

Day 1. Wednesday Sept. 10

1. Introduction

a) **New members declare oath**

This item was addressed prior to the meeting

b) **Call to order**

Eugene Pascal attended by phone and called the meeting to order at 9:18 AM

The board discussed who to have as meeting chair since it was difficult for Eugene to chair the meeting over the phone. Burt Hunt nominated Jozef to chair the meeting. Jozef accepted the nomination

Motion to approve Jozef Carnogursky as this meeting's chairperson		Motion GRRB 14-25
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

c) **Declaration of conflict of interest**

Jozef gave welcoming remarks to meeting attendees and asked members to declare conflicts of interest as they arise throughout the meeting.

2. Agenda

Members reviewed the agenda. Amy noted that under Tab 8. Agency updates that there would be only a written update by James Firth, Species at Risk Committee, which is in the electronic binder. No other additions or deletions were made to the agenda.

Motion to adopt the meeting agenda with the revision as noted by Amy.		Motion GRRB 14-26
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Doug Doan	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

Jozeph requested comments on what to do during the funeral on Thursday. The Board discussed and agreed to take a break during the funeral and then to reconvene.

3. Review and approval of draft minutes: Feb 18-20, 2014 Board meeting;

Mar 19, 2014 Teleconference; May 21, 2014 Teleconference; Jul 23, 2014 Teleconference

Jozef asked if all members had had time to review the minutes. The Board discussed that it may be best to make motions for each set of minutes separately, especially as some members were not on the board then. All agreed. **February 18th, 2014 minutes.** – Bobbie Jo inquired whether during the last meeting in February if there had been added to the minutes, board members standing under different portfolios and if that could be added to the minutes from that meeting. Amy reviewed the action items to see if that is where that went. Amy saw this in the March minutes pg 4, but was not in the February minutes.

Action item: to add board member discussion on standing under different portfolios to the February minutes.

Charlie asked about work being done on fracking. Amy answered, regarding pg 5 –of 33 in the minutes. He noted a lot of discussion in the Sahtu but not in the Delta. Amy noted that the notes in the minutes were with regard to a tour

Amy had taken in Calgary. She noted that Janet’s role is to keep informed of what is coming up, to attend meetings. Janet clarified no discussions to do this in the delta area. Amy said so there is no further update on this. Bobbie Jo mentioned that the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers had recently done a round of meetings in communities. At GTC assembly, there was a motion to oppose fracking in the GSA until it is proven safer. Charlie mentioned about fracking in the NWT –MLA tours with chiefs and they came back with a report saying that the chiefs of Good Hope oppose it. Because a lot is happening in south, so he is concerned whether this is being looked at. He would like a copy of the motion.

*Action Item: Jozef said we could get this motion to Charlie.
Wilbert Firth has a copy of the motion about fracking from the GTC Assembly for Charlie.*

K Callaghan 2014-9-16 10:06 AM
Comment [1]: Each Action Item has been added to a table at the end of the minutes.

Motion to accept the Feb 18, 2014 minutes		Motion GRRB 14-27
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Charlie Snowshoe	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

March 19th teleconference. Bobbie Jo asked about Cindy’s membership and attendance. Amy clarified that she is an alternate and the full members are in attendance. Ron who is also an alternate is attending so he can make his oath.

Natalka noted a spelling error of her name on page 3; Jozef asked for clarification on discussion referred to on page 12 of moving of tag zone for Cape Bathurst herd towards Campbell Lake. Amy clarified that this was a side-note from ENR about discussions to move the zoning but was said in passing. Kristen agreed and clarified that Stephen Charlie had made this comment but there was not further discussion about it then.

Action Item: We can ask Stephen about the zoning changes when he attends later today.

Bobbie Jo asked if members commented on what files they want to be involved in. Amy said Cindy commented.

K Callaghan 2014-9-16 9:47 AM
Comment [2]: We forgot to do this. Suggest follow-up by email with Stephen

Motion to accept the March 19, 2014 minutes		Motion GRRB 14-28
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Johnny Charlie	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

May 21, 2014 teleconference. Burt noted that on page 3 other business #10, that there was a spelling error of “alternate”. Ron noted that under #10 he should be noted as an alternate member, not member.

Motion to accept the May 21, 2014 minutes with the noted changes made.		Motion GRRB 14-29
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

July 23, 2014 teleconference. Amy noted that there should be the same correction as above for Cindy in the attendance regarding text saying alternate member or member. Charlie asked about the Wildlife Act and noted recent news reports about the GNWT saying that people cannot hunt. Jozef mentioned that they will be speaking about the Wildlife Act regulations tomorrow and that Charlie’s concerns can be talked about then. Natalka noticed a spelling error of the word Wildlife under #7for wildlife act actions. No other discussion on the minutes.

Motion to accept the July 21, 2014 minutes with the above noted changes made.		Motion GRRB 14-30
Moved by: Johnnie Charlie	Seconded by: Charlie Snowshoe	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

4. Action Items –Review and discussion

Amy reviewed the action items table with the board members. These were action items since the February board meeting. She noted that in the meeting binder there was also supplemental information.

Action item: Amy will make a table about what she has heard from board members indicating their interest in various files and can solicit members to comment further so Amy can keep them up to date on those files.

Board member questions:

Bobbie Jo asked about 14-20 and scholarships. Amy clarified that none were approved at the last meeting but that this was about proper coding of the scholarships.

Action item: Adjust the action items to reflect that 14-20 was about proper coding of the scholarships.

Charlie: re# 25 –what is the latest on this with the Yukon government?

Amy: noted this would be on the agenda tomorrow.

No other discussions or comments on the action items.

Morning Break 10AM-10:15AM

5. WSF Update –Discussion with GRRB’s Wildlife Studies Fund Investment Advisors

Phil and Geoffrey attended by teleconference, reviewing the Portfolio Review document that is in the electronic binder.

Questions from Board:

Doug: clarify on the 80,000 annual income. The current value and one year return. Wouldn't the return be more than 80,000?

Phil: 80,000 paid in interest and dividends. We know how much those will pay, no matter what the stock market. We know that 80,000 will always be produced. It is the 7% that is the capital growth –stock market returns. Last year that was 20%. We don't believe that they will grow this much in the next year so we are telling you the income but not also the capital growth

Burt: If 80,000 taken out, the growth in the portfolio is net 200,000 last year?

Phil: Exactly. The growth comes from changes in shares. We know you have a 3.5% of portfolio income need. That is in the policy statement from a few years ago. Also to protect the capital of the fund. To continue to produce 3.5% of revenue so you can use that for your studies on a yearly basis. Some years a benefit from the stock market giving more than expected, such as this year. We don't expect it for next year, but you will still get the 80,000. But not massive increase expected for next year.

Burt: But even at 5%-6% we should see growth by another 60-80,000 in portfolio?

Phil: yes, that's what we believe

Burt: I have a second question: you operate under clearly written guidelines (new members need to know this) for 3.5% that goes towards an operating fund. The remainder goes back to the principal?

Phil: Yes, that is on the policy statement. We have a copy here and GRRB should have a copy. If not, we can send that. We worked on that with a board member a few years ago, but he is no longer on the board (Dan Topolniski)

Burt: what is in it for RBC? Are the fees disclosed?

Phil: The fees come on a quarterly basis. Always on statements. Fixed fee, not hidden. Charged monthly, assessed quarterly. I believe it is 0.05%.

Burt: pretty good work on your part. Thank you.

Doug: One final question: returns showing are net?

Phil: Yes, all returns showing are net.

Amy noted that the investment policy is in the orientation binder for new members.

Action item: Amy will share the electronic binder with the rest of the board.

Phil continued with his presentation from the Portfolio review document, ending with comments about a socially responsible investment company and oil sands related investments. E.g. Sustainable Analytics.

Phil: You can put in your policy statement that you can use this to help you manage your money. Bear in mind that some companies, although they don't come up on the list, may do work in mining and in oil business. This company-RBC can look into this for you. There is no extra cost for this. Some of us think that this may affect returns, but studies go either way. If you would like to start doing this in your policy, we can do this for you.

Questions from Board:

Burt: So the SRI must be a bundle of chosen or certain stocks. There must be stats on the return (e.g. TSX bundle, including non SRI stocks is such and such a return and this only SRI is such and such a return)? This must be done somewhere?

Phil: Sustainable Analytics may think Suncor meets their requirements... They say how companies do by their ratings. ...We have other clients that have named companies they wish to exclude from their portfolio. We don't have a bead on how they do. (E.g. If no oil sands or no pipelines). Two ways, leave to SRI to do the assessment or put in your policy specifics about what you don't want.

Burt: Their website, do they have info on stock bundles and what they do have available?

Phil: Yes, they rank everyone. Interesting to go through what they have.

Burt: Overriding question: starting with 2.5 million in 2010. Monstrous returns last year, and good the few years previous, so not sure why we are spending 80,000 but only increased by 200,000 when that would have been last year's alone increase. Shouldn't the fund be bigger? (apologies for not time for full review in asking this)

Action Item: Phil: we can go back and look at this. (amount of return; why only 80,000 and not more if returns were larger this past year) **We have no problem and can send that out to Amy.**

Burt: it would also be good to see what has been good to us, and what hasn't so we can adjust our expenditures.

Phil: yes, we can look at that for you. No problem

No other questions for Phil and Geoff.

Phil –can always call w/ question.

Burt: is there anywhere where we can see the stocks we now hold as equities?

Action Item: Phil: yes, we can send a copy of the current account of stocks right now to Amy's email address.

Burt: Thank you. That will also help us regarding the ethical issues also. Thanks.

6. GRRB Updates

a. Chair update

Eugene provided his update via call-in.

Eugene has been working with Amy on a lot of the emails and things like that. Some issues coming up: next week or the week after, we will be hosting a meeting with the other board chairs (ACCWM meeting), along with IGC/WMAC to come to a conclusion on the Bluenose management plan.

He has also been touching on –about 2 months ago, he met with the investors briefly and they provided information which was forwarded to Amy.

Eugene, Jozef and Amy working on the Wildlife Act. Current work on regulations. Because of a lack of resources, we have been following lead of Gwich'in Tribal Council because they have the funds for lawyers etc... on this file. So we are putting faith in their current lawyer that the regulations and the Act fall in line with the GCLCA.

It is sunny and warm in Fort Smith after a week of rain.

Any questions or things that you would like to see me work on or tackle?

No questions for Eugene.

b. Members update

i. **Jozef** gave his update. He has been working with Eugene and Amy on the wildlife act. A concern brought to the board last time is that the phases of implementation –pointed out that some of the regulations needed in the GSA need to be included as well, not just NWT wide. They need to recognize what we need. For example, to help local RRCs with their obligations under the claim.

He has also been working on the Bluenose plan. Position that it is time to finalize and conclude this plan. Going on far too long in his opinion. Lots of consultation on that.

Sheep plan, we have raised this and this will be spoken to later. Interested to see what it looks like now.

Speaking to GTC re regulations. Want to continue to use their legal counsel on that.

