

**Day 1. Tuesday, February 17, 2015**

**1. Introduction**

**Call to order**

Jozef called the meeting to order at 9:24 AM.  
The board discussed and approved Jozef as meeting chair.

<b>Motion to approve Jozef Carnogursky as this meeting's chairperson</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-01</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Ron Allen	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

Meeting participants did a round of introductions

**Declaration of conflict of interest**

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

**2. Agenda**

Members reviewed the agenda. There were no additions or deletions, but items were reordered to accommodate Amy Amos' scheduled absence for the morning and early afternoon. Members discussed the need for a flexible order to get through the agenda items.

James: request for update on new wildlife act during the meeting?  
Ron: Amy may not be as familiar with what is new lately, but ENR would be best.  
Cindy: Staff to follow up to see if an ENR person can attend by phone or in person to give an update.

<b>Motion to adopt the meeting agenda with order flexible as needed and determined by meeting chairperson</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-02</b>
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

**3. Review and approval of draft minutes:**

**Sept 10-11, 2015 Board meeting**

The board reviewed the minutes from their last meeting in September. Cindy appreciated the format with the action items listed in it.

<b>Motion to accept the Sept 10-11, 2014 meeting minutes</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-03</b>
Moved by: Johnny Charlie	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

No members had matters arising for discussion from those minutes. They said that as other items came up they would discuss.

**Oct 24 Teleconference:**

Cindy: edits for these minutes :  
Page 4, Peregrine Falcon and then next one down looks like copy and paste of decision item on short eared owl

management plan. So the correct decision needs to be reflected there. Short eared owl management plan motion, not peregrine falcon. (Kris did corrections to the document, shown on screen)

<b>Motion to accept the Oct 24, 2014 teleconference minutes with the edit suggested</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-04</b>
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

Matters arising:

Cindy provided comments in writing after the September meeting on the COSEWIC caribou status report on page 7 of 8.

### **Nov 12, 2014 teleconference**

Cindy had edits for these minutes:

Page 2, Under ammunition standards, second paragraph. Change to "Cindy Allen asked why"

Page 4, Under enforcement, change to "wildlife officer seizes", not "ceases".

The board discussed the meaning of the sentence as it was written, its meaning after the correction to seizes and of the ability of a peace officer to be designated if they are a member of an aboriginal government. The sentence was corrected by all to "...and asked if an officer from another government could be designated as a peace officer or enforcer" (Kris did corrections on screen)

Next paragraph: ceases changed to seizes

<b>Motion to accept the Nov 12, 2014 teleconference minutes with the edits suggested.</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-05</b>
Moved by: Cindy Allen	Seconded by: Ron Allen	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

## **6. GRRB Member updates**

a. **Ron Allen:** Since the meeting in Aklavik, he participated in staff hiring to replace Nataka. There were 50 applications for that job with the successful candidate, Kaytlin, hired to begin work in January. He also participated in the Conference of Management Authorities meeting in Yellowknife in January and participated in a November call when Burt Hunt was unavailable. He also did a little bit of work reviewing some wolverine SAR documents. Burt Hunt had submitted comments on the fishing license approach suggested by DFO. –That will come up later in agenda. Doug and Burt also reviewed some of the curriculum material submitted on caribou hunting and activities.

b. **Doug Doan:** Eugene was unable to attend the board forum in Yellowknife so Doug attended the two day meeting. Theme was transitions and was an interesting meeting. This was the first one to be chaired by GNWT and the first board forum Doug had attended. The Deputy Minister chaired the full meeting and did a good job. Most of the updates were associated with the changes relating to devolution. The federal government role in the forum has significantly changed. There were updates from the various boards.

c. **Cindy Allen:** Cindy was not able to attend in September, but in the meantime she provided written comments on some of the management plans discussed already (e.g. short-eared owl and peregrine falcon) and also provided also written comments for the caribou COSEWIC status report. She noted that their information did not reflect a northern perspective and some information was incorrect, so she tried to have that included and considered. She stated that Ottawa folks are not up to speed necessarily on what is happening in the north. She submitted comments regarding Mackenzie Valley fibre optic plan, so that it would not just protect Species at Risk but would also consider other wildlife (e.g. frogs) potentially affected by that development project. In the fall she attended the PCMB meeting in Whitehorse, finding it to be informative with very good things being done by that board. They just had their last meeting in Inuvik last week. She noted that they have a new website and information campaign, and these are some things the GRRB

may wish to look at in future as they have been done well.

d. **Johnny Charlie**—Johnny attended the September GRRB meeting in Aklavik and participated in review and discussions at the November GRRB teleconference.

e. **Bobbie Jo**—Bobbie Jo attended the PCMB meeting in Aklavik with Janet. She also took part in the November teleconference call for Wildlife Act Working Group (WAWG) on the meat wastage topic and spoke about politics around this issue. Bobbie Jo came from the perspective of TK and needing at a national scale, the message recognition that caribou are important to Gwich'in. She noted that this wasn't stressed in the NWT *Wildlife Act* so it was a good discussion. Some amendments were made as a result of her comments to the WAWG document. She was appointed by the GTC to Gwich'in Council International, a member of the Arctic Council. (Their topics often focus on climate change and global warming which impacts the work of the GRRB too).

f. **Jozef Carnogursky**: Jozef noted that he has not been too active since the September meeting. He was able to provide some comments here and there. He noted that it is very good to have other board members appointed so the work can be shared. He has been helping out Cheryl and Amy with signatures when needed. Jozef noted that GNWT has put his name forward for full member, and thought that the alternate board member suggested was Tracy Davison, ENR.

The board then briefly discussed the length of time for board appointments to go through.

## 8. Staff updates

### b. Wildlife Biologist

Kristen reviewed her written update with the board on her activities since the September meeting. Topics she reviewed were: **Wildlife Management** (Taking Care of Caribou management plan and action planning, Dall sheep management planning, Boreal Caribou Range Management Planning), **Research** (Sheep Pilot project proposal, co-authorship on research reports), **Technical Advice and report reviews**, **Liaison** items, and **Other** items related to such things as training and GRRB operations.

#### Questions to Kristen

Ron: What will take up your time during the next months?

Kristen: The working group activity for the caribou management plan will likely continue to be a priority with the action planning development target of completion of 3 plans in this year. If GRRB approves, some time will be needed for the sheep monitoring project—preparation in spring, quick to do field work, and then time for analysis in fall. ENR has also requested my in-kind assistance with caribou surveys this July. I've done this twice before helping to do the telemetry and they would like that again. Those are the priority items that come to mind.

### c. Fisheries Biologist

Kris reviewed his update verbally with the board reviewing Management Planning, Research, Technical Advice and Liaison job objectives he has met since the September meeting:

#### **Management Planning and Research Objectives**

Kris just attended a long meeting in Winnipeg last week on the Rat River advisory process as a focus. Babbage River in ISR and Rat River then updating the research plan for Dolly Varden IFMP. Right now our knowledge of Rat River char and of knowledge gaps is good. Will speak to that later in the agenda.

Attended the Beaufort Sea partnership meeting in Inuvik. A lot of different agencies participate. Pushing for more knowledge on food webs in near shore Beaufort sea to see how char are using that.

Attended the West side working group meeting –Kris gave update to them on Rat River (they focus mostly on big fish river)

Will be attending the Rat River Char working group meeting in two weeks and this will keep him quite busy. It was a good field season of research and will speak to results later in the agenda.

#### **Technical Advice**

In addition to technical advice Kris provided in the processes discussed above, he provided comments along with other GRRB staff on the Mackenzie Valley Fibre Link project. Kris has concerns about their water withdrawal sources. Our comments focused on withdrawal and water lakes. Their response was that in 2005 water lakes were identified as not meeting DFO requirements for taking water. Part of problem with those lakes is that we don't know if those lakes have fish; TK says they do. GNWT not willing to answer for us. Kris took a strong approach in requesting a lot of those lakes be removed. MVLWB did remove lakes that did not fit protocol, which was good. Kris is still concerned about our lack of knowledge of other lakes –all removed from license were on the north end of the project. Camp is at Campbell lake but nearest source they are allowed to withdraw from is 50km from that camp location, so Kris wondered where they are getting water? Are they in compliance with their license?

#### **Liaison**

Attended the meetings above as described for the WSWG, Beaufort Sea Partnership etc...

Attended the CIMP results workshop in November.

Attended various RRC meetings and January Regional RRC meeting.

Ongoing communication with RRCs and partners on shared files.

#### Questions to Kris

Johnny: regarding the water withdrawal for the fibre link project: the camp is getting water from town. They are having a slow process of moving to another camp location. Moving 20km away, but can't haul water from the lake near there.

Kris: have list of lakes they are allowed to draw from. Woodbridge lake is allowed.

Johnny: Hill lake?

Kris: Maybe that lake. Yes, our concerns were that the license be followed and that lakes not identified as important for fish (also) not be impacted.

Ron: Are there concerns with the fact that the cataloguing of lakes was quite a few years ago and water levels now are much lower. Maybe a lake that passed a threshold 10 years ago is low?

Kris: It is not clear if whether there is less water or not in those lakes? Couldn't comment on that. Definitely bathymetry is outdated if assessment of those lakes is more than 10 years old. I gave comments in terms of lakes close to limit (2.5) and requested that they limit snow clearing on those lakes to not increase ice depth. Majority of the ones left that were approved for withdrawal, I'm not too worried, but concerned about precedence of GNWT rationale for why lakes not needed to follow protocol, because it has been done before. Don't want significantly more withdrawal on these lakes.

Cindy: wondering about comments we made to DFO on legislation and other items –they wanted to give us a day for consultation...Did they ever come back to us?

Kris: DFO process for water licensing –DFO not involved at all in this. Notification sent to new fisheries protection policy branch –they triage and categorize it and then email back saying follow procedures on website, absolving them from process. On this project, no DFO oversight. Predictably, a lot of new developments in our region. I think the government has made it so that DFO involvement is limited as possible. This makes a greater burden on us to make sure things are done properly. Comes down to "guy with the shovel". If he doesn't know his responsibilities, then it won't work.

Cindy: sounds like GRRB needs to be right on top of it.

Kris: yes, did okay with this for this project, but capacity is not there to do research on lakes now; maybe in future.

Doug: If DFO had actually participated in the hearing in some way... You say they did not. Are their protocols regulations or policy or what? "Protocol" is a word that is not clear as to how much weight it carries.

Kris: a policy –this fisheries protection group goes through a strict list to define what kind of development it is; does it cause harm to fish; can it be mitigated? (e.g. like going through a flowchart of decisions) –If protocol is in place, they don't review it.

Doug: If a protocol says is being followed. Then DFO is okay with it?

Kris: Yes, but if we don't know if there is impact to fish or fish habitat, and if DFO says it (research) was done before on the lakes, then why can't do (the project)? Lack of information in our region...

Doug: So protocol may be in place but DFO is relying on regulators to be followed.

Kris: Yes, but they also rely only on the information they are provided with. Sometimes they don't know a project has happened. DFO may not hear about it, depending on how it was categorized (at screening). Doesn't necessarily involve the region, or the region's DFO staff.

Doug: In the final analysis, is protocol working?

Kris: For this project, sounds like it was okay, but I still have concerns about the lakes. GNWT seemed quite resistant to (amending based on) our comments, but the Land and Water board heard our concerns.

#### **d. Renewable Resources Manager**

Janet gave her presentation to the board following her written update summarizing her activities since September, 2014. These include:

**Management Planning** activities (e.g. updating the public registry, updating the regulatory review process and creating a new email for communication between the GRRB and regulatory agencies);

**Research and liaison** activities (e.g. presenting the harvest data results at CIMP meeting, PCMB Annual Harvest Meeting, Regional RRC meeting), assisting muskrat researchers with WSF application and RRC approval processes, recording new fisheries research interests of the RRCs for review at the September board meeting;

**Technical Advice** activities (e.g. reviewing and coordinating staff response to research and regulatory applications such as the Mackenzie Valley Fibre Line as well as other responses to agencies outlined in the staff update;

**Communications and education activities** (e.g. assisting Amy with the delivery of a Resources Management presentation and char management role playing exercise with Environment and Natural Resources Technology students at Aurora College.)

**Other:** Janet also secured funding for staff and board members to attend industry conferences including the northern oil and gas research Forum and the geosciences forum in Yellowknife in November and the Arctic Oil and Gas Symposium in Calgary in March. Janet will also be coordinating staff attendance at career fairs in Inuvik and Aklavik in March and April.

#### Questions for Janet

Doug: Regarding the Fibre Optic project –water removal issues were dealt with, but wildlife and wildlife habitat issues were commented on. To what degree have the GRRB comments been accommodated in the approval?

Janet: No, some of the comments they gave back were just what they had originally said they would do, with no changes. E.g. Set back of nesting habitat of horned grebes –We had suggested a greater distance. In their response, they just said they dealt with it, but did not actually change the setback.

Kris: GNWT response?

Doug: I am interested in the actual approval by the land and water board.

Janet: The land and water board looks at licensing of water withdrawal...

Kris: I did not specifically look at wildlife stuff, but there is a document from the land and water board with reasons for decision on both documents. That could be looked at. In my review it did not look at wildlife comments included.

Kristen: In my experience, unless they are backed up by legislation, the regulators cannot add some specific requirements for wildlife into a license approval. Many times there are comments that make sense but the regulator cannot mandate a proponent to abide by those comments.

Doug: But it sounds like there were some (legislated requirements) for Species At Risk that were not followed.(e.g. With regard to Set backs).

Kris: The majority of comments we made were on the GNWT wildlife and wildlife habitat monitoring plan. When MVLWB makes a license, they are limited –They can say they endorse the WPP and WHMP plan, but it is up to GNWT to put them into the plan proposed for a given project. We have to make sure our comments are targeted so that the regulator can consider putting them in, in a more implementable way, especially for fisheries and wildlife.

Fanny: When you were at our meeting, there was a question on the wildlife act, and definition of wildlife requested.

Janet: so defining wildlife as frogs too? Yes, need to look at definition of wildlife in the act. (e.g. including amphibians and insects). Need also to look at how plants are addressed in legislation.

Jozef: There is a definition in the Gwich'in claim also.

Bobbie Jo: I want to make a note under education about the career fair. Upcoming on Thursday, April 2 (before Good Friday) in Aklavik. Expect an invitation. There was also a bit of a discussion about video education on caribou harvesting. Hunters in the communities –they like the ENR video, but could the board and co-management partners make a video focussed on Gwich'in harvesters, as there are differences. Any movement on that item?

Janet: not from the GRRB, but GSCI has acquired some video equipment for their programs so perhaps they can be partnered with. The equipment is for their language programs.

Janet: Right now we have a copy of the current DVD that was made for each of the RRCs and the PCMB hunter education manual, but no movement on making videos (since September).

*Action Item: GRRB staff to attend Aklavik career fair April 2, if possible.*

*Action Item: Follow up on educational item for caribou harvest video creation*

Jozef: How much do we spend on harvest data for Porcupine Caribou and the harvest study?

Janet: About 20K per year.

Jozef: Did we follow up with GTC in terms of funding that part of the harvest study, as they signed the Porcupine Caribou Harvest Management Plan and Implementation Plan, but we are taking the cost to implement this? We should discuss sending GTC a letter to request assistance. It would be good to Cc the board of directors on that letter as well. That could free up some funds for other research or programs, like the educational videos Bobbie Jo was talking about.

*Action Item: Follow up with GTC on funding the harvest study. CC the board of directors on correspondence*

Jozef: You are looking for board direction on an up-coming oil and gas symposium? To send 2 participants (board and staff?) Is there interest in staff to attend?

Janet: I'm available to attend.

Jozef: Board members interested will notify Janet of their interest.

**e. Special Projects Biologist –Kaytlin Cooper**

Kaytlin gave a brief introduction of herself, outlining her education and work experience, and explained she has taken over from Nataka.

**Technical Review**

She outlined the work Nataka had done since the last board meeting in September: Boreal Caribou Status Report (federal), Red-necked Phalarope Status Report (federal), Peregrine Falcon Management Plan (federal), Short-eared Owl Management Plan (federal), Wolverine Status Report (territorial), and Boreal Caribou Recovery Strategy Framework (territorial). Kaytlin has reviewed Boreal Caribou Framework and Recovery Strategy (territorial) and Short-eared Owl Management Plan (federal), and is currently reviewing Proposed Listing of Northern Mountain Caribou (federal), Wolverine (federal), and Gypsy Cuckoo Bumble Bee (federal).

