



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board

Oct 5 & 6, 2016 Inuvik, NT - Meeting Minutes

Contents

DAY 1 Wednesday, Oct 5, 2016.....	3
1. Introductions.....	3
2. Agenda	3
3. Review and approval of draft minutes & Action Items	3
4. Reports.....	4
a. Chairperson Report	4
b. Member reports.....	4
c. Executive Director report	6
d. Agency Reports (Highlights only)	6
i. ENR report.....	6
ii. DFO report.....	8
iii. GTC report.....	8
e. Staff Reports.....	9
5. NWT Species at Risk Act.....	9
6. Fisheries Act changes -	11
7. Caribou discussions	21
a. Porcupine Caribou herd	21
i. PCMB “Trade-Sale-Barter Guidelines”	21
ii. Communication Messaging	24
b. Cape Bathurst, Bluenose West and Bluenose East caribou herds.....	24
i. Prioritization of Action Items	24
ii. Preparation for annual ACCWM meeting.....	25
DAY 2 Thursday, October 6, 2016	30
8. Resident Moose Hunting Regulations	30
Special Harvesting Areas	35
9. Grizzly Bear Management.....	37
10. RRC Session-Open Discussion between RRCs and GRRB.....	42
11. Interim Research Priorities.....	45
12. Business Arising -Motions and action arising from the in-camera session	47
13. Closing remarks.....	47
Summary of Action Items.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Summary of Motions.....	48
Meeting Participants	49



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board

Oct 5 & 6, 2016 Inuvik, NT - Meeting Minutes

DAY 1 Wednesday, Oct 5, 2016

Chief Niditchie School Gymnasium, Tsiigehtchic

1. Introductions

Opening prayer by Anna May McLeod.

Eugene Pascal, Board chair, could not attend and sent his regrets. The Board nominated Jozef and Johnny to help chair the meeting.

Motion to nominate Jozef Carnogursky as meeting chairperson for October 5th and Johnny Charlie as meeting chairperson for October 6 th .		Motion GRRB 16-32
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Doug Doan	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Call to order Jozef Carnogursky called the meeting to order at 9:45AM and gave opening remarks.

Round table Participants and board members introduced themselves.

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

2. Agenda

Members reviewed the agenda.

Motion to adopt the October 5 & 6, 2016 meeting agenda.		Motion GRRB 16-33
Moved by: Cindy Allen	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

3. Review and approval of draft minutes & Action Items

Feb 22-24, Inuvik Meeting

The board reviewed the minutes from the February in-person Board meeting and two teleconferences of the Board on May 17 and July 27, 2015.

Comments on the Feb 22-24, 2016 minutes:

Doug Doan: Page 6 –In the minutes, there is a highlighted question about board wanting legal clarity or not. Action item 16-03, re GCLCA section 12.6.4. Is that an action? Amy answered that it was an action and the GRRB is awaiting a response from the Willms & Shier Environmental Law office.

Motion to accept the Feb 22-24, 2016 meeting minutes.		Motion GRRB 16-34
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Johnny Charlie	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Comments on the May 17, 2016, Teleconference:

Cindy Allen: Cindy was not listed as attending that teleconference and should be added as attending

Burt: Note in the minutes, need to put in the date of the motion 2016-23 during #7 Committee updates

Motion to accept the May 17 teleconference minutes with the changes discussed.		Motion GRRB 16-35
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Cindy Allen	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Comments on the July 27, 2016, Teleconference:

Burt noted that there was a question about the local name of the Red-necked Phalarope was in the minutes (top of pg 3). Need to find the local Gwich'in name of this bird species to add to the minutes so that anyone reading it could understand which bird species was being discussed. Kaytlin noted that she has not yet been able to find it in current

records, but noted that a recent call had thought there was not a Gwich'in name for it. She will contact the RRCs to inquire further.

ACTION ITEM 16-34: Kaytlin to inquire with RRCs and the Language Center to see if there is a Gwich'in name for the Red-Necked Phalarope that can be added to the minutes of the July 27, 2016 GRRB teleconference call.

Motion to accept the July 27, 2016 teleconference minutes.		Motion GRRB 16-36
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Johnny Charlie	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Action Items

Amy reviewed past action items, noting which actions were completed, in progress or outstanding since the Winter 2016 meeting. All items were included in a table in the meeting binder for this agenda item and were presented onscreen for meeting participants during the review.

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

15-08 Re: GRRB Teleconference to review draft sheep management plan with board. Cindy Allen suggested that it may be good to have the call before the end of October, rather than in early winter 2017, before current board terms are up, so that there is consistency.

16-21 Special harvesting areas –There was a question as to whether the original intention was for these to be only for Gwich'in participants? Some additional language was proposed and needs board review and approval.

Burt Hunt noted that the board should discuss this item during the meeting as the board needs to formalize language regarding Special Harvesting areas and provision for non-participants. With board agreement, Jozef added this item to the meeting agenda item 8 (Moose Resident Hunting Regulations).

16-15 Burt Hunt: Have we heard from AANDC regarding the AANDC follow up on the implementation plan?
Amy: Yes, that will be in my update.

4. Reports

a. Chairperson Report

Eugene's report was provided in the meeting binder.

b. Member reports

Burt Hunt noted that he was asked to go to a Canadian Eco-Toxicity Workshop in Edmonton last week. To save on costs, it made sense for him to attend as there was little funding support provided. One of the segments of it was called *Community Driven Research in the North: Opportunities and Challenges*. Burt spoke to the group at this workshop on the idea of community driven research. Staff helped to provided a presentation for Burt to work from for this. Burt related some of the topics of discussion at the meeting: Mercury contamination in Great Slave Lake, stream monitoring in Sahtu, freshwater and environment monitoring, Slave River & Delta partnership & experiences from community based monitoring in NWT. Burt talked about developing research priorities in the Gwich'in Settlement Area (GSA) and how we funnel concerns of communities and RRCs into the GRRB and then take those ideas and concerns to develop priorities and interests. The presentation seemed to go over really well and there were not many questions. There were 300 participants with 4 presentations concurrent at a time. People are interested in what is happening in the North, so the room was quite full. He probably talked to ~75-100 people.

Amy had also received a request from Elaine Alexie (of Fort McPherson), Knowledge Partnership and Community engagement officer at University of Alberta. Burt met with Elaine at a break and with Roger Epp. He is the overall director of the program at the university. They want to assemble (at early stages now) what a group like ours could contribute. They want to talk about networking in the north. How northern priorities and interests are determined and how the university can be responsive to northern interests and needs. Burt gave back to them some of his presentation

and they talked about development of a Northern Forum, which would have many agencies, including RRBs and others, equivalent to circumpolar meetings, talk about mutual concerns from communities (climate change, industrial projects effects, etc.) He also talked about need for GIS in the north and there are a number of applications for GIS systems that could benefit groups like ours. How it is often done in isolation without a lot of resources to do it right. Software systems may all be different. They could look at GIS of the north, where each and every researcher and agency can get GIS from common source (E.g. all barren ground caribou information in one place.) They asked what our involvement was willing to be. After conversation with Amy, can say that we are willing to talk about this. Need to keep in mind financial restraint and what our resources are. Their impression was that this could be valuable and they could bring resources to the table that we could use. They said they would be meeting with others, and that we may hear more from them going forward.

Cindy Allen gave thanks and appreciation for her 5 years as a board member alternate for GTC. In the last little while she participated on the board teleconferences and in the spring with Bobbie Joe Greenland Morgan and Doug, they were on a subcommittee discussing the office lease and space. Had request for proposals about office space in Inuvik to consider it fairly. Submissions came in and info provided. GRRB has specific needs in the lease. In the end, we decided to continue where the office is (with a new landlord, the Nihtat Gwich'in). A good thing in that office operations were not further disrupted and relationships with other organizations in the building could also continue. This may be Cindy's last report to the GRRB with the approach of the end of her term.

Cindy highlighted things she has initiated or seen accomplished during her term:

-Advocated for Socially Responsible Investment Policy of the GRRB. This policy was discussed and enacted by the GRRB.

-Took lead for GRRB on NVRMA proposed amendments, when Canada insisted on collapsing boards to a Super Board (closing other land and water boards in the NWT). She was at a meeting with Canada and GNWT and others resource boards. Discussion about duty to consult with RRBs. Interconnectedness. Need to discuss and legal duty to consult about this. She advocated for that and secured monies for Canada to consult with the RRBs. She insisted on that. Canada is reviewing and reversing that decision (super-board). Currently GLWB is in place for another year while the new federal government is reviewing past government decisions.

-Advocated and insisted that we needed a Species At Risk Biologist at the GRRB because of all the requests incoming from Canada and GWNT under the SAR legislations. Implementation costing approach. Canada agreed with us. Kaytlin has been with us, as of December for 2 years with an extension. Hoping for permanent funding for this. Did this and advocated for the importance of the position's role to the GRRB-Implementation Planning review –Cindy advocated for a costing approach. Canada should not ignore the Implementation Plan, which was being done for years.

Glad that she was able to help the GRRB and the Gwich'in with these initiatives during her term on the GRRB. Mahsi Cho. She really appreciated her time and involvement here. Will miss coming up here. Hoping for a reappointment, but current term is up in a couple of weeks. Maybe will see you again. Mahsi Cho.

Jozef replied to Cindy: For me as a board member, and knowing our experiences when we only had 2-3 board members and no quorum, the addition of you folks has been a great help. Thank you for that from me.

Johnny Charlie –Was appointed to the GRRB 4 years ago and his term is up soon this year. Johnny thanked the board for the collaborative work being done. He related his plans to go to his camp and do fishing, trapping and hunting. Every fall meeting, the creek opens up and he has to wait to get up. Often there must be detours, so sometimes he can't make it. He described how there has been a change in the number of beavers in his area: his country had few beavers for a while and was dried out but now there are lots of dams and one is 4 feet high. He will be doing some trapping and work on trails to the mountains. Johnny wished all the board and staff luck.

Charlie Snowshoe –Charlie noted that effects of his failing eyesight and hearing are creating difficulties for him. He will be getting help for his ears this next month and for his eyes. He acknowledged the staff and researchers with technical knowledge that are looking into taking care of the animals and the fish, but he highlighted a concern of his that there are certain animals and fish that are decreasing and are disappearing. So he would like to hear more about the muskrats & the rabbits and to know what is being found out. He is also interested to know more about land-based change (climate changes) impacts in the GSA. He had heard news and media reports about charging companies for so much a foot (of development to assist in remediation or offset impacts), but damage is already done. He emphasized that it will be important to consider these topics too. Thank you.

c. Executive Director report

Amy focused on highlights in her written report provided in the binder. She noted that a lot of work has been done by the staff and continues to be done. All of the permanent staff have been here for at least six years and some of them longer than that. (e.g. Kristen since 2009, and up to Kaytlin 2 years ago).

She noted that all funding goals have been met. Teleconferences have been held.

Questions that seem to come up are updates on the board appointments and implementation plan process:

With the implementation plan process, GRRB submitted a detailed submission in 2012. GTC undertook a review of the G Implementation Activity sheets and engaged the GRRB in that process. The update is that there is work being done to complete the forward analysis process by AANDC. Ready for April 2017. They acknowledged that is ambitious goal. Senior advisor was hired to talk with all the board about their submissions. Amy talked with the senior advisor last week. Discussed the board's submission and will update the board further on those discussions.

Board appointments discussion

Amy reviewed the current appointment status of board membership and expiration dates of current positions with new nominations and reappointment status. (Table reviewed onscreen the most recent update from AANDC about board appointments with board showing all positions, vacancies and term dates.)

Burt Hunt: Environment Canada (EC) position vacant. What is that status. No current nomination listed. Run the risk that there is no representation, and if other nominations don't come through would have 6 members and alternates only. Is EC doing or intending to do anything about that nomination?

Amy: I have no information on that.

Burt: At DFO we used to be able to call up to Ottawa to inquire. Is there a contact at EC to ask this of?

Amy: Can try their director. Just have been communicating with AANDC and implementation directorate office.

Burt: May need to push the agency to prompt AANDC to move forward.

Doug Doan: other aspects that we can get into further: Suggesting an opportunity for further discussion as the day goes on.

Cindy Allen: GTC website has nothing on the site about a call for nominations, so am curious about their process also. Would like to be reappointed and is interested in continuing with GRRB. How to communicate that?

Jozef: Amy can follow up with GTC on that

ACTION ITEM 16-35: Amy to inquire with GTC regarding GRRB nomination status and process. How can interested parties advise GTC of interest and where are they in the process?

Doug: Thought I saw a poster in Inuvik asking for people to submit interest.

Grace Blake (GGRRC & Tsii. DGO): That topic should also come up under the RRC section of the agenda. Important to get appointments made on time. I know for self government agreement there is an ability to appoint certain members to public boards but don't know GRRB process or if we have a role in that. Suggest GTC look at that too.

d. Agency Reports (Highlights only)

i. ENR report

Stephen Charlie (Regional Superintendent) recognized the Gwichya Gwich'in for holding the meeting in their traditional territory. Thank you very much. Stephen introduced ENR staff attending (Marsha Branigan, Tracy Davison, Doug Villeneuve). Stephen spoke regarding highlights of the written update provided to the GRRB and focused on the wildlife update provided by Marsha and a forestry update provided by Martin Callaghan.

Forestry report highlighted the number of fires and status of crews this past year. Review and assessment of Values at Risk in the GSA for fire protection continues.

Regional Highlights

-Barren ground caribou Action Plan review with ENR, GRRB and WMAC NWT in October
-Zoning and development and impacts to social and cultural values... X Partnership...Stephen represents GNWT in that partnership. *(did not hear properly for minutes and this was not available in written update to clarify partnership further)*
-Water resource officer has been working with municipal partners to educate on water license process, sampling, licensing, etc. There is a good coordinated effort on this in the GSA. Also working on abandoned sumps and finalizing inspections.
-Environmental Officer continues to monitor spills, soils and remediation in the region. First to respond to James Creek spill (discharge of 6K diesel fuel into creek) Directed clean up operations, notified LWB, TRRB, water drinking advisories. That has since been mediated. -An example of what these officers do (Water and Environmental Officers)
-Field Operations –Wildlife enforcement patrols on highway and Tuktoyaktuk highway. Bear deterrence in communities. - Some concerns about residents harvesting on private lands.
-Concerns about people using the Tuktoyaktuk highway when it is not open. Will be charges laid if using the road without permission. All affected. Not a rights issue, it is a Dept. of Transportation Highway issue, saying no use and shutting the highway. Once that process is done, ENR can assist to inform communities. Both Inuvialuit and Gwich'in. There is no use of the highway currently.

Marsha highlighted items in the Written Wildlife update provided:

- Moose Survey proposed this coming spring.
- Dall's sheep survey next year
- Cape Bathurst, Tuktoyaktuk Peninsula herds recruitment in spring
- continuing to support muskrat research

-Marsha noted a new request of the GRRB: For GRRB consideration, regarding a program initiated to encourage harvesters to take bulls when caribou numbers are low. There was a program put in place for wolves. In the southern NWT trappers can bring a wolf with a hide on it and drop it off and ENR can arrange to have the animal skinned. That person gets the carcass collection price. The person hired to skin it, not the one who trapped it, can put the hide into the fur program. IGC has not supported that idea as they want their own harvesters to deal with it (trapping and skinning). ENR Inuvik needs to reduce what it is taking in to just a few samples. What ENR is looking for is support *not* to initiate that program (of sending in an unskinned carcass for sampling and skinning by ENR) in the Inuvik region. The idea would be to continue to have trappers skin their own wolf and bring the few samples in, rather than ENR doing everything.

ACTION ITEM 16-36: GRRB to respond to ENR regarding direction on wolf sample/carcass collection program. Will GRRB support continuing the current program, accepting samples (which may include carcasses), but not unskinned wolves for skinning and sampling?

Questions and comments to ENR

Anna May McLeod (Tsiigehtchic DGO): Stephen, there was fuel still here in the community down by the station. It never got taken out. Excuse of SAOs didn't know what to do, but there is no excuse. There is smell, and possible contamination. It is near a creek. Believe it leaked into the creek and into the river.

Stephen: I will look before I leave and will give the information to Roland, the Environmental Protection Officer and our Water Resource officer to collect samples.

Anna May McLeod: We need the RRO 1 here to do his job. He needs to be here to give out wood permits to people. Waiting for years for them. We would like to get a map of all the wood permits out there on our land. Where people are trapping, and fishing. We need to understand where people are cutting so we can better manage our land. Gwichya Gwich'in people here are very considerate over our land, which provides for us. We don't want anything to go wrong or for it to be used without respect.

Stephen: I will discuss with Doug, his supervisor, to work with his staff and officer here to ensure that the wood permits are addressed.

Anna May: If the wolves are overpopulating what is plan for the future? If you take the program away, there will be less wolves being killed and more issues will come up.

Marsha: I think there was a misunderstanding. Our program is still in place. What has not been initiated is for our office to receive a carcass that has NOT been skinned. They cannot drop off an un-skinned wolf. It is an option out there. Inuvialuit feel that their harvesters can skin and submit fur under their name, so they don't feel it is needed. We want to know what the GRRB thinks about that one aspect of the program.

Grace Blake question to Stephen:

It is really important to have the ENR officer to be here to get General Harvesting Licenses and Special Harvesting Licenses to work closely with the RRCs. Can we set up a training or workshop for the RRC on the water monitoring? We receive those licenses to review and they are very technical. Need to know how to work with Janet, but they are very detailed. We often get a number of them at the same time. We need time to review those licenses to properly comment and training to understand what to look for in them.

Stephen responded: Doug is taking notes on this regarding service for residents to access GHs and Special Licenses. A training workshop, our water resources officer has put forward a number of times, workshops in communities, for people delivering the program. For the GGRR we would like you to have greater understanding. Our water resources officer can contact you about that. Perhaps the RRC would like to be involved in this too.

ii. DFO report

Kate Snow (DFO Inuvik) noted that the department had shared a summary of conservation and protection activities (patrols and occurrences) in the GSA to date during the current fiscal year. This report was provided in the meeting binder. Kate then highlighted additional activities that DFO Inuvik office has been involved in:

- Rat River Working Group and West Side Working Group meeting in March to manage Dolly Varden Char harvests and the RRCs & HTCs that helped to provide information and participation.
- Communication meeting to update on the char harvests and provide workbooks for monitoring.
- Shingle Point harvest reporting.

Cindy inquired if Kate would be in attendance for the later agenda item about the Fisheries Act presentation later in the day. Kate noted that other staff will be attending. (DFO biologists from Burlington, Ontario will address this item.)

iii. GTC report

Bobbie Jo, GTC president spoke and noted that it has been a while since GTC attended. A report is not prepared, but it is important to be present and attending. Other staff are also here from the GTC. As president, we are looking at building relationships within the GSA as well as outside. We want to strengthen relationships with boards. We understand role and responsibilities of the GRRB. GTC can take a more proactive approach to make sure Gwich'in interests are represented as GRRB is a public board, in its decisions about land and wildlife management. Thank you for providing time on the agenda. Introductions: legal council David Wright, since June. Credit to former leadership for establishing this position.

David Wright introduced himself and thanked Gwich'ya Gwich'in as hosts. Great to be in this meeting and see the work of the GRRB. No shortage of hard quality work. We have been working on opening up channels of communication to get communication and cooperation flowing. We respect GRRB as an independent body and are looking forward to opening up further dialogue with GRRB. Federal government reviewing key natural resource statutes and regulations. Touching on core areas of core GRRB mandate. Looking forward to cooperating with GRRB on that as this unfolds. Still waiting on funding and timelines from federal government. As soon as we know we will communicate with the board and communities more broadly. Jeff Langlois and Claire Truesdale, both legal council to GTC, also in attendance today with us.

David commented after lunch to highlight that Jeff Langlois has been tremendously helpful on the Peel watershed issue and will be leading efforts on intervention going to the Supreme Court.

