesses, and will be financially out of reach to almost anyone of moderate income levels or lower. By allowing responsible exploration and mining to take place, many more Yukoners including First Nations peoples (as well as Canadians elsewhere through tax and royalty revenues) will benefit through solid, well-paying jobs. Canada will also eventually require access to the mineral potential of this area, including materials for the equipment and infrastructure for alternative energy sources. This can be done while keeping the integrity of the ecosystems in place. Acceptance of the plan as proposed doesn't provide a service to most Yukoners; it provides an injustice.

I have seen considerable change in the rivers of the watershed over the past 40 years. I think that the YTG believes that mining and oil and gas interests provide great profit to the Yukon. The Carr report done in the mid 1960's does the kind of economic analysis that shows the relative benefits of these costs to the Yukon's economy. Faro stands as an example where recovery costs greatly exceeds the benefit of the mine.

I would like to see even more protection of this area, but if opening up 20% of the area to development is what it will take to save the other 80%, then so be it.

Make the whole drainage a properly protected territorial park, and you will send a message to the world that the Yukon is, in fact, the beautiful wild land that they think it is. This is a perception of extreme value, economically and otherwise.

I support the current plan recommendations as the best we can do at the moment, but my true preference is for even more conservation of that area (and other areas) with no mining or oil and gas to be allowed. I say this only because of an experience I have been having over the past year of clearing environmental contaminants (mainly metals and plastics) out of my body. I am beginning to think that these substances (metals and oil and gas), as an elder once said, may in fact be meant to be left in the ground. I acknowledge that in the Yukon, or even in western society, we are not there yet in our understanding of how to live a more sustainable lifestyle so, in the interim, I do support the proactive approach the commission is recommending in this plan. Perhaps this will be a key stepping stone on the path to a more sustainable future.

I support the First Nations and want 100% protection for the Peel Watershed. I support no additional road other than the existing Dempster Highway. I think that no mine, oil and gas exploitation should ever be admitted in the Peel Watershed, but especially until the plan is finalized. It is essential to renew the moratorium expiring in 2011. If the moratorium would expire before the plan is finalized, it would be cheating on all Yukoners and go against our democratic rights.

I oppose development in the Peel River watershed. We are losing wild spaces at an alarming rate. The Peel must be protected in perpetuity from further development, such as mineral exploration, extraction or other industries, roads and structures. Non-invasive, limited wilderness travel (no trace) may be allowed.

The Peel watershed is not for us to exploit as we see fit. We only hold it in trust for future generations. Respect!

the value of the land is as pristine wilderness and will only increase over time as the world gets more and more crowded and wild places in may other places continues to disappear at an alarming rate.

Good land use plans are complicated. They are not intended for the casual reader - they are the shop manual for a very complicated machine. This plan is not too complicated. It has rightly set aside the myriad of details still required to effect proper management via the plan. It will take several years to properly implement this plan. Look at the UFA and individual First Nation Agreements - they are still in the process of being put into effect - in fact the Peel plan is one of those processes.

KEEP THE PEEL. The Peel does not suit mining. I'm nine years old and I hope when I am older I will see the Peel the same way it is now. IT HAS TO BE SAVED RIGHT NOW.

Wild land is Yukon's greatest asset, and its value will only increase over time. Yukoners want to preserve this land for the plants, animals and their descendants. Here we have a great opportunity to protect a significant amount of land.

The Peel Watershed is a globally significant wilderness. The mineral and other resources that exist sub-surface there are not irreplaceable. The watershed in its current state is. 100% protection is appropriate.

The Peel Watershed should receive as much protection as possible. The ecological and cultural values contained within it are priceless when compared with short term industrial development such as mining and fossil fuel extraction which completely destroys the ecological and cultural values.

If the measures are protested by the resource industry stakeholders, I beg them to consider the fact that this preference for complete conservation is unique to this intact watershed with the many qualities described. Most of the territory is open to resource exploration, including where land use planning has already been completed. The watershed has a unique overlapping of many interests and stakeholders, and it is imperative that planning honour the widest and deepest set of values, where economics is in line with heritage, cultural, ecological, spiritual values. I commend the Planning commission for the outstanding job they have done of truly listening to the values at stake. Planning with wisdom endures indefinitely.

I wanted to specifically point out yet another failure of the planning commission. They did not at all see the sustainable interests of mining and exploration. In the first few pages of the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan they showed a picture of old fuel drums with the name of an exploration company on them. Why did they do this. Could they not have put a picture of an exploration company conducting sustainable and environmentally friendly exploration work. Small, yet meaningful; this is yet another bias coming from the commission.

I believe the entire Peel watershed, 100% of it, should be protected from industrial development. Even 20% is too much land to risk to the human appetite for short-sighted gain at any cost. How many abandoned and contaminated mining and other industrial sites are Yukoners already paying to maintain and mitigate? Let's not even risk this in this pristine environment.

The Peel Watershed should be protected AT LEAST as strongly as outlined by the Peel Watershed land use planning board

In addition to its mineral resources, Yukon has highly valuable resources in the form of vast tracts of beautiful, unspoiled wilderness that is home to abundant wildlife, supports traditional lifestyles of aboriginal peoples, and attracts non-motorized recreationalists from around the world. This particular tract of land is worth preserving in its current state.

I support 100% protection of the Peel Watershed for the sake of the generations to come. I would like them to have the opportunity to experience this magnificent wilderness area rather than paying for massive clean up of a exploited and scarred landscape.

I am a Yukoner who values our resource industries, and I support the need for balanced development across the Yukon as a whole. However, the Peel watershed truly is a special case. I have been there, and I see it as a unique treasure. I therefore find myself, uncharacteristically, on the side of those who are urging the fullest possible protection of the watershed. I am also influenced in this by my respect for the wisdom of the First Nations who know the land the best. I think we should honour their wishes.

If the Peel Plan is to be executed, I have one thing to say. And that is if You execute in this form, then have the land as pristine as You would have. But do not allow any man to cross this land. Whether He or She be Native or non Native. This land is for all Peoples.

Inside Canada = 16

I support 100% protection.

The Peel Watershed should ban roads and ban industrial development. I support the First Nations in their call for 100% protection!

I strongly believe 100% of the Peel Watershed should be protected, with no roads or industrial development within it.

Wilderness and wildlife values in this region far exceed any benefits that may come from industrial development. Industrial development of any kind is not compatible with the value of the region as a wild and natural place.

Think of the future and not just the immediate profit which is short term.

I am in favour of large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development. In the North, roads and industrial development are compatible with protection. I support support the First Nations in their call for 100% protection. I'd like to see all of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized.

I am in favor of the Peel watershed to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas exploration and development

Do not place the pipeline where it can ruin the only clean nature habbitat of the gwich'in because thats all we have left of what we had right form the start.

Yes, I would like to point out the Tombstone Park in Yukon as an example of what happens when an area is designated as a park only. It has now attracted bumper to bumper tourists that are not regulated efficiently and you can see the garbage and destruction along the main pathways where too much human activity has devastated the environment. Much more than you would get from a regulated mining exploration company that would be proactive in protecting the environment whilst exploring and 99% of the time create social and economic stimulus to the area without ultimately finding a mine.

This wilderness is remote, beautiful and intact; a remnant of what North America was like before development. I canoed the Snake in 1997 and sets of friends have canoed the Wind in different years. Contrary to some comments, we are neither rich nor elite; just ordinary working Canadians who love wilderness and choose to travel in wilderness rather than purchase RVs, ATVs, snow machines or visit tropical resorts. To know that there is still a chance in North America to protect a remote, intact ecosystem is inspiring and a source of hope. To contemplate its destruction through development which will not be "sustainable" is almost unbearable. The history of "development" shows that industry and long-term survival of wildlife and wilderness are not compatible. Please demonstrate vision and protect the entire Peel Watershed for future generations.

There are some areas in the world that should be left just as they are. The Peel Watershed is one of those places. The world needs places that are just there, we don't have to use every inch of the world for our own selfish comfort.

Once a pristine wilderness area like the Peel watershed is ravaged by harmful industrial activity like logging, mining and oil and gas development, its uniqueness is lost forever and all the money in the world cannot bring back what has been lost. This area must be left in its wild state for the sake of the wildlife.

I believe there is a need for large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development. Eighty percent protection is not enough, I fully agree with First Nations in their call for 100% protection. Fish and wildlife depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed and it should remain this way for future generations. Lastly and clearly, the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized. Please fully protect the Peel Watershed in its entirety. Thank you

I am in favour of large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development. Roads and industrial development are not compatible with protection. I support the First Nations in their call for 100% protection. I value the well-being of fish and wildlife and believe they depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed and I want it to remain this way. All of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized.

I appreciate the focus on preservation and conservation. I also appreciate the development of policies to protect this very special place. I support the use and enjoyment of this place through renewable activities carried out in a sustainable way (ie. hunting, fishing, paddling, hiking), and think that it is wise to begin to manage these and learn more about the ecosystems and the people it supports. I worry that opening the watershed up to development and any building of new roads, will open the way for more in the future. I would like to see strong policies ensuring that ANY development that happens is not only minimizing its impacts on the watershed, but that the purpose of this development is also in alignment with the principles of sustainable development. Do we really need the oil and gas, and minerals that we are taking? What is the land being developed for? Is it wise? Who benefits? There needs to be mechanisms in place to stop the development if it is not in alignment with the values of the plan. I come from Alberta, where there has never been a project stopped due to an environmental impact assessment - Stronger policies, and a stronger vision, are needed to achieve sustainable development. Our ever increasing dependence on oil, gas and virgin minerals will increasingly put pressure on wilderness areas - and we need very strong policies in place to ensure that the social and ecological systems that we depend upon are not degraded over time.

I think roads and industrial development are incompatible with protection; thus, none should be permitted in the Peel Watershed. I value the well-being of fish and wildlife and believe they depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed to thrive. I think all of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalised.

My name is DENNIS R. NELSON, and I am an environmental researcher, hiker, and naturalist from the "Windy City" of Chicago, IL (USA). For what is worth, Saturday, September 25, 2010, was America's "National Public Lands Day"--which could be "expanded" to include Canada's Yukon as well! I am in favor of larger-scale protection for the Peel Watershed--with no roads and no industrial development. (Roads and industrial development are NOT compatible with this sort of protection. I support the 'First Nations' in their call for 100% preservation.) Because I value the "ecological well-being" of fish and wildlife species/populations, they depend upon the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel watershed--and it should remain that way! I agree with the Reel Watershed Planning Commission that managing the Reel Watershed in accordance with the "vision of sustainable development" is fundamental to the integrity of the entire plan. ALL of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from any additional mineral, oil and gas exploitation until the plan is finalized. Thank you!

To sell a pristine wilderness for the short term "quick money" is a mistake. Once this area is developed, do we turn to the next pristine wilderness in the pursuit of money? Can't we find places for development that already have roads and development. I think future generations will thank us if this area is preserved from development. Once the roads are built and development starts, the area will never be the same. I wonder if that will affect the tourist industry.

