

YUKON FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING
June 9 to 11, 2020
MINUTES
Zoom Video Conference

DAY 1: Tuesday, June 9, 2020 – Regular Meeting

PRESENT: Carl Sidney (Chair), Danny Cresswell, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Franklin Patterson, Ken Taylor, Randy Taylor

REGRETS: John Burdek, Dennis Dickson

STAFF: Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Steve Hossack

SUPPORT: Colleen Henry (Minute Taker)

IN ATTENDANCE: Ryan Hennings (Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife, Environment), Janice Sibbeston (YFWET, Manager), Saxon Ritchie (Fish and Game Association), David Dickson

OPENING PRAYER, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Carl Sidney welcomed and introduced everyone and said the opening prayer.

ADMIN AND FINANCES (TAB 01)

A. AGENDA REVIEW— C. Sidney

Carl Sidney reviewed the agenda. There were no additions or deletions.

The Board discussed whether the Fish and Wildlife Branch Update on Day 2 would be in camera. Presentation materials will be open to the public. Future discussions may be in-camera.

Motion – 2020-12: That the Board accept the June 9 to 11, 2020 agenda as presented.

Moved by: Ken Taylor

Seconded by: Michelle Dawson-Beattie

Passed by: Consensus

B. EXECUTIVE REPORT (TAB 02) — G. Van Tighem, R. Taylor, C. Sidney

Graham Van Tighem provided an update on Board appointments. The Board is down to 10 members. CYFN is attempting to extend appointments for one year. Graham will provide updates as new information is received.

Graham reviewed the Executive report provided in meeting kits.

Comments/Questions:

- Beaver River Land Use Plan — Franklin Patterson will participate on the working group.
 - Laberge RRC — The Board is helping to mediate issues the Laberge RRC is currently experiencing. The Laberge RRC region is an overlap area.
 - Yukon Forum Workshop and Working Group Meetings — The Board's role is evolving based on the review and will likely be diminished. The Board can effectively communicate with the working group, but may choose not to attend monthly meetings.
 - Regulation Change Process — It was suggested by YG that the Board discuss changes to the regulation change process.
 - Bison Working Group — Michelle Dawson-Beattie will attend.
-

FINANCIAL UPDATE (TAB 03) – D. Sheldon

Diane Sheldon reviewed the financial report to May 31, 2020 provided in the meeting kits. Funds will be earmarked for community visits, forum activity and website.

Motion – 2020-13: That the Board accept the financial report to May 31, 2020 as presented.

Moved by: Ken Taylor

Seconded by: Randy Taylor

Passed by: Consensus

APRIL MINUTES (TAB 04) – D. Sheldon

Diane Sheldon reviewed the April minutes.

Comments/Questions:

- Transfer Payment Meeting RRCs and Board — Graham Van Tighem and Ken Taylor provided an overview of the meeting regarding Board reporting requirements, budget scrutiny/oversight, proposed changes, and YG's threshold requirement for monthly financial statements. The written response from the Board is included in correspondence. This conversation will likely arise again in 2021.
- CTRRC Meeting regarding moose regulation changes — No one from Yukon government attended. If the Board requires technical assistance from Yukon government staff during meetings, the Board can provide that request to Ryan Hennings. The Board asked for clarification from Ryan regarding lines of communication with the department.
- Motion — 2020-09 and Motion — 2020-10 address the nominations, but not the selection. The minutes should reflect that the appointments were acclaimed.

Motion – 2020-14: That the Board accept the April minutes as amended.

Moved by: Randy Taylor
Seconded by: Ken Taylor
Passed by: Consensus

CORRESPONDENCE REVIEW AND OUTCOMES (TAB 05) – G. Van Tighem

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the correspondence and the listing provided in meeting kits.

