



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

| DAY 1 Wednesday, September 18, 2019 | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Chief Niditchie School Gymnasium, Tsiigehtchic | | | |
| <i>Item</i> | <i>Action</i> | <i>Led by</i> | <i>Expected outcomes</i> |
| 9:30 AM Arrival | Coffee and tea provided | | |
| 1. 10:00 AM Introductions | a. Call to order b. Recognition of new members & oaths c. Round table d. Declaration of conflict of interest | Jozef Carnogursky, GRRB | Motion Information |
| <p>Call to Order: 10:00 (Jozef) Jozef recognized the new Board members (William Koe, Myra Robertson) and re-appointments (Doug Doan, Burt Hunt, Ron Allen, Robert Fraser). Oaths have been sworn.</p> <p>Attendees (morning session): Jozef Carnogursky, GRRB Chair Margaret Begg, GRRB Member Doug Doan, GRRB Member Tracy Davison, GRRB Alternate Sam Bullock, GRRB Member William Koe, GRRB Member Myra Robertson, GRRB Alternate Amy Amos, GRRB Executive Director Édouard Bélanger, GRRB Staff Sarah Lord, GRRB Staff Jordan Norman-Goose, GRRB Staff Kaytlin Cooper, GRRB Staff Cheryl Greenland, GRRB Staff Allen Firth, Nihtat RRC Rayann Storr, INB Youth Geraldine Blake, INB Youth Norman Snowshoe, ENR Lila Voudrach, ENR Phillip Blake, Tsiigehtchic Chief Jenny Andre, Public Dougie Wilson, TRRC JulieAnn Andre, GRRB Peter Ross, GRRB Jessi Pascal, ERRC</p> <p>Amy gives housekeeping info. Declare conflict of interest as it arises.</p> | | | |
| 2. 10:10 AM Agenda | e. Review and approval of agenda | Jozef Carnogursky, GRRB | Motion |
| Board can discuss members vs. alternates, because recent appointments are "Government of Canada" and not just "DFO" or "Environment Canada". Add as additional item under item 10. | | | |



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------|
| Motion to accept the revised September 2019 Board meeting agenda | | Motion | |
| Moved by: Doug | Seconded by: Margaret | GRRB 19-35 | |
| All in favour | Motion Carried | | |
| 3. 10:15 AM Minutes & Action Items | a. Review and approval of minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 2019 teleconference | Jozef Carnogursky, GRRB | Motion |
| | b. Review of action items | Amy Amos, GRRB | Information |
| Motion to approve the July 2019 teleconference minutes | | Motion | |
| Moved by: Sam | Seconded by: William | GRRB 19-36 | |
| All in favour | Motion Carried | | |
| <p>Amy reviewed past items brought forward, and then new items since the last teleconference. See meeting binder for full report. Highlights included:</p> <p>Dall's sheep teleconference needs discussion with RRCs. Transboundary issues with Yukon have not been addressed yet, so only the management table has been approved and the actual management plan has not yet been approved by the Board. This is a pending item until we can prioritize it and move forward.</p> <p>ACCWM moved to increase the total allowable harvest (TAH) and increase the Gwich'in portion by 1%. Letters of support from other RRBs sent to the Minister. Waiting for response.</p> <p>Mandatory submission of deer heads to ENR was discussed by Jozef with GTC. The concern is Chronic Wasting Disease, which is fatal to deer and also to caribou and moose. ENR has requested a decision from GRRB but our mandate is strictly within the Settlement Area. There are no deer in the GSA, but there may be Participants in the south who are affected by this issue. Jozef recommends Board approve ENR's request to create a regulation to encourage targeted hunting of deer by resident hunters. There would be no limit for resident hunters. Resident hunters would still need a tag, and would need to submit the head to ENR for testing.</p> | | | |
| Motion to approve the proposed amendments to the Big Game Hunting Regulations under the NWT Wildlife Act relating to deer harvesting as presented. | | Motion | |
| Moved by: Tracy | Seconded by: Sam | GRRB 19-37 | |
| All in favour | Motion Carried | | |
| <p>DFO annual meeting: Larry Dow agreed to cover the cost of 2 attendees. Board can discuss the chosen delegation now that there are new members appointed. Larry will call in at 10am tomorrow.</p> <p>General discussion of how Board decides which members will attend various meetings - deferred to tomorrow, with 'role of alternates' discussion.</p> | | | |
| 4. 10:30 AM Reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Chair report (verbal) b. Member reports (verbal) c. Executive Director report (verbal) | Jozef Carnogursky Board members Amy Amos, GRRB | Information |
| See the meeting binder for individual reports. | | | |



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

a. Chair report: Jozef discussed the meetings he has attended since the last teleconference meeting. Lack of notification of Board appointments is a problem — we will follow up with Government on this. Jozef spoke with MP Michael McLeod and mentioned it to him so we are notified of appointments on a timely basis so our members can take part in discussions. Upcoming meetings: *Wildlife Act* Section 15 (Yellowknife), CMA, ACCWM, DFO annual meeting (Winnipeg). Met with GTC President as often as possible.

b. Members reports: Sam reviewed his activities, including Finance Committee activities, CMA meetings (Inuvik, Yellowknife, teleconference), GRRB teleconferences, Dolly Varden IFMP Steering Committee meetings.

c. E.D. report – Amy: Amy gave highlights from her full report in the meeting binder. Amy has been with the Board since 2009. She reviewed the current staffing and plans for the vacant Renewable Resource Manager position. Waiting on options report from consultants and may restructure that position so not advertising yet. Amy discussed financials, administration and operations. Changing RRC engagement to try a 'community tour' this fall. Environment Canada earlier this week provided 4-year funding to support federal Species at Risk consultations, which will help cover the cost of community tour. Did various youth engagement and outreach activities with other staff (Nature Day, Taii Trigwatsi, school visits, Board Forum in Fort Good Hope focused on youth and traditional knowledge, bring youth delegates to Board meetings).

Question: Who developed the RRC Manual. Answer: GTC.

Question: Position and power of the RRC seems up in the air. DGOs create the RRCs but Claim doesn't say they oversee them. I asked GTC if they could get a legal opinion; not sure how fast they will respond. Will GRRB pursue that? Should this be brought to Regional RRC? An RRC 10-15 years ago had a lot of power, their Council was voted in and elected, and now they're appointed. It's a Council under the land claim and the way I see it they shouldn't be overseen by anybody unless they're a Committee. It seems really mixed up not only in Tsiigehtchic but all the communities.

Answer: Thanks for that. GRRB and GTC have done lots of legal work on that. We're happy to share that with you.

Action #19-16: GRRB to send material to Roxanne McLeod re: roles & responsibilities of RRCs, including legal opinion.

Question: Over the years I see problems with Porcupine Caribou not letting the leaders pass. We need more education initiatives for the leaders to pass. I'm not sure if GRRB or RRC to initiate programs for harvesters. Not just Gwich'in harvesters but others who use the Porcupine herd in this area. "Take a Kid Trapping" used to be a good program and Let the Leaders Pass could be modelled on that. This year people hunted early and I know the caribou won't be here all winter because of that.

Answer: PCMB has the mandate for that. GTC is the signatory to the management plan. GRRB works with GTC to push the messages that they want to send.

Question: We need something concrete done.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Answer: We can encourage PCMB to do it, that's their mandate. GTC has a member there, as do all the other communities. I'm not sure if we have any allocated dollars for Porcupine caribou education specifically but we do as much we can.

Question: We hear that year after year, but we need something more concrete to solve the problem.

Answer: We agree. It's always a big issue. We have discussions with Joe [Tetlitchi, Chair of PCMB] about that all the time.

Question: Do we work with Inuvialuit to talk with their HTC's?

Answer: This year GRRB staff met with Joint Secretariat staff to see if we can coordinate better on shared files.

Question: I'm not putting any words in Joe Tetlitchi's mouth, but I remember him saying something like 'our Board works with the RRC's' so I'm not sure.

Answer: PCMA takes precedence over the Gwich'in Claim, it's written right in the land claim. It's always an issue because it gets really complicated really quick, especially when you have a healthy herd that's doing well and a number of groups with constitutionally protected harvesting rights. The only way to limit those rights is for public health, public safety, or conservation reasons. I know we've been down the road with regulations before that 5 communities recommended to PCMB, but they kind of fell apart.

Question: I know in July people are already going out there and hunting and taking truckloads of meat down the highway, and stories of meat being left at the dump, and I don't know what we can do about it.

Answer: We have heard that and we hear it every year.

Question: Can we as a Board formalize our concern to the PCMB? If it is an issue, can we push a letter from our Board to their Board about this?

Answer: I don't know if we as a Board have decided if there is a concern. It's an opportunity. We've been down this road a couple times and other groups have told us to back off, it's not our mandate, so it's complicated politically.