Jeff gave the GRRB a short overview of the status of that Peel Litigation Process: 2 years ago the court quashed the Peel Land Use plan. The appeal upheld the first court's order, but gave an opportunity for a [...not heard...] plan to be put in

place. The Yukon First Nations have been granted an opportunity to appeal that to the Supreme Court of Canada. GTC is going to seek leave to intervene in that case.

e. 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.

After lunch:

Amy gave words of thanks and appreciation on behalf of the GRRB to Bobbie Jo Morgan, Cindy Allen, Charlie Snowshoe, and Johnny Charlie who have each served terms on the GRRB.

Bobbie Jo was a board member with the GRRB for three years until she began her new job as GTC president. Bobbi Jo spoke thanking the board for that recognition and remarked that it has been a really good experience. She said that the GRRB has a lot of knowledge and the members offer a lot to the board, and that is a matter of pride that the board has such a range of expertise and knowledge. She encouraged the board to continue their good work. She also spoke about the amount of time to do appointments, from the GTC's perspective. She said that the GTC met with federal and territorial representatives regarding implementation and that topic came up. She noted that the GTC needs to get nominations in faster in addition to government nominations and appointments. By working together, they can speed up that process. In the next year or two, she expects that the board should see that improvement. She wrapped up her remarks by noting that her time on the board was a good experience and she looks forward to a continued good working relationship between the GTC and GRRB. She gave thanks to the board and staff for the good job being done by them at the GRRB.

Amy noted that Cindy Allen, & Charlie Snowshoe have been on the board for 2 years. **Johnny Charlie** has been a board member for many years, back to the late 1990s. On behalf of the GRRB, Amy provided gifts and thanks to each of them for their contributions as board members.

5. NWT Species at Risk Act

a. Boreal Caribou-Review and Approval of the NWT Boreal Caribou Recovery Strategy

Kaytlin reviewed her prepared presentation on the Recovery Strategy with the board, noting also the consultation process undertaken and areas where Board and RRC comments had been incorporated and addressed in the strategy. On the whole, the GRRB and RRC comments were addressed in the recovery strategy. She felt that the strategy is a lot stronger now after incorporating and allowing for a longer review process. She recommended that with the RRC support, and her review that the GRRB approve the recovery strategy.

Questions and Discussion

Amy noted that the process going forward that if the GRRB is supportive of the strategy, that this would go next to the Conference of Management Authorities to their upcoming meeting. We can have board members participate on that call (up to three).

Motion to approve the Boreal Caribou Recovery Strategy as presented.		Motion GRRB 16-37
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Cindy Allen	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Archie Norbert made a comment to the GRRB: He says that we don't call it boreal caribou, but call it woodland caribou. In the last few years, the wolves are chasing them and the caribou are coming closer to town. We are concerned about our kids. A wolf killed a dog near town recently. Another thing is the wolf culls: It is needed here around here anyway. I think the population is closer to town and is larger.

Jozef acknowledged other mechanisms in the strategy to deal with wolves as well. How to proceed will come with time. We will do our best to take as many questions and comments from the RRCs and public also. We will have an RRC and public session with the board on the agenda as well.

Louie Cardinal: Does this apply to just the GSA or all over up and down the Mackenzie?

Kaytlin: This is an NWT strategy. There will be range plans specific to the GSA.

Louie Cardinal: is the information being shared through the whole GSA also?

Kaytlin: NWT wide right now.

b. Review and Approval of the NWT Amphibian Management Plan

Kaytlin reviewed the NWT Amphibian Management Plan from her prepared presentation (also provided in the binders) with the board. There are 6 amphibian species in the NWT: Northern leopard frog, boreal chorus frog, wood frog, Canadian toad, western toad and long-toed salamander. The only one in the GSA is the wood frog and it is considered to be in good status. Threats to amphibians are diseases (e.g. fungus and rana virus), habitat loss and degradation, accidental mortality, UVB radiation, pollution, collection, non-native species, & climate change. She noted that the northern leopard frog and the western toad are threatened in the NWT. Threats are common to these species and so management needs are similar. The goal is to maintain a healthy and viable population for each amphibian species across its NWT range. She reviewed the various objectives and approaches to meet the objectives as described in the management plan.

Kaytlin noted that the RRCs have not provided comments on the plan, but have not voiced any concerns about it. She noted that no significant impacts on cultural practises or the exercise of Aboriginal or Treaty rights are expected. She recommended the board approve the management plan.

Questions and Discussion

Cindy Allen had some suggested edits to the plan:

1. When talking about threats. Lines 902-903, pg. 35 of the plan. Habitat loss and fragmentation as a threat. I would add habitat degradation into that list as it is mentioned as a threat in the plan later on.

2. Line 1111-1112 it says for pollution, the final line: *“however large scale agricultural development is unlikely to occur in the northwest territories”* i.e. pesticides and farming impacts to the amphibians. I would add after “is unlikely” at this time, or in the near future. Food security is a big issue in the north and people are growing their own food, so this could become an issue in the future. Especially in the southern part of the NWT.

3. Section 76. The Fibre optic line is mentioned. I had mentioned this before when the Fibre Optic line was being discussed, that the amphibians needed to be considered. The GRRB is concerned with the whole ecosystem, including the frogs and their habitat. Can ENR or anyone else address this? Were there any studies done on the Fibre Optic line to address concerns with amphibians? If there is a knowledge gap and people raised the concern, was the concern addressed in any way?

Jozef: We will have to follow up on the fibre line question later.

ACTION ITEM 16-37: GRRB staff to review fibre optic line plans and associated documents to learn if concerns raised about impacts to amphibians by the line’s installation were addressed or if any studies were pursued in response.

4. Clarification when talking about UVB radiation, to clarify how that works: It is that because the ozone layer is thin, the idea is that the frogs are getting burned (like a sun-burn), but it is very damaging to them. The mechanism of this threat was not immediately apparent in the management plan.

5. What does GRRB staff do to mitigate, monitor or manage effects of diseases? i.e. with equipment or boots, etc... E.g. Could be transporting a virus or disease on waders or boots, if not cleaned properly. I assume they wash their gear and equipment but want more information on that.

Kaytlin: We can definitely develop best management practises for that. Right now we don’t think they are in our area, but good to have proper practises to prevent spread. Will make a note of that.

ACTION ITEM 16-38: GRRB staff to ensure best practises for field work include cleaning gear and equipment to reduce likelihood of transporting viruses or diseases between waterbodies that could impact wildlife, such as amphibians via viruses on uncleaned equipment or waders and boots.

Jozef: some recommended changes: if those changes were accepted, can the board approve the plan if those were made?

Doug: I agree with Cindy's comments, but with the one about agriculture, in the Southern territories, there are a low number of very large agricultural initiatives in the works. The largest egg producer in Canada is in the NWT. They have in the past been efforts in pork and other endeavours at a significant scale. If you are going to modify the wording, may want to make a step back from that.

Burt: or could remove the whole last sentence? "However...is unlikely to occur in the NWT". What if removing it entirely as there is some large scale and there could be some in the future.

Doug: Yes, can eliminate that sentence.

Charlie: I haven't lived on the land in many years. There has been a big change now. Muskrats and rabbits are not as many around. Also mice. I thought I would share that too.

Louie: How will regulations be enforced? Through ENR, GTC, boards?

Kaytlin: With enforcement, because the frog in this area is not at risk, we can only suggest to industries that they follow best practises, but cannot use the SARA. If they are degrading habitat or water quality, then we have other avenues.

Louie: How many are invasive?

Kaytlin: Don't know of any (all are naturally occurring).

The board discussed its position on the management plan and made the following motion:

<p>Motion to approve the NWT Amphibian Management Plan, with the recommendation to make two suggested changes that would improve the plan:</p> <p>Changes are:</p> <p>a. Changing wording of part of a sentence in (line 902), to include habitat degradation as a threat, revising to "habitat loss, disturbance and degradation" and</p> <p>b. removing the sentence (Line 1111) about large scale agriculture being unlikely to occur in NWT.</p>		<p>Motion GRRB 16-38</p>
Moved by: Doug Doan	Seconded by: Cindy Allen	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Moment of Silence for Agnes Neyando:

Grace Blake noted that Agnes Neyando/Vitrekwa Modest's funeral is being held in Fort McPherson at the time of this meeting. Agnes is related to the Niditchie family in Tsiigehtchic through marriage. Grace led a moment of silence and a prayer with the meeting participants.

6. Fisheries Act changes -

This agenda item was for Fisheries and Oceans Canada staff to review with the GRRB, as a stake holder, changes that had been made to the Fisheries Act in 2012. Ron Allen, GRRB director, joined the meeting by teleconference for this agenda item.

Stephen Haayen and Jennifer Wright introduced themselves and summarized their experience with the department on various files and programs. Jennifer also noted that Transport Canada had supplied her with a handout to pass along for the GRRB. She noted that she couldn't speak to it herself but that the GRRB was welcomed to review it and provide comments to Transport Canada if desired.

ACTION ITEM 16-37: GRRB to review the Transport Canada handout that was supplied to GRRB by DFO staff for potential GRRB comment.

Jennifer took the board through the supplied presentation. The minutes below record questions and discussion as they relate to the topic in general, or as they related to specific slides in the presentation given to the GRRB and included in the meeting binder. Some clarification remarks Jennifer made about text of particular slides may also be noted.

Questions and Discussion

Slide 11, Phases of the Review Process

Kris Maier (GRRB staff): This is pre-engagement for submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans (SCOFO). When will there be a chance to review proposed (new) changes to the Fisheries Act? We don't want a repeat of last time. So can you speak to where in that flowchart DFO will be engaging people? What is the timeline for the process?

Jennifer Wright: Should there be further amendments proposed there will be consultation. In second line on the slide, the first step on flowchart: "Proposals to Address Standing Committee Report Recommendations".

Stephen Haayen: There are also additional slides that speak to that. SCOFO recommendations will be a public document. It is not a government action yet, so we are not sure of our specific actions. That stage Jennifer indicated, will include the consultations. Further slides will show that process.

Slide 10, Scope of the Review

Amy Amos (GRRB staff-E.D.): In the future slides, it may answer this too, but further to Kris' point, in one of your responses you said engagement with aboriginal organizations, but we are a public board not an aboriginal organization, so we wanted to ensure engagement with us fit in there too. I will wait to see in your slides how they also describe the timelines.

General Question

Burt Hunt (GRRB): ...*[Some of Burt's question was not heard properly for the minutes...]* What are we doing today with the process that has been achieved in 2012? Without the process that we now appear to be having... A slew of changes were made in 2012 that turned the Fisheries Act on its head. And now changes have been made but now we are tweaking the changes and inputs?... We are sculpting it more? But changes are done...

Jennifer Wright: Right now we are just engaging to inform everyone and explain the changes so you have the information necessary to provide a submission to SCOFO for them to consider with any comments, concerns, opinions that you would like to provide for them to consider. I can't explain what happened 3 or 4 years ago with that government and the way they proceeded with those changes. I can't speak to that. Right now, the government's mandate is to review the changes and restore.... *[this part was not heard for the minutes]*. That is the mandate the department has been given. This is the time to express any concerns over those changes that were made in 2012 and try and influence any changes going forward.

Burt Hunt (GRRB): That answer opens the door to questions like: If everyone liked what was before better, can we recommend to SCOFO that we go back to what it was before? Now I am confused. We made the monster changes.... That is done. Now we are not talking about big changes now, we are talking about the little stuff...? *[not all of Burt's comments were properly heard for the minutes]*.

Stephen Haayen: Yes, what happened four years ago is a done deal in that we can't change what was done in the past. Justin Trudeau and the other Liberals were sitting in Opposition watching that happen, indigenous groups, NGOs, opposition parties and even former conservative ministers of DFO raised concerns about changes to the act. That mandated an election promise to do a review of the changes to the Fisheries Act, to the Navigation Protection Act, and National Energy Board and Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. So in addition to just talking about if you want it back, we do need to inform first. So this is a dialogue, this isn't a consultation, per say. This is a dialogue. Tell us why-what is wrong now under the current conditions. We also want to inform about maybe what had been improved as not everything is bad. - Maybe- I can't say whether if any of it is bad or good, but I think there were changes that strengthened the act. -So what we want to do is provide an informed decision for you to provide recommendations to the Standing Committee on what to do now.

Jennifer continued her presentation: (Slide 12, Approach to the SCOFI Review Process). All Canadians are encouraged to participate in this process, either as witnesses or by providing written submission to the Standing Committee. Supplemented with engagement with Indigenous groups, via direct discussions with department officials; provinces and territories via Canadian Council of Fisheries and Aquaculture Ministers; and public via online for several weeks, starting next week. Any individual can go online and provide comments. There will also be a workbook for DFO staff as well so that staff can comment on the changes that were made in 2012.

Jennifer reviewed the proposed scope of the review milestones and timelines. To highlight, the SCOFI report to be presented in February 2017 and then the government has 120 days to respond. That will be public.

Slides 17-23, Serious Harm to Fish (Section 35 slides) & Definitions (Section 2), Application of Section 35 and Changes.

Jennifer reviewed the serious harm to fish (section 35): Under the changes, the former sections 32 and 35 were merged into the new section 35. So, 32 was the section dealing with killing of fish by means of fishing and 35 was the harmful alteration, disruption, destruction. Now, the new section 35 reads: "**No person shall carry on any work, undertaking or activity** (this is in bold as this was added) *that results in serious harm to fish (that replaces the had under the old 35) that are part of a commercial, recreational or Aboriginal fishery, or to fish that support such a fishery*".

Under section 2 of the act, serious harm to fish is defined as "*the death of fish...*" (which captures the old section 32) "*...or any permanent alteration to, or destruction of, fish habitat*". Fish habitat taken out of the new 35 but is now covered in the definition of serious harm to fish. Note that the definition of fish did not change at all from the former act to the newly amended act. The definition of fish habitat, the only change was "*any other areas including*" which was added to this definition (as shown underlined on the slide): fish habitat "*means spawning grounds and any other areas, including nursery, rearing, food supply and migration areas, on which fish depend directly or indirectly in order to carry out their life processes*".

Stephen Charlie (ENR): –I see that aboriginal fisheries is in the definition in relation to an organization (slide 21): in the definition it says members (of an Aboriginal organization). Aboriginal fishing rights are incorporated under this aboriginal meaning? So the previous version (of the act), aboriginal organization was added to that?

Jennifer Wright: Yes.

Stephen Charlie: It said aboriginal organization but it didn't say member, in the previous version?

Jennifer: The wording in the third line, "or for purposes set out in land claims agreements", so the wording above should capture any type of aboriginal use for fish purposes.

Kris Maier: I think there is some confusion. He is asking about in the previous version of the Act, how was aboriginal fishery enshrined? Correct? And the change Stephen, was that it wasn't specified, before it was all fish protected, regardless of whether it was fish subject to an aboriginal fishery or not, under the previous act.

Stephen Charlie (ENR): (slide 23) Okay, yes. What I am also getting at here is that I am concerned about the definition of an aboriginal fishery. In some areas land claims are not settled. So going back to the previous slide: "*No person shall carry on any work or activity that results in harm to fish that are part of a commercial, recreational or aboriginal fishery, or to fish that support such a fishery*". It doesn't say member there. However, later, a sentence identifies the necessity of being the member (slide 21) of an aboriginal organization, that (idea) gets to individuals and to their subsistence harvesting rights and that is separate from a fishery undertaken by a member of an aboriginal fishery organization.

Jennifer Wright: To clarify your concern Stephen, is that is it that there will be fish that won't be protected as 35 is currently written, or is your concern about the terminology of organization that is used?

Stephen Charlie: It is the terminology of "organization". Later on in the definition it says harvesting by an aboriginal organization but now it mentions by any of its members. It is not further defined in section 2 there.

Stephen Haayen: I am going to take note of that. That is a good point how that is worded. Lawyers looked at this a lot. They were trying to make sure that it was inclusive of all aboriginal representation. They were thinking organizations or any aboriginal membership covered under organizations, but you are right that not all aboriginal peoples are covered under an organization per say. That would even include the Afisare [*? -not heard clearly for minutes*] First Nation members and Metis, for instance. That is an important point I will write down. It is a very important point. They were trying to get at the first part in the original section for food, social and ceremonial purposes, which gets back to section 35 (*of the constitution*) and constitutional act rights, -in other words highlighting the importance of fisheries to aboriginal peoples in general. Never an intention to focus in only on organization or members of an organization.

Burt Hunt (GRRB): The history of this provision is that -and this is to Kris' point -that they wanted this to be a "used fishery". Picture that in lands across the Canadian arctic. There was an argument that in these places in the far north, there is nobody using the fishery (not commercial, recreational, aboriginal fishery) because there is no one is there, arguably. That was the argument. The old act said that this is fish and fish habitat. So, in other words, if you were a zillion miles or kilometers from anywhere and there was no fishery, it got the very same protection as a place next door to Burlington, Ontario. And that they said that there might be a degree of protection required greater in Burlington than there is in the Canadian arctic, and that is a point of course to be argued, of course. But they wanted there to be a defined fishery there, so it shows the names commercial -with obvious connotations, recreational -easily defined, and aboriginal fishery-that is, there are places in northern Canada where there is not commercial fishery or a recreational fishery but there are local users, here for instance. And so, that is that third category that caught those kinds of fisheries, so this is actually is an improvement in the definition. That was the reason why. They wanted to make sure that there was some *value* – and that again can be argued to the point -that there is some value to a user of the fishery. So they took it out -fish and fish habitat [*not clearly heard for minutes*]-and they took it out and made it to a user fishery -one of those three.

Jennifer Wright: Yes, just to add to that point. The word "is" in all three definitions implies it is an active fishery, being used at that time, whether it is commercial, recreational or aboriginal. That has come up these last few years. Through guidance and policy, we are expanding that to "may be" or "can be". We are not dis-considering it having to be an active fishery by definition here. We have a little bit of – a step further, that it may be or can be used in some point in time, we can afford greater protection.

Kris Maier (GRRB staff): What you just said is about the 5th or 6th different interpretation I have heard from DFO about how aboriginal fisheries was intended to be applied. We were told an aboriginal fishery would apply to any water in a land claim area; that it would apply to any traditional fishery that wasn't being actively pursued; or that it would only be existing fisheries that were being actively pursued. -We've been told a number of things. The solution here is not to tinker with the wording of commercial, recreational or aboriginal fisheries. What we need to do is go back protecting all fish under the Act rather than just the ones that can be subdivided into these categories. We have a number comments in addition to what we have provided already.

Jennifer: Thank you. We made a note of the comment, and I encourage you to include that in your submission.

Slides 23-30 presented: Application of Section 35; How has Section 35 Changed?; Section 35 Authorization; Section 6 factors Slide –this is new under the act. All four must be considered by the Minister before authorizing or refusing to authorize a project; Purpose of the act (section 6.1); Fish Passage and Flow (sections 20-21); Regulatory Authorities (section 43); Compliance and Protection (sections 37-39) some new conditions: enforceable conditions, duty to notify (everyone has the duty to notify the department if they feel serious harm to fish may be occurring), duty to take corrective measures (by the proponent), powers of fishery officers -expanded powers to direct and order under section 35 of the act; Compliance and Protection (section 40) –penalties increased and fines to Environmental damages fund

Slide 30, Compliance and Protection (Section 40)

Doug Doan (GRRB): Regarding the Environmental Damages Fund, it seems to me that over a period of time, there could be a significant amount of capital accumulated. What is the other side of the coin in terms of the government's use of that capital to deal with and enhance conservation and fisheries protection?

Jennifer Wright: I don't know entirely. We have had only one charge in the last three years, currently going through the courts, under that section of the act.

Doug Doan: To give you a bit of context for my question, and this relates back to Burt's comment about diamond mines. There is a traditional aboriginal fishery in [*not heard*] lake, albeit traditional and not widely subscribed to. The aboriginal groups proposed that some of the funding for creating habitat be used in alternate lakes that were actually supporting aboriginal fisheries, but that wasn't permitted. The guidelines or regulations governing use of that money did not allow for a great deal of public input on how that should be done.

Jennifer: Was the source of that money through offenses or via fines and penalties, or was that through requirements to offset or compensate?

