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Arctic Tourism in Times of Change: Dimensions of Urban Tourism
3. Urban Tourism in the Wilderness City Whitehorse, Yukon (Canada)

Suzanne de la Barre (Vancouver Island University, Department of Recreation and Tourism Management)

Introduction

The City of Whitehorse is located in Canada’s northwestern most territory, Yukon, and is a “small city in a big place”. Accordingly, many of its urban characteristics are similar to those of cities found in other circumpolar regions, and it shares many similar roles and functions as a core center located in a periphery that has been, and remains, significantly defined in relation to a vast natural resource extraction region. The following section of this report will examine urban Arctic tourism in relation to the City of Whitehorse.

Locating Yukon’s Urban “Arcticness”

Canada’s Arctic context lies within the vast boundary of Nunavut and the northern and eastern parts of the Northwest Territories. While its importance is unquestionable, where the North is actually situated has been, and continues to be, the subject of much debate. The geographer W.L. Morton claimed that the North began along a line beyond which cereal crops would not readily grow (Morton, 1972). Arguably, the most famous Canadian geographer to contribute to ideas on definitions of “arcticness” is Louis Edmond Hamelin, through his work aiming to determine “where is the North”. Hamelin (1988) invented the notion of “nordicity” as a means to measure “northerness”, and created a system based on assigning “Polar Units” to places. These units – or points – are allotted to such things as latitude, summer and winter temperatures, population, and accessibility. For a quick reference to Whitehorse features related to aspects of “nordicity”, see Table 3.1, Whitehorse Summary Features.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>WHITEHORSE (Yukon, Canada)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>60° 43’ 0” N / 135° 3’ 0” W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population – City</td>
<td>32,011 (01/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population – Region</td>
<td>40,962 (01/19; Yukon total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>38.5 (Yukon total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area – City</td>
<td>34.92 km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Density</td>
<td>621.8 persons per km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Density</td>
<td>.01 km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Context – Density</td>
<td>3.91 persons per km² (Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National definition of “urban”</td>
<td>At least 1,000 persons, with 400 persons or more per km² – population center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National definition of “rural”</td>
<td>All areas outside population centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily temp – January (Celsius)</td>
<td>-11.0 Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily temp – July (Celsius)</td>
<td>20.6 Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest city over 100,000 persons</td>
<td>Anchorage (Alaska, US) (800 km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Edmonton (Canada) (1991 km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vancouver (Canada) (2396 km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Indigenous People</td>
<td>25% (all Yukon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of governance/public service</td>
<td>Federal, territorial, municipal, First Nations (2 within city limits: Kwanlin Dün First Nation and Ta’an Kwäch’än Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy – top three by GDP</td>
<td>All Yukon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism – visitors/year</td>
<td>491,200 (2018) (all Yukon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sales</td>
<td>$11.7 million, or 3.0% increase, compared to the same time period in 2018 (Canada increased 1.6% over the same time period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Strategic Tourism Development Plan</td>
<td>2018–2028 (all Yukon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Whitehorse Summary Features

As such, while Canada has only two territories with land mass located within the Arctic Circle, it has other vast regions near it – including Nunavik in the province of Quebec and Nunatsiavut in Newfoundland, and then, along a continuum of “northerness”, the northern regions of Canada’s central and Western provinces from Ontario to British Columbia. The Yukon Territory, while located in the nation’s sub-Artic region, has “nordicity units” which include its distance from larger urban centers, low population density, climate, and economic reliance on resource extraction.
The urban Arctic tourism context that is explored for the Canada contribution here stems from inclusion on the same basis as that found in the Suter et al. (2017) initiative, which aimed to develop metrics to guide sustainable development of Arctic Cities. Specifically, the present contribution examines urban tourism with reference to the City of Whitehorse as the major urban center north of 60 degrees latitude. The Yukon is located south of mainland Alaska (US), east of the Northwest Territories (Canada), and north of the province of British Columbia (Canada) (see Figure 3.1). At 483,450 km², the territory is the third largest of Canada’s thirteen jurisdictions and has a population of 40,962, of whom 75% live in Whitehorse (YG, 2019a). With an overall population density of just 0.01 people per km², the territory makes a claim to its wilderness tourism opportunities and brands itself as “larger than life”.

