

CPAWS

Date: June 23, 2021

Attendees: Randi Newton

DRPC: Tim Sellars, Nicole Percival, Char Luscombe

Notes:

Questions and comments from CPAWS:

- Cumulative effects – has there been modeling done on Moose, caribou and salmon? How does this tie to disturbance thresholds?
- Ecoregion representation – there are areas of underrepresented ecoregions in the planning region. See YG's targets.
- SMA temporary withdrawals – unclear which ones were recommended for temporary withdrawal
- Linear disturbance thresholds for Grizzly bears is exceeded in low LMUs – (0.6 km/km² - data for Alberta)
- Wetlands – tiered approach to development in wetlands? By claim and by LMU to prevent race to develop fens.
- Some SMA 2 areas similar to SMA 1 areas (e.g Habitat Protection Area recommended for Scottie Creek)
- How were Zones of Influence taken into consideration with respect to roads and disturbance thresholds?
- One concern with the cumulative effects thresholds is the lag between approval, development, documentation of disturbances.
- Curious about how Yukon Parks (Yukon Government) have received SMA 2 areas
- Questioned how YESAB will deal with multi-elevational projects e.g. LMU 23 (Fortymile), Placer projects do typically prefer to build roads on ridge tops
- Asked about withdrawal in non-SMA areas e.g. LMU 11 in the Flat Creek wetlands, noted that it is an ISA1 because of Timber harvest and low-mineral development, could this then have staking withdrawn as well?