Doug: It was offsetting

Jennifer: I can't speak to that particular project, but they would have to meet the requirements of offset policy we have now. I am not sure how that would have affected that project. This money is set out to go to enhancing and restoration projects so it is possible that it could go to areas like you say.

Stephen Haayen: I have been in contact with IEC about applications to that fund. They will fund people who may also be looking for funds through other Species at Risk funding programs. So, it is actually an application process for that capital. People put together proposals on some work they wish to undertake and it goes through a review and contribution agreement process. In regards to the offsetting, we cannot speak to the specific conditions of offsetting, but if it was a case of hatchery productions of fish, it would not meet an offsetting requirement in terms of improving the long term sustainability of a fishery, but would provide for a nice [*not heard*] fishery for one or two seasons; that might have had something to do with it but I don't know particulars of that file. One of the particulars of offsetting, is that they want to see some growth in the sustainability of the fishery at the end of the day when doing an authorization.

Burt Hunt (GRRB): And, contrary to what I think you are saying, if you actually did [*not heard*]... If you displaced habitat, and you can be authorized to do that, then you would be expected, as part of the authorization, to replace plus, that displaced habitat. So, you could try to regionalize that. So that if you were in a certain part of the world, you wouldn't have money collected in Saskatchewan go to Ontario,and the authorization felt that... the authorization for that particular project and that particular vicinity and the work would be done in that vicinity for the benefit of those users.

Jennifer: Yes, that is correct. That was under the former act for offsetting. That is how we look at offsetting requirements today. We prefer like for like in the vicinity of the project. We prefer targeting species that are going to lose habitat; we want habitat improved or recreated for those species. That is always our first preference.

Archie Norbert (public): Re: Development- I was here when seismic started years ago. They obstructed a lot of waterways a long time ago and fish were cut off from spawning grounds – (development) cut off creeks from rivers. It would be good if some of that money could be used to open up where seismic lines filled in creeks and cut off fish movements. Beavers are also making dams and cutting off additional waterways. Another thing: we are lucky right now, climate change and effects on fish migration and stuff like that - we used to finish ice fishing in September when I was a kid. Now we finish ice fishing in middle of November. So as climate changes continues, what will we do about our ice fishing? This is all part of my concerns. Now maybe we will fish with boats all winter. Need to consider about climate change also when we make new laws. Climate change is really affecting us. Also the seismic lines cutting off fish spawning routes. This is still affecting us.

Jennifer: Thank you, we have taken your comments down.

General Remarks

David Wright (public, GTC legal staff): Several of us from the GTC need to head back to Inuvik. I wanted to thank you Jennifer and Stephen for coming out. Some of what you are seeing here is what happens when consultation and

deliberation about legislative reforms is not done properly, which was certainly the case in 2012 when this was pushed through. I think what you are also seeing is that the GTC and the co-management boards will have slightly different but complementary views. The consultative processes are designed [...] -I think you are probably hearing that it is important to hear both of those two different voices and listen to them. They are distinct: the GRRB is a public institution while the GTC is an aboriginal organization. I encourage you to repeat that back in Burlington and if you are in touch with Transport Canada to do that as well. Finally, my third point is on funding: we still have not heard anything on funding and I think you have heard from a number of organizations and groups and some lawyers about the uncertainty in that area. Coming to communities like this is tremendously valuable, as you are hearing, and funding is critical in order to do that. In order to be here, let alone have these meetings to have engagement and capacity building in the community. I wanted to hammer that point home. Thanks again.

Grace Blake (DGO/GGRRB): I am happy that the Fisheries Act will be reviewed again. For us the local people, we need to have input into that. I have not felt good about head office for this fisheries department being in Winnipeg. It is so far away from us. The department seems to be set up for commercial activity of businesses as opposed to looking at the common person making a living from the fish, as in our communities. We do that all summer, from spring, right into fall. Right into late October or early November, and in the winter on the lake ice. I have a problem with Fisheries (and Oceans Canada), because it is not devolved to GNWT; it is at arms length. The office in Inuvik has one person for whole Beaufort Delta but focuses on the ocean because of activity there. It is crucial that we find out how the department can best work with the local people as opposed to being in opposition to the local people. It is our livelihood. We eat fish. It is really fundamental to understand the Fisheries Act and how we as Canadians and aboriginal people have our voice heard and have a say in this legislation, not in a punitive way, but how to work with aboriginal people.

Our Traditional Knowledge (TK) also needs to be taken into consideration. I doubt it is taken into account as it is federal. We say in the north that we want everything to be based on TK and the knowledge of the elders. That should be taken into consideration as a recommendation. Like for activities and business activities on the river where the eddies are being affected, who is monitoring that? Who is working with the communities about that, that making sure it is not interfering with the day to day livelihood of the local people? I say that because the ferry operations have a water license that allows them to put granular material into the river to build up the approaches. That washes down, affecting the original fishing eddies. Some places people cannot set nets now as a result of that but the Department of Transportation does not understand us. So how do we as local people have a voice when we are up against operations like that? Not to be against, but how do they understand our tradition and values and culture? That comes before any kind of a business operation. So, we need to be taken very seriously as people that live off the land, and the water. I am interested to see how we can work through the Fisheries Act and how it comes down to us so far away from the department. Why do they only have one person in Inuvik?

Stephen Haayen: Thank you for your comments. Ron Allen is also on the phone and Burt (with history of DFO) is here and they remember when we used to have a district manager up in Inuvik. And yes, we had more people in days gone by. That is something that David, and Amy and Kris and members on the board will be talking about, because that is all associated with those changes that have arisen since 2012. Not all of the changes are due to the legislation but some are due to the ways that the government and the department as a whole has decided to deliver federal programs. So, but I thank you very much. They do mention aboriginal Traditional Knowledge as a consideration in our policy document. That is somewhat of an improvement. You are right, and I agree with you that the integration of local knowledge and working in close contact with the local communities is so extremely important. Thank you so much for sharing your comments.

Charlie Snowshoe [Elder/GRRB board member]: I can hear Grace talking but I cannot hear you Stephen. I am glad Grace brought this up. My question is how did this Fisheries Act come about? It sounds to me like commercial fishing [...*is the focus?..not heard clearly*]. This sounds funny for me. I let you know that what Grace is saying is true. [...Eugene, our chairman...*not heard*]. My question, where I am going, is that when I hear you talking, is that the Fisheries Act and you [...*not heard*] ...I heard at one time even though the history of the Act is back from the 1780s when Great Slave Lake had a commercial fishery in there and they had a problem. And that is when the Fishing Act started. So the question I have is does this fishing act mean us too? People that fish for themselves? What Grace is saying is true, that is what we are all saying. We take care of the land and water and what is in the water. The Fisheries Act is made by the government. Only now are you talking about consulting. What the heck is that? Sounds crazy for me. Technical knowledge is going nuts. Keeps you guys away from talking to us. Why is the Fisheries Act made? For Who? For me? Or for commercial interests? [*note, some comments not heard for minutes*].

Stephen Haayen: A quick response on that, as your opinion is worth hearing. Originally, there was a patronizing approach. There was a focus on the Fisheries Act initially for the settlers in Canada. Now, we are only here talking about very specific parts of the Fisheries Act, not the fisheries licenses, quotas or NWT regulations around fishing. My understanding, not knowing details—the lawyers in the room can speak to that, is that the Gwich'in Comprehensive Land Claim Agreement would have the information that would reflect the population in the GSA. I have taken note of your views and there is always room for improvement. The Fisheries Act and every other piece of legislation in Canada should reflect needs of all population of Canada, and including in your area. In the lands settlement areas there is additional expectation, because of the specific divisions of government.

Charlie: Another question I ask is that we have a land claim. And in it, it states that we have land use planning that protects. [...*not heard* ...]. We have our own land claim agreement. Do we need the Fisheries Act? The government made the act, but we are the government now, the first nation government under the land claim. That is a question I have.

Stephen Haayen: I can't honestly answer that question. I have met with many indigenous organizations in Ontario, not so many out here yet. Some organizations, some First Nations have said we have no rights to manage their fisheries. That is an internal position so I can't respond to that. That is for the people in the GSA to decide how they want to deal with that during their land claim negotiations.

Jennifer resumed her presentation, going through the following topics on each slide:

Fisheries Protection Program Review—DFO, the program now has 16 offices in 6 regions. The regions have not changed, but number of offices have been reduced: in the Central and Arctic region alone. Have gone down from 19 to 6 offices. We have offices in Yellowknife, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Regina, Burlington and also a small office in Iqaluit that have fisheries protection program staff.

Organizational Structure—Regulatory Review; Fisheries Protection Policy Statement; Five principles outlined in the policy; Serious harm to fish; Policy Interpretation of Serious Harm to Fish; Projects near Water Website; Review and Decision Making Process;

Assessment of Effects—note that offsetting is a recommendation under the current act, but could not do this previously;

Ministerial Authorization under Paragraph 35(2)(b);

Fisheries Productivity Investment Policy—a new policy, a guidance document for proponents;

Ways to provide your views—direct input; direct engagement with DFO, information sharing on online tool;

Expected Timelines Slide—now in final engagement phase and then SOFO reviewing what they received and providing report to government by end February with 120 days to respond, and then development proposed changes and then consultation;

For More Information—link to visit for comments, and regional contacts;

Jennifer noted that additional handouts will probably come in the next week or two. Stephen noted that GRRB staff have Stephen's email address and can share it if requested.

Additional Questions and Comments

Charlie Snowshoe (GRRB): A background history of what happened in the past. We didn't understand in the past. We didn't have much development activity in our area. All of a sudden oil and gas came in. They were doing seismic work, dynamiting. They made bridges and plowed up creeks. Johnny's dad [*Johnny Charlie -GRRB board member and elder*] was hunting muskrats and got to a lake and there were dead fish floating around. These are the things that happen. The Dene and the Metis at the time got together and started working on land use planning. The Inuvialuit said they wanted to dredge Stock Point lake. A young guy said he did not agree with that as it was a known spawning area. They said okay. We talked about spawning areas in our regions. All these things came about. For instance, when we were doing seismic work they were bulldozing right to the ground. Under the land use plan the communities got together and said no more of that and they listened to us. That is where we brought up protecting the land and the fisheries. Thank you.

Burt Hunt (GRRB): I heard 3 things about costs and capacity here today:

1. David Wright mentioned a concern about the ability to actively participate in consultations. [] We are not addressing that cost, but we are assuming that cost. That is a concern.
2. The cost of the review as authorizations come in. You talked about engagement and involvement of groups and users. There is a cost to that. That is large and is a capacity concern. We are concerned about the imposition on our resources and we need support with that.
3. Charlie and Grace commented about fisheries officer presence in the old days. There was sufficient presence to deliver programs. Now there have been changes in the habitat program but also changes to the local capacity of DFO. There is no officer in Inuvik. Charlie mentioned concerns with a bridge outside of town. There is no one to go out and see when there are issues reported under your duty to report. The capacity to work with you and to work with these changes is a big issue. We don't have the resources to do that. Your department is not allocating resources to do that.

Jennifer Haayen: Yes, the closest officer is in Yellowknife.

Cindy Allen (GRRB): Thank you for your presentation and for coming up here to talk to us. We have been on a call with the minister of DFO or DM in the past, and it was not a fruitful discussion. We are glad that you are here for your presentation and to answer our questions and hear our concerns. GRRB will be putting forward a written submission. -I will be recommending that. I have a number of comments and questions now:

1. In the Definitions section, there was a lot of discussion on aboriginal fishery. The definition says "using the fish as food for social or ceremonial purposes or for the purposes as set out in a land claim agreement entered into with an aboriginal organization." What about those aboriginal people who have treaty rights but who do not have a land claim agreement? Is that covered? What is your definition of the land claim?

Stephen Haayen: Under the policy [*not heard*] that that will be covered on. If it is a negotiated modern treaty or even an older treaty, they would be covered. The modern treaties are the land claims settlements. Original treaties go back to the section 32 definitions which is the use of resources for food, social & ceremonial purposes. So it doesn't matter. You don't need to have that treaty right in order, as it is guaranteed under definition of aboriginal.

Cindy: But as currently worded in the definition, there must be the land claim to have an aboriginal fishery. There are people with treaty rights without settled land claims. You don't have that as currently worded. It is not clear. I am making that point.

2. When talking about offsetting and financial assurance for projects that could damage fisheries: what is the financial assurance? What is the amount? Does DFO secure that financial amount up front? In the NWT and other parts of Canada, major projects go ahead, but then they declare bankruptcy and walk away and then there are no funds left to clean up. I am curious about what is the financial assurance that you secure and do you actually secure it?

Jennifer Wright: The regulation I mentioned that has been in force since those amendments were put in force in November, 2013 does make it a requirement for a letter of credit to list that type of financial assurance. It is made out to the Auditor General of Canada and sits with DFO. It is intended to cover the situation as you described (e.g. if proponent leaves a project at any point in time for whatever reason) that letter of credit is meant to cover off the department having to fully implement their offsetting plan, which includes mitigation, contingencies and all the monitoring requirements. Some monitoring requirements for some of the large scale projects go on for years. We have some letters of credit for millions of dollars. We hold those until the proponent's full responsibilities under their letter of authorization are completed. And then we release that letter of credit at the end. Even includes small scale cottage owners who might want to do some small alteration of their shore line. It is for large scale and for small scale. No one is exempt from the letter of credit requirements, except for provincial and territorial crowns - governments and the federal crown. That is in the regulation.

3. So the way I understand how these legislative changes have rolled out: If a fish isn't killed, it is allowed under legislation? The way it is written in the definition, the fish has to be killed. So if a fish is harmed, that is okay? I am wondering about that.

Jennifer Wright: To clarify on the slide, the definition of serious harm under section 35 includes three things: the death of fish, the permanent alteration to, or the destruction of their habitat. Only one of those things needs to happen for the prohibition to apply. So a fish does not have to be killed for section 35 to apply.

Cindy: So temporary alteration or destruction of habitat is allowed? What is permanent? What is temporary destruction or alteration?

Jennifer Wright: The word permanent alteration, I am not sure why they chose that word because when you look up a dictionary definition of permanent, it is pretty clear. But the way it is defined, and this is really an interpretation of the definition within policy-not defined under the act, is any impact to fish or habitat that would limit or diminish the fish's ability to use any of their habitats, as defined under the act, to carry out one or more of their life processes. So, that could be temporary. For example, if a project was ongoing for a number of months, but they couldn't avoid the time when fish needed to move through an area or use that area for spawning, that would be more of a temporary impact by what we would consider temporary. But, it would fall under permanent alteration and that would be an impact that we would consider authorizing even though it is not permanent being more of what we would think of as a destruction of habitat.

Burt: An unfortunate choice of words.

Jennifer Wright: Yes, I don't know why they went to "permanent". Before it was "harmful". We had no problem with "harmful".

4. Regarding regulatory authorities under section 43, they can be established and there is a long list. One of the ones I am wondering about is: There is the delegation of regulation for section 35 decision making under the Fisheries Act. I have asked this previously of two DFO officials: does that mean that authority can be delegated to the Gwich'in? They are becoming self governing. They are a land claim organizations and have aboriginal rights to fish and hunt and carry on traditional activities. Can they possibly, working with the GRRB if everything lined up, can the Gwich'in manage the fishery? Can they do section 35 authorizations?

Jennifer Wright: I can answer that question in part: Right now under that last bullet point (*on the slide*)-Delegation through regulation, that has not been done with anyone in the last three years. -No province or territory or any organization. What has been done are two MOUs in place, one with the National Energy Board and another with the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. And what those MOUs are about is that how they can do the front-end review on behalf of the department. E.g. So when CNSC reviews licensing facilities and applications, they will look at whether or not by licensing, or the facilities' impact on fish would contravene section 35. So they do the front-end review for us under the MOU. They have not been delegated any authority under the regulations, but that would be an example of what could happen, possibly, down the road. If the department wanted to go that route. I cannot speak to whether a group like yourselves would be considered. That is something you can place in your submission and comment on.

Cindy: I was asking because you have been hearing all the Gwich'in people talking about how important their fisheries are and decisions are being made in the south without any understanding of how aboriginal northern fisheries work. So, it might make sense if the delegation and management comes north to the people actually using that fishery.

Louie Cardinal (public): Will this be for big companies in the GSA, that affect the waterways? Will this be run by them before hand before they start a project?

Jennifer: To clarify, will future amendments be run by industry?

Louie: Yes, for on Gwich'in land.

Stephen Haayen: After the amendments, implementation of the Fisheries Act is for everyone. The biggest to smallest of organizations. Or even just Joe Smith rebuilding his dock.

Louie: Locally people will talk to you if you are mismanaging, and then we talk to community and then the GTC.

Stephen Haayen: We cannot comment on the management of the fishery. We are only looking at the areas of the Fisheries Act that have changed. The management rules haven't changed. As far as the rules go about permits and things like that, they still have to go through that process with the land and water boards up here as well. There are two levels of oversight and that won't change.

Grace Blake (GGRRRC & DGO): I appreciate this conversation about an MOU possibility with the GTC to delegate some type of regime from DFO to an organization like ours, if it is possible. If DFO agrees with that there should be options for engagement. We are all about networking, and building relationships and working together for a solution. That is why we went in our land claim agreement, such as via a board like this and co-management. We want to see that for fisheries too. We don't have a separate department for fisheries like the Inuvialuit do. We can work with GRRB and GTC to make recommendations and to improve our subsistence living. I am all for putting your definitions clearly stated, not only aboriginal fisheries but aboriginal persons, to really define the local people, as I mentioned before. That is one of the significant points made by Stephen Charlie about the definition of aboriginal fisheries and membership of organizations. Need to consider the local people that fish for a living.

Kris Maier (GRRB staff): I will try to be brief. See the Mandate Slide -The board has already submitted comments regarding changes to the Act, but I have a number of comments drawing from those, so if the board wishes, they might be considered board supported:

1. Regarding Burt's comments, one recommendation from GRRB may be to return to pre-2012 Fisheries Act. If that happened, would that be a one and done, because there were still changes needed at that time. If that is a recommendation, would there be a chance to re-edit the Fisheries Act?

Jennifer Wright: We cannot speculate on how the government is going to take SCOFO's report and recommendations.

2. To follow up on Cindy's remarks, as far as the death of fish being too narrow a definition. A lot of this can be found in the GRRB's original submission. (I don't know if the two of you have that, but it should be on record with DFO somewhere.) The death of fish is too narrow of a definition of serious harm. It doesn't sufficiently consider short and long term impacts: mutilation, mutation, changes to growth, fecundity and fitness, short term, long term growth -all of the kinds of things that can impact populations of fish, that are not captured simply under the definition of the death of fish.

Jennifer Wright: To clarify, that death of fish was really just taking section 32 and including it in section 35. Section 32 was the killing of fish by other means of fishing. -Taking the destruction or killing of fish and placing it in 35.

Kris: I understand. However, the definition is too narrow.

3. A major issue I have with section 6 is that the Minister can make authorizations in the public interest; this is too easy of a catch all. A Minister could authorize a project, regardless of any impacts that might be identified.

Jennifer Wright: I can comment on that. It was added because in cases of public interest, the Minister has the discretion to refuse to authorize a project. So for example, we have one in the department right now where there is a mining project where there will be a full lake destruction. The community there is quite concerned about that full lake being destroyed. Having those concerns being brought forward, even though the proponent can demonstrate that they have met A, B and C of section 6 factors. Now, under D of section 6 the Minister has the discretion to refuse based on public interest and concerns raised. That public interest, it can go both ways. It is not meant for the Minister to have the discretion to authorize all projects, it can also go the other way. That is important to understand.

Kris: It is my opinion, and the board can disagree with me, is that that is too much oversight for one person. To be able to make those decisions for something that is so vague and fairly unidentifiable as "the public".

Stephen Haayen: So it is the veto power that is a concern, that you would like to see removed?

Kris: I think if you want to do something to address some of the concerns that have been mentioned about a lack of traditional and [...not heard...], community and aboriginal involvement. It might be best to incorporate those and the factors that should be taken into account instead of something so vague as the public interest.