Question: Just recently the Native User Agreement for Porcupine caribou was signed in Inuvik. I haven't seen it. I'd like to see what's in there. What's been on my mind is control. That's what it comes down to in the end. We have no control, nothing. It's been like that since Day 1. Ever since this highway was in place we have no control. I was thinking is how can this Board give us support to look at it, go to GTC and PCMB, if we can get support we can change it. If you look at Tuktoyaktuk they have hunting zones set up and you're allowed 1 caribou and you have to take an Inuvialuit with you and it's all documented. They have control. And if we had control, we could say 'no hunting until September' and it would solve all the problems with ATVs on the land. That's another problem that should go directly to ENR but it's on private lands so they can't enforce it, and then over the border it's Yukon Government responsibility. So it comes down to us sitting here doing nothing — and that's not right. I'd like to see that Agreement and what it says.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Answer: The NUA is an agreement between all groups on how they would share a Total Allowable Harvest on Porcupine caribou if one was ever set.

Question: So who is entitled to hunt Porcupine caribou? Sahtu? Inuvialuit? Everyone?

Answer: The signatories to the PCMA. We recognize this as an issue and we'll do our best to work with PCMB on the messaging that comes out. If there are concerns we call on the communities to bring them to PCMB as well, but we will do that too.

Question: Before the Dempster was put in there were strict rules about who was hunting caribou. And now we have the road and we end up with this. That should have never happened.

Answer: I understand. Some of these things are written right into the land claim agreement so we have to work with those processes and rules. It's complicated.

Action #19-17: Summarize concerns related to Porcupine caribou and communicate them to PCMB, GTC and ENR.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|-------------|
| 11:15 AM Break | Snacks provided | | |
| 4. 11:37 AM Reports cont'd. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Agency reports (verbal) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. ENR ii. DFO e. Staff reports (no presentation) f. Other reports (no presentation) | | Information |

d) i. ENR Report:

Norman gave a brief agency update, including staffing (new: Angel Simon, Faye d'Eon-Eggertson). Need to fill vacancies in Tuk WRO (?), geospatial analyst, Sachs Harbour patrolman. CHAP is run by Lila from Inuvik. ENR also participates in "Take a Kid Trapping", trapper training workshops, WSCC harvester's coverage, harvester's disaster compensation program, 'Genuine Mackenzie Valley Furs' program. Refer to written report for details.

Lila discussed field operations including tags, compliance checks with outfitters in the ISR, bear safety presentations in community schools, Sight Your Rifle, access to private lands. I have noticed the process is not always clear to the public. My suggestion to both land claim groups is to put something out to educate the harvesters so they know the process of who to go to for permission to harvest on private lands. We're doing a lot of education and there are a lot of HTC and RRCs who are unclear about the process. Inuvialuit are going to have staff training for all HTC staff and I will give a presentation on their role in all of these processes. If the Gwich'in were interested in doing something like that I'm only a phone call away.

Complaints of grizzly bears breaking in to cabins at Husky Lake. ENR needs to do public education to have cabin owners report to us so we can get bear samples to see if there are specific problem bears. Grizzly bears in landfills too. ENR comments on water licenses to tell landfill operators and municipalities that they need to have controlled access — locked gates, fences — because bears are getting habituated to people, because people come and watch them in the landfills at night.

Encourage schools to involve RRCs and HTCs in local on-the-land programs and ideas, like trapping beavers.

Norman reviewed the Water Resource Officer (WRO) activities, and Forestry activities including firefighting. Slow fire season this past year.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Question: Tags for moose?

Answer: Only for residents.

Question: Concerns about caribou. If you go in the ISR you see lots of signs saying 'this is our country, don't bother the caribou, leave them alone' and then in the GSA the caribou pass right at James Creek and you don't see one sign. Then at the Yukon side you see signs for when you go into Vuntut settlement land. I'm really concerned. I want to see signs and monitors. Signs will really help if we get them out there.

Answer: That was raised at the regional RRC meeting so I mentioned it to Communications that we wanted signs showing management area G. For the Inuvialuit signs those were Inuvialuit [can't hear]. Even if we had maps to hand out that would be good. Because right now we say you need permission on private lands, I feel we need to give maps to show where that is. I would like a big poster in our office too to show the entire region, and make copies to share with local RRCs and HTC's so that they are aware and show harvesters. But a lot of times I'm telling harvesters it's an issue for their licenses. I ask if they have a phone, because you can see the private land boundaries on Google Maps. As for patrols, this year was difficult because our officers were so busy with bears. Right now with hunting season underway, officers are being told to initiate their own patrols. Expect to do 1 or 2 patrols in their own communities per week. I agree we need to be out there. So that's something I'm going to be pushing for. Norman and I have been discussing the officer's role and they have quite the workload. I hope we can address that in-house. My goal is to make sure that they're out there as often as they can be, because that's our job. We have 2 roaming patrols to check all those non-resident hunters, sport hunters and we need more presence out there.

Question: There is no vehicle stop up there up at 8 Mile or James Creek. We know how much came to Inuvik, came to McPherson, but we don't know how much went the other way.

Answer: The officers were busy in our region with bears. We've had officers travelling between communities to go in and assist and assistance from other regions. It was a really busy season. But yes, now that bears are quieting down we will be out there.

GTC is responsible for signs. There's a special management zone near James Creek and we've called GTC and ENR to ask.

Answer: In the Tlicho area, they put up signs even on snowmobile trails and walking trails so you always know. That's up to the land claim organization but I think it's good.

ENR: Even the signs saying you need permission to harvest, and what phone number to call, is really good.

Question: You can't have it at the border so you're concerned about it coming from this side over, so it needs to be at the gorge. We need signs saying Gwich'in Settlement Area.

Answer: I'll bring that message forward to GTC Lands.

Question: On the Land Unit — is that new staff for the region, or is it a re-organization of existing staff?

Answer: They're central. We assist them in the region if they come in and do anything.

Question: You said officers have been busy. So why don't you have a list of all the environmental and wildlife monitors to go in to places for those purposes when the officers are not available? Like a short-term appointment for those monitors.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Answer: In Aklavik with all the bears, the hamlet themselves hired bear monitors. We had staff there and they had bear monitors. So they worked together. But they were hired by the hamlet.

Question: Talking about private lands and ENR. How much authority does the RRO in McPherson have? I ask because all the ATVs that go out onto the lands, what happens if he sees that — what can he do?

Answer: There's no legislation regarding ATVs in the Wildlife Act. But the RRO it depends on the harvester. When we do a patrol and see somebody harvesting on private lands we'll stop and we need to see proof that they have permission to harvest there, like the letter from the RRC. That's the authority the officer has.

Question: The RRC council has to step up. And they're not doing that. So this needs to be talked about.

Another question is: these patrols you're doing. Back in the day the officers would go out on the land and in the Delta, go all over to make sure things are going good. And we haven't seen that. So I'm wondering if you can bring that back and make [name] do his job.

Answer: A lot of the management practices on the Dempster are mandated by the PCMA. A lot of people don't realize that. Anywhere there's Porcupine caribou habitat, anybody that's signed onto the PCMA has a right to harvest Porcupine caribou. Anywhere in their habitat. It's a really powerful piece of agreement. That's why we have people from different lands and areas. We have to look really closely at those agreements and land claims prior to making any enforcement. We have to keep that in mind when we're talking about Dempster highway Porcupine caribou harvesting. That was signed back in the 70s and it's still valid today. It's very powerful.

Question: Bear problem. I understand the dump sites in Inuvik are closed after-hours. But there's always that wastage and food. And people in the springtime, fall time they're throwing their food like fish that they don't require, they throw it outside that area and it attracts wildlife. We need to have more access to the dump site for the community. I don't think people should be penalized for wastage. Sometimes they over harvest because people asked them to go catch fish for them and it turns out they don't need that much, the harvester has to do something with that fish and that's why we have bear problems. When I was growing up, my parents would burn the food that was wasted. We should have a designated area where we can incinerate wastage so it doesn't attract wildlife.

Answer: Along with the bear problems that are escalating every year, one of the misconceptions is that ENR is the one that manages the landfills. And we're not — municipalities do that. Municipalities decide to lock up the dump and change the rules. In terms of getting rid of excess food or food you don't need, you won't be penalized if you come to ENR and say you have some meat you need to get rid of. We'll take a look at it but we're not going to charge anyone. Municipalities have to be involved in management of these landfills. In terms of wastage, like fish, we do see a lot of fish wastage in the Delta. DFO is aware of the fish wastage and they have been coming up two years in a row once a year. But if you're leaving wastage out, that's a wildlife attractant. We need to be doing more public education on that. Officers are looking for that when we get a bear call.

