

YUKON FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

February 12 – 14, 2019

MINUTES

Yukon Inn – Willow Room

DAY 1: Tuesday, February 12, 2019 – Regular Meeting

PRESENT: John Burdek, Ron Chambers, Danny Cresswell, Michelle Dawson-Beattie (AM), Dennis Dickson, Carl Sidney, Ken Taylor, Frank Thomas, Blanche Warrington

REGRETS: Dave Andrew, Shirley Ford, Michelle Dawson-Beattie (PM)

STAFF: Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Tecla Van Bussel

SUPPORT: Sharon Kerr (Minute Taker)

PUBLIC: Janice Sibbeston (YFWET Manager), Christine Cleghorn (Director, Fish & Wildlife, YE), Ken Reeder (Carcross Tagish RRC), Laura McKinnon (Executive Director Alsek RRC), Samara Carlick (TTC Salmon Steward), Jodie Pongracz (Fish and Wildlife)

OPENING PRAYER – Carl Sidney

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

John Burdek welcomed everyone and provided opening remarks.

ADMIN AND FINANCES (TAB 01)

A. AGENDA REVIEW

John Burdek reviewed the agenda. There were no additions or deletions.

Motion – 2019-01: That the Board accept the February 12-14, 2019 agenda as presented.

Moved by: Frank Thomas

Seconded by: Ken Taylor

Passed by: Consensus

B. EXECUTIVE REPORT (TAB 02) – G. Van Tighem, J. Burdek and F. Thomas

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the Executive Report provided in meeting kits.

Comments/Discussion:

- Forty-mile caribou — Graham Van Tighem, John Burdek and Ron Chambers provided an overview of hunting practices, harvest, meetings and management.
 - Graham provided an overview of the management plan (one to two percent growth).
 - Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in is having difficulty understanding how to incorporate licensed harvest for this herd as aboriginal harvesters have been told not to hunt the herd for 25 years. Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in is working on increasing harvest. There is disagreement within the team on who can hunt and when. Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in gets to harvest, Alaskans get what is left and Yukoners will get nothing.
 -
 - Matt Clarke is the Yukon government representative, Graham represents the Board, Mark Wierda is the representative for the RRC and Darren Taylor is the representative for Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in.
 - Alaska wants Yukon to harvest 1,000 animals (1% of the herd). If the caribou don't come into Yukon, they can't be harvested. There was some discussion about allowing Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in to hunt in Alaska. Animals were in Yukon in the fall for six weeks. Some challenges were:
 - Elders were angry when the caribou were harvested.
 - Caribou simply don't come into the Yukon every year.
 - Minister Frost will meet with the Chief Joseph are poised to discuss and resolve this issue in 2019.
 - The Board should recommend Yukon and Alaska meet to discuss ongoing issues with moose and caribou.
 - The management plan is for five years. The first year will maintain the harvest allocation of 65/35. Yukon will not meet its harvest level in 2018-2019.
 - It was recommended government meet with the Fish and Game Association to determine harvesting options for licensed hunters.
 - Harvesting is a privilege. We need to manage the caribou for the best needs of the caribou, rather than manage to how many we can harvest.
 - Christine Cleghorn provided information from a Yukon government perspective. The biggest gap is between Yukon government and THFN and they have been



working together. The next opportunity for a harvest would be August or September 2019. The Minister will meet with the chief soon.

- Maintaining growth of herd will ensure Yukon has access to the herd.
- Burbot in Dezadeash – In the past, Kluane First Nation people would not eat burbot. Who has the problem with the burbot numbers? CAFN people probably had the same culture. We need to look at who has the problems and how it fits in. We have to consider the cultural component. Is it a good idea to raise the burbot if it isn't utilized by First Nations? Burbot are heavy predators of other fish.
- Good information is in the current angling regulations. Few people read it and utilize the information. We need to get more information out to people so they understand why we fish the way we do.
- Implementation Working Group — Graham and John provided an overview of discussions at the working group meeting regarding Board honoraria.

C. FINANCIAL UPDATE (TAB 03) – D. Sheldon

Diane Sheldon reviewed the January 31, 2019 variance report provided in meeting kits. There were no questions or discussion.

Motion – 2019-02: That the Board accept the YFWMB Financial Report to January 31, 2019 as presented.

Moved by: Frank Thomas

Seconded by: Ken Taylor

Passed by: Consensus

ACTION ITEM REVIEW (TAB 04) – G. Van Tighem

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the Action Item list.

Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board	
Status of Action Items	
2018-2019	
Action item 2018-05: YFWMB staff will reinstate the Trapping Working Group upon the completion of the Unfurled event and being the process of determining next steps.	<i>Ongoing. Graham met with Frank Johnstone. Information is included in correspondence.</i>

<p>Action item 2018-14: The Board will work with Environment Yukon and affected First Nations and RRCs on the ATAC Road engagement process.</p>	<p><i>Ongoing. The Executive Director will follow-up with Karen Clyde. Members of the Habitat Working Group will be contacted.</i></p>
<p>Action Item 2018-22: The Executive Director will obtain a copy of the CYFN Resolution requesting a review of the Board.</p>	<p><i>The Executive Director will attempt to obtain a copy.</i></p>
<p>Action Item 2018-23: The Board will draft a response letter to CYFN and government regarding the Board review, particularly as it pertains to parameters and scope of discussion, the federal government inclusion and the short timeline. The draft letter will be sent to Board members for review.</p>	<p><i>Completed. Two letters were sent and are included in Correspondence.</i></p>

Comments/Discussion:

- Yukon Forum Resolution — That information should be public. The minutes of the Yukon Forum are open. This should be addressed by Stratos on Day 2.

CORRESPONDENCE REVIEW (TAB 05) – G. Van Tighem

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the correspondence provided in meeting kits.

Comments/Discussion:

- #6 — Trapline Administration Questionnaire — The following questions were raised: Are RRCs representing the First Nations? Overlapping traplines is a huge issue. At what point will Mark Callan engage with trappers and the public? The Board will invite Mark Callan to the April meeting to provide information. He has made progress on the overlap issue. Board members discussed overlap issues and impacts across Yukon.
- #9 — Workshop – “Total Impact: Our Collective Footprint” — Blanche Warrington and Tecla Van Bussel will attend.
- #15 — Fight for the Hunt — This is aimed at BC government. The concession is in Yukon. Grizzly bears are a big issue in the Dease Lake area and not having licensed harvest in the area will add to the complexity of the problem. Graham provided information about the reference to land claims in the letter and the regulation change regarding black bear meat and hide.

DECEMBER YFWMB MINUTES (TAB 05) – D. Sheldon

Diane Sheldon reviewed the minutes.

Corrections:

- Page 18, 19 – Blanche Warrington will discuss changes with Diane.
- Moose management working group – Christine Cleghorn understood that the decision was made to activate the working group and government has proceeded. John clarified that this warrants a broader discussion in the working group or process. There will be more discussion.
- Accept the minutes as presented with clarifications.

Motion – 2019-03: That the Board approve the minutes for December 11 – 13, 2018 with amendments and clarifications.