4. It would be nice to see in the Fisheries Act, the incorporation into the act of the policy interpretations of the definition of serious harm - that is important to have defined. Those interpretations are not enshrined in the Fisheries Act and so are not enforceable.

5. Finally, overall, you showed a map of the offices -Grace mentioned that offices are run out of Winnipeg. It is not reasonable for western arctic project reviews to take place in Burlington. With all due respect, we need expertise to manage projects here. What I have seen on the ground, as a result of the changes to the Fisheries Act, and especially with the self-assessment process, is that companies and industrial projects here don't view the Fisheries Act or DFO as something they need to concern themselves with in this region. There are a number of projects going on right now that are creating serious harm to fish that were never initiated a departmental review because they self assessed.

Jennifer: The department should be notified of those projects.

ACTION ITEM 16-40: GRRB to formalize and submit comments for SCOFO/ DFO about its concerns with the current Fisheries Act.

7. Caribou discussions

a. Porcupine Caribou herd

i. PCMB "Trade-Sale-Barter Guidelines"

The board reviewed the letter from the PCMB to the GRRB regarding the Trade-Sale-Barter Guidelines. Joe Tetlitchi (PCMB chairperson) and Deana Lemke (executive director, PCMB)

Joe thanked the GRRB for inviting them to come and making room on the agenda. Joe gave a brief history of the PCMB and the status and history of the Porcupine Caribou herd. Joe then discussed all the ways that the caribou are affected, noting that the only thing that we really have control over is how they are hunted. Joe stressed that it was important that the Harvest Management Plan was developed by the communities. He noted that if a situation arose where harvest needed to be limited and a total allowable harvest set, that it is important to know what each community has been taking. He pointed out that just recently the PCMB had the lowest turnout of harvest reporting information and the PCMB is not getting the data that it needs. He remarked that it is really important for the community to get that information in to those collecting it, to help understand the caribou.

Joe then turned to discussing in addition to reporting harvest, the trade and barter, and sale of caribou meat. In his words:

Joe: They are the ones that know their harvesters. We definitely need the harvest count. That is really important to us. When we developed the HMP, there was buy-in from the communities, prior to getting the HMP established. We did a community tour prior to developing the HMP. We asked questions and about concerns. One of the concerns was the sale of caribou. In the agreement it says it cannot be commercialized, but can be traded or bartered. PCMB regards trade and barter as the same thing. Sale is forbidden. Trade and Barter is a sticky point. We all know it has always been there.

Commercialization and the sale of caribou has always been there. Now because of what it states in the Porcupine Caribou Agreement, the PCMB needs to make guidelines for that issue. And deal with that issue. It is because too, we are looking around us and seeing all the other herds declining. Of 10 major herds in Canada, the Porcupine caribou is the only one that is relatively in good shape. It could always come crashing down. If there were only 2 or 3 bad seasons when calving, that can wipe out the calving period and that is worrisome. The caribou are sensitive. We are doing everything we can to do our part as managers. I talked about the HMP, and the concern of the communities about the sale of caribou. We developed guidelines on this and started getting information.

I talked about communication. We take it so seriously. Every user community in the NWT and Yukon has to have an involvement. All depend on the Porcupine caribou. If they get low, everyone will suffer so communication is really important. Guidelines were sent out to every agency in each community: GTC, DGOs, Bands, RRCs, HTC, RRBs. We covered everybody. Based on that we got feedback. Based on that the guidelines were developed. Started in 2008. They went out for feedback in 2010. In 2011 we finalized the guidelines.

Want to stress that each community's values, people do things differently and we respect that. One of the things in the Sale and Barter, we cannot tell communities to do it a certain way. These are guidelines for the communities to use. It is a complicated issue. What do you do when you spend \$400-\$500 to get caribou? In town people may not have a vehicle or are disabled, so you sell or trade a caribou for 3 gallons of gas (bartering). In the guidelines, you can get the equivalent of the cost of going out. That is when it is sticky. What if someone goes to the border, where it is not very far to get it or if someone goes three times as far to get it. A caribou at the border may cost \$50, or if someone goes to Tombstone, their cost is greater, so can they up their price? We tried to be fair and put in the guidelines. It will be the responsibility of the community. They know their hunters. What if there are very few out there and the band office wants to send people out. How much do they pay them? How much for gas? How much for caribou? These are some of the challenges. We don't have an answer for that. What we can do is develop guidelines that every community can look at.

Every community has different values, but once again it will create situations where, for example, if Tsiigehtchic does something totally different than Aklavik, then there may not be seen to be equality. Then, if people see that Aklavik can do it, they want to do it. These are possible scenarios I am throwing out that are challenges, for the sake of talking about the issue. It is an issue I think we have to look at. We don't have a situation like in the Bathurst area or in Fort Smith or in Sahtu. They are all suffering because there is not much caribou. They feel it. They would give anything to the communities to go and hunt. They don't have a quota anymore.

I really want to stress the importance of the Guidelines. They are made for the communities. They are guidelines. They are a stepping stone.

Deana: We have a few copies of the guidelines with us here. The board outlines what the PCMB considers to be reasonable expenses but discretion is too community organizations to implement or enforce as they see fit. If there are inconsistencies, the PCMB gets called with respect to this. The board sent out the July letter, to ask each party how they view these guidelines, including to the GRRB. What do they do with respect to enforcement? How do they perceive these guidelines? -And the broader sale issue? Where to go from there?

PCMB is requesting the GRRB advise the PCMB of what the GRRB's "*position is regarding the application and community enforcement with respect to sale trade and barter of Porcupine caribou meat*".

ACTION ITEM 16-41: GRRB to review and provide PCMB with its position on their Guidelines for Sale, Trade and Barter of Caribou meat.

Joe noted that it is hard to catch people who are doing sales of Porcupine Caribou. The PCMB received many calls last year from people concerned about there being sales of caribou meat. Joe reminded the participants that PCMB doesn't do enforcement. It is ENR in NWT. They are who people should go to with concerns related to enforcement.

Right now, ~99% of the caribou are west of Arctic Village. Very few of them are in Canada. It doesn't look good (for Canadian hunters to access caribou today), but having said that it doesn't take long for them to turn around, like they did last year.

Questions and Comments

Cindy: Mahsi to Joe for your presentation. I am looking at the guidelines here and have a question. What is considered commercial? It says other products such as dry meat, caribou soup or sold to gatherings or celebrations is concerned are commercial, so that is not allowed. Caribou served at community gatherings or schools is allowed. So my question is that we have catering contracts to caterers. If we pay a caterer who serves caribou soup, is that commercialization under the guidelines. Do we need to monitor where the caribou is coming from?

Deana: This came up in our public engagement. The PCMB struggled with this. There needs to be some flexibility and not policing everything. The board determined a good standard is that someone would not make caribou stew and sell those bowls. But, if you were hiring someone to make a meal for the meeting and that is what they made, then you are not

really buying caribou. This is a guideline we put out because communities were looking for direction. However, there is autonomy there in how each community addresses how it fits for them. What we find harder to deal with though, is that it is so inconsistent though, that it seems to be left up to each individual person to how to interpret, so that why the PCMB interpreted it as what they see commercialization as looking like. This confusion though, is why the PCMB is looking for responses now on how these organizations interpret the guidelines and what their position is on how sale is defined by Gwich'in and Inuvialuit, so we can look again and have consistency.

Joe: To add to that, I would like to see organizations take a common-sense approach. By that I mean, the caribou is so important to the communities. There are families struggling because there is no caribou. We are okay here, but other people are struggling. When caribou don't come back, they suffer. Organizations like this, we have a choice. We can turn around and draw a guideline and say as GRRB or as PCMB, as an organization that we don't want caribou stew. I am looking 30 years down the road. I want those grandchildren to see the caribou and appreciate what we have. We need to use a common-sense approach as we can get someone to cater for us and give us chicken. The person is going to buy the chicken and send an invoice with some cost recovery on it. With caribou mat, I think it is different. We have a choice. We have to look long term. We need to think about those young kids who we want to be able to appreciate what we have now. This is close to my heart so I am being honest.

Grace Blake (DGO/GGRR): I am glad you say these are guidelines. I think it is the GTC that has to start working with the communities so we can come up with an agreeable manner in which to help the PCMB manage. Even though there is one representative on the board from Fort McPherson, management seems at an arms length away in the Yukon. We also need to look at (the requirements of) that alternate seat. We need to formulate ourselves between the communities to look at Porcupine caribou management. Not only GRRB, they are the research arm and all the categories of caribou and the numbers and this and that. ENR too, and they do the enforcement. But we have to take responsibility as GTC communities, to work with...- Every year we hear- this spring and fall-, we hear, Oh, the Inuvialuit are going up to get caribou. People don't know what is in the PCMA that was signed in 1985, that allows them to do it. We in the communities complain about the same things all the time. We have to be proactive, not complainers. We have to take responsibility. As GTC we need to start working together to look at these guidelines and to support what they are doing. Right now in Tsiigehtchic, the recent survey of caribou harvest, no one answered those surveys. We need people to come to the communities, to work with the communities. Maybe the message needs to come from the community, maybe, or jointly. The communication strategy has to use every means possible on how we want our caribou to be taken, distributed and used. Last spring (I haven't heard complaints yet on this) but that user agreement is with Dene, Metis too. Way up the river they have no caribou. We have to look also at the quota system in Inuvialuit area so they are hungry too. How are we going to help them as a neighbour? Or someone wants to come from the Tlicho area to here to get caribou for their family because they have none. What are the scenarios that are happening or can happen? What is the mitigation measure we can put in place? Be proactive. So we are always looking at what is there: Is what is there really relevant to the situations of today. That is how we will work with people. Good work on all the research, but one step further: We as each GTC community, we need to work together. For far too long we have heard the same issues come forward with no solution. This is arms-length again. We need to bring it directly. Then we can get buy-in, when they have opportunity to get input. That can work.

Archie Norbert: My concern is, that a few years back there was no caribou around. I followed drilling, fracking and the causes and how it affects the vegetation and the water. They drilled around Eagle Plains. Caribou quit migrating through there. Every meeting I went to about the caribou, everyone talks about research, but I want them to research the plants on the migratory route around Eagle Plains and the water, but I have not heard anything back. Our people depend on that herd. It is not coming through. I don't know if it a solution or what, but where they migrate from and to the calving grounds should be protected. Not fracking. It was banned from some states. I watched one documentary. - You open a tap of water in a building and the lighter would burn up because of the gases coming with the waters. Birds are dying. Fish are dying. That is what fracking has done in some states. Why can we not also look at that and protect the migration route? That is my salute. Let's look for solutions. I am tired of people coming here and making money and we don't see...we don't understand how they use the land or how much they pay. Everything should be included and everything. This is our land they are using. This is one thing I would like to see get done. I was hoping the president would be here, but they are busy. This should be discussed on a long-term basis. Everything is changing. Our kids need to get college and university education. We need to be at the same level to deal with these people. That is another thing. I would like to

see that migratory route really and firmly put in place to protect it. That is only way the caribou will keep running. They are all over the place now. Thank you for listening.

Liz Vittrekwa (TRRC): The selling of caribou is always a problem for us. Over the years, we talk about TK and from what I have heard we never sold it in the past. We traded and did a lot of trade. Lots of people travelled by dog team. A person would come to our community and our community gave what they could but now, we talk about people going by trucks, we put money into our vehicles and skidoos, but on the other hand, these individuals are going to the RRC for money to hunt. But, then they come back on the other hand and go and sell it to an elder. That is not right. So, we deal with that. We try to educate our people through CBQM (radio), by word of mouth and by the elders, but some people are very hard headed and don't want to change because all they see is money. Another thing too is the cleanup. They talk about all the hides and heads left on the side of the highway. Gwich'in use whatever they can but other native users that don't. We need to respect their values, but it is left on the side of the road because they can't eat it, but when we get accused because it is so close to home. You talk about native users that can go out an hunt. They have their own values. Who will be educating them? We want to be educating our young people on what parts can be harvested to reduce wastage. We try to provide solutions, but at times it does not work. Because we are so close, people think it is our responsibility to go clean up after everyone.

Deana: Native User Agreement –responsibilities under that agreement: Under the HMP, the Implementation Plan everyone agreed to specifies that there should be Native user agreements. 1 in Yukon with 3 parties, and 1 on NWT side with Inuvialuit and Gwich'in. Under implementation plan, all parties agreed to come together too discuss how to deal with things that overlap. Some issues will be dealt with when we have those discussions. Not as quick on this side. Still need GTC and Inuvialuit to meet.

ii. Communication Messaging

Deana Lemke spoke regarding the PCMB's recent messaging ideas and the need for a really good communication strategy: It is another mandate under the Harvest Management Plan and the Implementation Plan, that we have a communication session with the user communities, with our parties and stakeholders to talk about concerns, challenges and successes, so we can share that knowledge and not reinvent the wheel. Our board has been working on a number of things:

1. our website has new updates
2. communications around harvest reporting and the need for harvest reporting
3. the need for reducing meat wastage; for not shooting into the herd; for not leaving meat behind. See recent samples provided. (Can send to all RRCs for input also) Really open to feedback on how to get these messages out. We need that for so many reasons. Without it we cannot move forward in an informed way as managers.
4. Partnership with Vuntut Gwich'in, on caribou recipe cookbook and using all parts of the caribou. It is almost ready to be printed. Will be made available on our website and in hard copy.

Communication working group includes Janet and Kristen and any of our user communities. The invitation is open for participation from RRCs and communities on that group.

b. Cape Bathurst, Bluenose West and Bluenose East caribou herds

Kristen introduced this agenda item for discussion by the GRRB. Points raised for the board to discuss were:

- The Action plans for each of the Cape Bathurst, Bluenose West and Bluenose East caribou herds;
- The current actions and task prioritization for each herd;
- GRRB and RRC recommendations for the next iteration of Action plans leading up to the November 29-Dec 1 Annual Herd Status meeting;
- GSA inputs to the monitoring table for each herd, where available;
- Sahtu hearing report (by the SRRB)

Detailed discussions during the meeting on these items were:

i. Prioritization of Action Items

Kristen noted that the action plans are the next step towards implementing the approved management plan, Taking Care of Caribou, that was signed and approved by all the boards in 2015. Kristen briefly reviewed the status of action planning for these herds, noting that the action plans underwent a final review by the ACCWM in Deline in July. At this meeting tasks were prioritized for implementation. After that meeting, the action plans were sent out to all boards, and to Gwich'in RRCs for comment. To date, no RRCs have commented on the prioritization request from August or given input to bring to the annual meeting as part of GSA inputs to the monitoring table. This is still welcome if the RRCs would like to make comments. The GRRB did approve the plans for implementation, however new discussions will be held at the November annual herd status meeting about the action plans and herd status, so there is time for new GRRB and RRC input to prioritization of actions for implementation and to provide information for the monitoring table, if it is available, as each region has also been asked to share new information it may have for each herd. The GRRB is co-chairing this meeting with WMAC NWT. Kristen circulated to the board and RRC members in attendance a copy of the current monitoring table and a summarized list of actions for each herd with current ACCWM prioritized actions shown in bold.

ii. Preparation for annual ACCWM meeting

Amy noted that the GRRB approved the current plans for implementation, but at each annual meeting, the action plans and implementation will be reviewed. This means that there is time for the board to give direction on top priorities or suggest new ones to bring forward to the ACCWM meeting... -Does the GRRB support current priorities, or different priorities, or new actions suggested? This advice doesn't have to come today. There will be a GRRB teleconference meeting in October, that this could happen at.

Kristen also noted that the RRCs can additionally provide comments to the board, and those can be passed onto the ACCWM.

Amy: It will be helpful to whomever attends as GRRB representative at the meeting for to have direction on these from the board.

Amy reviewed the preparations being made for the upcoming November (Nov 29, 30 & Dec 1) ACCWM herd status meeting with the board and meeting participants. The meeting agenda has been prepared. Invitations will go out by October 4th. The meeting includes time for public participation and input into the information presented and discussions as well as in-camera discussions by the ACCWM.

Amy noted that the board should: 1. Decide who they want to attend and present on behalf of the board at the November meeting and, 2. Have a discussion about what input they would like to provide for that meeting.

Action Item 16-42: GRRB to agree upon representation at the ACCWM annual herd status meeting and give input and direction in preparation for that meeting.

Amy noted that Eugene and Ron attended the July ACCWM meeting in Deline to review the draft action plans and prioritize actions for implementation. Kristen attended as staff support.

Sahtu report

Ron Allen (via teleconference): *(note the connection was poor and some comments were missed [...] for the minutes)*

Ron: Since June 8 the working group's work was done (action plans completed). All the representatives of all the management boards were at the July ACCWM meeting in Deline, including Kitikmeot Wildlife Management Board. Action plans were developed and so on. There was another amendment made to the MOU about how the boards work together to make it clear that the ACCWM is not taking over any authority of the individual boards.

At the time of the Deline meeting, the Sahtu RRB had not yet released its March hearing report. They did so at end of August. Their decisions included in the report were kind of done in a bizarre way: Their decisions are not consistent with what was presented to them at the hearings.

There are more concerns going into the fall caribou harvesting season. In particular, there are concerns about the process in the Sahtu. The SRRB agreed that they would [...] a community plan, but none of these communities in their region have accepted that. The Deline plan is only for the community of Deline. The SRRB rejected any Total Allowable Harvest; they rejected the use of tags and there are major concerns about [...] monitoring and [...] harvest [...] so it is likely from my perspective that the Sahtu RRB believes each community should just do it on its own; that we should just trust

them that everything will be okay. The past pattern was that they were taking [...]cows, not just bulls or bulls only by any stretch and that is not likely to change given the set up there now. We should have a very interesting meeting in November, when those concerns may be brought back up again.

If folks are to look further, I suggest you look at (in the Sahtu hearing report):

Figure 5, page 44 (look at last paragraph there) & leading into ACCWM meeting there are some major questions on management. Also, look closely at decisions **24, 26, 28, 29, 32, 37**. Think about those and think about what those decisions that might mean in terms of management of the herd. It is not a good picture. Understand that in the Sahtu there are only two functioning RRCs. How can communities manage caribou if they don't have an RRC as required to have an effective conservation plan, which were supposed to have been put in place within 120 days? They have removed the requirement to have tags. No TAH; individual community management; [...not heard...]

Excerpts from Sahtu Report as referred to by R.Allen:

FIGURE 5: COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN REQUIREMENTS Community Conservation Plan Requirements

In order to be deemed complete and ready for review by the SRRB, community conservation plans must include, but not be limited to, the following components:

1. Identification of key issues and knowledge gaps in Ɂekwé conservation with respect to:
 - a. Education
 - b. Habitat
 - c. Land Use Activities
 - d. Náts'ézé (harvesting), including promotion of Dene béré kats'ɁɁwe (alternative harvest)
2. Dene concepts and terminology related to conservation issues, programs, and actions
3. Research and conservation programs, actions and timelines for addressing priority issues and knowledge gaps
4. Approaches for Ɂedets'é k'áots'erewe and regional/cross-regional accountability in plan implementation, including:
 - a. Náts'ézé zones
 - b. Monitoring
 - c. Measures for supporting compliance
 - d. Youth programming
 - e. Progress evaluation
 - f. A harvest plan based on Ɂedets'é k'áots'erewe
5. Consideration of the appropriate seasons of harvest and harvest locations and zones
6. Community sharing protocols and godi kehtsɁ (agreements) with other users within and beyond the Sahtú, including a protocol for implementation reporting
7. Community coordination in developing plans

Where a community conservation plan has not yet been established, it must be completed within 120 days of a formal request from the SRRB. Where a revision to an existing plan is formally requested based on new evidence about herd status, it must be completed within 90 days. Plans and revisions will be approved by the SRRB, within 60 days of receipt. If plans or revisions are not completed according to these timelines, interim measures will be put in place, in consultation with affected communities, within 60 days of the original deadline; this may include implementation and enforcement of mechanisms identified in the SDMCLCA such as a Total Allowable Harvest.

...

