



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board

February 23-25, 2016 Inuvik, NT Meeting Minutes

Contents

DAY 1 Tuesday, February 23, 2016	3
A. Introductions	3
B. Agenda.....	3
C. Review and approval of draft minutes	3
D. Action Items.....	3
E. Review reports.....	4
F. Rat River Working Group.....	5
G. Caribou discussion	5
H. RRC & public Session	8
DAY 2 Wednesday, February 24, 2016 – WSF Proposals and Research Results	11
I. Dolly Varden ecology	11
J. Dolly Varden management	12
K. Burbot migration	13
L. Harvest data collection	13
M. Arctic Borderlands community monitoring.....	14
N. Muskrat population monitoring	14
O. Muskox Ecology West of the Mackenzie Delta.....	16
P. Wildlife management	17
Q. Youth & Communications.....	17
R. Finance Committee.....	17
Review & approval of Terms of Reference.....	17
DAY 3 Thursday, February 25, 2016	18
R. Finance Committee	18
Selection of Committee; Socially responsible investment policy statement	18
S. Review & approval of safety policy -Amy Amos, GRRB	18
Approval of the Safety Policy	19
T. Board and Staff Session In-Camera.....	19
U. In-Camera	19
V. Business Arising	19
W. Budget & Work plan.....	20
X. Closing remarks	20
Summary of Action Items	21
Summary of Motions	22
Meeting Participants	23



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board

February 23-25, 2016 Inuvik, NT Meeting Minutes

DAY 1 Tuesday, February 23, 2016

Nihtat Gwich'in Council boardroom (Alex Moses Greenland Building)

A. Introductions

Call to order Eugene called the meeting to order at 9:10AM and gave an opening prayer and remarks.

Round table Participants and board members introduced themselves.

Declaration of conflict of interest Eugene asked members to declare conflicts as they might arise.

B. Agenda

Members reviewed the agenda.

Motion to adopt the February 23-25, 2016 meeting agenda		Motion GRRB 16-01
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Doug Doan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

C. Review and approval of draft minutes

Oct 6-8, 2015, Ft. McPherson Meeting

The board reviewed the minutes from the October in-person Board meeting and two teleconferences of the Board on October 29 and Dec 15, 2015.

Comments on the Oct 6-8th minutes:

Ron: Draft minutes say meeting from Oct 6-7. Correct these to include that there was an additional meeting on the 8th.

Doug/Ron: Remove highlights on page 10. These are captured in the actions.

Motion to accept the October 6th-8th minutes summary with the corrections discussed.		Motion GRRB 16-02
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Doug Doan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Comments on the Oct 29, 2015, Teleconference

Correct the file name to reflect the correct meeting date.

Motion to accept the October 29, 2015 teleconference minutes.		Motion GRRB 16-03
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Motion to accept the December 17, 2015 teleconference minutes		Motion GRRB 16-04
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

D. Action Items

Amy reviewed action items, noting which actions were completed, in progress or outstanding since the Fall 2015 meeting. All items were included in a table in the meeting binder for this agenda item.

Action items in which there was additional board discussion beyond Amy's review were:

09-47 –GRRB 15 year report. The board discussed this item, its purpose and utility and noted it is well past 15 years now. The board decided to create a new action item to address this one. (See 16-01 below).

Action Item 16-01: To drop 09-47 from outstanding action list and create a new action item to defer consideration of a multiyear GRRB report until 2018. At that time, the Board will consider the utility of an official report reviewing the board's work over time since the 10 year report. If agreed to in 2018, this would be for publication in 2020.

15-55 -research priorities workshop. The board discussed this item and created a new action item:

Action Item 16-02: Amy to follow up with the board by teleconference to give more financial information to help with planning and decisions on holding a research priority workshop and the scheduling of such a workshop in 2016.

Additional action items discussed included: **15-43** BNW harvest data request by WMAC NWT; **15-47** no survey info since '80s on mountain woodland caribou in southern GSA; **15-48** keep as an action to follow up on fuel source and usage for Fort McPherson heating system; **15-24/25?** Amy to explain the Special Harvesting Area legal opinion in person and give written copy to RRCs; **15-58** –ENR talking to GRRB about possible dump fence in Inuvik and who else (e.g. MACA) would need to be involved; **15-52** calendar content and suggestions for youth focus and elder focus for new themes and ways to get community photos for use.

E. Review reports

a. Chairperson Report

Eugene spoke to some of the items in his Chairperson report noting that he attended the PCMB meeting in Dawson and that the IGC and GTC have committed to work on a user agreement for the Porcupine caribou herd. Eugene thanked Amy and the staff for their work to support the board and himself as chairperson.

John Norbert inquired as to how talks were going for caribou.

Eugene explained that there have been some issues in the management of Bluenose West caribou (e.g.: the Gwich'in and Inuvialuit are on a tag system, but this is not happening in the Sahtu although legislated) and that some good discussions came out of a joint meeting of these three boards in November about this issue with more work to do. Eugene noted that there have been good discussions in relation to the Porcupine caribou herd and preparations for actions in the event of a herd decline.

b. Member reports

Bobbie Jo spoke to her report to the board about activities she was involved in and the importance of communication from the board to the RRCs and to the communities. She thanked Anna May McLeod, Fanny Greenland and RRC members for their work.

There was a small discussion about board member attendance at RRC meetings, including financial restrictions on board member versus staff attendance and the rotation of the fall GRRB meetings through the communities to encourage community participation and GRRB-RRC discussions.

Doug Doan highlighted some outside meetings he attended in addition to internal board work, including the BNE caribou herd allocation meeting in Yellowknife. He noted that there were no decisions made at that meeting, and general but not 100% agreement at that meeting. He also attended the board forum meetings in 2015 and 2016.

There was some discussion about roles and responsibilities of the GRRB and understanding of these roles after a question from an RRC member. Ron spoke to the board structure and how nomination and appointment works for RRC information.

Burt Hunt explained his appointment as a DFO appointee and his role on the GRRB as a board member (bringing his knowledge from his work with DFO, to help with decisions of the GRRB). He clarified that board members don't represent the agency that nominated them. All board members work in the interests of the public of Canada, including the Gwich'in. He clarified that members bring their knowledge to the table, but not their jobs outside of the GRRB. He then spoke to his report to the board outlining the committees and working groups he has been participating in, as described in the board member activity summary prepared by Amy.

Ron Allen introduced himself and briefly outlined his recent activities for the board as described in the summary report. He also explained his appointment as an alternate government appointee to the board.

c. Executive Director report

Amy clarified how all staff reports are formatted with particular headings linked to each job description. (The reports are used in performance evaluations as well as helping to inform the newsletter preparation). Amy then quickly reviewed highlights of her prepared report including items under the categories of personnel and staffing; financial administration; board operation and administration; liaison and communication.

d. Staff reports

Amy clarified that all the prepared staff reports will be drawn from for the newsletter and were provided in the board meeting binder. Staff were available for questions about their reports.

F. Rat River Working Group - Kris Maier

Kris reviewed his presentation (supplied on screen and in the meeting binder) about the activities of the Rat River Working Group (RRWG) and its upcoming activities: The RRWG meets once per year to recommend a voluntary sustainable harvest level for the Rat River char stock and then consults with communities to get feedback and then lets harvesters know about the recommendations. The RRWG relies on data provided by harvest monitors as well as from DFO science assessments at the Fish Hole area to come to their recommendations for sustainable harvest levels each year.

Kris noted that this year, there is a big difference between population levels estimated from monitors (showing an increase in population) and from the science assessment (which shows a decline). The confidence intervals around these estimates don't overlap, the difference is so large. Kris discussed possible reasons as to why the estimates could differ and why he felt that the science assessments were likely closer to the true population size. He did note that he was surprised that assessment showed a decline. He also noted that char monitors caught more fish this year than was previously agreed to resulting in a high harvest. There was some discussion as to how sampling procedures could be managed to prevent overharvest.