**Liaison**

Kaytlin collected and provided RRC comments regarding Boreal Caribou Recovery Strategy Framework (territorial) and attended RRC meetings to discuss Proposed Listings of Northern Mountain Caribou, Wolverine and Gypsy Cuckoo Bumble Bee (federal).

**Meetings Attended**

Nataka attended the TK Conference and Boreal Caribou Range Planning meetings in Yellowknife and Kaytlin attended the CMA meeting in Yellowknife and the Regional RRC meeting in Tsiigehtchic.

**Research - Bank Swallow**

Nataka conducted bank swallow surveys with Leighanne Lennie from Gwichya Gwich'in RRC in Tsiigehtchic. Kaytlin will be continuing the project by sending data to eBird, writing a report and distributing it throughout the GSA and applying for funding for more surveys through the SAR Stewardship Fund.

Upcoming work included reviewing Little Brown Myotis Recovery Strategy (federal), Boreal Caribou Recovery Strategy (territorial), Boreal Caribou Range Plans (federal), Barren-ground Caribou (excluding Dolphin and Union populations) Status Report (federal and territorial), Peregrine Falcon Management Plan (federal), and Olive-sided Flycatcher Recovery Strategy (federal).

There were no questions for Kaytlin.

**Morning Break 11:05-11:15**

**Staff Updates, Continued**

**Office Manager**

Cheryl reviewed her written presentation with the board. She highlighted procedures in place for paying honorarium and per diems for board work. She reviewed her involvement in WSCC training, conservation calendar edits, attended a geoscience forum in Yellowknife. She noted that WSCC forms are out for 2015 among other items she spoke to.

Questions

Ron: Can you elaborate on your involvement in the budget?

Cheryl: I assist in the operating budget for core funding; managing contribution agreements. That is different funding from GNWT or government of Canada and we report on all of that. All are tracked through a project system. Staff manage their own project budgets, with my assistance tracking on accounting software.

Ron: What software and do you have what you need?

Cheryl: Simply Accounting is used.

Ron: Kudos to you and thank you. From what I have seen at this group and your administrative support systems, especially as compared to other groups, you are doing very well and should be recognized.

Bobbie Jo: Thank you to Cheryl also. One question: with software, is there a need for upgrade or is it okay right now?

Cheryl: In addition to Simply Accounting, we run honorarium and payroll through Ceridian online, they take care of deductions and other payroll items, so I am doing okay.

## **21. WSF update: harvest data collection project—Janet Boxwell**

Janet reviewed her presentation on the GRRB harvest data collection program. She spoke about the GRRB and RRC roles in the study, harvest data collection methods and results. She spoke about participation level in the harvest study (e.g. in 2013-2014, less than half of caribou harvesters on the list participated in the study, with improvements in one community in the latest harvest data collection round underway) and caribou harvest levels reported and estimated. She also presented harvest reports of other species (moose and Dall's sheep). She discussed successes and challenges in the harvest data collection program. She noted that the GRRB's harvest survey form is being used as a template in other regions for the Porcupine caribou.

### **Questions**

James Andre: harvester list –Does it go through the RRC for review? I haven't seen it. I disagree with some names I saw on it. In Fort McPherson, at least 10 moose were hunted (but not all reported). I wonder if people get interviewed just to get an interview done? Need to target the hunters that are active.

Janet: Last year, for the 2013-14 data, I took a list that had 160 names and we went through them one at a time with the RRC to determine if they were active, key, absent or otherwise and the RRC gave input. I can go to the RRCs again and update the list for the 2014-2015 cycle.

*Action Item: Update harvester lists for the 2014-2015 cycle.*

Cindy: about the harvester list, to follow up: On your chart you have it broken down by age of the caribou. In your list, can we get data on the age of the harvesters themselves? If we are trying to ensure the idea of "let the leaders pass" for example, and we want the young people to participate in that, I am interested in knowing how many young people are participating, as well as men and women. There may be differences in information provided between these groups and these results can feed into our education programs for harvesters.

*Action Item: Add harvester age and harvester gender to data collected and provide results to GRRB summarized by these categories also.*

Jozef: There were extra slides after the presentation that you didn't review.

Janet: Yes, those were additional comments on the PCMB harvester education manual for general info only.

## **Noon Lunch Break 11:55-1:15pm**

## 9. Caribou Discussion

Board discussion on the “Taking Care of Caribou” management plan and implementation. Kristen noted that Amy added this item to the agenda so that the board could discuss the topic as needed, but Kristen had not received direction to make a presentation on this agenda item for the meeting so in the absence of Eugene and Amy, she would bring board members up to date with an overview to get their discussion started.

She reviewed the changing status of the management plan after the September board meeting, leading to it being signed and submitted to government in November, including the approval and signature of the GRRB on the recommended plan. The GRRB participates on the Advisory Committee for Cooperation on Wildlife Management via the board’s Executive Director, chairperson and another board member. Kristen continued to participate on the committee’s technical working group to complete plan edits and is now working with the group on writing the action plans this year. Kristen updated the GRRB on recent actions, meetings and correspondence between the GNWT and the ACCWM, including the GRRB, from late August until the present. She noted that the signed management plan describes a process for decision making on herd status and management actions to be taken.

She noted that ENR initiated meetings on management of Bathurst and Bluenose East caribou in August and during the fall, prior to the completion and submission of the management plan. GRRB chair, she and two GTC representatives attended two technical meetings held. Leadership (GRRB and GTC) attended another meeting. She noted that the Minister communicated urgency for decision making and comments by ACCWM on ENR proposed management actions as ENR actions related to winter harvesting in late 2014 and early 2015. Kristen shared a summary of communications between the Minister, ENR and the ACCWM (including the GRRB), on the Bluenose and Bathurst management issue and provided a file with these materials for board review, if desired.

The board decided to move further discussion on this item in-camera later in the agenda.

>Additional conversation related to this topic came up during another part of the meeting (board and staff session), so it was included here for clarity:

Kristen notified the board that the working group was looking for board comment on the order that actions plans were being written (currently order proposed is Bluenose East herd, then Bluenose West herd and then Cape Bathurst herd) as well as to what consultation, if any, the board wishes to have on the action plans in the GSA. (The consultation policy specifies how consultation on management plans is done, but not for action/implementation plans). The working group is trying to ensure that the goal of completion of all three plans in one year can be met.

*Action item: Board to notify Kristen regarding order of action plan creation*

*Action item: Board to notify Kristen regarding direction on GSA consultation on action plans.*

## 10. Dall’s sheep Discussion

Board discussion on the Dall’s sheep management plan next steps. This item was added to the agenda to create time for the board to discuss. Kristen had not planned a presentation for this item but reviewed actions taken since the Board’s September meeting to lead off discussion for the board members:

Kristen reviewed the status of actions taken on this management planning for sheep since the September

meeting. She noted that following the board's direction, she and Amy drafted a letter for board review and approval to notify plan partners of the September motion by the board (to approve the priority actions in the draft plan's summary table of actions). The letter also asked partners to participate in the actions in the short term as precautionary measures while management plan finalization continues, expressing the board's interest in continuing to complete the plan with plan partners. After board approval, the letters were signed by Eugene and then sent out by email and hard copy to all plan partners.

Following on the letter, Kristen created posters which were put up in Inuvik and sent to four RRCs for posting in their communities about the board decision. The newsletter also included information about the decision and a facebook page update also shared the information. She and Amy also attended a board meeting of WMAC (NS) at their invitation to talk about the letter and the board's perspective on management planning for this sheep population. They were also interested in finalizing the management plan.

Kristen explained that she will separately be presenting a research proposal to assist the board in beginning steps on the remaining actions they approved, if they approve that project proposal. (Community monitoring program running to help detect trend via annual lamb recruitment)

#### **Board Discussion and Questions**

Doug: So we sent out a letter. Have we heard back from any plan partners in response to our letter?

Kristen: Not to my knowledge. Not in writing anything formal. Amy could confirm this.

Jozef: Any discussion on trying to finalize the plan?

Ron: I would be inclined to discuss this with Amy (when she is here) as it was discussed at the board meeting and maybe at the board forum as well, so there may be more that we need to hear before we go further.

Jozef: So we will move to defer discussions until this afternoon when she is here.

Bobbie Jo: Can you refresh my memory? What changes were proposed by Vuntut Gwich'in and YTG

Kristen: I don't have them in front of me. I know that they had suggested changes to the actions table-right now the draft plan sheep numbers include lambs. They had suggested changes to the thresholds so that the numbers only represented adult sheep observed. That was one big change. They had a number of other changes throughout the document. I know that they had other concerns about the mandated licensed closure to resident hunters. They have certain procedures to follow in the Yukon that may differ from the process mandated in the GCLCA which has an order for how things get restricted.

The remainder of the discussion was deferred.

Jozef expressed that it should be a priority to finalize this item. He acknowledged that other parties may want changes, but the GRRB has mandate to manage in the GSA.

Cindy: Is this the one that they were looking for community monitors?

Kristen: There is a community monitoring element in the plan. Communities supported this. I know there were some external concerns raised about the viability of this element in the plan.

Cindy: Janet's comments this morning? A different program?

Kristen: Yes.

Jozef: on this one, there is also a growing interest in commercial outfitting. We have said over the years that we would not consider anything until a management plan is in place. We are almost there, but we never seem to get there. It comes up every year.

Doug: it would be helpful to have the letter that went out to partners for that (deferred)discussion as well.

*>The remainder of these notes were recorded in the afternoon, after Amy arrived, but placed here for clarity>*

**Board Discussion continued**

Amy: We discussed with WMAC NS at their meeting; just a conversation. That is all we have heard from Plan Partners. We did send letter to all parties.

Ron: What should we do next to move this along?

Amy: Board wanted to move it to get approved. We don't have funds to bring everyone (plan partners) together for travel. If meeting was in Inuvik, need to think about that, if you want us to push towards that. Does board want us to take this leading role? It would likely fall to Kristen to coordinate.

Ron: Jozef, you have more history with this process. It has been dragging along a long time. Is it worth putting the time effort and money into finishing this one and saying it is final or in progress forever?

Amy: Another point is that there were previous comments from other parties. We need to know how to tackle those comments. To approve it, should there be another gathering or teleconference of the board to go through those comments? Some comments were significant and went away from what we'd heard at the community meetings. Might be good to have a board position first. With ACCWM plan, see same thing that it is hard to get agreement of the parties.

Jozef: yes, 18 years taken to complete the forest management plan.

Amy: Yes, also adding different territorial governments too for this one.

Jozef: I think it worth sitting down and going through it. A lot of those issues are pretty significant. May need a refresher and a conference call.

Ron: treat it like a SAR file. Come to grips with it ourselves first. Make a plan for getting it off the table.

Jozef: lots of partners and lots of expectations out of that plan from the partners. Now, some issues are conflicting. Some actions items in it can be expensive. Plan partners may not be willing to commit funds as written in the action plan.

Ron: I don't know all the history, but I don't appreciate the subtleties yet. Hard to solve ourselves, but we can identify areas we are okay with and what we can do. Start there. Effort to do that. Better than it just sitting there and sitting there.

Amy: This is part of what Jozef was mentioning at the September meeting too, or a previous call. About how some commitments are written into the plan. Kristen tried looking at what it looks like when those items are pulled out. Recently plans have had the action/implementation plan separate, but sheep plan had them written right in. Part of what we were thinking is that hesitancy to sign off is because of those commitments. Kristen has an edit of the plan where she took out the commitment aspects. Took out who and left in the action. That document could be reviewed too.

Jozef: a majority of the plan was the table we approved last year. It looks like we are finding ways to work with that chart by ourselves. I think it needs to be done however we do it.

Amy: To summarize what I heard: the board has an interest to push it forward to get it approved, understanding that is a lot of time and commitment. Board is open to serious modifications if needed. The board is interested in a teleconference to review this item later.

*Action item: staff to provide board with materials needed for sheep management review prior to teleconference*

*Action item: board to hold teleconference on sheep management*

**Questions**

Bobbie Jo: discussion over email with the board seemed in support of James’ Firth reappointments. With SAR, there is a lot of scientific perspective, and we need to make sure that we are strong at local, TK, especially with SAR. It is important to have an active harvester and trapper to be at this committee too, as James is. They can bring the changes that they are seeing to the discussions. If he is doing a good job, then I’m supportive. For an alternate, our last face to face meeting, we discussed board members wishing to take on topics as a portfolio, to put their names forward.

Kaytlin: also mentioned at CMA meeting, that technically we are not supposed to have alternates. It was also suggested as a possibility that board staff can also assist.

The board finished their discussion and made the following motion:

Motion to reappoint James Firth to the Species At Risk Committee and to add Cindy Allen as an alternate		Motion GRRB 15-06
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Ron Allen	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

**14. WSF proposal: Dolly Varden Char projects –K. Maier, GRRB**

Kris had two proposals to review:–

**Rat River Dolly Varden Char Habitat and Juvenile Occupancy**

- i. Results from WSF project last year
  - ii. Plans for this year and WSF Proposal

Kris reviewed the main objective to assess the juvenile habitats of char stock to get a tool predict what the adult population will be.

Now better understand the spatial extent of juvenile habitat use in the headwaters in Fish Creek, have characteristic habitat data, have invertebrate samples and temperature and remote habitat monitoring.

Kris reviewed 2014 results and where fish were and were not detected in the headwaters, and where groundwater inputs were noted. Stream gradient and steepness of stream appear to relate to fish presence. Noted that the presence of fish were detected for the first time in some of these streams and this is important for land use planning.

Cindy: clarify ground water?

Kris: we don’t have a good understanding of the mechanism, but it is not from surface inputs but is being expelled from underground at a consistent temperature (very conducive to spawning fish at this location). It may be from melt water that goes underground and then back up, but we don’t know that.

Tommy: salty?

Kris: No, not like Big Fish River.

Kris noted that probably should start doing metals analysis on the water samples. Some metals show up on otoliths, so understanding where they are in the habitat will help understand why the fish have them.

Kris noted differences in abundance of invertebrates captured at three different sites. At the glacier field, very

few bugs, at the upper site, few, but at the tributary near the groundwater input there were thousands and thousands more invertebrates than the other sites. This is significant for providing food for juvenile char at that site.

#### **Plans for 2015**

To do same thing again, but expand into four new tributaries into Fish Creek. This will help us understand how fish habitat relates to fish population.

Note about methodology: we did not kill fish with electrofishing (explained on slide effects). We captured 127 fish in 40 sites. This is the 9<sup>th</sup> time talked about electrofishing but now recently getting some pushback on using it as a method. We got a lot of data from this, so wish to continue this method.

The standardized CABIN process used for monitoring invertebrate samples-now we have reference sites.

Cindy: differences in water temperature?

Kris: Need to ask Neil (co-author), but suspicion is no and that it seems to be very stable.

Sue at the Land Use Planning Board may have funds to expand this monitoring through using remote cameras to monitor aufeis field and relate melt and formation to fish habitat and activity. New technology can use satellite to send the photos sooner than collecting the cameras.

Kris then reviewed his budget for the project and his request from GRRB.

Cindy: Dead sampling came up as an issue before. We were trying to move away from dead sampling but I see that in here.

Kris: for Grayling?

Cindy: Yes

Kris: I feel that the data from that dead sample is not informing us enough. Juvenile dead sample however, we can address more clearly the growth rates. We can also look for the virus (that can cause pop declines) that is in adults –often is more prevalent in juveniles, but as it is in kidneys, need dead sample. Stomach samples can also be related to invertebrates collected.

Cindy: in this case, dead sampling provides useful info, but previously dead sampling of grayling was not helpful?

Kris: Yes. Also a lot of mortality at this life stage, so many we will dead sample will die anyhow, so could be lesser impact on population.

Abe: On this new method for electro-fishing. Last year at WG, Kris gave us a video of how it is done. On the video it looks one way than how it looks when actually doing it. The net sampling was good for me for 19 years. I asked in Winnipeg of the scientists, how much of the currents are used by the fish in that creek. Does electro fishing affect the eggs and spawning. Noted that Inuvialuit won't allow electro-fishing in their area. Our TRRC is concerned. We're going to bring it to the RRWG. We want to do it with nets, rather than this new method.

Another community member was at the fish hole and saw it. Our concern is the use of this method in the GSA.