Hearing Decision 24

The Ɂehdzo Got'ɁɁ Gots'é NákedɁ (Sahtú Renewable Resources Board) accepts Resolution 1.2 of the April 23, 2015 Sahtú Meeting that "the Sahtú region continue the traditional laws of relationship with the Ɂekwé through a Sahtú-developed Ɂekwé plan including a process of self-regulation, driven by community-based monitoring and decisions." The SRRB accepts the principle that community-based monitoring and decisions are the most effective mechanism for Ɂekwé management and conservation in the Sahtú region.

Hearing Decision 26

The Ɂehdzo Got'ɁɁ Gots'é NákedɁ (Sahtú Renewable Resources Board) finds that DélɁɁ's Belare wíle Gots'é Ɂekwé plan for Ɂekwé náts'ézé ɁɁa (harvest management), náts'ézé gha k'ínats'eneta (harvest monitoring), dícho así k'ets'ɁɁ ajá t'á náze gha báts'odi (it's gone down so we're going to let it rest), and dene béré kats'ɁɁwe (alternative harvest) is consistent with the intent of the cross-regional Action Plan for the Bluenose-East Caribou Herd developed by the Advisory Committee for Cooperation on Wildlife Management (ACCWM) in the Taking Care of Caribou Plan process. The SRRB recommends that the ACCWM revise the Action Plan for the Bluenose-East Caribou Herd to recognize the DélɁɁ approach.

Hearing Decision 28

The ʔehdzo Got'Inę Gots'ę Nákedı (Sahtú Renewable Resources Board) will assess the need for a Total Allowable Harvest limit if an annual review and assessment of community conservation plans in the Sahtú region demonstrates that conservation concerns for Bluenose East ʔekwé are not being adequately addressed.

Hearing Decision 29

The ʔehdzo Got'Inę Gots'ę Nákedı (Sahtú Renewable Resources Board) recommends that NWT Environment and Natural Resources amend Schedule 5A of the Big Game Hunting Regulations under the Northwest Territories Wildlife Act to add a condition for current zone S/BC/03 that requires harvesting authorization from the local ʔehdzo Got'Inę (Renewable Resources Council), and removes the requirement for a tag for Bluenose East ʔekwé.

Hearing Decision 32

The ʔehdzo Got'Inę Gots'ę Nákedı (Sahtú Renewable Resources Board) will work collaboratively with ʔehdzo Got'Inę (Sahtú Renewable Resources Councils) to develop an adaptive approach to ʔekwé náts'ezé gha k'ínats'eneta (caribou harvest monitoring) as a basis for conservation planning.

Hearing Decision 37

The ʔehdzo Got'Inę Gots'ę Nákedı (Sahtú Renewable Resources Board) accepts Déłıne's Belare wıle Gots'ę ʔekwé plan for ʔekwé ʔeʔa hegerjchá gha (enforcement of) Bluenose East ʔekwé kanáts'ezé (caribou harvesting).

Doug: My recollection is that last year when the GRRB met with the Sahtu RRB and WMAC NWT in Inuvik last year in November 2015, at that time Sahtu said they would share harvest information. Did they do this? We may have followed up with a letter on this?

Kristen: Their Executive Director sent a letter by email on April 4th acknowledging that they had not supplied the information they had agreed to share. At the time they said they would try to meet that. They did outline 6 points of information that they would try to share.

Jozef: It is probably safe to say that the board will have much discussion on this and will bring comments to November meeting.

At this point, Ron left the call, as he was also having difficulty hearing the meeting due to the network connection issues.

Jozef pointed out that there were prioritized management actions provided and inquired whether the board wanted to review the actions.

Cindy inquired whether the key habitat areas were not already known: If key habitat areas are already known, and I may be assuming something to think that they already are, that this should help in the identification and protection of key habitats as the top priority.

Kristen: the short table shown on screen are the broad objectives, each with tasks to complete to accomplish that broader action. One of the first tasks is to look at what information we have already to identify those key areas and including talking to communities to get their input. We know (some key areas) from work ENR has done and from collar locations as well as information from traditional knowledge already collected, but this hasn't been formally done to pull it all together, which is why it is prioritized to be followed using the steps (tasks) identified.

Doug: We have been talking about harvest data collection for a significant period of time and this is recognized as a priority action. In the meetings and calls that have happened... How to say this? Is there any movement with the Sahtu or is it a brick wall? If it is a brick wall, then the approach to the next meeting may be critical and may not be a conventional approach. It sounds like we are hitting a brick wall. Ron sounded quite frustrated and that is the impression I am getting. It would help to understand if there is any movement at all.

Kristen: I am not sure if I can give a complete answer to this. I haven't read the entire Sahtu hearing report. I appreciate Ron having done so. They are rejecting the use of tags and want to come up with their own system. I don't know what that system is. There are a lot of concerns about the (harvest) numbers that will come out as there is not understanding of how that system works/will work. There are concerns that if there is a rejection of tag use (in their area), what does that mean for other regions. There is the issue of fairness to all users and that is an issue that is outstanding. That is problematic going forward, at least as far as regarding management using tags.

Doug: How are other boards reacting to this?

Kristen: I don't think there have been formal replies from other boards yet. WMAC NWT is doing a community tour this next month in ISR to discuss the action plans. I can't speak to whether their discussions will include this topic also.

Jozef: Some of the discussions I have been part of -I know it has come up- there are strong opinions on why for instance, we use tags in the ISR and GSA but not elsewhere. It has come up at those meetings, that I have been at. Perhaps Marsha can address this. At some point, we have to ask ourselves moving forward whether we're wasting our time if it is becoming a brick wall. We are only responsible for the GSA. At the very least we can say that we have done our part as a board with our tags and process. I am looking forward to a good outcome to the meeting. I am hopeful that there will be change and a different approach in the Sahtu. I share Ron's frustration.

Marsha: For those that don't know, I also sit on the board of WMAC NWT. We (WMAC NWT) share these concerns. We raised them collectively at the meetings. I don't feel like we are at a brick wall yet. But we may be at a brick wall for tags. They have made progress. -Recognizing that there are concerns over the herds and actions that need to be taken. They don't seem to have the same approach. I cannot say we are at a brick wall yet. I share your frustrations. In the Deline plan, they do talk about using sample kits as a mechanism to understand the harvest. However, that is just Deline and that is only for Bluenose East. It doesn't apply to Bluenose West.

Colville Lake is a different thing. The reference that I think Ron was making about a comment that the TAH was racist, was from Colville. They made such a statement in their press release. They have a whole different way of looking at things. Last I heard, they wanted a data sharing agreement to provide harvest data to the SRRB. Providing the data is part of their (RRC) responsibility. The SRRB is not asking for raw data, but is asking for a summary. How many caribou taken, where and sex ratio. And they want a data sharing agreement. I don't know how you deal with that.

I did want to say (as Kristen mentioned) that WMAC NWT is going to talk to the communities, HTC's and IGC starting next week. The GRRB has been invited to partake in those meetings to hear concerns about the plans. Colville Lake and Sahtu situation is on the agenda. We are trying to figure out a way to bring that conversation forward. There have been serious concerns about charges for Inuvialuit hunting in a closed zone. There have been tags in legislation in the Sahtu for the Bluenose-West but those regulations there are not being implemented. So, everyone is in a bit of a quandary as to how this is going to move forward. There are three boards for BNE herd (One board has a TAH, one board now doesn't and I don't think the Nunavut board has made a decision yet). So, that is three boards making recommendations for one herd and to two different governments. It is complicated. That is why we were trying to develop this management plan in the first place -because we knew it was complicated and to try to make it less complicated. I am not sure the goal has been achieved.

As Jozef said, the Inuvialuit will take the same approach. To show that we are doing what we need to do, to try to conserve the herds for future generations. ...I still think that a user to user meeting may help. It has not been attempted yet: the Gwich'in and Inuvialuit going to Colville Lake and talking to people.

Grace: My thoughts about that are that you are dealing with traditional communities. Traditional people. Far more traditional than us. Colville Lake, they are isolated, except for their winter road. They don't have self government but they try to operate as much as they can on their own. This is where Traditional Knowledge is really important. Maybe you have a budget for TK or you can suggest to the people who you are meeting with-your consultation parties. In specific emergency cases, sometimes you have to bend a bit to get ...you know.. a sound coming together of parties. No longer is it the day when you force someone to do something they don't want to do. They will do it anyway. That is residential school mentality. You have to get away from that. It doesn't matter if you are a co-management board or... People do not want to be told what to do by anybody. They know the situation. Just like the Tlicho too. They don't want anyone to force a quota system on them. They want to be able to figure it out for themselves. It is a critical issue. I think last year I went to your board meeting in Fort McPherson, I said that we do our part here, and we let them figure it out over there. We cannot put undue pressure on them. We need to respect them. We need to use TK, their own people-their own elders to

do consultation, to figure out the right way to meet their need, because they have a need, and comply with the overall emergency of looking after the herds. The more we do that, the more people will be willing to take part. That is the only way to go with our native people today. There is no enforcement, even if you want to force someone, they will not budge. They are dealing with fallout from res school. Need to be smart in the way you approach, drawing people in to making a decision. Let them make up their own minds. I didn't really like Ron's comment about the RRCs participation. I don't think anyone should talk like that about another organization, because these people, they have their own reasons for doing what they do. If they don't, it is because they don't like the mechanism being taken. We have to use psychology- traditional psychology- to figure out different ways to work with our people -All of the aboriginal people are our people. You have to support them. Those communities that don't have a highway were probably more poor than us. So, you have to just really consider. They go on the land, they do all that traditional stuff, making dry meat, It is a commodity for them. They use every part of the caribou. We need to understand who we are dealing with and why they are the way they are. It is not our business to get frustrated about it. We are in a position, in where we are part of a decision-making mechanism but if we get impatient and try to force somebody, it is not going to go anywhere. So, we have to stop and think and allow people to do what they need to do to come onside and figure out their own- what they are willing to put up with in order to save the herd.

Burt: I am respectful of Grace's view on this. Hopefully there is peaceful resolution, []...cooperation and discussion and community involvement and people deciding this for themselves and amongst each other...[...] and in consideration of each other. And your point Jozef was that we follow the rules, we take care of our own, and so on. And we should be commended for that. But there comes a point, if someone else implicates the others []...and therefore, it is not just take care of your own house, you can do what you want, but if someone else is hurting a resource, then my question is in the brick wall scenario, where does the ultimate authority lie? [...] It gets to a point of where there is a conservation concern. It is not just Colville Lake, or just Sahtu. Because it implicates the Tlicho, it implicates us, and a whole bunch of others, and possibly to the detriment of those others. So, my question is where is the authority? Does the Minister have the over riding authority? A question for Steven, for the Minister to rise in the brick wall situation. Where everything has been pushed to the edge and we have tried what Grace suggested and someone needs to intervene because the actions of someone are hurting others Not just themselves. Where is the authority in a brick wall scenario? Who does what?

Jozef: It is my understanding that the ultimate authority for management is with the government, in short. The Minister is the ultimate authority.

Burt: With an illustrated conservation concern.

Jozef: Yes.

Stephen: And also with public health and public safety.

Marsha: I want to step in, and I may be speaking out of turn, but I don't believe that our government is yet ready to do that. We think that progress is being made. They believe in the process that Grace has alluded to, that the communities need to work through a process on their own. They have unfortunately not been doing it until now. In hindsight, maybe we should have pressed the Bluenose East issue earlier. In some way, I don't know how, to try to get them to rethink what they are doing there. There is not proof, I don't think for the Bluenose-West, that what is going on there is a conservation concern. We don't really know what they're taking but I don't think they are taking huge amounts from the Bluenose West herd. I would think that right now we need to let the communities do this. If the government goes in heavy handed, then it is likely to back fire and we will end up in court. But all the boards feed into that process, because it is a huge thing to talk about here. You know how it works, if the government tries to make you do it, it generally doesn't work very well. If get community buy-in for conservation of the herd then we will be way farther ahead in long run than the government coming in with a heavy hand.

Stephen: GNWT is the ultimate authority through the Minister. Right now, last winter ENR was in Colville Lake for 16 or 18 weeks, working through their approach. There was no tags, but basically there was monitoring. They were down from the 345 that they can take. Last winter though, the caribou were so far away. Again, this year, ENR is going to be in there. This will show a process of traditional knowledge. The department is staying back. As Marsha mentioned, we see some movement forward. We count the caribou. They say they count the caribou. How are they counting. They have been living with the caribou a lot longer than the government has been counting. But it comes to a fairness issue. Some are being charged and some are not. The government made the choice to move a different direction. They have the authority. Right now they are working with them to see what happens.

Jozef: I have a question. Marsha, you mentioned that there is no actual proof of a conservation concern –that what they are doing is hurting the herd, the Bluenose-West. If that is the case, then why are we under a tag system here and in the ISR?

Marsha: That is a good question. We don't have to be. We don't have to be under a tag system. We thought all groups were going to go that way, but in the end, they didn't. The numbers from last year -and it is not great evidence- indicates that their numbers there were under the TAH for the herd. When I think of a TAH, it is a number that the board thinks risk-wise, that the herd can withstand. That number, the TAH, has a sex ratio. It doesn't have to be mandatory. We decided it would be in the GSA and the ISR. A TAH is not necessarily mandatory. It is a number that is reasonable at a point in time for conservation purposes. How you implement it could be different. You could decide to do something different. The Inuvialuit are having a conversation about if they want to do something different in the meetings they are having.

Jozef: The reason I ask, more specifically, for the GSA, there are 22 tags that we receive. The message that we have been giving - specifically the NRRC in Inuvik over the years -has been encouraging members to NOT utilize those tags for conservation purposes. We have been sending the wrong message because it is not a conservation concern?

Marsha: No, that is not what I am saying. What I am saying is ...You are encouraging your members not to use the tags, the use of which we decided would be enforceable in the GSA and the ISR to conserve the herd. In the Sahtu, they are telling members don't take so many caribou, don't take so many [] because there is a conservation concern. What I am saying is that what I think is going on right now, in the last year, is that they are not way over their TAH. So that we don't have to say, hey guys you are taking more of the TAH than you were allocated in the harvest -taking way too much.

Jozef: The TAH in the plan?

Marsha: the TAH that was recommended. It is not actually in the plan. The 4% of the herd. It is supposed to be bull dominated. I don't know that we are meeting that either. There has been action in the communities to talk about the separation of the harvest, to do something about it. As we all know, it is hard to change the rules and make more rules. It is exactly what you are talking about.

Grace: Where is the harvesting happening in the GSA for the Bluenose? Who is getting the tags?

Allen: There are 22 tags that the NRRC holds (for Gwich'in).

Marsha: They can be used in the Inuvialuit area. In I/BC 06 zone. G/BC/03 was shut down for barren ground caribou. They haven't been using them.

DAY 2 Thursday, October 6, 2016

Chief Niditchie School Gymnasium, Tsiigehtchic

Johnny Charlie called day two of the meeting to order at 9:20AM.

8. Resident Moose Hunting Regulations

This agenda item provided time for the GRRB to continue their discussion about potential changes to regulations governing reporting of moose harvesting by resident hunters in the GSA, and broadly in the Inuvik region, including in the ISR. Kristen gave a short review as background to lead into board discussions:

The WMAC NWT has concerns about a lack of knowledge about resident moose harvest and are concerned about potential impacts to the moose population, in light of possible increases to moose harvesting while barren ground caribou harvesting is limited in the region. They have had reports about not seeing as many moose. They recommended resident harvest reporting change from voluntary to mandatory under the regulations, including providing evidence of sex and harvest location in hunter reports. ENR approached the GRRB for its recommendation, as resident moose hunters issued a tag in the Inuvik region can use their tag in the GSA or in the ISR, and anywhere in the NWT open to moose hunting. Resident hunters have a limit of one moose tag during the moose season each year in open areas (with large portions of the GSA closed to harvesting by them). ENR provided a report to the GRRB on its reporting system using

successive mail out voluntary hunter surveys. ENR felt that resident hunter reporting rates were sufficient to estimate resident moose harvest and cautioned against mandatory reporting for fear that some hunters would falsify their reports. Kristen reviewed the data ENR presented so that the board could review its earlier conditional support for the regulation change before finalizing its decision. The board had asked for more information about resident hunter reporting rates, the number of tags issued annually, the annual reported harvest and estimated harvest, methods of estimating harvest and determination of bag limits. The GRRB had also acknowledged that it would need to develop a strategy to improve aboriginal moose harvest reporting to add to an overall picture of harvest to assess total harvest sustainability. It further asked for ENR to work with the GRRB in evaluating moose harvest sustainability.

In summary, ENR reported that normally resident moose harvest classified as from the "Inuvik region" groups harvests from the GSA, ISR and SSA all together. They did a special analysis for the GRRB on only the GSA and ISR harvests, noting that it can be difficult to separate out GSA and ISR harvests based on the information provided and that they cannot give good estimates on separated numbers by GSA or ISR alone, as the number of hunters is too low for statistical purposes. They reported that on average 48 tags are issued each year, but only one in six hunters on average are successful, and those moose are majority bulls, with few cows or young animals taken. The estimated annual resident moose harvest (in the GSA and ISR combined, excluding the Sahtu) was 9 moose per year on average (range 3-20). When the Sahtu harvests are included, the estimate rises to 20. The reporting rate was 48% after sending mail out surveys up to 3X per year to hunters with tags. Response rates have not changed over 20 years and do not show evidence of reporting bias in relation to harvest success or non-success. ENR commented that no moose conservation concern has been identified. The bag limit of one tag per year during the moose season was said to provide reasonable access to hunters without putting excess pressure on the resource. Most resident moose hunters of the ISR and GSA hunt in the ISR and GSA. ENR requested a meeting with the GRRB and WMAC NWT to further discuss this issue.

Kristen noted that the response rate of 46% is adequate in a large pool of hunters, but for a pool of only 48, response rates would need to be at least 67% to get margins of error (of the 95% confidence interval on the estimate) to be $\pm 10\%$ (ENR prefers this margin be much less than 10%). She suggested that the GRRB might be okay with $\pm 10\%$ as this would equate to an error of only ± 1 moose on the estimate at the current harvesting rates. She also noted that if the number of tags issued (avg. 48, range 35-61) is an acceptable upper limit on the harvest to the GRRB, then it may not matter to the GRRB how many under that number are taken (and reported) by residents.

Questions and Discussion

Jozef: We also need to talk about the Harvesting Areas for moose, including Special Moose Harvesting areas in addition to general open versus closed areas in the GSA. Areas west of the Mackenzie are completely closed to residents for moose hunting in the GSA...

Cindy: Can I get clarification? Only one moose per year seems quite low if there is not a conservation concern. Why is there a limit on harvest? Aboriginal harvesting rights and limitations on GSA residents... *[not all of comment heard...]* People need to be able to provide for their families...

Stephen: As a clarification, in the regulations a resident harvester is a licensed, non-Aboriginal harvester. I can comment on why the lands west of the Mackenzie were closed to harvesting. It was because there was a regulation made a long time ago in response to a concern farther south down the river that aboriginal harvesters were not getting their moose on islands in the Mackenzie. So, the old regulation changed to close off all islands in the Mackenzie to resident hunters, but because the Mackenzie delta is made up of islands, that closed the entire area off to residents.

Richard J. Blake: [...] also no concern since doesn't affect Aboriginal harvesting.

Grace: Surveys are really important. Most important is for us to be smart about how we do this. If you are looking at the moose population and are only looking at resident hunters that is a different thing. In the GSA, the Gwich'in harvest study is important. The Gwich'in harvest study needs an improved strategy -possibly a stipend or gift certificate or reward for taking part in the survey. It is important to let community know well in advance and really important to work with them.

Burt: What has been the feedback from resident hunters about this?

Kristen: There hasn't been feedback as none has been directly sought from resident hunters.

Grace: Somehow that information has to be communicated to the Aboriginal community. This is information that must be shared with the communities. The local RRCs don't hear about who's hunting along the highway and they should know where residents are hunting, if residents are not given opportunity to hunt in the delta.

