

**PEEL WATERSHED FINAL RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN
CONSISTENCY CHECK**

YESAB Project #	2012-0092		
Project Title:	Crest Remediation		
Date:	April 11, 2012	Completed by: (name)	Sam Skinner
Submitted to:	YESAB Mayo Designated Office Box 297 Mayo, YT Y0B 1M0		

Project is consistent to the Final Recommended Peel Watershed Regional Land Use Plan: (select one)	Yes
---	------------

Background Information and Conformity Check Analysis

Affected Landscape Management Unit(LMU)(s): Map 1 and Section 5							
LM Unit #	9	LMU Name:	Snake River				
Zoning:	Special Management Area	Land Owner:	YG				
LM Unit #		LMU Name:					
Zoning:		Land Owner:					
Landscape Disturbance Indicators*: Surface Disturbance (ha):							
LMU	Cautionary Level	Critical Level	Current est. Level	Project Estimate	Total Estimate	Notification Rqr'd**	Parties Notified
9	0	0	Not yet provided	0	Not determined	No	No
Linear Disturbance (km):							
LMU	Cautionary Level	Critical Level	*Current est. Level	Project Estimate	Total Estimate	Notification Rqr'd**	Parties Notified
4	0	0	Not yet provided	0	Not determined	No	No
<p>* Surface disturbance indicators do not apply existing mineral claims. ** the YLUPC shall notify the Parties prior to submitting the conformity check to YESAB if they are concerned cautionary or critical levels may be reached</p>							

Special Management Considerations: (Section 5, LMUs)

The upcoming Northern Mountain Caribou Action Plan may be relevant to management of land-use activities in this unit.

Affected Values and General Management Directions (GMD): (Section 5)

Only include values identified in LMU. If no GMDs exist or are relevant, do not include in this table.

Ecological Resources:	Corresponding GMD:
Bonnet Plume Caribou Herd	<i>Avoid or reduce activities in significant wildlife habitats during important biological periods (e.g., utilize timing windows): the proposed project is within a Fall Key Area for the Bonnet Plume Herd.</i>
Contaminated Sites	Policy Recommendation #4: <i>Contaminated sites should be remediated, with the priority being those sites with the highest potential to negatively affect water quality and/or tourism and big game outfitting.</i>
Heritage, Social, Cultural Resources:	Corresponding GMD:
All subsections	No relevant GMD
Economic Development:	Corresponding GMD:
Air Access	Policy Recommendation #16: <i>In the Conservation Area, outside of existing dispositions, new airstrips should not be allowed. Existing airstrips and landing locations may continue to be used, however.</i>

Plan Recommended Best Management Practices:	
Wildlife	<p>Flying in Caribou Country. How to minimize disturbance from aircraft. MPERG Report 2008-1. Available online: www.geology.gov.yk.ca/pdf/2008_1.pdf</p> <p>Flying in Sheep Country. How to minimize disturbance from aircraft. MPERG Report 2002-6. Available online: www.geology.gov.yk.ca/pdf/MPERG_2002_6.pdf</p> <p>Guidelines for Industrial Activity in Bear Country. For the mineral exploration, placer mining and oil and gas industries. MPERG Report 2008-2. Available online: http://www.geology.gov.yk.ca/pdf/Guidelines_for_Industrial_Activity_in_Bear_Country-web.pdf</p>
Water	<p>Best Management Practices for Works Affecting Water in Yukon. Water Resources Branch, Yukon Environment. May 2011. Available online: www.env.gov.yk.ca/mapspublications/documents/bestpractes_water.pdf</p>

Additional Analysis or Comments:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project shouldn't result in any additional linear or surface disturbances since it will be on previously disturbed areas. This project may also hasten recovery of these disturbed areas, resulting in a slight reduction in cumulative impacts. • However, the biggest potential for conflict or disturbance resulting from this project will likely be due to air traffic. The best management practices listed above should be heeded to help mitigate concerns. • Considering this area is adjacent to a big game outfitting base camp and to several large streams, it conforms nicely with Policy Recommendation #2 (<i>Contaminated sites should be remediated, with the priority being those sites with the highest potential to negatively affect water quality and/or tourism and big game outfitting</i>). • Strictly speaking, this project is consistent to Policy Recommendation #16 (<i>In the Conservation Area, outside of existing dispositions, new airstrips should not be allowed. Existing airstrips and landing locations may continue to be used, however</i>) since air traffic will use an existing airstrip. However, significant and persistent improvements to the airstrip (outside of any mineral claims) would be counter to the intent of this recommendation.