Comments/Discussion:

- Letter #6 from Yukon Hog Producers Association (YHPA) — Graham Van Tighem will draft a response to the president of the YHPA and circulate it to the Board for review and comment prior to sending.
 - Attachment to Letter #6 *Eurasian Wild Board Fencing Guidelines for Yukon Territory*:
 - These are guidelines and not regulations. There is no capacity to enforce them.
 - This is coming from Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Department of Environment and the minister have been very clear that they don't support, or want to see, wild boar in the Yukon. Any direction the Board wants to take should be directed at the minister of EMR.
 - Steven Hossack provided an overview of subset regulations from EMR and Environment. They are taking the Board's recommendation into consideration, but Dr. Mary Vanderkop has also said that the Board recommendations will fall under the animal protection control.
 - Government departments are at odds on this issue. With recommendations from the Board, it is hoped that wild boar will be kept out of Yukon. The Board will continue to follow up with this.
 - Letter #7 Dall Sheep Permit Hunt Assignment GMZ 7 East — Graham provided an overview of the Board's concerns with high profile communications from the department to the public. The concerns were in relation to 60 permits in a sheep management unit which was not a Board recommendation.
 - Letter #11 YFWMB Recommendations regarding Eurasian Wild Boar in Yukon – A copy of the letter will be forwarded to Minister Pillai (EMR).
 - Regulation change response letter has been received. The Board has been requested to keep the letter confidential until recommendations from Minister are sent. Executive will draft a response in the next week or so.
-

COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE (TAB 06) – S. Hossack

Steve Hossack provided an overview of the communications update provided in meeting kits.

Comments/Questions:

- Website Proponent RFP Assessment Rubrik:
 - All proposals were sent to Board members.
 - Aasman scored 88 percent and provided a budget for a phased approach (\$10,000 isn't adequate to cover the entire cost). Aasman was able to provide

services above and beyond the in-house capability. Aasman will bill to actual work completed.

- The working group will meet at the end of Day 1 to discuss the proposals and the rubric and report back to the Board on Day 2.

Motion – 2020-15: That the Board approve a \$10,000 increase to the website budget from the identified surplus funds.

Moved by: Randy Taylor

Seconded by: Ken Taylor

Passed by: Consensus

MEMBERS TIME — IN CAMERA

No minutes were recorded.

DRAFT

DAY 2: Wednesday, June 10, 2020 – Regular Meeting

PRESENT: Carl Sidney (Chair), Danny Cresswell, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Franklin Patterson, Ken Taylor, Randy Taylor

REGRETS: John Burdek, Dennis Dickson

STAFF: Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Steve Hossack

SUPPORT: Colleen Henry (Minute Taker)

IN ATTENDANCE: Janice Sibbeston (YFWET, Manager), Ryan Hennings (Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife, Environment), Robert Perry, Matt Clarke, Mike Suitor, Rob Florkiewicz, Matt Ball, David Dickson, Saxon Ritchie (Yukon Fish and Game Association)

FISH AND WILDLIFE BRANCH UPDATE (TAB 07) – R. Hennings

- **Fortymile Caribou**

Ryan Hennings provided a brief introduction. Yukon government is proposing to move forward on a fall hunt of the Fortymile caribou herd.

Mike Suitor provided an overview of the *Fortymile Caribou Herd Background and Summer Hunt* PowerPoint presentation provided in meeting kits. Topics included: caribou numbers from 1973 to 2017; expectation in Yukon in summer and fall/winter; harvest planning range wide scale; range wide management planning 2019; harvest planning in Yukon; 2020 winter hunt summary Yukon licensed hunters; overall 2019-2020 summary; hunt considerations; draft Yukon harvest management plan goals; Fortymile caribou range and fall hunt (map); and proposed fall licensed hunt details.

The minister of Environment is meeting Deputy Chief of Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in on June 11, 2020. Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in has concerns regarding incidental moose harvest and an increase of hunters in the area. This is an area that is important to Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in moose harvest. If there is Board support, Fish and Wildlife Branch will work with Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in to finalize the management plan for Fortymile caribou. At this time, Yukon government is seeking support from the Board to move adaptively in a phased approach for a fall caribou hunt.

Comments/Questions:

- Board members don't want to see a Yukon government public announcement saying it was done because it was a Board recommendation. Make sure the messaging is clear. Recommendations are different from support. There is a difference between the Board supporting a YG proposal. The Board and the department can work on communications together.