Kris: We'll talk about it at the RRWG and with the RRC. It is not being used as a replacement of the seining. IT is because we can't catch juveniles any other way.

Abe: Vittrekwa as well?

Kris: no.

Kris: to my knowledge it does not affect developing eggs or young fish. They don't have a nervous system to be impacted by a shock, but I need to look that up. I will do more research and will bring that to the RRWG.

They do use electro-fishing in the ISR. In Ivvavik and in the Babbage. It has been done there in the past, but they are focussing elsewhere right now so they aren't needing it. We need to understand more about juveniles now after lots of study of adults.

James: go up in winter? I hear there are a lot of otters there

Kris: we saw otter sign in November 2014 up there. Camera monitoring will also help us detect this and see what otters are doing.

## **2. Similar methodology for Arctic Red River**

Arctic Red River Headwaters Assessment Pilot Project –expanding the dolly Varden work in the GSA

Kris noted that there has never been fisheries work in this region. Likely because it is so remote. It is quite large region. GGRRRC and GLPB would like information on this region. IFMP has some direction for this work (to identify other stocks of Dolly Varden in the GSA). Winnipeg SAR recovery plan –desire to include non-anadromous sea run stocks in the plan, so this work would help. Kris reviewed the project objectives and his draft budget, noting significant commitment from GLUPB to the project and his request of the GRRB for funding support.

### **Questions**

Leighanne: Will you use monitors from Tsiigehtchic?

Kris: We will hire monitors from Tsiigehtchic.

Jozef: ARI funding?

Kris: 6K is fellowship funding; 4K is for research assistantship

Jozef: methods effects on spawning and RRC support?

Kris: providing request to the GRRB with expectation that RRCs will support methods. If not support, expect not to get funds from GRRB.

George: Will you be doing water sampling too?

Kris: Yes, chemicals and metals.

Doug: same funding partners as in other proposal? Same leverage of GRRB funds to amount of work?

Kris: dependent upon how much DFO bringing to table. I think there may be some additional DFO funds to the other project that I didn't have in the budget. For this project, they are only supporting access, but not other methods.

Tommy: Is the location accessible from fixed wing?

Kris: It is from Norman Wells but not Inuvik

Tommy: maybe from Mayo?

Kris: Outfitter is licensed pilot and is able to get to those lakes and they may have camps and cabins for support. Lot is unknown. If funded, then we'll identify the sites with the outfitter input too (for logistical support)

Tommy: horses possible?

Kris: Outfitter used them last year.

## **12. DFO Update - Operations update and Review of commercial fisheries policy**

Larry Dow presenting, Ellen Lea (biologist) & Kate Snow (technician) attending – DFO

Larry introduced himself, noting that though he is in Iqaluit, he is still responsible for NWT. He confirmed that the board had received information on the policy update. It is an Emergent Fisheries policy. It is Canada wide. We are doing consultations Canada wide and sent these communications out across the country. It really does not make changes to how do business because of the co-management regime we work in up here.

Essentially what it is is: it talks about a DFO Regional Advisory Committee for new fisheries on page 6. A clause is

also there that states that existing committees will still function. A new policy. Not official yet. End of the day is that it doesn't really change how we do things up here. See page 9 – Where Land Claim Agreements are in effect, the need for the role of an advisory committee will vary. So it doesn't really impact us. This is part of the small C consultation. A lot of policy written for the east and west coast.

Ron: Burt looked this and submitted to comments to the Board a few weeks ago so they have had a chance to look at it. Streamlining, what we see as a good thing by us as the number of hurdles and time taken to process a new license for fisheries in this part of the world... Our interest would be access to new licenses of a commercial nature within the GSA. We would like to have a first go at anything that would come up. If you think a back a few years ago to what we went through north of here in the Beaufort when interest in opening fisheries to folks in other parts of the country. So those concerns are still with us and we are still a little edgy about an outside interest deciding that they can make a new fishery here and the impacts of that to fisheries resources without going through the hoops we want them to go through and the local folks not having a first crack at it.

Larry: What Ron was referring to was a group from BC back in 2005-07 who wanted to do offshore work. It wasn't done very well and had poor results. I am not aware of any potential commercial fisheries in GSA. Definitely if there was a concern, you would be the first to know. We have some small commercial fishing: some coney, whitefish etc., but if affects new fisheries, consultation is number one. Very important.

Cindy: Is this new policy coming into place because of potential opening up of high arctic?

Larry: This policy only applies in Canadian waters. They have been trying to write this for 5-6 years. Don't know if what is going on in high arctic had impact to this. Do know that DFO wants to update and revamp this policy. They have ongoing discussions on potential fisheries. The environment is taken seriously up there. I don't know.. There are national discussions about the high arctic.

Cindy: I had another question that I asked before and I am glad you are here because we haven't had DFO presence at our board meetings for a while. I had a question about Marine conservation area. It is on the books in Parks and Environment Canada that there should be a Marine Conservation Area in the Beaufort Sea. Where is that at? If they are planning to open up for oil and gas, then how does that work with the conservation area?

Larry: We have our Marine Protected Area Network –want linkages with the areas. I don't have all the details on that. They are not about creating a new area, but about having linkages. No point having an area sitting by itself. I can get a specific answer for you on that if you want more details on that.

*Action item: DFO (Larry) to get GRRB information on the status of development of the MPA in the Beaufort*

Larry: Steve Newton from oceans program has been in discussions with Environment Canada. They are pushing for the MPA Network. There is more federal funding coming for that.

Cindy: the Network is different than the MPA?

Larry: I don't want to speak out of turn, but that would play -be part of it, but DFO MPA network will not be separate. Eg. one off in Baffin Island .. In terms of the Beaufort, I am not aware of any on the go. Is it that they have specific areas to be conservation areas?

Ron: I think the question is what is the status of that one that was to be created and then didn't go anywhere...

Larry: with Parks to push through?

Cindy: yes. It is on the books...

Larry: haven't heard anything about that. I know eastern arctic is a little different, but I have not heard about that one. What area?

Cindy: I would need to look at a map.

Larry: I haven't heard anything on this side

Cindy: That is what I was wondering. It seems like they are pushing development rather than conservation. I am concerned. If one thinks of the blow out in Mexico and how they couldn't deal with that. The technological challenges in arctic are a greater concern.

**Comment [KAC1]:** I think that Ellen has been consistently attending GRRB meetings. It may be worth a note to Larry to confirm this has been happening. Perhaps Cindy is thinking of senior management attending, but at the least, he is sending staff.

Larry: I understand and know what you are talking about. Screening boards would come into play there. Yes, about same season relief well and stuff like that. For Marine Conservation Area, I am not aware of any on this side. There would still be an environmental review process to go through for development.

Ron: Back to commercial fishing, in your analysis of the policy, do you really think it will streamline anything for us? It was cumbersome before. Steps from 3 to 2, but in your view, will it speed things up?

Larry: yes, they talk about 1, 2, 3. They want data either way before they go to a fishery. They have streamlined a few things but still a process in place. Can't say in a year or 6 months. Need data from more than 1 year before going down that road.

Problems when don't get all the data required. No fishery will go ahead without peer review.

Ron: what if small effort fishery? Small market, small catch? Will this make our life easier for small scale stuff?

Larry: Right now in GSA regulations have water bodies listed for commercial fishery. Don't know if new ones coming. Not a large scale fishery intended by this.

Ron: will we be caught by this?

Larry: co-mgt process. Work with science folks in Winnipeg. Go with what science tells us we need. Not a cumbersome process

Ron: are there current fishery development projects underway so we can see how it works?

Larry: No, but in eastern arctic yes. There, we are paying fishers to collect samples for us, DFO trains them to do sampling. They do sampling under contract (making more \$ sampling than fishing)

Ron: Is there a model available to us to look at?

Larry: Yes, we would look at that. DFO wants to promote economics

**Comment [KAC2]:** Is this an action item for DFO?

*Action item: Larry to supply GRRB with a model of the new DFO fisheries policy/protocols available for review*

Kris: Halovic River situation?

Larry: Cambridge Bay –every year contract with DFO to have community members do sampling with Les. Unique fishery for char. Largest for char in the north

Kris: what I am wondering for GRRB: DFO uses weir to enumerate stock; then commercial fishers take over weir and get fish, and then back to DFO sampling program. Has that undergone this policy? What works or no?

Larry: that fishery has been underway for quite a while. Les collecting that data for a long time. Can see what he did. Did not undergo this process. Policy was there, but that one is not a new-emerging fishery as described here

Kris: yes, wanted to see if there was anything we can look at as an example.

Kris: yes, for larger scale fisheries. We don't have at the GRRB the involvement with commercial fishery licensing process in existence, but GRRB should be aware of it or informed of at minimum. Don't know if GRRB wants to have that discussion while Larry here.

Larry: licensing of individuals? Do you commercial fish?

Kris: Yes, I do. Perhaps a bit of a conflict for me, but the GRRB may wish to discuss this.

Larry: For water bodies without a commercial fish license; if person applies and is eligible, we go ahead, but so small scale normally that we don't do anything else.

Jozef: in terms of Inuvik DFO operations: presence?

Larry: Staffing changes and budget cuts caused staffing decrease. I am moved to Iqaluit. Kate Snow is here. If things go well, we will have a technician here. Discussion about having a senior DFO person in NWT. Discussion whether in Inuvik or in Yellowknife. They would be responsible for fisheries management on this side. Want the position filled but don't know where it will be located yet. Ellen's position would report to that position.

Discussion to increase senior management. We have Kate Snow and we want to keep her as long as she wants. Although we have reduced staff, we are doing what we can.

Jozef: let him know that there is life in Inuvik.

Larry: Yes, will pass on. He is aware.

Jozef: question about patrols and frequency in Inuvik region?

Larry: can get that for you. They have to report. Patrol days –last officer was transferred to Yellowknife. Will provide summary of patrols from last year. To Shingle Point each year, but don't know exactly when. Sometimes unexpectedly, like when the beluga showed up in the delta.

*Action item: Larry Dow to provide summary of fisheries patrols in Inuvik administrative region.*

Jozef: The fisheries trainee position here before was partially funded by DFO. That was very useful to have and to help people get into fisheries biology and management. Is there a possibility of getting that funding back?

Larry: things have changes in terms of management procedures. Right now it is hard to give \$ to an organization for that. Contribution funds are very hard to get. Almost impossible to give like we used to do. Maybe DFO could bring someone on as a casual to work under DFO (not GRRB), but in GSA. That is doable, but only way something similar would happen.

Doug: The new policy –can you give us more information about timelines? In the incubator a long time? –we are looking at comments....

Larry: No way to get comments in 30 days –I realize that. I put 45 days in the letter. It will be March when we will be getting comments in. We'll have to pursue comments with some folks. If boards have to wait to discuss until their meeting, then have to deal with that. We had to put a date in the letter to start from.

Doug: What are your expectations (for timing)?

Larry: key dates: all comments and information to me and then forwarded on. Send comments to me by first week of March. Then I put package of comments from NWT together and then they go. It will take time to get comments.

Doug: what happens after you get comments? Next steps and timetable?

Larry: no timetable for the next steps, although they are pushing it. Right now they are working across Canada to get comments first.

Tom Wright: Question to the GRRB –are you thinking of a commercial fisheries?

Jozef: some discussion on small scale, but not larger scale.

Tom: Wouldn't you have to talk to the people and see if that is what they wanted?

Jozef: Yes.

Tom: Inuvialuit had a fishery here, but if you got bigger than that you would get in trouble.

Kris: That's what I was getting at: GRRB is not involved in commercial fisheries discussions right now. Not being addressed by board.

### Break 3:50-4pm

#### **18. WSF proposal: Dall's sheep monitoring pilot project**

Kristen reviewed her project proposal for sheep monitoring with the board. She reviewed the board's September motion to approve the priority action table from the draft Dall's sheep management plan and noted that two remaining items in the approved table could be partially addressed by the proposed project. She reviewed the focal area of the sheep monitoring project and the three project elements and their rationale and methods: Community Workshops, Remote Camera observations of sheep and Camp Based Observations of sheep.

She completed her presentation with a review of her budget and her funding request from the GRRB

### Questions

Cindy – when will project start?

A: In March or in April – workshops to help with planning. Mid-June for observations. Idea is to do them the same time as the aerial surveys get done after early lambing season.

Tom: Is hunting closed?

Kristen: In September the board approved a voluntary closure. No resident hunting exists for this population in the GSA.

Tommy- sounds like it was closed already. So a bit confused about this.

Jozef – We sent information on voluntary harvest restriction/closure last fall.

Kristen: So it sounds like we need to do some more educational and communications work on this item.

*Action item: Create and circulate new communications materials about the sheep management motion from the September meeting*

James – is anyone studying what's going on in Sheep Creek Area – outside of this area? (south on the Dempster). Any correspondence with Yukon on studying sheep? Other studies?

Kristen: not to my knowledge.

*Action item: Ask YTG if they do any monitoring of sheep in the Southern Richardson mountains*

Jozef: Did you make any requests from other plan partners for funding?

Kristen: ENR has requested \$5,000 from their next fiscal budget and expect to be able to contribute at least that amount. Haven't requested from others yet.

## **5. Chairperson Update**

Amy reviewed Eugene's written update to the Board. Eugene is still in Fort Smith, and plans to be back in Inuvik this summer. He has been working closely with Amy on chair duties. Eg. Usually before an item goes out to board members, Eugene reviews and then it goes out to the board. He approved time off for the office closure over the Christmas break.

He has been the ACCWM representative for the GRRB. Eugene signed the caribou plan on board's behalf. He was quite involved with BNE discussions and working group meetings. Participated in 4 teleconferences for ACCWM and signed off on letters for the GRRB relating to this file.

He has been participating in the Wildlife Act working group and attended the Conference of Wildlife Management Authorities

### Questions

Bobbie –update from Eugene for today? He was going to dial in but then we haven't heard from him.

Amy: No, no update.

## **7. Executive Director update**

Amy reviewed her written progress report from the binder. Topics she covered included Personnel management, Staff Training, Financial management (e.g. Variance report and project summary in binder), Board administration, GRRB appointments and vacancies, liaison, communication –website, public registry, newsletter, conservation calendar, facebook, IT support, and other files (Wildlife Act Working Group,

Conference of Management Authorities, Species at Risk). Invited by GTC to attend university tour in St. John's about her experiences and about the GRRB and accepted that invitation. Also will be attending Governor General's Canadian Leadership conference from May 22 to June 5, 2015. Noted that she has a new publication as a co-author on the burbot livers.

Questions:

Cindy: You haven't heard back about the 10 year implementation plan? Who are we waiting for? AANDC? Other? A break in communication with GTC?

Amy: How I understand the process is that it is the Implementation Committee to do the work with discussions between federal, territorial, and GTC. New amount for GRRB's budget is regular incremental increase as in claim, but no additional funds as we requested. To my knowledge it was supposed to be in place as of April 1.

Cindy: GTC representatives are going to land claim leadership convention (LCAC). We can raise the issue of implementation there. I suggest sending an email to GTC, to let them know of our concerns with implementation. Request update and try to make headway?

Cindy: Another item, at the LCAC upcoming meeting, the Trondek Hwech'in (Dawson and Mayo part of peel watershed case) will be giving an update on that case. I don't see GTC giving an update on their involvement in the Peel Watershed. I think the Gwich'in should be giving a legal update on the Peel Watershed. It is fundamental to Gwich'in people and is important that Gwich'in, not just from Mayo and Dawson City, speak to it. Meeting is next week, so may be too late. This may not be what the GRRB does, but I think the Gwich'in should speak to their involvement in that process.

Ron: related to that and treat as a request for information. Ask if they will comment on that item, or intend to do so? As a way to remind them, perhaps. Ask them to query the budget submission and additional requests. Will that submission be reviewed and responded to? May be worth a note asking them about it. Not a big downside to asking and that might be our role, to ask what they intend to do.

Amy: I can send an email

Jozef: nothing heard about implementation funding either. Perhaps add that to your query.

*Action item: Amy to send email to GTC re GRRB budget submission; ask if that will be reviewed and responded to; include request for info on if there will be GTC involvement/legal update at LCA convention re: Peel Watershed case.*

**Day 1 discussions ended at 5:03pm.**

## DAY 2, Wednesday, February 17, 2015

Meeting called to order by Jozef Carnogursky at 9:05 AM.

