

**YESAA Triggered - YG LAND APPLICATION REPORT**  
**Updated to 19<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2008**

**GENERAL**

Application Number	2008-1040
Name	<b>DANIEL H. BENKERT</b>
Application Type	Rural Residential
Date Review Completed	
DO Application Number (YESAB)	2008-0181

**LOCATION**

NTS Map #	115A13	
Geographic Location Name	Near Bear Creek Subdivision	
Latitude and Longitude	60°48'51.6" N 137°42'04.9"W	
Watershed and Drainage Region		
Nearest Community(s)	Name: Haines Junction	Distance from project: 14 km
	Name:	Distance from project: km
First Nation Traditional Territory(s)	Champagne Aishihik First Nation	
Surrounding Land Status		

**APPLICANT’S REASON FOR APPLICATION AND SIZE:** During my stay in W Canada specifically YT, I got to love the land and it’s people. I made numerous valuable friends that I don’t want to miss anymore. I’m applying for this residential land as I’ve chosen to live here and contribute to the Haines Junction community, it’s growth, wealth and development. I have a strong inclination for liberty, freedom and peacefulness and I think this place outside, but still close to the village, incorporates the values listed above. These values are also manifested in my profession: I’m a helicopter pilot and a geologist. My free time is dedicated to the outdoors, in summer as well as in winter. I would like to use this land as home for me and my family. The place perfectly combines our vision of remoteness within social accessibility. I plan to build a log cabin in agreement with this great nature, with minimal impact on the environment. Solar panels, wind energy and generators are planned to supply. The house will be built in 2009, given approval to this request. References can be given upon request.

The parcel is about 3.5 hectares.

**APPLICATION SKETCH DATED JULY 31, 2008 (LANDS BRANCH) IS ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT**

**SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO DISTRIBUTION:**

<b>Lands – Client Services:</b>
<b>Natural Resources Officer INSPECTION COMMENTS – Haines Junction District:</b>
<i>Inspection date: July 30, 2008</i>
<b>Existing Improvements:</b> No improvements on site
<b>Soil:</b> Unsorted glacial gravels (up to “cobble” size as visible in exposed cuts) with up to 26 cm of lacustrine fine to medium sand over top.
<b>Vegetation Cover:</b> Application area lies within the perimeter of a 1940’s Bear Creek fire (exact date unknown). There are residual islands of original white spruce that were spruce beetle killed in the 1990’s and re-growth white spruce (3106 m) after the fire.

**Terrain:** Lies within the Shakwak Trench just north of Haines Junction. The area applied for is mostly flat at the top of a raised terrace above the Alaska Highway.

**Water bodies:** Within the Dezadeash/ Alesk drainage –Bear Creek within 200m of the area under application.

**Exposure:** Generally flat

**Erosion or possible permafrost:** None in the applied for area

**Access Roads:** There is an existing “trail” into the application area at km 1592 off of the Alaska Highway. Distance measured from egress off of the highway to the application area is less than 500m.

**Suitable for Building foundation:** Yes

**Suitable for Septic:** Yes

**Distance to Water Supply:** small creek within the general vicinity

**Subject to Flooding:** No

**Environmentally Sensitive Areas:** No

**If roads in area, any maintained YTG:** North Alaska Highway

**Distance to nearest community:** 14 km

**Distance to Power:** 3 km Nygren subdivision

**Garbage Disposal:** Haines Junction Village disposal site

**General Comments:** The area is suitable for the intended purpose but two larger issues need to be given consideration.

1. Current and only access is along a road that is used by firewood cutters into the Bear Creek SBA conflicts over use and safety issues could arise for both the applicant and timber permit areas.
2. The application is in a known and well used fuelwood cutting area. A large component of the surrounding forested area has been killed in the spruce bark beetle outbreak of 1994-2000. This is what is providing the source of fuelwood but it creates a high fire hazard potential because of both vertical and horizontal fuel loading (as visible in photos 4 and 9)

**Photos are on file**

**Land Claims Implementation Secretariat:** *No comments received of November 19, 2008*

**Property Assessments:** *Received by mail on October 2, 2008:*  
No RETP Concerns.

**Planning/Land Development/Building Safety:** *Received by email on October 28, 2008*

Development Officer

Building / Plumbing Inspector:

“Prior to the placement or construction of any building or structure on the site, development, building, plumbing, electrical and/or gas permits will be required from the Building Safety Branch. Inquiries can be directed to 867-667-5741.”