- Hunt plan — The total number is 160 bulls if every permit is filled. If we have another winter hunt and if it is more successful than last year, we will still be harvesting far fewer caribou than the Alaskans want us to harvest even if the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in hunt is the same as the licensed hunt. One of the reasons that we have been particularly cautious is because of Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in concerns about various things, including the possibility of incidental moose harvest.
- Q: Did you consider other options such as closing moose harvest while caribou harvest is open or having a buffer zone? A: *It is correct to assume we won't take the full allocation this year. That has been made very clear at the harvest management coalition table. The key is, we need to show we are stepping into it. We did discuss a moose closure. Moose aren't readily available in that area at that time of the year. We conducted a survey in 2017. We don't have Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in harvest data, but based on conversations with COs, we're confident we're within the limits. We did talk about that. We felt it was an overkill step to close the moose season, not to say we wouldn't consider it again. We could consider options further down the road.*
- Q: What is the ultimate Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in goal with their relationship with this herd and their harvest? I look at the relationship between the Vuntut Gwitchin and the Porcupine caribou herd. Do you get a sense that this is something Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in is working toward? A: *I can't speak on behalf of Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in. We have heard that they would like to see the herd continue to grow. They're not seeing them as frequently as they did. They are interested in harvesting this summer and are encouraging their citizens to hunt.*
- Q: Regarding historical range, you talked about bring the herd back to their historical range. I think they were in the millions at one time. That's quite a goal. Is that even possible? A: *We are seeing caribou come across the border. Caribou like to be in alpine and sub-alpine areas in summer. We completed the first of three components on habitat and impacts. Summer range within Yukon is very limited. The area that is used is along the Alaskan border around the Top of the World area, Ladue river, and White River. Habitat modelling and local knowledge collected in the 1990's and 2000s identifies the Dawson range as a significant summer range. The Ogilvie mountains were also identified, but the evidence is much thinner and little information is available. We need to see the herd expand into these summer ranges if we wish to see the herd grow. It's hard to say how big the herd was. The number often used is 580,000 which was a crude estimate. That goal is still within the plan because it speaks to the original recovery goals established by Yukon and Alaska. No one expects that they will fully reoccupy their entire historical range. We can't manage a herd based on a peak. We have to manage through the whole population cycle. There are challenges to identify the distribution goals. There have been changes in habitat (i.e. Dawson range and mine development). The idea that we will go back to one million animals is unlikely to be achieved.*
- The meeting between the department and Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in was a ministerial request. The department will provide the Board with an update following the conversation.
- A DDRC letter in support of the summer/fall hunt will be forthcoming.
- Q: Alaska is dictating to us what to do. If the numbers were so high in the past and we can't get to that number, why are we letting Alaska tell us we need to harvest? It is

problematic with salmon. A: *They want us to harvest to avoid a potential collapse. Managing the herd is very complicated. The biggest issue is that we created a moral standard to not harvest and now we have to reverse that.*

- There is nothing to stop licensed hunters to go up to the top of the world to harvest moose. This is not category A land. This involves a general application. This is bull moose harvest only. Not a lot has changed in the situation, except that now there is another species to harvest. They may actually be fat healthy caribou which is exciting.
- A point Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in is making is that if we introduce 160 hunters, who wouldn't be there if not for the caribou hunt, there is a pretty good chance there will be increased incidental harvest of moose.
- 65/35 split to harvest — Q: It appears that Alaska has more weight when it comes to decisions at the table. Does the split hold when it comes to making decisions and discussions at the table? Is this a 50/50 cooperative coalition in discussions? Or do Alaskans hold more weight? A: Sometimes the Yukon has more than 50 percent say on management decisions and sometimes we have less. The 65/35 was agreed upon years ago. Alaska harvested their 65 percent and Yukon didn't to promote herd growth. We wanted the herd to grow big enough so they would reoccupy their former historic range. The population has grown so high and so quickly that, at the last coalition meeting and during conversations, we agreed that we would start harvesting caribou. That wasn't a decision that was forced upon us. It was agreed upon. We had to convey that there are First Nations in Dawson who believe it is a traditional law to not harvest the herd. Those laws were created by our coalition trying to recover that population. Now that it's recovered quickly and is showing signs that there may be a potential decline, Yukoners are being asked to do their part harvesting. We are saying to Alaska that we will do our part, but we can't harvest 100 percent in the first year. We're trying to cooperatively move forward to initiate a harvest. We may have to change the way the harvest rolls out. The coalition has agreed to start harvesting. Every representative on the coalition from the Yukon agreed to that. We do caucus as a coalition before we meet with the Alaskan members.
- A major consideration for Alaskans is their legislation. Both the Fortymile and Nelchina herds are considered intensively managed herds which means the Alaskans must provide reasonable opportunity to anyone with subsistence rights. There is a lot of political pressure on the state to generate enough caribou and to create enough reasonable opportunity for harvesters. That is a driving force behind their approach to achieving harvest goals with this herd. They want to see the goals met to keep the herd out of the high 70s and not see a decline which would maximize their ability to have a reasonable harvest.
- What do you do to halt the decline? In Alaska, they would stop cow harvest and increase wolf control. The alternative is to harvest a lot of bulls.