Kris noted that the RRWG meeting hasn't happened yet (it will take place March 7th), so there has not been discussion about recommended harvest levels with this group yet for 2016. The IFMP recommends a 5% safe harvest level but 2015 harvest was 8.1% of 2014 estimate. The population appears stable, but status is unclear. Environmental conditions appear to play a major role in regulating population size; a predictive model is needed.

Discussion concluded with remarks about who will be attending the RRWG meetings and also about attendance of the West Side Working Group meeting.

12:00 PM -1:15PM LUNCH BREAK

G. Caribou discussion

Eugene called the meeting to order at 1:15PM, afternoon introductions were made and the agenda continued.

a. ACCWM (Advisory Committee for the Cooperation of Wildlife Management)

Eugene addressed membership of the Committee and the focus of the ACCWM currently on the "Taking Care of Caribou" management plan and its implementation to address actions for the Cape Bathurst (CB), Bluenose-West (BNW) and Bluenose-East (BNE) caribou herds.

Eugene reviewed the Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement (**GCLCA**) **section 12.6.3 and .4** regarding creation of a **Bluenose herd management agreement** and the government to work with the users of the Bluenose herd to establish an agreement for its management, but not specifically mentioning the GRRB (*Note that the GRRB is mentioned in section 12.6.2 related to management agreements for migratory species*). The section also discussed the Porcupine Caribou Management Agreement (PCMA) in similar fashion, using a notwithstanding clause in relation to such agreements' priority over the GCLCA where they may be inconsistent.

Board discussion related to roles and responsibilities for management of these caribou, including the GRRB's involvement in approval, recommendation and implementation of management and action plans for these caribou to date, as well as the possible need for GTC involvement (see GCLCA section 12.6.4). Eugene noted that when the GCLCA was signed, the herd was thought to be just one herd, but new information has shown it to be three herds (with GRRB interests primarily in the Cape Bathurst and Bluenose West). The Board discussed the potential need for a legal opinion on this section (and costs of such) and management planning for these herds since the GCLCA was signed. Questions were posed as to how

things were working and the relationship with the GTC on this (ie. Perhaps it is not an issue). Comments made included the extent to which GTC was involved, and how the GRRB is acting as the main instrument for management of these caribou in the GSA. Discussions turned to the need to get clarity on this issue, including engaging with the GTC, possibly with the GRRB chairperson making a presentation to the GTC at their meeting in March. Eugene noted that the GTC and the Inuvialuit Game Council (IGC) will be meeting to discuss a user agreement for Porcupine caribou. The topic of “Bluenose” caribou may become part of these discussions.

Action item 16-03: To get clarity on the GCLCA section 12.6.4 by seeking a legal opinion on interpretation of this section, the board’s roles and responsibility for management of “Bluenose” caribou, and done so in light of management actions taken and underway since the GCLCA was signed. IS THIS AN ACTION—BOARD WANTS LEGAL CLARITY BUT WASN’T CLEAR

Action item 16-04: For Eugene to engage with GTC on the issue of roles and responsibilities for the GRRB and GTC in the management of “Bluenose caribou”, possibly including attending and presenting to GTC on this in March.

Discussion turned to the **ACCWM itself and the roles and responsibilities of the Committee** and of the GRRB to make recommendations on management decisions to the Minister directly.

Tracy Davison (ENR) made a comment on this topic: “The ACCWM and the management plan were created and signed by the GRRB. This is quite a different beast to the Porcupine Caribou Management Agreement”. The ACCWM does not have government representatives on the committee. It is a forum created by the boards to discuss shared issues, often caribou. The management plan is driven by the boards and the boards signed the plan. The GNWT is not a signatory, but the plan was recommended by the boards. GTC was aware of the process while drafting the plan. It was not done in isolation from the GTC. It is not a government management plan, but is a board management plan. There was no mgt plan when the GCLCA was signed, so there is a provision for the management plan. The GNWT did a plan in 2000, but it was not signed, and fell by the wayside. There has not been one until now. “

Board discussion next turned to the challenges involved in management of the three herds by so many groups, including the movement of caribou across so many management boundaries, uneven enforcement, lack of full understanding of harvest levels, and lack of agreement (in some cases) on actions to take and degree of cooperation, or lack thereof by all users and management bodies. The board then discussed commitments made by the SRRB at the joint meeting of the SRRB, GRRB and WMAC NWT in November and follow-up on those items.

Action item 16-05: After the passing of relevant deadlines, for the Board to send a letter to the SRRB regarding the commitments made at the joint meeting (Nov 2015), and that the GRRB is awaiting the information committed to being shared (e.g. harvest levels etc...).

Amy noted that **the MOU and the Correspondence Procedure of the ACCWM require board comment and/or approval.** The Board entertained a motion to approve the changes as well as further discussions around challenges of the Committee and of the GRRB. Discussion included the value of a management plan when not all parties participate to same degree (eg. Lack of harvest data/uneven tag usage); parties stepping in and out of participation depending on how things are going (e.g. WMAC NWT; challenges in Sahtu); changes that impact herds made without full consultation and involvement of parties (e.g. zone change between Cape Bathurst and Bluenose-West caribou); and the value of the ACCWM as a forum for sharing information and cooperating on such issues. On the subject of the zone change it was noted that the GRRB to date has only brought concerns to the ACCWM but not also to the Minister. After all discussions, the board approved the following motion.

Motion to support the amendments made to the ACCWM MOU and Correspondence Procedure		Motion GRRB 16-05
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

b. GRRB follow-up on caribou management issues:

The board next discussed rationale for the GRRB letter sent December 17, 2015 to the GNWT after receipt of the WMAC NWT letter to the Minister requesting additional BNW tags. The Board again discussed its concerns about the status of

the CB and BNW herds and impacts of increased harvest to both herds that would result from a switch to the Rivest methods and therefore, from an increase of BNW tags and harvest increase. The board also discussed concerns about continuing at a 4% TAH given the BNW herd status and lowest population size. The board reviewed its letter, as well as earlier motions passed and recommendations made during the Board's Dec 17th teleconference regarding status decisions and management actions for CB and BNW herds to the ACCWM that precipitated the letter.

Amy noted that the ACCWM meeting to determine herd status did not go into discussion of additional actions although Eugene presented the GRRB's recommendations to the Committee. This has resulted in the working group struggling to confirm what the ACCWM had approved and what it hadn't for inclusion of actions in the herd action plans.

Motion to send a letter to the Minister (GNWT) to address the BNW GRRB concerns specifically and to copy that letter to members of the ACCWM		Motion GRRB 16-06
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

The board then further discussed its concerns about the zone change between CB and BNW harvest regions without consultation with the GRRB or other parties to the ACCWM and the potential impacts of such changes to the CB herd (as outlined in the recommendations table from the December teleconference). The board discussed the need to talk to WMAC NWT and GNWT about the board's concerns. There was some discussion about authority to make by-laws (zone changes) by WMAC NWT and the GNWT responsibility to enact changes when they are proposed.

Motion to send a letter to WMAC NWT and the GNWT, copying the letter also to parties of the ACCWM, encompassing concerns about the Cape Bathurst herd zone boundary change as expressed in the table and reiterating the Board's recommendation to the ACCWM that this herd be assessed as Red status.		Motion GRRB 16-07
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

c. Consideration of a broader caribou communications strategy

Eugene led this discussion. It centred on impacts of Porcupine caribou harvesting activities along the Dempster highway and behaviour of some harvesters during the 2015 fall harvest.

Wastage

In response to concerns about wastage, the GRRB has agreed to work on educational messages and materials. (e.g. Respect the Words of the Elders poster; Let the Leaders Pass stickers; newspaper letter to the editor; newsletter and calendar messages to date). The Tetlit RRC has coordinated a caribou education workshop in Fort McPherson for its harvesters.

Let The Leaders Pass

There was then some discussion about Letting the Leaders Pass. Eugene noted that Johnny Charlie Sr. used to let the first herd that arrived pass and that there were GNWT regulations that closed the road to hunting for a few weeks when the caribou first arrived. Now regulations have been dropped and harvesters are hunting as soon as the caribou start to show up by the highway. This message is not unique to the Gwich'in; other regions have similar traditions (e.g. Kitikmeot – caribou migrate around a lake and back so the elders say to let the caribou pass so they will come back).