Moved by: Frank Thomas

Seconded by: Carl Sidney

Passed by: Consensus

COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE (TAB 07) – T. Van Bussel

Tecla Van Bussel provided a communications update. A copy of the update was provided in meeting kits.

Comments/Discussion:

- Board appointments — Terms need to be updated and corrected.
- Newsletter — Members discussed publishing a Board newsletter. Staff agreed it is reasonable to include executive activities and communications in point form. There is a communication gap which the Board needs to fill. First Nations are busy and are not able to know everything that is going on. A simple newsletter can help. It should also be available in hard copy. Tecla will work on the newsletter for the April meeting.
- Yukon Conservation Society presentation — Tecla provided an overview of this presentation which focused on the financial burden of abandoned mines.
- Fisheries Act — Tecla will meet with Elizabeth to discuss the Fisheries Act. DFO officials will be in Whitehorse on February 18 to meet with Board members who have been involved including Frank, Carl, Blanche, John, as well as members of the YSSC to provide an update.
- Members' Appointments — Some appointments will expire soon and new appointments will not be made until after the Yukon Forum review. Christine Cleghorn confirmed

there will not be any extensions. CYFN has not done a call-out yet. Members will further discuss appointments during members time.

DIRECTOR'S UPDATE (TABS 08 and 09) – C. Cleghorn, J. Pongracz

PHA Review Update

Jodie Pongracz reviewed the presentation of “Permit Hunt Authorization Review What We Heard” included in meeting kits. Christine Cleghorn provided an overview of the third-party review and provided an overview of next steps for implementation, rollout and testing.

Comments/Discussion:

- The “What We Heard” document didn’t support the working group’s recommendations. Jodie provided information about her discussions with the Yukon Bureau of Statistics and offered to provide a copy of the survey. Graham provided information on discussions with Fish and Game and predictability of draws and asked if the information had been shared. Jodie confirmed there were in-depth discussions at stakeholder meetings.
- Joint permits can cheat the system.
- Christine Cleghorn provided background information on the lottery system, issues and third-party review.
- Returns and Reissuances — Graham provided context regarding the Board’s recommendation on returns for medical reasons. There is a lottery within the top picks if it is a limited number. The conversation was leading toward a certainty system whereas the randomness causes uncertainty.

Director’s Update

Christine provided an update on the following:

- The letter from Minister Frost regarding Board recommendations on the conservation plan. The minister’s response and recommendations are expected by April 2, 2019. April 30, 2019 is the deadline for submitting regulation changes. There may be two changes — one to address roadside bear hunting and another for managing bear harvest at a bear management unit level.
- Minister Frost’s meeting in Ross River with Chief Caesar. John Burdek has been invited to attend.
- Porcupine caribou management harvest meeting and response to drilling in the refuge draft environment impact statement. The deadline for responses was extended to March 13, 2019. Don Russell was hired to work on scenarios and responses. This will be shared with First Nation partners and the Board. By the Board’s June meeting

government will know whether the impact statement was adequate or not. If not, more time and analysis will be required.

- Regulations changes regarding the following: burbot; carnivore program; Nelchina caribou herd and licensed harvest; and PHA changes will be forthcoming.
 - Regarding the Board review, the budget is \$50,000 and will be completed by the end of April. This will be further discussed throughout the meeting. There will be a focus group meeting on Thursday morning.
 - Leadership dates are March 19 and 20.
-

YFWMB REVIEW – J. Burdek, G. Van Tighem

John Burdek and Graham Van Tighem provided an overview of the YFWMB Review. Members had a lengthy discussion regarding: monthly meetings; working groups; budget; focus, structure, mandate and need for clarification; federal government involvement; process for response; definition of success; fish and wildlife decision; involvement of Executive, past chiefs and community/on-the-land perspective; and spirit and intent of UFA.

The following documents were included in meeting kits for members' review:

- Stratos letter to the Board;
- Stratos interview guide;
- Board recommendations;
- Board internal report; and
- Yukon Forum review resolution.

Comments/Discussion:

- Board structure — The Board's structure evolves. Nothing says the Board must follow any particular structure other than record keeping and finances.
- Board presentation — The presentation and information will be submitted. The Board will provide documentation, identify gaps and solutions.
- Past members — Past chairs will be interviewed but past members should also be interviewed.
- The questions were not confidential. The Board is developing its response.

DAY 2: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 – Regular Meeting

PRESENT: John Burdek, Ron Chambers, Danny Cresswell, Dennis Dickson, Carl Sidney, Ken Taylor, Frank Thomas, Blanche Warrington

REGRETS: Dave Andrew, Shirley Ford, Michelle Dawson-Beattie

STAFF: Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Tecla Van Bussel

SUPPORT: Sharon Kerr (Minute Taker)

PUBLIC: Christine Cleghorn (Director, Fish & Wildlife, YE), Diana Dryburgh-Moraal (Fish and Wildlife), Sophie Best, Samara Carlick (Salmon Steward, Teslin), Norman Adamson (Lake Laberge RRC), Laura McKinnon (Executive Director Alsek RRC), Vicky Weekes (Stratos Consulting), Caitlyn MacMaster (Stratos Consulting), Harvey Jessup (Chair, YSSC), Elizabeth MacDonald (Executive Director, YSSC), Barb Coppard (Policy Analyst, YE), Janice Sibbeston (YFWMET Manager), Chief Bob Dickson (Kluane First Nation), Chief Richard Sidney (Teslin Tlingit Council),

MOOSE HARVEST WORKING GROUP UPDATE — C. Cleghorn, G. Van Tighem

Graham Van Tighem, Christine Cleghorn and Tecla Van Bussel provided a Moose Harvest Working Group update on the following: background and history; community engagement; working group meetings; regulation change proposal process; timeline; adaptive management; and Board attendance at community meetings.

The following documents were included in meeting kits:

- Moose Management Meeting Notes January 17, 2019;
- Moose Management Meeting Notes January 24, 2019;
- Moose Harvest Management Framework, October 15, 2002; and
- Working Group Timeline.

Comments/Discussion:

- Hunting pressures move from one location to another. We need to consider the whole picture and know the status of moose and caribou. We're only dealing with licensed

hunters and we need to consider history and traditional knowledge. We need to work harder to solve the problem (RRCs, First Nations and the Board).

- This has been a slow decay and incrementally more challenging to manage. Our tools are out of date. We need to look at broader engagement. The Board needs to say what we need to do to make it better.
- Manage wildlife within traditional territories as per the final agreement. Consider moose in Alsek traditional territory. The main issue is predation. They are on a permit and have been for a long time. Why are we still having trouble? Trappers were trapping wolves, but they weren't going to be able to trap enough wolves to bring back the ungulates. In some areas there are too many bears and we're not dealing with that.
- Government has talked to the working group about the moose pressure issues. Government doesn't have First Nation moose harvest data. There are predator issues. The Board wants to do other things also. Government can't responsibly put areas on permit without addressing how to handle additional pressure elsewhere.
- One frustration is there are only two options presented. There are other options available such as predator management. Some Board members are saying government has to act more quickly, but there is not much action to date and no regulation changes, why suddenly does the government need to "adaptively manage".
- Government is proposing an adaptive management strategy to allow the minister to act quickly. However, some members aren't seeing where the whole picture is being addressed. Adaptive management allows for quick response and in a territory with 35,000 we should be able to make up our minds quickly. We need to have a bigger conversation and consider traditional territory mgmt.
- Government is happy to do other things, but who will do them and what is the timeline?
- We need to scope the bigger picture and keep it moving with biology, predators and other issues and work on it all at the same time. We need to not lose sight of the bigger picture. We should use a holistic approach. We talk about the predators all the time but there is no approach other than trapping. Plans and/or actions, both immediate and long-term need to be developed.
- The traditional territory conversation is of interest. There is the question of scale. The way we manage moose must be considered with respect to scale. We must consider why the traditional boundaries are set the way they were and what that territory means to individuals to put the individual appetite or flair on that management strategy within that particular territory. Teslin is different from Dawson and Old Crow is different from Carmacks. One of the biggest complaints with the grizzly bear management plan was that the bear management units might be too coarse. Some management needs to be on a finer scale and some needs to be broader.