The Yukon Territory is highly under explored with regard to its mineral and energy resources. Restricting access to areas or placing additional areas off-limits to exploration and other resource development activities strongly restricts the potential of the Yukon to support its citizens and Canada. The Yukon's future belongs to responsible natural resource development, not locking up areas in the belief that one is conserving those areas.

you think all of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized you value the well-being of fish and wildlife and believe they depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed and you want it to remain this way

I support the plan to preserve the Peel Watershed 100% from any mining activity. In understanding that the proper framework to construct the EIS documents by the proponents does not implicitly imply that the assessment work nor the mitigative measures proposed will be accurately considered. The construction of the road into the area is not feasible in itself due to the remoteness of the location. I believe that any mining activity should first be done in areas already in close proximity to existing roads/highways. The current acts and regulations that the government has set for hard-rock mining are very vague and present many legislative loopholes that any mining proponent could jump through. The Peel Watershed is one of the last remaining landscapes which serves as a haven for wildlife, outdoor enthusiasts, or as a way of life for people who have lived on the land. Please keep the Peel Watershed as a protected area and improve on the current knowledge of mining to rewrite the acts and regulations so that future generations can extract needed resources in a minimal impact way. I am in support of protecting the Peel Watershed from all proposed mining activity.

We German cannot imagine such an amazing landscape in our country or even in Europe! I told everyone I know about my experience in your country and showed thousands of pictures. I have never seen so many envious eyes and fascination.

Full Peel ecosystem needs permanent protection.

I had the opportunity to see lands of the Peel River Watershed, Snake and Wind River two years ago. We were on the Three Rivers Conservation Expedition, and I could realize that this region is one of the most beautiful, pristine areas in the world that no one should have the right change this landscape forever...please just leave it alone!

100% Peel watershed Protection! Honor 1st Nations! This spectacular world heritage wilderness area must be kept that way! No roads or development. It is not a sacrifice area! For our health & economy & sanity- Keep it Wild & pristine. It would be much appreciated by all present & future generations of all species. Thank you, Lydia Garvey Public Health Nurse USA

Although I am not a citizen of Canada, I do visit often and do extensive backwoods camping. For this reason I have a decided opinion about what should be done in the Peel Watershed Planning Region. I emphatically favour large scale protection for the Peel Watershed, with no roads and no industrial development. Because of that, I believe roads and industrial development are incompatible with protection as the First Nations have argued in their call for 100% protection. Only in this way can fish and wildlife, which depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed, be preserved for the future. Thus I agree with the Commission's perspective that managing the Peel watershed in accordance with the vision of sustainable development outlined in the UFA is fundamental to the plan. In short, all of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized.

What parts of the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan do you not support? Please be specific.

Inside Yukon = 39

Rather than 80% of the area protected from industrial development, I want to see 100% of the Peel watershed protected including the Dempster Highway corridor. I also think that all claims staked after the start of the Peel watershed planning process should be terminated.

I would like to see the entire Peel watershed set aside for protection - all 100%.

I do not support the consideration of industrial activities along the Dempster highway, because of the ecological, aesthetic, and economic values of maintaining the wilderness character of this area. I wholeheartedly support the First Nations request for full protection of the watershed. To maintain the integrity of an entire watershed is a unique opportunity in our age. The Dempster and Blackstone area is prime winter caribou habitat and migratory area, not to mention habitat to an abundance of other large mammals. It is also an unforgettable place to visitors, and so many Yukoners, who discover this place by vehicle (Dempster), canoe (Blackstone) or foot (all areas). It is the one wilderness area of the watershed which is accessible to people by vehicle for recreation, tourism industry, subsistence harvesting. If the Dempster corridor or the Blackstone river were compromised of their wilderness qualities, it would put the wilderness of the Peel watershed out of reach of the appreciation of those who would not fly into the region. Conserving the Dempster and Blackstone and other IMA's from industrial development keeps these assets of the region active and healthy. If we are not to compromise our tourism industry, we must maintain the integrity of this corridor. If we are to conserve the integrity of the watershed, it would be wise to conserve this corridor as well.

I am happy that the plan recommends 80% of protection, however we should go for 100% protection. I do not support the idea of 20% of Integrated Management Area where oil, gas and mine exploitation may exist. I do not support the idea that there would be any uranium exploration or exploitation in the Peel Watershed. Uranium is one of the most dangerous industry for the environment and human health. I do not support that the IMA are at the start of the Watershed. What is the use of protecting an area if there is pollution such as acid rock drainage right at the start. I support the First Nations in their will to protect the whole watershed.

I do not support any of the land use recommendations. As is, the recommendations fail in achieving anything close to a balance. Closing 98% of the Peel Region to resource-related industry is unfair to everyone with current and future interests in the economies of the Yukon and Canada.

I question the character of the capacity to limit development. The YTG appears to be able to override the plans conditions when deemed necessary from what is often a political perspective. The rush on staking claims in the watershed is an example of the YTG commitment to preserve the watershed.

I don't support grandfathering the existing claims in some of the core conservation areas.

I do not support resource extraction in the Peel watershed, including the almost 20% of the watershed currently proposed as an Integrated Management Area. Places like the Peel are too unique globally to be allowed to be developed in that way. The issue of outstanding claims within the watershed should be resolved without allowing for mineral extraction in the watershed.

I do not support existing or new industrial activities in the Integrated Management Areas. I do not want to see 20% of the Peel Watershed excluded from protection.

I do not support ANY development in the peel watershed. No claim staking should be allowed. This area needs to be kept pristine for all future generations and our overall health and wellbeing.

I do not support any aspects of the Recommended Plan as stated. A lack of surface road access effectively negates any potential for a mineral deposit to be placed into production, and effectively sterilizes the land from development.

I do not support the Integrated Management Areas. I believe that these areas should, at a minimum, be given SMA designations. First, I believe in protecting the entire watershed and that would also entail these areas currently planned for IMA designation. I do not believe that mining and industrial use in any part of the watershed can ever be done in a manner so as to completely guarantee that there would be no effect on the wildlife or water. Keeping the entire watershed as intact as possible is of utmost importance for me. Additionally, some of these IMA's are in the porcupine caribou herd habitat. Given the current uncertainty of the caribou population's status and the unknown effects of climate change, I believe it is prudent and necessary to leave any area they need now, or may need in the future, as completely untouched by exploration, mining or other industrial activity as possible. Furthermore, I do not support recognizing the right to exploration of the existing mining claims within the SMAs, especially for those staked during the post-2004 rush. Exploration, so far, has not left the Peel Watershed as untouched as we might hope. Exploration has left its mark both physically, with abandoned camps, fuel barrels and contamination, and also psychologically in the minds of visitors that have endured near-constant overflights by exploration aircraft.

at any time NO MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT on this land . Limited ACCESS by Air with restriction . THIS SHOULD BE A RESERVE FAUNIQUE ALL THE WAY.

I do not support the removal of the consideration of cumulative effects since the Draft Plan; while this is a complex issue, it needs to be dealt with at some point and we have seen the buck continually passed on cumulative effects through a variety of levels of planning and assessment. I think existing mineral claim owners should be compensated instead of allowed continued access and development rights within SMA's. The allowance for development of existing claims runs contrary to the intent of the plan to allow 'sustainable development' as defined in the UFA.

The process for allowing existing mineral claims in SMAs to continue, without expansion and without ground access, is a convoluted way to find a compromise between the legal obligation of government to existing claim holders and the necessary conservation agenda of the Plan. Other jurisdictions have dealt with this by compensating the mineral industry for lost claims, - a well publicized and well-known process. It seems logical that this Plan should make a similar recommendation, but it is not discussed. This is a weakness of the Plan

I do not support 80% being withdrawn from exploration. I continue to feel that if you want to close the area to industry then it should be closed to everyone as an equitable solution. This means no eco-tourism and no industry, tourism or groups of any sort. First Nations would be allowed to hunt, fish and use the land in a traditional manner but no joint venture relationships for the purpose of making money. What is good for one is good for all - we are a democracy and people are entitled to make a living - to give ecotourism access and not exploration or prospectors is wrong. It is clearly biased.

There is no reason to be specific on this matter. That is because I do not support any of the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan. There is vast potential for mining and exploration in the Peel Watershed and to exclude it from any development is reckless. There is the potential for this area to support a large number of high paying jobs within the territory in the future. To exclude the region to industry yet provide access to other user groups is simply wrong. I also think that it is a joke for the commission to even suggest that airships would be a viable resource transportation method in the future. This unbalanced land use plan sets a precedent for other plans in the future.

I do not support the removal of 20% of the Peel Watershed from protected status.

none

I do not support any parts which allows for roads and industrial activities. The Peel is our last chance of large scale protection of a truly magnificent area.

I don't support mineral and resource extraction from the Peel. This would require roads which would forever alter the character of the Region. I don't trust the Government or industry to keep the environmental impact to a minimum in any part of the Yukon, never mind the Peel. Environmental regulations are always up for negotiation, unfortunately.

I do not support the development of any roads, winter and/or summer, which would support industrial development in the Peel Watershed. I feel that the development of roads would create a difficult situation to effectively protect the watershed (habitat, fauna and flora diversity).

I do not support the recommendation of 20% in the Peel plateau and other areas for extractive industrial development. I am also extremely hesitant to support any further exploration in the whole planning region as this will only allow the "death by a thousand (small) knives". The impacts of exploration are already quite large - witness the Caribou Creek mess, Crest Iron Ore deposit waste cleanup (yet to be completed after 40 years) and the materials, fuel and camp debris that other companies exploring have left in their exploration areas over the 80 years. Even some the new exploration camps, drill sites, and infrastructure will likely be abandoned, notwithstanding the clauses in their permits requiring clean up.

I do not support any of the recommended Peel Watershed Land Use Plan. I don't think there is any way to develop this area without having a permanent negative effect on the environment. Why can't we just leave this area alone? I think the short-term gains (\$) are not worth the long-term environmental issues this Plan would cause.

I do not support the IMAs. I believe those areas need the same protection as the SMAs, especially in the Northern part #5 where they are in the wilderness away from the the access rd, the Dempster.

None

I do not support the removal of 20% of the Peel watershed from protected status. I do not think that the plan should be amended to allow for road access.

I do not support allowing 20% of the watershed being an integrated management zone. I think that 20% should be protected.

80% protection is not good enough. Please listen to the people and protect this watershed 100%

I do not support any industrial uses, including ongoing work of current mineral/gas claims. I do not support any road development.

We do not support the recommendaiton to leave 20 per cent of the watershed open for industrial development. We do not support allowing the mineral claims, iron leases, coal permits and oil/gas dispositions to remain in the protected areas. Even without new roads, work on these parcels could have a huge impact on the land, the water, the wildlife and other users.

None.

anything that allows the exploitation of any existing claims that were filled after the planning commission started its work, anyone who filed them was just trying to do a land grab so to speak. all claims filed after the start of the commission should be allowed to expire and no new claims should be allowed in the peel region. All Claims from before ~1600 of them should be released over an extended period of time. I feel that

I do not support the removal of 20% of the Peel watershed from protected status at all. There should be no road access to existing claims or any in the future. No motorized use on the land. I also feel that Wilderness Tourism activities need to be managed and monitored so that this area is not "loved to death" resulting in negative human impacts on the landscape over time.