FireSmart Manager:

This project does not meet any FireSmart standards. I would strongly urge the proponent to meet with the Zone Protection Manager to discuss fire response issues given the nature of the road and not removing trees i.e. for FireSmart work.

From the FireSmart office it is recommended that the new house be built using FireSmart standards and the

area around the home be treated under these standards as well.

This office offers a free FireSmart assessment for rural properties, we would be pleased assess this property once the house is complete.

Recommended guidelines for fire service access driveways

- Driveways more than 45 metres in length should be a minimum of 3.7 metres in width and provide 4.1 metres vertical clearance over the full width. Fire officials may specify additional width and clearance.
- Turnouts shall be spaced so that drivers can see from one turnout to the next. Turnout requirement is waived where the fire service access width is 6.1 metres or more. Driveways more than 90 metres in length should be provided with turnouts at locations approved by fire officials.
- Driveway gradients should not exceed 10%. Exceptions to this may be negotiated with fire officials.
- Driveway turns should not restrict the access of the largest emergency vehicle likely to be operated on the driveway. Fire officials will specify local emergency response agency requirements.
- All gates should be at least 9 metres from the public right-of-way and should not open outward. Gate openings should provide a clear opening at least .6 metres wider than the travelled way.
- Fire service personnel should be able to unlock any gate restricting fire service access.
- Driveways should have an all-weather surface capable of supporting any fire apparatus likely to be operated on the fire service access.
- Dead-end driveways more than 91 metres in length shall be provided with a turnaround at the terminus having no less than 15 metres outside diameter of traveled way. Fire officials may authorize a “hammerhead T” turnaround to provide three point turnaround ability. Dead-end roads should have signs warning of their no-through-traffic status. Recommended guidelines for signs for road, driveways, and buildings
- Signs should be clearly visible and legible from the road and use a consistent system that provides for sequenced or patterned numbering and non-duplicated naming.
- Signs should be built of non-combustible materials and mounted 2 metres above the surface of the road.
- Signs with information such as “dead-end” or “bridge out” will be placed by designated by fire officials. Signs will be placed identifying firefighting water source and type of location.
- Letters, numbers, and symbols used on all signs should be at least 10 centimetres high with a 12-millimetre stroke, contrast with the background color of the sign, and be reflective.

Subdivision/Land Use Planner:

2008-0181 Spot Rural Residential Disposition near Bear Creek West of Haines Junction

- No planning or zoning at this location
- Would be preferable if parcel was moved closer to an existing settlement mode (Bear Creek/Nygren Subdivision) to reduce impact on wildlife, environment, hunting and trapping by spreading out development
- Would be preferable if the lot size was reduced to about 2 hectares to minimize development footprint and impact on the environment.
- Applicant has indicated that lot is approximately 3.5 ha and is oddly configured to provide space for a septic system. A smaller more regular shaped lot should be able to accommodate rural residential lifestyle and infrastructure needs.
- If approved, subdivision approval is required prior to disposition
- Appears part of application area is within 115H13-001 - a wildlife preserve notation
- Access road as described by applicant does not appear to be of an adequate width and certainly would not accommodate emergency vehicles. Access road may have to be upgraded.

Recommendation: Approval for a smaller more regular shaped lot preferably closer to existing settlement mode.

**Land Use:** Received by email on September 8, 2008:

may need land use permit if trail needs upgrading, access permit.

**Environment:** Received by email on October 21, 2008

Environment has completed a review of proposed project and would like to make the following comments and recommendations.

**Valued Ecosystem Components:**

**Wildlife Habitat**

This area is known habitat for many species such as bear, moose, wolf, coyote and various bird species

including raptors.

### **Water Quality**

The application site appears to be near an unnamed creek and detailed site sketch indicates the access road crosses this creek.

### **Environmental Effects:**

#### **1. Loss of wildlife habitat:**

Development activities add to the continued loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat. Loss of habitat may lead to increased human/wildlife conflicts, wildlife avoidance of the area and loss of biodiversity. As the proposed activities involve the development of the parcel (clearing, building and potential future fencing) the result may have significant effect on the wildlife. This application will also expand the “zone of influence” and may affect the ability of wildlife to move through the area and/or negatively impact wildlife connectivity.

#### **2. Potential for increase of wildlife conflicts:**

As development continues to expand into “wildlands” they have the potential for attracting certain types of wildlife (bears, wolves, coyotes, etc). The proposed rural residential application and activities has potential to set up ongoing wildlife interaction and conflicts.