I've been quiet as a board member the last few months. Ready to be more involved this fall.

ii. **Ron** gave his update. Pleased at the appointment as an alternate member. Kudos to Amy for the orientation manual. Nice to get refreshed. A good manual and not everyone has that. With the website, that looks good on you. Nice to see how fast expense claims dealt with, etc.. Very good. Background in fisheries management, long ago an officer. Lived in Inuvik, Tuktoyaktuk and other places north and east. A variety of interests, enjoy getting out hunting and fishing. Last two springs working on wolverine field project with GNWT. Would be pleased to get involved in files on renewable resource management and species at risk etc.. As a student did lots of field work in Ontario (collaring, etc...)

iii. **Burt** –happy to be here. I echo Ron's comments. Talent around this table...school of hard knocks learned that way too. Can tell by the discussion that we have wonderful depth on the board. To staff, have same picture of Ron and not getting expense claim in previous experience with other organizations but never have I walked in getting a stub and receive money in bank the same day! The work coming through is to credit of ED and staff. My strength is in fisheries back ground. I once lived in Tsiigehtchic. I worked on Mackenzie valley fish resources and files for pipeline 1, back in "71 or "72. I lived in Yellowknife with involvement in pipeline 2 also.

iv. **Bobbie Jo** –in November it will have been a year since I've been on this board. I used to be staff of GRRB years ago. Looking forward to more involvement in files. I attended the North American Caribou Conference in May 2014. A good group with a full meeting. Diversity is good. Great staff. Looking forward to put all expertise together to fulfil mandate. We should consult with elders for their expertise. RRC members have

valuable input (e.g. Wilbert Firth and Fanny Greenland have been involved with their RRCs for many years). Nice to see young people here getting involved. Want to make good progress together.

v. **Doug Doan:** pleased to be here. Have been on other boards in NWT. None of them quite compare to efficiency experienced here in first 30 days. Have been in NWT since 1987, Bechoko, Yellowknife and Inuvik. Have friends up here. Retired from government, nice to keep one oar in the water and in touch with communities. Looking forward to working w/ board.

vi. **Charlie Snowshoe:** I would like to thank staff for doing a good job on research. Maybe this is not under our mandate but am still interested in water. Losing water. Water low. Now dam in Yellowknife is shot and no one is saying nothing. We know why it is happening. We bring it up time and time again. I want to bring it up again, for research. Never heard of GRRB doing research on water. Oil sands releasing dirty water, going into river before Christmas but no one said everything. Under GCLCA, we have to protect quantity and quality of the water so I need to bring it up but whose mandate is it? GRRB? Tribal Council? I can walk across the Peel River right now, I think, that is how low it is. Can go up to 125 miles, Caribou creek –now they can't come up the Peel. Hard to come down the Mackenzie right now. Wanted to bring it up to look at taking care of that.

vii. **Johnnie Charlie:** Board appointments, finally got it back 13 months... Most recent meeting with Amy and Natalka (SAR). I have a concern about muskrats and people talking about this –I've lived in McPherson 6 years straight. That person who came up (re: muskrat research and research interest), should go talk to people about it. They are running out of habitat. Draining water. In my area, I lost some country –erosion caused many lakes to dry out. So now access to muskrat lakes is lacking because the lakes are dry. Waiting to see what happens. In 1987 when a lake drained out, we wanted to dam it up and ENR helped fund us building a dam. Creek was 40ft wide, we put trees across and poles on each side, mud and sand bags. Result was good but it lasted one year –the lakes came up to level, but high water knocked it out the second year. Now, I will have to relocate where my cabin is, because there is no longer access. On Google Earth, you can't even see outline of some of these lakes anymore. This is one of my concerns. Can't say it is disease. Not enough of them for disease to spread. Low water did not help any. One of my concerns for sure and would like someone to look into it.

Jozef noted GRRB is close to a full board with a few appointments still to come.

Doug noted that GNWT has inter-jurisdictional agreements with Alberta and BC, but he doesn't know much about the water. Some people point to problem originating in Alberta or BC. With devolution, GNWT is responsible for water. Some benefit, perhaps, to ask them to tell the board what they are doing with water. What is going on with these agreements with AB and BC to shed light on some of these issues?

Jozef noted that the board can ask GNWT representatives about this when they are on the agenda.

7. Staff updates

a. Executive Director update

Amy gave a verbal update of her written presentation and noted that she also has supplemental information for the board in the binder.

Questions to Amy:

Burt: Are we waiting for a new lease? Will rates be increasing?

Amy: We are supposed to sign a 5 year lease. ICP can come to us at any time and give us a lease to sign. They haven't done that because of discussions about ownership of that building. Amy has let it be because fate of

GLWB is to be decided on. They probably won't need that office space. If we sign lease for entire floor, we won't be able to afford it. Have emails saying they will continue with current arrangement and costs. But they could give us new lease for signing at any time. They could also increase it. Need to consider that for new GRRB budget. Current budget is based on money coming from GLWB and LUPB for their office space.
Jozef: good job. Thanks for all your work.

b. Wildlife Biologist

Kristen reviewed her written update with the board.

Questions to Kristen

Johnnie: Where was caribou fence?

Kristen: It was an enclosure to keep out grazing animals like sheep as part of an old project. I'm not sure exactly where it was found, right now. Ian has the coordinates.

Amy reviewed notes and said it was on the south side of Mt Lange.

Charlie: Ratting in Crow Flats Are there muskrat declines? Johnnie noted they also have trouble accessing lakes because of draining etc...

Kristen answered that she thought there were lots of muskrats but agreed there were some lakes draining.

Didn't want to speak for the researcher who did the research though. He had a lot of good information about methods that could be used in our area for assessing muskrat populations.

c. Fisheries Biologist

Kris reviewed his presentation and written staff update with the board.

Questions to Kris

Ron: What will you be doing for habitat monitoring?

Kris: We'll go into that.

Burt: Are grayling absent now?

Kris: cooler at top of watershed and found farther down.

Burt: is there an arctic salmon? (2:31)

Kris: Pacific Salmon and Pink salmon near Aklavik. I think that there are probably pink salmon spawning in lower end near Destruction City. If they have been seen that far up, then they (pink) are probably spawning there.

Charlie: water level?

Kris: Changing a lot, but it is very consistent. I have a video I could show you. There were holes in rock face and water coming out. Not sure where that is coming from but thinks water supply is pretty good. Good rain and snow fall in recent years so my opinion is that water supply and ground water recharge is good. Not like earlier years like in 2007 where Fish Hole Creek it ran dry and was below gravel. Lots of water now.

Charlie: no grayling this year?

K: none in upper sites, but some in Fish Hole.

Charlie: Grayling decreasing? Increasing?

K: don't know. I think they use the lower end of the system a little bit, but we don't have information on their

numbers.

Kris paused to recognize John Carmichael, a char monitor from Aklavik, who was in attendance at today's meeting. John mentioned that the fish were done running.

Johnny Charlie: Regarding the cabin photo Kris showed. This cabin is in Husky Lake across from Fort McPherson. Johnny helped build it. For the Aklavik RRC coordinator, the TRRC coordinator found funding for this. This is the 4th they are building. They are replacing old ones with new ones (insulated floors etc...) for community use.

Noon Lunch Break

7. Staff updates Continued

d. Renewable Resources Manager

Janet gave her presentation by power point and following her written update.

Questions for Janet

Burt asked whether instating the 45 day response policy for research and development application was working. Janet said that it has generally and gave some examples of how this has worked well so far, enabling her to give the policy to organizations requesting response with short notice. Also have a new email address (not just Janet) for responses to come into, so requests aren't missed if Janet out of the office.

Doug: Why pay interviewers \$30 per survey interview and harvesters \$20? Why the difference in the numbers?

Janet: No, we're not doing that. The interviews are done 3 times a year. If harvesters come in all three times, they get \$60 incentive (not a payment) and if only once they get a \$20 gift certificate. It works out the same amount given out by each RRC, it just is allocated differently by them, depending on what they wanted.

e. Special Projects Biologist

Natalka gave her presentation to the board by power point, reviewing her written report with them. There were no questions for Natalka after her presentation.

f. Office Manager

Cheryl reviewed her written presentation with the board.

g. Summer Staff (Technician Trainee and Summer Student)

Amy noted the written updates from the Summer staff (Alicia McCrae and Jozef Semmler) are in the electronic binder

Bobbie Jo: It would be nice to have a letter from the board directly to the summer student and technician trainee thanking them for their help and acknowledging the work they did etc...

Action item: Send a letter to the summer staff from the Board thanking them for help and acknowledging work they did.

8. Agency Updates

d. GTC Update

Tsatsiyé Catholique spoke to the board. He began his job at the GTC recently. Doing a lot of review and research among other things right now.

Currently he is involved in the new wildlife act review. He is trying to see the whole picture and wishes he could answer questions on that, but is learning as he reviews the information. Talking with Amy and Jennifer Lam (IGC) He is involved with the CIMP file.

Research review. The November meeting with the GRRB –logistics

Environmental assessment board –fracking interest. GTC will only do it if 100% safe, which isn't possible, so that helps make things clear for him.

Eagle Plains –some fracking issues there. He will be talking with Bobby Mills from Dawson City on that topic.

Currently going to meetings such as this for community involvement and observer status as he learns. In future will be able to talk more knowledgeably about items.

Burt: Will there be more on the agenda about the fracking issue? I don't understand the permitting system.

Presumes GNWT issues permit. Where does GTC enter into the approval process? How is that received (or not) before a permit is issued or not?

Tsatsiyé: I am putting together a folder on this, getting all the knowledge and information on my plate right now. People coming to Inuvik on November 4th to talk.

Burt: fracking is happening in Eagle Plains?

Tsatsiyé: may be coming

Burt: in GSA?

Jozef: not right now, but in Sahtu.

Burt: Sahtu has a process for approval of this w/ territorial government

Jozef: if in GSA we would have an opportunity for comment

b. Environment Canada Update

Natalka showed the written agency updates (migratory birds; species at risk) on the screen. Donna Bigelow will be addressing the board tomorrow. She can speak to these items then.

Ron: Is there a GRRB board position on the species at risk approach to the world? Supportive? Other areas where not in support of where environment Canada is going, specifically with regard to the SAR program, listing rating etc...?

Natalka: to date, the board has been supportive of SAR process. Some concerns about migratory birds and impacts in other regions with different policies. To date, no lack of approval of the process.

Ron: RE wolverine. People (GRRB) considered down side of listing or not?

Amy: A few years ago with regard to boreal caribou recovery federal strategy. Kristen reviewed that and identified concerns. Board reviewed that and board decided not to support some components of that strategy but in the end the strategy was still posted. One action item for the NWT range planning proposed as a result of the federal strategy. Board gave direction to review the GRRB 2012 comments to see how addressed in the NWT range planning process and give direction to that planning.

a. Department of Fisheries and Oceans

At 2pm Larry called in and reviewed his written presentation with the board

Questions for Larry

Ron Allen: Curious about the status of DFO in this part of the world. An overview of personnel and resources

available to programs of the GRRB?

Larry: As you know, DFO went through a deficit reduction action plan. Fisheries officers were moved to Yellowknife. Our fish protection program which used to be <in Inuvik? –couldn't hear> and Habitat Biologist left. All the fish protection biologists are now in Yellowknife. In Inuvik we have our Oceans staff and our fisheries management biologist, Ellen Lea. The ocean's staff report to Steve Newton in Winnipeg. Ellen Lea Reports directly to me. Turns out <not heard??> human resources we're still good. But what we do not have is the same number of staffing as a result of government reductions.

Jozef: A few years ago there was a fisheries technician trainee program (at the GRRB) partially sponsored by DFO. Would there be funding available to assist a similar position at the GRRB?

Larry Dow: Gwich'in implementation funding was used to give that money via a Contribution Agreement to the board for that position. However, policies have changed for how it works, so not as possible. Could consider us bringing them on as a casual basis or do a contract with the board and use operations and maintenance funds similar to Rat River. Past setup is not possible because financial rules have changed

Jozef: With regard to dollars available for education purposes (calendar), is there money available from DFO for that?

Larry: most definitely for that. Have done it for 2 years. Will be there next week and can talk to Amy. Not an issue on that.

Charlie: going to rat river this fall by dog team?

Larry: no, by helicopter. It is much faster. ☺

Fanny requested a copy of Larry's report.

Action item: Amy noted that she will give the entire binder to Corrine who can make that available to the ERRC members and for Fanny who requested a copy of Larry Dow's report.

c. ENR, GNWT Update

Stephen Charlie (ENR-Inuvik Superintendent) and Marsha Branigan (Manager of Wildlife) presented their agency update to the board.

i. Stephen reported on additional staffing regarding water responsibilities from AANDC with devolution. Protocol agreement with lands. Water resource officer position. Still have not been able to staff that position. Lands have been doing all the inspections, but they are getting taxed. Issues with water resource officer positions throughout the territories. Possibly new strategies to be taken. It is a technical position, with a lot of knowledge (e.g. Water chemistry, interactions with oil etc...). Need relationship with Lands to be positive.

Paul Voudrach retired recently from his regional environmental protection officer and coordinator. Roland Malegana has accepted the position of regional environmental coordinator. We hired Jasmine Kapour to support the ENR office financially.

Trying to work together with co-management partners, RRCs and GRRB

Going out to do consultation engagements with regard to new Wildlife Act. Consultations are on the regulations. Three phases. Phase 1 was to give a preamble and substance to it before moving forward. Were to have finished consultations by end of August. Amy worked with Stephen on these meetings. Inuvik is largest of all the regions with 8 communities. Diverse in Beaufort region. Sometimes returning for further engagement is needed. Got it done. Appreciate structure here with GRRB, RRCs and HTC's etc...

A busy fire season. A debriefing session later this month to evaluate how the fire season went prior to the fire management meeting in December. Review operations as senior management (managers and superintendents).

Overall operations, we have 20 staff now in Inuvik and 10 in outlying communities and then seasonal fire staff.

Operation is larger, taking on more. Not announced yet, but increase pressure in fur program. Not ENR's program. We help ITI deliver the program. Discussions at senior levels on this program. May end up with more work for ENR on this (if take on the program).