Fish and meat wastage — if people are overharvesting we get reports of meat wastage in the landfill and that's against the *Wildlife Act*, so a person can be charged for wasting meat, but we give out permits for example if their freezer stops working. If that happened, the person should come in to our office to get some information and we would issue them a permit to dispose of it. You're right about those landfills. The hamlets need to manage what's going in there and segregate it. If there's wastage seen in those landfills then it should be reported to us. But for food waste we heard these comments in Aklavik as well regarding segregation and storage. It's the hamlet's responsibility to ensure that happens. It's something we comment on when they apply for water licenses and so on.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Question: If ENR is giving permits to get rid of wastage or excess, caribou, moose, fish, maybe the hamlet could say that there's going to be a cost for incinerating that in their dump. Other than that, I can see the option being ENR have RRO1s having incinerators in their yards and do it that way rather than bringing it to the next local available area. Because I think the dump is for garbage and waste, not food. That's just a suggestion.

Question: There are incinerators, but at the dump they have to hit a certain temperature and those kinds are expensive. The communities will have to talk to GNWT to meet the needs of the dump. The wastage, the garbage, it's a big problem. Even the stores dump their spoiled food and bears will come in and get it. We have to eliminate bears coming in to town. My other question is what's going to happen about salmon coming in. We're starting to get too much salmon. Will it affect our whitefish stocks? What is the cause? Is it fish farms? Is there a project going on?

Answer: DFO is doing a project on this. The Arctic Salmon project is going on and we will provide you more details.

Action #19-18: Bring GSA signage issue to GTC Lands

ii. DFO agency update deferred until tomorrow when Larry Dow will call in.

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|-------------|
| 12:40 PM Lunch | Provided | | |
| 5. 1:10 PM Grizzly Bears | Grizzly bear management discussion | Lila ?, ENR | Information |
| Lila provided a draft report from all officers in all communities about grizzly bear incidents. Final version of report to come. Officers in Aklavik assessed high number of bears at the landfill. In August, 5 bears shot in Inuvik (all GSA, but collar data shows 2 individuals were residing in ISR and coming to landfill to feed so ENR is reporting to both land claim groups) and 8 in Aklavik. With fences coming in, problem bears will have to seek other sources of food because they were dependent on that garbage and their access will be cut off. Because of that unique situation we developed that report. [Portions of this segment were presented under item 4] | | | |
| 6. 1:20 PM Species at Risk | a. Down-listing of Peregrine falcon | Myra Robertson, ECCC | Motion |
| | b. Down-listing of Olive-sided flycatcher | Myra Robertson, ECCC | Motion |

Myra declares conflict of interest

a. Down-listing of Olive-sided flycatcher

On the phone: Bruce [didn't catch last name]

Myra presented her report. These are "good-news" stories. These are species that were listed under the *Species At Risk Act* and now their populations are not looking as bad as they were when they were first listed. Category under federal SAR is proposed to be moved to a lesser category or be moved off the list.

Olive-sided flycatcher is a small bird found in the GSA. It eats bugs. It is listed currently as 'Threatened' and we're asking for a decision from the Board to move it to 'Species of Special Concern'. In the cycle of SAR activities, we're back at 'listing'; it was initially assessed as Threatened in 2007 by COSEWIC and was listed under SARA in 2010. Threats to olive-sided flycatchers included habitat loss and degradation, especially in South America; large declines in insect populations; collisions with towers and other structures during down-listing. Populations are still declining but the rate of decline has slowed over the past decade. NRRC discussed this topic last night and had no concerns with the down-listing. Have not heard from other RRCs yet.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

| | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|--------|
| <p>Motion to support the down-listing of the Olive-sided flycatcher to Species of Special Concern under the federal <i>Species at Risk Act</i></p> | | Motion | |
| Moved by: William | Seconded by: Doug | GRRB 19-38 | |
| All in favour. | Motion Carried. | | |
| <p>b. Down-listing of Peregrine falcon New information suggests it should be taken off as a federal species at risk. GNWT does not do birds for its species at risk. Falcons prey on other, smaller birds. They are the fastest animals in the world, diving at over 320 km per hour. It overwinters in South America. Populations initially declined from pesticides (such as DDT); human disturbance of nest sites; development along the Mackenzie River and resource exploration and development more generally. Reason for down-listing is that in Canada the population has increased by over 100% between 2000-2005 and estimates of current population is that they are as abundant now as they were before they collapsed. If down-listed, all documents would still remain on the Species at Risk public registry. TRRC, NRRC, AHTC support the down-listing.</p> | | | |
| <p>Motion to support the down-listing of the Peregrine falcon to Not at Risk under the federal <i>Species at Risk Act</i></p> | | Motion | |
| Moved by: Sam | Seconded by: Margaret | GRRB 19-39 | |
| All in favour. | Motion Carried. | | |
| <p>Myra asks to present a few other updates on SAR, if time allows. Chair permits. Myra presents information on the development of a Recovery Strategy for Gypsy Cuckoo Bumble Bee. Board staff have reviewed; next step is going out to do consultation. Feedback from communities, then will bring to Board for review and decision. In addition, Barren-Ground Caribou consultations were planned to continue in Nunavut but due to the federal election those have been postponed to fall 2020. Grizzly bears — national working group has been established to work on management plan, tasked to provide TK and other documents. This national working group is moving forward. Horned grebe is a species of Special Concern and a management plan is being prepared. A presentation and facts sheet will be sent out in the next 2 weeks to provide comments, due Dec 1. Full national public consultations will be 2020. Collared Pika: working group established. Preparing draft management plans. Should see plan go out this winter. Amy mentioned the good news with SAR consultation funding from Environment Canada. There is a call for more SAR funding: Habitat Stewardship Program, and Aboriginal Fund for Species at Risk. Calls for November, applications due in December.</p> | | | |
| 7. 2:00 PM Migratory Birds | Proposed modernized Migratory Birds Regulations overview | Myra Robertson, ECCC | Motion |
| <p>Myra provided a fact sheet and reviewed the report in the meeting binder. This is not related to Species at Risk. Federal regulations for birds like geese, ducks, songbirds, shorebirds, not ptarmigan, grouse, hawks, owls, or ravens because GNWT manages those species. Myra reviewed the history of legislation associated with these Regulations.</p> <p>Question: Why is IFA mentioned by name in this? I'm wondering why a clause for the Gwich'in wouldn't be included too, similar to what's proposed for the Inuvialuit. Just because it speaks to harvesting birds and eggs in the Gwich'in region. If it's similar I don't know why it wouldn't be included.</p> <p>Answer: It's a specific clause in the Inuvialuit land claim that their rights in legislation need to be clearly stated. It's a bit redundant. But I will flag this comment and bring it forward to our lawyer. If the decision is to make a clause in the Regulations what you will do is clarify it; in a legal world a land claim always has</p> | | | |



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

higher priority than a federal Act but one of the purposes here with this modernization is to make it clear to all parties so that's a good point.

Question: I realize it's just a briefing note, but it's almost self-contradictory because the first bullet point says remove all these specific group names and then the second and third re-introduce names of different groups.

Answer: I raised the same point. The second clause mentions Section 35 rights which doesn't mention a specific group name. Even places where land claims are unsettled.

Question: It's just a question of consistency. Why name Inuvialuit and no one else?

Answer: In the past, they said we need a clause like that in there because of their land claim. But I will bring your comments forward.

Question: In my meetings with Indigenous issues in law in Canada, it's often said that the word Indian is the only term that the courts will recognize, because it's in Section 35 of the *Constitution Act*. If we're changing the title of different people, how does that reflect future challenges when the word of law only recognizes the word Indian? Does that mean our Government will change that definition in the *Constitution Act*? I always have a problem with the word Aboriginal because 'Ab' means 'not', it means 'not original'. And of course these words change over time but still. It all comes back to wording of *Constitution Act*.

Answer: We're kind of avoiding that by not saying any word, just saying 'those with harvesting rights under Section 35' falls within our regulations. So if things change re: what's recognized under the Constitution, our Regulations will follow that trend. Our Government is moving to using 'Indigenous' instead but it's not consistent yet. So saying 'section 35' is a way to get around that.

No change to general hunting license.

'Special harvesting license' for migratory birds, or something like that to allow non-beneficiaries to undertake a subsistence harvest for ducks or geese or so on. In the proposed Regulations there is no mention of this. Your land claim makes a link to federal law. ECC may review this regulation in future but not right now. If you feel strongly one way or the other as a Board you may want to say so.

The last item: we have heard concerns about this from other organizations. This is about a non-Indigenous person hunting with an Indigenous person. It says that if you hunt together, the daily bag limit is that of the non-Indigenous person. This relates to some enforcement issues happening down south where non-Indigenous hunters were hunting with Indigenous hunters and wasting a lot and officers had trouble charging them because they would say those birds belonged to their hunting partner. If you have concerns, I will bring those forward.