Mary Rose noted that this has been a concern in Fort McPherson, especially after the caribou didn't come for a few years. The TRRC would like to see more encouragement of the Let the Leaders Pass message, enforcement and something in place on this soon. There was then Board and RRC discussion about communication needs, the potential for involvement of Gwich'in monitors, and the role of the RRCs in talking to their communities.

John Norbert spoke about the need for communication between communities (e.g. about the caribou workshop) and noted that complaining about each other was not something that was done long ago. Permission was always asked before hunting in someone's area. He noted that there are many elders who can't hunt and so people who harvest a lot in order to share with the elders should not be unfairly accused of overhunting. He reiterated that it is not the Gwich'in

way to complain about each other.

Harvest Reporting

The discussion then turned to the importance of harvest reporting, including the reporting of all harvests taken through community hunts and the methodology required to do that and ensure there is not double reporting. Communications at the board level also need to emphasize all harvest reporting.

Janet then noted some of the recommendations that came out of the caribou workshop: expansion of future workshops to other communities; and making them open to the public, including to the Inuvialuit for common resources. Janet also noted some comments made by ENR in relation to what ENR can enforce (e.g. safety issues) and what they cannot (Let Leaders Pass) under current legislation. Janet also commented that ENR said they would like to have more people on the highway next year, especially for safety concerns.

Land Damage and habitat impacts from ATV use on the Dempster during caribou harvest

Eugene commented that there were photos sent around of damage ATVs are doing to the land (when used before adequate snowfall and ground freezing). He noted that there is not a caribou conservation concern that the GRRB could act on in order to manage this issue, but it can be looked at. The board then discussed the environmental impacts of this and the role of the GRRB as well as the mandates of other parties who can be involved in such discussions and decisions. The Board further discussed how it can include this item in its communications strategy about respect for the land.

H. RRC & public Session

a. Open discussion between the RRCs and Board members followed by b. public discussion with board.

a. RRC and board Session

Amy gave a presentation with the participants that reviewed the Board's mandate, GRRB and RRC roles and the goal of this session with the RRCs and the Board. After this presentation councillors discussed various topics and concerns with the GRRB. These have been grouped according to council membership and where possible, by topic:

TRRC

Stony Creek Gravel Pit -Mary Rose let the board know that the TRRC has sent a letter to the GTC regarding the proposed Stony Creek gravel pit. The TRRC is not in support of that application because of impacts to fish and water. She wondered if the GRRB was taking a similar action. Amy noted that the GRRB also made a response to the application and was also concerned about Stony Creek being an important fish bearing body. (The GRRB's response is in the meeting binder –see Janet's staff update). Kris also noted that the GRRB has engaged DFO fisheries protection if it does go to a permitting stage.

TRRC and GRRB -Mary Rose: a comment that the relationship with Board and TRRC is working well. We are trying to get our community engaged. We have a local radio station that we use quite often, not a newsletter. Each department takes turns on a weekly basis. This is a way to get information to the community members. Also talking one on one.

Communications -Bobbie Jo: a comment about messaging at the board level. Maybe we can discuss further with RRCs. The GNWT has an elders and school fund that goes to each school (if applied for) –this is more partnership possibility for RRCs. Lots of traditional activities that go on each year. More correspondence with RRC level and work with the DEA for the school to get traditional teachings in practical interactions and teaching can be valuable. RRCs can think about that for partnerships.

NRRC

Interactions of caribou and muskoxen -Neil noted that he had not heard of any studies on interactions of caribou and muskox, although this is important to research. Kristen and Tracy mentioned that there is a proposed project for 2016 that will start to address this. (See the WSF application from ENR/YTG on this –Day 2-in the binder)

NRRC and GRRB -Neil noted that NRRC interaction and relationship with the GRRB is very good. He noted that he has been with the RRC since 1992 and the relationship with the GRRB is good with lots of help from the GRRB to RRCs.

Roles and responsibilities of RRCs -Neil mentioned that the GTC was supposed to have addressed this topic with RRCs by October and November, but it didn't happen. There was some additional discussion around this topic, including the old RRC manual.

Amy noted that she has a presentation she has provided to RRCs in the past when they get new councils about how the RRCs and the GRRB work together, including some RRC roles. She can come to the RRCs and give that at any time. She is also planning to visit all RRCs to talk about review of action items (e.g. review of GBMA and enforcement in Wildlife Act; special harvesting license and legal opinion).

Action item 16-06: Amy to visit the RRCs to review RRC roles and responsibilities, along with review of outstanding action items (review of GBMA and enforcement in Wildlife Act; Special Harvesting License and the legal opinion).

GRRRC

RRC training (Roles and Responsibilities, Continued) -Anna May commented that some training for their coordinator could be helpful. Amy suggested that she could spend some time with the coordinator prior to a GRRRC meeting when she presents the Roles and Responsibilities presentation. John also noted that the GGRC has just had an RRC election with new councillors who need to know what they are doing and who would benefit from an orientation.

Mary Rose noted that there is a need for an RRC operating policy that is more formal than the existing manual. Garth noted that the manual is a good place to start work from to make better. Anna May noted that the initial manual was good and simple but the manual was then put aside by the DGOs because of disagreement about whether it followed the GCLCA. They would like to review the manual for changes and then redistribute it. Anna May noted that the DGO is going to have a RRC-DGO workshop on March 14-16 to talk about roles and responsibilities. She reiterated the need for a by-law policy and resource manuals to help guide the RRCs. Bobbie Jo wondered if it would be appropriate to do a review at the RRC regional.

By-laws and Rules for Participants -John Norbert asked about what rules are in place and whose mandate is it to address poor behaviour by Participants. He related a story about a person who makes a new camp every year somewhere new, and never cleans it up; who cuts wood in someone else's area without asking; who has no repercussions although people are unhappy with him and have told him so. Anna May also clarified that that this person just goes and does it without talking to the RRC first.

Eugene noted that there are a lot of traditional unwritten laws understood by the Gwich'in that include respecting the people who are there and using a resource, asking for permission, and cleaning up. He noted that he has had discussions with another management group and they say there are 2 options: 1. Continue trying to establish understandings with those unwritten rules. ; 2. Go to other organizations like the GTC who have some ability to enact some of those rules.

Bobbie Jo pointed out a section of the GCLCA that could apply to John's concerns as it describes the powers of the RRCs in managing this issue. She quoted section 12.9.4.b where it gives the RRCs the powers to manage the "*local exercise of Gwich'in harvesting rights including the methods, seasons and location of harvest*". She noted that the RRC needs a policy in place to enforce this. She also mentioned that this section can also apply to the habitat damage caused by ATV use, as that falls under the methods of harvest. Some interpretation would be needed of the manner this is done by the RRCs as the section also says it must be done "*in a manner consistent with legislation and the policies of the Board*".

The board then discussed differences between by-laws and regulations that could be enforced and limitations of the GRRB (i.e. Board mandate does not include disciplining Participants). They also discussed alternative methods of dealing with the issue relating to education and communication strategies. Ron suggested that posting photos on website (or facebook) of what is unacceptable behaviour can create social pressure on individuals to change their behaviour. This could apply to the concerns John expressed as well as to things like wasted meat. Responsibilities for action were further discussed with inclusion of roles for GTC with self government and rules via the Lands and Resources department brought up by Garth (GTC).

Mary Rose related a story of how the TRRC did not give permission to an individual for a new camp until an old one was cleaned up, as an example of how the TRRC has tried to manage similar events.

Youth education -Anna May related the importance of educating youth and gave an example of a young man who was instructed by an elder to throw a black bear in the river after shooting it. The young man disagreed and wanted to learn how to skin it. Anna May said that by teaching them in the schools, young people can make changes.

Ferry Landing Monitoring -Anna May related a council concern about wanting monitors hired for the ferry landings with Dept. of Transportation as there are occurrences that are not being reported that the community is seeing (e.g. oil spills).