Porcupine caribou collared animals. Majority of population is currently west of Eagle Alaska. Expect similar to other years with low caribou. A big item is the GTC and Inuvialuit who want to move forward with recommendations to PCMB to rescind regulations on the highway. Issues relating to enforcement, charges laid, staying of charges etc.. Realized that regulations were not accomplishing what they were intended to do. Parties agreed to rescind those regulations. Yukon and NWT have different processes for legislation. We will work with our co-management partners to see how they felt about it. Parties agreed to move forward. Consultation with RRCs and HTC's gave support for rescinding the regulations. Gone to legislative committee and out for consultation and will go to judicial review to rescind in NWT. Yukon following a different process. We are concerned about the void after the regulations are gone. Mechanisms under the PCHMP and IP, that a native user agreement be formed and have mechanisms to regulate themselves. Then, can move forward with mirrored legislation to enforce on aboriginal harvesters. If they think against the law to do this at this time of year, then GWNT makes regulations, and enforces them, following the agreement mechanisms. At this time, it is for the aboriginal groups to decide how they want to do it. Want to see movement on this to fill the void left by rescinding.

One outstanding issue: potential for muskox harvesting in Richardson Mountains west of Aklavik. An issue that is there. Muskox in Yukon are protected. A different mechanism in NWT. No management zones right now. Aboriginal harvesters can harvest them in NWT. Numbers are not that high. There has been a harvest of the muskoxen in the last couple of years and I think it is increasing. I think a lot of people, especially the Gwich'in, would like to see them all gone, because of the interaction between caribou and muskoxen. Would need to look at biological parameters etc... to see if harvest can be sustained. With current beneficiary numbers being taken, not sure of the long term viability of the herd. Not just herd in GSA, also in ISR. May be moving back and forth between regions. Population numbers change and thresholds change. Need to look at that and be more diligent about that. Something that is tricky. For outfitting, needs to go through GTC. They are the authority on issuance of outfitter licence. We just look at biological aspect and issuing license.

Questions for Stephen

Charlie: We've been talking about water for the last 30 years. We've seen changes. My question is what is the GNWT planning to do concerning the water? Water is already drying up? Are they going to go after oil and gas in AlBerta. Also a lot of spills going on. Are they going afar that? The Bennet dam is drying up the country. Another dam in there on top of that. When you are saying the GNWT is going to take over the water, I am wondering what are they going to do? We have a claim. It states that we have to protect the quantity and quality of the water. Nothing is happening in that area. You may think that spill in AB will stay there but keep in mind it is flowing this way. That doctor in the paper said that if that came down the Mackenzie in 5 yes no fish left. I keep bringing this up about the quantity of the water. I am always telling my story. In the 60's... ..Do they know that? Does it end up in Yellowknife? That's what gets me? What are they going to do now that they have taken over. My question is to them, not to you.

Stephen: Each province and territory has authority over the water. Each region has rules and regulations for water use. One jurisdiction can't influence over another jurisdiction. That is why there is an agreement over the Mackenzie river basin. AB, SK, NWT, Nunavut. With the water strategy GNWT hired consultants went to the regions and convey the information and negotiations in developing a new agreement between the jurisdictions. In that agreement that are discussion on flow and quality. A good neighbour upstream would allow water to come to your area in low water season. How much? That's what that agreement is for. Quality has to be of a certain amount too. A new department for us with devolution. To effectively mgt a federal govt responsibility –

K Callaghan 2014-9-16 9:32 AM

Comment [3]: We didn't ask if this concern about current harvest means they are going to act faster on this file (to assess population size, composition and harvest levels etc..). Could mention this in our letter when we ask for muskox harvest numbers that Stephen mentioned they have.

most of the staff have transferred so we have a lot of knowledge.

WRT water levels now.

In AB and waters coming from them: their waters are tested (federal and provincial). Trained scientists. Legislative authorities to collect samples, proper procedures and put forward that data. It would be illegal to falsify those records. So, I can't speak for those jurisdictions but only for Inuvik region. That's all I can say on that. Low water levels –issues in Peel region. LUP in Yukon is before the courts there. I can't comment on that.

Charlie: Bringing this to your attention, I understand that you don't know, but you can go to your top guys and get that question to them. Just recently that dam in Yellowknife, it dried out. They are going to start burning oil. People may move out of YK because of the price of oil. It seems like they don't understand what is going on with that river where the dam is, that they don't know why it is drying out.

Stephen: TK, 150 yrs ago, they said it was very dry. When settlement started after 30's, settlers started growing crops in that area but aboriginals wondered why they were doing that when it could get dry again. Not something new. Something that has come and gone. Climate change and dry seasons. May see more dry seasons and more extreme fire behaviour. We will have to work for this, plan for and management around it.

Charlie: they had no concerns then about it, but now development is doing their work. E.g. That dam. On top of that, oil sands and mines in AB alone, using all that water. Eleven 45 gallon drums to get one of oil. You are talking about way back when no development was happening. That's my beef about the water. They need to look at the quality and quantity of water in the GCLCA. If they don't do anything, we will go after them. Not picking on you, but want you to pass on this message of what they will do to care for the water.

Doug: In terms of water flowing into the NWT. There is a water quality monitoring program in place?

Stephen: yes, on the water that flows from Fort McMurray. Water that they bring in and water they discharge.

Doug: I am asking further downstream. Are we historically recording?

Stephen: yes, was under AANDC now devolved to GWNT. Also water survey of Canada –they deal with quantity.

Kristen: numbers of muskox harvest you mentioned- are these recorded by ENR?

Stephen: Yes, have those. Officer in Aklavik has recorded that. Thought it was low but is higher than thought.

Don't have those numbers on me.

Action Item: follow up with Stephen about muskox harvest numbers recorded by officer in Aklavik

ii. **Marsha** presented the GWNT ENR written update for Inuvik wildlife department

Questions to Marsha

Doug: Question about where grizzly bear dens are with respect to the project and data.

Marsh: Yes, don't want everyone to know where dens are to avoid hunting pressure there but collected to help developers avoid those den locations.

Johnnie: What did you say about tapeworms? Muskrats?

Marsha –Yes, one of the muskrat carcasses turned in had tapeworms in it. Cook your rats. You can get tapeworm from them, so make sure you cook it. The same thing as in caribou, like when see little grains of rice in muscle.

So, you want to cook it.

Johnnie: I only thought dogs get them.

Marsha –No, lots of things get tapeworms, including us. If you are getting hungry a lot and losing weight, go see a doctor as people can get tapeworms too. Ask an officer for our little blue book of diseases in wildlife. It has pictures and it says how to prevent getting it. You can get tapeworm from caribou too.

Afternoon Break 3pm-3:15pm

10. Dall's sheep -Presentation on survey results & draft management plan

Kristen reviewed her presentation and written briefing note with the board.

Questions to Kristen

Burt Hunt: I have a question about the users and the harvesters. Like, it would be fine to do something in the GSA and involve the Gwich'in RRCs, but is that everybody? Or are there people that have come from outside. E.g. if working for government they could issue licenses, but are there other beneficiaries who have rights and who would come in and harvest those animals and who wouldn't be "caught" by that process?

Kristen: Yes, a good question. Yes, there are other parties, such as ISR users in Aklavik that use the sheep population.

In the GRRB harvest study '95-2001, we had about 10 sheep reported harvested with a total of 20 when including reported harvests in that time from other non-Gwich'in beneficiaries who participated in the study, and then there are ISR users (in GSA). In terms of current harvests we are not getting much information. E.g. Only one sheep reported since in 2010 to the GRRB and there may be more being harvested by Gwich'in but we are not getting that data. Aklavik HTC seems to have a good reporting program and they may be getting those numbers, but we haven't seen those numbers yet. We've started talking with them about sharing data. ENR has plug records also. Right now though, we don't have a good sense of the total harvest. We want to look that for sure and also to think about what to do if people are coming in from other areas.

Burt: It will be important to involve other participants or else you penalize yourself because there are others operating on a different set of rules.

Kristen: In the GSA, there is no legislated resident or outfitted hunting (no zone for it) for residents of this population. On Yukon side there are sometimes tags given (up to 2 per year, not always all used)

Ron: I know of one being used.

Burt: Would the Board talk to Inuvialuit users? If Board decided to follow the actions (eg. voluntary closure), would we work with our partners? Who would we talk to?

Kristen: Yes, if the Board recommended a voluntary closure, it would be very important for everyone to know about it so we would want to talk to all the parties in the plan.

Bert: What is the structure? Who would you talk to?

Kristen: At the community level, (in addition to RRCs) it would be the Aklavik HTC and then higher up it would be WMAC. Also other partners such as Vuntut Gwich'in Yukon fish and wildlife management board, Yukon government, NWT government (ENR), GTC, RRCs.

Bert: And so talking to those groups is part of your recommendation?

Kristen: Yes, definitely.

Doug: Is this the same sheep as in the Sahtu or another species or subspecies?

Kristen: Same species. I believe they have Dall's sheep there. Don't think Bighorn that far north.

Doug: Are there any federal assessments of this population?

Kristen: No, not for this population. Parks Canada may have some information for sheep elsewhere, but not for this population.

Bert: Further to Doug's question, this is not a migratory population?

Kristen: No, not these sheep. Also, the previous biologist before me at the GRRB did some collaring work and

they do not move very far.

Jozef: This population is all in the Gwich'in Settlement Area and in the Yukon.

Ron: How robust is the population estimate from these surveys? (We hear all kinds of things about the caribou surveys, so curious about these ones)

Kristen: It is not an estimate. All of the population numbers (except for 1997) are observed animals only, with no sight-ability correction factor. That is hard to apply and it hasn't been. So all of these surveys were done the same way with observed animals only, with exception of 1997 which was an estimate.

Ron: The two-day gap in completing "Lick" block is not an issue? Could sheep have moved a little bit during that time?

Kristen: Based on where we flew the parts of the block, they were separated and I don't think that sheep would have likely moved between those sections over two days.

Ron: So you are pretty comfortable and feel this is a defensible and accurate number?

Kristen: With regard to how robust it is, we are always going to miss some sheep in every survey. Compared to surveys previous, we had less missed days, less changes and so probably less movement (than could have been with other surveys). Even if we had gotten above 500 animal threshold –say 502- that is still quite a drop and we didn't miss 200 sheep, so I would be okay following the management plan based on the count that we have.

Burt: So your recommendation #2 is to work with other parties as soon as possible. Is that the discussion with the HTC, WMAC, and other parties you mentioned?

Kristen: yes, important to do this. I think it is important for the Board to know exactly what they would like to see happen to then let the other parties know what the Board's position is and how important they feel this to be.

Other parties have said they want to move forward on this, so it isn't a question of raising a concern about that, but more about what are the (Board) comments going to be and what are the next steps.

Bert: So this news won't surprise anybody?

Kristen: It shouldn't as the results were shared, but there haven't been engagement meetings other than what we talked about (RRC meetings).

Doug: Partners include the Yukon?

Kristen: yes, Yukon government is one of the partners. They should be aware of survey results (field report went out after survey). All the users are covered. In the management plan there is quite a list (Kristen reviewed the list).

Charlie: I'm a little bit confused about the map. I never heard of Sittichinli across from McPherson.

Kristen: The Sittichinli block was an area that the TRRC wanted GRRB to look at because they were seeing sheep there in the fall (sheep not seen yet there during June surveys) so it was added. The blocks in the survey area help us keep track of where we've flown during the survey and help compare between areas (Eg. Sheep is for sheep creek; Millen for Millen mountain). They are named based on mountain or watershed in the block. The boundaries of each survey area have valleys with the main mountains in the middle. Those valleys help us keep track of the different areas.

Charlie: Did you name them?

Kristen: No, it wasn't me. This happened a long time ago. It helps us keep track when we compare surveys. The Blocks are only used for this survey and nowhere else.

Amy: When we did consultations in 2008 and 2006, there was some request to get input from communities on the names to change to Gwich'in names, but when we showed maps of the blocks, there wasn't really input on

the names to change them.

Burt: Did the board get caught by not finalizing this at the time? This would have been made easier if we had a finalized plan now? So it wasn't a burning issue and got put on the back burner, but now we (current board) are victims of that and now have to sort of re-live the management plan and get agreement on what to do, now that this is the case (a decline) .

Kristen: It would have been good to have the plan approved already. Lots of reasons why it didn't happen –no one party at fault. It would for sure, have been nice to have the plan in place to know what to do next.

Burt: Time is of the essence. I agree with the recommendations given. Need to work for plan to be finalized with other parties. Do we need to make a motion on this?

Amy: I think if you are supporting the recommendations then direction is good. A motion might be more for approval of the plan, which isn't being asked for at this point.

Kristen: Board could decide to approve the plan. That is up to you, if you feel that is an appropriate step.