The other significant change is related to nest protection. Currently nests are protected year-round whether they're used or not. In proposed Regulations nests are protected when they have conservation value, so when they're occupied or in nesting season. Also, there are a number of things in the Regulations to decrease abandonment and wastage. Myra detailed several more clauses and changes in the proposed Regulations.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Question: About drones for hunting waterfowl and other birds — does that apply to moose?

Answer: The proposed Regulations apply to only migratory birds like ducks and geese. Not about mammals like moose, those would be the territorial government's responsibility.

Question: You're really addressing the *Indian Act*, at its core?

Answer: I'd say we're addressing the Constitution, but I'm not a lawyer.

Question: If a new Government comes in after the election, will this be shelved?

Answer: The consultation period ends at end of September. If there are significant concerns it will go back for further consultation. If there's concerns we can deal with, rather than significant push-back, we'll move forward with what we heard and be put forward in Spring 2020. Most of what we've heard to date has been fairly positive, but there are some things we're hearing that we may not go forward with in the final version.

Question: When you say 'the groups' are you referencing only people with land claims, or are you having this discussion with native people in reserves as well?

Answer: This is a federal process so this information has been sent to people in unsettled land claims as well, including all groups in NWT who have an interest in wildlife. Are we having face-to-face with all those groups? No, we're waiting for people to ask us if they want that. Some groups are keener on birds than others. But the information has been sent to all of them. We are making sure we have face-to-face with all the co-management boards.

Question: This is for all people with Section 35 rights, so people from Newfoundland and so on, at the federal level. So why are only Inuvialuit singled out? Everybody has the same rights under Section 35. When we have issues under the land claim, we can go back to Section 35, it always goes back to that.

Answer: It depends on asserted rights. By being more general it's open to changes if geographic boundaries change. The purpose is to clarify it, because it's not addressed in the current *Act*. I will ask that question and follow up.

Chair: If we can get more clarity on that, that would be helpful.

Question: Are you looking for something in writing?

Answer: Yes. Comments and concerns in a letter from the Board that will be sent up the chain.

Comments are open until Sept 30. Not asking for approval at this time. I will seek clarification on whether we will be coming back for approval later.

Question: I want to bring to the Board's attention that Species At Risk are mentioned in this as well. Any Species At Risk are not protected by this, they're protected by the SARA. This relates to nests — a migratory bird listed under SARA is protected year-round as a resident under the SARA. I have no concerns with that but I wanted to flag it for the Board. And also, SAR cannot be gifted.

Question: Section 44 I want to make sure the Board understands that, if someone who is exercising Section 35 goes hunting with someone who is not exercising Section 35, there will be a daily bag limit for that group that is the Resident Hunter limit. So if I go out with Jordan and I'm allowed 15 geese per day, and Jordan harvests more than 15 geese, I'm going to get fined for that. Am I understanding that right?

Answer: Correct. Taking off my Environment Canada hat and my Board hat — this one is weird. I would raise concerns. It means as Ed described that if Ed + Jordan go hunting, their combined limit is only Ed's.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

That seems strange to me. It's not even 15 + 15 because there are 2 people in the hunting party, it's only 15.

Question: So an Indigenous person with a non-Indigenous person can take fewer geese than if 2 non-Indigenous people go hunting together. That's weird. I worry this will prevent Indigenous and non-Indigenous people from hunting together, because it prevents the Indigenous person from harvesting as much as he normally would, or the non-Indigenous person will get fined.

Question: About alien resident hunters harvesting migratory birds — are they required to get permission from the RRC? I don't see why it's open country here. I don't think it should be. I'm not comfortable with non-Indigenous people out on the land, it doesn't matter if they know their safety and everything — what if I'm out there and I don't know they're there? It's just common knowledge. It's common knowledge and courtesy to say I'm going out here, I'll be out there for how long. Even us when we're going out, we say to our family and community, I'm going to this place for this long.

Answer: They are encouraged to get RRC permission for private lands.

Action #19-19: Follow up with comments to the proposed Migratory Bird Regulations updates by the Sept 30 deadline.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 2:32 PM Break | | | |
| 8. 2:42 PM RRC & Public session | <p>Open discussion between the RRCs and Board members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwichya RRC • Ehdiitat RRC • Nihtat RRC • Tetlit RRC • Public | Jozef Carnogursky, GRRB | Advice received |

Amy reviewed a few slides on the GRRB mandate, consulting with RRCs, examples of what could be discussed. Chair opened the floor to RRCs and public in general for questions.

GGRRC: This spring we had some fish dumped down by the river. I know GRRB is more of wildlife-oriented, but there was some meat in there. I don't think we found out who did it. It goes back to you can get permit to dispose of your extras, overharvest, spoiled meat but it's a concern because it attracts wildlife. We are having trouble with wolves close to town in the last couple of years, they've taken dogs and that's somebody's livelihood, it's somebody's pet. It does affect people. If we could have something in writing or an ad or a regulation where with your extras you need to burn it — that's what I always did at the camp when I couldn't get rid of stuff. I didn't want animals around my camp. In town it's just a bigger problem. Why are we disposing of stuff just like that. It's disrespecting your resources. But again that comes back to your hunting licenses. Long ago you learned from your parents and learned to hunt respectfully, to treat them respectfully, to not talk about your animals and resources disrespectfully and that's not the case today. Parents are not teaching their children and in my opinion I don't think hunting licenses should be given out unless there's a course of how to hunt, how to use the parts of the animal, how to dispose of them respectfully. And DFO has to know that when we throw our scraps on the shore, our fish scraps, it's consumed by the birds in 10 or 15 minutes so that's not wastage for me, that's feeding the birds, that's helping them. If we didn't throw those scraps out those birds would be starving. But things like that — it's not the way it used to be and it's never going to be the way it used to be again and it's up to us to make changes to help these people that don't know. And I think it should be coming from some parts GRRB, some parts ENR, some parts Fisheries, I think



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

we should all amalgamate a course. And it's not going to all happen at once — this Taii Trigwatsii program I like it because it has concepts that all match in there, upgrading, cultural activities, a lot of stuff in there. Even for young people here, I think they should take a course.

Action #19-20: Pass on concerns around incinerating extra food to ENR & Hamlet/Town

Response: Thank you. We will notify some of the responsible authorities as best we can about incinerators. Norm was here before and I think he heard us loud and clear. We will follow up on that. We can pass this information along to people in charge of things like [can't hear] and that. In terms of licenses and that, I know GTC had directed him to develop that (?) I can't remember the details on that but there was talks about having young people go through a course. I'm not sure if that made the final cut for the *Wildlife Act*. We can follow up on that and get more information for you.

Response: Under new *Wildlife Act* it's mandatory for resident non-Indigenous hunters to take a course, which they're developing the curriculum for.

Question: I recommend you do not put an age limit on it.

Response: If you're a resident getting a new license, or if you had an infraction, you have to take the course. No age limit. For Indigenous hunters it's not required though.

Response: Other groups are creating their own curriculum. They didn't want to make the same course for each region. GTC was involved in that. So there is potential there.

Question: I wanted to address a fishery topic. At the meeting last fall in Winnipeg, Larry Dow did mention community monitors in the High Arctic where they don't have DFO officers present all the time, they can train local people who are active fishermen or hunters. They don't have the same powers as a fisheries officer but they would have some power to record and be on site when infractions occur. Like a Guardianship program. That could be through an Indigenous organization. GTC could access funding for that. RRCs may be able to as well. It's a matter of people expressing interest and knowing how to access that, and figuring what to do. Could be an education role.

The other topic was funding available for wharfs and docks so that proper ramps could be made for kayaks and small boats so you're not sinking in the mud when you pull up to shore. We had that discussion as well. In the High Arctic this is something they can do. So that was another thing I remember we talked about.

ERRC: I want to state a couple future initiatives that we're going to work on and hopefully we'd be able to lessen our concerns about grizzly bears, salmon, char. The first is to try to get the overlap agreement updated between the Inuvialuit and Gwich'in. When we did our beaver program in the spring, there was an issue between HTC and RRC. We said strictly all beavers must be caught in GSA. We had a member who had a family camp in the ISR so she wasn't able to bring in any beavers because the HTC was really strict on making sure the RRC members didn't harvest any beavers in their region. So we're going to make clear all the family names and places families harvested in the past, we will work with HTC to get that done (even though it might be DGO's responsibility to get that done).

Also for fishing areas. We run a program with DFO every summer for Dolly Varden harvest interviewer. There are some Inuvialuit harvesters harvesting char in mouth of Husky Channel, so I was thinking to talk with DFO to see if the interviewers for HTC & RRC could communicate more to know who was fishing in the GSA and how much char we're getting, so we could have more accurate numbers for the Gwich'in.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

With moose I want to try to implement the management plans for moose, Dall's sheep, muskox, any other big game to the community. It's difficult — we're a multicultural community — there are jurisdictional boundaries. I know some people have harvested big game in our region. I wanted to know if you could provide the management plan that would have that information so I could see if I can get that sorted out. With permits, too. There's some people in Aklavik that go into GSA and harvest wood, I don't know if it's for themselves or they're selling it, but if RRC and ENR could do patrols during the winter, we can make sure they do have their paperwork. The permits are free.