- **Elk Management (R. Hennings, Matt Ball, Robert Perry Matt Clarke)**

Ryan Hennings provided an overview to elk conflicts in the Takhini Valley.

Robert Perry reviewed the *Elk-Agriculture Working Group Update* PowerPoint presentation provided in meeting kits. Topics included: an overview; November 18th meeting with the agriculture industry; five options discussed at the elk working group meeting on December 9th; options government directed the department to pursue; and a three-phased approach.

Comments/Discussion:

- Working group membership —The membership is mostly the same as it was when the terms of reference was signed on June 2nd. Back Country Hunters and Anglers is no longer a member.
- Q: Will there be an opportunity to apply for permits? A: *That is still being worked out. It will be as fair and equitable as possible.*
- Q: Regarding a phased approach and fencing, did you discuss the process? A: *Fencing already exists. The game farms are the most common areas for fencing entanglement and damage. The fencing is only in the problem areas, so it isn't as extensive or problematic as one might think.*
- Q: Why don't farmers put up fencing on their own? A: *It's a long-standing issue. The core elk zone, further to the west, is where the elk predominantly were. There are 135 farms in the Takhini River buffer zone. Many farms predate the elk coming into the area. If we were to look at fencing that entire area it would cost millions. We want to support food security and the farms. Part of that is making sure farms aren't heavily indebted with the expense of putting up fences. The fences run from \$5 to \$10 a linear foot. We are pushing forward a plan to balance the interests of the farmers to produce food and not having to install high and expensive fences all over the landscape and still having the elk on the landscape, but not in the core farming area.*
- Considerations around future agricultural dispositions — I don't know why agricultural dispositions would be considered within in elk range in the absence of a regional land use plan. *There is a land use plan for farming and farming development in the Takhini Valley. There are approximately 130 farms in that area and there is some room for expansion in that area. Those would be the dispositions that were discussed.*
- Q: Why would you consider more dispositions that you know would come into conflict with the elk? A: *The way that we would mitigate for that is that the farmer has to take on the knowledge that they are a farmer in wilderness lands and because of that they must have certain caveats. For instance, they may be asked to put fencing around their property so as not to have elk on their lands. They may talk about certain ways that they prepare their fields, removing their crops, stubble on the landscape. They would be asked to make sure they consider those things going forward to mitigate for elk. That's why we're discussing having protocols in place.*
- Q: Have you considered reducing the harvest of wolves and bears in the area to increase predation? A: *No, we have not. In recent surveys we have seen quite low recruitment as it is. It is something to think about.*
- There haven't been any agriculture dispositions in the core elk range. There is a differentiation in the mapping and the work in terms of where we expect elk to be and where we have planned and been promoting agriculture development. The issue is elk in the buffer zone.

- Q: When we talk about issues and conflicts with farming, the elk were introduced in 1951 which predates a lot of farms. When we talk about food security, exactly what does that entail? I used to live near farms that could barely grow hay fit for livestock. How is it classified as food security when it is not extremely fertile soil? Where is it available? Who buys it? It's relatively boutique and doesn't entail food security. A: *If you go into any grocery store you will see local products for sale. Thousands of pounds of meat have been processed and delivered to families in Yukon so far this spring. The expanse of farm area in that Takhini Valley generally produces hay. There is some grain production, but they have mostly moved away from grain because of the elk. The hay goes toward cattle and horses which supports the outfitting industry. The quality has gone up tremendously in the last 15 years. The elk have created a challenge through this area. We could require farmers to put up their own fence or not, but if they can't afford it then we wouldn't have people farming because of the impacts that are happening because of the elk. The elk come in in a herd. It's not an issue with wildlife like bear, moose, deer or any other species. It's just an issue with elk because of the habits they have and because of their association with the oat and hay crops. Historically, our production hasn't been incredible in the Yukon but, in the last 15 years, it has improved. Originally, when the elk first came into the Yukon, they went to farms. We started the conversation thinking about 84,000 caribou and the importance of that herd and we are dealing with 200 elk. This is such a struggle in the Whitehorse area. We feel there is a lot of production in this valley and if we can manage the elk issue better hopefully, we will see that increase again.*
- Both of the times that the Board was responsible for leading the elk management plans, we made statements in and around the allocation of resources for managing wildlife with the goal of targeting what we would call "core important species" such as moose, caribou, sheep and bison, as opposed to imported species like elk. Currently, there is a huge amount of money being spent on elk. That has always been a concern with this Board in addressing this conflict. These management actions are extreme, they do fall in line with the short-term objective to achieve two principles in that we shouldn't be spending hundreds of thousands on elk every year when we can be putting that money toward moose, caribou and sheep conservations.
- Future actions — We currently have elk adaptive harvest management. I would suspect that future amendments to reduce elk and agriculture conflicts could probably be achieved through adaptive management. We may not have to wait a year or two to deal with some of those things if there is something we can do. We have the ability to maneuver quickly because of the adaptive management.