Wildlife such as bears, wolves and coyotes can very easily become accustomed to human activities in a populated area, such as urban neighborhoods, as easily as a remote area and once realizing human activities are not a threat and are not deterred due to routine activities and noise.

In order to reduce the potential for wildlife/human conflicts and/or property damage, garbage, including kitchen waste must be handled in such a way so as not to become accessible to wildlife. The proponent should contact the district Conservation Officer for information concerning appropriate garbage handling and wildlife deterrent practices.

#### **3. Potential for contaminants entering adjacent unnamed creek:**

A risk to the water quality exists due to accidental contamination entering the adjacent waters during normal and high water levels. In this case, the detailed site sketch supplied by the proponent showing the parcel boundaries, location of the residence and access road; appears to indicate that the access road crosses the nearby unnamed creek. Although the parcel appears to be at an appropriate distance from the creek, the potential access road stream crossing is of concern. If the point at which the access road crosses the stream is more than 5 metres in width (as per the *Waters Act* and Regulation) the proponent may require a water licence to undertake work in and around the stream. The proponent will need to ensure that the stream is not negatively impacted by ensuring contaminants and run-off do not enter the waters; (for example) by installing an approved culvert and/or bridge, etc. The proponent should contact Environment, Water Resources at (867)667-3227 for guidance on whether a structure will be needed to cross the unnamed creek.

### **Environment’s Recommendations:**

1. The proponent shall keep all garbage, including kitchen waste, in a container that prevents access by bears and other wildlife, until properly disposed of by hauling to a licenced landfill facility or by burning daily to ash by forced air or fuel fired incineration.
2. The proposed project activities (construction and maintenance, as well as any upgrades and/or use of the access route) shall be managed in such a way as to not allow for contaminants and/or run-off to enter the adjacent unnamed creek.

### **Tourism:** *Received by email on October 24, 2008*

No known tourism concerns with this project.

### **Heritage Resources:** *Received on email on November 3, 2008*

Further to our conversation of this morning, I would like to provide the following information for the Project 2008-0181 (Benkert) file.

We note the comments from Champagne and Aishihik First Nation regarding the heritage potential of this area. CAFN may be unaware that an archaeological overview assessment of this application was carried out by our Development Assessment Archaeologist in August, 2008. The bluff edge described in the CAFN correspondence actually lies outside of the application area, but it was examined along the length of the terrace and no archaeological evidence was noted. Shovel testing was carried out within the application itself, but no cultural material was discovered. Sediments away from the bluff were much thinner than at the terrace edge and

there was no difficulty testing the buried horizons.

In summary, archaeological overview assessment has been completed for this application and there are no archaeological resource concerns.

Please let me know if any further information is required.

*Received by email on August 7, 2008:*

Archaeological overview assessment of Land Application 2008-1040 (Daniel H. Benkert) was completed August 6, 2008. There are no further historic resources concerns with this application.

*Received by DART on October 14, 2008*

Archaeological overview assessment has been completed for this application. No archaeological or historic resources were identified. Should the applicant discover any historic resources, they are requested to notify Government of Yukon, Heritage Resources Unit at 667-5983

**Highways:** *No comments received of November 19, 2008*

**Forestry:** *Received by email on October 15, 2008*

The application is within proximity (1 km or less) of existing cutblocks and logging roads. The application area is within a forest planning area. These areas will be accessed periodically in the future for forest management purposes (silviculture activities). Access into the existing cutblocks should not be impeded by the rural residential development.

The application area currently contains young forest of medium site productivity class. The "Strategic Forest Management Plan for the Champagne and Aishihik Traditional Territory", has identified the general area as a long-term timber supply area. The removal of the young forested land-base limits future forest management options.

**Agriculture:** *No comments received of November 19, 2008*

**Department of Fisheries and Oceans:** *No comments received of November 19, 2008*

**Environmental Health:** *Received by email on October 21, 2008*

Proponent states that a residence will be built on the applied for land and that a permit to install a sewage disposal system may be required. This activity may have socio-economic effects which affect human health, specifically, cumulative effects with regards to sewage disposal.

- Non-Discretionary Requirements -

1) Sewage disposal systems must be installed and used in accordance with the *Sewage Disposal Systems Regulation*.

- Permits and Authorizations -

1) Under the *Sewage Disposal Systems Regulation*: 1) Permit to Install a Sewage Disposal System; and 2) Authorization to Use a Sewage Disposal System.