Another thing we're going to work on: since self-government is coming, we need to train our people, we need to train our members, for the past couple of months we've been really busy with GNWT, GRRB, outside agencies, with wildlife monitors but they're not fully funded— we want to figure out a budget to get their FAC, wilderness first aid, and so on. Eugene and I took on some of the jobs for these organizations because there was no one available. We talked with our council that that shouldn't happen again, so our council's next priority is to talk with folks and get a pool of people trained.

The bear problem we had was 8 bears destroyed and a few of them were from the GSA (2 of them) but most were at our local dump. The HTC contacted us and wrote us a letter asking if we could help them out to give them some tags for the bears so we can assist in this community initiative.

When I went to check my net last month, I saw that orange mass. I didn't have any sampling kit. I contacted GNWT. I think there should be little buckets and so on so people can take a sample right away and forward it on to them.

Response: Just on some of those I can provide some advice. I think it's great at the community level. You talked about wanting access to the management plans for certain species; we can provide that. They are posted on our website as well. It sounded specifically like hunting within certain areas is of particular interest and I think the *Wildlife Act* is particularly relevant there; it's online and I can flag specific parts for you that might relate to your concerns. With permits and patrols, ENR Forestry headquarters are in Hay River and they're coming up to Inuvik in October and we've asked for a meeting with GTC and them. Sarah will be at that meeting and can bring your concern forward.

Training wildlife monitors: I talked with the ECCC office because we were thinking about that too, like what things we can give Jordan while he's with the Board. There's a course I might have shared with the RRC that's an online course you can do it for \$2,500 and you get your wildlife monitor certificate and my understanding is ECE does have funding to help cover that tuition. It sounded like they wanted the individual person to apply to ECE. It's possible but requires paperwork. With the bear problem I talked to Eugene but the way the tag system works is anytime all tags aren't used in a year they give credits, and many years in the past not all the tags were used, so some credits have been banked. If the RRC wished to share some of those credits it wouldn't come out of their tags for this year.

Amy: Another thing we're doing is working with Inuvialuit on data-sharing agreement for harvest information.

Question: In the last couple of years we had studies on the muskrat. What's happened with that?

Answer: We're working with a researcher, Jeremy Brammer, on muskrats. He's been working at Jackfish Creek at East Branch looking at density and what could explain the change in muskrat numbers. We've heard a lot of comments on predation by otters, so he looked at stomach contents to see if they are eating a lot of muskrat. From what I remember, there was not much muskrat in otter stomachs — at least for otters caught in the winter. He usually comes to the Regional RRC meeting to present his findings.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Question: I'd like to see more about habitat — water and hydrology. What are beavers doing to the water. Another thing I observe is that there's hardly any mosquitoes now and I wonder why. Lots of birds eat bugs and so I wonder if that's having an effect. I'd like to hear more about that kind of habitat stuff.

ERRC: I forgot to talk about the harvest surveys. Are you trying to do one at a regional level?

Amy: Over the years we've been struggling sometimes to get harvesters participation in the survey. Some communities are really high and some are not. We're trying to figure out better ways. This past March we brought all 4 communities together in Inuvik to discuss ways we can address this. Maybe there are ways we can re-design the survey, think outside the box and make it more relevant.

Action #19-21: Ed to re-send email about muskox outfitting to ERRC.

ERRC: We're thinking about how to make the harvest survey more useful too. One thing is to give the harvesters more control, ask them what questions they think should be asked. That might help make them more comfortable with it.

Question: I'd like to see TK in your presentation. More and more I'd like to see TK come into play with more governments, excerpts from the land and our life.

Question: You said community tour with GRRB. When is that?

Answer: Inuvik Sept 25 in the evening. The other 3 communities are day sessions. Tsiigehtchic is Sept 30, Aklavik Oct 1 and Fort McPherson Oct 2.

Question: At that community tour you'll be explaining what GRRB does?

Answer: It's our first time doing it so we'd appreciate comments on how to improve. But plan right now is for each of the staff to give an activity update like what's in the newsletter and then have a break and do some consultations like federal SAR and requests for community input on Bluenose caribou and moose hunting regulations question. We booked the entire day, but we think it'll be half a day. Lunch is provided.

Action #19-22: If Community Tour is going to be half a day, spend the morning with the older students in the school.

Question: About TK, we could look into printing more of the 'Words About the Land'.

Action #19-23: Send Gwich'in Words About the Land book to Sam.

Question: Just FYI we had a grizzly in town over the last few days. So don't go out after dark.

Thanks everybody for your comments. We will pass on a lot of the information we heard and will use it as a Board.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------------------|
| 9. 4:15 PM Review GRRB Priorities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of GRRB Priorities • Decision on any emerging priorities | Amy Amos, GRRB | Motion (if changes) |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------------------|

Amy reviewed the 2018-2023 research and management priority list and what new research interests have been heard and recorded in the past year. Suggestion that beavers should be added as a 'Priority' (and not just an Interest). Up for Board discussion.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Question: I thought in terms of the muskrat study, there was terms of collection beavers and other mammals as well.

Answer: There is some beaver work being done. The challenge that I have is without it being on the priority list I'm limited in how much staff time and resources we can put towards it. There are people doing work on it, but we're not really involved. Inuvialuit really want to work with us on this file and deal with it collectively, but it's not on our priority list.

Question: And just to clarify, it's the increasing numbers of beavers in the area?

Answer: Concerns are more beavers than there used to be, they're moving north, the Inuvialuit put on a beaver collection program and they did engage the Board but it wasn't a priority for us at the time so we could only say 'keep us informed'. And after that program we got letters from ERRC and GTC. It's still not on our priority list.

Response: The researcher working on beavers right now — it's her first summer — the first thing she will do is compare numbers now to studies done in the 50s and 60s to see if the density changed. They also have old photos of the Delta from that time to see how much those lakes have changed over time and is that tied to potentially the beaver and how beavers change hydrology. If it becomes more of a GRRB priority it would allow us to help that researcher a bit better. It's up to the Board.

Question: We've got 3 more years with this list, so if it's a capacity issue can we wait?

Answer: It's something the Inuvialuit are pushing for. They're holding a regional community workshop and they want us to participate. At the time the priority session was held they didn't emerge at that meeting as a priority. We've got SAR populations that are declining. This is like the opposite, where it's overabundant and maybe management actions could be taken. I wonder if instead of specifically saying beavers we could say 'overabundant species' — that would allow snow geese to be addressed as well. I think if we have some resources and flexibility we can add to it. Should there be a provision in there because things go in and very few things come out — we could say "subject to the capacity and availability of resources" to give us a little bit of wiggle room. I think we do that with all our priorities though. Once it's in there you feel responsibility to be making progress. It sounds like it's a #1 priority for Inuvialuit, and a priority but not as high for us. Is there anything we can take off of the Priority list? We don't usually evaluate that until the 5-year workshop. Am I hearing it wouldn't be that much extra workload for your staff? Currently we did support that beaver program because we linked it to muskrat, so we could put that in our letter of support.

| | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------|
| Motion to change "muskrat" to "muskrat & beavers" on the GRRB Research & Management Priority List. | | Motion | |
| Moved by: Doug | Seconded by: Sam | GRRB 19-40 | |
| All in favour. | | Motion Carried. | |
| 10. 4:30PM Administrative items | a. Approval of GRRB annual activity report | Amy Amos, GRRB | Motion |
| | b. Species at Risk Committee appointment | Amy Amos, GRRB | Motion |
| | c. Safety update/reporting of incidents | Amy Amos, GRRB | In-camera |
| | d. Decision on February 2020 meeting date | Amy Amos, GRRB | Decision |