I think the Blackstone river should also be part of the Special Management Area. It's a beautiful wilderness trip where you don't have to fly in and walking up the Oglivie is part of the adventure. It's a wilderness trip that is very economical and has no whitewater so many people can use this river for recreation.

I do not support the Intergrated Management Areas. Especially IMA 1,3,4, and 5. I wonder what mitigation can be done in a SMA that would protect it from the bi-product of industrial activity up river. When preserving a watershed, it only makes sense to also protect the head waters. I do not support the Lower Ogilvie River, The Blackstone River, the Dalglish Plains and the Peel Plateau IMA designations. These should be re-designated as SMAs.

I do not support the view that the Peel Watershed Planning Commission is an impartial body representing all Yukoners. The Commission is solely representing the views of northern First Nations and private user groups.

My only concern is with the areas that would remain open to development, access roads and/or motorized recreation under the Commission's Recommended Plan, contrary to the clearly expressed and deeply held views of Yukoners generally and in particular of the First Nations whose traditional land this is. I am also concerned about the potential for Off-road Recreational Vehicle use and thus damage of the area, which may not be adequately addressed by the Plan.

100% PROTECTION

Inside Canada = 15

I do not support oil and gas development or mineral development in the watershed. I do not support the development of new roads near the Dempster highway. I do not support any major developments in the region.

I may have already commented on this in question one. The 20% unprotected area should be reduced to 0%. To repeat my view from question one: We have many examples of reaching a compromise between the forces of environmental protection and development. They almost always work out to be short term profits for developers and long-term damage to the environment. The cleanest methods ever devised for mining and other extractive industries still leave lasting scars on the earth long after they take their decade or two of profits then leave. If there were some dire need for the natural resources located there, then maybe a case for compromise for compromise could be made. However, a few jobs and minor economic gains do not justify any road development or extractive development. And finally, the First Nations people who live there don't want the development. For once, it would be nice to actually treat their wishes seriously, especially since it will also profit us long-term by preserving a true wilderness area - something almost non-existent today.

I believe there should be 100% protection of the Peel watershed, not just the 80% now being proposed.

I do not support industrial development in any part of the Peel Watershed.

Each and every one that wants to destroy even an inch of it.

I do not support any development in the Peel Watershed and believe that all uses including wilderness tourism should be very limited and regulated carefully, erring on the side of caution.

The proposal that only 80% of the Peel Watershed be protected.

I do not support roads and industrial development, mining or oil and gas activity.

I support the First Nations Peoples request that not only 80% of the watershed is protected but all of it (100%)

I am opposed to any industrial development in the Peel Watershed. I believe that "sustainable development" will only result in the eventual destruction of the entire ecosystem. Caribou, grizzlies and other wildlife need intact wilderness. I also believe that the entire Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized.

I don't support the idea of protecting only 80% of the Peel watershed. I support the First Nations peoples' recommendation that 100% of the Peel watershed be protected from development, including roads and industrial uses.

I do not support the concept of Integrated Management Units. The language is loose and nonspecific. I fail to understand how exploration of mineral / oil and gas resources would not eventually result in development of lands, including roads. In development of any land use plan, we must think into the future. In its current state, the plan does not incorporate adequate current and future protection of the Peel Watershed.

I do not support any of it at all, our land is pure, a gift and more importantly it is ours! 20% is alot, can you imagine what this can do to our animals and plants? Mother Nature is dying slowly and the people to blame is the government and all the oil and gas industries, their killing her, and we are also to blame for letting it happen. \we cant have NO DEVELOPMENT on our land, our land that is untouched by the government and only touched by our people, our people lay there resting, life was concieved and born there. The land is to great for industry to ruin our history!!!

I support the First Nations in their call for 100% protection of the Peel Watershed. I do not believe that 80% is nearly enough.

I do not believe any of the watershed should be developed for profit. The people that live there and know the area best, like the First Nations people, should have the strongest voice regarding use of the area.

Outside Canada = 8

As I was saying, I only support 100% protection of the whole area

I do not support ANY development in the peel watershed. This area needs to be kept pristine for all future generations.

I do not support any development in the area. Some areas of the planet should be preserved for the good of all the creatures who depend on a healthy environment. I'm sure developers can find ample areas that already have roads and other development. To target a wild and prestine area seems greedy and irresponsible.

20% of the Peel left available for development/ unprotected - this needs to be reduced to 0%, i.e. 100% should be protected. Otherwise the ecosystem/ watershed is not intact and its value as pristine wilderness is lost, and the health & well being of the local fish & wildlife will be threatened. There should be no mineral, oil, gas or other resource exploration or extraction, nor other industrial development within the Peel watershed. I do not support any claim staking, exploration or development while the planning process is underway - any claims that were filed after the planning commision started should be allowed to expire without allowing any exploitation of said claim. And pre-existing claims should be 'bought out' with compensation to claim owners.

Oppose: Any industrial activity, including road building, in the remaining natural areas.

i do not think roads and industrial development are compatible with protection

I do not support closing more of the Yukon T. to mineral claim staking. I do not support closure of the area to surface access. I do not support non-compensation for existing rights holders if the plan is enacted as recommended. I do not support a moratorium on uranium mining activities. I do not support restricting the permitting of new airstrips. I do not support closing the Wind River Trail as a legally existing right-of-way.

I do not support the part that allows any company or person in with the intent of creating development of any kind or removing the resources for profit. The government has been allowed too many times to make promises that aren't kept. I've seen the destruction searching for oil in Alberta. Keep out! It always sounds good in theory, but never turns out the way you say it should. You are wanting to dig into the heart of Canada. 100% protection! Nothing else will work. If you provide 100% protection, then you can guarantee that nothing will get damaged because there will be nothing allowed there to damage it.

What parts of the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan do you support? Please be specific.

Inside Yukon = 51

The area for protection is too large. Cut back by 60%

I support that no roads should be allowed in the Special Management Area. I support protection of the Peel Watershed, however, I am in favor of 100% protection. I support traditional use of the watershed by the First Nations concerned.

I support protection of the watershed. It is such a unique area on our planet, a great big ecosystem hardly touched by people. Think what a great opportunity it will be for people to travel to this area 200 years from now, if we preserve it as is.

no development in any of the area, I recently had the opportunity to spend a weekend at heart lake, it as absolutely breath taking. If any development takes place it will no longer be a peaceful and calming place. It need to remain as is.

I support a minimum development in the watershed and a maximum of conservation (at least 80%). Permitted staking, exploration and development within the Peel Watershed while this process is being completed totally undermines the effort and value of the planning commission process. These activities need to stop. I applaud and support Chief Taylor and Chief Mervyn for having the foresight to protect and conserve this area. The Yukon Government and industry representatives cannot overlook the intent made by the local Peel Watershed self governing First Nations. For the future and well being of the Yukon, Canada and the World, The Peel Watershed needs protection!

I support the emphasis on setting aside the majority of the watershed as SMAs although I would prefer to see the entire watershed set aside as SMAs, with no IMAs.

I support 100% protection.

I fully endorse the recommendations of the Peel Land Use Planning Commission. I concur with protecting the 80% of the watershed, as indicated in the plan.

I support the First Nations' recommendations for 100% of the entire 68,000 square kilometre Peel Watershed to be protected.

100% protection from development (including any roads) for this magnificent watershed.

None, at this time, when considered as a whole. The planning process exhibits symptoms of Stockholm Syndrome--taking on the agenda of your captor, even if this implies your annihilation. Unfortunately, the recommended plan does not envision any "protection" or re-zoning to avert the reckless endangerment to our prosperity, social/economic inclusion, and future for wildlife/wilderness protection implied by its recommendations. It has only ever been human affluence (sometimes at the expense of its own, most vulnerable, members) that enabled, amongst other things, understanding and preserving of wildlife & wilderness. By all means, for governments in a protective mood, consider this an endorsement to protect all the knowledge industries (traditional-geoscience-biology-archeology) and extractive industries associated with high productivity/low ecological footprint (mining, oil & gas, some local tourism--depends on carbon footprint). Most importantly, though, this submission is likely best viewed as a vigil rather than input, endorsement or "view". While there is no scenery along the way, devices of rhetoric are employed to provoke much-warranted thought when considering the potential permanent alienation of future scientific knowledge and highly-productive resource use in an area 77,000 square kilometers in a jurisdiction where residents rely on \$22,000 worth of transfer payments from Canadian taxpayers every year simply for the privilege of being here.

Decision-makers: We have rarely been so sorely in need of leadership to extricate us from this environmental NGO-capture (not all NGOs fit this profile), but there are a number who exhibit little respect for First Nation and other fellow Canadians, and who stake their claim in Chapter 11 planning processes and their equivalent. Those who do so squander their credibility for they seek to manipulate us (treating us as their dupes) to their unimaginative ends. They assume, in fact assert, that they are the ones with the answer to all our ills: withdraw, withdraw, withdraw. Take 25% in the morning, 25% at noon, 50% at night. "Aw, really? We were only asking for 80%, but we cannot, in all good conscience, not lend our voice to 100%! It would be unethical and disloyal. (Stage direction: Look differentially at person in the audience who appears to be of aboriginal ancestry.)" Such behaviour is manipulative of First Nations members (mining us with 19th century romantic philosophy as noble savages). It preys on our guardian sentiments, particularly our fears (assuming the self appointed "protectors" are free to enter, mine and market our innermost apprehensions for our children's and grandchildren's prospects--after all, we're not stupid. We know that earth's population growing from 7 to 9 billion before it reverses, and how we handle this reality, will define whether or not our children die of old age; in war; famine; catastrophe or as cast-offs--those who could not keep up with the voracious appetites of the privileged few insisting on their rights to have "my-pristine-wilderness-experience-while-THEY-eat-organic-cake-in their gang-run, chagas-ridden huts". And after all, we have seen not only our future prospects squandered, but we have the immediate experience of having our very children taken from us, so we have a visceral reaction when the stakes are put before us in this way.) The "protectors" consolidate their power by exploiting our connections to and love of nature and wilderness--supposedly in need of "protecting", by casting aspersions of some imaginary assault. After all, what is the presumed assault we are all called to protect against in the Peel? This is not set out in the plan which has taken as its purpose to "protect" against some undefinable evil that can be summed up as "exploration and development". BINGO! Secular eco-fundamentalism has its original sin. There is a net transfer of wealth implied in the recommendations of the plan. Our children get fewer tools and choices with which to manage bigger challenges. Frankly, if this is the will of the people, then the market will demonstrate it by putting up the resources to "retire" prospective scientific research and entire classes of extraction from the economy, as well as compensating our ancestors for what we now consider to be their misplaced investments. The Nature Conservancy developed this business model and has exercised its market power in this way for over 30 years. Now, they haven't arrived to the ranks of Fortune 500 but they have provided the means for this generation to invest in this particular vision for future generations.