Tsiigehtchic bear issues and ENR response -Anna May noted that there were many problem bears during the summer. There were situations where bears were shot and left in the dump. ENR did talk to people about dangers and warning people, but there was also another occurrence with 2 grizzlies bothering women at a fish camp when ENR initially responded but left when it got dark and then wouldn't return or answer phone the phone or messages about it. Eventually a community member decided just to shoot the bear themselves, but they were afraid they were breaking the law in doing so, and then they left it in the dump as they couldn't reach the RO 1.

Bank Swallow Survey -The GRRRC supports it and will talk further with the TRRC to see if the two RRCs can do it jointly.

Feedback from Researchers -Anna May mentioned that the RRC rarely hears back from researchers and do not get reports back, although the ARI applications say they will be provided. Amy noted that she could bring this concern forward to the ARI steering committee for the ARI strategic planning process. Janet noted that their online website has a place to access reports and that RRCs can get a password to access their system. Kristen also noted that researchers who do not provide reports are not allowed to get more money from ARI until they report: the ARI applications, they say they will provide a report, but we never get reports back.

Action item 16-07: Janet to assemble reports from past research from the ARI system and supply those to the RRCs.

Anna May also commented that it was good to have Janet's posters about results of the harvest study. Anna May also enjoyed the workshop in Yellowknife about the MVRMA.

ERRC

Curtis reviewed the ERRC report provided in the meeting binder. He noted the harvest study has been quite slow this year to get participation, among other items. He noted that there was ERRC support for WSF applications (but did not name them). Bobbie Jo inquired as to whether there were concerns or comments about education and communication at the council meetings. Curtis noted that these issues do not come up very much.

b. Public and Board Session

Larry Dow (Director of Northern Operations, DFO) was in attendance. He noted that Ryan McLeod is back working as a casual employee with DFO for 90 days; Larry is hoping to move him to a term position after that. He clarified that Ryan is available to assist with GRRB fisheries work if the GRRB makes such requests. Larry also spoke to the constraints of sending Ryan for electro fishing training (budget won't allow large travel costs; requests need at least 6 weeks for approval). Kris noted that there is a need for this training to align with GRRB safety protocols.

Amy expressed thanks to Larry and DFO for the financial support for printing and shipping the conservation calendars and also thanked ENR for additional contributions to calendar production as both ENR and DFO contributions are significant in producing the calendar each year.

Anna May inquired about availability of Ellen to assist in processing fishing licenses for a day in Tsiigehtchic. Her involvement will also help to answer questions about Special Harvesting Areas and commercial fishing restrictions. Larry noted that Ellen can help with this but will need 6-8 weeks' notice of the request to plan ahead.

Amy noted that there has been a large delay on the DFO side in approving a small fish regulations fact sheet. She and Kris worked with Ellen & Terry from DFO on it and that it would be very helpful to have for harvesters in the GSA.

In response to a question from Eugene, Larry stated that he did not know if there will be a review of changes in the Fisheries Act by the new government. **Larry noted that there will be a meeting in March (8-10) and that if Eugene is available to attend, Larry and Eugene can check about that question.**

Garth Greskiw (GTC, Director of Lands and Resources Dept.)

Garth spoke briefly to the Board noting that he is encouraged by all the support that may be possible and is especially happy about all the knowledge holders in the community and looks forward to working them.

He spoke to the Stoney Creek Gravel Pit proposal and noted that it was risky and has social impacts, as is being heard by the Board at this meeting. He also noted that there is an economic impact (to refusing the proposal). He plans to schedule a meeting with the economic development coordinator at the GDC to make sure they have all the concerns about the environmental risk.

DAY 2 Wednesday, February 24, 2016

Nihtat Gwich'in Council boardroom (Alex Moses Greenland Building)

Eugene called day two of the meeting to order at 9:05AM

The agenda items for this day were all **Wildlife Studies Fund proposals** to the Board. Presenters who had previously received WSF support reported on their past research. Those requesting WSF support for the 2016-2017 fiscal year previously submitted written applications to the Board (also provided in meeting binder) and gave presentations on their proposals (copies of powerpoint presentations were provided on screen and in meeting binders). The minutes below provide a short description of research results; the topic of each WSF proposal and the topic of discussions and questions given from the Board to the presenters.

I. WSF Proposal “Dolly Varden ecology” -Kimberly Howland & Colin Gallagher, DFO

Past Research Report-Dolly Varden Char

Via teleconference call, Kim reviewed the past research with the board. 2015 objectives were to collect char Rat River population information to assist with decisions of the Rat River Working Group. Their methods included recapture, tagging and live sampling of char at the Fish Hole as well as getting a small dead sample of resident char for additional information. Recapture and tagging work is used to determine 2014 population estimate and for an estimate of population size in 2015. Kim reviewed numbers of char recaptured, tagged and sampled and biological information gathered from the sampling. She noted that grayling that were live captured and released in the lower area of the Fish Hole. She summarized the project findings by noting that compared to 2013, the char 2014 abundance has either gone up dramatically based on tag returns from monitors or there has been a moderate decrease based on fall seining. She said there is more confidence in the estimates from fall seining because of much higher tag returns. They suspect that tag returns are off from the monitors, so more follow up will be needed. She and Colin believe that it is safer to use the lower estimate and will recommend that to the RRWG for their review. The population appears stable for the moment.

Questions on Results:

Kim clarified that seining is done every year and is helpful to look at whether there is recruitment of juveniles. Tagging is not done every year, (although it is helpful to do on a more regular basis, to get inter-annual variation in abundance). She noted that seining doesn't provide information on abundance while the recaptures from tagging are necessary to get abundance estimates.

WSF Proposal “Dolly Varden ecology”

Kim presented her research proposal to the board on Dolly Varden Char Ecology. Objectives of this proposal are to: Continue to collect time series information at the Fish Hole by continuing seining work to support decision making of the GRRB and RRWG and to continue live sampling and tagging of char to get inter-annual abundance. She also proposed to continue a small dead sample of 20 resident char to add to the collection of biological information.

Examine movements and habitat use of char to help address gaps in assessing vulnerability of char to climate change. Kim then reviewed the methods proposed for both objectives, focusing on the new methodology in their second objective. She described how 10 satellite tags on large individuals >550mm and 60 somewhat smaller archival tags on large individuals >450mm would be used to collect depth, location and temperature information. These will help collect information on habitat use from 10months –up to 2 years. Satellite tags will release and send information via satellite once they float to the surface, but archival tag data will only be accessed if archival tags are found again with the fish.

Questions on Proposal:**Objective A**

Kim responded to a question of how to address the variation between seining and monitoring results. She noted that discussing methods and observations with monitors could explain their low return rate. She also noted that it is not unusual to have estimates higher from harvest monitors as their sample locations likely mean a population component is missed with fish that are up at the fish hole earlier and are not available for capture, thus affecting the estimate.

Kim answered a question about whether monitoring continues to be worthwhile and how to adjust it to make it more reliable. She noted that multiple lines of evidence are best and that monitoring is a valuable program. If there are similar trends from both indices, that there is more confidence in the results. She also noted that we now have longer term data for biological indicators from the monitoring so it is valuable to continue that time series. To make it more reliable, she noted that it will be important to get a better understanding of what is going on with the fish that are not migrating. Understanding what % of population is resident could make possible an adjustment to the monitoring estimate that way.

Objective B

Questions and discussion on this objective related to the functioning of the satellite tags. Kim explained that the satellite tags will only transmit once released and floating at the surface, although some transmission may be possible if the fish come up to the surface in shallow water before release of the tags. She noted that marine mammals with satellite tags frequently surface and so transmission and data collection is possible on those occasions but that this is limiting for char methodology. She also noted that tags can give information on large scale movements by detecting changes in light levels and this is used for migratory tuna, but that this is not possible for char, given the smaller scale of movements and the lack of large light level changes from day to night at these latitudes.

Additional discussions related to the multi-year contribution agreement and administration of the funding as well as use of documented TK for char in Kim's work.

