

# YUKON FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

December 11 to 13, 2019

## MINUTES

Yukon Inn – Fireside Room

---

### DAY 1: Wednesday, December 11, 2019 – Regular Meeting

---

**PRESENT:** John Burdek, Ron Chambers, Danny Cresswell, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Carl Sidney, Ken Taylor, Randy Taylor, Blanche Warrington

**REGRETS:** Franklin Patterson, Dennis Dickson,

**STAFF:** Graham Van Tighem, Steve Hossack

**SUPPORT:** Colleen Henry (Minute Taker Via Recording)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Janice Sibbeston (YFWMET Manager), Christine Cleghorn (Director, Fish & Wildlife, YE), Sandy Smarch (Teslin RRC), Shawn Wassel (YOA), Rob Florkiewicz, Ken Reeder, Saleem Dar (Canadian Wildlife Service), Shannon Stotyn (Canadian Wildlife Service), Matt Clark

---

### OPENING PRAYER, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Carl Sidney said the opening prayer. John Burdek provided opening comments. There was a roundtable of introductions. New members, Randy Taylor, Sebastian Jones and Dawn Kisoun introduced themselves and provided a brief background.

---

### ADMIN AND FINANCES (TAB 01)

#### A. AGENDA REVIEW

John Burdek reviewed the agenda provided in meeting kits. There were no additions or deletions.

**Motion – 2019-21:** That the Board accept the December 11 to 13, 2019 agenda as presented.

**Moved by:** Ken Taylor

**Seconded by:** Carl Sidney

**Passed by:** Consensus

Clarification on the Day 2 in-camera discussions regarding the proposals was provided. RRCs may attend. The in-camera sessions are closed to the media. A policy on in-camera sessions will be developed in the future.

---

## **B. EXECUTIVE REPORT (TAB 01)**

Graham provided an overview of the Executive Report provided in meeting kits.

### Comments/Discussion:

- Yukon Forum Board Review — John Burdek and Graham Van Tighem provided a brief overview of the Board Review. The Board will meet with the Yukon Forum Fish and Wildlife Working Group.
- Yukon Water Forum — Steve Hossack provided a brief overview. Presentations focused on ground water, service water, climate change, ecosystems, microplastics in the Yukon River, salmon, UFA, and elder storytelling. The emphasis was on acknowledging work that has been completed and community projects. RRCs presented and discussed changes in Kluane Lake.
  - The Yukon water forum is a gathering place to discuss the water strategy. There was no formal presentation.
  - Beaver River Management review meeting (October 22 or 23) — Christine Cleghorn provided an update. NND and YG are the two parties. The planning committee has four smaller management plans for: harvest management, road access, adaptive management plan for cumulative effects, and the overall land use plan. The parties were advised that the timeline needs to be extended from the end of March to the end of August. NND approved the extension. The “What we heard” document is on the website. The values, interests and issues will be posted later in the week for public review. The harvest management regime is looking at meeting in Mayo in early January. That discussion will hinge on the moose regulation changes. The road access management plan will be completed by the end of March. The cumulative effects plan milestones are not available at this time.
  - Angling working group — There have been no meetings. It will reconvene after regulations changes are completed in the new year (February).
  - Wetlands Policy — There was no formal presentation. It will reconvene in the new year.

---

## **C. ACTION ITEM REVIEW**

There were no actions items from the last Board meeting.

**Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board  
Status of Action Items  
2019-2020**

**Action Item 2019-01:** The Board will review the operating procedures. The operating procedures will be discussed at the next Board meeting.

*Conversation is ongoing with the Yukon Forum Fish and Wildlife Working Group prior to reviewing the operating procedures.*

---

**D. FINANCIAL UPDATE (TAB 01)**

Graham Van Tighem provided an overview of the November 30, 2019 financial variance report provided in meeting kits.

**Motion – 2019-22:** That the Board accept the variance report up to November 30, 2019 as presented.

**Moved by:** Blanche Warrington

**Seconded by:** Danny Cresswell

**Passed by:** Consensus

Comments/Discussion:

- Working group expenses include Board member honoraria.
- The wolf management working group is the wildlife management plan working group.
- Currently the projected surplus is \$36,000. The maximum carry forward is 15 percent. The Board will require external funding to actively participate in the Yukon Forum review. Otherwise, the Board will have to drop other activities. Board meetings alone makes up a substantive part of the budget for the whole year.
- Beaver River management plan funding has not been forecasted.
- Website — The Communications Working Group will meet with Steve and Graham and look at a path forward over the next few months.

---

**E. OCTOBER MINUTES (TAB 01)**

The following edit was identified:

- Day 2 — YG presenters need to be added to the attendance list.

**Motion – 2019-23:** That the Board accept the October 22 to 24, 2019 minutes as amended.

**Moved by:** Carl Sidney

**Seconded by:** Ken Taylor

## **F. CORRESPONDENCE REVIEW (TAB 01)**

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the correspondence provided in meeting kits.