![Figure 3.1: Map of Yukon (Licensed under the Open Government Licence – Canada)](image)

The Yukon’s road infrastructure differentiates the territory in a significant manner from Canada’s two other territories, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut, which both have limited (NWT) or no (Nunavut) road infrastructure connecting communities internally, or to the rest of the country (NWT has one road connecting to road infrastructure external to the territory). In contrast, the Yukon’s fourteen communities are linked by 4,700 kilometers of all-weather, year-round roads, and the territory is infamous for having the Alaska Highway, which since its completion in 1942...
1949 has connected the state of Alaska to the "lower 48" (latitude), or what is officially known as the conterminous United States.

City of Whitehorse

The City of Whitehorse – or The Wilderness City as it has branded itself – is located at 60° 43' 0" N/135° 3' 0" W, and sits at Mile 918 on the historic Alaska Highway. The city was incorporated in 1898, and became the capital city of the territory in 1953 when it was relocated from Dawson City, located 535 kilometers north, which had been the capital since 1900. Whitehorse is Canada’s 64th largest city, and has a population of 32,011 with an average age of 38.5 years (City of Whitehorse, 2019a). With a total area of 34.95 km², the city has a population density of 621.8 persons per km² (Statistics Canada, 2017a).

Figure 3.2: City of Whitehorse, winter. (Credits: Government of Yukon, © Government of Yukon)

The city’s historical population fluctuations tell its frontier settlement history. From 1901 to 1951, Yukon’s population vacillated as a direct result of the Gold Rush (YG, 1988). From 1951 onward, the demographic trend has been a slow but steady increase. Table 3.2 presents these demographic events, and includes the Yukon Government’s 2011 projected population for 2021, also demonstrating that by 2019 the territory has already surpassed the lower projection population number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Whitehorse</th>
<th>Yukon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>27,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>8,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>4,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>9,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11,277</td>
<td>18,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>14,814</td>
<td>23,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>24,151</td>
<td>31,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>29,617</td>
<td>38,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>29,962</td>
<td>38,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>32,283</td>
<td>40,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>32,011</td>
<td>40,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 (2011)</td>
<td>30,721 to 33,179</td>
<td>40,130 to 43,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 (2019)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.2: Populations of City of Whitehorse and Yukon 1900 to 2019, with projections to 2021 (YG, 1988; 2019a) and 2040 (City of Whitehorse, 2019b)**

Table 3.2 presents a description of the great fluctuations that define the city’s population changes after the 1898 Gold Rush. Recent population trends are due not only to the city’s continued importance as a support hub for the resource sector with low unemployment rates, but also to a combination of its increasing attraction as a “cool” place to live, providing a high quality of life due to the available recreational, health, and cultural amenities on the one hand and its growth as a knowledge sector on the other. A key challenge is the lack of available and affordable housing (City of Whitehorse, 2019b).

In 2010 Canada began using the term “population center”, which replaced “urban area”. A population center (POPCTR) has a population of at least 1,000 and a population density of 400 persons or more per km$^2$. All areas outside population centers are classified as rural areas (POPCTRs) (Statistics Canada, 2017). The City of Whitehorse is further classified as a “medium population center” (population between 20,000 and 99,999).

**Governance**

There are four levels of government in the Yukon Territory: federal, territorial, municipal, and First Nations (which is the term used to identify the Yukon’s Indigenous people). Land claim settlements, negotiated in the territory between 1993 and 2006, have provided recognition and authority for 11 of the 14 First Nation communities to self-govern and direct their own future development (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2015). The City of Whitehorse sits on the traditional territory of two Yukon self-governing First Nations, the Kwanlin Dün First Nation and the Ta’an Kwäch’än Council.)
Economic context

The economic development in the territory since the 1898 Gold Rush has primarily been characterized by “boom-and-bust” cycles in a manner that typifies many of Canada’s natural resource-dependent towns and regions. The present day economic activity centers around three sectors: mining (12.9% of GDP), construction (7.5% of GDP), and tourism (4.4% of GDP) (City of Whitehorse, 2019a). Notwithstanding the still dominant resource economy and its “path dependency” attributes, tourism has garnered considerable, if inconsistent, attention since the Gold Rush era. However, in the past decade there have been a number of successful diversification efforts that are worthy of mention, including the knowledge economy (energy and climate innovation), entrepreneurship and business development, and the cultural sector. These sectors are supported by national economic diversification agendas and programs, for instance through Government of Canada northern economic development funding programs and investments (Government of Canada, 2020).