But let's be frank, in the Yukon where practically everything is First Nation or Crown land/resource/decision, it is easier to take control of the democratic levers wherever possible and withdraw, withdraw, withdraw. It is not hard to do. For the most part we want to trust someone to give us the "right" answer. And what motive could non-profits possibly have? Our world today knows two forms of power: money and public opinion--the latter implies control over decisions and prospects. The former implies control over...prospects and decisions. Honey, can I please get some sleep now? I am tired! Honey, just call Spawcs....What do you mean "Spawcs who"? You know, Spawcs. No, not pointy ears Spawcs. You are such a Trekkie in a Zack and Coady world! No wonder the kids can't talk to you! Spawcs, Services to Protect All Weary Citizens. They are listed in Whitehorse, not Watson Lake, silly. It's an international service, not some mom-and-pop thingy. Whitehorse: Spawcs. You know, see whether they have someone who could park the laundry, cast the kids, indoctrinate the car, and hang my vote out to dry. Being insulated from the consequences of our decisions is utterly exhausting! Besides, I have pilates at 6:30 am. How could you forget, it's on the electronic calendar. I need my sleep. What? Oh honey, just call Spawcs--it's on autodial. They know what to do. You don't need to be in control of this--just call them. And bring me my chamomile tea, would you?"

The price of democracy is eternal vigilance. We have been offered the opportunity to provide our views on the proposed Peel Watershed draft land use plan. Sadly, I cannot assert

this submission amounts to views, as there isn't much scenery available--at best it might be considered a vigil. All the same, I hope this vigil will be worth your consideration. To the extent these observations have deviated from the parameters of land use planning, it is merely a reflection that the whole process has been taken hostage by an external agenda, which demands a broader response, lest there be some notion of trying to locate a decision in the average range. For those of us who love numbers, it is well known that the "average" is completely distorted when you have a deviant extreme or extremes, which is not to suggest that I find the debate on this issue to be polarized between two extremes. There is no polarization in a hostage taking. One side has control and sets the terms of any discourse. Government: Yukon, Canada & First Nations: Please show your respect for us and understand that Yukoners are, together, capable of rising to the challenge of living sustainably in a world that holds great demands for us and at least two generations to come. We are not dupes, we are partners. Encourage you to thank the council members for their time and quiet knocking of teeth these many months, and leave us with a heavy doorstop, eventually to be recycled, but not an unbearable legacy. Thanks but no thanks is the only acceptable response to the recommended "plan" to eviscerate our democracy, culture, society, economy, environment and decision-making toolbox for this and coming generations.

Having read the recommended Plan, it is very well done. Specifically the IMAs and SMAs as shown in the recommended Plan make sense. My belief is that legitimate planning considerations were used to identify a balance of the highest and best economic and social uses of these lands. Knowledge gathered in the planning process appears to have been reviewed carefully. The review has produced recommendations which are wise choices for sustainable use. It provides the best options for the future. I support the plan's recommendations. One last comment; the public battle between industrial interests and their lobbyists and the go slow and no development interests and their lobbyists represents a fringe on each side of the public discussion in my opinion. Each wants the plan's recommendations changed to suit more narrow beliefs. Each side claims that the plan's recommendations are very flawed, are not supportable, and they want more land set aside or available to their beliefs. Unfortunately their positions would be exactly the same regardless of the plan recommendations. It would be, 'give us more land'. It is their inherent viewpoints that are flawed, not the Plan's recommendations. Thank you for your excellent work.

I am generally supportive of the Plan, but would prefer to see 100% protection for this area.

I support a minimum of 80% of the Peel Watershed to be protected from industrial development.

I support the government in NOT compensating the existing claims in the Peel watershed. I support designating the Wind River trail as not being an existing route. I support the work done by the commission in attempting to protect 80% of the watershed, but I would like to see the Yukon government accept the First Nations' recommendations of protecting 100% of the entire 68,000 km watershed.

I believe that all of the Peel Watershed should be protected. We have the opportunity to save this important wilderness from the disruption and destruction that industry will inevitably bring. This is a chance to join with First Nations in standing up for the waterways, the fish that live in them, the animals, plants and all that sustains this special area. Let us not betray future generations with our greed and short sightedness.

I do not agree with any of the recommendations of the Peel Land Use Plan. This entire planning exercise has been a complete waste of Canadian tax payer's dollars. To remove this 68,000 square kilometers from any future development is ludicrous. We do have competent regulators in this country that are more than capable of reviewing any developments on a case by case basis rather than shutting down 14% of the Yukon for business. Harry Lebedoff Whitehorse

NO DEVELOPMENT WHAT SO EVER. THIS PRISTINE WILDERNESS AREA NEEDS TO BE LEFT AS IS!!!!

I support 100% protection of the Peel Watershed. I am significantly concerned with the potential for mining exploration and development to create unforeseen, large scale damage to the water quality, which supports a huge area of Yukon habitat, including areas outside of the Peel Watershed.

Without having been in the region, I trust that the LMU and more specifically the SMA have been selected with the knowledge of the people who have lived, been raised up and travelled the area. I support the SMA

The Peel Watershed Planning Commission has undertaken a huge task but they do not go far enough. I support the First Nations call for 100% protection of the Peel Watershed. This area is incompatible with any mining or oil or gas exploration or other industrial development. The explosion of mining claims since the process began speaks volumes to the greed of corporations and the ongoing support of short term non-renewable resource development that the current Yukon Government courts. The moratorium on further staking must be extended. Hopefully the costs of mineral extraction by air will be prohibitive to further development.

I support complete protection of the Peel watershed

I support the majority of the recommendations in the plan. In particular the conservation objectives, the creation of SMAs and the restrictions to access and mineral staking in certain areas.

I support the Recommended Plan as a whole. It is obvious that the Commission spent a great deal of time and effort learning about the region in question, identifying different distinct ecoregions/planning areas within the watershed, and weighing the value of the land in each case as unspoiled wilderness vs. as a source of mineral deposits. Why second guess this work? My only concern is with the areas that would remain open to development under the Commission's Recommended Plan, contrary to the clearly expressed and deeply held views of the First Nations whose traditional land this is. The government should seriously consider protecting 100% of this area. The Peel Watershed is hugely valuable to future generations in its current relatively unscathed state. There are few such large tracts of undeveloped wilderness with high wilderness tourism potential left in the world. Please keep it that way.

I support the plan of protecting at least 80% of the Peel Watershed, but this does not go far enough; the entire watershed must be protected. In the last thirty years we have seen how overuse has destroyed the cod fishery off the east coast and, indeed, most of the major fisheries of the world. We have also seen the eradication of nearly all the old growth forests on the west coast. In the last 100 years we eliminated the bison from the prairies and the passenger pigeons from the skies. Such a large area of untouched wilderness, the Peel River watershed, is unique in the world and we owe it to ourselves and future generations to preserve it as wild and untouched as it is. When bison were plentiful we wiped them out for little more than their tongues and in a short while we had eliminated all but a very few of them. Whole ecosystems were changed, the way of life of first nations peoples were destroyed and we are all the poorer for it. Likewise, the destruction of the cod destroyed a way of life for the people of the east coast. We are rapidly approaching that point with respect to untouched wilderness; there is very little unspoiled wilderness on this planet of this size, remoteness, and uniqueness. This is the last huge herd of bison, the last school of cod, the last flock passenger pigeons. We cannot allow it to be destroyed too.

I support nearly all components of the Recommended Plan, including the strong conservation emphasis, the land use zoning and designation scheme, and the strong restrictions on mineral and oil and gas developments (wilderness conservation is incompatible with mineral development).

%100 protection.

As a resident of Yukon, I want to see the YTG protect this area from any development for at least 100 years. The commission's work is more than I have time to review right now, and I don't want to be specific as the questions on this website ask because the Peel watershed needs to be protected in its entirety! Protect it! It is better to leave it and if in 100 years it proves to have been not the best choice for the planet and persons on it, then review it. In my opinion, to date the government of the day in Yukon has not grasped the concept that there is much more than short term economic gain at stake here. A moratorium needed to be placed on staking in this area years ago. It is another short sighted move of this government to have allowed the staking to continue. How could the resulting staking frenzy not be interpreted as a money grab? Protect the Peel watershed in its entirety. No, not every area of the Yukon, but definitely this area.

I am in full agreement with First Nations and other groups that call for 100% protection of the Peel Watershed. Such a rare and wild area that is entrusted to our decision making calls for careful, thoughtful, sensitive and responsible choices for the well being of this place and all who live there. With countless examples of such places, peoples and living things that have disappeared so rapidly and irreversibly around the world, I believe it is our full responsibility to ensure that the Peel Watershed remains intact and pristine.

I strongly support the protection provided in the SMA Land Use designation. This LU designation provides emphasis on Fish and Wildlife, Watershed Management, Heritage and Protection. This is critical for the Peel Watershed to maintain its ecological and socio-economical integrity. I strongly support that the plan recognizes that there are many different non-mineral values in the Peel Watershed and that ALL are important to preserve.

We support the emphasis on protection in the Peel. Although we are pleased to see 80 per cent recommended for protection, we think it should be 100 per cent. We totally support the recommendation that no more roads be allowed and that the Wind River Trail be stripped of its status as a guaranteed right-of-way. We also think the existing mineral claims, iron leases, coal permits and oil/gas dispositions should be extinguished.

I agree with the First Nations in 100% protection of the Peel Watershed. It is such a beautiful, wild and amazing place that it should be left alone. This area will be worth more to the Yukon if it stays pristine.

I support 100% protection of the Peel Watershed. We as a society have been very poor guardians of our planet. We have an opportunity to protect an entire watershed and be leaders in responsible management of our lands. I am not anti-industrial development, however I feel that there are places that should have 100% protection while we allow development to occur in other areas. This allows for certainty as industry knows which areas are available for resource extraction and which are not. We have an opportunity to show foresight and speak out for those that do not have a voice in the process (animals, plants...). humans have damaged many entire ecosystems leaving the plants, animals and human inhabitants to suffer. The area should have been withdrawn from staking during the planning process as the end result was a staking frenzy in areas that are not even economically feasible for industrial use. There are not many remaining large tracts of "wilderness" or intact ecosystems left. Let the Peel watershed be one of them.

I support all parts that are pro protection

I support those SMAs that do not allow roads and have land withdrawals

I do not support any of it. We have done quite alright, in My opinion, without a land plan all these years. Let the land be open to all as it has been. If you choose to select certain areas and not allow any development, or activity you choke off man and his ability to grow and expand his knowledge. The earth in My opinion is one huge living organism. All ecosystems work together. All as one. Not in small little pockets. When North America was under glaciation, I would assume no lived on the ice. But now we have climate change which gave us a place to live and die. It still can be this way, or should I say is this way. What You are saying in the land plan is that it is to be what You have written. I say let the land be as it is. Let those who want to use it, use it. Those that do not want to do not have to. The earth has taken care of itself all these years. But that does not mean we leave out common sense. If there is a better way to mine, than it should be done. If there is a better way operate a tour operation than do it. Now a final few words. We have common sense. Let this prevail, instead of laws. Don Hrehirchek

Leave it alone!!

I agree with our Yukon First Nations, the Peel Watershed needs to be 100% protected.

I specifically do not support a single portion of the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan.

I support 100 percent protection of the Peel Watershed, with no road development and no resource extraction industries. Anything less would be unacceptable in protecting this unique Yukon ecosystem that will continue to attract world wide visitors to the Yukon for generations to come.