### Comments/Discussion:

- Some letters and invitations are addressed directly to individual Board members. Correspondence should be sent to the Board which will then decide who will attend.
  - Danny Cresswell provided a brief overview of the Land Claim Agreement Coalition. (Letter #7)
- 

## **COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE (TAB 02) – S. Hossack**

Steve Hossack provided a communications update. A copy of the update was provided in meeting kits.

### Comments/Discussion:

- One problem is communication with elders. How do we keep them in the loop regarding who we are as a Board? We call elders in to make statements about history, but they're not in the loop. We need a different way of transferring the message because not many elders can receive information digitally. We should work on plugging in to elders forums or meetings to ensure they are included in discussions. Wildlife is their life and they, of all people, have relied on wildlife more than anyone. How do we make it inclusive? We need to make more reference to elders who have contributed.
- There are opportunities to show an information video to elders in communities. The calendar also provides a visual for elders. The Board needs to make its information relevant.
- Use Yukon and First Nation names for animals to be inclusive and acknowledge history and people. We don't need to become language experts, but a few traditional names make a difference. First Nations will pick up on it right away. Names like "thin horn sheep" confuse people in communities.
- When doing updates on the website, it would be beneficial to have a section to address issues that were raised so that we communicate to the public who we are and what we do.

### Regulation Change Proposals 1, 2 and 3 (Moose)

John Burdek provided information on extending the deadline for comments on the moose management regulation change proposals by 90 days. The public has expressed a lot of concerns indicating there is not enough time for comment. The Board had a lengthy discussion on concerns that have been raised in anticipation of the public meeting later in the evening.

### Comments/Discussion:

- There is an impression that the Board views these proposals as important, yet a majority of the public response is against them. By extending the deadline for comment, there was a concern that there could be a perception that the Board didn't like the results of the public engagement so we'll continue consultation until we get the results we want. I know that's not what the Board does, but there is the possibility that that perception could arise.
- The concerns are the timelines, the lack of understanding, and how the regulation change process works. Feedback points to timeline and process.
- It is important that the public understands that the Board is diagnostic about these proposals.
- It should be stated upfront why the Board is extending the timelines.
- It is important not to defend the regulations. A decision has not been made yet.
- Graham Van Tighem provided background and history of the conversation around moose harvest management Framework for new board members. The Board is presently reviewing the moose harvest management framework which is a Board document. That review of that document is meant to mesh with the adaptive management framework. We have been driving this issue at Yukon government for many years. The government has responded with this proposal and the marriage of that proposal with the adaptive management framework. It needs to be better explained. This Board is as responsible for this proposal as are those who owned it. We need to find a way to refine it, recommend it and get to the point of management.

**Motion – 2019-24:** That the Board approve extending the period of the public engagement for regulation change proposals 1, 2 and 3 for by 90 days.

**Moved by:** Carl Sidney

**Seconded by:** Ken Taylor

**Passed by:** Consensus

---

#### **BRANCH UPDATE – C. Cleghorn**

Christine Cleghorn provided a branch update. The branch has been deeply engaged in regulation changes and 40 Mile caribou harvest management. A draft document containing the status of 2015 and 2017 intake of regulation change proposals was included in meeting kits. An edited version was distributed at the meeting. Most of 2015 regulation changes have been done.

Christine also provided an update on staff changes. Starting in January, Dennis Barry is moving from operations to corporate for nine months. Christine will move into Dennis's position and a new person will take over Christine's position for nine months.

---

## **SPECIES AT RISK UPDATE & UPDATE ON NATIONAL GRIZZLY BEAR MANAGEMENT PLAN (and other items) – S. Dar, S. Stotyn,**

Saleem Dar reviewed a PowerPoint presentation on the Species at Risk in the Yukon, including: the SARA cycle; species listing; completed SARA plans; plans in progress for birds, mammals, insects, and plants; and prelisting consultations (two species). Letters regarding prelisting consultations for the Hudsonian Godwit and the Yukon Draba will be sent to the Board in January.

### Comments/Discussion:

- Collared Pika — How do you go about protecting something that lives in an endangered environment in the first place? There is a difference in where these things are. Their whole environment was endangered maybe 100 years ago. The main threat to Collared Pika is their environment. This is one of the first species where climate change is the main threat. It is a really important plan because it is so threatened by climate change. It's not threatened by hunting, although you can hunt Pika in Alaska. We can manage development and make recommendations for development in alpine areas. We can look at areas where there is less impact by climate change. The recommendations are there to guide research and actions. If resources are limited, where do we want to focus efforts?
- An overview of the assessment process was provided to the Board. The Board receives a draft report before assessments are completed. Each species has a different challenge and there are different ways to manage at the ecosystem level. Federal government released funding in 2018, but the focus was in the south. Assessments are on a national basis. We are looking at ways to recover on an ecosystem basis. Monitoring is often a component that goes into a plan. This information should also be taken into account in land use plans. Education and public awareness are a big part.
- Are beekeepers part of the problem? Bumble bees on the list because they have declined in the south. Honey bees compete with native bees. It may not matter so much in the Yukon. Permits are not required; however, Yukon government could use the animal control order.