- Graham provided an example of frustration for big game outfitters dealing with regulation changes in their game management subzones.
- The adaptive management proposal will address moose management units within game zones. There will always be overlap issues and people will need to talk to their neighbours. In the end, there will be tools we will be able to apply without legislative changes.
- We have tools. The wolf plan says we do predator management within the context of ungulate recovery. That led to the structure of the work in Alsek.
- At the traditional territory level, information on how many moose will be taken is a great starting point and would help to inform government on where we're at.
- We want to make it easier to adaptively manage moose by using one tool in the moose management framework. We have other tools that we're not looking at including the adaptive management proposal. We should write the proposal to do restrictions and rotational closures. It should be broad. First Nations and Yukon government will have to work together.
- Wolf management is a tool used in areas where moose recovery is needed. When do we start doing that? It could be that we open hunting every other year. There are ways to manage more closely without having to go to permitting.
- We have to consider culture and history. In Kluane, when we were younger, we had to go a long way to hunt for moose. We had to hunt for days. Now if someone doesn't get a moose within a couple days, they feel there is a problem. We don't have the number to back up the fact that maybe we didn't have much moose to start with and maybe we're trying to manage to what we never had. We need to consider that in some places. There are so few people remaining who remember hunting back then, but they were some of the best hunters there ever were. They had to do a lot of work to get a moose. In some cases moose is a newcomer to some areas. Some people believe there was an animal behind every tree. That's not the case and the wolves get hit. We had more caribou — there is no doubt about that — and there is less now for a variety of reasons.
- There was a beetle kill in Haines Junction area and you can barely find a squirrel, let alone anything else. Those things aren't in the equation. We need to look at the total big picture.
- We have bison now. If I can't get a bison, I will hunt moose. We're not using that as a bonus to ourselves. We're backing our privilege to shoot something. We have perceptions of how wildlife does things. For example, some people say bison eat muskrat houses impacting the muskrat population but it doesn't sound right. The Arctic Institute did research and the less you harvest species like muskrat the worse it is for them. Their populations go down. There are fewer people harvesting muskrats in the history of Old Crow and the muskrat population has decreased. That doesn't sound

right, but we need to include that information to inform people. Then if we have to go out and do something like wolf harvesting, we can go with the full confidence that this is absolutely what we need to do and we can put the resources and effort to do it. If there is a fuzzy understanding, I'm not comfortable with some decisions we make. It goes back to — if we never had any of those animals in the first place, how do we build the population if they weren't there in the first place.

- On the Haines road, there used to be caribou there and they were hunted out and they never came back. That is a gap area that never refilled. That puts more pressure on caribou in the rest of the country that people used to harvest in the Haines area. There are places that have done better but we don't have a good history.
- There was a meeting 15 years ago which was attended by about 30 people. The biologist said poison was introduced to poison wolves that kill moose. That wasn't true. Poison was introduced because the wolves were getting horses. You can't manage to misinformation. There were stories of bison chasing moose. Where do people get this information? There is too much misinformation to make good decisions on. Maybe we will never have a full answer, but we should work at to take misinformation off the table. Some cases we may be heading in the wrong direction. The same argument can be made with fish.
- RRC and FN are managing their traditional territory. The department has moose management units and have been operating that way for a long time. We have had the UFA for a long time. Don't you think it would be more efficient if the government started working toward management in traditional territories to work alongside First Nations departments and RRCs? This UFA is not going away. If you were a manager of a First Nation lands and resources department and you take care of your traditional territory and if the government was managing to the traditional territory alongside you it would be more efficient.
- Some people out there don't know the situation. Some families may harvest two or three moose a year and don't realize there is an issue with moose. There was a closure for moose in Alaska and there is now a population of 175,000 moose according to ADF and G. They didn't just close the hunt, they had an ambitious predation program (wolf control) and it brought the moose back. There are potential mines that will bring 1,000 more people in Yukon. They will want to get moose. The problem will get bigger unless we get a handle on it.
- The timeline for the program is too long. There are issues that need to be address right away. There is too much damage. Near Ross River people didn't see cows with calves last year but there were tons of bears. People saw bears right up until December or January. Some years ago the Board did a workshop called Two Eyes, One Vision. What happened with that information? We need to have all the First Nations participate in a

workshop for fish and wildlife right away. We need a workshop with RRCs and First Nation lands and resources managers and directors whether they're self-governing or not. We have transboundary issues with people coming and hunting. There are tons of moose being taken in southern Yukon. Do they know the issues? Probably not. The government should have a huge workshop to get better direction. The suggested timeline is too long. There will be more problems in two years by the time we try to manage anything.

- The issue is complex and there are different interpretations. First Nations manage on settlement land but not on traditional territory as a whole. It is all confusing. The Board's involvement should be from the RRCs. We need to lay out responsibilities. Two Eyes One Vision was an excellent example. We were able to bring traditional knowledge and scientific decision together.
- We need to have another moose harvest working group meeting to further discuss these issues.

YFWET LIVE RELEASE STUDY — G. Van Tighem, D. Zimmerman

Dennis Zimmerman provided findings from his research document, entitled *Exploring Yukon's Perspectives on Catch and Release – moving beyond polarization towards shared values*.

Graham Van Tighem provided an overview on trust discussions; angling working group feedback and concerns; spring grayling; Little Atlin Lake; lake trout; releasing pike (regulations); ethics; potential regulation on lingcod; bull trout in Alberta; a way forward.

Comments/Discussion:

- Managing strictly with science doesn't fall within the UFA. Traditional and/or local knowledge needs to be considered equally.
- Guiding — Historically some fish were caught and some were let go although the term catch and release wasn't used. First Nations were guides and guiding is still going on. What is the history and who built it? First Nations don't have a history of commercial enterprise.
- There is a lot work being done to bring people together on polarized issues.
- Lingcod — They have just recently been used. First Nations didn't traditionally use them. They can't be caught in a net. Who says they are a problem? Lingcod are predators impacting other species. We're making rules because someone has a beef. We can't manage to misinformation. Don't make a rule because of knee-jerk reactions. We need more information.