1. proposed division of the planning region into SMAs and IMAs
2. subregional plan for the Dempster
3. declassification of the Wind River Trail
4. comprehensive water management plan - special attention to Ogilvie and Blackstone
5. goals of the plan as stated on page 1-7

I support the protection of the Peel watershed from industrial development: no roads and no extraction of mineral resources. I would like to see 100% protection against development for the entire watershed. Let us pass on some small part of the Earth in pristine conditions to future generations and allow them a say in the future of this land.

I support the protection measures the plan lays out. This is a unique area whose value is still to be fully revealed. Our kids and grandkids will profit from this area in the future if the area is protected now.

I support the precautionary principles of the plan, the democratic reflection of stakeholders in the plan, the strong values of ecological integrity and sustainability of economic activities. I support the view that acceptable human activities must fall within the ecological sphere of the Venn diagram. I support all protection proposed in the plan.

I support the Recommendation of 80% protection in the Peel Watershed in Special Management areas as a minimum level of protection. I feel that the First Nations' call for 100% protection is the ideal outcome and one that I would support.

I support the focus on protection in this plan, and believe it could go further. While I understand the desire for economic opportunities I do not think these need to be linked only to mineral activities, and I do not think mining can ever be a 'sustainable' development. I support the efforts of the the commission to seek all views, and the focus on First Nations activities within the area and their perspectives. I support the assumption that the wilderness character of the area is essential to the majority of renewable resource development opportunities and believe this should entail more protection for the region. Mineral wealth provides a short-term, one-time gain for a small number of people, often non-residents; with clean-up often left for local governments to manage. I therefore support the high level of proposed protection and believe it should increase.

The plan calls for 80% protection. Now it appears that some of the affected FN governments are calling for 100% protection - I fully support this position.

I support the parts which offer maximum protection of the land and they should be extended to the entire region. 100% protection of the Peel, nothing less will do in the long run.

I support the Peel Watershed Regional Land Use plan in general. If anything, I would like to see 100% of the watershed protected from industrial development.

I support traditional uses of the Peel by the First Nations for whom it is a part of their traditional Territory. I support responsible tourism where impact to the environment is minimal. Hiking and canoeing can be accommodated but not ATV's and the like.

I originally supported the recommended plan fully, but I have been convinced by the First Nations affected that 100% protection from industrial development and the supporting infrastructure is the only way to ensure the 'conservative' and precautionary principals are upheld. First Nations citizens and the resources in their traditional areas have already been insulted by " industrial development" ie exploration infrastructure and debris at Caribou Creek, and the Crest Deposit, tote roads and trails in the Hart and Wind and Bonnet Plume valley over traplines, and hunting areas. Even though we all should be outraged as Yukon citizens that some companies (and of course the people who work for these companies) allow environmental degradation, First Nations citizens have, and will feel the direct impacts if there is, say, waste stream from a uranium deposit, an oil pipeline break or any other disaster affecting the water or lands. Despite the best currently available environmental engineering, spills and other disasters do occur very regularly in mining and oil and gas industries. To protect the Peel watershed it has to be done completely.

Inside Canada = 23

I am in favour of large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development.

I support the idea of protecting the Peel watershed from development, including roads and industries.

In favour of large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development. I support the First Nations in their call for 100% protection. I value the well-being of fish and wildlife and believe they depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed and I want it to remain this way. I agree with the Commission's perspective that managing the Peel watershed in accordance with the vision of sustainable development outlined in the UFA is fundamental to the plan. I think all of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized.

I would support 80% protection if that is all that is possible, but 100% protection should be the goal. We have many examples of reaching a compromise between the forces of environmental protection and development. They almost always work out to be short term profits for developers and long-term damage to the environment. The cleanest methods ever devised for mining and other extractive industries still leave lasting scars on the earth long after they take their decade or two of profits then leave. If there were some dire need for the natural resources located there, then maybe a case for compromise for compromise could be made. However, a few jobs and minor economic gains do not justify any road development or extractive development. And finally, the First Nations people who live there don't want the development. For once, it would be nice to actually treat their wishes seriously, especially since it will also profit us long-term by preserving a true wilderness area - something almost non-existent today.

I support 100% protection of the Peel Watershed and do not support the proposed land use plan.

I support the protection of the whole Peel Watershed and believe the area should be left alone.

No development whatsoever. The land should be free of all mining, oil and gas industries. Also these deposits are Canadian and should be held in reserve for future generations whereas they might develop better techniques of extraction.

I support protection of the Peel watershed against industrial activity.

The Peel Watershed needs to be 100% protected from all industrial development. There are not many areas left in Canada that haven't been touched by industry. Let's protect the Peel.

I am in favour of 100% protection of the Peel watershed. There should be no gas, mining or oil development now or in the future.

i support saving the peel river water shed %100, this is our land and we dont need another government telling us what to do, they damaged us the dont need them to damage more! talk abt salt on a wound! havent they taken enough, this is pure land, only touched by our ancestors and our elders! as gwichin people it would damage our way of life and our spiritual beings will not be.

I am in favour of large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development.

None. The Yukon already has 14.5% of its territory removed from the mineral land base. Without modification, this plan will increase that to 25.8%. Mining brings high-paying jobs and tax revenues with a relatively small environmental footprint. Exploration, which causes negligible environmental impact, needs a large landbase to focus down to where an economic deposit could lie hidden. Exploration has been done in the Peel for 60 years and it is still pristine - why not let it carry on and still be pristine. And if an economic deposit is found, Yukon has the environmental review processes in place to determine whether it can become a mine responsibly or not.

I am in favor of 100% Protection of the Peel Watershed.

I support full protection of the entire Peel Watershed. This means no mining or oil or gas exploration or extraction anywhere in the watershed, regardless of previous mineral claims.

The protection of the watershed and that there shall be no surface access allowed except in the Dempster Highway corridor.

The Peel River Watershed.

I support the creation of protected areas. I support keeping the land road free. I support banning new mineral claims in the area. I support the strong focus on protection, and the goal of sustaining social and ecological systems over the long term.

I support complete protection of the Peel Watershed from any road building, exploration for mining, gas or oil, industrial development. This is an intact wilderness ecosystem and needs to remain that way.

I am in favor of 100% protection of the Peel watershed with no industrial development and no roads other than the Dempster Highway and any roads deemed appropriate for its protection.

I support 100% protection of the Peel Watershed with no mining, roads or industrial development whatsoever. I support the First Nations call for 100% protection. There are few large areas of pristine wilderness remaining on this planet--the Peel Watershed is a valuable resource as is, undisturbed.

Your question seems to limit the range of response. In order to "be specific" as you request I have to be able to quote chapter and verse from a huge document that is read, I imagine, in large part by people who are paid to read it, in lesser part by people whose livelihood it will affect, and by some interested individuals with the necessary skills who are able to make the time. I am not one of those who can "be specific", and I imagine that allows you to dismiss my comments as peripheral to your mandate, if you wish. I hope I'm wrong, because I'm going to repeat what everyone else in this forum has said so far in one way or another: do not fulfill your mandate. You say "The objective of regional land use planning is to provide guidance for the integrated management of lands and resources in order to ensure sustainable development and sound environmental stewardship while minimizing land use conflicts." I say: We have proven time and again - locally and globally - that we can not foresee all the consequences of our attempts to manage lands and resources. On a purely financial basis here in the Yukon the taxpayers of Canada are footing the bill for over a half a billion dollars in on-going charges for the Faro mine, BYG, Clinton Creek, to mention a few of the more recent failures of miners to clean up after themselves. That is only the financial side of things. The environmental costs are still to be determined. We have demonstrated that we cannot, despite our best intentions, guarantee that we can "ensure sustainable development and sound environmental stewardship". That puts you in an uncomfortable position, I think, given that this is one of the last vast tracts of relatively untouched wilderness on the planet. You can carry on inserting the thin edge of the development wedge into this area, as though we haven't learned anything from our past mistakes, or you can protect this unique area.

I believe that the Peel Watershed deserves to be protected 100%. We already have a resource that is precious and envied by the world: pristine wilderness is at a premium. Let's keep this resource safe and develop it as an ecotourism destination. These natural wilderness areas will be more and more in demand as other areas become more developed. Then we will always have it for the future unchanged.

Outside Canada = 14

100% protection. With all that has been developed, it gives people comfort to know there are places like the Peel Region that are still wilderness. To destroy this area with roads and development would be a shame. I would like to visit the Peel someday, but not if it has nothing to offer except more development.

I support large scale (100%) protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development that disturb environment. I want to ensure well-being of fish and wildlife which depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed. The vision of sustainable development is important to follow. Furthermore, I support a withdrawal from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized.

There should be no development of the whole Peel watershed. No mining, mineral exploitation, oil exploration, road building etc should be allowed. The only human use allowed should be traditional First Nation activities and responsible low-impact non-commercial tourism such as hiking and canoeing.

Support: Protection of the environment from industrial activities.

I also support the protection of the entire area. You Canadians should be proud of this amazing piece of nature that is left there!!!! having spent 3 weeks with a group of young people in Canada I am pretty sure that this is one of the most valuable landscapes in the world- but not if it is going to be destroyed. Therefore I think 100% should be saved.

I support & applaud the protection of at least 80% of the entire Peel Watershed - however I feel this needs to be expanded to a full 100% protection as the First Nations leaders have called for. Roads & industrial development are incompatible with watershed ecosystem protection especially in such a unique & pristine wilderness area as the Peel. The remote, diverse & undeveloped nature of the area is part of its inherent value - to the local flora & fauna, to the First Nations & what remains of their traditional way of life, to Canadians who take pride in the fact that we still have some wilderness left, & to countless millions of other around the world who continue to travel to Canada to see our 'wilderness'.

It is important that we don't left alone The Peel Watershed. It must not use for industry and oil production

I support traditional uses of the Peel by the First Nations for whom it is a part of their traditional Territory. I support responsible tourism where impact to the environment is minimal. Hiking and canoeing can be accommodated but not ATV's and the like. The whole region should be protected. It is unique...

I am a student from Germany - I was in this area in line with a conservation expedition in year 2008. So I saw this beautiful landscape and intact nature. This was a very impressive experience for me. Therefore I hope that this land will be free of mining and other industries - 100%! This untouched nature is an important present for Canada and the whole world.

THAT AT LEAST 80% OF THE WATERSHED BE PROTECTED WITH NO SURFACE ACCESS BE ALLOWED.

you are in favour of large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development. you support the First Nations in their call for 100% protection. you value the well-being of fish and wildlife and believe they depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed and you want it to remain this way. you think all of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity until the plan is finalized.

I am in favor of large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development.

I support discussions about planning and the process.

this breathe-taking wilderness in the Peel Watershed must be preserved! In my eyes, there is no single part, the whole Watershed must be seen as one part and has to be protected.

Surface Access in the Region

Are there areas that should remain roadless? If so, where?

Inside Yukon = 34

All of them. Having lived in the Hart River for years, I have seen the damage inflicted on terrain/animal populations by even a winter road.