---

## **40 MILE CARIBOU HARVEST MANAGEMENT UPDATE AND ADAPTIVE HARVEST PROPOSAL 2020 – C. Cleghorn, M. Clark, J. Burdek, G. Van Tighem**

Graham Van Tighem provided a background of the Board's involvement in 40 Mile caribou harvest management. Matt Clark reviewed a Fortymile Caribou Herd Backgrounder presentation provided in meeting kits. Today we are asking for opening a hunt on January 1, 2020 that would go annually until March 31. There is a commitment in the memo and the draft harvest management plan to evaluate the hunt regularly to ensure the tools are used properly.

### Comments/Discussion:

- Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in Letter — The letter mentions there are impacts. What are the impacts? Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in has not harvested since mid 1990s. Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in

wants time to rebuild a connection to the herd. That has been happening since 2017. The other issue is access to moose. Caribou hunters will learn all the trails and return to pursue moose which would result in another issue for Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in to have to deal with in their territory.

- Moose are not in the goldfields. People aren't hunting moose up there because there are none. There were a lot of moose in 2015. A pilot who has picked up Yukon Quest dogs at Scroggy said it was the worst he has seen in the last 25 years.
- One goal Yukon had aspired to is getting caribou to reoccupy the historical range. Alaska's interest is to stabilize the herd. Our negotiations brought us to a point where we're not trying to grow the herd, but we are trying to stabilize the herd. It puts all of us in an awkward position because of the issue Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in is bringing up with respect to their concerns. We have to facilitate the goals of the harvest management plan which is to take the harvest because the growth can't be the historical growth. Decline can precipitate quickly once it reaches a tipping point. To reach the management objective, Yukon has to do its part.
- There are hundreds of mining roads where caribou used to be. How much of a deterrent is that for the caribou? There are hundreds of roads compared to the Alaska side.
- There is certainly a lot of activity in that area.
- In 2015, caribou were spotted by Swede Creek and Coffee Creek. People were hunting by boat to see if they were there. The first hunt in 22 years was three years ago. Gwitchin were afraid to shoot them along the Dempster Highway.
- The winter hunt is limited to 25 permits. The idea is, it's a time when we're not worried about moose and there should be room for hunters to spread out. Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in had a major concern about re-educating people and they don't want to be displaced or have competition with licensed hunters.
- There is a letter from the Dawson RRC to the minister in support of this hunt in meeting kits.
- We need to be aware that history is an indicator of what we're dealing with today. They are building a big complex near Coffee Creek where there used to be a major caribou crossing and there is an archeological site. Why would there be a village there? The only reason I can think of is because there used to be caribou. History needs to be part of planning. Wherever there is a village site, there is a reason. The only reason I can see is there was a crossing. If we make decisions with reasons behind it we can override the politics.
- Yukon government did not receive a letter from Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in regarding a meeting. That letter was sent to the Dawson RRC and the Board.
- It's difficult to separate the management plan from the recovery plan. The management plan has to support the objectives of the recovery. It's not clear how it will help achieve those objectives. This discussion doesn't help us decide the harvest plan but it should support it.
- The country comes alive again. That's what we're trying to do.
- In our last conversation, we talked to Alaska about the contents of their plan. We left with an agreement that they would continue to allow a two-percent growth of the herd

and that a harvest would slow it from a three- to -four-percent growth. Since then, they had another season of sampling. Some metrics for population health continue to low, one being the number of three-year old calves that are able to give birth.

- The challenge is if we're going to continue investing our allocation of the herd to achieve those goals, we won't see licensed opportunities because the herd will be brought down on this side if they're not coming into Yukon at all.
- The crux of the issue is that we have a recovery plan and a harvest management plan and they mesh, but the rate at which we are recovering is being slowed. Alaska has a goal. They want to harvest Fortymile caribou. Our goals, in order, are to have the herd occupy their historic range, maintain growth, subsistence harvest and licensed harvest. Alaskans are not okay with three- to four-percent growth anymore due to the threat of collapse. We can't do that unless we commit to taking one percent.
- Is there historical data or TK that it gets to a certain threshold and starts to occupy more of the Yukon? We don't have that information. 50,000 came in, first time in a long time. Until they move further into their historical range, the range is trampled and that is where the other metrics are causing great alarm for the Alaskans. Yukon tries to get more information about quality of habitat but Alaska manages strictly on population. There could be a multitude of factors that contribute to birth rates of three-year-olds.
- YG invest \$100,000 into research and monitoring a year, which is a fraction of what the Alaskans do.
- Yukoners having to harvest Fortymile caribou is not a big surprise. There were two resolutions from previous Tr'ondëk GA's. When the herd reached 61,000 there would be a harvest, including licensed harvest. We're at 84,000. We've all been involved for many years. We've all been watching the population. None of this is a surprise. We've been having this conversation for six years.
- Yukon has forgone its harvest in exchange for growth in hopes that population will growth and the herd will reoccupy its historic range. Alaskans have taken their share of the animals. They were harvesting at two percent. Our contribution was harvest. Alaska's contribution was management of predators on the calving grounds and around. They spent millions on this herd. We spent \$100,000 a year. Alaskans have put in more than 10 times the resources.
- Alaskans are very respectful in identifying Yukon and Canada have initiated this program. We've had a longstanding space to not harvest. It doesn't conform to their management approach. We have reached a time and place where they have run out of patience with us. This mirrors our frustration with the salmon management. That also speaks to why it's important that Yukon takes this opportunity seriously before it doesn't exist.
- Alaska has a subsistence harvest which is political and very different from Yukon.
- We should expect that the herd size will begin to fluctuate like the Porcupine caribou herd.
- When the hunt is on for Fortymile, state troopers don't get out of their vehicles because bullets are flying all over. That's political management.