- The angling working group has been inactive for a while. There is no champion for catch and release. We lack technical support, but that shouldn't hold us back. We should get the angling working group going to support work Dennis is doing on catch and release.
- Yukon government doesn't have a big budget for fish. This initiative is one of the best tools to curb the problem. Dennis is one of the best guys to have at the helm. How can the Board and government work together to complete his work? How can we promote this initiative? Government wants to support the work and have asked him to indicate what he needs.
- Slot limits do nothing to protect spawning fish on small lake trout lakes. Slot limit is 26 inches but some fish don't get bigger than 14 inches so how do you protect spawners if you don't have regulations?
- Traditional knowledge is different in different regions. Lingcod in NWT is called loche and they are caught in November. They make special hooks and you don't have to touch it. They put the hook in the water and whip it out. They save the liver and make into loaves like bread. In Teslin lingcod is treated differently and they aren't clubbed. It is called army fish. We eat them and have always eaten it. Traditional knowledge is different between communities. Teslin is only 200 plus kilometres from Haines Junction.

PROSPECTIVE ORV PROPOSALS — R. Giesbrecht (LRRC)

This presentation was cancelled. Graham Van Tighem provided information on his discussions with RRCs on regulations. Carcross/Tagish RRC will have a discussion with locals about habitat. A crux of this discussion will be ORV. The discussion will take place on February 26, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. Graham and Board members will attend. Other topics to be discussed during follow-up engagements include: elevation control for ORVs; temporary closures in rutting or calving areas; or ORV closures in areas where there is over harvest. Ken and others will take the lead and put fish and wildlife first. The Board should participate in discussions.

Comments/Discussion:

- Most RRC boards are made up of both First Nations and non-First Nations. They can take both roles and come together to work. Everybody has First Nation and non-First Nations on the Board and they should be able to work it out.
- There are snowmobile tracks all over the Southern Lakes hillside and areas where tracks indicate caribou that are trying to get away. Those issues won't be addressed as the ORV regulations deal with rubber tires and licence plates. The Board may be able to help facilitate the meeting on February 26. Anyone who wants to attend should contact Graham.

- Monitors play an important role. People are aware that monitors know they are there. There was an archaeological study two years ago on islands in Aishihik. Half the islands are burned. One was totally burned. Who did it? Monitors are the only ones who have an idea. They become extremely knowledgeable about the area.
 - Elevation control is in relation to people taking four-wheelers on trails to the high areas where they begin creating their own trails. There are trails everywhere in the Southern Lakes region and the machines are bigger.
 - The ORV does not include snowmobiles. The issue of snowmobiles was raised during the Southern Lakes caribou recovery discussions and it went ballistic within minutes. It is very controversial to discuss the issue of snowmobiles.
-

YFWMB Review Discussion — Stratos Consulting

John Burdek welcomed visitors and provided a background of the YFWMB review and the Board's correspondence and suggestions.

Vicky Weekes commented on the review process. She also introduced areas covered by the review process including:

- Legal landscape and fish and wildlife framework in Yukon;
- Board mandate, activities and operations; and
- Board governance and management.

A handout of five questions for the Board were distributed. There was an open discussion for each question. (*Note: comment from Vicky in the discussion are in italics*)

Chief Dickson provided information on why he moved the resolution. The *Wildlife Act* needs to conform to the First Nation Final Agreements. That was the reason the resolution was passed. He asked the minister at the Yukon Forum to open the *Wildlife Act* to deal with the 1,000-metre corridor and government refused to do it. Territorial government has decided to focus on the Board and forget about the other initiatives that were included in the resolution. Chief Dickson did not ask to have the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board reviewed and was unsure how this came forth.

Chief Sidney provided information on negotiation of the UFA. We understood we wanted to create a process. The management framework was based on cooperation with First Nation governments, Yukon government and federal government. That cooperation would come in a number of ways. The overall intent was to ensure the resources we are responsible for and make recommendations around would be adequately represented. This is one of the many institutions created by the UFA and is one of the most important. We have the water board and the YESAA process. We want to ensure there is a structure and institution in place that

adequately represented the First Nations and the public. That structure would make recommendations to all governments on the issues dealing with fish and wildlife. We have witnessed the growth for First Nations to take on their own responsibility. The laws we create are parallel to Yukon government's laws. First Nations are still lacking resources to fully implement their plans. First Nations contribute a fair amount to discussions. Relationship with government are positive. We are dealing with overharvesting and we bring those issues forward to the department directly. The other management framework is the RRCs which allows public to access and provide input into decisions that will affect them. First Nations jurisdiction is recognized along with the right to harvest. One struggle was having this body as a decision-making body which was not achieved in negotiations. The government negotiators didn't want the minister's discretionary authority fettered. The compromise was to create a body to make recommendations to the minister. Negotiators wanted this body to have more capacity to undertake specific reviews and projects independent of First Nations and government in specific priority areas. The compromise was to bring the director from the department on to the body as a technical advisor to the fish and wildlife management board. That relationship is critical. The relationship with this Board to the public is critically important. The relationship of this Board to the department is super important. Another fundamental issue was making this body the primary instrument for wildlife. Negotiators had numerous discussions about what that included. Development is happening in First Nations territories and RRCs are being impacted and inundated with requests for representation in those forums. The landscape has changed from 25 years ago. In achieving certainty, we have allowed industry to come in and develop projects, more of which are coming on stream and have direct impacts to the resources on the ground. There has been a fundamental shift. What affect has the resource had? You can have impacts from more hunters and more people on the ground. With government developing tourism as a sector you will have more people on the ground. We see it all the time, particularly from the First Nation perspective. It's having a huge impact on resources out there.

The review of the Board came from leadership which wanted to ensure we have time to reflect on what we've done and what we can do to improve the processes and come back with recommendations on where we will be at in the next 25 years. The world is changing at a rapid pace. Climate change will have a huge impact on the resource on the ground. Rivers are changing. It's phenomenal how quickly it's changing the resources out there. We need a body like this to ensure that there is monitoring taking place and we have the eyes and ears on the ground. That is a challenge at the First Nation level. We have a long history with our First Nation communities. We know how changes have occurred over the last 50 years. When you talk about the framework that's what I wanted to speak about, the basis of that relationship which was based on full cooperation. Respecting the bodies that are established, such as this board and RRCs, is critically important. It is in that forum that we bring issues forward. First Nation

governments can advocate on their own but having RRCs there will assist in bringing discussion into focus. During the negotiations focus we ran into huge problems with government on the land selection. We were selecting land on the Nisutlin River and elders told us to select land on the east side. That's the breadbasket for your people. We selected the whole area and wanted to select the other side of the river as well but government wouldn't allow us to do that. They had huge problems with us selecting huge portions of the water way. We approached a number of citizens who took the same position to have proper management in place. That is the essence of the agreement and how it evolved and how First Nations became partners with the Yukon government and ensuring instruments like fish and wildlife management are properly resourced. I sat on the Board and have experience with its function and its successes.