Knowledge economy

With the final transition of Yukon College into Yukon University in May 2020, the City of Whitehorse is poised to augment the benefits it can draw from a growing knowledge economy (Yukon University, 2020). University programs will focus on Indigenous Governance, Business Administration, and Northern Studies. The Yukon Research Center and the Cold Climate Center, both affiliated with Yukon University, are also positioned to make significant contributions to both the knowledge and climate/energy sectors. It is worth noting that the municipal council declared Whitehorse a “Climate City” in October 2019, and the Yukon Government followed suit a few weeks later with a similar declaration for the territory (City of Whitehorse, 2019c).

Entrepreneurship and Business Development

The Northlight Innovation Hub, which has been home to Yukonstruct, Co-Space, and Makerspace since 2019, has a mandate to support entrepreneurial activity and innovation. Indeed, in 2018 the City of Whitehorse won a national competition for entrepreneurial communities with populations of around 20,000 across all of Canada and was named “Startup City” (Canadian Federation of Independent Business, 2019). The governments of Canada and Yukon have boosted their investments in this sector (Government of Canada, 2019).

Cultural economy

The cultural industries are a direct contributor to Yukon’s economy, and are gaining attention. According to Statistics Canada, Yukon’s culture GDP was $58.4 million in 2017, a 2.8% increase from the previous year, and amounted to 2.1% of the total territorial economy (YG, 2018b). The Yukon Government embarked on its first ever Cultural Industries Strategy in 2019 (YG, 2020).
Tourism

Canada’s north has long lured tourists with its enchanting pull of rugged and pristine wilderness. Many northern Canadian communities, faced with an increasingly contested natural resource base and armed with the romantic appeal of “The North”, have engaged tourism as a strategy for economic growth, stability and, increasingly, economic diversification. Modern “road”-based tourism made its mark in the nation’s northwesternmost corner in 1948, with the completion and opening to the public of the Alaska Highway.

The Yukon is best known for its role in the 1898 Klondike Gold Rush, which saw over 100,000 gold seekers cross its border and make their way to the gold fields near Dawson City (Coates & Morrison, 2005). Until recently, the Gold Rush event dominated the cultural aspects of the Yukon’s tourism. More recently, the territory has given attention to the demand for Indigenous tourism – even while it is challenged on the supply side (Hull, de la Barre & Maher, 2017). Despite these cultural offerings it could be argued that, like other circumpolar northern destinations, the territory remains primarily a nature-based tourism destination.

The Yukon Tourism Development Strategy (YG, 2018b) identified that tourism is responsible for between 3.9% and 7.2% of the territory’s annual GDP. In 2016 a 6.7% increase in tourist spending from the previous year was identified, which translates into an approximate $303 million revenue. The most notable growth in the sector has been associated with winter season (Figure 3.3). Diversifying seasonal visitation in the Yukon has largely been focused on gaining winter visitors. In December 2017, the territory hosted its first winter tourism summit to try and capture some of the anecdotal hype that was fast becoming impossible to ignore. The 2016 winter season made it clear that winter tourism infrastructure was pushed to the limit – reflected in local media headlines: “Winter tourism ‘totally crazy’ in Yukon this year says operator” (Waddell, 2017) (for a more in-depth discussion on Yukon’s tourism seasonality, see Rantala et al., 2019).
Specifically, Yukon winter tourism saw an increase of 21% in international overnight visitation between 2013 and 2017. Overnight visitation is compounded by a recorded 13% increase in retail sales, which according to Yukon Government analysts represents a positive shift in the direction of the industry (Patch & Kerr, 2017).

According to the Yukon Government’s Visitor Exit Survey (2019d), from November 2017 to October 2018 there were 491,200 visitors to Yukon. Of these, 62% were from the United States, 28% from Canada, and the rest from international markets (not the US). In addition, 42% of visitors listed Alaska as their main destination, while a similar number (43%) listed Yukon as their main destination. The top three reasons for visiting Yukon were: 1) Leisure/recreation, at 37%; 2) In transit to/from Alaska, at 22%; and 3) Personal reasons, at 13%. Despite the growth in winter tourism, 78% of Yukon visitors still arrive during summer.