- This conversation is really about: How are we sharing the harvest? We have a share. Our maximum is 225 and there are 1,000 animals. Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in has started and it's time for us to start too.
- YSSC started off with diplomats at the table.
- There is an opportunity for everyone to meet some level of need. The caribou are doing well. This is meant to be a positive success. Alaska is being strategic and political. There are moderately loud alarm bells but they're negotiating with us. In the end, something good will come of this.

The Board will further discuss this item on Day 2 and formulate a formal motion.

---

### **MOOSE HARVEST MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK REVIEW – G. Van Tighem**

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the Moose Harvest Management Framework PowerPoint presentation including: main discussion points; history of the guidelines; tools already in place and not yet in place; adaptive framework; comments from Selkirk First Nation, Champagne Aishihik First Nation and Yukon Conservation Society on the current guidelines and common themes; limit ORV access; staggered harvest (proposed by YCS); and next steps.

#### Comments/Discussion:

- This is not about the regulation change, but it will be married to the regulation change.
- The new guidelines will be recommended to the Minister of Environment in April (not June as the presentation indicated).

---

---

**DAY 2: Thursday, December 12, 2019 – Regular Meeting**

---

**PRESENT:** John Burdek, Ron Chambers, Danny Cresswell, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Franklin Patterson, Carl Sidney, Ken Taylor, Randy Taylor, Blanche Warrington

**REGRETS:** Dennis Dickson

**STAFF:** Graham Van Tighem, Steve Hossack

**SUPPORT:** Colleen Henry (Minute Taker)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Janice Sibbeston (YFWMET Manager), Christine Cleghorn (Director, Fish & Wildlife, YE), Sandy Smarch (Teslin RRC), Shawn Wassel (YOA),

---

**YUKON WILDLIFE ACT REGULATION CHANGE MEETING — REGULATION CHANGE DISCUSSION  
(Preparation of official recommendations by the Board to Minister of Environment)  
R. Florkiewicz, B. Coppard, G. Van Tighem, S. Hossack**

John Burdek provided a brief introduction. The Board discussed the public meeting held on the evening of December 11, 2019.

Public Meeting Comments and Discussion:

- Education from grade 7 to 12 is the best place to start on education regarding the UFA and hunting rights. Education is always a good place to start.
- Someone from Aboriginal Affairs should attend public sessions.
- There is a lot of misunderstanding. A lot of work needs to be done by all governments involved. Misunderstanding is where the anger comes from. There is a lack of knowledge and appreciation for the roles of the RRCs, First Nation governments, and community voices.
- There was some misunderstanding and those who misunderstood are loud and not afraid to state their opinion. Reasonable people sit on their hands and don't speak up. We have to come up with something to give a bit of background about how we are operate under the UFA.
- People go with predetermined thoughts and agendas.
- How are they involved with their local First Nation? What about other issues like cow moose harvest, population, reducing the decline of the numbers?
- A lot of the emotion in the room was fueled by people who know better which fuels ignorance. How do you educate people who should know better? Maybe we need a

strategy for public meetings to be effective. Complaining about the UFA is counterproductive.