Comments/Discussion:

- This is a big question and depending on the issues at hand there will be various responses. If we're talking about moose or caribou, there are many players who may or may not participate. If you consider how the Board is structured that's another conversation, but it is related. It depends on what level.
- It might be confusing to refer to the "management framework". There are overlapping and intertwined elements. The Board operates under Chapter 16 of the UFA. Department of Environment receives its mandate from the politician of the day. First Nations have governments and they have a variety of frameworks. To try and comment on "the framework" is difficult because there isn't a framework. There are a lot of practice and habits and some constitutionally protected legal entities and for some that's how it has always been done.
- I thought we were going to talk about the direction that came from the Yukon Forum. You are from Ontario. I have been a member for 15 months. Some issues of concern from the resolution from the Yukon Forum is new. We only have enough funding for four or five meetings a year. We have working groups. I have been involved with salmon for 25 years — chinook and chum that are transboundary. You're interviewing members of the Board and some members are brand new and are just getting familiar with the Board. If you interview each of us, we are all going to give the same answers on guiding principles and mandate which come out of the UFA. That's our mandate. The Premier and ministers have to step up and deal with real issues of caribou and salmon which are transboundary. In 25 years, we have never had support from federal or Yukon government on the Yukon River salmon agreement. The chinook salmon are being wiped out. We have issues with: Forty-mile caribou herd; ANWR and Porcupine caribou herd; the grizzly bear hunting closure in BC; and transboundary moose hunting issues affecting Teslin, Champagne Aishihik, Ross River. The Board only makes recommendations. The principle people have to step up.

- This Board came out of the UFA which states that the Board is the primary instrument for fish and wildlife in the territory and it's not. The reality is that there are three branches of government. This board's role is to make recommendations to responsible ministers, RRCs or First Nations on all matters related to fish and wildlife management, legislation, research, policies and programs. Our activities are driven by the objectives of the UFA. These agreements are meant to grow with respect to understanding and trust. It's the Board's job to continue to educate all branches of government about our existence and mandate, but this is time consuming while we are simultaneously addressing all the issues that Chief Sidney and other Board members have raised. First Nation governments talk all the time about how they are overwhelmed, overworked and challenged with activities. The Board has the same issues, but it is the Board's responsibility is to make recommendations to all governments in an "advisory" role... The Yukon Government, First Nations and federal government are the decision makers. Yukon government has overlapping and competing management responsibilities and challenges. The Board has representatives who have work to some degree with all branches of government. This is our common challenge and common goals.
- A Board member discussed the UFA and the Board's mandate and objective. They're quite specific and important to give First Nations and non-First Nations a voice in management of fish and wildlife in the Yukon. It has been under implementation for 25 years which may seem like a long time but these are constitutionally protected agreements. Other governments and the evolution of how things change — some governments are slow. The structure is there and the relationship is clear. Getting it to be fully implemented is the challenge. It is constantly evolving and the Board struggles with "who does what". This review brings it to the forefront to look at but to be clear, we the Board have followed the letter of the UFA for 25 years, it's the branches of government that have departed from that framework.
- A Board member commented on the intent. The Yukon *Wildlife Act* has to conform to the UFA. The resolution has a list of items but there is no mention of bringing the UFA and Yukon Act into conformity. There was also concern that the UFA is a tripartite agreement and Board members are wondering why there wasn't federal approval on this resolution as well. The annual budget of the Board is not very big with the amount of work the Board has to do and the high expectation that is out there. The Board meets five times a year and that's not enough time for the amount of work that is expected. It is hoped that more comes out of the review in terms of resources so the Board can do a proper job.
- The review of the Board is something the federal government should be involved in and should have approved prior to this ever happening.

- Is there anything in Canada or anywhere else similar to this Board. If this has been done somewhere else, what was the result? If you don't have any experience previous to what we we're doing you're continuous inventing the wheel and don't know where it will be going. We're creating as we're going so that's hard to judge in any specific way. I don't think there's anything comparable. *(Stratos comment) There are similar organizations but nothing exactly like this Board. You always have to recognize the differences and we're getting that from these discussions.*
- When we were negotiating our agreements, we were in contact with Nunavut and Dene Nation on a regular basis. The model we took this from was in Alaska. They had a game board set up with quasi-judicial authority. It was a decision-making body. The closest we can come to an RRC in those circumstances is a hunters and fishers association in NWT. We talked to those people on a regular basis. With respect to the federal government, we will see what the recommendations are when they come out. It is a tripartite agreement. We expect the recommendations to be positive and forward-looking and improve what we created. The funding is locked in place and has always been a big issue. What impact did that have on the Board and how much more could we have accomplished with additional resources. The agenda between the department and the Board is never the same. We want to be proactive.
- Resources are limited which is why we have working groups. There are gaps associated with information coming in. Governments have different in capabilities, capacity and size. The workforce in the territorial government have quadrupled in 25 years. First Nations are much smaller but they are also growing steadily – the Board stays the same and it's difficult to keep pace. There is constant grappling with that. How do they engage with Yukon government and federal government? Territorial and federal governments have to engage with First Nations and not overwhelm them.
- When the Board was established in 1993 the Yukon government's budget was maybe \$400 million. In 2017-18 it was \$1.4 billion or so... The government's budget has tripled. The Board's budget was \$400,000 in 1993 and if it grew at the same rate as government the Board's budget would be \$1.2 million today. The Board's budget goes up by the cost of living every year. There hasn't been any real increase with the exception of cost of living, our resources are not keeping pace with the government and this is one of our biggest challenges.
- We have a forum and we have chiefs who are former Board members. They are now on the CYFN leadership. We have former chiefs currently on the Board as well. We have had ministers and deputy ministers on the Board which has been very valuable to this Board. You can't buy that kind of leadership. It is worth protecting. There is a lot we are not able to deal with because we are dealing with Alaska, First Nations governments and some are not able to commit time. There are many things going on. This Board is made

up of the past leadership of the Yukon Territory and that should be respected. You can hear the commitment from the members of this Board and they are frustrated.

- It is not easy to identify the gaps. It's easier to identify what you are doing than what you're not doing. Any gaps can be identified through some of the limitations around capacity. In 1993 this Board had 2.8 staff and in 2019 it has 2.8 staff, whereas government has grown substantially – how do you expect us to keep up to the changes when there are no changes to resourcing, but everything else keeps changing.
- Regarding overlap, RRCs are advisory councils, there are other councils and sub-committees which relate to fish and wildlife, the YESA Board does environmental assessment. We worked on developing an MOU with RRCs because of the overlap. A big part was ensuring communication and transparency. RRCs address local issues, but we know if it is a licensed hunting issue it will affect other hunters so then the Board will bring it forward for consultation. First Nations have departments dealing with fish, wildlife and habitat. There will be some overlaps.
- One gap that is glaring is the intention that this Board would have more decision-making authority and there was resistance through negotiations, there is a significant gap between the notion of Chapter 16 that the Board is the primary instrument of fish and wildlife management and the reality that this Board has absolutely no decision-making authority. I don't see any capacity for the Board to make any decisions. That should be addressed as there are expectations from First Nation communities that this Board can help.
- From the first paragraph: "Other instruments such as the salmon sub-committee or RRCs may be reviewed at a later date depending on the outcome of this first review." What outcome could come out of this review that would determine reviews of other entities? This is hard to relate to. The RRCs are the most valuable resource we have. For example, with the black bear edible meat issue that came from an RRC. I would hate to think we have to try to fit into your ideas of what should happen so you'll be able to do the same good work for the RRCs or sub-committee. *(Stratos comment) We have no say over what happens with this. To some extent we're looking the broader intent, what has evolved, who is doing what role. We're considering those pieces and the relationship to the Board. Our intent is to help bring new things forward in a positive way. The comment about the first review might be a red herring. It won't affect how we look at things. But someone will be looking at the results. I would love to hear more about the cooperation. I would like to ask follow-up questions to some of the comments. Maybe that's how it relates to other organizations.*
- Cooperation can always be improved. Regarding the pending outcomes of the first review and bearing in mind the point raised about the federal government, we may want to expand the scope. This is only one component of the overall management of