All of them.

yes, everywhere

All areas within the entire Peel Watershed should remain roadless. Additional fragmentation of habitat should be avoided at all costs. Exploration and mining roads will lead to increased disturbances by recreational vehicles leading to further wildlife disturbance.

There are probably some existing trails and that should be enough unless areas were turned into Heritage or Parks. Then the First Nation should be consulted about what rd system they want on their traditional territory

The entire watershed

Yes, Snake river, Bonnett Plume, Wind. Hart and Blackstone should be roadless.

Everywhere should remain roadless.

There should be no roads anywhere in the Peel Planning Region

The best way to protect an area is to keep it roadless. It is the roadless aspect of the watershed that makes it so valuable. The Dempster is all the access that is needed, and should not be expanded under any circumstances.

all areas

Yes. The entire watershed.

All of them

The rest of the Peel should remain roadless.

Apart from the Demster Hwy, the entire watershed should remain roadless.

The SMAs as outlines in the Recommended Plan.

No, not without good justification.

The whole watershed (except for the existing Dempster Highway) should remain roadless.

all but the IMA should be roadless and only on existing roads in IMA should be permanent

The Snake, Bonnet Plume, Wind. Hart and Blackstone drainage areas should be roadless.

Everywhere in the Peel. The Peel is unique and the absence of roads is what makes it so.

The areas should remain as is - roadless

I think that the whole planning region should be roadless, except for tourist services ie lodges or other such facility adjacent to the Dempster.

YES, the entire watershed, aside from the pre-existing Dempster Highway,, which should not allow any offshoots from it.

No roads.

The entire area should remain roadless, particularly the Wind River trail. It is impossible for a developer to restore the land to its original state if a road is built. In this type of environment, any development of roads will have an irreversible impact.

Yes, the Peel Watershed should remain roadless, apart from leaving the Dempster in place.

All of them. Why not build trails? I understand the need to allow visitors if we are to preserve the area, but I don't see a need to be this intrusive. Roads negatively impact the entire area.

Yes - the entire area.

All of the Peel

Areas which have been identified as unique areas should remain roadless provided they continue to be accessible to everyone.

Everywhere else (i.e., except the Dempster.

Yes - the entire watershed.

100 % should remain roadless. Opening up this area will pollute the environment we all depend on for our health.

Inside Canada = 4

Yes, everywhere

All areas that are now roadless should remain roadless.

The Peel should remain road less, and existing roads should be left the processes of nature and all industry initiatives must be forbidden, including those already in place.

The entire Peel should remain roadless.

Outside Canada = 2

Everywhere where there is not a road now--the wildness of the watershed is its primary attribute

No new roads should be allowed in thw whole watershed. If this is not possible, then the areas around the Wind, Snake and Bonnet Plume rivers should be protected.

Are there some areas in the region where permanent roads could be allowed? If so, where?

Inside Yukon = 36

No.

There are already multiple ATV use only roads that are being completely exploited. There are enough roads and paths in use to allow for some travel and I do not believe we need anymore. If permanent roads are constructed, it will have a negative impact on what we are trying to save. As soon as permanent roads are installed, people will begin to misuse the area. It has been done before and it will be done again. That's just how people are.

Most of the region should be allowed permanent roads if they pass all of the current laws and regulations. There is enough monitoring to keep this area safe for future generations. These include YESAB, Yukon Water Board, EMR and other government oversight.

IMA 2 - Dempster Hwy zone.

NO!!!!

I am in full agreement with Bob Sharp's comments

no permanent roads anywhere

No. Roads become permanent regardless of being designated permanent or temporary.

No

The Dempster corridor should remain however, no other permanent roads are compatible with the conservation principles in the Plan. The climate and topography make it extremely difficult for the ecology to recover from the detrimental impacts of roads construction, usage and maintenance. Roads also open up and expose animals to over hunting and risk of being hit by vehicles.

No.

No, not except the Dempster Hwy.

No.

No.

The only areas could be immediately adjacent to the Dempster Highway.

Roads should be permitted only in the area closest to the Dempster and only within 50 kilometers of the Dempster.

The Dempster Highway traverses the Peel region, and should stay. But, that's it. Officially decommission the Wind River Trail. (I believe that there is some debate as to whether or not it is legally a "road".) Not only should no more roads be built, there needs to be control on ATV use.

No. The increase of roads in Canada is exponential and so are all the environmental and social problems that come along with roads.

Building roads is an incompatible activity if the objective is to preserve the ecological integrity of a pristine wilderness environment. My objective is to do just that. It is incredibly naive to believe that you can perfectly preserve a part without it being affected by the situation of the whole. An ecosystem is defined by the complexity of its interrelations, and building a new road will: Potentially expose the area to new invasive species, potentially allow harmful levels of human contact, and by its very existence affect the behaviour patterns of countless creatures in the area. Many species are

No. Industrial access roads should be winter roads only and decommissioned afterwards. Decommissioning is possible - it has been done before. Private roads are also possible - there are precedents for this.

No, they shouldn't be allowed. Since the Dempster already exists, leave that in being. But no new permanent roads.

NO

No! Roads would open the region to other destructive forces such as ATVs and mechanized hunting.

no

I think there should be consultation with the First Nation whose traditional territory permanent roads are being considered

No.

None that are not there and the Wind River road needs to be decommissioned. ATV access does not require a right of way. Just look at all the tote roads that have supposedly been decommissions and examine the ATV travel on these roads. Something else needs to be done to restrict such access.

No roads. Period.

I don't believe any permanent roads should be allowed

There should be no allowance of permanent roads because it would open up the area to everybody and would allow hauling ore with big transport vehicles. Fuel spillage couldn't be prevented especially in the dark winter month. Wildlife would be disturbed or accidentally killed. Permafrost in the area would make the building and maintaining of permanent roads extremely expensive.

Permanent roads should be allowed in any area where there can be justification for it. A couple of permanent roads could be built to assist with access into the area. Much of the exploration and oil and gas can be done on winter roads to begin with. Then, when necessary go through the existing YESA and DAP process to insure best choices and practices are allowed.

NO! Roads will bisect the land. We do not need an area that is carved into chunks. We need to maintain the area and support the moratorium on claims.

No, I would not want to see any permanent roads

The only road allowed should be the existing Dempster Highway. No additional road should be permitted.

Only the Dempster.

No. We haven't even begun to control ATV use in subdivisions so let's not imagine we can do so off the Dempster or anywhere else in this area. This area is unique not just to us and its inhabitants but to visitors to a large extent because it IS roadless. Having spent much of my adult life in the Peel watershed, I can't stress enough that we don't have any idea what the impact of permanent roads would be,

Inside Canada = 6

Yes. The Integrated Management Areas will become de facto parks if access is not explicitly allowed for industrial use, such as mining and oil/gas development.

no

no there should be no further roads into the region

NO

No, roads equal a division in the natural world, altering the earth to create pathways from humans would equal displacing the wildlife, blocking their migration paths and upsetting the integrity of the land.

No roads anywhere!

Outside Canada = 3

There should be no new roads anywhere in the Peel watershed. Those who are interested in roads, development, and denuded landscapes are welcome to visit West Virginia, the tar sand fields of Alberta, and other places that have been destroyed by extractive activities.

Yes, I don't believe the entire area is so sensitive that it cannot sustain some access in key areas. The plan is suppose to manage environment and resources, shutting it down completely is not proper management.

No

Do you agree that the Wind River corridor should "no longer be recognized as an access corridor"? Why or why not?

Inside Yukon = 36

I agree that the Wind River should no longer be an access corridor in the Peel Watershed. It will be the thin edge of the wedge when it comes to permitting access to mineral extraction projects.

Yes. The entire watershed should be roadless. If the Wind River corridor is an access corridor, it will be a gateway into the area. Cutting off roads will discourage future development and industrial activity.

It will take more than this to stop ATV travel along the road.

Yes I agree.. Upgrading that corridor to a winter road, let alone a year round road,, would be VERY injurious to the wildlife populations and the wilderness integrity of the wind River, This became very clear to me with Cash Minerals proposal to use the corridor as winter road and bring in equipment to build air strips, haul fuel for increased helicopter activity, etc

All of the Peel should be without roads and no ATVs should be allowed here

Yes.

Access must be made available to all or withdrawn from all but First Nations who may only access it for traditional use (no commercial joint ventures).

Yes.

It should not be recognized as an access corridor because it will encourage everybody to enter this area. The majority of claims with uranium 'as primary commodity' are located in this area and the development of mine sites would be a result of access. We have no way to store uranium waste products.

yes.

Yes I do.

yes

I absolutely do not agree with this statement. It has been an access corridor in the past and should remain open to access.

Yes. The Wind River trail, north of Braine Pass, is more of a route than a trail. It was developed without authorization or environmental reviews. It took the most convenient route and in some places it is right in the riparian in places. In other places, it is so overgrown you can barely find it. It does not deserve its designation and should be removed from the maps.

Yes. Because motorized access deep into the core area likely will have a devastating impact on both on the land and game populations. ATV's and their like is a big concern here.

Yes, because I believe its a highly sensitive area, and should be protected

yes I do - vehicular access deep into the Planning Region will eventually have enormous negative impacts on the wildlife and the land.

Yes, I have travelled in the Wind River Corridor and the "road" could not be considered as useable any more. The area is very sensitive to disturbances and opening the road would have irreversible impacts.

Most of the Wind River corridor isn't even a walkable trail. To consider it a right-of-way is totally arbitrary, and to turn it into an access corridor would be no different than building a road from scratch. Let it sleep.

Yes. The Upper Wind River is in the core of the wilderness protection zone. Vehicular access is incompatible with the primary value of this area.

I do agree that the Wind River road/trail should no longer be recognized as an access corridor. I do agree because I want to see the Peel watershed remaining roadless.

No, it is already there and access should not be restricted.

Yes, This corridor cuts through the core of the Peel wilderness. If it develops into an all season road the Wind River valley will no longer be a wilderness zone, and the wildlife resources will be heavily impacted.

Absolutely. The question should not include "no longer be recognized as an access corridor". It is my understanding it doesn't function as one now. I strongly agree that the Wind River corridor should no longer be recognized as an access corridor.

Yes.

Yes. this is in keeping with the principles expressed in the plan, and the intent of the SMA designation.

I agree that the Wind River corridor should not longer be recognized as an access corridor as the winter road was established before there were any regulations or review of such activities. Keeping the watershed as road-free as possible should be a priority. Roads of any sort lead to habitat fragmentation and increased disturbance of wildlife by recreational vehicles.

The Wind River is too fragile. It should no longer be a recognized access corridor.

Yes. Mistakes made 35 years ago when there was very little planning should not be used as an excuse to make the same ones again today.

yes. it is of apparently no interest to mining exploration at present. maintaining its ambiguous status only confounds management of the area.

Yes, I think it should be decommissioned. I have seen the "road" in a number of places along the Wind. It isn't really a road, simply less thick forest. It is nothing more than a skidoo trail and should no longer be recognized as an access corridor.

Yes. This particular corridor passes through and provides access to some of the most beautiful areas otherwise accessible only by air. If it is not closed to motorized traffic, it will eventually be used by mineral explorers, developers, and motorized recreationalists in ways that conflict with the conservation goals on which the Plan is based.