- We should have a moderator or facilitator.
- Put moose regulation changes to the last item for discussion.
- The Board has a 30-minute PowerPoint presentation on the UFA.
- For communications, the package was emailed out, it was available on the website, there were 25 paid radio spots, and there was an online survey. Most of the people in the room reviewed the proposals. We need to discuss how to condense the information so it is easier to digest. We need to focus on points that target other demographics (younger people in school). We need new tools to break down large or difficult concepts. Moving forward, we need communication pieces that address concerns and help people understand the importance and move forward. Steve has been in communication with the Department.
- We have community meetings regularly on a number of topics and we never see bigotry, let alone people applauding afterwards. It was upsetting and shocking. We see that behaviour in people all the time. There is no simple solution. Good communication and education are part of it. People don't realize what the First Nations gave up when they signed the UFA. Maybe there should be a statement at the start of the meeting.
- It is difficult to be an information provider and a facilitator. We must have a facilitator. We must ensure the meeting is recorded and insist that it is recorded and that people state their name on the record and that they speak into a microphone.
- We may need to take a second look at what the forum means. We are the people appointed by the people. It's wrong for those people to feel they can come and make us uncomfortable when we're trying to do this challenging job. They can't use us to vent. We need to, as much as we can, work for the wildlife in Yukon and take a second look at the value of this.
- Graham was commended for doing a fine job. We go all the way back to when it came to our table. Moose are everyone's bread basket. The basic needs level is an individual First Nation negotiation. Nobody relayed that information. There is a trigger in there. There is a First Nation responsibility in each hunting zone. Somehow or other the ball is in our court to try to get the First Nations to report their harvest. How do we do that? Government gets the information for some, but not others. Providing a draft presentation without knowing the real numbers adds more fuel to the fire.
- We should use video to record people and they will be less confrontational.
- Harvesting is an inherent right. We have to educate First Nations to report their harvest. We should consider having meetings on the weekend during the day.
- First Nation harvest was presented like it is a vacuum and it's really not. Some areas really have good information. It's not a total vacuum. It gives the impression that licensed harvesters are taking their quota and the First Nation harvesters are taking more than their quota. It's a matter of how the information is presented.
- Some First Nation harvesters are licensed as non-First Nation harvesters and may not be listed. How many people are doing that? There could be a lot of First Nations who are going through the process.

- Christine did an exceptionally good job of representing the UFA on behalf of everyone in the room. Everybody at Yukon government did a great job, especially Robert Perry. He answered honestly and transparently. People were speaking angrily, but they left happy.

Proposal Review Comments and Discussion: **IN CAMERA**

- Proposals 1 through 3
  - The goal is to have the toolbox and the regulations presented at the same time (by April).
  - Government will work on how to portray First Nations harvest better in presentations 2 and 3.
  - The draft of the toolbox has been sent to First Nations and RRCs.

**40 MILE CARIBOU HARVEST MANAGEMENT UPDATE AND ADAPTIVE HARVEST PROPOSAL 2020 — C. Cleghorn**

Christine Cleghorn provided an overview of the proposal. A package was provided in meeting kits. This is for a winter harvest only and this will be crafted into a recommendation.

**Motion – 2019-24:** That the Board approve drafting the Fortymile caribou harvest management and adaptive harvest proposal 2020 into a recommendation.

**Moved by:** Blanche Warrington

**Seconded by:** Ron Chambers

**Passed by:** Consensus

---

**DAY 3: Friday, December 13, 2019 – Regular Meeting**

---

**PRESENT:** John Burdek, Ron Chambers, Danny Cresswell, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Franklin Patterson, Carl Sidney, Ken Taylor, Randy Taylor, Blanche Warrington

**REGRETS:** Dennis Dickson; Michelle Dawson-Beattie

**STAFF:** Graham Van Tighem, Steve Hossack

**SUPPORT:** Sharon Kerr (Minute Taker, CAH Services)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Janice Sibbeston (YFWMET Manager), Christine Cleghorn (Director, Fish & Wildlife, YE), Sandy Smarch (Teslin RRC), Elizabeth MacDonald (ED, Yukon Salmon Subcommittee), Harvey Jessup (Yukon Salmon Subcommittee), Mary Vanderkop, Todd Onsrge (Chair, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers), Richard Cherepak (Treasurer, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers), Kevin Hurley (Wild Sheep Foundation)

---

**YFWET UPDATE**

Refer to YFWET minutes.

---

**YUKON SALMON SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE AND BUDGET APPROVAL — E. MacDonald, H. Jessup**

Elizabeth MacDonald provided an update on recommendations to the Minister of Environment including:

- not providing allocation to angling, domestic or commercial industry for chinook based on preseason forecast;
- allowing a conservative First Nation industry;
- open an allocation for chum;
- using in-season data for Porcupine chinook, chum and coho; and
- make sure all fisheries are using a six-inch mesh net or smaller.

The response from the minister indicated agreement on the recommendation on allocations and using the six-inch mesh or smaller and conservative fisheries for Yukon River chinook. They

altered one recommendation for a commercial or domestic fishery that caught a female chinook to release all chinook alive or dead.

The YSSC responded and asked for a new chinook management matrix and for development regulatory tools to allow for the release of chinook females.

DFO implemented in-season changes without discussion with the subcommittee. One was a closure to Yukon River angling until the end of September. It prevented catch and release fishing. Chum angling was closed.

Elizabeth also provided an update on: salmon runs and spawning escapement goals; meetings; workshop; Inter-tribal Fish Commission meeting with First Nations; and the 2021 budget.

Comments/Discussion:

- The salmon run was higher than seen in recent years, but was not comparable to the historical runs.
- It seems the size of the salmon are smaller than the average in the past. The fish is also torpedo-shaped. It is a different run than 20 years ago.
- The Fishing Branch escapement goal was not met this year.