fish and wildlife. There are certain areas of the UFA we didn't want to delve into including review and when it should happen. The only area of review was Chapter 22, economic development. We haven't done a review yet. When we talk about cooperation, the relationship that should have existed between Teslin and the department requires a lot of work at the ministerial and leadership level. We have a good relationship, but there is certain information we should have access to but don't (moose population information). If it weren't for the RRC we wouldn't know about the moose in our area. That's where we need cooperation. We raised our concern and we will probably address the issue in a satisfactory way. That cooperation should be transparent and there shouldn't be any hidden agendas. CYFN leadership is fully aware of challenges other First Nations are contending with respecting development in their areas. They are inundated with mining applications. They're struggling to keep abreast. The RRC is critical to assisting First Nations. Issues were raised with EMR. There should be regulations in place to limit mining impacts to wildlife.

- The external landscape to the Board has changed considerably over the last 25 years. The complexity and the number of issues coming before the Board in 2019 are different than in 1995. The Board has been developing and the issues have been developing and expectations are growing. It is the same with First Nations. They are developing their capacity, passing laws and growing departments. It can be overwhelming. First Nations have avenues through RRCs, the Board, Chief and Council or government-to-government. The RRC and Board processes are a lot slower than going through Chief and Council which is appropriate.
- Every Act in the Yukon should come into conformity with the UFA. In the Southern Lakes area, recommendations were made to shut down a winter habitat area for an urban caribou herd. Land use applications were denied in that area. Woodcutters were given a permit somewhere else. Someone who was denied an application staked a claim in that area and built a road and a house and it's all legal. How is that managing habitat and wildlife if all the acts aren't in conformity with what we need to do? We're piecemealing away the habitat for critical wildlife. It is certainly about our rights to hunt. Moose and all big game animals are on permit in my traditional territory.
- Another example is the Wind River Trail access road. Doing our environmental assessment process through the YESAB adds another level of complexity and bureaucracy. We were dealing with that environmental assessment and the most challenging thing is that people's perspectives were that it was not a big deal but it was for a potential uranium mine. A lot of the assessments undertaken in Yukon are piecemeal. They start off with an access road. Then it builds to something else. It can take a long time to figure out what is really going on. Sometimes it's obvious. That's really challenging because you need to know where to align your resources to get the

biggest bang for your buck. When the UFA was being negotiated there were three directors for the Department of Environment and now there are 10 or 11. We have a responsibility to get to know these people. It takes less resources and time to maintain positive relationships with three people than 10 or 11, especially when they keep changing and moving around to other departments.

- The spirit and intent of our final agreements has been watered down. The spirit and intent are like traditional knowledge and we are losing people.
- There will be an opportunity to speak in focus groups and interviews. Focus groups will be scheduled in the next few days.
- The Board will share an internal report to help guide the questions and provides information on work that has been completed.
- One of the gaps is there doesn't seem to be a mechanism for First Nation Lands and Resource departments to engage with the Board directly.
- The definition of primary instrument makes reference to tools used within engineering. It is meant to be a filter or simply a sober second thought. The challenge is how do you achieve that with fish and wildlife management when there are so many bodies, organizations, governments, associations, information gaps, and individuals with unique points of view trying to evolve, change or affect wildlife management in this territory both nationally, internationally, territorially and regionally. If there are transboundary herd like the Forty-mile caribou we go to Alaska and debate with the Alaskans. If there is an issue developing a territorial-wide management plan we partner with the Director of Wildlife and develop a conservation plan. The things specified in the UFA we are achieving for the most part. The other issue is whether the tail is wagging the dog or the dog is wagging the tail. The reality is if we're the dog, we're not big enough to wag the tail anymore. The government has grown so big with respect to budget, capacity, reach, industrial and economic develop, that as a primary instrument of fish and wildlife management there too much to do, and we are both empowered and limited by the scope of the UFA. We can't pay attention to all of it. There are a lot of things the Board can't be involved in. All we can do is strategically align resources to get the biggest bang for our buck and ensure we are at 4000 feet, not at 4 feet. Building and maintaining relationships is important to this process.
- I got a lot of my training on the UFA from the chiefs who were here. The people at the table who helped develop the UFA and Chapter 16 were smart and saw something that is fantastic. It was a vision of what was needed to manage fish and wildlife in the Yukon. We have been places where people didn't understand what the UFA is. We have been developing a presentation for a few years. I want to give this presentation for you so you can have a better understanding of what Chapter 16 of the UFA means. It tries to educate people. We gave it to a few chiefs and wanted to deliver the presentation at

CYFN leadership because a lot of people at the table were there 25 years ago. We wanted to find out if we were on the right track or not. If there is time it is something you should see. It's about 30 minutes. We work hard to promote Chapter 16 and the UFA. We work with RRCs and First Nations and try to make it better for fish and wildlife in Yukon. It's important to everybody at this table. We're not trying to make a living doing it.

- The presentation is designed to make people aware of the UFA and to educate them. New people are moving in all the time. Education is a constant initiative to make people aware of the UFA. It can never be a snapshot in time.
- The Environment Minister we advise is a former chair of the YSSC which is so important because we don't have to educate them on what we're trying to do. If someone is looking for a particular result chart, we may never have that. The only way we can feel we've accomplished something is if the wildlife populations go up. There are so many variables working against it it's hard to do but we do have some successes. If we didn't have a Board like this, I don't think we could imagine getting anywhere near where we are now. Sometimes quality is a main point. We have some of the freshest waters in the world. That's why people are attracted to Yukon. Somebody has been doing something right to maintain that.
- One question is: Is there any change that should be made to mandates and roles of fish and wildlife management? Within this Board our mandate comes from the UFA. That's the reason we're here. As far as the Board's mandate and ability to work, we don't pick and choose. We work cooperatively with the department.
- We bring accessibility to wildlife management. People don't want to be told what they want to do. They want you to ask them what they think we should do, what we should recommend! That is something the Board does and is one of our greatest assets.

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

Elizabeth MacDonald and Harvey Jessup provided an update. A copy of the update was provided in meeting kits for members' reference.

Comments/Discussion:

- Ron Chambers provided information about previous outreach and discussions in communities. It used to be "them and us" and the discussions were between Canadian and American diplomats. One thing that helped was relationship building. There has been a big change, but it takes time.