Yes. This was an illegal winter trail and should be allowed to disappear and grow back fully. Allowing a winter trail or permanent access compromises the high conservation values and forces the decision makers in the future to consider development because of the advanced stage of (investment in) exploration. I have indicated this type of access is a "death by a thousand knives" to an area that has ecological integrity, because one road leads to branch and then another. As I have indicated earlier - permitting and regulation do not make model citizens of the extraction industries.

Yes - All of the Peel should be without roads.

Yes. Allowing road access is a recipe for damage to the ecosystem. The problem is not only the road itself, but the fact that it opens the area to motorized vehicles, including ATVs, and whatever damage they may cause off of the road.

Yes.

Inside Canada = 6

Considering what it is, an overgrown and unsafe roadway the Wind River corridor should not be considered for future use

No. It has been used for decades and is an important access route which will be needed again in the future.

Yes, - Our land is very pristine and pure, who knows what will happen with our land and water?? yeah the corridor was used in the past, only to our elders and ancestors, not to oil and gas industries! And the corridor will always be used, by our leaders, our future leaders and our people!

There should be no road in the Wind River corridor. An access road guarantees wilderness destruction.

There should be no road access period. Roads will fuel the destruction of this vast wilderness.

Yes, this area has high wildlife an wilderness values.

Outside Canada = 1

No, it exists and has been used in the past and should be used in the future.

Do you have any other comments on this topic?

Inside Yukon = 15

We are concerned about ATV use. The plan does mention this specifically, but it's a critical issue that should be dealt with when deciding about access.

I believe in maintaining the region as wilderness. There are already too few areas that cannot be accessed by motorized transport, both in the Yukon and elsewhere. Any road access would compromise the area.

Access to the area should be by way of designated float plane access points, horse or hiking only.

Please keep the Peel free of motorized vehicles of all kinds except aircraft and emergency equipment.

One road quickly turns into a network of transportation. One does not have to use much imagination when looking at a map of the present claims in the Peel Water shed to see the area that would be fragmented by access routes. I don't want to have to imagine what it would look like if additional claims are allowed to be staked and what would occur if roads were allowed in the Peel Watershed.

The value of the Peel is in its wilderness character.

a road is a road is a road - in 40 years of resource management i see this as the paramount challenge to the conservation principles of this region.

I have a real problem with restricting access to this area. We have so many biases involved to restrict industry that this should not be considered a fair process. You should be looking at developing a set of principles that will allow open access for all but will mitigate any damage to within reason. (A good example would be building a road on a shale slope over top of a stream knowing it would continually sluff into the river. This is where you would force another option to be considered if possible)

I believe that constructing roads in the Peel Watershed region would be inappropriate. Roads would permanently affect the area creating access to a valuable pristine area. It is not possible to: "restore the area to its original state when development ends." No roads should be constructed.

Roads are the beginning of the end - keep them out forever.

The value of this area is in it's roadlessness and wildness. Let it be and it will only become more valuable with time.

Road access increases habitat fragmentation, roadkills, as well as more hunting access to the public. This is why I think the area should remain roadless.

I support the local First Nations vote for 100% protection of this region. The true value of these lands lie in their wild and unique ecology.

I grew up in an era of creating and over-loving provincial parks in British Columbia and especially in Alberta. Through the last two decades, parks many of us thought were protected for their wilderness flavour suddenly had huge cabins, lodges, and unnecessary roads being created by the very administrations we entrusted to preserve them. We have a rare opportunity here of preserving the wilderness nature of an incredibly beautiful and untouched area of the Yukon. Once the opportunity is gone, it may never return. You can't rebuild a healthy ecosystem if it gets too damaged. Building a road opens the area to just such an outcome.

In many ways roads, trails, railroads and airfields have more potential for damage to the environment than the developments. Linear developments in the permafrost have the potential to destroy watersheds. Once a road is built the ongoing maintenance continues the damage.

Inside Canada = 4

i think the government is doing what they always have been doing, treating us like we are not human, they think they can step all over us and not think about our lives, our children, elders and our future. They do not know that WE are all one, we all need one another to survive, we need the land, the water, the animals, and no matter how much money comes from this, WE will all pay for it in the end, they do not know that THEY are WE too. They will ruin our land and theres it will effect everyone!!

I am in full support of 100% protection with no compromise. I believe that anyone person proposing to develop the any one part of the Peel river watershed should be required to paddle one of its great rivers and witness first hand what it is they plan to destroy. Just this alone would do wonders for our national treasures. By destroying any one part of our wilderness we destroy the answers to questions we haven't even asked yet. Answers more valuable than we could ever imagine. We all know what the right thing to do is lets do it for once.

If at some point in the future when orebodies around the world are depleted and/or if an orebody within this region was discovered and was economically mineable, how would the ore or concentrate get out of the area if there are no roads and the process of reviewing construction of any new roads was to take too long, or essentially held hostage? Same goes for any new potential hydro lines to a new mine - essentially the potential mine would never be allowed.

I support 100% protection of the Peel watershed. Please keep the Peel free from motorized vehicles.

Outside Canada = 1

Access should be focused on low impact activities that generate wealth for residents of the region without degrading the scenic and ecological resources that make the Peel watershed one of the most extraordinary places on earth.

Where permitted, should access roads be available for public use, or gated and controlled?

Inside Yukon = 31

no public access to roads - they must be gated and controlled (that is monitored) any snowmobiler/atver can get around a gate.

Access roads should be available for public use. Canada continues to be a democracy.

There should be no access roads. If there are, they should gated and controlled to prevent secondary destruction by 4x4s and ATVs.

Where permitted, roads should be tightly monitored.

As much as some do not want roads anywhere, they can provide tourist industry services and access. They could be for public use but relatively short.

Access roads should be permitted in a majority of the region. The entire management area should not be excluded from road access. If there is a concern about access for everyone then when a road is put in by industry it should be gated and controlled to restrict access beyond what's needed.

There should be no access roads. If they are available even if they are gated and controlled, it will not be possible to manage access to these roads. Gated and controlled access roads sound like the type of roads that would mostly be used for industrial purposes. If the Peel is going to be protected, industrial purposes need to be made so impossible and impractical that it is not worth the money for them to spend.

Yes, but how? Just look at the inability of Whitehorse tyo restrict mortotized vehicles on the restricted areas. We need to find another way. It works in some States and Provinces and it should be enforced in the Yukon.

It is unrealistic to think gating and controlling roads will really control anything, unless perhaps they are staffed and there are stiff penalties for breaching the barriers - and that's equally unlikely. I guess gating and controlling is better than nothing, but they should not serve as a justification for building the road in the first place (e.g., arguing it'll have no negative impact because it'll be gated and controlled).

Roads shouldn't be permitted, apart from the Dempster. If, however, contrary to this comment, roads are permitted, they must be gated and controlled.

The option to allow roads within all IMAs still needs to be considered, as long as roads are non-public (i.e. reserved for industrial use only). However, the risk is very high because it is very difficult to control public access on a linear access route, especially in the open tundra habitats frequently found in IMAs. Gating alone is insufficient; it is too easy for off-road vehicles to get around gates. Control structures would need to be at incised rivers (bridges), and would have to be manned.

I do not believe that access roads should be permitted in the Peel Watershed, in any LMU; however, if this level of protection is not afforded, then I believe these roads should be gated and controlled to prevent further disturbance of wildlife.

Roads should not be permitted, but if so, they should be tightly controlled.

if permitted, motorized activity should be restricted and the regulations enforced

Roads should not be permitted.

I believe that no road should be allowed.

Access roads should not be permitted. They are almost never 'reclaimed' after, even if that is supposedly the agreement.

Roads should simply not be permitted, at least within the 80% of the region recognized in the plan to be designated as wilderness protection. gated or controlled access roads, I believe won't work, based on the lack of respect shown currently by some re keeping their vehicles out of "non-motorized areas". Wildlife need sanctuaries-areas without roads.

if the road is though a protected are then access should be controlled

I don't think roads should be permitted. Having said that, the response depends on the outcome and use of the lands in question. How can I answer this if I don't know if the lands will have any protection or not? If the area will not become a park, then uncontrolled access will be a complete disaster in this fragile ecosystem. If you do allow a road, gate it and limit access!

I think they should be open to the public. This way all Yukoners can benefit and utilize this area should they choose.

No roads should be permitted.

Access roads should not be permitted in this area. If they are, they should be strictly gated and controlled for the reasons set out above.

There should be no roads.

No. Public access would result in truck, argo, atv and snowmobile access to areas where the spread of trails would be impossible to control. The wilderness character of the area would be lost, and the rich wildlife populations of the area, which exist only in isolation from easy hunting access, would be reduced to the relativley sparce levels of the rest of the Yukon.

There should be NO access roads.. If there were they should not be available for public use.. they should be gated and controlled.. and de-comissioned afterwards.. But of course this would not happen.. Four wheelers would use them easily even if they were gated and regular trucks could not access them.. Wildlife populations would be impacted because where there are roads or four wheel access there is hunting.. ..

Roads should not be permitted.

Controls on access roads should be mandatory - however examples of successful management or decommission of access of roads in the yukon are incredibly hard to find. the plan should be very wary of recommending actions that do not have precedence.

I am not sure. It is not necessarily a bad this to have them for public use because people who would enjoy going on those access rd for the beauty of the country could probably naturally do some monitoring and in some way be watch dogs for the protection of the environment

AT ANY TIME NO ROAD . MAKE A "WILDLIFE RESERVE", to prevented any future development.

They should not be permitted. If they are, they should only be available for non-motorized use.

Inside Canada = 6

No absolutly not.

Yes, the access roads should be gated and controlled to prevent unauthorized access by recreational users who invariably go off-road to enjoy their recreational vehicles. It is not the mining companies prerogative to allow non-company vehicles access to their property. There seems to be, in these comments, a mind-set that it is the miners who damage the environment which is not true. It is the unauthorized recreational users who do the most damage by not staying on the existing road surface.

I agree with Lu from the Yukon, Wilderness Reserve all the way

Access roads should not be permitted. Even if gated and controlled I doubt very much that this control would be effective. Roads will only permit and hasten the destruction of wilderness. Who will pay for staffing at control points and checks to monitor unauthorized access?

Use of existing roads should be carefully monitored to protect ecological, wildlife, and recreational values, with ecological integrity given precedence. No new access roads should be permitted.

Gated and controlled, so they are used for legitimate purposes.

Outside Canada = 1

If access roads are controlled, it must control all users.

Usability of the Recommended Peel Watershed Land Use Plan

Are there any changes you would like to see in the layout and presentation of the next version of the Plan?

Inside Yukon = 8

It is too long of a process. I came to the consultation meeting two weeks ago thinking that this was the last one before protection was going to take place. I was really surprised that there was going to be another consultation meeting after the Peel Watershed Planning Commission meet again. I even heard that there was going to be a draft final recommended plan consultation meeting and a final recommended plan consultation meeting. YTG asked Yukoners what we wanted. We want protection. First Nations want protection. Now, YTG needs to act and stop consulting. Next spring, my vote will go to the party who will be capable of protecting 100% of the Peel Watershed without endlessly consulting.