J. WSF Proposal "Dolly Varden management" -Kris Maier, GRRB

Kris reviewed his prepared presentation with the board highlighting information needed from the IFMP for char. The project's main objective is to assess juvenile habitats of char stock. The ideal long term goal is to have a model to predict adult population status in advance using that juvenile information. Kris combined presentation of 2015 results from his projects with his proposal for 2016/2017:

Rat River Juvenile Char Occupancy Project –Results and Proposal

Kris presented 2015 results from Rat River project on juveniles and habitat information that examined benthic sampling, temperature, habitat characteristics and location. He noted that the predictive model will need information on occupancy of juvenile char in Fish Creek. Kris showed the location of sampling in the upper part of the watershed where new information was obtained. He noted that this appears to be a critical area for the stock in general and may produce many of the anadromous fish in the stock via recruitment. He showed where juvenile and resident char were found in 2014. He then contrasted this with where work was done in 2015 and noted how important the tributaries seem to be. Because a dead sample was not taken in 2015, more information is needed to understand which fish were resident versus anadromous. He noted that it was interesting that they were up high in the alpine in mid August. This time of year it is frozen solid, so there appears to be a migration into that tributary. Probably not anadromous fish spawning there but juveniles directed migration there perhaps for rearing purposes. A lot of new information about the stock and generally increase understanding of what is driving understanding of the stock.

Kris then presented results of benthic invertebrate sampling, length sizes for different aged juveniles from 2014 and 2015 and noted that sample sizes were low and more information is needed for the model. He reviewed results from water sampling of concentrations of dissolved solids, nitrogen, and strontium in the different tributaries and sites sampled. Of note was that strontium results were very high in a tributary where there were also many juveniles and larger sizes.

Kris summarized his results presentation and proposal for research in 2016/2017 by noting that only 2 tributaries have been examined so far. Growth rates seem to vary by site. Tributaries are important for spawning. Bigger sample sizes are needed. Water chemistry can vary significantly between sites. The needs are to finalize the juvenile occupancy model

with at least one more year of sampling and to get a larger dead sample. More water chemistry and temperature data. Monitor water temperature and install new cameras. Survey other possible habitats (such as Scho Creek). Continue expanding knowledge of juvenile habitats.

Arctic Red River Fish surveys –Results and Proposal

Kris then presented results from the Arctic Red River work done in 2015 and his request for 2016/2017. He noted the importance of understanding all the Dolly Varden char stocks and other fish present in upper watershed. There is interest in mineral development in the area so it is important to get baseline data.

Results of note were that Dolly Varden char were found; these were likely resident judging from size <270mm; grayling and sculpin also present as well as suspected presence of whitefish, inconnu, suckers and chub/dace (via info from outfitter). Analysis is still underway and so the genetic and water sample results are still to come. Kris hopes to publish the results as a short note in the journal Arctic.

His proposal for 2016/2017 is to focus on some of the larger lakes in the Arctic Red River accessible by float plane to document what is there. He expects whitefish and chub/dace. He plans to do a more detailed investigation on life history information for char. Helps to understand what is going on for Rat also, when understanding char occupancy in relation to habitat and location. He would like to do benthic invertebrate sampling (CABIN) and expand habitat monitoring.

Questions on Proposals:

The board asked Kris clarification questions about funding sources and priorities in Rat River work versus proposed Arctic Red River work.

K. WSF Proposal “Burbot migration” -Tracey Loewen, DFO

Via teleconference, Tracy presented her proposed research to the GRRB. She proposed to look at Burbot migration patterns via otoliths collected from burbot within the Mackenzie River and Coastal Delta Regions. She noted that there have been two subspecies documented in the region, in part by GRRB research and that the use of coastal waters and migration of burbot is not well understood. Her proposal is to use existing otolith samples already collected to answer new questions: Age at which they first migrate; frequency of migration, size and growth differences. She noted that strontium concentrations are higher in marine than in freshwater and that this strontium difference is apparent in the different parts of otoliths of the fish, showing the habitat that they have been in as it relates to strontium concentrations. Results may help understand life history of migratory burbot as compared to other burbot in the area.

Questions on Proposal:

She answered questions about the TK knowledge collected, her monetary request from the board and how that money would be used in her project.

**12 PM to 1:30PM Lunch
Called to order at 1:35PM**

L. WSF Proposal “Harvest data collection”-Janet Boxwell, GRRB

Janet presented the objectives and results of the harvest study project (June 2014-May 2015), current status, and proposed work for 2016. She clarified the GRRB and RRC roles in the project. She noted that the 2014-2015 year there were not many Porcupine caribou available for harvest and that participation was only 41% on average, but much lower than this in 3 of the 4 communities. Harvest reporting needs to improve for better accuracy of estimated harvests. She also reported harvests of other caribou, muskox, sheep and moose as well as other harvester observations recorded during the interviews, including a lack of awareness about the sheep voluntary harvest closure and 2014 population status. In the current year, participation and reporting has further decreased. Some ideas for how to address this were raised at the caribou workshop in Fort McPherson (more meetings; more use of radio; consideration of remuneration for reports; further discussion with RRCs to address). She reviewed her funding request for the project with the board.

Questions on Proposal:

The board asked questions to clarify her funding request. A suggestion was made to consider hiring only one interviewer to do the interviews in all four communities to address some issues raised. A suggestion was made to consider incentives for reporting and Janet clarified what incentives exist and what changes have been made to try to address reporting rates and to bring costs down. Discussion then turned to the funding sources and it was noted that the GTC has not

contributed funding to the harvest study, although they are the party that committed to data collection in the GSA. The GRRB has written to the GTC executive and board about this with rationale for their funding assistance without response. A suggestion was made to send another letter

Action item 16-08: Board to send a letter to GTC regarding the need for funding assistance to collect Porcupine caribou harvest data.

Discussion then included possible funding assistance from ENR. Amy noted that funding decisions from ENR must typically wait until their new fiscal year but that she could make a request to the local ENR department.

Action item 16-09: Amy to request funding assistance from ENR for the harvest study program.

Discussion concluded with comments and suggestions for how to better incorporate information from community hunts. Janet noted that although these have happened, she has never received such data from RRCs. A suggestion was made by RRC councillor to ask the harvesters who participate in the community hunts to report directly, in addition to their own harvests. Janet noted that it will be important to distinguish between community hunts and other harvests in order to ensure there is not double reporting. She felt this could be done on the form with some changes.

M. WSF Proposal “Arctic Borderlands community monitoring” -Kelly Milner, ABEKS

Via teleconference, Kelly presented results from the past year and expected work for the upcoming year. The objectives of the program are to look at ecosystem change in the range of the Porcupine herd, using community based information combined with science based information; to build relationships; and to foster capacity building approaches. She reviewed the multiple partners of the project and provided some initial results processed from this past year. She noted some ways that the work is being used by other agencies (e.g. by PCMB and by Parks Canada).

She noted that there was a concern about whether and how the data collected was being used to help make management decisions. If the information is not helping, how can we make sure that we are meeting the needs that partners have? She then noted some preliminary steps are being taken to: consider how to provide service (not just having a database); clarify what the data is and is not; look at timing of monitoring to line up with other processes; review program delivery and look where collaboration could reduce duplication; focus on strengths. The plan is to use information about the indicators and responses given above which may change timing of some of their data collection. Small changes. May be looking at modifying a few things from the program to be more in alignment.

Questions on Proposal:

Kelly answered questions clarifying that the community members sharing information for the project are chosen through the RRCs and the HTC and are not exclusive to wildlife harvesters but may also include berry picking and fishing, for example. The lists may change year to year. Kelly noted that she plans to visit Inuvik next week to talk with the RRC about the results from Inuvik and will visit the other RRCs later in the year when the information from their communities is ready for presentation.

N. WSF Proposal “Muskrat population monitoring” -Jeremy Brammer, U. Victoria/McGill University

Jeremy presented results from the project work that he and Chanda have been doing in the last year: presentation at the Jan 2015 Regional RRC meeting; Feb-April 2015 pilot carcass collection program; June-Aug 2015 habitat surveys and TK interviews; Dec 2015-April 2016 interviews; Jan-Feb 2016 carcass collection for this winter and spring.