- When we say, “We’re from the Yukon”, they say, “So are we”. There is still some work to be done. Alaskans don’t understand the difference between Canadian origin salmon and US origin salmon.
- Before we had the committee, they developed a fisheries industry in Alaska without considering that some salmon have to come to Canada. They had already developed their lifestyle around this economic development strategy before they realized salmon were raised in Canada. There aren’t many economic opportunities there so they value the salmon. Fish is really important to them. Their freezer is full. At first it was adversarial but times have changed. We have had to make a mindset change here too.
- Three committee members’ terms expire. The committee may not have new members by April.
- There is a joint technical meeting in March 2019 in Fairbanks. YSSC should know the forecast for the 2019 chinook run. The offshore count has been reasonably accurate in 2017 and 2018. By the time the fish get to Eagle we have better sense of what the run will be like.
- Yukon River Panel meetings are April 9 and 10. The kick-off for the International Year of the Salmon is on the evening of April 8, 2019. Invitations will be going to Yukon government ministers. The open meet and greet is on April 9, 2019. The International Year of the Salmon is for five years.

SETTING BOARD MEETINGS FOR 2019-2020 (TAB 15) – G. Van Tighem

Members discussed meeting dates for 2019-2020.

- April 15 – 17, 2019
- June 11 – 13, 2019 (On the land meeting)
- October 22 – 24, 2019
- December 10 – 12, 2019
- February 18 – 20, 2020

Dates will be flexible. Graham and Ken will meet to discuss locations for the on-the-land meeting. Other Board members are welcome to join the discussions.

DAY 3: Thursday, February 14, 2018 – Regular Meeting

PRESENT: John Burdek, Ron Chambers, Danny Cresswell, Dennis Dickson, Carl Sidney, Ken Taylor, Frank Thomas, Blanche Warrington

REGRETS: Dave Andrew, Shirley Ford, Michelle Dawson-Beattie

STAFF: Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Tecla Van Bussel

SUPPORT: Sharon Kerr (Minute Taker)

PUBLIC: Janice Sibbeston (Manager, YFWMET), Ken Reeder (Carcross/Tagish RRC), Norman Adamson (Lake Laberge RRC), Michael Draper (EMR), Samara Carlick (Salmon Steward, TTC), Lesley Cabott (Beaver River Land Use Planning Committee), Rob Florkiewicz, Christine Cleghorn

OFF ROAD VEHICLE REGULATION DEVELOPMENT – M. Draper

Michael Draper provided an update on the ORV regulation development including: engagement and consultation for 90 days; brief history; amendments to the *Territorial Lands Act*; 2014-15 consultation and results; 2017 workshop and *What we heard* report; next steps for consultation with First Nations and engagement with stakeholders and public at large. The department plans to have open houses and meet with RRCs and First Nations during the 90 day period. They will be seeking recommendations on areas the department should be looking at right now. They are also looking to establish ORV management areas in regions with a land use plan or park regions. The questionnaire is on the Engage Yukon website.

The meeting kit contained: the *Report on the Select Committee on the Safe Operation and Use of Off-road Vehicles*; *A Summary of Comments on Off-road Vehicle Regulations*; a workshop summary report from December 5 & 6, 2017; and *Regulating Off-road Vehicles in Yukon Proposal and Questions February 2019*.

Comments/Discussion:

- There needs to be some cultural sensitivity on archaeological sites as archaeological information is lost if people are using ORVs in those areas.

- Heritage Yukon has talked to the department about protection of archaeological sites. Archaeological resources are not considered a part of this because the department is looking at environmental damage to the land base and the flora. Heritage resources is not covered under the *Lands Act*. Once the regulations are in place the conversation will start on other aspects and other territorial departments can look at their legislation to find areas of support. No other department has a mandate or authority to deal with it.
- As a Board we can make the recommendations. The Board can send a letter directly to Michael Draper raising issues. He can then pass it on to the Department of Heritage. Representatives from the Department of Environment and Department of Highways will be present at the open houses. It is hoped that conservation officers will have ticketing powers for infractions.
- Wildlife monitors are out on the land and they can be watching. The Board also sponsors some of those people through the Trust. The Board can contribute information.
- The department isn't looking to turn off ORV's in Yukon but some areas require protection: alpine areas, wetlands, special management areas etc. There are 100s or 1,000s of kilometres of unmaintained roads administered by Department of Highways. They are not subject to regulations. We're looking to stop the expansion of those roads. A foot trail turns into a quad trail which then turns into a road. We're also trying to prevent boon dogging. The plan is to better manage ORV use.
- First Nations have self-governing powers. Nothing precludes the ability for First Nations to take the regulations and using them in a fashion that works for them. We want to share the work and resources out on the land.
- Licensing would be applicable to ORV management areas. The Highways act doesn't allow for blanket coverage. Highways intends to do an amendment to the Motor Vehicles act after the ORV regulations are complete.
- A fire was started across Kluane Lake. There was no idea who started it. That area is not the same. You can't recognize people out there. If there are wildlife monitors in the area, they have a pretty good idea of who is there and what's going on. It is a key element of enforcement.
- The Summary Convictions Act will apply and there will be a ticketing ability. The department will be looking at permitting for ORV management areas. Permits can be taken away for repeat offenders and conditions can be put on the permit.
- In the long-term there will be a network of ORV management areas.
- Highways has land use permitting options and a resource road program for road upgrades to a mining operation. Traditional trails on Crown lands that aren't accessed by vehicles may be subject to ORV management restriction. First Nations would be consulted.

- Michael Draper provided information on the resource road regulations. Unmaintained roads will continue to be used the way they are used.
- Two permit hunt applications coming up are both accessible by unmaintained and maintained roads. The Board has done quite a bit of work on the ORV issue for 20 years. We manage this work through RRCs and First Nations. The Board also has a habitat working group. A lot of correspondence has been sent from this Board. Habitat and fish and wildlife are the primary priorities of the Board. The Board also takes harvesting and harvesting rights very seriously.
- Education will be tagged to ORV regulations including practices in other jurisdictions.
- There are transboundary issues with BC hunters in the Teslin area. They go to the BC region of the lake and cut trails. People have to be made aware Yukon is making regulations.
- BC has a mosaic of regulations and they have an ORV act. Should Yukon do the same? It would add two years to the process but the activity continues in that time. Ticketing will be used to enforce regulations and they will be in the \$800 to \$900 range. The department will also look at seizure of vehicles. The final regulations will be determine following the consultations.
- There are apps that exist to show people how to get around the rules.
- The minister is keen to see this happen sooner than later. The target is late summer. The department has a requirement to consult with First Nations and this is a public issue. There are misconceptions and a lot of misinformation out there so there will be a 60-day consultation. Following the consultations, the regulations will be drafted.
- Public education is important and should be started now.
- The department has met with outfitters. The Yukon outfitting association has a mandate about ORV use. They're supportive of proper use. There will be ORV proposals supported by outfitters. The department will take into consideration commercial users but what is out there is an unmaintained network. They're still subject to the regulations.
- The resource road regulations will come online and that will be a registered right with the EMR office. Exploration has been a concern for those using quads to do their work.
- Hopefully people will begin to regulate themselves (e.g. recycling).

The Board will convene a working group and craft a response to the process.