**Motion – 2019-26:** That the Board approve the Yukon Salmon Subcommittee 2020-21 budget as presented.

**Moved by:** Blanche Warrington

**Seconded by:** Ken Taylor

**Passed by:** Consensus

---

**REGULATION CHANGE PROPOSALS HART RIVER AND GRIZZLY BEAR ROADSIDE HUNTING AROUND CARCROSS — G. Van Tighem, C. Cleghorn, R. Florkiewicz**

Hart River Caribou Sustainable Harvest

Graham spoke to Rosalee and Ian Fraser. They wanted to wait until EMR finishes regulations on ORVs before dealing with Hart River and ORVs. The Dawson RRC is very much in favour of the proposal. The Board agreed to advance the Hart River proposal as presented.

Roadside Bear Proposal

Graham spoke with Ken Reeder. He was surprised and alarmed by the variation of the corridor to 500 metres. Graham suggested Ken respond in writing and speak to his co-chair. Graham read the response to the Board.

The Board had an in-depth conversation and agreed to advance a recommendation for the Carcross/Tagish viewing of 100 metres.

---

## **ANIMAL PROTECTION AND CONTRACT CONTROL ACT AND ANIMAL CONTROL ORDER UPDATE**

### **— M. Vanderkop**

Graham Van Tighem provided an introduction. Mary Vanderkop provided an update on Eurasian boar, control order (in effect January 1, 2020), developing new legislation and processes, and testing.

#### Comments/Discussion:

- Is there resistance in the unit to euthanize sheep? The destruction of positive animals is accomplished by slaughter. Some positive animals were baby goats. We discuss with the owner how to carry that out. We have been responsible for the destruction when they were deemed jointly as not suitable or not desirable for slaughter. It is difficult for people to do. It is always a challenge. People have a lot invested in their operation. There was one instance where one owner made the case that they did not want their animals to be destroyed. They agreed to ship the animals to the Maritimes where there are no wild sheep. They produced a waybill. Government has been flexible to accommodate people while meeting outcomes.
- There have been detections of this bacteria in sheep, moose and caribou in Alaska. Government is doing surveillance and COs are on the lookout for wild sheep and caribou. To date, everything tested in wildlife has been negative. The department wants to test more animals. There is a significant die-off in United States and BC. The Dawson RRC saw a wild sheep in a pen with domestic sheep. That sheep was euthanized. This is the first time that an order like this under territorial legislation has been used like this. It is an important tool. There was excellent cooperation from the agriculture side. This is an aggressive approach. Owners are compensated, but it is hard for them to cope with the fact that government is coming in. You take away their dreams and identity. These are people who are willingly cooperating with something that is quite demanding on them.
- As difficult as it is for sheep owners, we don't have that problem with wild boar to the same extent. We need to make the case to government that this is a problem that can be fixed with low cost and impact to owners. We need to move with haste on wild boar.
- Yukon is leading the way on this topic. Action has been taken fairly quickly. The Wild Sheep Foundation is supportive.
- Reporting has been done on a stakeholder basis and early in the calendar year there will probably be a summary. The compensation amount will probably not be

included. Vast majority of farmers haven't charged back for items. There will be considerable dollars spent on compensation.

---

### **BACKCOUNTRY HUNTERS DN ANGLERS — T. Onson, BHA Chair**

Todd Onson provided an overview of: the organization; membership; chapters in Canada; foundation and basis; activities; engagement with hunting community; access issues (i.e. residence regulation);

We see this board as the

#### Comments/Discussion:

- Q: Are you the voice for the animals or the people? A: Both. Q: Isn't that what the RRCs and this Board are for? A: I would say no. Q: Where's the difference? A: We see this board as the sober second thought for government on land use, people, hunting, fishing, First Nation's related issues, on resident hunting related issues. A voice of sober second thought has to be set aside from all the comments. It is a place where comments go. The elected minds mull over everything that has been said. Our voice is another that we want you to hear. The RRCs have a voice at the local level. Across the Yukon there are a lot of people who don't understand how the RRCs speak or if they speak for them. By the same token of your comment, we could say there doesn't need to be a Fish and Game Association, a BHA, a Trappers Association, or an outfitters association because the Board could do all of those things. But then it would be impossible for this Board to gather all of these voices and all of that information if those organizations didn't exist.
- Regarding the advocacy for more access to the land. I went through your website briefly and it's an American website, but you're taking the organization's name. One of the strong points is advocacy for more access to the land. Can you explain what you mean by more access to the land or advocating for more access. Are you wanting more trails? A: It's about maintaining existing access. Most public access in the US is on BHA bureau of land management of land. They have federal land at 100 public access for multiple use. Federal government wants to divest themselves of those costs and responsibilities and they give them to the state. The state can then sell the land and the owner can then post signs that restrict access. They are working to restore access to some places. It is about retaining access to federal land they still have access to and building partnerships and opportunities to get new access to waterways. We're not advocating for roads. We want access to the land and the resources. We have a mix of non-quad users and ARGO users. We want to maintain what we have and work with legislators.