Bert: I wouldn't think that, but I would support the approach to get the other parties aware and start moving towards acting on the measures being talked about.

Jozef: I have some concerns –or not really concerns, but I'm not entirely in agreement with some of the wording, I guess. This process has been going on for 7-8 years. At what point do we as a board do we make a decision, especially when the framework has been agreed to, by pretty much everybody? It can prove to be very diff at times to get agreement now with other issues especially when we have two other groups from the Yukon, who by-pass the working group and send it out to the other parties and say "We want you to approve this". That is concerning for me.

Then, given recent numbers, it is time for the Board to finalize the action plan. What do you do with management, given that most of the sheep are in the GSA, and some in the Yukon? I don't think that we would be taking unilateral action on our own. I think that is our mandate, to manage wildlife in the settlement area. I've at this on this file for quite some time, and it is really frustrating sometimes just to get a decision made on what to do.

I'm open to it, but it is a really drawn out process and is becoming a trend with other things as well (like the Bluenose plan, which we'll talk about later). That's how I feel.

We have a role to play on management in the Settlement Area and people need to respect that –our role. The other partners need to respect our mandate and a job to do. I'm okay with engaging other partners, especially on the framework. It is just the management actions –particularly the numbers and what we do there. That is the key, but trying to get consensus on the minor stuff, that is going to take some time.

Bert: I have a question about the changes proposed (by YG and Vuntut Gwich'in) that have not yet been considered by the board or reviewed with the communities. Do we run a risk of our responsibility to manage and then run into a roadblock? (I don't know what these changes are) -And then will we go from cooperation on the management plan to being at a loggerhead when it comes to implementing actions, if we do this and then go no where? I am with you (Jozef?) on our responsibility. The question is how do we achieve that –with sugar or vinegar?

Kristen: I can clarify some of what I was recommending. I hear what Jozef is saying and that is why one of my recommendations was not to approve the plan, but to follow the actions in the plan (supporting the plan as drafted-the major actions that are there), and letting the other parties know that that is what you are doing because you feel this is important. That they don't necessarily have to do that, but you have the responsibility in the GSA and within the GSA, this is what you are going to do right now, but are still are going to engage with them to finish the plan. So that acknowledges the collaborative role and cooperation, but still the management

responsibility of the board.

One of the biggest changes proposed by Yukon and Vuntut Gwitch'in were regarding changes on thresholds to more conservative threshold (500 adults not 500 animals including lambs). If that had been the case, we would have been near that threshold back in 2010. So, it is a much more conservative approach, which could be good, but the consultations on the thresholds that were done, were for all animals observed so communities haven't given input on those suggested changes. So that is why it is a substantive change, because those threshold boundaries might be hit much sooner.

Bert: but this would not be a measure they would be arguing with, because their position would probably be that we should have done this before.

Kristen: Another big change would be who would be allowed to hunt. In NWT, participants are given priority and then resident and non-resident harvesters. They may do things different in Yukon and they had some comments about that as well.

Jozef: I hear you Kristen too, but I think we need to focus on this and get something in place.

Kristen: Yes, I'm going to step back so you (board) can discuss this.

Jozef: The board will run into other issues too if we don't have something in place. Eg. there aren't going to be many caribou around this year and that can raise the pressure on sheep. There are not many of them and you can do a lot of damage really quickly if it's not managed.

Richard Ross: did you do one or two surveys?

Kristen: One survey this summer in June.

Richard: The population? It went down?

Kristen: yes, it went down.

John Carmichael: When was the last one?

Kristen: We last did a survey in 2010. At that time there were fewer nursery sheep then the 2006 survey. This year's survey shows an overall drop of 200 sheep since 2010 so almost 30% drop. A 29% drop. 32% drop of adults.

Jozef: Maybe we can talk about the table?

Charlie: So if I understand, you did it on the NWT side and showed it to the Yukon government, you got it back and they say they are going to do some changes there?

Kristen: They are a partner to the plan, just like the Board is. So they didn't say that they were going to do these changes, but that these are the changes they would like, what do we think of these changes? They weren't making changes without talking to everyone else. So nothing has happened since they sent that letter.

Bert: When I read that letter, they are essentially saying "let's get on with it"

Kristen: I was going to say that it's positive that they want to work together. (not like with the caribou interim measures. Maybe they have learned from that and are wanting to work together.)

Bert: They obviously collaborated in the Yukon. All the letters look similar.

Jozef: so you need some direction on what to do.

Kristen: does the board want to meet later on this? (to have more time to discuss?)

Amy: you can flag this to be talked about later in the meeting.

Kristen: one thing for the Board to note, and that's why I included the consultation slide in the presentation is

that after last consultation round, the Board was in position to make a decision. You met the Consultation Policy requirements on those meetings. It is up to you if you want to go back to the RRCs, but according to the policy, the board has completed that stage so it's in your hands now

Jozef: discuss later?

Bert: nail down the specifics of the approach.

Amy: clarification, Kristen needs direction, but also what does Board needs from us in order to make decision to approve? (not now, but later if desired) if you need more information, let us know. We do not have money in budget for more consultation but have some money for RRC meetings.

Burt: so we have a generally approved Gwich'in plan, but what we need to know is from the Yukon, is what this does to the circumstances, if they have the more conservative stance?

Doug: I see there are three issues here: 1. What management action to take; 2. Finalize plan; 3. Work done here could actually be put in the context of finalization, given that all have been consulted, is a top priority. It is late to change stuff. If all people look to the end goal, there is an opportunity to visit stuff down the line, but now, now there's a compelling reason to take action. So, I'm not sure that you have to offend anyone. If you package it the right way, it can be a win-win.

Kris Maier: It may be worth noting that this (considering voluntary closure) is not unprecedented. We had a similar situation to voluntary closure on char harvest without a management plan in place. It is difficult to approve an action without a plan). Would be easier for staff to have an approved plan to refer to when implementing actions. However, with the char management is not unprecedented to have a result and then have to take a management action without a plan in place. Then (with char), Board gave direction to staff to educate.

Burt: It sounds like we have a management plan agreed to by Gwich'in, but other parties have changes. So maybe you do have a plan to point at and say this is what the Gwich'in parties want. If comments coming back (from other parties) are that measures weren't strong enough then we can adjust that sometime in future but we need to do something now. We want to resurrect the plan and want all parties' buy-in, but in the meantime we have to take action...

Charlie: did the GNWT supporting our management?

Kristen: I can't speak for ENR-GNWT on their thoughts on the plan. You could talk to Marsha or Steven here. GNWT participated in the process, so I'm sure they have an interest in seeing the plan completed. They may have their own comments on the plan also.

Charlie: maybe I'm misunderstanding. If Yukon government is not agreeing with our plan and coming back to us – it sounds like they are playing their game. That's why I said then don't deal with them and go on our own. We have sheep to protect.

Kristen: The only thing I would say is that they shared their comments on the plan, which was what all the parties were asked to do after their consultations finished. That is where it broke down. Not all parties did that, so Yukon followed process. Unfortunately now it is years later, and that's where we are at.

Jozef: So we need to give Kristen direction on what to do, moving forward.

Ron: I suggest we strike a small sub- committee be struck to discuss issue this evening and come back to table tomorrow.

Kristen: I can help as staff to do that tonight.

Jozef: Okay, we will try to figure something out. It sounds though, like we were all in agreement with the actions

in the summary table of management actions? Maybe that is all that is needed to do to move forward is to approve and support the summary of management actions until we can approve the plan? -To publically support what is laid out here? Is that a motion we can agree on?

Ron: We will still need to think about how to deal with the comments given (by the Yukon) We don't want them issuing tags next year. So we need to let them know we are moving on this, passed the threshold, actions to be taken... They may agree, we expect to see them do their part. Etc...

Kristen: A reminder that there are different actions to follow in that table, not just voluntary closure. Community monitoring system is part of that to help get trend and lamb recruitment information, so the board would need to think about how to move on those actions too (Eg. could be people from Aklavik going up and looking at the sheep to see lamb recruitment), if that is what you are supporting.

Burt/Ron: For the letter, here are some suggested points: Send to all parties. Say that the GRRB met in September, is aware of 29% decline of population and feels immediate action is warranted. The Board has approved the actions in the Summary Table and will be following the major actions (list). We acknowledge Partner comments shared to date (list). We recognize their concerns and that their suggestions would have triggered action sooner and want further discussion, but in the meantime we felt it necessary to take these measures from the draft plan, and have done so. The situation (of the population) illustrates the need to finalize the plan. We are taking these actions and expect partners to do the same. We look forward to working together to finalizing plan.

Jozef: So what I was thinking of, was to support and approve Slide 10 in the presentation (table from draft plan, page iv). The wording is vague enough for flexibility throughout the year in terms of management actions. Not necessarily everything in the plan, but specific actions. So we support that throughout the next year.

Amy reviewed with the board what she had heard: support for the table and those specific actions; (also to create a subcommittee –not necessary anymore?); letter to parties, content of letter.

Kristen: Amy and I can work on the content of the letter and will send a draft to the board to review before it goes out.

Doug: letter to all the parties, not just the Yukon?

Bert: Yes, and in that letter could acknowledge the letters submitted (Yukon, Vuntut Gwich'in, WMAC) and recognize their concerns, and invite further discussion on that but in the meantime, that we have to act.

Doug: yes, the precautionary principle.

Doug: A final clarification on the letter. This letter is going to urge Partners to get on with approving the plan and dealing with modifications at a later date? Are you hitting that? Are we delaying again by saying that?

Bert: Advising of action; adoptoing these letters; acknowledge concerns and wish to revisit plan want to list all partners to do that.

Doug: it sounds like you are punting it again. I think you dind't want to tdo that

Ron: letter content -keep simple: given our understanding of the #s of dalls sheep in the Richardson Mountains pi mtns and have draft mgt plan with action to take, we are going to take that action. We believe those numbers. Inform partners and Expect parties to respond accordingly. Don't have to say anything about the letters. We say there is an issue and are going t act and expect others to do the same.

Bert: but will have some saying, didn't you get my letter?

Charlie: Write the letter!

Amy: given #s, action in plan say this, we take these actions. We expect you too also. In addition, we want to work together to finalize plan.

Bert and that the circumstance illustrates the need to take action.

Jozef: for me, this table is the heart of the plan, so I am fine with that.

Motion to approve the Table "Summary of Management Actions and Monitoring" from the draft Dall's Sheep management plan and to send a letter to Parties on our decision today, as discussed.

Motion
GRRB 14-31

Moved by: Charlie Snowshoe

Seconded by: Burt Hunt

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Action Item: Kristen/Amy to write draft letter to Dall's Sheep Management plan Parties for board review; letter to go out afterwards from Board to plan Parties.

14. Research Priorities-Progress report on current priorities then decision on next steps

Amy Amos & Janet Boxwell, GRRB

Amy gave the presentation she and Janet prepared on Research Priorities Process.

Janet noted that GRRB needs a certain amount of flexibility in the research priorities so that new emerging priorities can be accommodated.

Amy finished her presentation with question to the board: Do you support this approach? Any suggested updates for current RPs? Should the consultation policy be updated? When should we plan the next RP workshop? In Sept 2015, 2016 or 2017.

Feedback and Questions to Amy from Board

Burt: So is this all coming to us in context of this is the resources (person power and finances we have)? Would this result in a prioritized list of staff recommended (w/ community consultation) and costs for each to use up the 80,000 each year? Is it as neat and packaged as that? I know reality may be there is not enough \$. Communities are an important part of this process. They may felt consulted to death on this. EG. Other area got lists from each community (very long) –a balancing act of some things (high profile things like whales) versus other items specific to a community that were not as important to others? So how to make a community such as Tsiigehtchic feel that they are getting something out of this and they are being addressed? You must have had the conversation about how to meet the needs of all the communities. So my first question is does it come with a \$ structure and have to do's and what is possible or not from nice-to-do list etc..?

Amy: No, we didn't look at it that way. It would be nice to look at it that way. In the past, what this list has done is to identify a list. Initially internally to do and then to look outside for external agencies to get done if GRRB doesn't have capacity for all. If GRR identifies top 10 priorities and then 10 nice-to-do's and staff advice. Look at 3 lists. We would need to give you capacity element and tell you what we could do internally or which agency might be able to cover it. Would need to look at it more.

Burt: need to have that dose of reality in it.

Doug: Not asking for the exact specifics, but you used terminology of "criteria". What is that? Who sets that?

Amy: back in 2012 at the workshop, it was set by the board. A collaborative approach by those who attended. (GRRB, RRCs, other invited agencies). Everyone in the break-out groups ranked the priorities, but the one element –the resource element wasn't assessed. E.g. Caribou came out as a low priority when it was highly valued by participants.