- Proposed Activities which Contravene the *Public Health & Safety Act* -

None.

- Omissions by Proponent -

None.

- Special Considerations -

None.

**Municipalities:** *Not Applicable*

**Champagne Aishihik First Nations:** *Received by email November 5, 2008*

**CAFN RESPONSE TO PROJECT 2008-0181**

**Residential Land Application- KM 1592 Alaska Highway, Bear Creek - Benkert**

We would like to make the following comments with respect to project 2008-0181:

**Land Use Planning**

We oppose this application, it is a spot land application. Kluane Regional Land Use Plan recommends that development remain in established nodes. CAFN would refer any interested parties seeking new or additional land in our traditional territory to pursue lands within the current nodes of disturbance at Bear Creek/Nygren area or in the Bearberry Lane area of Haines Junction in order to minimize socio-economic and environmental effects on the landscape.

**Wildlife**

The applicant states minimal wildlife activities in this area, however, this area is known for its wildlife movement between the two mountain ranges from Bear Creek to Kluane Lake. This area contains prime moose habitat, and is especially important winter cow and calf area. This area is known for its wildlife movement corridor (Alek River/Decoeli and Archibald Range to Ruby Range corridor) and habitat for moose and other species such as wolves, lynx, foxes and bears. We are very concerned about interruption to wildlife movement in this area. The Integrated Landscape Plan for the Champagne and Aishihik Traditional Territory, May 2007 (ILP) has recognized this value by declaring the application site as High Wildlife Value Area, please see excerpts attached.

In using the ILP and other resource plans and guidelines it is important to note that while they provide *some* guidance on pointing out areas of concern or recommend practices to limiting disturbance to the landscape, the processes of timber harvesting and residential or agricultural development are very different: forest harvesting and associated activities is essentially a seasonal or cyclical disturbance to an area (clearings and roads are often temporary allowing for recovery) whereas residential developments like the one proposed is a year-round permanent use of the land, and the effects must be considered with upmost caution.

This proposed development will add to the continuation of dissecting and alienating wildlife and their habitat. The loss of wildlife habitat is happening at a very fast rate in and around the Kluane Region, with increase recreational activities, forestry, logging, mining exploration, agricultural and land developments.

**Effects on Subsistence Harvesting**

The continued expansion of development into new areas increases issues of wildlife alienation and avoidance in and around these developed areas, these contribute to a further decline in harvest and making traditional lifestyles harder to sustain. The proposed rural residential application would put yet another limitation on harvesting within a radius of the proposed dwelling. Had the application been part an existing node of development, the decrease in harvesting area would be much less (since the no-harvesting provision is already in place there.) When harvesting is limited because of residential development, it is our Elders and those with limited means that are affected the most, since they rely on the harvesting areas that are easily accessible.

### **Trapping**

RTC #265 will be impacted by this development, and the trapper should be contacted and consulted with on any permanent land application within this area.

### **Scope of Project proposal/Access**

The application is unclear on the status of the access to this site. It appears that the proponent intends to use an abandoned forestry and/or mining related trail, and there is no information as to whether this constitutes an approved access. If access is not currently adequate, we would recommend the project proposal be withdrawn. If the provision of access is required, it needs to be included within the scope assessment of project. Further, we maintain forestry roads should be single resource use subject to decommissioning after their use; we do not want to see agricultural or country residential move into areas that have been harvested.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please contact me at 668-2292.

Sincerely,

*Comments received by letter dated October 9, 2008*

**Re: Daniel H. Benkhert, Rural Residential land application**

September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008, Sheila Greer and Graham Boyd undertook this inspection. Full details on this filed including accurate locational information, can be found in the Lands office files. Additional photos of the locales visited (beyond those presented her) are in Heritage Programme files.

Observations and comments: The requested parcel of land was well-flagged, so it was easy to establish what area was being requested. The setting has a beautiful view to the south, and features bluff-head loess (dune-like) sediments along the edge of the terrace bench. In a few places the sediments are exposed, and at one spot, the volcanic ash layer was observed more than a metre below the present surface. We walked around this exposed area at the front of the bluff, and saw no lithics or other cultural material.

Up top of the bluff, it features a very old burn, with many scattered deadfalls – quite dense in some places a few hundred metres back in from the terrace edge. The replacement vegetation is now fairly mature near the terrace edge.