### 13. WSF investment update

Geoffrey and Phil provided an update on the GRRB's WSF following their slide presentation provided to the board. They noted goals when they manage the money for the GRRB. They reviewed the portfolio amount and what withdrawals have been made in its history. They recommended an \$85,000 withdrawal for 2015. They reviewed the asset mix of the investments making up the WSF portfolio and the asset mix policy. They currently feel that it is currently better to have a greater investment in the stocks shown rather than bonds shown for this year ("overweight in equities"), as in the asset mix they discussed. They reviewed the RBC's current investment stance and rationale for the current asset mix in the WSF. They concluded that a low interest rate environment will continue to pose challenges. Equities provide income and are dividend providing stocks, so they will be helpful to replace \$ lost on the bond side. The current asset mix should protect the funds in the WSF portfolio.

#### Questions

Cindy: Why recommending an \$85,000 withdrawal from the WSF?

A: When the portfolio was built, the income from dividends and interest will be 75-80K per year as well as a small amount of growth from the capital side that will allow for the 85K total withdrawal. If more than that, it would withdraw from the capital too much. Following the (GRRB) policy for management.

Cindy: Because the GRRB is interested in managing and protecting renewable resources in the GSA, I am concerned that the GRRB does not have an ethical portfolio with investments in energy and the Alberta government. Those investments are made at the expense of other aboriginal peoples' territory and the resources there. More than 10% is in AB and the energy sector. What would happen if we divested our portfolio from Alto Gas, ARC Resources, Crescent Point, Husky, Suncore, Trans Canada? What would we lose? Can we change to something more in line with the mandate of the GRRB?

A: Yes, you can change. In September we presented options on this. We have socially responsible investing. We can screen this for clients. We ask the clients to put that direction into the policy statement and then we manage based on that policy statement. In September, in our report, we showed how we could adjust the equities to match that. We follow your directions. Regarding rate of return, that will most likely affect the rate of return, but cannot say if that will be positive or negative.

Cindy: How quickly can that change be made?

A: The board's investment committee needs to add that to the policy statement. That could be done in a week, depending on when get that from the board. With a screen like this, that screen provides socially responsible oil and gas companies too. We can provide list of those if you wish to review those also. That is an acquired taste and you may wish to not use those, but we can provide list of those with socially responsible background. Your choice as a client. You can provide us with that guidance

Cindy: I would like to see that list.

A. We can provide that and will send that to Amy in the next couple of days.

*Action item: RBC (Geoffrey/Phil) to provide list of socially responsible oil and gas companies for board review for possible change to investment policy.*

#### 4. Action Items –Review and discussion

Amy reviewed the action items table (provided in the binders and shown in the meeting on screen) with the board members. Numbers below reflect the item number given in the action table that was reviewed.

##### Board member questions:

14-3. Doug: When you speak to Mike, can he indicate the number?

Amy: Yes.

Jozef: I have some concerns with use of driftwood in other parts of the NWT. Do we have a chance to comment on that and how it is used? Some need a permit to haul driftwood from river to home. Can we comment on that? It is a concern.

Amy: Yes.

Cindy: I had asked that question before too. I remember ENR saying that they did a regulation change on that.

Amy: Ernie Campbell at a board forum said that.

Cindy: I don't know what the regulation change was. You still might need a permit.

James: for driftwood or any kind of wood to travel on the highway, you have to have a permit to take wood on the road. We asked that at the Regional RRC meeting.

Jozef: Was that overlooked in the Forest Management Plan? Need to make sure the plan guides the regulations.

Ron: Do we need to look at the plan and the regulations to see if this is covered?

Amy: Start over. Mike did present to the board but it wasn't the style where we follow with the SAR, with background, summary of all comments heard. I suggest we do that. There would be opportunity from the board to review. I can ask staff to look at this particular one.

Ron: Interested in impact of pellet project and cutting practises in Fort McPherson. I am in favour of a fairly thorough revisit of this and what it means to the communities when it gets rolled out.

*Action item: Follow up on driftwood regulations so board can comment. (Include follow up on Ernie Campbell's comment on regulation change at the board forum in Behchoko).*

*Action item: Board review of forest management process, including forest use for pellets in Fort McPherson.*

14-06. letter sent to GTC regarding funding from GTC to GRRB to help with harvest study.

Bobbi-Jo: Amy, were you and Patrick going to discuss this?

Amy: Patrick and I met and we felt a lot could be done staff to staff. Norm supported that but wanted board members of each organization to meet first to review staff conversation on this and then for Patrick and I to talk again after that review. The board review part hasn't happened yet.

14-09 –dealt with. Videos provided for RRCs.

Bobbi-Jo: We wanted specifically to have a similar video done with Gwich'in harvesters, rather than a territory wide video. (New action item to follow up on this)

Amy: That conversation is in yesterday's notes with a new action item to deal with that.

14-07 –Marine Protected Areas

Cindy: I am wondering if you can follow up and CC the DFO person on this too. Larry said he would follow up too.

Amy: I recall that there was an update on that at the September meeting. I emailed them in August and then at the September meeting, there were responses and those were added to the meeting binder.

Ron: We asked Larry yesterday about this specifically yesterday and he didn't know, so was going to follow up.

Amy: I may have in from September, and can provide that.

*New action item: 14-07b: follow up on this item in 2015, CC Larry and also provide binder materials from September meeting on this item to Cindy.*

14-31 Wilbert to provide copy of GTC fracking motion to Charlie.

Doug: Could you send out the fracking motion to me?

Jozef: (letter to GTC saying GSA is a no-fracking zone.)

Cindy: need baseline studies too

Bobbi Jo: that motion was passed in August

*Action item: Send motion on fracking from GTC to Doug Doan and full board for review.*

14-32 –caribou zone changes

Jozef: Are the zone changes reflected in the management plan?

Kristen: in the plan, such changes should come from boards to ENR, not other way around.

Jozef: Were we provided with information on this?

Amy: Need to seek clarification on this. And request information from Chair to ENR on the process.

Jozef: we are attending meetings with WMAC and on shared populations, but not to have discussion on regulation changes that they might be doing..., especially with ENR.

*Action item: Send letter to ENR from GRRB chair and ask for clarity on the zone regulation changes and on process taken*

14-39

Bobbi-Jo: for next year, it is nice to have that thank you letter from the board to the students.

*Action item: Send thank you letters to 2015 GRRB student position staff.*

14-46 –orange water scum samples from Aklavik and Fort McPherson

Janet: I contacted ENR. They have a water resources officer position that would deal with this. Right now that position is vacant.

Bobbi Jo: Some residents did provide samples to ENR. GRRB should have followed up on what happened to those. That's what should happen.

Kristen: EPO may also help while the water officer position is vacant.

Janet: I spoke to the Environmental Protection Officer and they didn't know about the samples submitted.

Amy: staff will follow up on this.

*Action item: Staff to continue to follow up on what happened to water scum samples provided from Aklavik to (ENR?).*

14-48

Kris: position ended because water monitor moved to Inuvik. Some discussion on establishing that again, but funding is needed and is currently unavailable.

Amy: communicate that to Eddy.

*Action item: Kris to follow up with Eddy on this.*

14-49 Wildlife Act

Amy: wanted to hear what GTC had to say. Talked with Tsatsiye. He said they have some funds for legal counsel work, so he was asking Patrick to see if counsel could do a quick review. Not sure where they are at. Then, GTC and GRRB would give direction to ENR. ENR won't do anything until they hear from GTC and GRRB on this.

Allen: What is the issue with the special harvesting areas?

Amy: No issue, it is just that they were not reflected in the regulations. In the GCLCA, the regulations should have them, but the new act doesn't. So we want to have them in the regulations. GNWT took them from the claim to do this, but need our review and GTC review on the regulations.

**Break 10AM-10:05AM**

Jozef had to leave the meeting. The board discussed who would assume chairperson roles for the meeting.

Motion to appoint Ron Allen as Chairperson for the remainder of the meeting.

Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland

Seconded by: Johnnie Charlie

Motion

GRRB 15-07

All in Favour

Motion Approved

**15. WSF proposal: Rat River Char Monitoring –DFO presentation**

Colin Gallagher (Kimberly Howland also on the line) reviewed his presentation by phone with the board from the slides he provided. He presented 2014 objectives and research at the Rat River Fish Hole and sampling at Fish Creek. He reviewed the fall seining methods at both locations. He presented results of the char seining and how many sea-run char were live sampled and number of recaptures of tagged char. The study assisted in calculating abundance estimates, which he reviewed. He also reviewed characteristics of the captured fish (age classes, injury rates, etc...) and what samples were collected from those fish that were dead-sampled. Abundance appears to have increased since 2004 (which was the lowest pop estimate since monitoring program began). The population shows indication of decline and the status appears relatively stable.

He then reviewed the proposal and methods for 2015 research, continuing to get time series information at Fish Hole and investigating work at Fish Creek. He outlined how many fish they wished to tag and release and how many they wished to dead sample. He then reviewed his budget and the funding request of the GRRB.

**Questions**

Cindy: You recaptured 15 char from 2013, and then estimated that there are almost 10,000 fish in the population. Is the recapture rate normal for 15, compared to how many tags were put out?

Colin: We try to put out 500 tags per year. Through seining, that is about how many we recapture. We also get more from the harvest monitoring in the delta (to assist with the estimate).

Kris: Can you speak about how the grayling dead sample may be feeding into the management process?

Colin: We were hoping that we would come across more grayling in our sample, but we have had low numbers, so hard to use it as a tool. Purpose last year was to help fill gaps in their biology, which GRRB would find useful, but as tool for the Rat, it is limiting because of low numbers. Could be used as independent measures of environmental variation as a form of indicator moving forward, but still ways away from that. There are more in other rivers, like the Babbage. Data in Rat has been hit and miss, so a ways a way from using this tool for grayling.

Kris: clarify about the grayling dead sample?

Colin stated that there would not be dead sampling of grayling this fall.

## 16. WSF proposal: Arctic Borderlands Monitoring

Michael Svoboda reviewed his presentation with the board. He reviewed the goals of the program (to monitor and assess ecosystem change in the Porcupine caribou range); to encourage science and TK studies; to improve communications and understanding regarding ecosystem knowledge and management; to foster capacity building and training.

He then reviewed how the ABTK Co-op uses GRRB funds and the long term data collection of the program, noting that the GRRB has supported the community monitoring program for almost 20 years. He reviewed the work that is done in the communities for the program and the program cycle, from planning and collecting to analysis, reporting and decision making among other elements.

He reviewed the next steps of the program and long term plans. He concluded with the proposed project budget and the Co-op's funding request of the board.

### Questions

Cindy: I want to compliment you on the new website. Information is easier to access. Can you clarify that for 19 years the GRRB has supported the project?

Michael: Yes, they have been involved for 19 years, but possibly not funded for that long. About 5 years ago the funds were limited federally, so more reliance on partners for funding.

Cindy: what would youth be doing with your project?

Michael: When we began the youth program, we asked communities what was desired. They wanted youth involved, but not further direction. We asked for clarification on what that involvement should be. One Gwich'in community had youth committee in place (Aklavik has had one on and off). WE did Inuvik first, then to Fort McPherson and asked what Fort McPherson wanted and they were open to anything. Our program has specific focus; we were able found funding for training youth to be their own leaders. That helps youth to run their own meetings. They practised those skills at the training. Outcome of that meeting in Fort McPherson was research priorities they identified, which was exciting. I've been making contact with agencies to try to make links between what the youth proposed and getting some of it done. So to summarize, it is a leadership facilitation component, and this is what we want to continue, as well as to build on projects identified by the youth.

## 17. WSF proposal: Bluenose-West and Cape Bathurst caribou surveys (2 proposals)

Jodie Pongracz (ENR Inuvik) presented for Tracy Davison (ENR Inuvik) who sent her regrets at not being able to attend. Jodie reviewed the presentation Tracy provided to the board for two project proposals:

### A. Monitoring of the Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula, Cape Bathurst and Bluenose-West barren ground caribou herds

Jodie presented results from the recruitment surveys and calves per 100 cows. In 2014 it was  $47.8 \pm 2.1$  for the CB herd and TP herd. This is higher than the 2013 recruitment rate of  $25.9 \pm 3.4$ . The results are similar to the 2011 recruitment rates for the CB herd ( $47.4 \pm 2.8$ ) and Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula herd ( $52.4 \pm 4.6$ ). No recruitment surveys are planned in 2015, but in 2016. Rates can vary from year to year (weather, predation, disease, etc...)

Fall Composition survey results were also presented. They flew 28<sup>th</sup> October on Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula. Tuk Peninsula results showed a ratio of 50 bulls per 100 cows. This would be considered a normal ratio. They attempted to do Cape Bathurst on Oct 29<sup>th</sup>, but weather came in. Weather prevented flying again until 4<sup>th</sup> Nov. 4<sup>th</sup>. This date was late and results showed high number of bulls to cows. The Tuk Peninsula animals moved down to mix with the Cape Bathurst. There is worry that this was too late and the herd was separating and therefore cows were missed. The resulting bull to cow ratio if all days were considered was 108 bulls to 100 cows. This is much higher than normally seen in caribou herds. This is also a concern for recovery as more cows allow for

higher herd growth rates.

In NWT barren-ground caribou herds, ratios have varied from 70 bulls:100 cows to 31 bulls:100 cows, in a healthy herd the number of bulls can be lower than the number of cows because one bull can breed with many cows. In some ungulate populations very low male to female ratios (below 25 bulls to 100 cows) have been documented while calving rates remain high.

B. Photo Survey of Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula, Cape Bathurst and Bluenose West caribou herds.

Done every 3 years. Jodie reviewed the methods of the survey and the population estimates recorded for these herds. She noted that the 2012 and 2009 estimate was not different for BNW. For CB all collars were photographed and estimate was slightly higher in 2012 than in 2009 (about 500 animals higher). For TP estimate, it was 2234 in 2012. This was significantly lower than the 2009 estimate (by about 500 animals).

Jodie then reviewed the budget, in-kind support and financial contribution requested of the GRRB.

Questions

Bobbie Jo: Please clarify in your breakdown, GCLC funds are implementation funds? Does IFA has an equivalent to this?

Jodie: IFA funding is one pot. There is not a separation between the GCLCA funds and what we are here for now. They have only one pot. They do their budgeting for the IFA funds directly and the board directs ENR on how those funds are used.

Ron: Slide on Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula estimate, there is a typo (23 out of 22 collars photographed) That is higher?

Jodie: A typo. It should have been 22 out of 23. For the Cape Bathurst caribou, all collars were photographed and that is why there are no Confidence Intervals on the estimate. With that in mind with the stats, if all collars are found and animals counted in that area, the methods don't allow for a CI, although there could still be animals counted, so it is at the least a minimum estimate.

Cindy: Support from GRRRC; other support letters coming?

Jodie: RRC approval forms sent to date were included in the application package but all RRCs were consulted, as described in our application. I don't have the information on the letters, but can get that from Tracy. For a wildlife permit to be issued, we need those forms to come back, so it will be pursued.

**20. WSF proposal: Youth and communications**

Amy reviewed her proposal with the board. She noted that the GRRB has consistently allocated some WSF money to the board in recent years. The amount has varied. It is used: to present the Nature Day programs in the spring; in the youth work experience program (to facilitate youth working with local researchers); and also less of a priority to send staff to do presentations at career day etc...; in the calendar and educational materials that go out. Amy reviewed the revenue for the Youth and Communication programs at the GRRB.

She clarified that there are funds in each program that can be deferred for the next fiscal, if the board approves. She suggested that the board put in a total of \$5000 to the program.

Questions

Bobbie Jo: do we still offer the youth work experience program, in addition to the summer student position?

Amy: Yes. Some years we get more than others. E.g. Last year students helped ARI with a seeding and reclamation project. Sometimes they work in the greenhouse and elsewhere.

Bobbie Jo: I wanted to ensure that we are not cutting programs, but can still do this with the funds you have proposed.

Amy: Capacity of staff also affects our ability to do this, especially for the youth work experience.

Janet: To add to this, last year with the ARI partnership, it was very successful. They put a call out on our behalf too, for their researchers and then we could get youth from other communities on projects in those communities that are permitted through ARI. ARI also used our summer student and tech trainee working with the youth so it helped with capacity building for the senior students.

Bobbie Jo: Nature Day should expand. Not necessarily with more funding from us, but with partnerships with local school staff and RRCs. I see it every year and is a positive program, but it would be good to expand to try to recruit more youth. To expand to a school-wide day. It is good for the grade 3s, but not for others. I can email you my ideas.