Janet: in the binder there is the criteria in the workshop report. Came out with a number for each priority. (1-5 with highest priority being 5)

Amy: to also fit into categories e.g. Mandate, Resources, Community, Capacity, Interest of Partners, etc...

Ron: a system for this certainly needs to be adaptable. I like the staff initially compiling the priorities with their experience in the communities about what will likely work. Why is this all labelled research when there are other tasks that have to be done and use resources. This made me wonder if that was the right word. I like the process by which the staff helps the board evaluate and weigh these. (E.g. very expensive; could do this other thing; timing etc...) Need to be adaptable cycle to financial cycle.

Amy: what I am hearing is that it is okay to proceed. Agree labelling of title may be an issue

Ron: yes Consultation Policy needs to be considered. If meeting C obligations per legislation, can we do it with staff input on logistics and likelihood etc...

Jozef: so everyone good with this approach?

Burt: would be good to have capacity issues addressed –financial issues.

9. Fiber Optic link Update - Fiber link project update, i.e. Bathymetry work / wildlife habitat protection plan - Nick Lawson, Stantec & Sean Craig, GNWT (call-in)

The call began with introduction of board members for Stantec. Sean Craig introduced himself and said this is an exciting project for the territory and for the GNWT. Glad to have Stantec assisting with permitting and environmental side of this. Sean gave the first few slides of the presentation they had shared with the board (presentation is also in board binder) as a quick overview.

Burt: question about little dotted red lines shown on map.

Sean: those are little roads, not subsidiary fibre optic lines.

Nick gave the remainder of the presentation about the field programs and other information.

Questions to Sean and Nick

Sean gave clarification to Charlie about what the project is for.

Kris: When can we meet next week?

Sean: We arrive Wednesday and go to Tsiigehtchic Wednesday night. Meet with NRRC on Thursday night, so sometime on Thursday or Friday morning. I have tentative arrangements to meet with Liz and Sue on Thursday morning. You propose a time that works for you and Nick and I?

Kris: Thursday at 1pm is good.

Sean: Okay

Nataka commented on needing more than 1 week notice for this, so disappointed we are hearing about this visit now and not sooner.

Kris mentioned he has some concerns about water withdrawal and some other areas so there are concerns to talk about..

Charlie: When are you going to Fort McPherson?

Sean: As communities closest to the project in their traditional territory, those are the communities we have focused on (e.g. Tsiigehtchic and Inuvik in GSA)

Jozef asked for other questions on the presentation. He thanked Sean and Nick for taking the time to call in and

present and looked forward to hearing from them next week.

Sean asked for Kris' questions and comments in advance of next week's meeting if possible. He recognized that just over a week's notice, but would help with productive discussions.

Cheryl made some announcements: Would like a group photo while everyone is here. Going to announce if there are any changes for the charters. Bring luggage to office as transfer from band office tomorrow.

Jozef adjourned for the day. No in-camera session was held.

DAY 2 Thursday, September 11, 2014

Aklavik Indian Band boardroom, Aklavik

Meeting called to order by Jozef at 9:13AM. Fanny gave morning prayer.

12. Bluenose herds (Cape Bathurst, Bluenose-West, Bluenose East caribou herds management)

Kristen reviewed her presentation and written briefing note with the Board regarding the status of management planning for these caribou herds and her recommendations for their consideration.

Questions for Kristen and Board Discussion

Ron: what surprises or push back might be expected from other parties?

Kristen: Inuvialuit parties are some of the major harvesters, so they are looking at not limiting harvest until absolutely necessary. Board would have to consider conservation issues and how much flexibility (or not) to take. Those will be major topics. IGC questioned thresholds. Working group did what they could to address concerns. Red threshold of BNW versus BNE –it is lower for BNW, because if set same as BNE, that would have placed it under the red zone actions, limiting harvest further for BNW, which would have been hard for communities and could have caused lack of support for plan, so that is why there is a difference between the two. Some flexibility already on that, and that could be mentioned. WRRB was ready to approve the last draft. NWMB has not officially commented after some early staff comments. They wanted the final version before their board did. Not sure of other issues that might come up. We've been surprised at some meetings, though, at things that came up at last minute.

Burt: Are you interacting with IGC enough to know whether the threshold (50%) they want is a deal-breaker? Are they malleable?

Kristen: That was an unexpected comment and a new concern. Not sure if this is a deal-breaker. To my knowledge, based on the minutes from the ISR meetings we had available, it did not seem to reflect what the communities said in ISR. There were some comments –of 4 communities, 3 made no comments during last engagement on the thresholds and of the one community that had comments on the thresholds, some of those comments were to be more conservative, so the 50% was a surprise to us. That could be a question to them about how they came up with the 50%. Most communities did not comment on the thresholds during the last engagement with exception of Gwich'in communities who asked for higher thresholds.

Jozef: Also need to be aware of some comments received later in process was to manage as one herd. Last minute – after agreed to manage as three herds by all parties and the plan was drafted, was the IGC

recommendation to manage as single herd. This is a major issue that may come up. We need to be prepared for next week.

Ron: precautionary approach on these thresholds?

Kristen: the TOR was for 3 herds. Also, a recent study looked at the herds and concluded that the herd designations are robust, but that in defining herds, one should not look just at calving grounds, but also need to look at spatial affiliation between cows. A long time ago, was considered one herd, but more information since then suggested otherwise and so parties have taken that approach with this plan. One rationale for lumping together is that the number would be higher and so harvest restrictions could be lessened.

Bert: Is there denial about the BNE estimate?

Kristen: I'm not sure why 1992 estimate is important to be included –For one thing, it is a past estimate and is not the current size of the herd, so would not affect current management actions. For another reason, is that it was only about 15,000 animals out of a herd expected to be at least 100,000. When look at combined estimate for all three herds, it is larger, but that estimate has same issue of only 5 collars used and not entire range flown for the BNE portion –author stated this in the paper for both estimates.

Ron: Are there reindeer concerns that come into this?

Kristen: Not heard that as a hang-up on the plan. We have heard some people have voiced concerns that reindeer are mixing with caribou. It seems to be more of a concern on the Tuktoyaktuk peninsula. Not a major factor for management actions though.

Kristen: At ACCWM meeting, I will be there as staff technical support for the GRRB representative and can speak to process taken, but not there as a negotiator at that meeting.

Jozef: This is another example of a management plan that's taken lots of time. Forest mgt plan also took ~13 years to approve. It can get frustrating when trying to manage as 3 herds and then right at the end, this comes up. **I am ready to approve the plan as written and take that position.** I think the board needs to have some serious discussion and give clear direction to the representatives to take to that table.

Burt : who is advocating single herd?

Kristen: Inuvialuit Game Council.

Burt: NWMB?

Kristen: haven't heard that position.

Doug: whole issue of commercial tags became quite explosive, so this could be dynamite for government.

Kristen: an update for the Board: while I was away in August, GNWT had a meeting regarding BNE and government looking at recommending harvest restrictions on that herd, independent of what the plan is calling for. Not sure if GRRB notified or invited to the August meeting?

Amy: yes

Kristen: Whatever the GNWT is recommending for BNE could add to the urgent discussion at the table.

Burt: How does what they are saying fit with the plan? Are their measures in line with the plan or more restrictive?

Amy/Kristen: I think more restrictive

Kristen: (shows population figure) The last survey 2013 for BNE estimated about 68,000, putting that herd close to mgmt. action threshold, which is where the first restrictions would take place (outfitter, resident restrictions, etc..) Not quite what the plan says, but is close.

Burt: so would it be better for government to have a finished plan?

Kristen: I think it would be really good, because then you could ask them to follow the plan, but because the plan hasn't been adopted and is taking so long and they have a conservation concern, they are wanting to talk to

everyone now about it for actions now.

Burt: I am with Jozef on take our position and get on with it.

Charlie Snowshoe – Why are the caribou disappearing? It is like with the rabbits around where I am –no one knows why they are down. All of a sudden we get this news and we have to cut down on hunting. And all three herds decreasing? So I want to know how many outfitters in YK before restrictions?

Kristen: right now, none because they aren't allowed to take any.

Charlie: no, before this happened.

Doug – about 10. Now restricted.

Charlie – At one time I was in Yellowknife and one time I was at the dock and one full plane full of horns. That's why I wanted to know. So many bull horns, and just one plane. That's why I wanted to know. Why and how are numbers low?

Kristen: ENR would know how many outfitter tags were used. What we don't know is all the other harvest numbers. That is something the Board recommended for this plan (harvest reporting). Sounds like important for you to know how many caribou taken and how many outfitter tags were used.

Charlie: yes, my question is why and how?

Kristen: not sur. Don't think anyone can give you that answer. That's why we are asking questions (monitoring table) eg. – icing events, predators, other factors that work together. Plan tries to assess all these factors, as best we can while acknowledging that it is tough to find this out.

Charlie: refers to the herd of 500K and it was wiped out down near Whitehorse 10-15 years ago and the wolf was blamed but the large community of Whitehorse had relied on those caribou. Not just NWT with outfitters. What about SK, northern Manitoba? They probably have big game hunters too. I heard part of the herd (BN or Bathurst) was found in Russia. Those are funny things for me, that is why I have to ask these questions.

Jozef – once the plan is in place we can go back and adjust later if new information comes out.

Kristen: plan is to be a framework. Subject to review (5 years and then 10; parties can ask for review at any time). Idea of plan is to be a framework so plan doesn't need to be updated. Details of what will be done will be in the Implementation plan – action plan with more details next. Some people wanted them all in the plan, but that is hard to work out ahead of time as capacity changes so that is why it was left out for working out year by year.

Jozef –So direction is to move ahead?

All agreed.

Amy – who will be representative at the meeting. We are co-hosting, which means we are helping to chair.

Eugene – meeting is Sep 24-26 – will see if he can make it and let us know if he can be there in person. Jozef prefers to be participant rather than chair. Amy and Kristen as staff support.

Also a teleconference at the end of October to further discuss about what happened at this meeting and what we will do on the final plan

Ron: so position is that current plan is acceptable and that will be brought to the meeting.

Jozef: Yes and discuss in October and November on motion if needed then.

All agreed.

11. Federal Species at Risk

a. Review & Approval of the management plan for the Short-eared Owl in Canada

Donna Bigelow, EC & Nataka Melnycky, GRRB

Donna was unavailable to review her presentation (in the electronic binders) with the board this morning. A motion on this item was deferred to the November call. Donna is looking for direction now on the 90 day review period. Nataka clarified that normally the GRRB had 90 days to review a management plan. However, this plan is being made in Quebec so not in the NWT EC office (aware of the review period) so sometimes she doesn't get them in time for the full review period. So, can GRRB make motion in next teleconference.

Nataka wants to go to communities to present owl and falcon information to get feedback about how to deal with the management plan approval request from EC and will compile for the board so they can make a quick decision.

Board discussion

Bobbie Jo: Advise against deciding now and do so at teleconference call in November with reference to input then from communities as compiled by Nataka. All board agreed and gave this feedback to Nataka

Action Item: Nataka to compile input from RRCs on SAR management plan prior to November teleconference.

b. Review & Approval of the management plan for the Peregrine Falcon

Donna Bigelow, EC & Nataka Melnycky, GRRB

This item was deferred to November as above for Short-eared Owl.

Action Item: The GRRB to review the RRC input on the SAR management plans and EC presentation slides and then to make a decision about approval of these plans at the November teleconference

12:00 PM lunch

12. Wildlife Act regulations

Amy reviewed ENR's presentation on the Wildlife Act Regulations, noting that she attended ENR consultations in most GSA communities with Stephen Charlie and has participated on the working group for the Wildlife Act. She noted that RRCs should comment by September 19th so the board can review those comments and bring to the working group at the Sept 29th teleconference meeting. She said the language of the regulations is in the binder. This is just the presentation on them. The regulations will be coming into force of November, 2014 (phase 1 regulations). Phase 2 items require more engagement to bring into force and more consultation on them.

SEE AUDIO for questions and answers here near beginning when some missed (KC asked question near beginning but forgot to record notes while listening to answer).

Questions to Amy and discussion during her presentation

GHLs and SHLs 7:38:03

Regulations affecting aboriginal harvesters.

Amy: You do not need a license to harvest in your aboriginal area. GHLs are available for people with aboriginal or treaty rights to hunt in the NWT....a GHL allows you to hunt out of your area in the NWT. If you already have a GHL, then it will be valid for your lifetime. Anyone who wants a GHL must have the right to harvest in the NWT. You must carry proper identification (to recognize your ab rights). If refused a GHL, there is an appeal process in the regs.