Burt: The suggestion of reporting the location of resident of harvests (to RRCs) is an additional rule. The folks affected should be notified and consulted on this. There is a required step here to consult those most affected by these rules. We are responsible to the public.

Cindy: Do we know how the overall moose population is? Is it the objective to get a picture of the overall population? I would think you would also want information on the number of moose, the sex and age harvested. Does ENR have a current population estimate for moose?

Kristen: We need to put together all the information we have. In the spring, in preparation for the GRRB May teleconference I provided a report to the GRRB that summarized population estimates from historical surveys. These help provide part of the picture of the moose population size. However, the last survey was in 2011. This was an ENR survey that GRRB participated in. I think a new survey may be being considered for 2017.

Grace: It is a community tradition to eat all the meat and share the meat, not sure if that's the same with resident hunters or if they eat all the parts? Maybe the residents could share with the local community?

Stephen: There are rules about wastage in the Wildlife Act that indicate what parts are considered wastage. Could consider working with resident harvesters to bring back some parts. However, there is sometimes reluctance in communities to accept those parts from people they don't know because they don't know how it's been handled. It is not a violation of Wildlife Act to leave some parts such as guts, head, tongue etc that may be considered delicacy by others [...] ...corporate history of resident harvest zones... [...]

Marsha: In further answer to Cindy's question about the objectives of resident harvester survey. Yes, it is to help get a picture of the moose population. We could also consider making a fact sheet on how to prepare parts of the moose, or where to bring back parts to share if a hunter doesn't want them. (that could be delivered with the survey)

John Norbert: This is our country we live in for all our life. It is very strange to see people from the outside trying to say what we should do with meat and all that stuff. We know that already. We have been working for how many years together. Like you know, that new Wildlife Act: that should be done with us. People here get meat and they share with each other. That is how it was in the old days.

Louis Cardinal: In general, from your studies, are moose populations healthy in GSA?

Marsha: We have some science information on how the moose are doing from the aerial surveys we do periodically over time. That is why we are proposing to do another one in 2017. We do rely on community members to tell us if things are changing and maybe the moose are not doing as well. WMAC NWT has been hearing that people are seeing fewer moose in some areas in the ISR. E.g. Inuvik HTC has said that. That is why they are raising this concern. It also stems from the new WA with a mechanism for hunting on private land and an ability for I or G to allow people to hunt on private land or not, so they want to have more information on how the moose are doing and how many potential harvests might be taken from their private land to tell if it is okay to let resident hunters on their land to hunt moose. So, it is all pieces of a puzzle. I don't think there is, from what I have heard, a giant situation with the moose in the area -I don't think it is bad- We are just trying to get more information.

Kristen: Louis, there is a poster near the food table that shows the results of the last survey that was done in 2011 in the ISR and GSA. I'd be happy to talk about it with you further.

Marsha: One more thought: Regarding the map that is up there and about the corporate history of why the open/closed zones are the way they are that Stephen spoke to, for the resident harvesting. Maybe it is time to relook at those zones,

and especially as there is now a mechanism to allow resident hunting on private lands. This is before my time, but over on the west side, where there is no resident harvesting, it could be in relation to private lands, I don't know. But if you think about it, a resident harvester who lives in Aklavik can't hunt over there. Residents need to eat too. Maybe we should have a discussion with the Gwich'in and Inuvialuit whether they want to change those zones or not. They have been like that forever. That little description that is beside it (in the hunting guide), doesn't quite make sense anyway, especially now with the private land issue.

Doug: Just a question, in the ENR's July 28th report, they suggest a teleconference of both boards with them. I assume that has not happened yet. My question would be, what is the objective that meeting? Such as what you are discussing? Have dialogue about that?

Marsha: What I said just now was not part of ENR's response. I was just looking at the wall, at the map of the open and closed zones for resident moose hunters and thinking about the corporate history of what Stephen mentioned. You can re-look at those at any time and make recommendations to change them. The meeting ENR suggested is because we are working with two different boards and it would be nice to have consensus on this, with more information. It is difficult when one board says they want mandatory and another says no. If both think it is worth pursuing, then can bring it to the residents to ask them what they think about it. Or at least inform them that it is being considered.

Jozef: I was thinking about something additional that may require some more work: Special Harvesting Areas themselves. There is one on the Dempster just for Porcupine caribou. My question is: do we need to make amendments to allow moose hunting in special harvesting areas, according to the GCLCA. That may be a little bit more work to figure out those areas. To pay attention to and make sure they are there...

Amy: There is a provision in the GCLCA Section 12.4 that Jozef was talking about. I have it open here. Section 12.4.4 c says *"Persons who are not participants (and I assume this means residents) may, pursuant to legislation, harvest moose in the special harvesting areas designated for the harvesting of moose during a season in the fall of the year. The season in such area shall be no longer than 90 days in duration and shall close no later than the 16th day of December in any calendar year. Such special harvesting areas are set out in schedule VIII, appendix F."*

Just to summarize, what I have been hearing for the note takers and for direction from the board:

- There are 2 board decisions needed:
 - mandatory reporting,
 - and where hunting can happen
- Next steps:
 - Consult with residents
 - Meet with ENR
 - Make decision

Amy: a reminder that yesterday the board decided to talk about the Special Harvesting wording under this agenda item also.

Louis Cardinal: I was wondering about the moose – I see lots along highway, what part of the road can you shoot from? Some people say you can't shoot from the road. Can you shoot from the edge of the road? (You can't shoot along or across, but from the edge?)

Stephen –It is a violation to shoot across the road. It is a violation to shoot along the length of the road. You can shoot from the side of the road in the direction of the animal into the bush, not across the road. However, you are not to be on the surface of the road while you are shooting.

Johnny Charlie: We have to keep safety in mind too.

Charlie Snowshoe: Talking about moose. People have to start getting at moose because there is going to be no caribou. (I am getting sick of my company. I can't hear and see but I know you are talking about moose.) I don't know how much the people care about the moose today. I was travelling for medical and I was on the side of Campbell lake near the

campground. There were a couple moose in there. I go and ask my driver where is the moose? It is still over there. Coming out of Inuvik later, there are still moose over there. Then I hear you can't shoot moose off the road. A good hunter will go in and take the moose from off the road. Like they used to do in the old days. When they see a moose track, they surround it; they know where the moose is going to come out. They know the country and the guy behind made noise to chase the moose away and one of them would see it. That is how they used to hunt moose. The thing is that you all know, we were talking about it yesterday, even for caribou meat, way back when we started talking about the caribou management board and plan, there was a guy sitting with the board. He passed a few years back. When it first started. 25 years ago. He mentioned why worry about that caribou. That young generation they don't care about caribou. You know, that is a heck of a long time and that is true. The same with moose. I notice that. By golly when someone sees moose tracks... they would walk a long way from Fort McPherson in my time. You travel from Fort McPherson and walk through deep snow to that lake, looking for moose. Another time there was another guy. 12 miles below he saw a moose track, it ran away from him and he was a good runner on snow shoe and he knew the country. He took off after that moose. He ended up by the Mackenzie! That's what they used to do with moose.

You know when I talk, I talk about the background of our people, for you young people to know. I see it now today. On something else that bothered me, -maybe some of you people still do that-I don't – When our people used to travel around. When they go out hunting. They make fire all the time. They cook their meat on the fire. Everything, fish, everything they cook. Now, all you do is turn the switch on the cook stove, boil your meat, put it the oven. Maybe that is something we need to change, to get the kids to enjoy the fire meat again, you know?

And, like I say, I had a good taste of moose meat and dry meat this morning. [...] they go out hunting every year. I hear it from here and I hear it. One of the guys that used to be out in Mackenzie in September back and forth. Everyone knows Richard Blake, and that is what they do. They hardly go out on the land to hunt moose. They depend on the highway. Same with caribou. A few years back -10 years back-there were a lot of moose around. A couple of years ago, a good hunter from Inuvik, travelled up the east branch halfway up, hunting for moose but didn't see one track. When we used to travel to Aklavik, we used to always see moose tracks. That guy who travels back and forth from Aklavik. He says it's a big change.

My question, is that in the animals -the furbearers, the martens, minks, rats, when they overpopulate, they get a sickness -nature takes care of them- that is what they used to do in the olden days. Our people would never get sick. And then they get over populated. The only sickness they would have is starvation. Nature takes care of the people and I think it does the same thing with the animals. Biologists are sitting around and talking about moose. This is the way I think. At one time there was lots of moose tracks and now nothing. Or [] the change... You know, I want to bring it up to the meeting. By golly, if you see a moose on the side of the road, shoot it.

Burt proposed a motion, there was discussion:

Louis: [...] discussion about rules and regulations for harvesting moose, you need to think about if enforcement is happening for locals, non-residents and residents. There are rules and regulations for us on how to harvest moose?

Stephen: There are rules and regulations that apply to everyone. The 2014 new Wildlife Act recognizes Aboriginal and treaty rights. They are not impacted by the new act. There are conditions in the Wildlife Act as I mentioned in regards to shooting near or across the highway and these apply to everyone and that includes aboriginal harvesters, residents, and non-residents that are enforceable for everyone. There are safety requirements that are enforceable for everyone. The regulations being discussed right now are for resident harvesters. There is a different view and approach for individuals that have a right to harvest versus those with a privilege to harvest (residents) and that have a condition applied to them. If you have questions about rights to harvest including treaty rights, I can speak to you as an individual later.

The GRRB is generally supportive of mandatory reporting of moose harvest by residents, but recognizes that such would be subject to further discussion with at minimum ENR, perhaps others, and should involve consultation with those affected.

Motion
GRRB 16-39

Moved by: Burt Hunt

Seconded by: Jozef Carnogursky

All in favour

Motion Approved

**Note there were different wordings given by Burt for the motion above. Double Check against Amy's notes.

Possible actions from next steps reviewed and motion are:

ACTION ITEM 16-43:

- a. GRRB to involve resident moose hunters in discussion/consultation about moose hunting regulations in GSA, including issue of mandatory reporting*
- b. GRRB to discuss where resident moose hunting can take place in GSA*
- c. GRRB to discuss mandatory moose harvest reporting with ENR, WMAC NWT and other affected agencies (RRCs)*
- d. GRRB to make final decision about mandatory moose harvest reporting and locations of permitted resident hunting in GSA*

Special Harvesting Areas

Amy: The board needs to have a discussion on wording regarding **Special Harvesting Areas**. The board has had previous correspondence about this. There has been back and forth between GTC, the GRRB, their legal council and ENR about how the Special Harvesting Areas in the GCLCA would be put into the WA regulations. There was draft text forwarded to the board. The board needs to let me know if the board is comfortable with that draft text.

Jozef: As long as whatever is put forward is consistent with the GCLCA, then that will work for me.

Grace: If we are considering opening up the special harvesting areas to residents, not aboriginal people, then it is very important to look at the application process. How do they get the okay to go into the GSA for special harvesting areas? Does the RRC work with them on the parts that say, they don't need? There needs to be some kind of working relationship between the hunter and the community.

Louis: If you are considering giving access to private lands to residents, you also need to consider regulations about squatting. As soon as you give them access to a lake, they start squatting in a good hunting area. Good regulations need to be in place so that doesn't happen. If one guy goes into a managed area with access, down the road they may think they can build a shack. Need regulations so they only go in for hunting and nothing else. Need also to think about how industry comes into the territory and works, need the same guidelines for this.

Amy: I can give some clarification about this with some more context about what is being asked of the GRRB. The new Wildlife Act from 2014. The old act was pre-land claim and so the special harvesting areas outlined in the agreement were not included in the old Wildlife Act. Now, with the new Wildlife Act passed, ENR has been asking about the text of new regulations in order to include the special harvesting areas, and to include the intent in the agreement for those special harvesting areas. The GRRB did make a decision last year, but ENR had some questions to clarify, so the GRRB wanted legal advice on that. GTC also got legal council. We worked with legal council to ensure that the text is mirroring what is in the land claim agreement. Our question to the lawyer was whether the original intent in the land claim agreement was to make the special harvesting areas just for Gwich'in participants or not? The lawyer, said yes, but it is not so straightforward, because of parts in the claim give harvesting access to residents, such as for harvesting moose, as I quoted earlier. The legal advice summary was that "notwithstanding the wording (in the section I quoted earlier), altogether the intent of the land claim is indeed to restrict non-participants to access to special harvesting areas for the purpose of harvesting wildlife". He recommended the regulations use similar wording in the claim agreement where such harvesting would be inconsistent with special harvesting by the Gwich'in. This is in itself problematic as the board would need to determine what is inconsistent with Gwich'in harvesting. However, because that is wording in the claim agreement, he said that is wording that should be included (in the regulation). So, then the board had a discussion and they asked about what if a non-participant was harvesting for Gwich'in families? What wording could allow for that? So the new wording gives an exception for those with a Special Harvesting license approved by an RRC. So that is what we are talking about. The board is giving direction on whether that additional wording for that exception is good. This is all consistent with the land claim agreement, but needs to be formalized, as it was never in the regulations.

Grace: This question is not about moose, but is about Special Harvesting areas for fishing. For a scenario where nonaboriginal people have aboriginal partners who are not allowed to fish in those special management areas. We need to look at this all across the board, not just for moose but for fishing too. If a person needs to provide for their family and their family is aboriginal, you need to take a good look at that and see how to do it...instead of penalizing people. Those

people got a letter from DFO. That is not what the claim is about. It is about looking at feeding our people and that is really important for us. What we are talking about the moose also needs to go over to talk about the fish.

Burt: Question to Amy. Was that only in regards to moose, the Special Harvesting Area provision, and would it cover the situation as Grace mentioned for fish?

Amy: This text would only apply to the Wildlife Act. Grace's concern is acknowledged and important but it would be a different process, because it is from a different act. The board would support it but through a different act.

Burt: Direction or motion needed?

Amy: Direction is fine because we have a previous motion. A motion would be stronger.

Amy then reviewed the wording of the proposed motion for the board. Burt moved

Anna May: I think you should put the word respect in that motion. In our culture, that is a strong word for us. That is our law, respect. With respect to the fishing licenses, they come through the RRC so we have the power of who or what they can do in the GSA. So we want the same with hunting and trapping too. So that everything goes through the RRC and they have the power to say yes or no. I think it has to go through the DGO to, as the DGO has more power than the RRC. They need to know who is giving rights to who on their lands. With the fishing one we had an issue where there was a non-aboriginal married to an aboriginal and wanted to go fishing but couldn't touch the net as DFO wouldn't give them a license. They said to come to the RRC but didn't want to so it stopped there. That's where all these issues are coming from.

Louis: I was wondering if you can put in the regulation that when you come to apply for the application to hunt for special lands to that you have to report in and when you come out you have to report to. Then you don't have to go chasing someone around to report. They have to come in to report and when they come back to report. That should be in the regulations. It is important for access to special lands.

Motion to approve adding Special Harvesting Areas under the NWT Wildlife Act with wording suggested by the legal counsel of GTC, with the additional text: with the exception of those with special harvest licences approved by RRC.		Motion GRRB 16-40
Moved by: Burt Hunt	Seconded by: Jozef Carnogursky	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

**Check motion wording against Amy's notes.*

Amy: In response to Louis, your point is a good one and through this process the RRC has the power under the claim agreement and the wildlife act to add conditions. Such as if a non-participant wants to access those areas to harvest, the RRC can put on those conditions and then ENR would issue the license with those conditions so the wording in the motion allows for that.

Louis: What about them accessing special lands? To report when they go and when they come back what they harvested. So if they go in there to hunt, they have to report.

Jozef: We did just pass a motion that will require mandatory reporting for resident hunters in the settlement area, so they will have to report

Louis: all?

Jozef: anyone legally hunting will have to report.

Louis: In and out? So not disturbing anyone else's rights on special lands? [...] wording on access and reporting is very important. [...]

Grace: When you are corresponding with the RRC on this matter, or any other matter, would you quote any section of the GCLCA that applies, to assist us in reviewing what decision took place?

Note, Added to the minutes: Section 12.4.4 of the GCLCA addresses special harvesting areas as discussed in this agenda item.

Liz Vittrekwa: A suggestion as you are doing your motions, is it possible to put them onto the screen and what you are adding? From our perspective, it is difficult to understand. That way we as RRC members can acknowledge it also. With respect to what Anna May and Grace were saying for non-aboriginals married to a Gwich'in person, what would happen if they divorce?

Stephen: Aboriginal harvesting rights are not transferrable to non-Aboriginal people. That's why this process is being established here, so that non-beneficiaries will be able to harvest in the GSA through this process. The rights are not transferable. E.g. If Aboriginal woman has harvest rights, then rights not transferred to her non-Aboriginal partner. They have to have the appropriate license. The RRC must give permission for this person to be able to harvest in their area, for a particular animal, at a particular time of the year.

Jozef: That person would still require a license either way.

- Break for Door Prizes -

9. Grizzly Bear Management

This agenda item provided time for the board to review issues related to management of Grizzly bears according to the Grizzly Bear Management Agreement (GBMA) signed in 2002 by the GRRB and all RRCs. Additional issues that have since arisen were also part of the discussion.

Kristen spoke first to the board to review the objectives of the agreement and the way the GBMA manages bear harvests through a tag system, including the use of credits that accumulate when tags go unused. The credits can be applied to problem bear kills rather than drawing from subsistence harvest tags in some instances. She also addressed how tags are allocated to RRCs and the GRRB and distributed to Gwich'in hunters. She summarized what hunters need to know to follow the GBMA with those tags. Her presentation included a summary of recent bear harvest levels in the GSA (as reported by ENR to the GRRB in an annual report provided separately by ENR for this meeting). She wrapped up her presentation by outlining two items for board discussion that have been unresolved and need board input for direction and resolution as well as three new concerns for board consideration:

Unresolved

1. Which comments from the 2009 GBMA review to accept? Are there new changes to address?
2. Fair system for allocation of tags by RRCs to Gwich'in participants in a zone in which they do not reside.

New concerns:

3. Request for use of tags by an outfitter in G/GB/05 (in the Mackenzie mountains)
4. ENR request to the GRRB on how/whether to legislate the GBMA
5. GRRB request to ENR for complete reporting on kills from Defense of Life or Property (DLP), and information needs and ENR actions for GRRB to understand DLP kills in the GSA to reduce the need for DLP kills.

Discussion and Comments

Amy then addressed the board about some progress made in these areas:

- a. Regarding Point 4 -Over the summer I did talk to all the RRCs. One of the questions I asked them was about their thoughts on how the system was working. This relates to ENR's request to the GRRB about whether there is interest to legislate the management agreement. This is a voluntary agreement only between the RRCs and the GRRB but it is not under legislation of the Wildlife Act. So, the general response I got from all 4 communities was that it was fine how it is. That if we were to look at legislating it, that there are still comments that people have, as Kristen mentioned. That would need to happen first. There would be more questions needed before legislation and the GRRB would have to hold a public hearing as no formal TAH set through a hearing as this is a voluntary limit.
- b. Regarding Point 5 – The GRRB requested more information from ENR. We did meet (Jozef, Amy & Kristen) with wildlife and enforcement staff from ENR. GRRB had given ENR some standing advice from a few years ago (that advice was given after discussion and consultation with RRCs). We wanted to talk about that. We have some progress made there. If there is anything that we should bring to this meeting. One concern was about information being provided to the GRRB about defense kills. We have already seen an improvement with the information flow to me. It is included in the binder to the board under Reports folder. ENR had some questions

for the board too. Standing advice was what to do with the hides from DLPS and reporting when a DLP happens. One piece of information missing is what to do when hide is poor quality. Standing advice did not say what to do in those scenarios. It said for all hides to go to auction. There needs to be someone who can sign on behalf of the GRRB for those hides.

Stephen: We don't want to see an animal destroyed in defense of life and property if it can be prevented. In the summer hides are very poor. We have a program where hides can be entered into the Mackenzie Valley Fur program. An individual from the GRRB needs to sign off for it however. ENR cannot enter fur into their own program. We have some of the best fur in the world that enters that program. To keep that standard high, we cannot be sending in poor quality fur, such as are found from a July bear. That is why we are suggesting a change to how DLP kills are considered. That would not be automatically sent to the program, but potentially destroyed if it was poor quality, after getting as much biological data as possible. -using it as much as possible first. Regarding the promissory note, it has to go through the GRRB or one of their staff authorized to sign off on it.