*Action Item: Bobbie Jo to email Janet ideas on possible expansion of Nature Day*

Doug: a follow up to Bobbie-Jo's remarks. When I look at the expenses, they are up and down. Is that because, you also get other funding? So the expense column is not the total project budget?

Amy: No, that is a good point. I'm just reflecting what the GRRB has spent on this program. In other years when we get external funds (EG DFO funds for calendar, it is not recorded directly in our books); for the youth, some came out of our core funding. WE have some in core for travel. For the youth, it is often quite inexpensive and travel is the majority with snacks and meals covered. Communications costs more. (E.g. the calendar is close to 10K)

Doug: I think it would be helpful to the board to show the total. Just like in the wildlife projects, so we can see the commitment year by year, as in the wildlife projects.

Amy: I can do that

Ron: that is a good idea. It helps us see how others are contributing, and helps us see that it is much bigger than it looks.

Ron: Nature Day –Question is this done in all the schools in the GSA?

Amy: Yes

Ron: consider having those students do some artwork and that becomes our calendar for the year? That makes that nature day even more important. An idea.

Doug: One suggestion, building on that. People would respond to the calendar if there were opportunities to showcase the youth in the calendar.

Ron: Or using their drawings and names. A legacy of sorts and recognition of that day. It wouldn't hurt to have a youth focused one.

Amy: Struggle every year is finding good quality photos every year. We have adjusted our camera settings so we hopefully get good ones.

*Action item: GRRB staff to pursue possibility of having a youth focused conservation calendar for 2016*

Bobbie Jo: we can use the \$4,674 dollars for scholarships?

Amy: it is for youth; you can use it however you choose.

## **Addition to Agenda: Participant question to ENR on Wildlife Act Implementation**

**-Martin Callaghan & Doug Villeneuve. (ENR)**

This item was an addition to the agenda following on James Andre's question on day 1 about the status of the wildlife act and related regulations.

Doug: The first phase was passed back in November. Next phase will be starting this spring, going through the

next regulations. This phase is big M regulations, outfitting, importing of harmful species, harvest reporting, harvester training and commercial activities. This will be starting in the next few months.

Ron: Can you elaborate on reporting aspects. Schedule and steps?

Doug: Rob Gau would need to send that. We don't have dates for that yet.

Amy: Rob Gau gave a presentation at the board forum on this item. He wasn't sure either but anticipated the working group would reconvene in early spring to work on those key files.

Ron: remind ENR and other folks that consultation is burdensome, but we need as much advance notice as possible to better participate, plan and respond. Expect lively discussion on the monitoring and reporting aspects of the regulations.

James: When we had the Regional RRC meeting, I had a concern about bartering and sale. Our aboriginal rights. What Stephen was saying and what was written. I think that sometimes officers can look aside and let things continue. E.g. Every year we have carnivals and people sell caribou head soup. It is a little income. Now you can't do that anymore. I am quite concerned about that. Not everyone does that, just our elders. The other issue is dry meat. We can trade and barter, but I have said in the past that if someone is going to go hunting, you open the gate if you can transport as much caribou as you want in the NWT or Yukon. We know in the past lots of caribou have been taken, but if you can't sell caribou. Way down to Ogilvie it costs \$500 in gas. Don't see a problem selling caribou, if it is to recover the cost of the gas. Officers seem to overlook it. But in law, I disagree with this rule. Barter. It is expensive to go hunting now. Not easy to recover expenses. I wanted clarification on that. They say they will work to solve those three things, but it is taking a long time. How to word it in the regulations? I want something in there that we are exempt from for certain things.

Ron: thank you. Amy to add to that.

Amy: I can answer some of that and Doug can add from my involvement with the Wildlife Act WG. I heard 2 key things from what you said: 1. Concern with selling at community events. 2. How to define what is commercial.

1. From what I understand selling at community events, is that that is written into the act. It is identified and is there. How it happens needs to be sorted out as it is new. Then, I also know from talking with Stephen is that he has been trying to work out those details. E.g. With muskrat Jamboree, he is trying to find ways that the church can sell at their tents. Conversations are happening on this.

2. The bigger issue of what is trade or commercial, it comes to this board to define. That is an item flagged for the regulations. GRRB has a consultation policy to follow to help them decide how to do that. WE will come to talk to you about this in making these definitions. That is coming in the next year or so.

In addition to those two, at the regional RRC meeting, Stephen talked about dedicating \$ to go to communities to talk about what is in the act, to do more education on what is in the act and regulations

Doug: on the community events, a general wildlife permit is needed to sell soups at the community events. I recently got an update from Yellowknife on that.

James: that is good news. Is there anything in the act about fish?

Amy: No.

Amy: Doug, is ENR doing officer training based on the regulations? We talked at the WG level about all the different types of licenses needed. It is complicated. Lots of layers and lots to consider with different regions and who can harvest and who can't. We talked a lot about needing officers well trained and need a manual for officers to use.

Doug: we are not getting too much direction at this point. Amongst ourselves we are reading up and corresponding to get clarification. There are grey areas until all the regulations are in place. No formal training yet.

Doug: I have the plain language Wildlife Act here if anyone wants a copy.

## Lunch 11:50-1pm

### 22. RRC session and GRRB Session -Presentation on GRRB/RRC roles, Review notes from last RRC session; Open discussion

Amy reviewed a presentation for the start of this session. Her presentation reviewed these topics: the objective that GRRB wants to ensure it has effective relationships with the RRCs; the GRRB mandate of wildlife, fish and forest management, and acting in the public interest; GRRB roles for management, research, providing advice to government and close relationship with community RRCs; how the GRRB is different from other organizations, including government; what a co-management body is and primary goal of the GRRB; broad GRRB and RRC roles; RRC role to participate in the collection and providing of harvest data to GRRB and government; GRRB consultation policy and that it addresses GRRB decisions regarding Research, Wildlife Management, Limiting harvest, Traditional sharing, and Advice to Government. How the GRRB and RRCs work together, illustrated by an example of the research priority setting process and the goals of this session such as getting information from RRCs on local concerns about wildlife fish or forest; best ways to get community input; feedback on what GRRB is doing well or that can be improved on.

Ron then suggested that each RRC take a turn to speak about concerns and then go around again to talk about the other topics identified.

Amy also clarified that the GRRB will provide a collation of RRC sessions into a document that will be shared with the RRCs. That will allow for RRC to see what was discussed and raised previously and what progress was made on those items.

#### Discussion and RRC Remarks

Allen Firth: Suggestion to put the document on the website, to facilitate RRC review of the collation of RRC sessions as described.

*Action item [?]: Post Collation of RRC Session document on the website when it is shared with the RRCs*

#### TRRC

James Andre (TRRC): I am impressed with the GRRB and the work the board does. Every time we have to reach the GRRB, we can get through. It would be good to have a copy of your work plan to bring back to the Council. We also have a radio program that we can announce through and review what is happening and what is going to happen. We have not had a chance to submit a proposal, but have a research interests:

1. Walleye. A student wrote to us recently. She wants to study fish. We suggested that maybe there is an opportunity to study walleye.
2. I don't know if it is in the GRRB's mandate, but with ABTKCo-op, the slumping and permafrost melting is having an effect. The big mud slide up the Red River and up the highway. What is the effect of that? (E.g. The big one up by the airport.) What is the effect on the fish of that? Mike Sutor did a presentation last year. We have to adapt like everything else, but it is getting bad. We would support more studies on that, although we understand it may not be your mandate. Or maybe it is?
3. Does the slumping affect the route of the caribou migration? People are now hunting moose because there aren't caribou. We were raised on caribou and the elders suffer when it isn't there. E.g. An elder buying spare ribs –she wanted caribou brisket so purchased ribs. I don't know what we would do without caribou. Two years now, they have swung so far over (away from regular migration route) this fall. Why would they go west? Why all of a sudden in the last two years? I don't know so am suggesting this.

**Comment [KAC3]:** Amy, I'm not sure if this is an action item. Many of the RRC comments could be interpreted as action items, but some are research interests and requests for information. Other than this one which I made into an action item, I left them alone and did not add others to the action table, unless it was something staff or the board specifically said they we would follow up on.

4. Are people chasing them? As a research interest, the “why” of this (changed migration) would be good to help solve.
5. People are concerned about herring, although they need a special net. But, people don’t fish them anymore. Can Amy direct us in the right path to do the study ourselves for herring? Rather than bringing in biologist from the south?
6. They were called Tou, but they are Snipes. They used to be all over, but now we don’t see them anymore. We could do the study ourselves, but need someone to initiate the work. I don’t want to burden the GRRB to do more studies. You are doing an awesome job already with what you have.

Ron: Are there forestry issues in Fort McPherson?

James: At one time we were trying to make a forestry plan. They brought in someone from Vancouver. They said it would take a tree 500years to grow. With climate change and permafrost melt, maybe that has changed. We notice more shrubs in places.

1. Dry wood (deadwood) is getting hard to get. People have to go a long way to get that now. People are going back to burning wood to offset the cost of fuel. We had a disaster a few years ago when the power plant blew up ~ 10 years ago. Everyone that had wood stoves, had lots of people over! Lots of people then converted to wood stoves now.
2. If you look at sand bars and floods, they are interrelated. Need to watch where to cut. [*note-this remark may be related to the GNWT pellet project using willows for fuel in Fort McPherson*] Sandbars start, then keep going, ...
3. We try to manage, but it is hard. It is done well in the Inuvik region, so they don’t get a lot of people [cutting] in one area. That is also a concern too.

#### **ERRC**

Fanny Greenland (ERRC):

1. From my perspective, there is a lot of concern about the lack of caribou and wondering if they had been chased back? We know Inuvialuit go hunting and sometimes they share.
2. Others have concerns about fish and
3. Dall sheep. They are doing studies on them...
4. When we do get information from GTC or GRRB, we put them on our website right away in a public area.
5. I really used to enjoy when GRRB would sponsor young adults going out in the bush with John Carmichael to do char monitoring and samples. He used to take out 4 or sometimes 10 kids out. The GRRB helped with that. I would like that to continue. John may now be retiring. It would be nice to see young kids in training.
6. When we have our regular RRC meeting, can a board member attend a meeting?  
 Ron: We could entertain a request. Staff probably could.  
 Fanny: Bobbi Jo is in our community  
 Ron: Encourage you to extend an invitation
7. Nice to see Nature Day in our community. It is good when the staff come.
8. Also the on the land training with the char monitor.

William Francis: on that caribou (migration change comment). The elders knew a long time ago. When the caribou were going to come back like that, it is because they know that they ate out their food here before, so they go someplace else like Alaska or the Yukon. It may take a few years but they will come back. Years ago, my grandfather’s parents followed the caribou and they went a long way to Alaska to Arctic Village. That is a long way to travel for caribou. They can’t do that now. No one can do that now. That is there reason they are not around now. Part of the reason. They ate their food here and need to give it a chance to row back. That is what I heard from my elders. And they are all gone now. So I don’t see why some people are worried like that. They will eventually come back.

## **ERRC**

Fanny: One more concern:

9. about otters and too many otters...and their impacts on fish

James Andre(TRRC): to add to the otter topic: They are trying to do a plan to get carcasses \$50-or 60 for a carcass. They are dangerous animals. They would kill you if wounded so you need to be a crack shot. There are a lot of beavers and no rats. Haven't had muskrats for a number of years. I was talking to Jeremy Bremmer and he said there were a lot there. We know there is not as much water in the delta as there used to be, so we ask why. Is it because of the Bennet dam? It used to be a sight to see when the ice moved because of the pressure and strong water. Now it just goes along and no action anymore. I wonder if our muskrats are down because of less water in the delta. Is it because of the dam? There are lots on the coast now. What is going on? My buddy said that at one house up there he got 15 muskrats from it. All these animals are going that way and the seals are coming this way.

James Andre (TRRC): I don't know but it is a concern I've brought up for years. Maybe not a mandate of the GRRB:

1. These rig sites. 18 up the Peel alone. Another rig site up at Swan lake. A camp across from Fort McPherson and another by Husky Lake. I have been after GTC to do something about it. I saw a report from Jozef and someone else, he was with INAC at the time. INAC said they flew over the places and some they tried to walk to and they didn't see anything. But they said that about caribou river too until they started digging and found it was contaminated. Swan Lake has creeks that flow out with fish in them. There is a gas pocket in swan lake too. It seems like no one is interested in the contaminants left behind. IN ISR they would make you pick it up. In the GSA, they don't care. You can leave a truck in the lake and no one cares.
2. There are places with trucks in the lake, and no one cares. It bothers me. We say the claim is for our children's' future. We aren't doing a lot for that future. I brought it to you and feel better. Maybe something will happen, even if it may not be part of your mandate. The YTG said they couldn't find some sites, but that may be BS.

Ron: We will break for next scheduled agenda item but will come back to this item for more discussion.

Clarify your comment. Was it about herring or cisco?

Kris: same thing. it is arctic cisco.

James: they are different.

## **19. WSF proposal: muskrat traditional knowledge**

Chandra is an MSc student at University of Victoria. She presented on behalf of the research team (also including Dr. Trevor Lancz and Jeremy Bremmer, and Dr. Humphreys). Project is monitoring changes in muskrat health, habitat, and abundance in the Mackenzie Delta.

Chandra reviewed previous work done on environmental monitoring using TK in the GSA and ISR. She noted that concerns about muskrat populations and habitat have been raised by community members and reviewed comments from Gwich'in community members. She reviewed some of Jeremy's work doing muskrat push up surveys in Old Crow flats, surveying ~ 200 lakes per year and noted the interest in his presentations that he gave on his project results in Inuvik and Aklavik.

She summarized why they have a research interest in this area and then reviewed her proposed research: to document changes, examine how widespread the changes are and to look at why they may be happening.

Objectives were to:

1. Document traditional knowledge of muskrats and muskrat habitat. Methods use participatory multimedia mapping and map based interviews secondarily;  
She reviewed her funding request for this part of the project for interview participants and for youth assistants.

2. Examine muskrat habitat quality using lake surveys

She noted that some of the money from part 1 could help youth assist in this part of the project, but no separate request for this component.

3. Document trends in muskrat abundance and relate to habitat, using aerial surveys of push-ups and comparison to lake surveys of muskrat habitat

She then noted her funding request for this part of the project: \$11 K to survey 200 lakes

She reviewed the significance and relevance of this project to the GRRB and communities and noted that all four RRCs supported the research proposal.

Questions

Bobbie Jo: It was a good presentation. In my experiences, muskrat is definitely a concern in the communities. Out of curiosity, have you ever eaten muskrat? This won't affect our decision, but I am interested

Chandra: No. Caribou, geese, lots of other foods, but not muskrat yet.

James Andre: What lakes will you go to of those 200?

Chandra: We are still deciding that if the project goes ahead. A transect sample probably between Inuvik and Aklavik. That can be decided upon with community input.

James: plane only or planning to go with someone out on the land and go with them to check their lake and traps?

Chandra: Yes, most of the population surveys for push-ups will be mostly by plane. I thought about how we can do this with community members. I am hoping to come up when people are going out and go with them and learn from them. Not for counting push ups though. But to see what is happening and learn.

James: my question is that you speak mostly about the delta. There is also good habitat (or used to be) between Fort McPherson and Arctic Red outside of the delta.

Chandra: yes, we've heard that too. We can't do everywhere at once. But it is good to hear about other areas that should be studied, so if people want to share information about that, we are interested in those areas as well. The delta is our starting point, but doesn't have to be set in stone.

George: This weekend on the radio Quirks and Quarks talked about how 1/3 of the delta is drying out...

Janet: Ed Strusiak is a science reporter out of Edmonton that they interviewed. His references? Can you look into that.

Chandra: what was the question?

George: that was all.

James Andre: When you fly around, will you go once in the spring and again in the fall?

Chandra: We will follow Jeremy's past research which is to do it every spring, which captures the houses built the fall before. They are more visible in the spring (as maybe not all were built in the fall yet). It is always in the spring, based on Jeremy's methods.

James: a lot of them are frozen in the spring.

Chandra: so a lot in the spring might not be in use?

Charlie Snowshoe: I've been talking about muskrats for years. In the past, I know what has happened. It started

years ago drying out in the delta. There used to be millions in the delta. Once they built the Bennet Dam... It used to be a real good delta in Fort Chipewyan and another delta in fort Smith. That all dried out. In fort Chip, they used to have a lot of rats. A guy from there spoke on the TV, but now, no rats due to low water. Now you are talking about doing research?