Bert: In the case of GHLs, if for example, a person is hunting in the ISR and has permission to hunt once, they never have to get that permission again? Is that how you would read #1 and #2?

Amy: If they have a GHL, then yes. They would need to get the GHL hunt exclusively outside their area. If they were only going hunting once, they could get a special hunting license. license

Bert: so there is no way in this example, for the Inuvialuit to remove that right? This would read, once I've got it, I've got it forever.

Bobbie: That is an aboriginal and treaty right (can't be removed).

Amy: The second slide coming up will help I think, with this question and what I think you are getting at: Green is your land claim area. You do not need any license to exercise your aboriginal right or treaty right to hunt in your own land claim area. For example, if you are a Gwich'in in the GSA you only need proper identification on you to hunt in the GSA. The GTC will determine what this I.D. will be. However, if you want to hunt in NWT outside GSA and not on other private lands, then you need a GHL (the middle brownish colour on this slide). If you want to go outside your area, still in the NWT but you are on someone else's private lands, then you need permission from that aboriginal group (red colour). Does that answer your question Bert?

Bert: Yes, it does, but my question still stands. Once given that permission, is it only given once? What if something changes? Eg. if Gwich'in in ISR hunting with SHL and then population goes down and they want harvest only by Inuvialuit, can they remove that permission?

Amy: Not in the brown (GHL), but in the red (SHL) potentially. Permission for SHL is on a yearly basis, as I understand it.

Bert: Okay, that answers my question.

Amy: NOTE to ask about this issue with working group...

Jozef: All the regulations are subject to the land claims, so if there is conflict between the Act and the claim, it is the claim that is given priority. Eg. With the transboundary agreement: anything that says the Inuvialuit are subject to in the ISR, it applies to Gwich'in as well. It works the other way too. If there are limitations in the GSA, then it also applies to Inuvialuit as well. That's written right into the claim

Amy: The other point on the transboundary, is that if there are existing transboundary agreements, or pre-existing agreements like the Porcupine Caribou Management Agreement, this wouldn't apply to them. E.g. Inuvialuit person coming into GSA specifically for Porcupine caribou that person would not need to get a GHL or a special hunting license for Porcupine caribou. However, if they wanted to come into the GSA for something like moose, then they would have to follow that

Kristen: I have two questions:

1. When whoever gives permission for GHL, can they apply conditions or is it a blanket allowance? Could they say no, not near so and so's camp for moose for example? How specific can they be?

Amy: (back 2 slides) Refer to ENR to be sure, it is your aboriginal right in your own area but for GHL it is exercising your treaty right in NWT, unless on private lands.

Kristen: Okay, so if you are on someone's private lands, then you have to get their permission to get your GHL?

Amy: you don't ask them for a GHL. That is a process for ENR. It would be the SHL that can set conditions on private lands.

Kristen: sorry, I misunderstood. For the red –it is the SHL then?

Amy: yes, then it is the RRC that would give permission to allow someone else in their area and can put terms and conditions

Bert: so the answer to the question about can they set rules would be in there would appear to be there. If they wanted to say only one moose, for example, is yes.

Jozef: The Special Harvesting License would be used. The RRC or HTC can say the conditions how long, what for etc...

Amy: but that is for a non-aboriginal. For an aboriginal person, they just have to give permission.

[Kristen-but does that permission for an aboriginal person set conditions too?]

Kristen: Okay, so the second part of my question was

2. I am thinking of next steps for sheep. If down the road, the board limits sheep harvest and wants to move beyond voluntary limits or say no hunting in the GSA. What then are the steps the RRC would follow to talk to these people to restrict hunting on private lands, as we know that Inuvialuit residents in Aklavik also take sheep? There is the overlap agreement, so this is a little bit confusing to me. We'll need to think about how that works with the regulations (for aboriginal persons).

Jozef: overlap agreement will take precedence over this legislation.

Kris: If an aboriginal person is not on the list under the overlap agreement but wants to hunt on private lands, what do they need? The full SHL with permissions etc...?

Jozef: **This is where we need some more information.** The claim speaks to other things as well e.g. if Inuvialuit has traditionally hunted in GSA, they continue to have that right. And to the Gwich'in in the ISR and on the north slope. That said, any management decisions the board makes would apply to Inuvialuit as well in GSA. That's already there. (in the regulations)

Kris: does that relate to the overlap agreement?

Jozef: that process is there already. We can clarify some of this. This will need more work.

Amy: The permission would come from the land claim area for the private land access.

Charlie. I disagree with the GNWT telling us what to do. I totally disagree. To me, this undermines our treaty (need to use licenses to hunt). They are telling us what to do in our own area. Saying that you can't hunt outside without an identification card or a special license.

Jozef: That will be a similar process. E.g. maybe just show your enrolment card to the officer. That is what is being set up.

Charlie: I don't like that.

Amy: It is not ENR telling people what to do. Every region, including non-claim areas can have recommendation on this group. Jozef, Eugene and me. Groups even had lawyers review to make sure land claims were respected. It's not ENR doing this. It has been very collaborative, and they are trying to make sure land claims are respected.

Dall's sheep: GRRB and RRC putting a number on Dall's sheep? Quite a number of Inuvialuit take sheep. They sell horns and hide which helps their income. If talking about a license to come into our area (they take 5-8 sheep but no one is there to document it.) So that is a question. Another question is our rights-what is happening with polar bear in YK and being charged as an aboriginal. His rights should be respected

Jozef: Yesterday the board approved management actions for Dall's sheep. We can talk about that a little later on. For the rights, the act makes sure that the rights are respected.

Amy: Dall's sheep and how that applies. Their plan is to have this in force November 14. They will bring forward results of community consultations. Expect November to be in force. If that happens, in December, these would apply. In GSA, for sheep on private lands, no one else but Gwich'in can harvest from that area. In order to access the harvesting in GSA, if aboriginal from another group, would need to come to ERRC to get permission. That would be the only way. Charges could be laid if that wasn't followed.

Doug: I'm a little bit confused. I thought you said they had pre-existing rights.

Jozef: This discussion had to do with some problems identifying people. E.g. Gwich'in in Decho harvesting. How to identify them as Gwich'in and not another group with land claim in that area. So this just helps identify who the harvester is (and rights to that area).

Amy: If there is an overlap agreement (pre-existing rights), may not go into regulations, but the officer would have a manual to follow and that would go into there.

Doug: Re. the sheep. If the GRRB said no harvest, then that information would go to Inuvialuit and that should help solve that problem?

Jozef: yes, and the GRRB decision would apply to Inuvialuit in that area. Management regime.

Q. Decision of the board, they consult with RRC before making final decision?

Jozef: Yes, that is standard.

Amy noted that the GRRB would take appeals of RRC decisions on awarding of SHL. Board's decision is final. In other regions, it is the Minister that decides.

Burt: how to decide a "subsistence lifestyle"? I see a problem with that. E.g. I work at a shop I Yellowknife and go hunting sometimes, would I be living a subsistence lifestyle?

Amy: this is part of the act.

Jozef: up to the local community to permit them.

Kris: SHL is anyone the RRC permits

Comment: Stephen Charlie said that SHL for one year is moved to 5 years and no restrictions on what an aboriginal harvester can take. (if they get it, then they can get moose or bear or whatever)

Bobbie Joe: in the claim, section 12. 4.8 RRC permits persons who are not participants to harvest, but according to legislation and according to conditions set by RRC. That authority of the RRC is very strong. Can set conditions for that non-participant.

Jozef: This regulation empowers the local community in a way the legislation didn't before. Council can now have more control. We'll talk to Stephen about what he said

C. The timeframe on this for aboriginal, if they submit application in September to hunt for moose, what is the turnaround time for a decision? What will the RRC do? What if there is an appeal? What is the timeframe? If someone just moved in, can the RRC approve this so that they can hunt the next day?

Jozef: I think that is the intent of this. I think it has timeframe in the regulations? Up to 30-40 days?

C. that's a concern.

Jozef: if RRC is fast and they get that decision to ENR, it could happen within hours.

Amy: Appeal process is not just for if RRC declines, but also if RRC never tells applicant.

Q. Personally, if I were to marry a Gwich'in woman, could I harvest under her claim agreement?

Amy: No, still need a GHL. On private lands, get permission.

Kris: does marriage confer the rights?

Amy: IF one parent Gwich'in, if one Inuvialuit—you are registered with one and you have to choose.

Jozef: if have a GHL, then it is grandfathered in.

Natalka, even if they get divorced?

Jozef: yes.

Amy: if not aboriginal, then need SHL. If aboriginal, need GHL

Q. Stephen Charlie said GHL is for 5 years.

Amy: in my notes, it is only 1 year. Not a change. Used to be a special GHL.

Q. so can a person renew or have to reapply each year. Renewing would help to speed up process...

Cheryl: used to be a sticker to renew each year.

Jozef: yes, I would get a sticker

Amy: With SHL, to renew a SHL, that would be at the discretion of the RRC. ENR is not going to tell you how you approve it. E.g. May not need a form, just come to RRC meeting. Up to RRC

C. Can we stick to agenda? Public can speak to board later about concerns during public session.

Jozef: Thanks for that. We are ahead on the agenda.

C. It is fresh on our minds now so helps to ask question as it comes up

Jozef: Thanks. We'll let the board give us direction on that as we continue.

Amy continued with her presentation

Jozef: re caliber. There were lower calibers being used. This gives them the authority to do something about it.

Wastage

Ron: is there any sort of rationale for not putting ribs on that list (e.g. for caribou or bison)? Ribs aren't a hind quarter.

Amy: it was discussed at length. In the Inuvik region, there was a question about this and they said no, it is not on the list; should it be on the list? The GRRB can comment and recommend that.

Ron: it is a pretty minimum standard to include the ribs. E.g. moose diagram suggests ribs are on the list.

Amy: They are asking for those comments. On the 29th, they want to identify any hot topics. The board can agree on that.

Action Item: Add as a GRRB recommendation. Include RIBS as items not to be considered wastage in regulations.

Wastage. –shot/diseased/caching/markings

Ron: these are monster steps forward. Good work.

Natalka: if for cultural reasons it is left behind, should it still be marked?

Amy: Yes.

Phase 2 what to expect

Note: GRRB has a role with determining what is commercial.

Amy noted that in the meeting binder there are fact sheets and other materials (e.g. summary of GSA comments heard)

Jozef: some of the other things we were looking at is use of helicopters, down times, etc... It was an issue for us. Harvesting on private lands etc... Some made it in. Helicopters didn't. We wanted to include as a simple insertion. EG. If as a Gwich'in, I could fly up to Black Mountain and shoot sheep and fly back to town without a limit on when I can hunt after arriving by helicopter (e.g. 12 hour or more). Right now not in the regulations.

Amy: Wildlife effects monitoring plans in place. Land and water boards include some of the wildlife related comments on their permits, but they can't enforce it without phase 2 regulations.

Amy: for the board. Summary of comments received is in meeting binder. Info also about SHL. ENR wants direction on what to do with that. I understand it, it is in the GCLCLA what to do with that but the latest regs not in there. They tried to do that. Refer to what is in the binder. They want to know if you agree with that. GTC has a lawyer that is looking at that. If you look at those and have concerns, let us know.

Amy: another item that was flagged was the Grizzly bear management agreement (between GRRB and RRCS) that outlines the tag system. From AT, KC and Marsha's understanding was that ENR should have signed it for reflection in the regulations but it is not legislated now. It is voluntary abidance. Does GRRB want that in the regulations?

Jozef: there were some concerns about what about the tag system and how it was set up in the communities. Done by zones right now (e.g. each RRC has a number of tags only for that zone) so it limits people from Inuvik going to Fort McPherson. Not big issues but some we have to work out.

Questions

C. Grizzly bear tags for communities. Aklavik is out of tags. One tag left. Quite a bit of people come in right away. Is there some way we can at least have 2 tags at all times? If down to one, should be able to get an extra one?

I have been on the waiting list a few times, but it is too late. If we can work something out for this. Some communities don't even do their tags.

Jozef: something we can look at. To transfer things not being used

KC: I'll follow up on status of tags for the RRC with Marsha (re only having one tag available for ERRC left to use) and will get back to ERRC and GRRB on that. Marsha thought beginning a new cycle so should have more than 1 tag available. The zone regions were set up so one zone didn't get hammered with all the tags (from all GSA) so how tags are allocated would be for the RRCs and GRRB to talk about if there is a change. Thought that at beginning of new cycle so should have more than one. Will follow up.

C. yes, understand that, but would still be good to have at least two. Have been on the list, but not able to get tag.

Jozef: we'll follow up. Kristen will get information to the RRC.