He next discussed the monitoring plan for the next three years and outlined questions research will help to answer in three areas 1. Winter carcass collection, 2. Spring aerial push-up and lake habitat surveys, 3. Knowledge Interviews. He presented the questions associated with each component and answered questions on each:

1. Winter carcass collection –where are they fatter? Bigger? More contaminants or parasites? Where are predators eating them?

So far results indicate they are small with no parasites and little contaminants. To address the need for predator carcasses with full stomachs, harvesters get more money if the stomachs are full plus payments just for turning them in.

Questions on this project component

Sample location- Jeremy clarified that getting the specific lake location of a muskrat harvest is helpful, more than just what lake it was from, especially with large lakes. He noted that collections will be from all GSA communities and from harvester trap-lines across multiple lakes so results may not be specific to lake locations but may be able to show trends across the delta.

Sample Sizes –Jeremy noted that current sample sizes are not sufficient and more are needed. He noted that the sample sizes of predators is on track, but the number of muskrats is too low (last year only got 100 of 300 desired). The Board and Jeremy then had a discussion about the need to control harvest locations (so not all come from the same spot) versus getting enough muskrats, potentially by raising incentives, including archiving unused material. Eugene commented that there is a market for muskrat carcasses locally and people may buy them for \$12 each skinned to eat as an explanation for why Jeremy may not be getting enough carcasses turned in.

Action Item 16-10: GRRB to help advertise Jeremy's project and the need for carcasses on the GRRB facebook page and website. Jeremy to send ad as a jpeg for posting.

Historical Trends- Jeremy clarified that there are a few 1950s and 1970s reports as a baseline to compare to from 25 lakes that will help answer broad questions about changes in muskrat abundance over time

Body size differences-He explained the rationale for asking whether muskrats are bigger versus smaller as habitat gradients may result in different body sizes and that by documenting habitat change in the delta, this could explain impacts and changes seen.

Old Crow muskrats -Jeremy answered a question from John Norbert about Old Crow muskrats by noting that there are not concerns about less muskrats there as 1980s numbers are similar in the flats as today. He noted that there are fewer trappers to observe changes and there are concerns about impacts of less trapping, such as large population cycles. Reassuringly, there has not been a decline

Lakes drying out-John also wondered about the impacts of beaver activity on muskrat populations and if good muskrat lakes are drying out as a cause for declines in the delta. Jeremy noted that the lakes near Old Crow do not appear to be drying out but there are other changes when lakes cut into creeks and then drain and dry out. At the same time though, the banks are coming down and some lakes are getting wider, not deeper. He noted that from a satellite, there is more surface area water visible, even with the ones that drain, because of how the banks slump. It may or may not be good for muskrats. Lots of shallow areas. Jeremy plans to work through satellite images to see if there are comparable observations in the Mackenzie Delta as in Old Crow flats.

Beaver impacts—Following on John's comment above, there was a short discussion about the impacts of beavers on muskrat populations and whether Jeremy's project will collect information about this question. Jeremy said that as of now, that has not been looked at. A suggestion was made that Jeremy could ask for information about beaver observations from people bringing in carcasses to help examine this. John commented that beavers were imported into the delta at one time.

Fur returns as possible indicator of presence/abundance -Jeremy: already has NWT historical records of fur returns. Big question is that fur returns are going down across the board. Hard to say if one species in particular is going down versus just not being trapped/bought. Initial information seems to show muskrats from delta going down fast and more than other places. Not sure if there is a larger pattern, as something similar in Old Crow. Less muskrats or less people bringing them in.

Overharvesting –Bobbie Jo wondered if interview participants had made comments about overharvesting in the past. If the population was brought down low by high harvest, whether it would take a long time to recover. She said that when she was a child in the 80s, it was a fur based economy. She noted that the family would go out in March for the summer trapping. For one family it was normal to see them skinning 100 rats. On a good day 100 rats, on average more or less depending on family size. That was a way of living. Prior to that, traditional based it was different because it was for food, but not also for fur as a fur based economy. She also noted that as a child she was told to say "Zun Na Dilli" when they would throw muskrats in the river. It means "Come back to life again". They had to say it every time.

Jeremy responded that most of his experience is with trappers in Old Crow. They would tell stories of Pete Lord who would trap hard the same lakes 50 traps a day during ice trapping season. He would pull thousands out. He got told he was taking too many and cleaning it out. He would do this, but the next year it would be full again. People in Old Crow have told Jeremy that trapping out keeps it at a low enough density for reproduction or immigration into the area. Some research trapped hard and muskrats were marked. They found that muskrats from adjacent lakes moved into an area that had been trapped hard to take it. He also noted that in the east 70% trapping in New Brunswick was considered sustainable.

2. Aerial push-up counts and lake habitat surveys -Where are there more? Less? Why? Lakes now versus 1970s? Jeremy asked the board if any questions were being missed in this component. None were given.

Jeremy noted that beaver lodges may be visible from aerial photos as a way to ask questions about beavers, but that this isn't useful unless the lodges are visited to see if they are active.

Anna May noted that in recent trips with helicopter that there are many rat houses between Inuvik and Tsiigehtchic but she was concerned that warm weather may have resulted in them sinking in by now.

3. Interviews, summer 2015 -What makes a good muskrat lake? Do muskrats in the delta cycle? What does trapping do to muskrats? Beavers good or bad for muskrats? What has changed in the past 20 years for muskrats?

Muskrat body size and sample bias - A suggestion was made to have interview participants also asked about muskrat body size changes, and also whether people might be biasing the sample by turning in only small carcasses and keeping larger ones. It was suggested to investigate whether this may be happening.

Water level changes -The board discussed impacts of large scale water level changes and whether there could be noticeable changes observed in the delta and in muskrats at the time water from the Bennet Dam was dumped. Additional questions suggested were to ask about the changes in lake size and number (surface area changes). Jeremy noted that he has photos dating back to 1985 for comparison to help answer these questions.

Frozen push-ups -Eugene noted that in some falls it looks promising with lots of push-ups but then in the spring you find lots of frozen push-ups. He wondered why and if it might be otter predation, climate change or something else. He also noted that in the past few years a lake near Aklavik (across from June Firth's) has drained and is now half the size. Jeremy commented that overflow is a huge factor in the push-ups from fall to spring. From his work in Old Crow he also knows that snowfall amounts are also important.

O. WSF Proposal "Muskoxy Ecology West of the Mackenzie Delta" - Mike Suitor (YG), Marsha Branigan & Tracy Davison (ENR)

Tracy presented on the group's behalf, with Mike joining by phone. Tracy noted that is a joint project with government of Yukon and Parks Canada with GNWT. The project should help answer some research gaps relating to muskox and is responding to concerns expressed previously by GRRB and others. The Yukon government is taking the lead on looking at population size, herd composition, habitat use and now possibly also the interactions between muskox and caribou (depends on funds received). Tracy then presented information existing about knowledge of caribou, from muskox surveys and other surveys in the area, also incidental reports of observations. The current proposal is two part: 1. Aerial survey of muskoxen in the Northern Richardson mountains to help assess population size; 2. Additional satellite collaring of muskoxen in the NWT side (there are already 8 collars in Ivavik NP and Herschel Island). The collars can help examine questions related to habitat use, seasonal movements and range use, proximity to other species (including to collared caribou to help address interactions concerns). Collars will also help with composition surveys to understand how the population is structured (age and sex).

Tracy noted that the WSF request is to help with the purchase of 3 collars in the NWT and their satellite data costs. An additional in-kind request is for Kristen to assist with 2-3 days of the aerial surveys. Tracy noted that there have been some meetings already with the WMAC NS and Aklavik HTC and they plan to meet with the ERRC soon about the project.