YUKON WILDLIFE ACT REGULATION CHANGE PROPOSALS (TAB 08) (IN CAMERA)

Graham Van Tighem provided a brief overview.

Steve Hossack reviewed the *Moose Management Proposals 1 – 3* PowerPoint presentation provided in meeting kits. Topics included: YFWMB public survey #1 Fall 2019; who we heard from; public review (fall 2019) major comments and themes; YFWMB online survey proposal responses; 90-day extension to public review rationale; timeline of extension to public review;

who we heard from during the extension; letters received (formal responses) from Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in, Alsek RRC, CPAWS, Kluane First Nation, YOA, Teslin Tlingit Council, Yukon Stone Outfitting, Ta'an Kwäch'än Council, and YFGA; YFWMB online survey #2 spring 2020 and responses; public review (spring 2020) major themes and comments; final considerations (nine questions).

Comments/Questions:

- There is no indication that increased engagement will change support unless there is a considerable jump in understanding. RRCs, First Nations, and NGOs support the proposals. Opposition comes from the public. The questions at the end are easy to answer, but questions 6, 8 and 9 need more work.
- There was no RRC support at the AGW in November. One challenge with the approach is there could have been a modified chronology to the approach. The government did a good first step to identify areas of concern and sharing them with Yukoners to give everyone a better sense of the issues and where and how to address them. The second part dealt with the moose harvest management framework which is the toolbox. It would have been ideal for the Board to have an opportunity to review that toolbox but not in competition with the adaptive management proposal.
- Surveys, public input — Looking through questions, this would be better referenced as adaptive harvest management. There is confusion through public consultation about harvest management without an overall plan or vision. Public confusion could be addressed through an overall moose management plan in which these adaptive harvest management regulations could reside. The overall plan could provide the overall vision for the moose.
- North Yukon RRC and non-settled First Nations — Especially where there is a lot of hunting impacts (Ross River, White River and Watson Lake), will there be any plan to reach out to those First Nations before we go any further? A: *I respect the position the Board is in and I understand that they have a significant challenge. I see there are conflicting messages in here, one being they don't want to see the government going for a whack-a-mole position. The branch and department recognize that and understand the whack-a-mole approach hasn't been effective and change is needed. If adaptive management is recommended, concerns such as meat wastage — should someone shoot an undersized bull — are opportunities for the Board and the department to engage and collaborate on educational programs to engage and work with the Fish and Game Association, HEED program and First Nations to provide the education to prevent these things from happening and/or an phased-in enforcement response so that as people learn, adapt and hunt and move through these things they don't feel like they will be prosecuted and lose their vehicle. Those are questions we can address and work on. In the bigger picture, is adaptive management where Yukon needs to go? What does that look like? In the regulation proposal we had to lay out what it may look like, but it doesn't stop us from flushing that out, adding more to the toolbox or revising the moose management framework moving forward to be more inclusive and gain more public support. With a restricted toolbox, all we are really doing is having another form of a permit system. We have clearly heard that the government and the public want opportunity and they don't want to be restrictive. At this point we must balance that*

question in how we steer this forward. The one thing we can control is harvest. Habitat management and predator management and control is not on the table. Habitat enhancement engagement is a lot more complicated because you're dealing with work in traditional territories. There are important aspects to engage in, but harvest is the one certainty that we can control and that's why you see these proposals before the Board and why, in the past, it has been centred around harvest. In certain areas, harvest is not sustainable and may inflict on subsistence rights of First Nations. Harvest reporting is important to deal with situations and identify them and we can take steps to control harvest to protect subsistence harvest. It's complicated and there are many aspects. The Board has a big challenge and I look forward to hearing back from Board members on the best way to proceed and move forward on this.