Action Item: Kristen to follow up with ENR on bear harvest and tag usage report and will circulate that to the board and RRCs when it is available

15. RRC session and 16. Public Session -Review notes from last RRC session; Open discussion and RRC recommendations; opportunity for public to speak to the Board

Janet presented input from RRCs on education, research, management actions and status of GRRB response to each. She gave a visual presentation and spoke to her presentation with the board. Natalka noted that Jeremy Bramar may be applying to AFSAR to do some muskrat work in the delta and may come to the GRRB about the research proposal.

Jozef: We reviewed the action items from last year. Now it is a good opportunity for the RRC and public to address the board with any concerns or comments you might have.

Charlie Snowshoe: I want to inform the people of what happened after the Bennet dam was built. Fort Chipewan had a big delta and people were talking about all the rat trapping. After the dam, it dried out. Then, in Fort Smith there was a little delta in there and there are now no rats there. Down in our area, the same thing has happened. That's why I'm saying, the Bennet dam has done a lot of damage. Not only that, they built another dam below that main dam. I know that for a fact. Getting this information from Fort McPherson, I heard they made behind the dam, something like at 600mile? I asked a young guy that was there is it true that they made a 600 mile lake behind the dam. He said that is nothing. There is a 1400km of water behind the dam plus that lake. When they built the dam, they flooded behind the dam and a lot of dead animals were floating down that river. Staff telling them that, but they never say nothing. Just watch what is going on. All this just with that dam. I always repeat what I hear: there is a guy in Decline that works for the schools. Charlie Godet –he walked to school. A big rock on the shore. HE has seen that on the top of the rock was the water. 11 years later he said that he could see the whole rock. This is on Great Slave Lake. That's why I keep bringing this up to the young people that don't know what has happened n the past concerning that dam.

C. Water levels too, in the delta there is a lot of orange-yellow stuff in the water. From spill in McMurray? Testing done on this to let us know what it is?

Janet: describe what it looks like–slick, algae?

C. we don't know.

Ron –like an algal bloom

Bobbie Jo –my dad gave a sample to ENR for testing. They've not heard back. A lot of people have noticed it and are concerned. Old people have noticed it and they've not seen it before.

C. Coming from up the river? Is that in Fort McPherson. Want to see something done and feedback given to our community.

Bobbie Jo. Chief and council were to write a letter to ENR about this. Want a report from ENR on this on water quality. There are fishermen in McPherson too that talk about abnormal fish! Some people don't report but talk about it. Board needs to talk about it too and follow up.

Janet: get photos and sample, description of it. I will note it and ask water people to take a look

Action Item: Janet to inquire with water department regarding results of samples taken (re: Yellow-orange scum on water in Aklavik and Fort McPherson) and to follow up so that feedback is given to the community.

Bobbie Jo: Is this an ENR or DFO role?

John C.: you can see it from the air! You can see it at my fish camp. Muskrats, when take n water –some of those lakes should be tested too. It might be bad for the rats too.

Wilbert: who is representing Inuvik?

Amy: no one here from NRRC

Wilbert: I will speak regarding the Regional motions

a. on water issue. Last year a Cat went into the Peel and was left there by the Ferry crew. Done in the Mackenzie too. No charges laid. Nothing will be done unless the board starts asking questions of those agencies. We didn't get any answers from anyone about this and that meeting took place in January. Letters went out to those agencies too (ENR, DFO).

We also took it to the GTC assembly about the native user agreement. Get IGC and GTC working on that agreement. According to the motion, at minimum, they want to set an allocation of an annual allowable harvest of PC caribou in the Orange zone. To sub allocate the herd harvest. If can get this board to get GTC moving on setting up that user agreement, it would be good.

A herring concern. None up in delta. We brought that up. Mesh size is wrong. 2.5 likely too small and is cutting into our herring supplies. We are not getting any herring. It is disrupting their cycle.

Big game outfitting of sheep. Outfitting program. Fort McPherson wants that too. S.Charlie said it would likely go to GTC.

Resolution 11: we need community RRCs to work on getting participants and harvesters to start reporting harvest of caribou. We are not getting proper counts. The surveys aren't good. Not getting real numbers because people are not reporting. I don't know why but eventually when allocating, this will affect it (if harvest report is too low) Must start reporting. Coordinators need to work with surveyors on this too.

Forestry concerns: what is happening in McPherson –they are bringing in timber for elders. They were bringing it in from burnt out areas in the Yukon. We don't want invasive species brought in. We don't want more timber brought in. Only one person was benefiting from it, instead of spreading the wealth. We are concerned about invasive species.

Deep water lake water source for Fort McPherson also had a motion for it.

You can get the minutes of the regional RRC and GTC assembly.

Jozef to Wilbert:

Re: water/Cat –that was reported to the appropriate people and it is in their hands.

Native user agreement. Direction at GTC assembly to start that process, I'm sure they will follow up

Outfitting –Not sure how far that would go given yesterday's board decision GTC would be involved with that. Agree that more needs to be done on harvest reporting. Can work more on education on that. Maybe the way you described, if not reporting now, that may come back to haunt them. That could be a good strategy to try to get reporting done.

Herring, not sure about mesh size being used. Kris could speak to that and forestry

Kris: Forestry –ENR did introduce regulation regarding permitting of timber coming into territory. Should be something there for oversight of that

Herring at Shingle Point –not sure mesh size there. One salmon in freezer was caught at 3.5. A bit of a mix probably.

Deep water lake. Worth noting that on the lake, the LWB did not implement RRC recommendations. Those were good recommendations, so disappointing. License now for 6 years but no commitment from regulatory body or mgt system for water withdrawal to address community concerns, which is frustrating. Will try to work toward a better protocol on that.

Ron: What is the Gwich'in word for herring? Is that Cisco (that is being mentioned as herring at Shingle Point)?

Kris: Yes, that is Least Cisco.

Eddy: Always talking about wildlife numbers and that. Check point at 8 mile for reporting. Highway caribou also

come from west channel. No one documents that. Up to hunter to report every 6 months . That is too long. GRRB should have something set up where boards are launched to help with harvest study. E.g. Fort McPherson check station. A lot come in by boat. Harvest study but too long every 6 months. Need accurate numbers. Also for char. Had a monitor at big eddy had one at Husky but that was taken away. Don't know why Lots of car taken this time of year. Need reporting. Have a part time monitor. I get a lot of feedback saying reporting to HTC (not RRC). We need to report ourselves, not go to HTC to find out what the catch was. We need a monitor up the Husky doing samples, like up the river. Monitor the char ore closely. People are taking more than what they say, I feel. I want to see a motion for these fishery and caribou. Need to protect our rights, will help community, board and RRC in future. Accurate numbers will help have them forever.

John Carmichael: I am a monitor. When I stated there were 5 monitors, including at husky. We are asking for one at mouth of husky. 2 in McPherson, 2 in Aklavik. People are fishing there right now. Monitor here not too long, but they just monitor fish from here to husky. No one monitoring those nets there. He is asking for another monitor at mouth of Husky. Go through RRC.

Amy: Eddy, your two comments: 1. Check station and one near Aklavik. That is management via ENR with agreement with TRRC. I can follow up with ENR to ask about possibilities We will follow up on that and will also share with ENR on that as a first step. 2. With char monitoring, all \$ comes from DFO and they use implementation \$ they get for Gwich'in area. Usually spent each year and then they use operating funds too. This would be a RRWWG item. They meet each year in march. A good opportunity to bring that forward. Then you have GRRB, DFO, FJMC, RRCs HTC and all monitors there. They can talk about it there too. I will follow up with DFO. Larry is in town next week and I will mention it them too as something of interest. Don't know why no monitor at Husky anymore. Can find out and get back to you

Action item: GRRB to find out about why Husky monitor position was ended and get back to Eddy (RRC).

Eddy: asking game etc... but I am asking for a motion from GRRB to find the money (yourselves) to do this. It is important to do this. What is the use of these studies if not accurate #s. Put a motion to ENR to establish a check station. Same thing for fish monitor. Don't ASK. Same with Dall's sheep. Asking but still in same place. Sit around and talk and talk but 6 months go by again. Forever. Come up with a motion, with action. You are a strong board and RRCs. I'm concerned. Everyone is. Do something about it. I sit on the RRC. I feel that today there is a circle we are going around in with Regional RRC. Didn't have minutes. I brought up 50 pages of concerns but couldn't ask questions. I'm here for our people. I would like to see something happen. With the monitor and check station. Get a check station here and a monitor. To have it for our children and grand children. It upset me when you said I'll ask. Stop asking and make a motion and an action. That's what I am saying. With dall sheep, trying to do sport hunting 20 years ago, and still nothing. A lot of people just give up. Charlie is still talking about the same thing. 40 years ago.! That's the way I look at it.

Jozef: I hear Eddy's concerns. A lot of these are in partnerships. I understand frustrations. All we can do is follow up with other organizations for a monitor in Aklavik

Cheryl: suggest ... <not heard>

Bobbie Jo: first step is to...

Jozef: a motion from the ERRC would be helpful to see what they are looking for. That will help us with our case too, when we talk to other parties.

ERRC member: We made a motion about the monitor already. You should see that soon.

Charlie Furlong: I was going to comment on some of the actions and concerns brought up about cultural camps etc..., but I guess when you look at the land claim agreement, it talks about wildlife management being the jurisdiction of GNWT but also the boards and who you are to work with –GNWT and federal government on

drafting policies on wildlife management. I don't know, you've been in existence for 20 years. I don't know what you have done in 20 years on those policies. This morning you talked about the management Act and regulation. That has been going on for 20 years. With some end coming to it, with the hope that will be the model for guiding wildlife management. I think that sometimes, the board such as yours in existence e too long and you forget about your mandate and objective and people question what you do.

And education process need on responsibilities of those boards and committees of those under the GCLCA. It wasn't only the Gwich'in that signed it. The governments too. They all agreed to implement those principals under that agreement. We tend to forget that. I've notice that over the years. We talk about culture, traditions and our way of life. I have noticed over the years, quick to point fingers to their people to set up camps or whatever. Traditionally, if you talk tradition, the education that the young people need to go out on the land to hunt, was the responsibilities of the parents. That doesn't exist anymore.

People point fingers at the schools or at the GTC or at the GNWT. But is it's the responsibility of parents to do that. Parents are around that understand that, a few of them. Some living example of that and how to work on the land. E.g. John Carmichael on how to survive on the land and a few others in town. Today to take kids out on the land, everyone wants to get paid. It is not a responsibility anymore.

As a co-management board, you should be encouraging parents to go out on the land. Every spring and fall, they encourage parents to go out o the land 4 gallons of gas subsidized. 10-20 families out on the land and they go out and harvest and come back. Some of them go a meeting and report on what they did and what they harvested. It is a family responsibility. That is what we lost. We have the cultural camp in the past, but it is such a big liability of that organization -80% of time taking to fund and then insurance and liabilities and all that stuff, whereas a family member with a camp in the bush doesn't need that. Just take out kids for a week and shoot a caribou or learn to set a snare. Another thing, you talk about harvesting animals, there is no control. Years ago, you would take an elder with you. That elder was self-appointed elder who went along to make sure traditional rules were followed, You never left anything behind. People e today leave parts and only take the best and go home They don't know. They have no respect r the land or the animals. My father when alive would never shoot a cow moose or cow caribou. He learned from Fort Norman where he come from He say you chose to take a cow moose, you have actually shot 3. (Each cow will have three calves over its life.) That's the same thing for caribou, so you do that unless you really had to and needed to (shoot a cow). But you get a few caribou up here, and then right away you get 100 skidoos harassing them all over the country. Our RRCs are mandated to monitor those. That is in the claim.

Take a step back and look at more managing than policy building. Look at your roots and start from there.

Cultural camps are good, but t really parents should take responsibility M may be need a camp for those without the parental capacity to do that a camp more effective quarterly if parents took kids and used camp quarterly to report what they did. They could tell each other successes and failures. We gar going too far from culture and traditions. Need to go back and use the tools, the GCKSA, the board, the RRCs etc... Not just policy and policy and policy. I can see it. We are getting too far. Your board is becoming a government board. Everything else we are following too much government policy. So, let's; step back and have a look at ourselves and see whose responsibility is what.

Archie Inglangusuk: About caribou monitoring. ENR officer has sample bags here. You could pick that up \$25/bag. Up to community member to ask for sample bags. You don't need a check station to get the bags, can go the ENR officer to get it done.

Break for Lunch 12- 12:45

15. RRC session and 16. Public Session Continued

Board reconvened after lunch to continue the public and RRC session.