Mike clarified that Gwich'in participants can hunt muskoxen in the Yukon in the secondary or primary use areas, but that

this is subject to conservation and public safety constraints. He noted that because of the small size of the muskox population that 1-2 is likely okay but 30 harvested (as an example) would not be. He noted that the 2011 survey counted 101 muskoxen and there is a need for a new survey so we know where the population is at. There were suggestions to expand the survey transect lines further south towards the Rat River to encompass sightings there. Mike noted that muskox move around seasonally and that those seen in the south are often only single male muskoxen. He wondered if those observations were made in April, when the survey will occur. Tracy said that they would need to consider the additional cost of expanding the flight lines.

P. WSF Proposal “Wildlife management” -Kristen Callaghan, GRRB

Kristen submitted three proposals to the Board:

1. Dall Sheep Management Planning– She reviewed the proposal for this project that would help the RRCs and the GRRB review the sheep plan and get updated in time for a meeting of the Parties to the draft plan for further work and decisions. The proposal also includes a small educational item for work in Aklavik with the RRC and community there. She explained her budget request and that some deferred funds from 2015 activities that did not happen could be used for this project, and clarified costs in her proposal.

2. ACCWM working group GRRB staff costs in implementation of the Cape Bathurst, Bluenose West and Bluenose-east caribou management plan. She noted that in 2015/2016 that project funds covered both staff costs and some board costs for work on this file. There was not enough money left for her to attend a final working group meeting in this fiscal year. Her proposed budget would cover the costs only for her participation in three working group meetings in Yellowknife.

3. Board and Executive Director ACCWM/caribou management costs for work on the same caribou management file. She noted that the board used both Working Group project funds and General Operating funds in 2015/2016. She presented the breakdown for expenditures for these activities and suggested a budget for the upcoming fiscal year. The board would need to decide whether to use G/O or WSF funds (in part) for this work in 2016/2017.

Kristen answered a question about where she thought the work load was headed on this file. She noted that in the short term there will be working group activities to completing the action plans and then Board and ACCWM work to approve them. After that the focus will shift to implementation, which will also require more work and will depend on what is prioritized, so she found it difficult to say. Her proposed budget for board work in 2016/2017 is for 2,000 less than was expended in the current fiscal year.

Q. WSF Proposal “Youth & Communications” -Amy Amos, GRRB

Amy reviewed the budget and workload of the youth and communications work of the GRRB on this item. It includes school visits, newsletter editing and some costs of the calendar production. Board questions to Amy related to in-kind costs and Amy explained that work of the GRRB staff on these items is in-kind and not included in the proposal budget. She also noted that the editing of the newsletter and calendar are contracted items.

Departure of the RRCs and public from the meeting

The RRC representatives decided to leave at 4pm as the Day 2 agenda items had concluded. They were welcomed to attend day 3, but were not required. Other members of the public also left the meeting at this point. The board stayed to continue moving through the agenda:

R. Finance Committee

Review & approval of Terms of Reference

Amy reviewed the draft terms of reference (TOR) of the finance committee on screen with the board. The Board discussed impacts of the TOR being legally binding and the potential ramifications of this in possible situations when the committee or staff might not meet all the terms as capacity issues, schedule changes, board appointments and other items as might arise. Additional concerns were raised about the qualifications needed to serve on the committee as described in the TOR and desire not to be restrictive. After initial discussion about such concerns, the board undertook edits of the document, working with Amy who made the revisions and edits on screen as the board discussed and agreed to them.

Amy related the intent of the committee, the recommendations of the auditors, and the requirements of presenting financial information to the board for review. The board then had additional discussion about the role and responsibilities of the committee and the roles of the board and staff. Eugene quoted from the GCLCA (12.8.11b.) relating to the board’s ability to set by-laws and to form planning committees and delegation of duties, in addition to the fixing of

quorum. The board then had some more discussion and then made the following motions:

Motion for the GRRB to create a finance committee to advise it on financial matters.		Motion GRRB 16-08
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Motion to approve the Terms of Reference of the Finance Committee.		Motion GRRB 16-09
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

The discussion on this item concluded at 5:38PM when the meeting was adjourned for the day by Eugene.

DAY 3 Thursday, February 25, 2016 Capital Suites boardroom

Meeting called to order at 8:57AM by Eugene.

R. Finance Committee, Continued.

Selection of Committee members

The board discussed membership of its finance committee. Members expressing interest are Burt, Bobbie Jo and Doug and other members will be asked if they are also interested. Committee membership is maximum 3.

Action Item 16-11: Amy to get names of board members interested in joining the finance committee, to send email with all names interested and membership to be decided following board response.

Review & approval of new socially responsible investment policy statement

Amy presented the draft motion for board review as well as the current and proposed investment policy statements. The board discussed how the policy would be applied by the RBC investment managers. Investments which do not meet the policy criteria would be caught in screening based on the policy and potentially sold when/if economically feasible to do, to allow the board to move away from those that don't meet the criteria over time. The board discussed whether it would be wise to say something in writing about changes being made with due regard for market conditions in order to protect the Boards funds. **(get full correct motion wording from Amy for motion below.**

Motion to adopt the Socially Responsible Investment Policy for the GRRB.		Motion GRRB 16-10
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

The board next discussed the appointment of auditor for the GRRB's books for 2015-2016. The current auditor has been Paul Teoh, Chartered Accountants. There have been no problems in their work for the GRRB to date.

Motion to appoint Paul Teoh, Chartered Accountants as the GRRB auditor.		Motion GRRB 16-11
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

S. Review & approval of safety policy -Amy Amos, GRRB

Amy noted that the board does not currently have a safety policy although there are some items addressed in its operating procedures. She noted that the policy does not yet include a job risk analysis as that has been pulled at this time for additional work after staff comments. Amy reviewed comments given on the safety policy in the electronic version of the document on screen with the board. Specific sections in which there was additional board discussion and new policy edits were: personal protective equipment; emergency contact equipment; boat use; and ice auger use.

Action Item 16-12: Amy to add to field project planning procedures that employees must consider what protective equipment will likely be required and let the Executive Director know in order for assessments of what is “required” and “reasonable” to be made.

Approval of the Safety Policy

Amy discussed with staff and board how the sections were created for the policy and what was relegated to the job risk analysis for further work. The board then discussed when to implement and approve the policy if staff had not yet had a full review of the document. Amy noted that this is version 9 of the document and it has been in process for about 1.5 years. The board noted that amendments can be made with additional review but that it would be good to have something in place.

Motion to adopt the safety policy for the GRRB (version 9) and to make it subject to further review.		Motion GRRB 16-12
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Doug Doan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Motion to go in-camera		Motion GRRB 16-13
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

IN CAMERA SESSION

T. Board and Staff Session

Eugene invited the staff to join the board in-camera for a board and staff session.

U. In-Camera

GRRB staff departed and Board members discussed additional in-camera items

Motion to go out-of camera at 4:38PM		Motion GRRB 16-14
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

V. Business Arising

Motions & actions arising from the in-camera session:

Motion to approve a total withdrawal of \$79,000 from the RBC Wildlife Studies Fund account.		Motion GRRB 16-15
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Motion to approve the Wildlife Studies Fund allocations as described in “GRRB approved column” of the 2016-2017 allocation table for a total of \$79,000.		Motion GRRB 16-16
Moved by: Bobbi Jo Greenland-Morgan	Seconded by: Ron Allen	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Motion to approve the changes to the Personnel Policy in the Operating Procedures Manual as discussed.		Motion GRRB 16-17
Moved by: Bobbi Jo Greenland-Morgan	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Motion to establish a policy subcommittee		Motion GRRB 16-18
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Doug Doan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Ron Allen noted that he is interested in joining the policy subcommittee

Add to 16-11: Amy to ask about board interest in joining the policy subcommittee in same email as for finance committee.

Action item 16-13: Amy to make changes to the Personnel policy section of the Operating Procedures Manual, as approved.

Action item 16-14: Executive Director to review pay scale of staff and report back by next face to face meeting.

Action item 16-15: Executive Director to write to AANDC to give notice of the salary review

Action item 16-16: Doug and Eugene to work with lawyer to review Executive Director's employment contract and to update as soon as possible.