Marsha: there are three questions for the GRRB:

1. What ENR is asking for is authorization from the GRRB to not submit poor quality hides. In that case we would notify the board.
2. Are GRRB and RRCs interested in getting the claws and skull back from DLPs for educational purposes?
3. When we do send hides out to the program, who is the contact person that could sign the promissory notes? That the cheque would come to for the GRRB account?

Louis Cardinal: In the past there was one bear that was confiscated. We got word from ENR to bring the skin and all the information they needed to them. They said they would give the hide back. It has been 2 years now, but we have never seen that hide again. It was a DLP too. It came to the camp. It bluff charged and then again, so we shot it. We skinned it out, but the officer said it would be returned to us. If you are not going to do anything with the hide, it can go back to the hunter that shot it, rather than wasting it. Some hides are still okay for use in their sled or cabin. Need to utilize that hide instead of it sitting in a freezer. If it has hair on it, it is still warm.

Anna May: I have three points:

1. For the DLP kills, what did you call that number two in the brackets?

Kristen: that column (indicated) shows the number of Defense of Life and property kills and then the brackets show how many of those were female bears

Anna May: Life and property? What is that?

Kristen: If the bear is attacking your dogs or trying to break into your cabin and you have to shoot it...

Anna May: or attacking us?

Kristen: yes. It doesn't have to be attacking a person. If you are defending your things or yourself, that is DLP.

Anna May: Clarify the numbers in the table: you have the 6 tags and the two in brackets, if we use the 2 up then we have to do a defense kill?

Kristen: There is a credit system. If it is a defense of life and property, and if you haven't used up your six tags and a credit is available, then the credit would be applied to a DLP. I don't think there has been a situation where there hasn't been a tag available for a kill.

Marsha: If the RRC wanted to, they could just give that hunter a tag. If you have tags available, you don't have to ration them. If you are having a problem bear, a hunter could take a tag and go hunt it, instead of having to call it a DLP. If it is a summer time thing, the hunter may not want to do it because the hide is no good.

Anna May: I am saying that because there are a lot of grizzlies here and we may need to do more defense kills. May have to do [...]. If they smell our meat and come after us and we have to shoot them... If we use up those defense kills, then would there be more out there if needed? We don't want to get in trouble for shooting a bear.

Marsha: You will never get in trouble for shooting a bear in defense of your life or property. If there aren't enough credits then maybe the GSA credits can be applied, or you have to use up tags. But the other thing to think about how to keep the bear away in the first place, perhaps using electric fences.

Anna May: but you guys don't even have electric fences for us. You had one for the whole Beaufort Delta. We have been trying to get one for a few years.

Marsha: You could use your CHAP funding for that. We have a small program for that from Conneco Phillips. The fences do work. You can put them around caches and stuff. They work at keeping bears away

2. Does the GRRB or ENR hold the emergency tags?

Kristen: So usually it is a credit. ENR helps us keep track, so it is really important for the RRC and the RO in the community to get the information, so they can assign it. If it was an emergency it is almost always a credit that gets applied. In a few cases if there has been a lot of hunting for subsistence use of the tags and there have been a lot of DLPs then you might start to have to make a decision about whether the GRRB would allocate a tag from another zone, or what else to do. But, if it is an emergency, you don't have to worry about where that is coming from. This is a tracking system that helps us understand the number and type of bear kills happening so that we can tell if harvesting is sustainable or not.

3. We need to manage the bears. They are getting over-populated in the GSA. Is there an extra plan in place to work with that too?

Kristen: Jozef helpfully pointed out that we are not using all the tags. In many years, not all the tags have been used. So you can hunt the bears if you have the tags available.

Stephen: Harvesting a bear with the intent of harvesting is one thing. But to destroy a bear to defend yourself or your property is different. If you are going to harvest a bear, go through the process of getting a tag. We know there are tags available. If you have to destroy a bear DLP...the two are different. The concern is that someone could destroy a bear to get a hide and say it was after them when it wasn't, in order to avoid having to get a tag. So if you are linking acquiring a hide through DLP to get a hide is a problem. Think of that situation that could come in the future if there are not enough tags, what some people might do. The RRCs may want to think about that to avoid people going around having to use a tag for their harvesting.

Grace: The Grizzly bear tags are confusing. I understood that the tags were for commercial purposes, if you want to sell the hide then you use a tag. If you are defending your self or property then you don't need a tag right then and there at your camp. One of the elders said when a bear comes you have to shoot it because it will come back and come back. People are scared to go to their camps now because of the bear situation, especially if it is a person alone, or a woman with her children or by herself. If there is not someone to watch. Right across here, last year there was a grizzly bear and sightings again this spring, so they are coming around. I never used to hear about that as much in this area. I would hear about it in the delta, but then 12 miles down here and now 12 miles around the camps destroying one of the fisher woman's camp 25 minutes up the Mackenzie, so it is a real concern, because the people here like to fish in the summer and some of them are afraid to go out. So, we need to look at that.

I see something about outfitter there. We need to look at outfitter. At one time we said outfitters cannot go hunt grizzlies. If we are considering that we need to look seriously at that, as Gwich'in should benefit first.

Johnny: I want to add to what Stephen said about the quality of the bear hide. This sheet says one bear was killed in July 29th, and another May 28th and the fur from the one in May was in good shape but the one from July and August were not very good. So many any bears shot after June 15th or June 30th are not good. I would suggest that RRCs consider not giving out tags after that date. What would you do with a hide from a bear that is shedding? It is useless.

Louis: Why not send DLP hide back to hunter who got harvested it in the first place to avoid waste? It can still keep you warm from the cold ground or on your sled, even if it isn't great. Don't just throw away any kind of hide. It can be used down the road, maybe by someone else if not by you. That is passed down from our elders. You need to consider how to best make use of it.

Amy: In the GBMA that was signed between FRRB and RRCs and is also in the WA, for DLPs the hide goes to the board or RRC. The reason the hide doesn't return to hunter in event of defense kill is to avoid people trying to avoid the tag system and killing them and saying it was a defense kill when it wasn't. That is part of the agreement.

In regards to how it goes also, is because of the advice given by the GRRB to ENR. That advice was given after consultation with the RRCs and communities then. The agreement says the hide goes to the board and the board wanted to know what to do with the hides. The RRCs gave advice to the board. The final advice from the GRRB to ENR was to send all hides to auction with the money coming back to go to educational purposes. That is to clarify what the current process is.

Grace: If some of these hides have been sold and there is money coming from that, I think it should go towards the purchase of bear fences for those that want it. I understand there is a big list of people wanting these fences but not money for it. I want to know how much money has come back from hides going to auction.

Louis: I would also like to hear back from ENR about status of hide from the defense kill I mentioned earlier. Want to know what's been done with hide. They had to get the hide but no benefit with it taken. It would be good to tell them what was done with their defense kill bear. I could use that hide at my camp on top of spruce bows. It would be good to hear back.

Jozef: One comment for Grace: You don't need a tag for a kill in defense of life and property. In terms of some of the comments about specific individuals, that is getting away from the conversation the board needs to have.

John Norbert: First of all I want to let you know that ...all belongs to the animals. They need to live and eat too, and everything else. With GB, the last 20 years or so we are having problems. Last few years...2 bears...[..]. Both destroyed...At some point something has to be done. Get the skins tags and sell them and money for bear fences. I have experience with bears quite a bit. Always be ready for it. Once they know your camp they will come back. You have to be ready for it.

Anna May: Does the GRRB have a TK policy attached to Management Agreement? I think it should be in an appendix to it.

Amy: This is the agreement between the RRCs and the GRRB. There is also a management plan. The agreement talks about the tag system. There is also a separate grizzly bear management plan. Culture and traditional knowledge is included in the Grizzly Bear Management plan (separate from the Management Agreement).

Anna May: Can we get posters on how the tag system works so we can put it up around the community? This will help people understand.

Action item 16-44: GRRB staff to create a poster explaining the GBMA tag system for community use by RRCs.

Amy: The next thing to talk about is probably the next steps. My recommendation is to establish a process to deal with outstanding issues. I see this as including a working group, looking for funding, perhaps also to help with a facilitator to help. ...]

Cindy: I have some comments about the wording in the GBMA and about legislative approaches. I have some suggestions on that. I think the GBMA as written right now doesn't necessarily reflect all the issues that are being discussed here. That needs to be addressed. I would also suggest in relation to the TK comment, from my experience in Yukon and in law school, you can draft legislation to include your indigenous laws and beliefs. Reading this, it doesn't seem to reflect that. In the Yukon, from my family's history, there are sacred stories about bears. You have to respect the bears. There are stories about marrying a bear, they are part of... those stories are known. Because bears can be very human like, they are considered a brother. That story about the bear.- That gives a sacred element to that. I don't see that reflected in this agreement. I would encourage all who want to work on this, that you embed those stories into your legislation. Consider that when you are working through that. It doesn't have to look like western legislation. It can have indigenous concepts in that. You can reflect all aspects of your relationship with the bear. This act doesn't talk about education or other themes, other than harvesting. So I would encourage that. If you think about legislation, you do not have to take a western approach. Some may disagree but that is my suggestion to include those indigenous concepts that respect your relationship with the bear and animals.

Grace: There should be a policy or guideline that says that everything GRRB does has to have TK, culture, and traditions and values or whatever embedded within whatever you are setting up. Because even though the GRRB is a public board, like some of the challenges you are having in the Sahtu, if you put the TK into the whole discussion, it will probably work better and will bring some understanding as to why there is a blockage sometimes. If the traditions that the people have for eons have abided by before the government came along, things would run smoother. I would like to see that direction

from the board that whenever they are doing something that TK would be embedded in. whether it is a study, policy or guideline or legislation.

Louis: Under a new strategy – under grizzly/polar bear act – if kill a hybrid on this side (in GSA) then who has jurisdiction? Inuvialuit or Gwich'in?

Jozef: I think we need to focus in a bit more on what we need to answer. I respect all the comments given, but there are some things we need to deal with like what to do with the claws, skulls etc... to get through these agenda items.

Charlie: I have a question. This grizzly bear management you are talking about in our territory. Have you tried in the Yukon, the board? I think that is where management is needed, in the Yukon. That is where the bears are now. That is where people are getting harassed. I don't know how you fence... the Yukon people they go for anything. They eat anything that is eatable. People complain about bull moose no good after they mate, but you meet some of them in the past that would eat the bull meat, the caribou meat. GB and black bear no one eats, but they eat too. One of the [...] in the Yukon told me that everyone likes dry meat. GB meat makes the best dry meat. Give it a try

Richard John Blake: I think you should let hunter of DLP defense kill keep hide– just give it back, they have to do a lot of work to skin it just to have someone come around and take it. They should be able to keep everything.

Liz: To add to what Richard was saying about DLP kills. Right now if the fur is poor, they automatically destroy it. Not too long ago the RRC received a hide back and we decided to let the person who shot it keep it. I think that should be a choice. If it can't go to auction, they should let the individual decide if they want it back. If the don't then rather than destroying it (like the claws and skulls) they should be kept for educational purposes. But up to the individual first.

Anna May: The skulls can go for educational purposes, but the claws can go out to crafts people. They can make some good stuff with that.

Amy: To review, Questions to Board for decision:

- Propose next step to seek outside resources to establish working group with GRRB, staff and RRCs. A big undertaking so likely wise to get someone to help facilitate this process. In this process, all of these comments we are hearing can be addressed (include revisions to GBMA and management)?
- ENR needs to know: When hide is poor quality, can ENR destroy the hide and then report back to GRRB and RRC? This is because current advice does not address hides of poor quality. ENR needs clarity.
- If they do destroy the hide, does the GRRB want claws and skull returned to GRRB for education, crafts or research use?
- Who will sign on behalf of Board when hides to go auction. I propose Cheryl can be that person. Need board direction on that.

Jozeph: Yes, yes and yes. A good process to move forward on this issue.

Burt: motion is yes, yes, and yes

Amy: Direction only is needed. 😊

ACTION ITEM 16-45:

- GRRB to respond to ENR regarding question of permissible for ENR to destroy poor quality hides by ENR prior to reporting back to GRRB and RRC.*
- GRRB to respond to ENR regarding if/when hides are destroyed, does GRRB want skull and claws?*
- GRRB to give ENR name of contact at GRRB who will sign on behalf of Board if ENR sends hides to auction on behalf of GRRB.*

ACTION ITEM 16-46: Amy to find funding to establish a working group that includes RRCs and a facilitator to revise the management agreement and address the issues brought up (incorporating TK into agreement/management plan, improving language (plain language) addressing past edits, tag allocation, outfitting, relationship with Yukon process)

Grace: I think there were some suggestions to be considered: there may be some cases where a hunter is going to say that it was a DLP when he is looking to do something otherwise with it. Once again, we need to be careful when we look at people like they are out to do something that is not right. I think it was suggested that ENR work with the hunter and the GRRB. I don't see the reason for the RRB to have the skull. That is probably what ENR should be doing-educational things with the bones or whatever you want to do with it. The claws should go to the hunter or for his partner to use in arts and crafts. We need to work with people and not against it. The board should have nothing to do with the claws as far as I am concerned. So, we are talking about money made from these different hides. We are going beyond what I think. Go back to the hunter. Maybe the hunter needs money too. Why should the board make money off these things? The hunter or the RRC crafts people need to be considered in all of this.

Joseph: In terms of education visits that we do to the schools, the kids like to see skulls, claws and things like that. That is where we are looking at. When we do the review, which will include all of those things, the money too, we can review all that. I don't think there will be any issue on the board working on this issue with the RRCs and to develop a process for all that.

Grace: Use ENR too. They have a warehouse for skulls etc.. Don't duplicate what is already available. Work together with ENR rather than try to do collection of skulls. That may not be what the hunter or RRC is happy with.

Amy: I want to make one point of clarification. I apologize if I am misunderstanding you Grace. I think that the question here regarding the hide being returned is specifically for defense kills. It is not always a hunter. It is often an officer who shoots a problem bear. A person who hunts a bear with tags for their personal use can do what they want with the hide. That doesn't go to the board. This is only in consideration of when it is a defense kill. A lot of times that is by officers. This is what is already in the Wildlife Act for those situations, it goes to the board. The board can choose to give it to the hunter. The reason they don't automatically go to the hunter, is to avoid situations where someone says it was a DLP to avoid getting a tag. Just a point of clarification.

Louis: in the past, if a DLP, the renewable resource person had a scoff-law attitude: I'm going to kill this! Prior to this, it was a defense kill, but now we get all this flack: Why did you kill it?! How come?! Their approach to a DLP comes with a lot of attitude. If they could drop it down, we would appreciate it.

Stephen: I wanted to recognize Adam and the young people from Tsiigehtchic who are taking the environmental monitoring course and are here at the meeting. Thank you for being here. You may find yourself as future leadership and environmental managers.

Grace: Consider the Renewable resources training RR training in Inuvik. We need all of you to think of replacing all of these jobs. You are our future! Thank you very much.

10. RRC Session-Open Discussion between RRCs and GRRB

Amy gave a short presentation to give context to the RRC-GRRB session and to review the goals of the session. The GRRB wants to ensure it has effective relationships with the RRCs. It has added specific agenda item to have time for the RRCs to address the board at each of its board meetings.

Questions and Comments

a. Gwichya RRC remarks

Grace: We have been talking at the GTC level and at the annual assembly: I don't know why we are spending our Gwich'in \$ to pay for this RRC when it is a public entity. I disagree with that and we will continue to talk about that. Implementation should have enough money to pay for what they have under their jurisdiction under the claim. They are also not getting adequate dollars to do the work. The staff are inadequately paid. There are many issues and may requests of the RRC. We need to go back to the beginning and look at how we compensate our people on what we are doing. Yesterday I talked about punitive measures from governments to our people. People are tired of that and want to work in a cooperative way. When RRCs make suggestions we want to be taken seriously. If you are asking us a

question and we give you a response you don't like, I don't know about that. We need to be understood as to why we are saying what we say. We need that concern to be taken into consideration as part of the whole recommendations.

The RRC needs to establish a good working relationship between the local RRC, ENR and the GRRB. We need to understand non-Gwich'in aboriginal people living in our community that they need to understand what they need to do if they want to go out on our lands to harvest. It is not just blanket permission to do what you want when you want. We need to understand what the steps are to work with the RRC and how to work with the RRC and to have a say. We need to avoid complaints about newcomers to the community because they don't understand. It can be non-aboriginal people too. We need to have that clear understanding on how to work in a peaceful manner so we are not creating problems. There are already bad feelings between people.

Why is a non-Gwich'in sitting on an RRC? Is it a public board or not? If there are concerns that there is a non-Gwich'in on the RRC, do they take part in talking about issues related to the GSA? All that is super important, the communication, to decision making process. The other thing is looking at the technicalities of permit applications. We don't have technical expertise in the community. We need help. I have been asking Janet for help to look over water licenses and have been asking the same of the lands department of the GTC need a simplest way possible to review as possible within the timeframe given. Sometimes multiple permits for review. Sometimes I can't handle it and get frustrated. We need a mechanism in which RRCs are capable and able to respond to whatever is put before them, through the public boards.

We haven't given a lot of time to forestry. My concern about the fish also. We talk a lot about wildlife. Fish is really important to people here. In every community no doubt. The ferry landings –there is a license for the landings –a water license. They are in the special fisheries management zone in the GCLCA, for fishing. Time and time again, I have been talking. I wrote out many concerns in the water license put forward by DOT because of all the material accumulating over the years is being washed down into the eddies where people used to fish and now they can't set nets anymore. The lands study is not comprehensive. And so I want us to do a comprehensive study. I talked to GTC about that- Tsatsiyé is looking at a CIMP application to do that study. I hope it is collaborative. Not against DOT, but to look at the implications of the material that is disturbing the eddies and the fishing spots that have been used for generations. Where all that material is flowing is causing a big sand spit out into the deep area down at the point of the Inuvik side. In that application it says there are 3 landings. But there are 5 landings –they use one towards Margaret's camp that is disturbing her camp. It is too close for privacy. Another landing on the same side to the downstream side and a place also to pull up the ferry. So there are 3 on the Inuvik side. That is not considered in the water license. We put that forward to the GWB but no one understands us when we bring it up. Because it is looked upon as being either against the DOT. Part of what the GRRB is responsible for is management and I am sitting on the RRC with their permission, look into all this. If I don't talk about it, no one is going to. Because they are scared to talk. Why are we scared to talk? Because someone will look at us the wrong way or not like what we say? Or interfere with something they are doing? No, it is about our livelihood. People are not rich here, the people that are fishing. That is how they make their living. Bartering and trading fish. And even sometimes at RRC meeting, it is hard to get people to share their views. We need to change that. If we believe in what we are doing, we need to change that. People need to speak freely and not be afraid. We don't speak because we don't want to make someone upset, we have concerns that go back to what Charlie was saying. That is why they made it a special fishing management area. But what does that mean for DOT? For Fibre optic line that wants to do horizontal directional drilling under the water for their line? All this, people have to be able to speak up about. And understand and take their concerns seriously.

And so, we need more to develop our working relationship with our communities, more seriously. I like all the work that was done with the char. Boy oh boy Fort McPherson and Aklavik worked together with the RRB. It was wonderful collaborative work. Okay, now let's do that for other concerns as they arise too. Like I said, during the claim when we are talking about the claim and the boards, we put co-management because we wanted to work with governments to make sure our concerns were well taken care of and not in opposition with one another. And if people are not reporting it is because they are scared to say what they are doing. Maybe ENR doesn't look favourably on it. With our claim, people don't want to be scared anymore. Now we are scared of our own people. Some of it because our own people do not have the [...] the water to see the net. They don't understand how near and dear the fishing industry is to us that live off this. We are not rich but material things but rich by traditional foods in Tsiigehtchic, especially the fish. And if people want to fish off the landings they should be able to do that. In the claim it says that if there is any activity that interferes with the traditional way of life that is a concern, and we should be taking that into consideration. First and foremost.