- Q: How much have you discussed with First Nation and government? The Yukon has 14 different First Nations that have settled their land claims and have traditional territory. We have subzones in our territory where numbers of moose are too low. We're restricting our own people to hunt. We have fish issues in our lakes. They are hit hard with catch and release. We have lots of traplines. There are a lot of issues. I think you should be taking this to First Nations. I have to get permission to another First Nation's traditional territory. You can do that too. Every year I get a hunting licence from my own people. You're going to hear that everywhere. A: Absolutely. We want to meet with First Nations. So far, we've met resistance.
- We have 14 First Nations with traditional territories that they look after that we want to look after. We look at our own people. We struggle with our own people who go out and do what you want to do. The resources are getting so depleted it's not funny. A: We already participate in hunting and we have been actively working with Christine and the Board on asking questions about moose harvest and licensing regulations.
- You should come and see us because we can give you a lot of answers. A: We would love to and we're getting there. We're new. Until today, we have never had anyone answer. We have never had an opportunity. Not one.
- Overall, the message is that you need to recognize there are 11 self-governments out there, there are processes and RRCs. You realize that, but just a reminder that there is more than YG and federal government. A: I agree. On the flipside, it's very difficult for us to open those doors, no matter how much we want to. If we want to go and speak to a community, we need to respect the community enough to be invited and not to demand. So, now we've been invited.
- We have a limited number of resources. We've talked about that. When we're all competing for the same resource and you're trying to make it easier for certain people to get at it easier, that doesn't work. Maybe that's how the message is coming and maybe that's what the question is. Yukon seems to be a focus because we are who we are with a smaller population and that's one of the points you make, that Yukon has a small population. That's one of the reasons why we have the resources we have. It's to your interest or our interests to see that we don't create more hunters for the sake of hunting. How do you take that image away? A: I think the understanding here is access. Not what access is, but the word itself. We're really talking about opportunities. When you're thinking about access, you're thinking about more ORV trails and more jet boats on rivers.
- No, we're thinking that you want to go use my backyard more than you can right now, because I have a couple cabins out there and a trapline and you can't hunt

within that area, but if you open that area and step inside the bubble, that might be a moose that I didn't get.

- When we're talking about a mapping plan, this is not about gaining more access to people's backyards. What we're saying is, land is being used in Yukon for various amounts of things. When people come to Yukon, they want the rural residential property, but they still have to work in town. A lot of land over the last 30 years have been taken up by rural residential properties. We're not taking that away from people. It's that there needs to be a focus or plan on how we keep these areas free for wildlife and still have a population in Yukon and people living like Yukoners. We don't want to access everybody's back yard. The point is that huge tracks of land along major roadways have been used for houses, which is appropriate. There's a roadway there; why not live there? But then there's a point where something's been lost because there's another person there. It is a data gathering exercise so YESAB has something else to look at that says this is how land has been used and how population has expanded away from the centre over the last 30 years because no one has gathered that data into one item.
- The young folks who come here are from hunting communities or backgrounds or many want to become hunters. They are coming here anyway. We can be mentors for them and speak some of the messages we learn on moderation and the experience of hunting. The hunters are coming. If they pay attention to what we're doing, that's great. We can help steer that ship toward opportunity, respect for land or the other things that are important to us. Access means opportunity.
- The magazines are American based. This is changing. As of next year, there will be a focus on Canada and Canadian legislation.
- It's a good time to have a meeting right now because of the public meeting we had on Wednesday night with all the issues that came up. There are a couple things that stand out. There is a difference between the backcountry hunters and anglers and the Yukon backcountry hunters and anglers. If I were to give you encouragement, it would be to define yourselves as much as you can as the Yukon Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, because the Yukon is unique and different jurisdiction. The second thing is, I see an opportunity to set a strong foundation and communication basis for your organization that respects First Nation final agreements, 16.4.02 harvest rights mean and how that relates to the difference between harvesting rights and harvesting privileges in this territory. When First Nations around the table talk about access, the sensitive underbelly is, not just ORV access and not just accessing backcountry that is not accessed, but also a perceived argument here between right versus privilege and trying to bump up one versus the other. As a foundation of your communication with your membership, which we should work on together, is to ensure there is no

misunderstanding on those things. All these questions relate to that misunderstanding right now. I see nothing but an opportunity here to build that relationship and foundation and have a positive working relationship. If I could characterize the challenge of the public meeting on Wednesday night, I would say it was because of a miscommunication issue that started in relation to some of the regulations and it happened because of a mischaracterization of information and we should avoid that in the future.