- *Q: If you don't want to go with predator control, how do you rebuild a population that is crashing because of predation, like the Chisana caribou herd? It's all predation. It says that in its management plan. It speaks to rehabilitating a game population in the UFA. If you can't rehabilitate it because of predation and you're not going to go there, then that wording in the UFA needs to change. A: We can't change the UFA. That's a tri-party agreement between the First Nations, federal government and Yukon government. What we learned historically in Yukon when we did go down wolf control measures is that once you start, wolves have the ability to quickly rebound and whatever gains you may have made quickly fall off until the balance is achieved again. One hesitation to going back down that road is: Once you start, when do you stop? Fiscally there isn't the ability, time or resources to do predator management on an ongoing basis without an end date.*
- *First Nations, when they were denning, didn't stop. If you're doing predator control through trapping, don't stop trapping. Encourage people out there. You can effectively reduce the wolf population by trapping. The limitation is not being able to trap on traplines that people don't use.*
- *The Board is always trying to set people up for success. We have said from the beginning that we needed to avoid having a conversation about the toolbox or the moose harvest management framework and focus on the regulation. I've heard that up to a dozen times from all of us who are trying to effectively bring this proposal to its end. Adaptive management is not married to any particular tool in the toolbox at this time. When we start talking about predator management or when we start talking about antler restrictions, those are hypothetical possibilities that can be utilized through adaptive management. My concern is that the reason there is very minimal public acceptability, particularly for adaptive management, is that the Yukon public does not understand what it is and how it works. By proposing regulation changes that deal with harvest restrictions for licensed anglers or hunters, people may not love the whack-a-mole approach but at least they understand what the end goal is. One of the hardest jobs we will have in getting support and not creating a revolt is getting people to understand what it means and how it's going to roll out. We can't keep saying we can change it if it doesn't work because that's still whack-a-mole. It is just happening more quickly. It is hard for the Board to help facilitate this when people don't understand what it means in the end.*
- *There is a lot of fear out there. We have seen a lot of successes with adaptive management with bison and elk and Fortymile caribou (if we move forward that way).*

That gives us tools to manage this way. With the moose on the Sifton Range and the South Canol, they've identified important concerns to address now. Is adaptive management what Yukon should be moving toward to manage moose? If so, we can draft those regulations to put those provisions in there while maintaining that conversation about the toolboxes, how they will be included, policy and steps to take to move adaptively in the future. During the public consultation, it wasn't clear. That is one of the learning lessons. The department can and should do better. Moving forward, we need to look at what has been said and try to do better. We are at a point where we have to come to some sort of conclusion and some sort of decision of what to do. Lars has made a very strong case about the Pilot Mountain harvest and how that is not sustainable. It's not quite as strong as the South Canol because the data is older. We also have to recognize that the department doesn't have the ability to do intensive monitoring across the territory every year. It's not feasible. The department has made over 70 intensive surveys across the Yukon using this approach. That comes into account when we're looking at the habitat and the results and those things get factored in so that we can make the best management decision with the information we have. The department needs to do better to educate the public, organizations and others and how that's done so there is better understanding and more support about how those conclusions are made. If we are to wait for data and surveys every time we make a decision I fear that the risk here are the moose populations and the wildlife comes at a higher risk because of the time it takes to get to all these different areas before we can have that conversation.

- Q: In the first go around, we had that dichotomous key that the department created. Why was it featured in the fall review, but excluded in the spring review? A: *When the original communication package went out it was confusing. From the feedback we heard at that time, it was deemed part of the confusion so it was removed.*
- My understanding was that the perception of a few organizations was that adaptive management would circumvent the UFA. We took it upon ourselves to get this into the public document so people could understand that the intent of adaptive management wasn't a circumvention of the UFA.
- The dichotomous key is where things should have started. We can improve on this. It needs to be fleshed out. People have a lot of questions. This could have been the tool to address those questions. It doesn't really follow through to a logical conclusion. People need a bit of handholding on this. People want to support adaptive; they just don't understand it. This stems from a communications standpoint with the original proposal. For such an important keystone species to Yukoners, this public education could have begun earlier. We can improve public understanding and potentially mitigate false perceptions.