Chandra: On what people see about rats, and what people say. Part of it is finding out what people have seen and talking about how many rats there are right now. We can find out about rat numbers now. We also want to look at what good muskrat lakes look like.

Charlie: There aren't rats in the delta now. Where did they all go? And why?

Chandra: That's a good question and part of what we want to try to find out

Cindy: What other sources of research will give you guidance? For your literature review and sources of information to give you guidance on muskrats?

Chandra: There is not a lot of area specific research on muskrats (there were some in the 50s) and Jeremy's recent work in Old Crow is a research source. There is a lot of similar research in the Peace Athabasca. The GSCI has a lot of interviews from 1990s available from the GEKP as a source of information.

## 22. RRC session and GRRB Session Presentation on GRRB/RRC roles, continued.

### TRRC

James Andre: I don't know if this is GRRB mandated, but support perhaps: I am thinking ahead about what can happen next if something happens. Here you have the Dempster highway and every year there is overflow to this man below. There are small culverts and they freeze up every year. I said they need a bigger plate. They are straight across and not angled. You can see the old creek and how it used to run and it doesn't run like that anymore because of the freeze up. We are trying to push DOT to do something, but nothing is done. Their highway crew keeps trying to grade it and cut it. They said they would put heat tape in it, but it is still not done yet. Maybe GRRB could raise a concern.

Also what if a tanker flipped on that ice on the hill? It would end up in the creek and in the river and would affect our fishing. I fish there every fall. I don't think that is too far ahead to think but it is for government. Maybe GRRB could write a support or a concern letter. –brought up at the Regional RRC meeting and at our meeting and ask when something will be done, and what could happen (if not corrected). Someone could add to it, but I raise it as an important concern.

Ron: Send us a note identifying the stream crossing and where it is and so we can look into what we can do from a fish habitat perspective. Say in your note that it is a worry or concern from your community and we can look at it from a fish habitat perspective and will get back to you on how we will proceed

Kris: what creek?

James: Creek runs from Ida lake. By the Arctic Red, just past the ferry to McPherson. George-town at the top of the hill just past the ferry crossing. Leighanne can do that.

Leighanne; we can add pictures too.

*Action item: James Andre/TRRC to send letter to GRRB about culvert and stream crossing concerns, just south of the Mackenzie River ferry crossing. Leighanne (GGRRC) to add photographs to supplement the letter.*

### GGRRC

Leighanne Lennie:

1. At the RRC Regional meeting, there was a motion to do a fish study on contaminants. Can Kris get something going on that?

Ron: clarify?

Leighanne: contaminants in fish in the Mackenzie. Can species at risk funds help?

**Comment [KAC4]:** Amy, in your margin on this topic, you noted:

**Remind Ron. RP: Ron- permit leave to GSA**

I didn't know how to interpret this or if it should go into the minutes as an action item.

Amy: I was there with the staff when that came up. The way the motion or resolution was drafted, they are encouraging and supporting research to begin so they can do a comprehensive contaminants study of all the fish. There have been some done in the past, so good to compare to current levels. GRRB name is in the resolution. I said that we can not commit to do something right away, but that RP process will take some time. Kristen: Public health may have some avenues to assist with fish contaminants research. We can help look into this and put you in contact with them to help.

*Action item: GRRB staff to help GRRRC find contacts for possible funding and research assistance for fish contaminants project.*

2. We have the bank swallow survey too. I will talk to Kaytlin and Kris some more. Tsiigehtchic want to get information on that too.

Ron: anything else in Tsiigehtchic?

3. GRRRC supported the muskrat research. And at the regional, the RRCs supported.

#### **NRRC**

Allen Firth:

1. GRRB has good working relationship with RRCs, but I have an issue with bringing documents forward for review. There are a lot of documents for review and I also get it from other people in the mail and someone else. Lots of overlap. The thick scientific ones come too. It is part of the mandate to bring to the RRC but there is a lot of duplication of documents. Instead of commenting separately on 3 identical documents, can we do it once? Just a concern from our RRC.
2. With the new Wildlife Act coming into effect, it says local HTC can grant harvesting rights to non-participants in the GSA. My question is: If we grant a special harvesting license or refuse it, can the GRRB override it down the road? Does the GCLCA speak to this?

Amy: There is an appeal clause in the claim. I believe it is specific to fur-bearers and public lands. The way I interpret the legislation, is that if there is not an appeal body, it might go to the Minister, but they would need to have really good reasons for an appeal, to make their case.

Ron: Can we seek a legal opinion on this? Sometimes we are the group that gets appealed to; some times of appeals the GRRB is the final stop and the Minister cannot override what we say. There are many variations coming up with the wildlife act changes. Our first response will probably be to get legal input before responding without knowing the exact specifics. It is good for us to know that may be coming our way and we may have to deal with that.

Allen: As soon as the act was passed, we have already been getting requests for licenses and we want to do what is right.

Ron: Do you anticipate appeals coming our way?

Allen: It says the GCLCA overrides the legislation, but the more I learn, is that it is also open to interpretation.

Ron: Okay, so we will take that as a heads up to educate ourselves on that so we can work with you on that.

*Action item: GRRB to get legal opinion and full information on the appeals process for HTC (RRC) granting of harvesting rights to non-participants in the GSA.*

*Action item: GRRB to follow up with RRCs after legal opinion and research is done on the harvest rights appeals process for non-participants as discussed.*

3. Federal SARA. A lot of these species are down south issues (e.g. AB, BC, Ontario, Eastern Canada). How do we tell them that it is all good up here?

Amy: We just had a call with the federal biologist and territorial people for SARA to talk about the same thing.

To reiterate the outcome of that call: Our interest was given that there are two acts and that there are sometimes differences in the federal act listing compared to territorial (e.g. if federally listed, but territorially is okay –how to deal with those situations?) From that call, we are still responsible to fulfil the federal act and recovery strategies etc... but we are obliged to follow those federal standards, but action planning for our region wouldn't be so much. When they do the consultations that is when we should speak up if there are no concerns. At the end of the day, they have to look at a national level. It may mean that we don't have to be as involved in action planning if the species is good here, but we would still need to review the documents.

Allen: My concern is as it is federal legislation, some of these species could be restricted and activities could restrict our harvest activities. How to get that point across to the federal minister?

Cindy: A good point. In my review, that is something I noticed. Difference between GNWT and federal. Is the species really endangered if okay in NWT? That was something that I specifically gave comments on. I think that it is important that the Gwich'in have their voice heard, even if only to say everything is fine. It is southern focused, but they don't really consider a northern perspective, unless we say something. It won't be helpful in the long run if their research is data is southern focused. E.g. In forest plan, the trees here grow so much slower and the lichen grows slower here, so impacts for caribou for food source (if a change in the trees and climate) then you can't use a southern standard for tree growth for management of caribou here. Need a northern perspective included in the assessments and planning. It's important to have that voice even if it is a lot of work.

Amy: re prohibitions on harvesting: the federal representative said that prohibitions would only be on crown lands and for non-aboriginals.

Amy: Regarding the wolverine questions we had. Territorially wolverine is not at risk, but federally they are consulting on an assessment of special concern, what does that mean for our participation in the process. Both acts apply. National has certain protections on federal lands and across Canada. One does not replace the other. Federal act looks at critical habitat while the NWT act does not automatically protect it. Federally it must be identified and protected with a recovery strategy written. NWT is not like this. Action plan is where we can be more region specific (E.g. Identify no threats in the region; or vice versa; or different). Main impact of listing is if a management plan or recover strategy is required. If the ranking is lower, then a management plan is required. If high ranking (more at risk) a recovery strategy is required. A strategy may have more restrictive prohibitions on public lands and for non-aboriginals. Require participation of board for action planning for those plans.

For wolverine: federal SARA, board can participate on national document, but participation can be less, since not at risk in the NWT.

Kaytlin: one more thing: with the management plans, it is recommending management, but not required. We can say it is fine here so we could not take steps recommended for southern regions in a federal plan.

Allen: Thank you.

Ron: As a board and under Amy's advice, we have a position to deal with Species At Risk, even though it is not permanent, Kaytlin's primary responsibility is Species At Risk. It is a big task for us. We appreciate your concerns and also wrestle with it as a board. It is a lot of work. Thank you for bringing it up. Take some comfort that we consider it a big file also.

Amy: One last thing too: Kaytlin and I have had conversations (and with Nataalka) about at our level, better ways of getting RRC input without overloading you. E.g. for NWT act, the SARC assesses all TK and science and report recommends a listing. That report gets presented to the CMA as a presentation. That presentation could be used in the communities sooner and give that to the RRCs, rather than the big 50-60 pages or more documents for review.

Neil Firth (to add to #1 mentioned by Allen above): those heavily worded documents- the GRRB used to have a person to simplify the language of the reports: A coordinator who would make those plain language for us and give it back to the RRCs. Not as a full time job.

Amy: I can look at doing briefing notes for the RRCs, similar to what we do for the board.

*Action item: Amy to look into doing briefing notes for the RRCs on technical documents they are asked to review.*

Ron: (To RRCs) If there are things we can improve on, we want to hear from you. (E.g. What you have raised about communication and not burying you in copies of the same document.) Are there other ways to improve?

Bobbi Jo: For me it is sometimes hard as a board member, but also as a Gwich'in beneficiary I have other interests. As a suggestion, listening to James' comments, some things may not be our mandate. Still important to raise concerns. As a board we review if it is our mandate and then if not, we can inform partners if it falls under theirs. E.g. climate change –Amy has a good relationship with Gwich'in Council International (Grant Sullivan) and we could work through some issues on that council. US will next chair Arctic Council. Climate change is always a concern. **X is the current chair**. The US is waiting for the chair of that. They want to get action and work done. Maybe an opportunity for communities to do community based projects. RRCs can always email me or call me with questions about GCI.

**25. Public Comments** -Opportunity for the public to speak with the Board. No comments were given.

**In-Camera.** The Board began an in-camera session for the remainder of the afternoon.

<b>MOTION to go in-camera, (Feb 18) at 3:27pm</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-08</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Cindy Allen	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	
<b>MOTION to come out of camera (Feb 18) at 5:21pm</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-09</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Doug Doan	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

**Dinner 5pm / Public Meet and Greet**

## DAY 3 Thursday, February 19, 2015

Inuvik,NT

Meeting called to order by Ron Allen at 9:05AM.

### **23. Species at Risk -Review and approval of federal SAR Act Amendments :**

John Moffet (Director General, Legislative and Regulatory Affairs, EC), Sara Neamtz (Senior Manager), Vesna Guzina (EC), Stephanie Haddad (EC); Linda Yonge (Director, ENR, GNWT)

John spoke about possible reforms to the Species At Risk Act (SARA) and noted the obligation to discuss the issue with the GRRB among other wildlife management boards. *It is a law reform discussion, so he asked us to keep the discussion confidential, as normally the government does not discuss this before the parliamentary process publically.*

John: Under the Species at Risk Act, there is a different approach for managing habitat on federal lands versus other lands in Canada. The issue is that currently the act defines federal land to include devolved public land in the NWT. It belongs to the crown although administration is transferred to NWT, not withstanding the intention of devolution. So that land is treated as federal for the purposes of SARA.

This has a number of implications, not to mention the way critical habitat is managed under the act.

After critical habitat is identified for a listed species at risk, the Minister has to make certain decisions. The timing and considerations and final decisions differ depending on whether the critical habitat is on federal lands or not.

If the species is terrestrial on provincial lands, the Minister must determine whether the habitat is protected by federal or provincial laws. If not protected, then the minister must make the recommendation to the governor in council to impose prohibition on the destruction of critical habitat. The Governor In Council has discretion to do this or not.

If the species' critical habitat occurs on federal land, the approach is quite different. 1. A timeframe for the Minister to reach a conclusion is limited to within 180 days. 2. The Minister can only consider federal laws in the decision as to if the habitat is protected. By law the Minister cannot consider whether territorial or provincial laws provide protection. 3. If the Minister concludes that federal laws do not protect critical habitat, the Minister must issue the prohibition order. There is no discretion. The Minister must issue a prohibition order. There is much less room for consideration of territorial activities, or other factors before imposing prohibition.

The proposal for the law reform is:

-Goal is to make the approach in the federal Species At Risk Act to devolved public land in NWT, more similar to habitat treatment in the provinces. This is consistent with the spirit of devolution.

-To amend the definition of federal lands. So it does not apply to public lands in the NWT where administration is transferred to territorial commission.

The *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (CEAA 2012)* and the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999 (CEPA 1999)* have been redefined this way in those acts. Can do the same thing with the Species At Risk Act so critical habitat in the territories is treated the same way as it is in the provinces. We also think it would be appropriate if that change is made to also say that even where the Minister concludes that the habitat is not protected (E.g. Not federal but territorial and territorial laws are accounted for) either way, before going to GIC, it would be appropriate to require the Minister to consult with relevant wildlife management boards for the habitat and species in question. This would be consistent with other obligations in SARA, where Wildlife Management Boards are asked for consultation and under their mandate for primary responsibility of these boards in their areas of responsibility.

So those are the 2 basic changes being considered by the Minister. We welcome feedback from you, questions, clarification, approval, etc...

#### Questions

Ron/Chairperson to board and meeting participants: Let's use wolverine as an example of how this might be dealt with. We have just done a review of wolverine issues here. Our situation may differ from other regions on this one. So let's think about how things may or may not work with that in mind.

#### Round table comments:

Cindy Allen: I'd like to know if you will be providing the amendments themselves. I would like to see some legislation with the changes in it. I could not find them online. The government is always making changes to SARA. I want to see the proposed changes.

I also don't agree with the timeframe. We were given the letter on 15<sup>th</sup> and asking for approval by Feb 4<sup>th</sup>. In letter to be consistent with consultations, but GCLCA has specific consultation definition, which includes notice, timely consideration of views and I don't think that is being effectively met here. Normally with other amendments to legislation, we are given a slide deck of points and not just a one liner, so I would like to see that information provided. Further, I don't necessarily consider this call as meeting the consultation obligations. The GRRB has its own policy which obligates us to consult with the communities, so we need to do that to meet our obligations to the members we represent to protect land and resources for the Gwich'in and the public into the future. I would also like to see the proposed changes to the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* and the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act* as you say these changes are consistent with changes to the other two acts. My understanding is that those changes have been done so that development can go through quickly. That is worrisome to me. We want to ensure the habitat and the animals are protected, not that development goes through quickly without fully considering the views of the residents of the GSA. More than a couple of my points. I wish to reiterate: the GRRB has a consultation policy; this is not consultation but information provision; and thanks very much.

John Moffat: May I respond to each comment?

Ron: Maybe we'll finish going around here first.

Doug Doan: Looking at the annex to the letter, the potential approach says that Environment Canada is considering a variety of options, including the definition change. Can you talk to us about the other options?

No other board members were ready to add questions or comments so John responded to answer those posed so far:

John:

1. A point was raised about the timelines asked for in the letter. We dealt with the chair or secretary (of GRRB) on that. I apologize. The timeframe was rushed. We were under political direction to move quickly. We appreciate that is not adequate time even to talk to board members, let alone for board members to discharge their obligations under the mandate of the board. My apologies for the timeline. We want to work with you to make sure that you can provide us with feedback that is based on a good understanding of the proposal.

2. You asked for copies of the changes made to CEPA and CEA and we will send you those amendments right after this call to your secretary.

*Action item: Environment Canada to send GRRB amendments to Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.*

You will see that they are as I described on the phone and in the letter. They amend the definition to exclude territorial lands that have been transferred to a territorial commissioner. The notion there...I cannot comment on cabinet Ministers or implications of the changes, but when we propose those changes, the goal was strictly to respect the spirit of devolution. Goal of devolution was to give territories authority over land equivalent to provinces and not subject to same type of oversight that they used to be subject to. We thought this was an appropriate change to make to the other two acts and we now suggest that for SARA.

3. You wanted actual text. We don't have text to give you. The text would be very simple. It would be very similar to CEPA and CEA. To amend the current definition: –other than lands under control of the commission of Yukon NWT or Nunavut. We are not legislated drafters, so it doesn't get drafted until approved and we can't get approval from our cabinet until we talk to you, so we can't share text yet. That is why we are sharing the wording in the CEPA and CEA. Wording change will be clear.