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>a. Approval of GRRB annual activity report</p> <p>Amy presented the 2019-20 activity report. The reporting requirement has been met but we can make changes if needed.</p> | | | |
| <p>Motion to approve the annual activity report.</p> | | <p>Motion</p> | |
| <p>Moved by: Margaret</p> | <p>Seconded by: Doug</p> | <p>GRRB 19-41</p> | |
| <p>All in favour.</p> | <p>Motion Carried.</p> | | |
| <p>b. SARC appointment</p> <p>Jozef explained that James Firth is currently the SARC appointee from GRRB. His term ends in March. Our recommendation is that we put a call out for people to see if they're interested in sitting on that meeting. James has expressed interest as well. It's more to get public input and participation.</p> <p>Discussion: Government of Canada has decided to use an open advertising process for our own Board appointments. Do we want to do that for this? James could re-apply, staff and public could apply? Yes let's take that as direction.</p> <p>Action #19-24 Put out a call for Species At Risk Committee participants.</p> | | | |
| <p>c. Safety update, reporting of incidents</p> <p>Amy suggests this be an in-camera item tomorrow. There's no safety updates for policy or anything like that but there were a few incidents that are more internal than public. Approved.</p> | | | |
| <p>d. Decision on February 2020 meeting date</p> <p>Decision: February 4-6th 2020, in Inuvik.</p> | | | |
| <p>4:00 PM Break</p> | <p>Open portion of meeting adjourned until 10:00 AM tomorrow</p> | | |
| <p>12. 4:13 PM In-Camera</p> | <p>Board members to discuss (motion to go into and come out of camera)</p> | <p>GRRB members only</p> | <p>Discussion</p> |
| <p>Motion to go into camera at 4:13pm</p> | | <p>Motion</p> | |
| <p>Moved by: Margaret</p> | <p>Seconded by: Tracy</p> | <p>GRRB 19-42</p> | |
| <p>All in favour.</p> | <p>Motion Carried.</p> | | |
| <p>Édouard Bélanger and Amy Amos were invited to the in-camera session. Édouard left the meeting at 4:34pm.</p> | | | |
| <p>Motion to come out of camera at 5:19pm</p> | | <p>Motion</p> | |
| <p>Moved by: Sam</p> | <p>Seconded by:</p> | <p>GRRB 19-43</p> | |
| <p>All in favour.</p> | <p>Motion Carried.</p> | | |
| <p>13. Business Arising</p> | <p>Motions & actions arising from the in-camera session</p> | <p>Jozef Carnogursky, GRRB</p> | <p>Motions & actions</p> |



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Action #19-25: Amy to have informal discussion with Brett Ellis re: bluenose west caribou
Action #19-26: Amy to bring to ACCWM as discussion
Action #19-27: Safety: Add signs in the spring when it's slippery in the GRRB parking lot
Action #19-28: Safety: Myra will share other wildlife defense information from her organization with Amy
Action #19-29: Amy to make informal contact with Gabriel Nirlungnayaq re: importance of DFO being present at the GRRB meetings
Action #19-30: Determination that full members will get first choice of attending meetings, then alternate members second. Add this clarification in to OPM.
Action #19-31: Determination that alternate members are alternates for their nominating agency. For example, an alternate member nominated by GTC can act as an alternate for a full member nominated by GTC, but not for a full member nominated by Government of Canada.
Action #19-32: Delegation for annual DFO-GRRB meeting in Winnipeg: Amy Amos, Sarah Lord, Burt Hunt, Sam Bullock. Speak with Gabe at that meeting to voice our concerns. Give DFO a half-day on the February 2019 meeting agenda.
 - Finance committee: if changing the delegation, need a motion

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|--|
| Motion to appoint Doug Doan to the GRRB Finance Committee | | Motion GRRB 19-44 | |
| Moved by: Margaret | Seconded by: Tracy | | |
| All in favour. | Motion Carried. | | |
| Action #19-33: Update Terms of Reference for the Finance Committee to allow ability to have alternate members. Should be 3 people at meetings re: budget, but now there are 4 committee members. | | | |
| Motion to update OPM Policy to reflect that full members get first priority for meeting attendance. Alternates will only be engaged if the full member is unavailable. | | Motion GRRB 19-45 | |
| Moved by: Sam | Seconded by: Doug | | |
| All in favour. | Motion Carried. | | |
| 6:00 PM Dinner | Public meet & greet - Meet the Board members and staff | | |



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

| DAY 2 Thursday, September 19, 2019 | | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Chief Niditchie School Gymnasium, Tsiigehtchic | | | |
| <i>Item</i> | <i>Action</i> | <i>Led by</i> | <i>Expected outcomes</i> |
| 9:30 AM Arrival | Coffee and tea provided | | |
| <p>Call to Order: 10:07am (Jozef)</p> <p>Attendees: Jozef Carnogursky, GRRB Chair Margaret Begg, GRRB Member Burt Hunt, GRRB Member Doug Doan, GRRB Member Tracy Davison, GRRB Alternate Sam Bullock, GRRB Member William Koe, GRRB Member Myra Robertson, GRRB Alternate Amy Amos, GRRB Executive Director Édouard Bélanger, GRRB Staff Sarah Jerome, Public Sarah Lord, GRRB Staff Jordan Norman-Goose, GRRB Staff Kaytlin Cooper, GRRB Staff Cheryl Greenland, GRRB Staff Allen Firth, Nihtat RRC Rayann Storr, INB Youth Geraldine Blake, INB Youth</p> | | | |
| 4. 10:00 AM Reports cont'd | d) Agency Updates – DFO | Larry Dow, DFO | Information |
| <p>[Larry Dow joined the meeting by phone at 10:15AM]</p> <p>Sports fishing limit. There were concerns about too much sportfishing. Are the Board in favor of decreasing the sportfishing limit? Larry presented numbers on pikes as a hypothetical example, but it would affect all fishes.</p> <p>Question: Is there a conservation concern for these regulations? Answer: There are no conservation concerns, but we are using a precautionary approach. There are concerns with more people coming and with climate change, it is more challenging to follow numbers. From a management standpoint, reducing numbers will help management. In GSA and Sahtu, we are lucky, no concerns except Airport Lake. There are no concerns right now, this is for down the road, in 10-20 years.</p> <p>In the ISR there are very few places where there are lake trout. We could reduce the limit at Dolomite (Airport) Lake. For long term management.</p> <p>Question: Have you done any consultation in the GSA?</p> | | | |



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Answer: No, we go directly to all the co-management boards. We don't think there is a need to go in the communities. DFO would like to know if the GRRB is in favour by mid- to late November.

At Dolomite/Airport Lake, right now the GSA and the Sahtu are different. If someone goes for 5 pike in the GSA, they could go get 5 more in the Sahtu a hundred meters away.

Concern is more ppl coming. People can go into the GSA, get their limit and then go to the ISR and get another limit. It's high. More consistent with southern NWT. If Sahtu agree. Inuvialuit already agreed. Then one quota.

Question: Is this all species?

Answer: Lake trout, northern pike, grayling, whitefish.

Lake trout: reduce quota in ISR. Catch and release in spawning time.

Another option is if the Board has areas where they want sport fish reduction limits lowered, ask DFO questions.

- 1) Is Board LT from 3:5 to 1:1? Would include Airport Lake. 0:0 at spawning time
- 2) Is Board okay to have one quota in the geographic area? Currently linked to land claim. Same limit but a bigger area.

Question: Do you want it reflected in the sport fishing guide? Do you need it by October?

Answer: By November-ish. We can't wait too long; they have to send it to the publisher so it gets included in the guide. By the first week of November I hope to know for sure. If you need more time to discuss it that's fine we can ask GNWT to hold off for a bit, but we can't wait forever. I won't be around next year so I'm trying to get everything done this year as much as possible.

Question: Do we know the number of these fish harvested?

Answer: No, we don't know. That's one of the problems with our resources is a creel survey is something to look at down the road. When we reduced the limit in the southern NWT it wasn't an issue because the numbers were still high. We wouldn't be looking at reducing the possession limits unless the GRRB wants. We don't have any hard data. We're not being over-critical in terms of possible reductions, we're just hedging that down the road. Like for pike going from 5-10 to 3-5 isn't really an issue, there's still a lot of fish to catch.

Discussion: Larry's proposal is a bit hard to follow given verbally with few details in a short email.

Action #19-34: Examine sport fishing limits now versus proposed.

We've worked so hard to try to build a relationship that has not really materialized, at the very least we should get a full proposal sent of this is what we'd like to change to, this is what data we have — this is totally his agenda. On the surface it seems like a simple request but fish are never simple. It seems like a legacy thing, like this is the last thing on his list and he wants it now. It's a bit of a pre-emptive "in 20 years" thing. A formal proposal would be a start. Need to give us time to consult with sport fishing people, like on Airport Lake — we don't know what people take now. They haven't even sent a proposal to GNWT; it would be interesting to hear what Tourism and other departments think. We'll get in contact with Larry and get more information. We are a public Board so we need to go through that process.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <p>11. 11:00 AM Commercial Use</p> | <p>Goal: Decide on instructions to ENR for a first draft of a regulation based on initial consultation. Then consult on the draft in 2020-21 (at least two rounds)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Results of July 2019 regional workshop • Presentation of recommendations • Decision on instructions to ENR | <p>Amy Amos, GRRB</p> | <p>Discussion then Motion</p> |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|

Amy: The reason we are here today is for Board to provide Direction and Decision to ENR so that GNWT can start drafting a Regulation. We have money to do consultations twice next year. We're not rushed, this will take some time. Amy gave her presentation as in the meeting binder.