- We like to think we can be the voice of reason and say, “These are the rules of engagement.”
- Fish and Game Association is a good example of an association that has been around for a really long time, but there is still not enough effort to educate people on these issues. The Board can only do so much. We have only 2.8 staff. It’s an immense amount of work. We need to ensure that that relationship, communication and the respect for the First Nation final agreements aren’t something within your communication that should waiver. It should always be constant and top-of-mind.
- The average person looks at this, and it seems like here is another bunch of coming in to kill our moose and run amok in the wilderness. Unless you get that message out, that’s exactly what people are going to think. You mention access, just look at the Southern Lakes. It’s only permit hunts for animals you can hunt on permit. The place has been shot up because of access. If everybody has to get in the same room — all these organizations, First Nations, et cetera — and look at the vision for Yukon. There are rights and privileges, but if I have a right to hunt and there are no more moose left to hunt it doesn’t mean anything. We have to bring the populations back in some areas. Can your organization contribute to something like that? A: Yes. We were here on Wednesday. Our organization would be on the side of making the pie bigger. I come from a biology background; I live in Haines Junction. I know there aren’t many moose there. I know the habitat has changed since the 70s. We have been supressing the fire hazard. It needs fire for different habitats. We need more than talk to make moose come back. If we can be an advocate for actions that result in better habitat to make the pie bigger then there’s enough room for everybody. We want to be a voice for that.
- We need to be a voice of reason. Everything we’re doing isn’t working. Everybody is saying the same thing. Nobody is willing to start from scratch and say we all need to be involved from the ground floor. Hunting and fishing and being on the land is way more than what you bring home.
- Right up front, put it out information on who and what you are. Then people are aware and can see the territory in the eyes of an agreement with government. If you’re going to have an in-road, it’s only fair to make sure people understand Yukon

has a special situation, history, and concerns. Competition is who gets what. How do we do and say that and, at the same time, say we're here for the wildlife?

- We need to put forward our vision and position. If somebody joins and finds they don't like our position, they're free to let their membership lapse. We're not going to tolerate members who are communicating misinformation or adversarial comments. We're not going to have them try to sway the vision we have. We have denied people membership on that basis. I will commit to starting a short article and we will talk to Graham and get the Board involved.
- Why would you take on the name of this organization when it is so different up here than where the organization is based? Are you tied to having to do certain things certain ways as they do in the States? Why would you take on this name? A: The basis is conservation of land, access to hunting opportunities, and animals. They were the most like-minded organization that existed that we could hold in Canada. We tossed around the idea of starting our own Yukon organization. Those tend to grow slowly or falter completely. We have access to BHA biologists, legal staff, policy staff who can address some of these issues for us. It's an instrument of capacity. Their values align with ours. Their structure allows us to take those core values and apply it to Yukon. The chapters have to define "backcountry" in their areas. We brought these publications because we wanted you to see that there was a large organization here, and maybe that was a mistake and maybe we're learning. The undertone is all of these things is the ethic, belief and the value in hunting — the value in the land. That's what we want to portray. Maybe when we move toward a purely Canadian publication it will make more sense.
- Your website talks about all these different facets of modern Yukon and then immediately carries on to say that in recent years many Yukoners have felt that these interests have eroded the voice of resident hunters and anglers. Included in these interests that have eroded the voice of hunters is the rich First Nation history. That's an unfortunate turn of phrase you don't mean, but that's definitely the way it reads. A: That is an unfortunate turn of phrase and not intentional. We can easily change that. What we're trying to get at there is that there are a lot of things affecting habitat of wildlife and there are a lot of different people who value it for different reasons. There are many resident hunters who feel that their value doesn't matter. I understand the other side of the argument as well. We were not, in any way, saying that the First Nations are eroding the voice of resident hunters. So, we can change that.
- My comments are along that line. You were at the meeting the other night and you heard what I would call picking on First Nations just because they have a right. This person that we're speaking of identified as First Nation also, but I don't know if he

stopped and thought about how much First Nations have sacrificed — how much land they gave up and how much of their rights they gave up. Hunting and fishing is our aboriginal right. It's our diet. We were born into it. Christine did a good job of defending the UFA. When we negotiated that agreement, the First Nation people have given up a lot and received a lot. When an organization such as this comes along and wants to be part of it, in 20 or 30 years are we going to be giving the same comments again? Those rights have to be respected. That was a Supreme Court decision. Now, we could work together. I'm not sure how big this organization is. We're having difficulty with salmon. We have a huge number of people in Yukon who depend on salmon. Americans think all they have to do is meet the border escapement and it's not. We have a hard time with messaging. This could be a vehicle that could help us.

- Contact First Nations to start a dialogue.

---

#### **MEMBERS TIME AND WRAP UP — IN CAMERA**

There was a discussion about Carcross/Tagish Development Corporation opportunity to purchase DFO hatcheries. There was also a discussion about genetic/gene banking.

The following items were identified for follow-up:

- Fortymile follow-up letter will be crafted and sent to Christine, John, and Ken for review.
- Backcountry Hunters and Anglers;
- Fish and Game Association, particularly around communication of issues around regulation changes;
- Moose Harvest Management Guideline review;
- February workshops;
- Meetings with Associations;
- Regulations;
- Wild Boar;
- Board website;
- YSSC budget letter;
- Wild Sheep Foundation and possibility of an award for Mary Vanderkop; and
- Reporting requirement for trappers.