4. "Lots of changes to SARA" was mentioned. I am only aware of one change in 2012 and that had to do with timelines for permits. I know there is ongoing discussion about how government will implement SARA and for specific species and recovery strategies and for critical habitat. Discussions have been underway for many years and will continue, but I am not aware of actual reforms to the act other than that one in 2012.

5. Doug, you correctly point to the letter saying that other options are being considered. The other options would not involve law reform. We are trying to figure out whether there is a way to allow the Minister to account for actions that territories take to protect habitat as a matter of policy under the existing legislation. Frankly, I am not sure that there is a good way to do that. When we wrote the letter we were already considering policy options and we advised the Minister that we didn't think this was possible. We are open to options. Easier to amend policy rather than law. Only way the Minister can account for protection provided by territories and abide by the law is to amend the law. Only way to have prohibition order change is to amend the law. That is a short response to those comments. I realize that may not satisfy the points Cindy raised. I am willing to continue to discuss.

Doug: Just a little follow up- I just want be sure I understand. I think I hear you say with respect to other options, is that in fact a change to the legislation would be confined to a change in definition. Is that correct?

John: with one more thing: There are two proposed changes: a. change to definition, b. to add one more obligation to consult with Wildlife Management Boards. I will explain that. If we change the definition, then it would mean that the approach to protecting critical habitat in the territory is the same as in the provinces. The minister would account for federal and territorial laws in assessing if protection to critical habitat is available. So that first responsibility, authority, opportunity... If for whatever reason, the Minister concludes that neither laws do protect critical habitat –That is, in a province the Minister would have to go to the GIC and recommend to the GIC and they have discretion to yes or no (for prohibition). We suggest that in the territories, there is an intermediate step, that the Minister would have to go to the Wildlife Management Boards first before going to the GIC and want feedback from the boards. So it is a way to get Wildlife Management Board input.

Doug: The Yukon experienced devolution and this did not seem to be an issue, so is this being driven by the territories, or is this housekeeping on devolution?

John: There are lots of factors:

1. SARA was new when Yukon devolution occurred. None of us at the table were in government at the time. The issue wasn't thought about. It wasn't put on table by either government (federal or Yukon), because they hadn't had a lot of experience with SARA.

2. Since then, YTG thought that this was the way the law already worked and they were surprised it didn't work

this way.

3. The other point I would make is that SARA has now been around for longer. As you probably know, there is a process for this. The way the SARA process works is a species gets listed, then period of time; then official development of a Recovery Strategy. The Recovery Strategy identifies critical habitat. Then the Minister identifies whether there is adequate protection for that habitat. What has happened since devolution in Yukon is that there have been species listed with habitat in Yukon, so now it is not a hypothetical situation in Yukon. We are now dealing with species in Yukon. Their government and boards must now think about species and habitat protection. Under the law the Minister must come to a conclusion about whether the habitat is protected. If not, the Minister will be required to issue a prohibition order. So the issue is now real.

Cindy: I was looking at SARA online and at section 58.1a and had a question about that. If critical habitat is on federal land on the Exclusive Economic Zone of Canada or in the continental shelf of Canada (e.g. migratory birds and aquatic birds). What is the exclusive economic zone of Canada?

Vesna: We can send a diagram that illustrates this. Essentially the zone that extends up to 200 nautical miles off shore (~300km off shore). A number of areas off shore, created by Oceans Act, Territorial Sea and then Exclusive Zone. Then it is the high seas where no country has jurisdiction. It is not land. Federal only.

Cindy: I am curious about the Beaufort Sea. The people here want to ensure that the land and animals and aquatic species are protected. So I just didn't know what the Exclusive Economic Zone of Canada meant.

Cindy: The definition of federal land means land that *"belongs to Her Majesty in right of Canada or land that Her Majesty in Right of Canada has the powers to dispose of and all waters on and air space above that land and the internal waters of Canada and territorial sea of Canada and reserves and any other land set aside for use and benefit of a band and all waters on and air space above those reserves."* I am curious about that. So that, this means that if the government is disposing of lands, the Minister has that prerogative. I am just trying to wrap my head around this.

Cindy: The air space- Does that mean that if there is pollution in the air (e.g. for species at risk) that the Minister would have to consider that as part of protection of critical habitat for a species at risk?

John: Yes. It all starts with how critical habitat is defined for a particular species at risk. If the habitat for the species at risk includes air, which it does for birds, then that air space is included in the definition of critical for that species. So the Minister must look at if that habitat is adequately protected. To do that, need to know the threats to the species. If air pollution is one of the identified threats (to the critical habitat), then the Minister must satisfy that federal laws are in place to reduce the risk to the species in the critical habitat. The amendment proposed is that if government goes with this change, it would require the Minister to also consider whether territorial laws are in place to address whether air pollution is a risk to the species' survival.

Linda Yonge (GNWT Director): The GNWT is in the position to now have a new Wildlife Act and Species At Risk Act. The boards were integral to developing that and the GNWT has tools now to protect critical habitat. This change would allow anything we do under those acts to be recognized. The GNWT is in support of this change.

John: Goal is to make sure that Minister can account for actions the territorial government will take.

Cindy: I have another question, but I'm not sure if you are able to address it. Under self government (as the Gwich'in are in self-government negotiations), if Gwich'in were to make a law (under self government) to protect species at risk or critical habitat of a species on their own land, will that be considered by the Minister?

John: We are doing this one step at a time. The first step is to redefine lands in the territory as non-federal so the Minister can account for the impact of territorial laws. I can assure you that what changes also being thought about, would be what changes are needed for the Minister to account for protection actions taken by aboriginal people who are operating under self government or other form of clear authority over habitat. We are definitely looking at that issue. As officials we realize that it will be an important one to resolve. That is not the proposal we are discussing with the board today. That could happen quite soon, but is not on the table right now.

Cindy: I understand that. It is on the radar.

John: It is on our radar, yes.

Kaytlin: I have a question that ties into what Cindy was saying. E.g. If a species is listed under federal SARA, but the territorial process says it is not at risk, what are the ramifications if the territory takes no action to protect critical habitat?

John: Under the current law it is irrelevant what the territory does. If the amendment goes through, the Minister must consider territorial action. In your scenario, that is an important one: if territory says not at risk but the species needs protection. In that case, the Minister would still be obliged to protect and recommend protection to the Governor In Council. The Minister is obliged to determine whether critical habitat is protected. If not, then Minister would go to GIC. One of the implications of the change that we are talking about is whether the GIC would impose a prohibition order. Can't say what GIC would do. I am confident that as an official, we would present to cabinet that territory has concluded that the species is not at risk. I don't know what the outcome would be. GIC could decide not to issue a prohibition order. I don't know what they would decide.

Ron: that is the wolverine situation, so that is a good example of what could happen.

Amy: (46:23) To follow up on Kaytlin's comment and your response: Would there be another step, where if the SARA amendment is made, is that if there were differences between federal or territorial legislation (in listing), an additional step with consultation with the board is added and that would be considered before going to the GIC?

John: Yes. The proposed two part amendment would mean that the Minister would go to the board before going to the GIC. It doesn't give veto, but makes the information from the board get to cabinet.

Ron: We were under the impression that that process would have to take place under the current regime –under land claims it is very clear that we have certain role now. So is that in place already? I suggest that the Minister would be taking a risk in not going and consulting with us regardless of whether there is this change in legislation. I am wondering if that second change is even necessary.

John: Yes, I can clarify that. You are absolutely right that at present, the Minister does have to talk to the board. The reason for that is that SARA defines the land as federal land. So if defined as not federal, we want to make sure that despite that change, the Minister continues to have to talk to the board.

Ron: Thanks, that is perhaps a legal question and we don't have to get into it. I appreciate that you are trying to ensure that this is done. We'd like to think that this is already in place and is pretty iron-clad.

John: Indeed, it might be. To avoid any kind of confusion or different interpretation by a government in the future, we are trying to make sure that that obligation is locked into by putting it into law.

Ron: Where do you see things going from here? What is your expectation of us in terms of this issue and what is on the table here for us?

John: I don't know the timing with which the federal government may proceed with this amendment. So I can't give timeline. Maybe an amendment in next couple of months. May be considered for a while. Election may intervene or not. Don't know. I'm being candid. Could be as early as a couple of months, so that being said, we welcome some kind of communication from your board (email or letter). We have talked to three other Wildlife Management Boards. At least one followed with a letter. Another asked follow up questions and then they followed up with a letter. Another is on the way. As example of what other folks have done. You have procedures and mandate. We are available for questions. We want some kind of communication. We want your board's views on the amendments. We will commit to ensure that the boards' comments go to the Minister.

Ron: Are there other questions for John?

Kristen: I am staff of the GRRB and work as their wildlife biologist. I think that you spoke to this, but would you be able to clarify, that with the changes proposed (definition change and change to include comments by the wildlife management boards), it also includes a change to the process so that there is not automatically a

prohibition order (if in a situation where the Minister assessed there was not adequate protection), but that it would go to the Governor in Council who has discretion on whether to issue a prohibition order or not?

John: That's correct. The Minister recommends to the GIC and they can do whatever they want with the recommendation.

Doug: The letter is talking about the approach and is asking for GRRB comments on approach. If text is put together, will government be coming back to us?

John: Yes, we asked for comments on the approach because we have no text. Likely an opportunity to comment on text will be after a bill is introduced. Federal legislation goes through 3 readings in the House of Commons and 3 readings in Senate. There is opportunity for intervention from interested parties at those stages. We typically go clause by clause of specific text. At minimum, an opportunity to comment on formal text after the bill is introduced. I don't know if whether there would be any decision to share draft text in advance with GRRB. I recognize that this is a bit difficult. I am not a drafter... It is extremely likely that the definition would be identical to what we put in CEPA and ECA, because of the definition change to federal lands.

Cindy: Has a Minister ever used prohibition powers in a case where critical habitat was not protected?

John: The Minister has issued an emergency prohibition under a separate provision. Only in an emergency under that provision. The government did that for sage grouse (not in territories). I would say that you shouldn't predict future based on past. There are a growing number of species being listed, growing number of Recovery Strategies being developed and growing number of critical habitats being identified and as a result of that, there is an emerging obligation on the government to consider prohibition orders. This is an implication of the SARA. Pressures emerge in the future.

Janet: I am staff of the GRRB. I have a question about prohibition and how it might be used. E.g. Critical habitat in relation to tar sands? Was there ever a prohibition order in that case where critical habitat must be protected for a species? For example, Boreal caribou? Ever adopted or used for that example or other? That is the example I am interested in.

John: The only order was the emergency order for sage grouse. Government identified numbers of critical habitat for boreal caribou. Created a Recovery Strategy. The next step is for the Minister to decide whether critical habitat is adequately protected. The Minister has not yet done that for boreal caribou, but it will be obliged to do so for boreal caribou.

Ron: Thank you very much. That concludes our questions and comments. We will provide a response in writing. You were going to send us a couple of things.

John: To confirm, we will I send the definition text in CEPA and CEA as well as a diagram to illustrate the Exclusive Economic Zone of Canada. If you have other questions, you can call us.

#### **CALL ENDED –Board and meeting participant discussion began**

James Andre: I have a comment about the timeline discussed: The GRRB has to consult with us to get feedback from RRCs. It is rushed. Not just for wolverine but other species we talk about. We thought wolverine were potentially at risk. Before anything can be legislated, more studies have to be put into it. Residing in Ottawa compared to here –use ski doo or car –to illustrate the big difference between even the provinces, eh? E.g. Grizzly bear. We could chase grizzly bear on one side but not the other. When animals move across boundaries (eg. Caribou and moose), it is really not studied well enough –the migratory animals.

Ron: Right now, we are going to get caught by legislation that doesn't apply to us. At least this would make it consistent to ensure access to having a say to put something on the Minister's desk. It looks like it would provide flexibility for the different assessments. We don't have to put in a prohibition because the law says so but that a

group would look at it and make some choices. That may be an improvement over the catch 22 we are in at the moment.

James: To me, it wasn't strong enough in our land claim. Because conservation overrules our claim.

Kristen: I think that the change to the definition seems valid and it is good that they are making sure to include the wildlife management boards. I am concerned though, that it could be a back door way for a government to avoid having to act, by sending to GIC who has discretion to act or not, rather than mandating Minister to act. No problem with changing definition to include provincial or territorial assessments, but change to the process to go to GIC and that discretion is worrying although there are pros and cons of that for sure.

Ron: Yes, pros and cons depending on how it is used.

James: He said something about other boards commenting. Who?

Ron: Well, I presume it is the Sahtu and other boards...

Cindy: Can we talk to them?

Amy: Yes, I talked to Jody who is the ED for the Wek'eezhii RRB. They talked to their board but they asked to go in-camera when they talked to them.

Ron: They said in preamble when they talked to us that it was to be private.

James: It would be good to Cc us on what all of your concerns are.

Ron: Yes, we have some common interests, one would think in this. It would be good to know how others have responded already.

James: but maybe the Sahtu may have a different view than us. And in the Yukon. They are all pro development.

Cindy: Yukon is in a different situation. First Nations with self government in the Yukon: if they make a First Nation law, it prevails over federal law and over territorial law. They are in a real bind in the Yukon. That is why I asked that question about self government. In the Yukon, the First Nations have the strongest self government powers because those can override federal or territorial law. Once there are self government powers here, will Gwich'in have ability to have their laws on Species At Risk override that? They couldn't say now because they are not consulting on it, but in Yukon if they make a resource law, it kicks out the other laws.

James: Is that an avenue to protect the Peel?

Ron: back to topic at hand:

Amy: Curious about the scenario we talked about if not at risk in a territory but is assessed as at risk federally.

What if it is the opposite scenario? What if endangered in NWT, but not in other regions and board and territory want to protect species. Would it have to go to GIC?

Ron: It is the other way around, it is a federal trigger. We don't get the trigger the other way. The odds of that happening are pretty remote. If we think something is in huge trouble they are likely to be supportive rather than otherwise.

Amy: I was thinking about Kristen's question earlier –if there was development happening and GIC says not to protect but in favour of development (a scenario) Can territory and board say they want to protect habitat or species?

Ron: Yes, in the territory they could.

Doug: I think that the important thing is the reverse of that. Without this amendment, the GNWT and board could not protect a species and its critical habitat on federal lands. With this amendment they can, because then the NWT would have the jurisdiction to protect. (because of the definition change)

Amy: And what Lynda was saying is that we have those tools in place and this change will allow us to use those tools.

Doug: Yes.

Ron....So in terms of our response to them as a board, we will get the material they send, what do we wish to reply?

Cindy: you might be a little...

Ron: Is the material they will send likely to alter our position? (e.g. need to see EEZ, the definitions in the other acts, etc..)

Cindy: Well, we still need to consult with the communities. For us to...

Ron: The question is what do we think of the process? Are we comfortable with the approach? If we can meet our consultation obligations and do it in a timely manner and do it well, are we unhappy with this approach? I don't think so. I don't hear anyone being particularly unhappy. Some consistency. Let's check with neighbours and see how they have responded to this. Given that we get to do consultation in a timely way,

James: But aren't they sending you stuff to look at? Don't you need to see that?

Ron: Approach isn't going to get changed by seeing that material. We have asked for wording and map of Canada with EEZ. That's not going to change anything for us. The question is, are we comfortable with this approach and I think we are, if we can consult with the communities and make we all understand what is going on and we have the time to do that.

Kristen: The board has an obligation to do the consultation but we are in a situation where the government has asked us to keep this confidential, so how should staff consult on this? What does that approach look like? (e.g. normally we would go to an RRC meeting or hold a public meeting... but they asked us to keep the discussion today confidential...)

Ron: The letter written to us –I don't see it being restricted. I don't think we are breaking any confidences if we deal with what is in that document (proposed changes to the legislation for these reasons).

Cindy: In an email I sent last night, I am curious what GTC has to say on this too? GTC agreed to devolution and signed onto the devolution agreement.

Ron: In theory, this is in keeping with that intent (to make us have responsibilities of a province).

Cindy: So, if they have concerns, I would like to know that.

Ron: Okay, so we are going to check with our neighbours, including asking GTC if they have an opinion on it. Then we respond saying yes, approach seems reasonable as long as we have appropriate time to do consultation and then respond.

Ron to Amy: We will direct the staff to do the consultation.