Discussion: "Commercial = reasonable expectation of profit" so not only reimbursement for expenses but their time is compensated for. That's how a business is run: salary + materials to do your task. If "profit" is the catch-word, what about "break-even" or "loss"? There's still a transaction. If the hunter is simply asking for his gas to be reimbursed and his ammunition, but he's not being reimbursed for his time — at Christmastime if you have craft tables set up people will charge a small amount for a product given how much time they sank into it, that doesn't seem commercial to me. It may not work but I'm throwing it out there as a way to think about it. Your breakdown of time, fuel, ammunition — people don't think that way. Your example of underselling for crafts is a classic example. To me it's not a benchmark to be looking at. I think if you're getting that detailed in your thinking that would be considered commercial. If I decided that Sam wanted fish I had caught, I'm not going to go into all those things, I'm going to say \$5. Or trade my whitefish for your char. I'd say that's not commercial. But if you're getting into all the costs of going out and hunting caribou and selling it I'd say that would be commercial.

Amy: I think all these types of examples were really talked about in the consultations and workshops. As I go through the slides I think some of these things will come up from what we've heard from people. The idea of reimbursement was talked about quite a bit. The slides will remind me exactly but overall there was support from the workshop in reimbursement but just for your own costs, and acknowledgement that if you have to travel further there might be a little bit more, and questions about when do you exceed that reimbursement so all of those things will come up.

Question: I remember when we started the workshop in Inuvik, Joe [Tetlitchi] cautioned us to use a great deal of caution on this file. PCMB have a role in this. The other comment I had was, was there a decision by the Board to go ahead and develop regulations? Or was it to just talk to people and start that process in getting information?

Answer: there was a 3-day workshop and Joe did make a lot of cautions on how the Board could move forward. By the end of the workshop it seemed to me there was a lot more comfort. We decided in the workshop that Porcupine caribou would be dealt with separately. And that we would make recommendations to this table to support what's in those trade and barter guidelines because it's not under Regulations. That's the last activity in this table so when we get there it will be clear we're not stepping on any toes. The second question, I'm not sure that the Board said that specifically that we have to make a Regulation, but there was support for moving forward in this process based on the Resolution from the RRCS so there was support to do that initial consultation, and support for the 2-year proposal this past February that has the intent of coming up with the regulation.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

Question: OK thank you, just making clear what happens if we go through the table and say no to each one.
Answer: Yes. My thoughts are mostly with the land claim and what rights the Gwich'in have and those rights are quite broad. But to be mindful there were clear comments throughout all the consultations that selling meat is not a traditional activity, but when the right in the claim says "sale" then you can't limit it, even though some of the consultation was saying that it's not a traditional way to sell meat. Some of the consultation goes against that. But we're leaning towards respecting the rights in the claim.

Question: Gwich'in have the right to sell edible products to Aboriginal people, but not to non-Aboriginal people. To me that's discrimination and taking away opportunity for Gwich'in. That wording needs to be changed, otherwise you're marginalizing the Gwich'in.

Answer: The wording comes right out of the claim, so any changes would have to come from GTC. We're just trying to highlight that for people.

Question: That could be one of the implementation asks to take on with GTC, sooner rather than later.

Answer: We also heard that through the process that maybe there needs to be opportunity to be able to sell to non-Indigenous people. What could happen is — it doesn't mean that that's not necessarily not allowed to happen, but that you have to go and get a commercial permit, just like commercial fishing. And in that process would be the support of the RRC. The Board is making it very broad — this wording is what the claim says, and we'll go into it in each section.

Question: Is there a stage where Health Canada comes in to the picture? E.g. the sale of meat if someone gets sick.

Answer: I don't think we're dealing with that scale of sale, we're not talking about selling it in stores or restaurants.

Question: So the definition wouldn't be for something like Extra Foods.

Answer: No, more to capture the community concerns about people selling on Facebook within the GSA. That question did come up in the consultations too though.

1. Trading meat for non-cash goods [see presentation for details]

Question: Is trading for non-cash goods just between Aboriginal and Aboriginal, or can it include non-Aboriginal as well?

Answer: in the claim it talks about traditional activity being between Gwich'in and Gwich'in, or with other Aboriginal partners. Maybe this is a gap that needs to be addressed.

2. Cash incentives for wildlife samples

Discussion: Isn't this happening already? Like the salmon heads? And wolves? Do we need this? I think it's just clarifying for us so that we know. So it wouldn't become a regulation. And we would clarify that to ENR so that 'we do NOT want this to be part of our Regulation'. What if ENR was offering very high monetary amounts for returning a sample that people might go make it an issue. It's not an issue here in GSA, although down south there's very high turn-in for wolves, thousands of dollars. It's something we'll watch. Generally, ENR management comes to this board and asks support for changes to incentives. For wolves for biological samples it's \$200, but additional incentives for the fur program. If you have a prime fur, it works out to about \$900. But nobody is selling their furs to Government. No but the prime fur bonus is paid by the Government. But the fur is sold at auction. Wolves are purposely higher than other samples. In the area of southern NWT



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

where wolves overlap with barren-ground caribou there is much higher money for turning in samples, isn't there? ENR tried to make a culturally appropriate program to encourage hunting there.

General agreement of Yes for #2.

3 & 4. Community hunts and feasts

Discussion: We have feasts all the time, everybody is sharing meat. I don't have any problems with this. I agree with this approach, it makes sense. I'm still thinking about how to define commercial activity. One difference is that hunters are not going out and do this on a regular basis. You may have a lot of feasts but it's not a 9-5 activity.

General agreement of Yes for #3 and #4.

5 & 6. Selling meat at community events

Discussion: What is this ENR permit? It's called a "General Wildlife Permit" and you go to the local ENR office, they ask you what are you planning to sell, and they would issue you a free permit and it needs to be displayed at the event. One permit for the event.

General agreement of Yes for #5 & #6.

7. Selling meat to Aboriginal people

Discussion: I like option 3. There was no discussion about minimum needs levels — how does that fit in with the commercial? If a TAH was set then we would rely on minimum needs. It would be a conservation concern. You mentioned defining what a business is — is that part of our discussion? As opposed to just getting a business license? Need to do more work with people and communities to define what this would mean. There is no clear agreement from the workshop; there is a general agreement about using the business approach but not about how to define this. It's important to know what words mean but when you're getting into defining 'business' ... if it's something in the works or being worked on that's a different area. When you get into the business side of things there's a whole bunch of GWNT legislation about this. We should look to those definitions to see if those already exist before we try to tailor-make our own definition. We talked about it at the workshop and tried to do activities for discussion but they were difficult. We decided we weren't going to come to an agreement at that workshop and we would just flag it to the Board. Everyone agreed it was fairly clear that if you were a business it was commercial. If you are a business and have a license you have storage, freezers, inspections, you have all that stuff, but many of the people we're talking about don't. Is any other area wrestling with this same issue? There may be some value in consistency or recycling. Is this general approach the way you want to go. I wouldn't want to send anything to Justice without having all that input from people on how we're going to define it first, and after we go through that process we can say this is what we came up with. Are we the first claim to define this? Yes. Well, we might want to patent our process! We're doing a community tour. The first meeting is next Wednesday. If you are familiar with business policies that we can present, then I can ask at the tour. My concern as Chair is it's such a big topic, a sensitive one, it's dealing with rights, I don't want to be rushed into something just because we're having a tour. It's such a big topic. Government is helping us with money to deal with this, so we can kind of separate it off? I think we have about \$20k left in the project and going to each community is about \$11k so it should be possible. Initially we were proposing to send something to them but acknowledge that some of it might not be 100%, but you're proposing we do this part up front and get the definition of a business first. That's my suggestion. If



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

we leave somebody off to the side or we miss something — it's better to hit everything right up front and once we're ready, say this is what we heard. We might not have all the answers right now. It's a hard one to get agreement on. Within the workshop there was so much difficulty with defining what it is, I would predict that I would do a community tour and there would be differences amongst all the communities and I would bring that to the Board and you would have to make a decision. There might be some really good definitions out there already that everybody can agree on. If we do that research on those existing definitions and bring that to the communities to see if they agree with any of those, that might be a good starting point. In the community tour I'm going to mention that there will be more work on this, and figure out a time to talk with people more, and then we'll go to ENR Justice after. Research, consultation, then back to consultation. A lot of this is ground-breaking and we should think it through however long it takes.

Question: Ultimately, who's going to have the authority for this work?

Answer: We would propose Regulations and the Minister would accept them, and then the Government would implement them.

Question: Would the communities be consulted before all this happened?

Answer: Yes. We have a clear process for consultation. And all this work is at our table because communities have been asking us to deal with it. We're involving everybody and trying to have the right definitions that communities want and that everybody is happy with and has the chance to give input.

Question: If it goes in Regulation and government implements it, would it just be for GSA?

Answer: Yes, just for GSA. Other areas would have to do their own process.

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 11:50 AM Lunch | Provided | | |
| 11. 12:45 PM Commercial Use cont'd | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue with the discussions and end with decision | | |

Amy: What I understand for selling meat to other Aboriginal people — there is general agreement on if there's a business that would be considered commercial. But there's not agreement on what we would define as a business.