Action item 16-17: Board Policy Subcommittee to include review of Executive Director moving into Executive level management with respect to how time is accumulated and to report back by the fall meeting.

Action item 16-18: if a hearing is undertaken in Yellowknife, to try to have a GRRB representative present

W. Budget & Work plan

Amy led the board through a review and discussion of the operating budget and work plan for the upcoming fiscal year.

Motion to approve the 2016-2017 operating budget and work plan.		Motion GRRB 16-19
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Bobbi Jo Greenland-Morgan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

X. Closing remarks

Tentative fall meeting dates were determined to be either the week of Sept 27-28, 2016 or the week of Oct 4-5, 2016.

Action item 16-19: Amy to confirm fall meeting dates with board via email and telephone.

Motion to adjourn the winter 2016 Board meeting at 5:07PM		Motion GRRB 16-20
Moved by: Ron Allen	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Summary of Action Items

#.	Action Item	Who
16-01	(To drop action 09-47 from outstanding action list and create a new action item): to defer consideration of a multiyear GRRB report until 2018. At that time, the Board will consider the utility of an official report reviewing the board's work over time since the 10 year report. If agreed to in 2018, this would be for publication in 2020.	Amy
16-02	Amy to follow up with the board by teleconference to give more financial information to help with planning and decisions on holding a research priority workshop and the scheduling of such a workshop in 2016.	Amy
16-03	To get clarity on the GCLCA section 12.6.4 by seeking a legal opinion on interpretation of this section, the board's roles and responsibility for management of "Bluenose" caribou, and done so in light of management actions taken and underway since the GCLCA was signed . (NOTE THAT IT SEEMED AS THOUGH THE BOARD WANTS LEGAL CLARITY HERE, BUT DID NOT EXPRESSLY REQUEST A LEGAL OPINION. IS THIS AN ACTION ITEM? Perhaps an additional action or instead it is to get a quote on the cost for a legal opinion?)	? Amy?
16-04	For Eugene to engage with GTC on the issue of roles and responsibilities for the GRRB and GTC in the management of "Bluenose caribou", possibly including attending and presenting to GTC on this in March.	Eugene
16-05	After the passing of relevant deadlines, for the Board to send a letter to the SRRB regarding the commitments made at the joint meeting (Nov 2015), and that the GRRB is awaiting the information committed to being shared (e.g. harvest levels etc...).	Eugene/Amy
16-06	Amy to visit the RRCs to review RRC roles and responsibilities, along with review of outstanding action items (review of GBMA and enforcement in Wildlife Act; Special Harvesting License and the legal opinion).	Amy
16-07	Janet to assemble reports from past research from the ARI system and supply those to the RRCs.	Janet
16-08	Board to send a letter to GTC regarding the need for funding assistance to collect Porcupine caribou harvest data.	
16-09	Amy to request funding assistance from ENR for the harvest study program.	Amy
16-10	GRRB to help advertise Jeremy's project and the need for carcasses on the GRRB facebook page and website. Jeremy to send ad as a jpeg for posting.	Jeremy/Amy
16-11	Amy to get names of board members interested in joining the finance committee and policy sub-committee, to send email with all names interested and membership to be decided following board response.	Amy
16-12	Amy to add to field project planning procedures that employees must consider what protective equipment will likely be required and let the Executive Director know in order for assessments of what is "required" and "reasonable" to be made.	Amy
16-13	Amy to make changes to the Personnel policy section of the Operating Procedures Manual, as approved.	Amy
16-14	Executive Director to review pay scale of staff and report back by next face to face meeting.	Amy
16-15	Executive Director to write to AANDC to give notice of the salary review	Amy
16-16	Doug and Eugene to work with lawyer to review Executive Director's employment contract and to update as soon as possible. update the contract or update the board?	Doug & Eugene
16-17	Board Policy Subcommittee to include review of Executive Director moving into Executive level management with respect to how time is accumulated and to report back by the fall meeting.	Policy subcommittee
16-18	If a hearing is undertaken in Yellowknife, to try to have a GRRB representative present -at caribou hearing? (specific to CB/BNW/BNE caribou only?)	Amy
16-19	Amy to confirm fall meeting dates with board via email and telephone.	Amy

Summary of Motions

Motion #	Motion	Mover	Second
GRRB 16-01	Motion to adopt the February 23-25, 2016 meeting agenda	Ron Allen	Doug Doan
GRRB 16-02	Motion to accept the October 6 th -8 th minutes summary with the corrections discussed.	Ron Allen	Doug Doan
GRRB 16-03	Motion to accept the October 29, 2015 teleconference minutes.	Doug Doan	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan
GRRB 16-04	Motion to accept the December 17, 2015 teleconference minutes	Doug Doan	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-05	Motion to support the amendments made to the ACCWM MOU and Correspondence Procedure	Ron Allen	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-06	Motion to send a letter to the Minister (GNWT) to address the BNW GRRB concerns specifically and to copy that letter to members of the ACCWM	Burt Hunt	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan
GRRB 16-07	Motion to send a letter to WMAC NWT and the GNWT, copying the letter also to parties of the ACCWM, encompassing concerns about the Cape Bathurst herd zone boundary change as expressed in the table and reiterating the Board's recommendation to the ACCWM that this herd be assessed as Red status.	Ron Allen	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-08	Motion for the GRRB to create a finance committee to advise it on financial matters.	Burt Hunt	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan
GRRB 16-09	Motion to approve the Terms of Reference of the Finance Committee.	Doug Doan	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan
GRRB 16-10	Motion to adopt the Socially Responsible Investment Policy for the GRRB.	Burt Hunt	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan
GRRB 16-11	Motion to appoint Paul Teoh, Chartered Accountants as the GRRB auditor.	Ron Allen	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan
GRRB 16-12	Motion to adopt the safety policy for the GRRB (version 9) and to make it subject to further review.	Burt Hunt	Doug Doan
GRRB 16-13	Motion to go in-camera	Ron Allen	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-14	Motion to go out-of camera at 4:38PM	Doug Doan	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-15	Motion to approve a total withdrawal of \$79,000 from the RBC wildlife studies fund account.	Doug Doan	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-16	Motion to approve the Wildlife Studies Fund allocations as described in "GRRB approved column" of the 2016-2017 allocation table for a total of \$79,000.	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan	Ron Allen
GRRB 16-17	Motion to approve the changes to the Personnel Policy in the Operating Procedures Manual as discussed.	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-18	Motion to establish a policy subcommittee.	Ron Allen	Doug Doan
GRRB 16-19	Motion to approve the Operating Budget and work plan as presented	Burt Hunt	Bobbie Jo Greenland-Morgan
GRRB 16-20	Motion to adjourn the winter 2016 Board meeting at 5:07PM	Ron Allen	Burt Hunt

Meeting Participants

Attendance-Day 1(Feb 23)

Board members: Eugene Pascal, Doug Doan, Ron Allen, Burt Hunt, Bobbi Jo Greenland-Morgan

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

Public: Fanny Greenland (ERRC), Anna May MacLeod (GGRRRC), John Norbert (GGRC), Mary Rose Tetlichich (TRRC), Neil Firth (NRRRC), Jeremy Brammer (McGill Univ.), Tracy Davison (ENR); after lunch Garth Greskiw (GTC) and Larry Dow (DFO) joined the morning participants for part of the afternoon session.

Attendance-Day 2(Feb 24)

Board members: Eugene Pascal, Doug Doan, Ron Allen, Burt Hunt, Bobbi Jo Greenland-Morgan

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

Public: Fanny Greenland (ERRC), Curtis Illasiak, Anna May MacLeod (GGRRRC), John Norbert (GGRC), Mary Rose Tetlichich (TRRC), Neil Firth (NRRRC), Jeremy Brammer (McGill Univ.), plus new afternoon participants: Tracy Davison (ENR), Stephen Charlie (ENR), Garth Greskew (GTC).

Attendance-Day 3(Feb 24)

Board members: Eugene Pascal, Doug Doan, Ron Allen, Burt Hunt, Bobbi Jo Greenland-Morgan

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

Public: None attended