*Action item: Amy to check with neighbouring boards and GTC to see if they will share their opinion or thinking on the SARA amendments*

*Action item: Staff to undertake consultation on the SARA amendments following the consultation policy.*

### **In-camera session**

<b>MOTION to go in-camera (Feb 19) at 10:28AM</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-10</b>
Moved by: Johnny Charlie	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	
<b>MOTION to come out of in-camera (Feb 19) at 11:08AM</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-11</b>
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Johnny Charlie	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

### **Working Lunch –Board and Staff Session**

### In-camera session

**MOTION to go in-camera (Feb 19) at 12:29pm**

Moved by: Johnnie Charlie

Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Motion GRRB  
15-12

**MOTION to come out of in-camera (Feb 19) at 1:18pm**

Moved by: Doug Doan

Seconded by: Johnny Charlie

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Motion GRRB  
15-13

**26. Operating Budget and Work Plan** -Review and approval of the 2015-2016 Operating Budget and Work Plan

The board came out of camera and made the following motions:

**MOTION to approve \$85,000 withdrawal from the Wildlife Studies Fun**

Moved by: Doug Doan

Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Motion GRRB  
15-14

**MOTION to approve the WSF allocations as described in the allocation table**

Moved by: Johnny Charlie

Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Motion GRRB  
15-15

**MOTION to approve the Executive Director's participation in the 2015 Governor General's Leadership Conference as part of professional development and funded as outlined in option 1 of the briefing note provided in the meeting binder**

Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland

Seconded by: Johnny Charlie

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Motion GRRB  
15-16

**MOTION to approve the upgrade of the GRRB's infrastructure up to \$5,000 of the current surplus under General Operating.**

Moved by: Johnny Charlie

Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Motion GRRB  
15-17

**MOTION to approve the 2015-2016 Operating Budget and Work Plan**

Moved by: Doug Doan

Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland

All in Favour

Motion Approved

Motion GRRB  
15-18

**27. Operating Procedures Manual** -Review and approval of updated Operating Procedures Manual

Amy reviewed with the board the proposed changes to the Operating Procedures Manual. Of items discussed, some particular Items noted were:

- Note changes to quorum
- Relocation: Do more research around people coming in and leaving. What about this and that?
- Sign a code of conduct with each staff member and add to the orientation
- Job Descriptions: Need to update the contacts
- Add Species At Risk Changes
- Schedule A: "Compensation" –Add into its own table. Label compensation and as guidelines. Add caveat regarding discretion of Executive Director.
- Take out Contractor versus Employee, or add as appendices. Call them guidelines and information.

Approved changes were:

- Quorum

- Vehicle Operating Procedures
- Conduct
- Vacation Pay
- Remove Waiting Period
- RRSP Benefit
- Staffing List
- Species At Risk job description
- Special Projects Biologist job description
- Technician, Technician Trainee, Summer student, Job description
- Compensation Rates
- Salary Scale
- Board orientation/Staff orientation
- Contractor/Employee as appendix

<b>MOTION to approve changes to the Operating Procedures Manual, as discussed, with the understanding that a more thorough review still needs to be completed on all sections.</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-19</b>
Moved by: Johnny Charlie	Seconded by: Doug Doan	
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

*Action item: update the Operating Procedures Manual to reflect the approved changes.*

### **Meeting Adjournment**

<b>MOTION to adjourn the meeting (Feb 19) at 3:56pm.</b>		<b>Motion GRRB 15-20</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland		
All in Favour	Motion Approved	

### **Attendance-Day 1, Morning Session**

Board members: Cindy Allen, Ron Allen, Johnny Charlie, Jozef Carnogursky, Doug Doan, Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan

GRRB staff: Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan, Kaytlin Cooper, Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier

Public: James Andre (TRRC), Allen Firth (NRRC coordinator), Neil Firth (NRRC), William Francis (NRRC), Leighanne Lennie (GGRRC coordinator), Fanny Greenland (ERRC), Eddy McLeod (ERRC), George Niditchie (GGRRC), Abe Wilson (TRRC), Tom Wright

### **Attendance-Day 1, Afternoon Session**

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

GRRB staff: Amy Amos, Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan, Kaytlin Cooper, Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier

Public: James Andre (TRRC), Allen Firth (NRRC coordinator), Neil Firth (NRRC), William Francis (NRRC), Leighanne Lennie (GGRRC coordinator), Fanny Greenland (ERRC), Eddy McLeod (ERRC), George Niditchie (GGRRC), Abe Wilson (TRRC), Tom Wright, Curtis Illasiak (ERRC coordinator), Sarah Beattie (Aurora College), Leighanne Gordon (AC), Alicia McRae (AC), Sally Esau (AC), Ryan McLeod (AC), Larry Dow(DFO), Ellen Lea (DFO) & Kate Snow (DFO)

### **Attendance-Day 2, Morning Session**

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

GRRB staff: Amy Amos, Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan, Kaytlin Cooper, Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier

Public: James Andre (TRRC), Allen Firth (NRRC coordinator), Neil Firth (NRRC), William Francis (NRRC), Leighanne Lennie (GGRRC coordinator), Fanny Greenland (ERRC), Eddy McLeod (ERRC), George Niditchie (GGRRC), Curtis Illasiak (ERRC coordinator), Doug Villeneuve (ENR), Martin Callaghan (ENR), Jodie Pongracz (ENR)

### **Attendance-Day 2, Afternoon Session**

GRRB directors: Cindy Allen, Ron Allen, Johnny Charlie, Doug Doan, Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan

GRRB staff: Amy Amos, Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan, Kaytlin Cooper, Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier

Public: James Andre (TRRC), Allen Firth (NRRC coordinator), Neil Firth (NRRC), William Francis (NRRC), Leighanne Lennie (GGRRC coordinator), Fanny Greenland (ERRC), Eddy McLeod (ERRC), George Niditchie (GGRRC), Curtis Illasiak (ERRC Coordinator), Charlie Snowshoe, Norm Snowshoe

### **Attendance-Day 3, Morning Session**

GRRB directors: Cindy Allen, Ron Allen, Johnny Charlie, Doug Doan, Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan

GRRB staff: Amy Amos, Janet Boxwell, Kristen Callaghan, Kaytlin Cooper, Cheryl Greenland, Kris Maier

Public: James Andre (TRRC), Allen Firth (NRRC coordinator), Neil Firth (NRRC), William Francis (NRRC), Leighanne Lennie (GGRRC coordinator), Fanny Greenland (ERRC), Eddy McLeod (ERRC), George Niditchie (GGRRC)

## Summary of Motions

<b>Motion to approve Jozef Carnogursky as this meeting's chairperson</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-01</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Ron Allen
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to adopt the meeting agenda with order flexible as needed and determined by meeting chairperson.</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-02</b>
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to accept the Sept, 2014 minutes</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-03</b>
Moved by: Johnny Charlie	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to accept the Oct 24, 2014 teleconference minutes with the edit suggested.</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-04</b>
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to accept the November 12, 2014 teleconference minutes with the edits suggested.</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-05</b>
Moved by: Cindy Allen	Seconded by: Ron Allen
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to reappoint James Firth to the Species At Risk Committee and to add Cindy Allen as the alternate</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-06</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Ron Allen
All in Favour (Cindy abstained)	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to appoint Ron Allen as Chairperson for the remainder of the meeting</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-07</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Johnny Charlie
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to go in-camera (Feb 18) at 3:27pm</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-08</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Cindy Allen
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to come out of camera (Feb 18) at 5:21pm</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-09</b>
Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland	Seconded by: Doug Doan
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to go in-camera (Feb 19) at 10:28 am</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-10</b>
Moved by: Johnny Charlie	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland
All in Favour	Motion Approved
<b>Motion to come out of camera (Feb 19) at 11:08am</b>	<b>Motion GRRB 15-11</b>
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Johnnie Charlie
All in Favour	Motion Approved

**Motion to go in-camera (Feb 19) at 12:29pm**

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

**Motion GRRB 15-12**

**Motion to come out of in-camera (Feb 19) at 1:18pm**

Moved by: Doug Doan                              Seconded by: Johnny Charlie  
All in Favour    Motion Approved

**Motion GRRB 15-13**

**Motion to approve \$85,000 withdrawal from Wildlife Studies Fund**

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

**Motion GRRB 15-14**

**Motion to approve the WSF allocation table as described in the allocation table**

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

**Motion GRRB 15-15**

**Motion to approve the Executive Director's participation in the 2015 Governor General's Leadership Conference as part of professional development and funded as outlined in option 1 of the briefing note provided in the meeting binder.**

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

**Motion GRRB 15-16**

**Motion to approve the upgrade of the GRRB's infrastructure up to \$5,000 of the current surplus under General Operating.**

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

**Motion GRRB 15-17**

**Motion to approve the 2015-2016 Operating Budget and Work Plan**

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

**Motion GRRB 15-18**

**Motion to approve changes to the Operating Procedures Manual, as discussed, with the understanding that a more thorough review still needs to be completed on all sections.**

Moved by: Johnny Charlie                        Seconded by: Doug Doan  
All in Favour    Motion Approved

**Motion GRRB 15-19**

**Motion to adjourn the meeting (Feb 19 at 3:56pm)**

Moved by: Bobbie Jo Greenland  
All in Favour    Motion Approved

**Motion GRRB 15-20**

**Summary of Meeting Action Items –Edited to only outstanding items and new items February 2015**

No.	Action Item	Who	Reference	Status	Deadline	Action Taken	Date Completed
14:07b	14-07: follow up on this item (what is process to establish a marine protected area in this region) in 2015, CC Larry and also provide binder materials from September meeting on this item to Cindy.	Amy	Feb 18/15 following on action item from 2014				
14-30	Add board member discussion on standing under different portfolios to the February 18-20, 2014 minutes.	Amy	Sept 10/14	Pending		created document, just need to share with members	
14-31b	Send copy of the GTC fracking motion to Doug Doan and full GRRB board	Amy? -other staff?	Feb 18/15 following on Sept action item				
14-32	Follow up with Stephen Charlie about the possible zoning changes for the Cape Bathurst caribou	Amy	Sept 10/14	Pending		Emailed on Jan 27/15. Heard that these changes may already be done. Will request an update.	
14-32-b	Send letter to ENR from GRRB chair and ask for clarity on the zone regulation changes and on process.	Amy/ board	Feb 18/15				
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 Feb 18/15	Pending		Table is done; just need to share with members for additional input	
14-40	Follow up with Stephen about muskox harvest numbers recorded by officer in Aklavik	Amy/ Kristen	Sept 10/14	Pending			
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	Pending		ENR has been contacted and will forward to GRRB when report is complete	Feb 18/15
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.  Staff to continue to follow up on what happened to water scum	Janet	Sept 11/14  Feb 18/15				

	samples provided to (ENR?).						
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 Supported again Feb 17/15			Need follow up	
14-48	GRRB to find out about why Husky monitor position was ended and get back to Eddy (RRC).	Kris	Sept 11/14 Supported again Feb 17/15				
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 GTC, 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	Pending		GTC was waiting for phase 2 to deal with this but after recent correspondence they are considering to hire their legal counsel to look at this now. Will advise when we know more.	
14-57	Follow up with GTC to see how to proceed with the special harvesting areas under the new Wildlife Act regulations	Amy	Nov 12/14	Pending		See action 14-49	
14-58	Talk with the communities and RRCs to see how they want to proceed with the grizzly bear tag system (i.e. Do they want it under the new wildlife act regulations)	Amy	Nov 12/14	Pending		Plan for 2015-16 fiscal. Will ask ENR for funds to do this.	
14-59	Have an agenda item at an upcoming meeting to talk about "board member participation in conferences". Decide who and when members should go.	board	Nov 12/14	Pending		Suggestion: Members can talk about this during their in-camera session in Feb 2015	
15-01	GRRB staff to attend Aklavik career fair April 2, 2015, if possible	Janet	Feb 17/15				
15-02	Follow up with GTC on funding request for the harvest study. CC the board of directors on correspondence	Amy	Feb 17/15				
15-03	Update harvester lists for the 2014-2015 cycle.	Janet	Feb 17/15				
15-04	Add harvester age and harvester	Janet	Feb 17/15				

	gender to data collected with harvester lists and provide results to GRRB also summarized by these categories.						
15-05	Board to notify Kristen regarding order of action plan creation for Taking Care of Caribou plans	Board via Amy	Feb 17/15				
15-06	Board to notify Kristen regarding direction on GSA consultation on action plans for Taking Care of Caribou management plan.	Board via Amy	Feb 17/15				
15-07	Staff to provide board with materials needed for sheep management review prior to teleconference	Kristen/ Amy	Feb 17/15				
15-08	Board to hold teleconference on sheep management	Amy	Feb 17/15				
15-09	Add Rat River Working Group presentation (Tab 11) to the board meeting dropbox files	Kris	Feb 17/15				
15-10	DFO (Larry) to get GRRB information on the status of development of the MPA in the Beaufort	Larry	Feb 17/15				
15-11	Supply GRRB with a model of the new DFO fisheries policy/ protocols for board review	Larry Dow/ -Kris to follow up?	Feb 17/15				
15-12	Provide GRRB with a summary of the fisheries patrols in the Inuvik Administrative region in 2014	Larry Dow/ -Kris to follow up?	Feb 17/15				
15-13	Create and circulate new communications materials about the sheep management motion from the September meeting	Kristen	Feb 17/15				
15-14	Ask YTG if they do any monitoring of sheep in the Southern Richardson mountains and share information with James Andre	Kristen	Feb 17/15				
15-15	RBC (Geoffrey/Phil) to provide list of socially responsible oil and gas companies for board review for possible change to investment policy.	RBC/ -Amy to follow up	Feb 18/15				
15-16	Follow up on driftwood regulations so board can comment. (Include follow up on Ernie Campbell's comment on regulation change at the board forum in Behchoko).	Amy/ Kris?	Feb 18/15				
15-17	Board review of forest management process, including forest use for pellets in Fort McPherson.	Amy/ Kris?	Feb 18/15				
15-18	Send email to GTC re GRRB budget submission; ask if that will be reviewed and responded	Amy	Feb 18/15				

	to; include request for info on if there will be GTC involvement/ legal update at LCA convention re: Peel Watershed case.						
15-19	Send thank you letters to 2015 GRRB student position staff from board.	Amy	Feb 18/15				
15-20	Bobbie Jo to email Janet ideas on possible expansion of Nature Day	Bobbie Jo to Janet	Feb 18/15				
15-21	GRRB staff to pursue possibility of having a youth focused conservation calendar for 2016	Amy and staff	Feb 18/15				
15-22	Post the Collation of RRC Sessions document on the website when it is shared with the RRCs	Amy	Feb 18/15				
15-23	James Andre/TRRC to send letter to GRRB about culvert and stream crossing concerns, just south of the Mackenzie River ferry crossing. Leighanne (GGRRC) to add photographs to supplement the letter.	Janet to follow up?	Feb 18/15				
15-24	GRRB staff to help GGRRC find contacts for possible funding and research assistance for fish contaminants project.	Led by Kris	Feb 18/15			Kristen sent Kris and GGRRC links to Northern contaminants program community based funding and contact name at DFO	Feb 18/15, Feb 19/15
15-25	GRRB to get legal opinion and full information on the appeals process for HTC (RRC) granting of harvesting rights to non-participants in the GSA under the Wildlife Act	Amy	Feb 18/15				
15-26	GRRB to follow up with RRCs after legal opinion and research is done on the harvest rights appeals process for non-participants as discussed	Amy	Feb 18/15				
15-27	Look into doing briefing notes for the RRCs on technical documents they are asked to review.	Amy	Feb 18/15				
15-28	Environment Canada to send GRRB amendments to Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.	John Moffat, EC	Feb 19/15			John emailed Amy a word document with the definition amendment to these two acts.	Feb 20, 2015
15-29	Environment Canada to send to GRRB a diagram of the Exclusive Economic Zone of Canada	John Moffat, EC	Feb 19/15			John emailed Amy a link to a graphic of	In email above on Feb 20, 2015

						the EEZC on the DFO website	
15-30	Amy to check with neighbouring boards and GTC to see if they will share their opinion or thinking on the SARA amendments	Amy	Feb 19/15				
15-31	Staff to undertake consultation on the SARA amendments following the consultation policy.	Kaytlin	Feb 19/15				
15-32	GRRB to respond to Government on the SARA amendments proposed following after 15-29 and 15-31 above.	Amy/ board	Feb 19/15				
15-33	Update the Operating Procedures Manual to reflect the approved changes.	Amy	Feb 19/15				