The property being requested under the Benkhert Rural Residential Land application file has both actual and potential heritage value, and therefore should not be released to the applicant. Two possible (tentative identification) adze cut stumps were seen within the block of land being applied for. The property experienced a major forest fire at some time in the past, with fire ravaging the forest stand so badly that it is likely that firm evidence of above-ground cultural features was destroyed at that time. In addition, the setting of the property (south-facing, terrace edge location; in the context of bluff-top Aeolian sediments) is one that is well recognized as having the potential for buried cultural materials. In the southwest Yukon, such settings are known to yield buried, potentially deeply buried, archaeological deposits. Because the cultural materials may be buried at significant depth below the current ground surface, it is also difficult to identify and mitigate heritage sites in such geomorphic settings. Shovel tests dug to detect buried cultural deposits may not go deep enough to confirm that cultural materials are present, or absent (i.e., shovel testing yields false negative results).

Champagne and Aishihik would request the assessment of an application not begin until receipt of a heritage assessment in writing from this office. Reasoning for this is process in nature for if significant heritage values are found it would be remiss to evaluate a proponent's application when concerns such as these would nullify the application.

*Additional Comments re 2008-1040 Daniel H. Benkert received by email on November 28, 2008:*

After reviewing the evaluation report from Yesaa I wanted to contribute additional information and clarification which I think may better define the concerns of Champagne and Aishihik regarding this application.

### Access

The route the proponent intends to use for access is described in the application as a "trail" or "abandoned logging trail." There seems to be some inconsistencies in the interpretation of access for safety in the yesab evaluation both for ambulance and emergency fire crews. YG Community Services state a variety of road conditions that they need to ensure safe entry and exit to the site for emergency fire response. The requirements speak to "driveway needs", but in reality, these requirements would need to extend to the highway. The bush trail leading to this site does not have a minimum 3.7 m width, nor 4.1m of vertical clearance along its entire route as well it has slopes greater than 10% , which is another maximum in the criteria. Furthermore access for ambulance may not be possible in all seasons. As this application is for year round residency this is a factor of some note.

Also of concern is the stream crossing on the proposed access. I have a copy of a report (attached) we commissioned to be done with respect to assessment of rivers and streams (fish habitat). The report concludes that all streams in the CATT (forest management planning area) should be considered fish bearing until a fisheries assessment is completed for these creeks, streams and rivers. A management guideline in the Integrated Landscape Plan (ILP) re-iterates this point.

Excerpt from: Environmental Dynamics Inc, (2006). OVERVIEW FISH AND FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT FOR THE CHAMPAGNE AND AISHIHIK TRADITIONAL TERRITORY (NON-OVERLAP AREAS). Final Report, Feb 2006.

*Generally, the fish and fish habitat information available in the CATT is limited to large streams, lakes and streams located adjacent to existing infrastructure (i.e. highways, roads). As such, many of the streams within the priority areas for forestry management planning are without significant fisheries information. This lack of data has the potential to compromise the quality of decisions made during forestry planning, environmental assessment, and operational processes. If no fisheries data exists regarding a particular stream or water body, the assumption should be made that it is fish bearing and these assumed values must be protected. Given the widespread lack of information regarding fish presence/absence and habitat availability and utilization in the CATT, all streams that have not been assessed should be considered fish bearing.*

As the proposed access is a single resource use access The Strategic Forest Management Plan (SFMP) and the ILP reference the potential negative effects of access. Access development should be minimal for purposes of protecting wildlife. The SFMP refers to Grizzly bear management recommendations which identifies a threshold for the area of 0.16 km per sq. km. According to an assessment of the road infrastructure within the ILP areas there is already 0.16 km per sq.km in the Landscape Unit that this application falls in. As well, all new access is meant to be de-commissioned. The principle issue is the proponent will likely need to improve the access, though hasn't clearly described his intentions in the application, thus a very likely potential for increased traffic and potential impact on wildlife.

For all arguments above, it only makes sense to re-direct the applicant to a new area with existing better access that meets the needs of emergency services (ambulance and emergency fire response units), while at the same time doing a far more effective job of mitigating issues related to fish in streams and impacts to wildlife.