Action #19-35: GRRB to research what would be a business and then do consultation. The result will be brought back to the Board. If the Board supports, it would go to ENR Justice. ENR would draft some text. That text would be consulted on.

8. Selling dry meat

Discussion: Any feedback from RRCs on whether they like this or not? This is putting more responsibility on them. They were part of the workshop; we did an exercise with sticky notes and the majority said they supported the RRC making the decision about advertising rather than Government, hunters, or others. One or two people said ENR officer but we talked with them and it really came down to specific individuals who really trusted the officer in their community. If the RRCs are hearing about it, even if not advertised on Facebook, that so-and-so is selling meat year-round for a high price, would that be a problem for the RRC? Maybe. With this approach we would not go there because it's not being advertised. But if that specific issue came up in the future then we as a Board could deal with that issue. If the RRCs brought that forward to the Board again then we would be in a position to deal with it. It might fall into that previous one we talked about. But how would you deal with it? Say I was selling meat year-round. If you were an individual then you're not a business then we wouldn't. It depends on how we define a business. This is linked back to #7, because what we come



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

back with for #7 may solve #8, or not. Whatever we define business as, #8 is saying even people who are not falling under a business, people still can't advertise online. The intent of this one is to just deal with posts and advertisements on social media and Facebook specifically. I asked about the wording because we need to consider how broad — is it any advertising or just on Facebook? Including Facebook but not just Facebook. The original thing came up as selling on Facebook, but — I've seen ads in YK Trader for selling and for looking. And on the radio maybe? At the Regional workshop we presented different scenarios including word of mouth, a big poster board in front of my house, is that advertising, is it comparable to Facebook? The impression was that word of mouth would be okay, radio not really. It's evolved into general advertising of meat. I think this could get complicated because even with Facebook you could restrict your site to certain people, but if certain people are the whole community, is it advertising or is it communication to your friends? It will get messy. Is it available to anybody or is it to a narrow group that's really quite broad in a small community.

I think if everybody's fine we'll go through some drafts of some Regulations to deal with it, we might get a better sense of how it plays out. The way this is currently suggesting is it includes all kinds of advertising, the broadest sense. It will be left to ENR or whoever is enforcing it to do the enforcement. It might put an obligation on the RRCs to do some of the investigation? No, ENR would enforce if it's under the *Wildlife Act*. It's like private lands; GTC would tell ENR what they want for private land enforcement and ENR goes and does it. If a Gwich'in posts on social media or puts a poster up or goes on the radio and they do not have RRC support, then ENR could enforce that. And if they do have RRC support, ENR would not enforce it. Even if they're selling to only Aboriginal people. They can sell to Aboriginals without advertising, but if they want to advertise and sell to anybody they would need an ENR permit as well as RRC support. Or they would need an ENR permit to advertise the sale of meat if they don't have RRC support. It's not supposed to be an opt-out. The intent of getting the ENR permit is to make sure the RRC is okay with it as well. I need a flow chart for this! In the south there are examples of how people deal with this, where the government is trying to support small-scale businesses like selling chicken eggs, where like if you're selling under this many you don't need a permit, but you can't advertise, you can't sell at a Farmer's market. But once you hit a certain number you have to get a formal business license. It supported the word of mouth approach. As long as they're avoiding advertising they can sell as much as they want among themselves, nobody will interfere with that, but as soon as they advertise they need RRC support. It's not that they can't do it, it's just that they need RRC support.

Direction is general agreement in terms of advertising. Disclaimer that before there's a definite opinion we need to solve #7.

Amy: Are there any questions I should be raising re: #7 when I do the consultation for getting definition on what is a business? I'm going to go through all the context of why are we here, etc. should I be saying 'this is where we're going' — the Board is generally in support of this but this is what they want to hear from you on? And then spend more time on defining business?

I think so. We have to try to stay with the original issue that we came up with and try not to dive into it too deeply right now re: amounts and so on. Just deal with the advertising on social media, that was the issue. Dealing with it step by step instead of trying to preemptively think about what might happen. Markets have a way of stabilizing themselves sometimes. I don't want to feel like we're turning into a regulatory body, even though that's part of what we're here to do. As we go through this process it might be as simple as once we start to get education out there that you can't advertise on Facebook, you need a permit, it might work itself out over time. It's the RRC that does the authorization so each community might have different ideas about what's acceptable and they can each set their own, however tight or lax they want to. And we don't see that as an issue in case of inconsistencies among RRCs? No. Each community is different.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

9. Porcupine caribou

Discussion: Right now because this is not in Regulations, does this mean ENR cannot enforce it if there's an infraction? Right, that's what I understand. Generally they're not supporting General Wildlife Permits for Porcupine caribou meat, but there's nothing in the Regulations. So this is putting Porcupine caribou in the Regulations so ENR can enforce it if there's an issue. The wording on this — say a Regulation was put in place according to PCMA guidelines, would we have any input into if and when those guidelines are changed? Because we may be proposing a Regulation with the understanding that it's for one specific thing but if the guidelines change in the future all of a sudden so do the Regulations and maybe that wasn't the intent. I think we're proposing to have specific text that reflects what's in the PCMA, 3 things in the actual text of the Regulation. Are we defining commercial use for the PCMB when they have the management authority for Porcupine caribou? They have the trade and barter guidelines which is their way of going about defining commercial. I'm scared to overstep at the same time because if the PCMB hasn't defined commercial and all of a sudden we're defining it, it may lead to some issues. I asked them the same questions a few years ago and all they said was it was theirs to manage. It says specifically there should be no commercial sales of Porcupine caribou, but it doesn't say what that is, so are we doing that for them? Maybe a better approach is for GRRB not to even think about going to ENR directly for this and instead based on what we've heard in the consultations (and Joe was part of that) we can give this to them and say if you wish to send it to ENR, Yukon Government, at least then it would be consistent between the two governments as well, because otherwise it will just be NWT. I know they've been wrestling with this issue for 20 or 30 years, so for us to just do it, I don't know. PCMA says it prohibits the sale of caribou meat except under very specific circumstances so I would say that it's not to be sold commercially, and if that's what they say, why would they have to have commercial use defined? Because some of the topics we're getting in to in terms of what our communities are considering commercial in terms of the time and what are 'reasonable' expenses, we're going a little farther than that in some cases. Because they would have to go with the Wildlife Laws in Alaska, the Yukon, and NWT. So if they had to say commercial use in those 3 different jurisdictions why would they have commercial use if their mandate says there is to be no sale of Porcupine caribou meat. One thing that really stuck out is a section in the PCMA about commercial outfitting, and debate about whether commercial outfitting is actually commercial sale, that debate is going on and hasn't really been addressed either. Is there sport hunting for Porcupine caribou? Yes, in the Yukon. It goes back to they've been discussing this for a long time and if we are to tackle this we should work directly with them. Joe's really familiar with this. It would be beneficial to get his guidance. He has some different views. It would be a good exercise to go through. And find out what might work for them to find out what issues they're facing and how we can better put together a definition that will meet their needs as well as the needs we're hearing in the communities. And what we hear for #7 might influence #9 as well. This is a big issue and I'm glad we're taking it on as a Board.

Amy: What I'm hearing is that there is not necessarily disagreement on what's here, but uncomfortableness with moving forward without working more closely with PCMB. Direction is to consult on #7 defining what's considered a business with GSA communities, and work directly with PCMB on this one specifically and come back to the Board with what comes out of that before there's any agreement on #7. Once I get more information I'll come back to the Board and once you support it I'll do the first bullet in 'Next Steps'. [refer to p. 40 of Amy's presentation] So this will happen over this next fiscal year, and if any hiccups it could be even longer.

Amy: ENR headquarters has funded this process and is very interested in where we're going. I have not shared the draft report with them because I wasn't sure where the Board would be with those. What should I share with them? I've told them general thoughts, but not the report.



Gwich'in Renewable Resources Board (GRRB)

AGENDA

| | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Discussion: Lila attended the workshop. The report just has recommendations, it doesn't say we're going to follow them necessarily. I think it's okay to share. We can say more work on #7 and #9 and bring it back to the Board, and still share it. | | | |
| 1:25 PM Closing remarks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public portion of the meeting adjourns | Jozef Carnogursky, GRRB | Information |
| Closing statement by Jozef. Thanks to the community of Tsiigehtchic, Board members, staff, public who took part, it's really appreciated. | | | |
| 3:15 PM Adjournment | Motion to adjourn; Board members to travel back to Inuvik | Jozef Carnogursky, Chair | Motion |
| Motion to adjourn the September GRRB face-to-face meeting. | | Motion GRRB 19-46 | |
| Moved by: William | Seconded by: | | |
| All in favour. | Motion Carried. | | |