BOARD MEMBERS' TERMS AND EXPIRATIONS

The terms for John Burdek, Frank Thomas, Michelle Dawson-Beattie and Shirley Ford expire in March. Members will further discuss the Chair and Vice-Chair elections during Members' Time.

BEAVER RIVER LAND USE PLAN (TAB 18) — L. Cabott

Lesley Cabott provided an overview of the Beaver River Land Use Planning PowerPoint presentation provided in the meeting kits including: project origin; planning region; government-to-government planning process; planning committee; planning objectives; road access management plan; the road and road access management plan; planning process four phases; meetings in Keno City and Mayo; key wildlife areas; moose observations; key moose winter areas; mining interests; heritage and archaeological sites; information gathering research to inform the plan; and the workplan.

The following documents were also included in meeting kits: the agreement between Yukon government and NND; a letter from the committee to the Board dated January 16, 2019; and a map of the Beaver River planning area.

Comments/Discussion:

- Access to Peel — This is a concern that has been heard. There was also concern about the ATAC gold deposit (off the map) but the road could go over to the raw gold deposit. It would require a new YESAB application. The orders come from the agreement signed by the Chief and Yukon government. Unless those orders change the committee has to move forward.
- Extraction — No one brings moose, sheep or goats. It is always extraction. The moose are extraction because people are brought in with it. Same with sheep and fish. Why is everything extraction-oriented? If you spend \$1 billion on a mine and you want \$1 million to do wildlife resource recovery you don't get it. We need to look at adding the cost to enhance the wildlife into the extraction. Right now, it's geared toward the benefit of the mines and Boards like the YFWMB try to make up the difference afterward.
- There is approximately \$750,000 going to NND over eight years for mitigation.
- Lesley Cabott reviewed clause 1(h) of the agreement regarding Fish and Wildlife Harvest which pertains to the Board. Graham provided information on correspondence with Karen Clyde who is appointed by the minister to deal with this issue. Meetings will take place next week.
- Uranium — The company has discussed gold but not uranium.
- Reality shows — There is an image that people can go wherever they want and do whatever they want in Yukon. It's important to take note of misinformation and include that in the plan.

- Contingency for extended timelines — The workplan focuses on a March 30th. A contingency plan should be discussed.
 - Cumulative effects — How will this affect wildlife? It will create corridors for predators and increase access to calving areas. There are abandoned mines. How will it impact the future? Mines still have rights to roads 60 years later.
 - The Board should contact the RRC and the Lands and Resources department to let them know about this meeting and ask if they need help from us.
 - There is an obligation to contribute. The Mayo RRC are mentioned in the plan regarding harvesting. Written comments are always good and can be attached to the “What we heard” document. The Board has a presence and its input is valued and should be shared.
 - Tiger Deposit — Why would we pick a tiger deposit in someplace like Yukon? Tigers don’t even exist in Canada. The mines could be a little more culturally sensitive to the area and perhaps use a name that the area used to have. This could apply to all of Yukon. Introducing a name that means nothing to the cultural use of the area is a big note. The Geographical Place Names Board is trying to reintroduce meaningful names that used to be out there. However, a First Nation would probably not like to have a potential disaster given a cultural name. We have so many names of places that don’t mean anything.
 - The agreement is dated January 21, 2018 and was included in Board kits at the June meeting. Why hasn’t this been in the forefront a while ago? There should be a working group to work with Lesley on clauses 1(h) and 5 of the agreement. Where will the funding come from? The work will be broader than outlined here. Graham will follow-up with Christine and Karen. The Board will also need to: follow-up with RRCs; meet with NND, the RRC and the planning committee; and clarify its role in the process.
 - This is a prime opportunity to start collecting data (moose numbers, traditional knowledge).
 - Industry should consider being players in the big picture rather than just with extraction. They can help resolve bigger problems. (Ex. oil industry processing Alaskan claims in the 70s) We can use as much help as we can. Industry doesn’t always have to be a villain.
 - There are many complicated issues that feed into this including the ORV regulations.
 - Quill Creek claim — Alaskans own the claim and they passed the property on. They don’t have to do any assessment.
-

ADAPTIVE HARVEST MEASURES (TAB 17) — R. Florkiewicz

Rob Florkiewicz reviewed the Adaptive Management 2019-2020 included in meeting kits for members' reference. The presentation included the following information: adaptive measures in regulation; wildlife regulations adaptive since 1996; bison and elk; Faro threshold; other adaptive approaches; Alsek RRC proposal; adaptive measures added in 2018-2019; and adaptive measures: 2019-2020. A briefing note on adaptive management dated February 2019 was also included in meeting kits.

Comments/Discussion:

- Threshold hunt — Faro is a good location because there is one way in and one way out. Information is pushed out on the internet and on radios. There is a 72-hour reporting period. We have gone over by one or two as people are out in the field.
- Outfitters wanting to hunt in the subzone are concerned that they won't be able to hunt. If a hunt is in progress a wildlife permit will be issued to allow outfitters to finish that hunt.
- The Faro subzones are completely different sizes and are based on sheep management. These three subzones have a lot of access with identifiable boundaries. Rob provided an overview of collaring work and data. There was habitual use by moose in these areas in the early 90s.
- Regulation change on GMS 7 East for Dall sheep didn't happen yet and won't be in effect this year.
- Rob Florkiewicz provided an overview of number of permits and success rates.
- Graham asked about the ATAC agreement, section 1(h) and 5 discussed with Lesley Cabott. Christine provided information on the principle and the approach of the agreement is that it won't be the final one. Other agreements will come into place. The department flagged the Board as a partner to deal with issues that came up in the ATAC agreement. Karen was selected to take the lead and others will be included. There is sensitivity around the timing and the Board wants to do a good job.

MEMBERS TIME AND RE-CAP – IN CAMERA (closed to media)

Stratos Interview

At no time did the Board recognize the Executive Director. He was acknowledged for doing a good job. No one around the table has any doubts about Graham, but it should be said on the record and should be said about all of the staff. Graham provided an overview of discussions and opinions he has heard regarding the review.

Board Chair and Vice-Chair interim elections.

Motion – 2019-04: That the Board appoint an interim Chair and Vice-Chair from March 15, 2019 until April 18, 2019.

Moved by: Ken Taylor

Seconded by: Frank Thomas.

Passed by: Consensus

Members discussed appointments, process and impacts to the Board. Board members will approach CYFN leadership regarding appointments.

Ken Taylor nominated Carl Sidney for the Interim Chair. Carl Sidney was acclaimed as Chair from March 15th, 2019 to April 18th, 2019.

Carl Sidney nominated Ken Taylor for the Interim Vice-Chair. Ken Taylor was acclaimed as Vice-Chair from March 15, 2019 to May 15, 2019.

Meeting Recap

Graham Van Tighem provided a recap of the following:

- Forty-mile caribou, Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in and Yukon government;
- Internal review document;
- Symposium on 2020 vision workshop and spirit and intent, Information on the regulation change process, UFA presentation and Operating Procedures will be sent to Stratos;
- Follow-up on the moose management working group;
- Angling working group and submission to the Trust;
- Beaver River ATAC agreement and habitat working group;
- PHA working group follow up;

CLOSING PRAYER — Danny Cresswell