#### Land Planning

CAFN has not been involved in the development or amendments to the Yukon Government's Rural Residential Policy. We have not expressed an objection to the Policy's statement that "the desire to reside in a rural environment is recognized as a legitimate land use activity". However, we believe this application does not hold true to the following statements of the Policy:

"land applications in rural areas will be directed to nodes to provide for the rational delivery of services and to minimize the impact on other resource users and the environment";

"applications located directly off the Haines Road and Alaska and Klondike Highways are considered on a case-by-case basis but are normally directed to existing nodes" (Site Criteria #2);

In 1998, CAFN and the Yukon Government, along with the Asek Renewable Resources Council and the Village of Haines Junction, engaged in a plan to identify candidate agricultural and rural residential areas in the Haines Junction region. This initiative, referred to as the Kluane Land Use Working Group, may be an example of a

“preliminary screening process” referenced in the Policy, as it was a response to pressure for these types of lands. While the process identified an area for agricultural development, this did not happen with rural residential. The KLUWG recommended that for Rural residential;

Development should take place only in limited planned areas either within the communities or on land immediately adjacent to the communities. Where the land needed for development is adjacent to a community, the land should be transferred to Yukon, included within the community boundaries, and regulated through local jurisdiction. CAFN believes this process should be revitalized and carried through to completion for rural residential as well.

Sound land management can only be achieved through land use planning. These dispositions affect trapping and traditional harvesting, and impact on connectivity. Decisions made on a case by case basis are heavily influenced on the particular issues of the day such as lack of available lots in planned areas. Meeting this demand through spot land applications is reactive and fails to make the best use of the land that is available. These land dispositions denote a permanent change in the landscape, they change wildlife corridors, and turn public lands into exclusive use areas and therefore must be considered with the utmost care. In the Yukon context, any land use plan must leave room for wildlife considerations as well as public use and enjoyment of lands.

While acknowledging the desires of others to live a rural lifestyle, CAFN would be remiss not to convey the impact this has on our citizens’ harvesting rights and opportunities, particularly hunting and trapping. As titled land becomes off-limits to First Nations people to carry out these activities, so does all land within a 1 km. radius around any residence.

In the absence of a Regional Land Use plan and with a lack of proactive community planning it would be irresponsible to convert public lands to permanent private ownership without some thought to an interim land allocation process.

There are presently unallocated lots in the Pine Lake agricultural sub-division.

Thank you for considering CAFN’s comments on this project.

**Alsek Renewable Resource Council:** *Received by email November 6, 2008*  
Re-Project Number 2008-0181

The Alsek Renewable Resource Council reviewed this application and did note that the parcel the proponent is applying for is within a wildlife corridor, often used by bears. The applicant should be made aware of this and take all measures to minimize bear/human conflicts.

This application also falls within trapping concession #265, the trapper who owns the Registered Trapping Concession (RTC), should be contacted and consulted with on any permanent land application within this area, as it may further diminish the trapper’s ability to utilize this trapline.

As discussed with the proponent, the Alsek Renewable Resource Council does not support any land use applications in the Champagne Aishihik Traditional Territory (CATT) in the absence of a land use plan.

Yours truly,

Susan Desjardins  
Executive Director

*Received by email on November 5, 2008:*

**Re- Land Applications 2008-0380, 2008-0400, 2008-0401, 2008-1040**

Council reviewed the above land applications in September 2008. These land applications do fall into an area that would be considered a “node” and would be considered more ideal for development. We noted that three of these applications are industrial in nature, with a residence to be built as well. As there has been no land use

<p>planning in Champagne Aishihik Traditional Territory (CATT) as of yet Council is concerned about receiving more of these industrial applications for less appropriate areas.</p> <p>The area applied for by all applicants is a wildlife corridor used mainly by bears, the applicants should be made aware of this and take all measures to minimize bear/ human conflicts. This area is used industrially through the gravel pit there, and would probably not be the worst place to house industrial activity.</p>
<p><b>Yukon Electrical Company Ltd:</b> <i>No comments received of November 19, 2008</i></p>
<p><b>Yukon Energy Corp:</b> <i>Received by email on September 25, 2008:</i> Yukon Energy has no concerns with this application.</p>
<p><b>Neighbours (only enter the Lot # &amp; Name if they respond):</b> <i>No comments received of November 19, 2008</i></p>
<p><b>Trappers # 265:</b> <i>No comments received of November 19, 2008</i></p>
<p><b>Big Game Outfitter 13:</b> <i>No comments received of November 19, 2008</i></p>

**DECISION:**

**INTERIM DECISION LETTER SENT TO CLIENT:**  
***(No IDL where application denied)***

**FINAL DECISION LETTER SENT TO CLIENT:**