I was involved in the beginning from the land claim with some of it. Not at negotiating but at the side, so I know what the public board is supposed to be doing. We need to expand our horizon into fish and forestry so that people are really well informed. I think I talked to Stephen about having a workshop here in Tsiigehtchic and maybe it could be with other

communities about understanding the new Wildlife Act. I am thankful you came here for your meeting. It was helpful for the students to come and listen.

A concern for me, is when I was working for the imperial oil for the Mackenzie gas project, they had monitors out: 1 wildlife and 1 environmental. They had to have 2 of those people out at all times on their project. Now with the Fibre Optic line, there is only one environmental monitor who has to be wildlife monitor too. One monitor who went out said that there should be one environmental and one wildlife. That is a grave concern there again. People don't want to pay extra money for it.

These are all important things to take into consideration. If it doesn't belong at this table, then it should go to Gwich'in Tribal Council. Thank you for listening to me. We look forward to the next meeting.

Johnny: maybe we can strike up a meeting with all parties. Maybe we can get some letters going.

Archie: The boys I raised are Gwich'in as far as I am concerned. I have heard comments about them fishing. I have yet to see a G marked on any one fish. Never. They are not our fish. They are to be shared. Their kids are registered Gwich'in. Where does that leave them? They can't fish or hunt? Have to get a license. The comments I have been hearing tick me off. They harvest moose with other kids in the community and give out the meat to all the families. They taught the kids how to hunt and trap and yet they are not accepted. That makes me mad. You know, we talking about people married to Gwich'in or to white people, but not consider what these kids are going to learn. You are not Gwich'in so you can't hunt? I am Gwich'in. My kids are Gwich'in. I call them my grandkids. They are my kids. At this meeting at this time, we are allowed to talk. I hate it when you come in and tell us what to do, but it is true. At least here it is a discussion, to work together to solve a problem. About the caribou, I hope this board talks about protecting the migratory routes of the Porcupine caribou. It is needed, to protect a way of life. No more drilling or mining in their calving areas. It is really –I am Gwich'in and sometimes some of these restrictions we place on people... You know - I recommend to Joe when he partnered up with northern, it is about time he says. We had a lawyer yesterday. We didn't have one for so many years. It is about time. We are slowly getting there, but you know. I talk about his fishing and how the gravel is being shifted down the river. How many years! It is up to this board, I think to enforce that. To make sure. They come in every year and they tell us they did dredging. I think I saw them do it once. They were supposed to do it every year. Now we can't fish in that bay down there. We have to go 30-40 feet to put nets in away from the shore now but we used to be able to do it from the shore. Lots of things tot work on and improve on. This meeting really made me proud to be here. I enjoyed being here and the comments made. Like Grace said, we need to start working together. We tell this to DOT, but a concern needs to be brought to you to enforce.

Anna May: As part of our RRC report, we need to do more workshops on our land claims, so we can clear up on who fishes, hunts and traps. That will be in future for us. The DGOs need to be considered a first priority over our land and RRCs secondary. They should only make decisions for outside of our lands.

The reporting that you ask for at the GRRB meetings, I asked Amy if she can sit with Roxanne and show her what to do for our written reports to this meeting. Perhaps a suggested format to follow for GRRB meetings. Climate change is affecting us way faster than expected. Some people have seen bats in the back of the water lake area. That tells us we are getting pretty warm. Next thing someone said they say snakes.

The special management zone for fish, they should have done a door to door questionnaire. Only the RRC knew. Some of us fished in those areas and could not get a fishing license because we were in a management zone. Who gave them the right to make a decision on our livelihood and never let us know.

Our funding is only \$8,000 a year from you guys. We can't have an office with that. We can't pay a coordinator even part time on that. The only thing we can do is buy paper. There needs to be a training component to the RRC positions for when we recruit new workers. That should be mandatory.

Amy: just a point of clarity? What funding is the \$8,000?

Anna May: That is ENR funding she is referring to. We also get GTC implementation funding. It is not all enough to adequately run our operation. Employee wages –they don't have a benefit package even. We need to look at that. It is the GTC that works on the implementation dollars, but my opinion about the other portion that is being topped up by the GTC from our settlement monies, is the part I am talking more about. We should not put more money into that as it will mean more cutback from the RRCs and we will have to use our own money. We should not use our own claim dollars for the RRCs. It is an government operation and the government should be paying.

Janet: Regarding point #1 –observations, local concerns etc.. around your community. We have heard that you are the eyes and ears of the land. In particular, I would like to mention and discuss about reporting your harvest. I am not sure if the class was here for that discussion. I want to put that into context. The PCMB members were here yesterday and they were talking about how important it is for the PCMB and management that they get this information they need for harvest reporting within the range of the porcupine caribou The GRRB has a harvest survey and some of you might have seen this. Twice a year there is a survey that goes around the community. It is also o for moose, sheep and muskox. We were talking earlier today about the need for moose harvest reporting earlier today. All of these animals are subject to management planning. All the species of interest to the Gwich'in people. Have hear a lot too in our communities. You are the best people to know what is going on in our back yard, no t me in Inuvik.

I would encourage you to participate in all these studies in the next survey round in November. The RRC will have information about that. We do have a display here on the harvest project. This is what is done with the information provided. At the moment the display is focused on the PC caribou. We are trying to incorporate the harvester knowledge as well. I have copies of the last form. If people haven't seen it you can talk a look there is also a serious of questions on the back about slumping and other concerns. I would be thrilled to hear from anyone about your concerns through h that reporting process also. If there are other things you would like us to ask about, we can change the form and add different questions. We have researchers who are doing muskrat research, in response to concerns raised. We also added questions to the form about muskrats.

John Norbert: Good afternoon. I want to talk about something else. These are organizations -you people apply for and get elected for this. But still, you also swear on the bible and say that you should do your best. Do your best to attend meetings. Right now, we are having a hard time to have meetings and that is not good. You have to be there. People elect you or appoint you and they depend on you to do the work. For me, it is not happening. It is a concern for me.

Sonny Blake, MLA: Good afternoon. On #3 there what is the GRRB doing well: What Janet mentioned, the harvest study. The Gwich'in are the only people in the NWT doing the harvest study. That is much needed for conservation as you already know. I encourage you to keep that up. Whether it is the Tlicho or the Sahtu, no one else keeps track. It is very important. It must be 15-20 years of information now. That is needed for the future. Someone mentioned today, this spring, they counted 14 muskox not even 10 miles from here. They shot one near the community and 3 after that a few years ago. There are other animals moving in. How they may affect the boreal woodland caribou herds, could be a concern in the future. Also the slumpage up the Mackenzie and up the ARR: In November, I saw that happen when the ice broke after that slump happened, it was up to a foot and a half, so it had to be in November when no one was up there. I like all the information you have been getting and encourage you to keep that up.

b. Tetlit RRC remarks

Richard: talking about the lands slide in the fort McPherson area. Maybe because of all the rain?

Also because of all the fishing –did they find out why the fish are so poor this year? When you are making a decision, bring it back to the communities and let them look over it first. Not like the GCLCA and then we found out after. Thank you.

Johnny: suggestion to RRC to write a letter to strike up a meeting to discuss these issues (including those raised by GGRC)

Grace: GRRB can talk about it and the RRCs can talk about it privately. I brought it up so we cal all think about how to move forward. GTC is putting together a proposal to look at how this landing affects the fishing and the people. I had taken the initiative to do that; now we need partners to come together and bring it to the end. This can be done for the Fort McPherson area too, they had an oil spill over there.

c. Ehdiitat RRC remarks -None spoken to

d. Nihtat RRC remarks -None spoken to

e. Public -addressed during GGRC item

11. Interim Research Priorities

Janet gave a presentation reviewing the research mandate of the board, its current priorities, its priority setting process and interim priorities.

- a. Discussion of research priorities
- b. Decision on any emerging priorities

Grace: first slide question –you have wildlife priorities. I want to add fish to that. You need to be specific. What does that mean to our government. What does it mean to be on this list? Will you get a letter of support?

Amy: The board had their workshop in 2012. They developed long term priorities for research that are set. Those topics summarized on the slide are part of the 3-5 year long term priorities. Likely next year or the year after there will be another workshop. If there is anything outside of that research list that is approved, to consider for the next fiscal. Sometimes things come up that were not considered in the previous workshop. It doesn't mean necessarily that GRRB staff will do this, but gives me direction to help support outside research on this by other people. Helps know that there is board support. Some of these are management plan commitments (e.g. sheep survey schedule); part of implementation of PC HMP so the rut survey is covered in there. Muskox has no mgt plan, but is a community interest for outfitting so we need information and so that is why they are a priority and on the long term list. The species at risk is an emerging one. Fisheries information is important on other lakes and rivers we don't have much on is also an emerging interest. We have commitments as well as interim priorities. The q to the Board is do you support the emerging interim priorities for next year? That will help if the GRRB evaluate project proposals for funding or letters of support or for staff time. IF they are not on this list, they are not forgotten, they get added to the research list. This includes items outside of our mandate too. We use that list to help encourage other researchers to help with the work so they know what the local concerns are. That is a way that the GRRB deals with requests and interest that come to the board. They are not forgotten.

Grace: not clear money or support letter?

Amy: This is the step before the funding. In the fall meeting the GRRB confirms its research priorities, including interim priorities that may be new. Amy reviewed the slide with the RP cycle process.

Grace: okay thank you. If we provide money to someone in the Yukon, e.g. Doing Dall's sheep, do we get that information as part of the overall sharing of data collection with the communities. I am curious. I haven't paid attention to the work done on the Dall sheep. I don't know how many are harvesting sheep or if they can harvest sheep. How does one get priority over another.

Marsha: comment on the interim priorities. The sheep survey is done collaboratively with the ENR and GRRB and YTG. Muskox is also collaborative.

Need to add also that a Moose survey also may be end of this fiscal or early next fiscal.

We need to start preparing for photo-survey in 2018 for CB, BNW. We need to do collaring in 2017/2018.

Motion to approve the interim research priorities as presented.		Motion GRRB 16-40
Moved by: Jozef Carnogursky	Seconded by: Cindy Allen	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Anna May: Make a Chart on the research project?

Janet: I gave a flash drive of research from 2012-2016 as collected by ARI through their permitting process.

Anna May: when they go and do the research, the pilots or assistants, they are taking pictures and collecting their own data without a permit. They are not included in the permits. I didn't agree that that was what they should do. We should be talking to those researchers. It is only for them and not anyone else that goes.

Departure of the RRCs and public from the meeting

A break in the meeting was called at 2:17PM so the board could go in-camera. Business arising out of the in-camera session would be discussed after the in-camera session concluded. Public participants departed the meeting at 2:17pm.

Motion to go in-camera at 3:15pm		Motion GRRB 16-42
Moved by: Jozef Carnogursky	Seconded by: Burt Hunt	
All in favour	Motion Approved	
Motion to come out of camera at 5:13pm		Motion GRRB 16-43
Moved by: Jozef Carnogursky	Seconded by: Johnny Charlie	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

12. Business Arising

- Motions and action arising from the in-camera session

The board discussed appointments and how to continue operations when there are vacancies.

Action item 16-47: The board agreed that when board appointments are low they may seek expert advice for board discussions but these experts will not have voting privileges.

Action item 16-48: The board will look at updating its operating procedures policy to include board operations during times when the board has appointment vacancies.

The Executive Director provided a safety update to the board, which included an incident report from this summer involving a grizzly bear encounter. The board was updated on the circumstances surrounding the incident and all the preventative measures that have been implemented afterwards.

Action item 16-49: Include safety updates as a regular agenda item on all Board meetings.

The new file sharing system (Share sync) was discussed and it was decided to continue to use it.

Action item 16-50: Create a "how to" guide for members to use and share files in Share Sync.

13. Closing remarks

Tentative winter 2017 meeting dates were determined to be **Feb 21-23, 2017 in Inuvik**

Action item 16-51: Amy to confirm fall meeting dates with board via email and telephone.

Motion to adjourn the Fall 2016 Board meeting at 5:17pm		Motion GRRB 16-43
Moved by: Jozef Carnogursky	Seconded by: Johnny Charlie	
All in favour	Motion Approved	

Summary of New Action Items

#.	Action Item	Page	Who
16-34	Inquire with RRCs and the Language Center to see if there is a Gwich'in name for the Red-Necked Phalarope that can be added to the minutes of the July 27, 2016 GRRB teleconference call.	4	Kaytlin
16-35	Inquire with GTC regarding GRRB board member nomination status and process. How can interested parties advise GTC of interest and where are they in the process?	6	Amy
16-36	GRRB to respond to ENR regarding direction on wolf sample/carcass collection program: Will GRRB support continuing the current program, accepting samples (which may include carcasses), but not accepting unskinned wolves for skinning and sampling?	7	GRRB-direction/ Amy
16-37	GRRB staff to review fibre optic line plans and associated documents to learn if concerns raised about impacts to amphibians by the line's installation were addressed or if any studies were pursued in response to concerns raised.	10	Staff - JBoxwell? Other?
16-38	GRRB staff to ensure best practises for field work include cleaning gear and equipment to reduce likelihood of transporting viruses or diseases between waterbodies that could impact wildlife, such as to amphibians via viruses on uncleaned equipment or waders and boots.	10	Staff-Amy to oversee
16-39	GRRB to review the Transport Canada handout that was supplied to GRRB by DFO staff, for potential GRRB comment.	11	GRRB and staff
16-40	GRRB to formalize and submit comments for SCOFO/DFO about its concerns with the current Fisheries Act.	21	GRRB and staff
16-41	GRRB to review and provide PCMB with its position on their Guidelines for Sale, Trade and Barter of Caribou meat.	22	GRRB? &Staff?
16-42	GRRB to agree upon representation at the ACCWM annual herd status meeting and give input and direction in preparation for that meeting.	25	GRRB
16-43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. GRRB to involve resident moose hunters in discussion/consultation about moose hunting regulations in GSA, including issue of mandatory reporting. b. GRRB to discuss where resident moose hunting can take place in GSA c. GRRB to discuss mandatory moose harvest reporting with ENR, WMAC NWT and other affected agencies (RRCs) d. GRRB to make final decision about mandatory moose harvest reporting and locations of permitted resident hunting in GSA 	35	GRRB & staff (Amy/ Kristen)
16-44	GRRB staff to create a poster explaining the GBMA tag system for community use by RRCs.	40	Kristen
16-45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. GRRB to respond to ENR regarding question of permissible for ENR to destroy poor quality hides by ENR prior to reporting back to GRRB and RRC. b. GRRB to respond to ENR regarding if/when hides are destroyed, does GRRB want skull and claws? c. GRRB to give ENR name of contact at GRRB who will sign on behalf of Board if ENR sends hides to auction on behalf of GRRB. 	41	GRRB/ Amy Amy
16-46	Amy to find funding to establish a grizzly bear working group that includes RRCs and a facilitator to revise the management agreement and address the issues brought up (incorporating TK into agreement/management plan, improving language (plain language) addressing past edits, tag allocation, outfitting, relationship with Yukon process).	41	Amy
16-47	The board agreed that when board appointments are low they may seek expert advice for board discussions but these experts will not have voting privileges.	47	GRRB
16-48	The board will look at updating its operating procedures policy to include board operations during times when the board has appointment vacancies.	47	GRRB & Amy
16-49	Include safety updates as a regular agenda item on all Board meetings.	47	Amy
16-50	Create a "how to" guide for members to use and share files in Share Sync.	47	Amy

16-51	Confirm fall meeting dates with board via email and telephone.	47	Amy
-------	--	----	-----

Summary of Motions

Motion #	Motion	Mover	Second
GRRB 16-32	Motion to nominate Jozef Carnogursky as meeting chairperson for October 5th and Johnny Charlie as meeting chairperson for October 6 th .	Burt Hunt	Doug Doan
GRRB 16-33	Motion to adopt the October 5 & 6, 2016 meeting agenda.	Cindy Allen	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-34	Motion to accept the Feb 22-24, 2016 meeting minutes.	Burt Hunt	Johnny Charlie
GRRB 16-35	Motion to accept the May 17 teleconference minutes with the changes discussed. (Changes were: Add Cindy to list of teleconference attendees; add in date of motion 2016-23 during #7 Committee Updates)	Doug Doan	Cindy Allen
GRRB 16-36	Motion to accept the July 27, 2016 teleconference minutes.	Burt Hunt	Johnny Charlie
GRRB 16-37	Motion to approve the Boreal Caribou Recovery Strategy as presented.	Burt Hunt	Cindy Allen
GRRB 16-38	Motion to approve the NWT Amphibian Management Plan, with the recommendation to make two suggested changes that would improve the plan. Suggested changes: a. Changing wording of part of a sentence in line 902 to include habitat degradation as a threat, revising to " <i>habitat loss, disturbance and degradation</i> " and b. removing the sentence (Line 1111) about large scale agriculture being unlikely to occur in NWT.	Doug Doan	Cindy Allen
GRRB 16-39	GRRB is generally supportive of mandatory reporting of moose harvest by resident harvesters, but recognizes that this is subject to further discussion with ENR, Inuvialuit, other agencies, perhaps others and recognizes that those affected would be consulted on the process. (check motion wording)	Burt Hunt	Jozef Carnogursky
GRRB 16-40	Motion to approve adding Special Harvesting Areas under NWT Wildlife Act with wording suggested by GTC legal counsel, with the exception of special harvest licences approved by RRC. (check motion wording)	Burt Hunt	Jozef Carnogursky
GRRB 16-41	Motion to approve the interim research priorities as presented.	Jozef Carnogursky	Cindy Allen
GRRB 16-42	To go in-camera at 3:15 PM	Jozef Carnogursky	Burt Hunt
GRRB 16-43	To come out of in-camera at 5:13 PM	Jozef Carnogursky	Johnny Charlie
GRRB 16-44	To adjourn the Oct 5-6/2016 meeting at 5:17 PM	Jozef Carnogursky	

Meeting Participants

Attendance-Day 1(Oct 5)

Board members: Doug Doan, Burt Hunt, Cindy Allen, Johnny Charlie, Charlie Snowshoe, Jozef Carnogursky. Ron Allen joined the meeting by phone (agenda items 6 - 7b)

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

Gwich'in RRC members:

GRRRC: Grace Blake, George Niditchie, Anna May McLeod (acting coordinator)

TRRC: Elizabeth Vittrekwa, Richard J. Blake,

NRRC: George Nerysoo, Allen Firth (coordinator)

ENR: Stephen Charlie, Marsha Branigan, Tracy Davison, Doug Villeneuve

DFO: Kate Snow

GTC: Bobbie Jo Morgan, Dave Wright (staff), Jeff Langlois (GTC visitor), Claire Truesdale (GTC visitor)

Public: Archie Norbert and MLA Sonny Blake. Afternoon session also included Adam Bathe (Aurora College) & students: Jenny Andre, Robert Koe, Louie Cardinal, Jason Blake McLeod, Robert Blake-Macleod, Geraldine Blake, Angela Koe, Archie Inglangasuk Jr., Edgar Blake

Attendance-Day 2(Oct 6)

Board members: Doug Doan, Burt Hunt, Cindy Allen, Johnny Charlie, Jozef Carnogursky, Charlie Snowshoe (AM discussions).

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

Gwich'in RRC members:

GRRRC: Grace Blake, George Niditchie, Anna May McLeod (acting coordinator)

TRRC: Elizabeth Vittrekwa, Richard J. Blake,

NRRC: George Nerysoo, Allen Firth (coordinator)

ERRC: James Edwards, Curtis Illasiak (coordinator)

ENR: Stephen Charlie, Marsha Branigan, Tracy Davison

Public: John Norbert, Adam Bathe, Archie Norbert, Sonny Blake, Margaret Nazon, Bob Mumford, Aurora College students: Jenny Andre, Archie Inglangasuk, Robert Blake-McLeod, Angela Koe, Edgar Blake, unknown, Robert Koe, Geraldine Blake, Louie Cardinal,