Bobbie Jo, for the notes, I will try to attend the monthly RRC meetings. I am also hearing what the community concerns are.

Eddy: we talked about using survivor money for cultural camps and issues with money. Specifically using the Gwich'in harvesters' assistance program in our community. Not enough is given out. I don't know why people don't apply or why they get turned away when they do apply. I spoke up on this at the RRC, so we had 6 applications, and I gave direction that they be approved, no matter what they applied for. But only \$6000 available. That is a small amount. Other communities get 30 or 40,000\$. I brought it to our RRC about the RRC applying for the remaining money to use for the on-the-land programs. If we are allocated 20,000 but only using 6,000, our RRC will keep asking for remaining money to do stuff like that. E.g. the trapping programs in Aklavik with ENR, there was a big list of names that wanted to take the trapping course. They were turned away because it was filled right away. We asked our coordinator to do a proposal for an on the land 10 day trapping course. We are looking at doing this and suggest that it be at Eddy McLeod's camp. Re GHAP money, that's what we want to use it for. We are not using all of it so want to try for stuff like that. Maybe also for Charlie's cultural camps, building cabins. We got some money and fixed up John Martin cabin. It is important to hunters in that area to not get caught in a storm and have a cabin there. We use them for cultural hunts that we do. They go there and take the youth and elders and take caribou. We want to finish the cabin at canoe lake. We are in the process of finishing that cabin. That money for GHAP for Aklavik, I'd like to see the remainder used that way. The RRC would probably put the application in for the remainder. I am hopeful that they can get that money for the application. Aklavik RRC membership in land claim is entitled to that money. Good to see that continues to happen.

Jozef: GTC runs that program, not the GRRB. So that request would go to GTC. We don't have anything to do with that fund.

Eddy: a support letter from GRRB can be helpful in that for our application, perhaps.

Jozef: I would be happy to support the RRC in that.

Charlie Furlong: instead of GHAP or CHAP, we used community based initiatives \$12500 for that. Working on reallocating funds for families to take young kids out. An extra CHAP, sort of.

Kristen –regarding the harvester monitoring programs –Not sure if funds coming from GTC to RRCs are earmarked for harvest data collection specifically (as there is a GCLCA responsibility of RRCs) but is a financial need. GRRB trying to find funding to support this. Mentioned CIMP funding coming to an end. Maybe another source for communities and GRRB to pool funding to do RRC harvest collection?

Johnnie: don't know why didn't use our people for the (Caribou Hunters) video. I had boys at my camp and they wanted to watch me, not a video. Would be good to have someone from our region in that video.

Bobbie Jo: yes, would be good to see our own people. That video was ENR funded. Cindy encouraged getting educational resources out. Not sure if that was in the minutes. She gave some good direction who to contact then. We also talked about GSCI mandate etc.. and board commitment with them in that area. We talked about it last time too. And partner with GSCI on that perhaps to find funding.

Action Item: Jozef: action is to find funding to do the video

Johnnie: special harvesting management areas (Mackenzie island and at boarder). Anyone can go through right now. Nothing can be done about it because of trespassing rules. I don't know if implementation committee is working on it. This is going on and on. I'm tired of hearing about that.

Jozef: we are working on that in the development of the regulations for special harvest area. We are trying to do that in this phase, not in second or third phase

Amy: In the meeting binder, under tab 13. There is a folder called special harvesting areas. That was how ENR is thinking about regulating those. **Want to see if the GRRB and GTC are okay with that.**

Jozef: That specific concern is addressed in the regulations, for that area.

Johnnie: so officers will enforce that?

Jozef: Yes.

Amy: I can tell ENR that GRRB is okay with that, for those regulations specifically.

Jozef: GRRB drafted something. It seems to fall in line. Also want to use tribal council, and make sure it is okay with them. Haven't heard back from them on this. Want to make sure GTC reviews so that it complies with the claim also.

Meeting Adjournment

Jozef concluded with thanks to the community of Aklavik for hosting, to the cooks, to the RRCs, to the staff, to the public and board members.

Burt: also added thanks to staff and board and others.

Amy: Not a closing remark but a good news item. Aboriginal affairs implementation department has given \$131K to board for this year with ability for deferral to cover Special Projects Biologist position and consultation on species at risk next year.

Ron: thanks to Jozef for chairing.

Charlie: Glad to be back in Aklavik and have a meeting. Nice to sit with elders and talk. I'm happy about being back here. I'm learning every day when we come to meetings. My stick in my mind, is the GNWT, I never did ever have any respect for them, when first brought into the territories. We have to really watch how they are doing their work. One thing that has happened in Yellowknife is to charge our own people for hunting caribou, hauling wood and setting nets. This has never happened. There will be more to come in time to come. Watch, keep your ears and eyes open. If you don't agree with it, point it out to them.

Corrine: thanks to the board for coming. Your board is getting stronger, by sitting here and listening to new members. Thank you.

Bobbie Jo: Thanks to all in the room for participating, my second meeting, and good to meet new members. I used to work for the board and understand how it can get frustrating. In my experience, with the staff staying at least 4 years, it is good. That helps in seeing progress and action on things. We all have a role. I am looking forward to next couple of years and good communication with communities. Doing our homework is important in coming to the meeting to make sure we meet our under the land claim and get good decisions

Wilbert: thanks to GRRB for putting up with us

1:15pm MOTION to adjourn meeting.

Moved by: Charlie Snowshoe

Seconded by: Burt Hunt

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Motion GRRB
14-32

Staff session-Staff & board member session

Staff & members only

Attendance-Day 1, Wednesday, Sept 10 Morning Session

Board members: Jozef Carnogursky, Doug Doan, Bobbie Joe Greenland, Ron Allen, Johnny Charlie, Burt Hunt, Charlie Snowshoe

GRRB staff: Amy Amos, Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier, Nataalka Melnycky

Public: Tsatsiye Catholique GTC, Wilbert Firth TRRC, Rachel Koe TRRC, Louie Cardinal, Archie Inglangusuk, Fannie Greenland ERRC, Corrine Dillon ERRC coordinator

Attendance-Day 1, Wednesday, Sept 10 Afternoon Session

GRRB directors: Jozef Carnogursky, Doug Doan, Bobbie Joe Greenland, Ron Allen, Johnny Charlie, Burt Hunt, Charlie Snowshoe

GRRB staff: Amy Amos, Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan, Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier, Nataalka Melnycky

ERRC: Fannie Greenland -President, Corrine Dillon -ERRC coordinator

GRRRC: Archie Inglangusuk

TRRC: Wilbert Firth, Rachel Ellen Koe

GTC: Tsatsiye Catholique

GNWT-ENR: Stephen Charlie, Marsha Branigan

Louie Cardinal

John Carmichael –Char monitor

Attendance-Day 2, Thursday, Sept 11 Morning Session

GRRB directors: Ron Allen, Jozef Carnogursky, Johnny Charlie, Doug Doan, Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan, Burt Hunt, Charlie Snowshoe

GRRB staff: Amy Amos, Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan, Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier, Nataalka Melnycky

ERRC: Fannie Greenland, Eddy McLeod, Andrew Charlie, Eddie Greenland, Corrine Dillon

GRRRC: Archie Inglangusuk

TRRC: Wilbert Firth, Rachel Ellen Koe

GTC: Tsatsiye Catholique

John Carmichael

Jeremy Mosher -AIB

Charlie Furlong –Aklavik mayor

Attendance-Day 2, Thursday, Sept 11 Afternoon Session

GRRB directors: Ron Allen, Jozef Carnogursky, Johnny Charlie, Doug Doan, Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan, Burt Hunt, Charlie Snowshoe

GRRB staff: Amy Amos, Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan, Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier, Nataalka Melnycky

ERRC: Fannie Greenland, Eddy McLeod, Andrew Charlie, Eddie Greenland, Corrine Dillon

GRRRC: Archie Inglangusuk

TRRC: Wilbert Firth, Rachel Ellen Koe

GTC: Tsatsiye Catholique

John Carmichael

Charlie Furlong

Summary of Motions

Motion to approve Jozef Carnogursky as this meeting's chairperson

Motion GRRB 14-25

Moved by: Burt Hunt
Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
All in Favour
Motion Approved

Motion to adopt the meeting agenda with the revision as noted by Amy.

Motion GRRB 14-26

Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
Seconded by: Doug Doan
All in Favour
Motion Approved

Motion to accept the Feb 18, 2014 minutes

Motion GRRB 14-27

Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
Seconded by: Charlie Snowshoe
All in Favour
Motion Approved

Motion to accept the March 19, 2014 minutes

Motion GRRB 14-28

Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
Seconded by: Johnny Charlie
All in Favour
Motion Approved

Motion to accept the May 21, 2014 minutes with the noted changes made.

Motion GRRB 14-29

Moved by: Burt Hunt
Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
All in Favour
Motion Approved

Motion to accept the July 21, 2014 minutes with the above noted changes made.

Motion GRRB 14-30

Moved by: Johnnie Charlie
Seconded by: Charlie Snowshoe
All in Favour
Motion Approved

Motion to approve actions in the draft plan Table "Summary of Management Actions and Monitoring" and to send a letter to Parties to the plan as discussed.

Motion GRRB 14-31

Moved by: Jozef Carnogursky
Seconded by: Burt Hunt

Motion to adjourn the meeting (1:15pm, September 11).

Motion GRRB 14-32

Moved by: Charlie Snowshoe
Seconded by: Burt Hunt
All in Favour
Motion Approved

Summary of Meeting Action Items

No.	Action Item	Who	Reference	Status	Deadline	Action Taken	Date Completed
14-30	Add board member discussion on standing under different portfolios to the February 18-20, 2014 minutes.	Amy	Sept 10/14				
14-31	Get GTC Assembly fracking motion to Charlie. Wilbert Firth has a copy of the motion for Charlie	?	Sept 10/14				
14-32	Follow up with Stephen Charlie about the possible zoning changes for the Cape Bathurst caribou	Amy/Kristen	Sept 10/14				
14-33	Make a table about what she has heard from board members indicating their interest in various files and can solicit members to comment further so Amy can keep them up to date on those files.	Amy	Sept 10/14				
14-34	Adjust the action items to reflect that 14-20 was about proper coding of the scholarships.	Amy	Sept 10/14				
14-35	Amy will share the electronic binder with the rest of the board.	Amy	Sept 10/14				
14-36	Phil: "we can go back and look at this. (amount of return; why only 80,000 and not more if returns were larger this past year) We have no problem and can send that out to Amy."	Phil Anselmo	Sept 10/14				
14-37	Phil: "yes, we can send a copy of the current account of stocks right now to Amy's email address."	Phil Anselmo	Sept 10/14				
14-38	Send a letter to the summer staff from the Board thanking them for help and acknowledging work they did.		Sept 10/14				
14-39	Give the entire electronic binder to Corrine who can make that available to the ERRC members and for Fanny who requested a copy of Larry Dow's report.	Amy	Sept 10/14				
14-40	Follow up with Stephen about muskox harvest numbers recorded by officer in Aklavik	Amy/Kristen	Sept 10/14				
14-41	Kristen/Amy to send letter to Dall's Sheep Management plan Parties	Amy/Kristen	Sept 10/14				
14-42	Compile input from RRCs on SAR management plan prior to November teleconference.	Natalka	Sept 11/14				
14-43	Review the RRC input on the SAR management plans (see action	Board member	Sept 11/14				

	item above) and EC presentation slides given at the Sept. meeting and then to make a decision about approval of these plans at the November teleconference	s					
14-44	Include as a GRRB recommendation to ENR that RIBS are items not to be considered wastage in regulations	Amy	Sept 11/14				
14-45	Follow up with ENR on bear harvest and tag usage report and will circulate that to the board and RRCs when it is available	Kristen	Sept 11/14				
14-46	Inquire with water department regarding results of samples taken (re: Yellow-orange scum on water in Aklavik and Fort McPherson) and to follow up so that feedback is given to the community.	Janet	Sept 11/14				
14-47	Jozef: action is to find funding to do the video (E.g. ENR Caribou Hunters video, only with Gwich'in harvesters demonstrating techniques)	?	Sept 11/14				
14-48	Action item: GRRB to find out about why Husky monitor position was ended and get back to Eddy (RRC).		Sept 11/14				
14-49	Re: ENR wildlife act regulations. They want to see if the GRRB and GTC are okay what has been written regarding special harvesting areas. Amy: I can tell ENR that GRRB is okay with that, for those regulations specifically. Jozef: GRRB drafted something. It seems to fall in line. Also want to use tribal council, and make sure it is okay with them. Haven't heard back from them on this. Want to make sure GTC reviews so that it complies with the claim also.	Amy	Sept 11/14				