Tourism development in the territory occurs with the support of multiple organizations at diverse levels, including national, territorial, and municipal/First Nations governments. Figure 3.4 presents some of the key players in the Yukon’s tourism development landscape. The organizations operate autonomously at national and local levels, with varying degrees of consultation and collaboration for diverse informational, promotional, and tourism development goals and objectives, including planning for growth, as well as industry, community, and environmental sustainability.
To this end, in 2017 the Yukon Government’s Department of Tourism and Culture initiated a multi-year, goal-oriented tourism development strategy with the aim of providing a ten-year adaptive strategy to identify the goals, values, and strategic actions to realize “a tourism vision for Yukon, developed by Yukoners”. The core principles of the plan aim to:

[...] foster the conditions for a thriving tourism economy, develop tourism in a manner that balances economic, social and environmental values, and bolster support for the industry by aligning our collective efforts with the core values of Yukoners (YG, 2018a, p. 8)

The plan supports the territory’s ambition to become a leading sustainable tourism destination, and includes significant attention to resident and community perceptions of tourism impacts and benefits. Establishing baseline data for these types of indicators can be challenging. A commitment to achieve an ability to track how Yukoners feel about tourism can be found in initiatives such as the Yukon Resident Perceptions of Tourism Survey, conducted in 2019 (YG, 2019c).

One highlight of the survey findings is that a staggering 94% of Yukoners feel that tourism "is good for the Yukon overall" and "benefits Yukon’s economy". This may or may not be related to the fact that one in ten Yukoners is employed by the tourism sector (YG, 2019c). Tourism’s growth is evidenced in several ways, including:

- Air arrivals in Whitehorse – up 8% in 2017 from 2016 and 18% higher than the 2012–2016 five-year average. International visitation was up 3% from 2016 and 7% higher than the 2012–2016 five-year average (Yukon Government, 2018d);
- Revenues from GDP, reported by the Yukon Bureau of Statistics every two years, will be one way the STD plan outcomes will be measured (Yukon Government, 2019d);
• From 2008 to 2016 Yukon business tourism-related revenue increased an average of 5.3% per year. To meet 2028 targets identified in the tourism strategic plan, tourism will need to grow at a compounded rate of 5.93% for the period 2016 to 2028 (Yukon Government, 2019d);

• The 2017-2018 Yukon Visitor Exit estimated that from November 2017 through October 2018 there were 491,300 visitors to the Yukon. This is an increase of 25% over 2012 estimates (the last year the Yukon Visitor Exit Survey was conducted) (YG, 2019d);

• August 2019: Year-to-date (January to June), Yukon’s retail sales increased by $11.7 million, or 3.0%, compared to the same period in 2018; Canada's retail sales increased 1.6% over the same time period (YG, 2019e).

Support for tourism is qualified further, when it comes to Yukoner’s opinions on tourism growth over the next ten years: 47% want to see tourism grow over the next ten years, and 44% are satisfied with a level similar to the current one (YG, 2019c).

**Whitehorse Tourism**

The City of Whitehorse functions as a center providing support to the resource extraction economy, which is synonymous with Canada's periphery (Figure 3.5). Tourism-wise, the City of Whitehorse is primarily positioned as a service hub and jumping-off point or gateway leading the visitor to the Yukon's wilderness recreation space; but despite this dominant role, it has emerging urban-centric destination features and development objectives.

Whitehorse lives up to its tag name of The Wilderness City, with more than half its 419 km² still undeveloped. Moreover, it has five parks, which account for 30% of the city's total area. The most popular recreation activities in Whitehorse are hiking, camping, walking/jogging, wildlife watching, and community events (City of Whitehorse, 2018). The city's recreational amenities are also tourism-oriented attractions. Still, while Whitehorse does offer numerous close-at-hand and quality nature experiences, even social media promoting “9 things to do and see” when visiting Whitehorse as a specific destination lists only two things that actually occur in Whitehorse proper; the other seven take place at locations between 25 and 250 kilometers away (HikeBikeTravel, 2019).
Part of the challenge may be that the City of Whitehorse does not have a distinct tourism department, or any specific or trained tourism staff tasked with giving the sector any particular or informed attention. In 2012, the City of Whitehorse closed its tourism unit and laid off its tourism staff person (Waddell, 2012). It is perhaps partly a result of lacking tourism-specific appointments or a focus within the city management infrastructure that there is also very little Whitehorse-specific tourism research or planning. Overall, the tourism information available for the City of Whitehorse comes from the Yukon Government. In 2018 the City of Whitehorse updated its Official Community Plan (OCP), and conducted numerous consultation initiatives as part of the planning process (City of Whitehorse, 2019b). It is through an examination of the OCP reports that some tourism-oriented, city-specific research or development context implications can be extrapolated. For instance:

- Tourism in Whitehorse hinges on enhancing its urban recreational and tourism amenities. These include trails, parks, and arts and culture infrastructure;
- Housing is identified as the greatest challenge the city faces from a short list of sixteen identified challenges in the OCP consultation process;
- Whitehorse has an employment rate of 71.3% (2016); however, employment/income inequality is identified as an issue. Alongside this finding is the knowledge that tourism is specifically impacted by the relatively lower wages for service sector workers, and the lack of available and affordable housing;
- The lack of a city staff person focused on tourism, culture, and community development is proposed as a need going forward for the city’s tourism development. Hiring a designated staff person connects to a strategy that would address other suggestions stemming from the community consultations, including the need to:
  - Create employment diversification, which is a challenge for the city
• Promote recreation and tourism as an economic development opportunity
• Encourage tourists to stay in Whitehorse longer
• Enhance arts and culture planning as a feature that creates a thriving city
• Enhance the city’s trail system
• Develop the waterfront area as an amenity that will support Whitehorse as a tourist destination
• Develop winter tourism and grow the aurora viewing experiences – these are highlighted alongside mention of emerging winter city issues
• Reconciliation objectives held by the city, especially given that city boundaries lie within the Kwanlin Dün and Ta’an Kwäch’än Councils’ traditional territory

Discussion and conclusion

The Yukon government’s research, tourism planning, and marketing Initiatives are all Yukon Territory-focused; they do not necessarily or specifically address Whitehorse tourism or its planning and development needs any more than they do any other community’s. Meanwhile, the City of Whitehorse does not devote much attention to planning or developing the city’s tourism, and nor do they promote it separately from the territorial – and mostly territory-wide – marketing initiatives.

Those visitors who drive or fly into the territory will likely spend some time in Whitehorse, as most routes to and from the territory make it necessary to go through Whitehorse – for instance, when driving the Alaska Highway coming from or going to the rest of Canada or the “lower 48” United States. Moreover, to access two of the territory’s key destination regions (the Klondike heritage area six hours to the north, or Kluane national park two hours to the west) from the South, one is required to drive through Whitehorse. Those arriving by air also predominantly land first in Whitehorse.

Still, when it comes to winter tourism, the city is markedly impacted by tourism due to the nature of how the wintertime activities rely on the city’s infrastructure. Winter tourism’s relative growth as an emerging type of tourism in the Yukon, with its own particular needs and impacts on the urban amenities that support tourism during a season when much of the activity takes place in the area surrounding Whitehorse, thus relies heavily on the services and amenities offered within the city. Not surprisingly, Rantala et al., (2019) describe how this is also the case in other winter tourism destinations. More generally, and according to the Yukon Governments’ 2019 Yukon Resident Perceptions of Tourism Survey, it is interesting to note that, to date, tourist use of nature is not a high ranking concern for Yukon residents (less than one quarter of the respondents) (Yukon Government, 2019c); that said, there are numerous comments relating to “place integrity”; for instance, concerns have been raised regarding the decreasing walkability of the downtown core caused by traffic, as have fears that tourism will exacerbate an already serious and still growing housing crisis.

In addition, as resident enjoyment of and enhanced reliance on arts- and culture-based activities increase, so might the encounter occur between tourists and residents through a higher demand for cultural or creative tourism experiences. Then, the need to consider host and guest encounters – how often, where, and when
they occur – will become more urgent (de la Barre, in press). These considerations may be specifically significant given reconciliation objectives, which are often associated with arts and culture, and the potential contributions that can be made by Indigenous-associated tourism.

If the urban Arctic is emerging as a place, and exhibiting any destination-like appeal – however tied to gateway cities these definitions may (still) be – then specific attention to the urbanness of Arctic (and Arctic-like) places will be necessary to ensure that sustainable approaches are considered in the light of their place-specific vulnerabilities. Arctic urban places have particular strengths that also hold distinctive place-based opportunities; for instance, their capacity to enable regional development and economic diversification. These possibilities may be overlooked when core center usefulness is collapsed into what their historic duties have been as peripheral service centers aimed at fulfilling the needs of resource extraction-based economies.
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