Yes, let's look at the big Yukon picture. Industry needs access to potential mines and oil and gas. Yukoners need jobs. These will help reduce financial dependency on Ottawa and the taxpayers of the country. It will provide good jobs with good pay to people and help them deal with addictions.

none

The same map of the LMU came back over and over. While reading the summary, there were times where a map of the Peel and it's tributaries and the watershed by itself would have been useful without the LMUs.

No.

No.

Better and bigger maps

This may not be an easy or even possible request but smaller scaled maps

Did you find the full version of the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan easy to read and interpret?

Inside Yukon = 11

Yes. Well written and organised.

I did not read the full version of the Recommended Plan. It is hard to read and interpret.

Almost impossible to read, all materials too small to read easily.

Yes. Pick and section and it is easy to read. Try to go through the whole thing and it is hard because it is long - this is not a good way to judge the document. it will always be used in bits and pieces.

Yes.

It was about as easy as a document of this nature could be. It was long, but I think thats par for the course when regarding a policy that will guide an issue as important as this.

I read sections, then I focussed my efforts on the summary.

Yes. It was fine. It's comprehensive and has the detail needed to make informed decisions.

Didn't read full version but I think it is necessary for professional and lobbying agencies. Too complicated for public at large

No, but I wasn't expecting it to be. It's a document about a big piece of the Yukon and it addresses complicated issues and values. It deserves to be difficult to read and interpret.

Only read sections of the full plan.

Inside Canada = 1

no

Did you find the Summary Plan easy to read and interpret?**Inside Yukon = 11**

It is a well written and lovely document, and succinctly lays out the issues.

Yes

Yes.

Yes. Very well done.

I took my time reading it because it is a subject dear to my heart and yes I understood it well

Again, too small.

Yes.

Easy to read, but could have included a bit more information on permitted and non-permitted activities, as these seem to be a conversation point.

Yes, I did read the Summary Plan, and it is a lot easier. I also liked that stakeholders talked in the consultation meeting.

It was well written and easy to read.

Yes.

Inside Canada = 1

yes

Do you have any other comments on this topic?**Inside Yukon = 7**

The key to the usability of the Plan lies in the Implementation strategy. The Recommended Plan includes some detail for implementation, but defers much detail to a future Implementation Strategy. I think an Implementation Strategy should be part of the Final Plan. This section lacks some specific direction as to which agency will take the responsibility for implementation of each of the key Tasks. What is the role of the Yukon Land Use Planning Council in implementation, and, if none (as implied in the Recommended Plan), why not? Is there an inter-departmental implementation group (seems necessary given the shared jurisdictions influenced by many Plan outcomes). The implementation section recommends development of single contiguous SMA (with overarching legal designation) for all SMAs within each emphasis class (e.g., heritage, fish and wildlife, etc.). This seems logically impossible, because many of the LMUs are not geographically contiguous. It seems administratively too onerous in that widely separated LMUs are difficult to jointly establish, monitor and manage. If amalgamation of LMUs is required (which I think it is), it makes more sense to amalgamate geographically adjacent SMUs in one legally designated entity, within which a management plan can deal with the different management emphases of the land base as outlined in the Plan.

One issue that might be worth looking at is to provide examples of similar or even identical examples of land-use for the different management areas. When reference is made to a territorial park, an example that could be given is Tombstone Park (even though it is outside the planning area, it allows the public an example they are probably familiar with). Similarly, when reference is made to an all-season access road, an example that could be given is the Tungsten or Canol Roads.

This can keep being examined and examined and it still really comes down to what is fair and equitable for ALL - I think this planning process is very biased and I recommend that it be returned to its original mandate which is LAND USE PLANNING - land use means all stakeholders.

Sounds like a good compromise. Implement it.

I would like to extend my thanks for the opportunity to provide my comments on the Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan.

Most respondents to this questionnaire are not qualified to answer this section. I'll bet that those tasked with actually implementing this plan would find it too short.

It is great that YTG asked Yukoners about the Peel Watershed discussion. It is great that the Recommended Plan passed from protecting 60% to 80% to protecting 80%. However, I support 100% protection of the Peel Watershed.

Outside Canada = 1

I am very much in favour of large scale protection for the Peel Watershed with no roads and no industrial development. I wholeheartedly support the First Nations in their call for 100% protection. They are earnest in their desire and I know myself how important native wild lands are to the well being of all citizens of every country. I also value the well-being of fish and wildlife and believe they depend on the remote, diverse, undeveloped nature of the Peel Watershed and want it to remain this way. I also agree with the Commissions' perspective that managing the Peel watershed in accordance with the vision of sustainable development outlined in the UFA is fundamental to the plan. We must plan responsibly for a beautiful future if we want to have one. I emphatically and sincerely believe that ALL of the Peel Watershed should continue to be withdrawn from new mineral, oil and gas activity while the plan is finalized. Please take our comments seriously, Thanks you!

Would you find a shorter plan more or less useful than the current full-length Recommended Plan?

Inside Yukon = 9

Less - the summary document should provide those without time or inclination to read the full plan with enough information to respond.

The summary gave a stepping off point for reading sections of the full plan.

A full-length Plan of the type presented here is necessary for management agencies (e.g., YESAB; Land Management Branch of Yukon EMR; Yukon Environment) to get the guidance and direction they require. Much of the volume of the Recommended Plan is in the details regarding each LMU (Section 4.2). This detail is required for management agencies.

The summary is easier for the public at large but is still complicated for people with not to much education

This is difficult to answer as I can't imagine what a shorter or longer document would look like. I do believe the summary was a good representation of the plan however, if one was to read the summary alone, you would be less informed.

This plan is so biased and limits industry unreasonably. This document should be scrapped.

I found the summary sufficient however, planners from all affected parties needed the complete plan, so that was required as well.

No, the plan has to be long. The summary plan fills this role.

No. Not to replace the original - shorter versions could be considered for the use of RRCs etc. Einstein said everything should be kept as simple as possible but not simpler. Oversimplifying this plan by shortening it will severely reduce its usefulness.

Inside Canada = 1

no

Zoning and Landscape Management Unit Configuration

Are there any LMU boundaries that you feel should be changed?

Inside Yukon = 7

I do not agree with the amount of LMU's which indicate massive withdrawal of land from access for all.

Get rid of the IMAs.

The maximum protection should be given to Hart, Wind, Bonnet Plume and Sanke - this makes a contiguous planning unit that better meets management for ecological integrity.

The boundary of SMA "M" should be increased to encompass all of IMA 5. SMA 'A' should be increased to encompass both of IMA 1s. IMA 2 should be narrowed.

No

Yes, see above

Yes, remove all.

Are there any LMUs you feel should be bigger or smaller?

Inside Yukon = 7

I believe the IMA should be re-designated as SMA. Again, the size and shape of the LUMs should be determined by the values which are emphasized within. It is difficult to comment on this criteria without more detailed maps and visiting each area. This is unrealistic for me so I will have to give the Planning Commission's the benefit of the doubt. What I do want to comment on is what occurs within the LMUs. All should be SMAs in one of the 5 SMA designations depending on the values within.

the whole area should be one SMA

Yes the complete SMA Protection zone should be larger

Yes, the entire area should be a SMA.

No

Remove them all and allow all to access.

Peel Plateau should be smaller.

Do you feel that the number of Landscape Management Units proposed is reasonable? If no, are there too many, or too few?

Inside Yukon = 14

No. It should be one large continuous protected area.

Reasonable

Too many units smells of management to me at which we are no good. Could we please just have one large green unit meaning full protection covering the entire watershed.

It took a lot of work to identified for the specific type of resources each SMA has. However, they all need the same level of protection and so the area should be protected as a whole. The more areas there are, the more they can each be negotiated separately. The area needs to be protected as a whole.

All LMUs should be Special Management Areas. There should be no Integrated Management Area.

There are too many LMU's proposed. I'm sure that the people involved in this could modify it to a more manageable #.

Without flying over the area and looking at it this is a difficult question. I suggest there is no need to divide these areas period. Unless there is a bonified reason - no restrictions.

In general the number is reasonable.

The number of LMU is irrelevant in my opinion. There should be as many, or few, as necessary so that each LMU is properly represented as a protection, Fish and Wildlife, Heritage, and Watershed Management area and one for the Dempster corridor.

Yes.

I feel that there may be too many management units and amalgamating them under a larger umbrella area may simplify management planning and the costs of doing so in the future.

If you are managing for the same reasons ie SMA then why not make one unit. I think the government needs a big picture or vision. Planning for individual units makes it easy for policy makers to change their minds on a unit later - thus fracturing the concept of conservation for ecological integrity.

This is the splitters vs. lumpers controversy. I would pose the question to those on the front line: FN Lands staff, YESAA staff, YG environment staff.

My only hesitation is that the use of LMUs may distract from a focus on protection by designating one particular emphasis for a given LMU. To me it makes more sense to look at designating the entire area as a park, recognizing that there will be protection of fish and wildlife and heritage etc. in all areas.

Inside Canada = 1

If the entire region is protected, ecological integrity and wilderness qualities will remain, fish and wildlife values will be protected and maintained, water will remain unpolluted and rivers will run free and heritage values will also be maintained. The best "management" of a wilderness is usually to leave it alone. It seems to me that all these different designations are only focusing on different parts of the same big picture; maintaining the entire Peel watershed as an intact wilderness with all its values preserved for future generations.

Outside Canada = 1

16 sma's why not just one great big green one, that is pretty much all that this plan is recommending. This is ridiculous, this process is suppose to come up with a recommendation to the government's that they can use to "manage" the region, not give them something that is so one sided that it ends up in controversy for ever.

Do you have any other comments on this topic?

Inside Yukon = 5

Protect 100%

First of all, I have to admit I don't have a full understanding of the rational behind establishing these management areas. My overall opinion on the Peel Watershed is to protect 100%. No development of any kind, especially mining. I also fail to see the point in dividing it into these micro-managed areas as proposed. Apply these individual principals to the entire area. I am in favor of leaving care of the area to the three first nations. If they choose to divide the area based on there historic cultural use of the land, so be it. Having said that, I would like some for of assurance that all people would have access to the rivers and land for the purpose of visiting and experience the wilderness. At some point in the future it will likely become necessary to limit the numbers of visitors per year based on noticeable impacts caused from travelers.

110% protection.

see above.

I would like to see the entire region given the highest level of protection.

Do you want to share any alternative suggestions for zoning or configuration?

Inside Yukon = 5

The suggested zoning configuration depicts the distribution of the main resource values. However, it is unlikely that each LMU designated as an SMA should get unique legal designation under legislation. There is reason to amalgamate some adjacent LMUs in a single legal land designation (e.g., Territorial Park; Wilderness Management Area), but the Recommended Plan's identification of resource emphasis could be maintained and acknowledged within the subsequent management of the larger legally designated SMA. An example might be the joining of small LMUs such as Hungry Lakes and Chappie Lakes within a bigger SMA. The final plan could recognize this possibility.

remove IMAs, redesignated as SMAs

Yes, remove all and allow access.

Yes, as above.

remove zoning and protected the whole watershed for all the resources it offers

Inside Canada = 1

Ecological integrity should be the first priority in all areas.