MEMBERS TIME (IN CAMERA)

No minutes were recorded.

DAY 3: Thursday, June 11, 2020 – Regular Meeting

PRESENT: Carl Sidney (Chair), Danny Cresswell, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Franklin Patterson, Ken Taylor, Randy Taylor

REGRETS: John Burdek, Dennis Dickson,

STAFF: Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Steve Hossack

SUPPORT: Colleen Henry (Minute Taker)

IN ATTENDANCE: Janice Sibbeston (YFWET, Manager), Ryan Hennings (Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife, Environment), David Dickson, Saxon Ritchie (Yukon Fish and Game Association), James Macdonald (Chair, Yukon Salmon Sub-Committee), Elizabeth MacDonald (Executive Director, Yukon Salmon Sub-Committee)

YUKON SALMON SUB-COMMITTEE UPDATE (TAB 09) — E. MacDonald, J. MacDonald

Elizabeth MacDonald reviewed the YSSC update to the Board provided in meeting kits.

Motion – 2020-16: That the Board approve the appointments of Al Von Finster as YSSC interim Chair and Carl Sidney as YSSC interim Vice-Chair.

Moved by: Ken Taylor

Seconded by: Randy Taylor

Passed by: Consensus

Comments/Discussion:

- It was recommended that the Board send a letter to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans Canada regarding the Yukon River Salmon Agreement. We are not getting the same returns as when the agreement was negotiated. We are only getting returns of four- and five-year-old salmon. The matrix was negotiated in regard to border escapement. The Yukon River Salmon Agreement falls under the Pacific Salmon Treaty. There are other agreements in the treaty and they all have a review process except for the Yukon River Salmon Agreement. However, there is a review clause in the treaty. We would like to research that and then draft a letter to Fisheries and Oceans Canada to ask for assistance to open the Yukon River Salmon Agreement. The YSSC will work with the Board to draft a letter.
 - There was a discussion about eight-year-old salmon. Some say they never existed. According to the Alaskans, chasing after older and larger fish may be futile.
 - In previous studies, salmon were aged on the length of the fish rather than scales. Chances are there were no eight-year-olds, but rather the salmon were larger.
-

YUKON FISH AND WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT TRUST (TAB 10) — K. Taylor, J. Sibbeston

Refer to the Enhancement Trust minutes.

YFWMB WEBSITE — R. Taylor

The Communications Working Group met at the end of Day 2 to discuss website proposals. Graham Van Tighem spoke with John Burdek who was unable to attend. The working group unanimously supports the Aasman proposal.

Motion – 2020-17: That the Board accept the Communication Working Group recommendation to accept Aasman’s proposal as submitted for up to \$20,000 for phase 1 and phase 2 and award Aasman the contract for development of the new YFWMB website.

Moved by: Randy Taylor

Seconded by: Ken Taylor

Passed by: Consensus

YUKON FORUM UPDATE — C. Sidney, R. Taylor, K. Taylor, G. Van Tighem

The Yukon Forum update and supplementary budget will be discussed during the strategic planning discussion.

Graham Van Tighem provided an update on the following:

- Financial savings through Zoom meetings which can be allocated to funding outside support if required.
 - An overview of work completed by Dan Lindsey.
 - Goals, objectives and timelines.
 - Executive meetings with parties who prompted the Yukon Forum resolution.
 - Recommendation for a strategic plan and strategic workplan.
 - Contract to Dave Joe to review implications to Board mandate and elements of the strategic planning and spirit and intent of the UFA because of the six recommendations Dan Lindsey produced.
-

YFWMB STRATEGIC PLANNING (TAB 12) — C. Sidney, R. Taylor, G. Van Tighem

Carl Sidney provided an update on strategic planning including:

- Executive Committee meetings.
- Hiring a facilitator (Dennis Zimmerman) and technical support (Dan Lindsey); and
- Discussions on meetings with First Nations (Lands and Resource directors and RRCs).

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the YFWMB Strategic Planning PowerPoint presentation provided in meeting kits. Topics included: conservation; objectives of UFA Chapter 16; section 16.7.1 which establishes the YFWMB; YFWMB Mandate; the Board and responsibilities; areas of

recommendations to the Minister; day-to-day activities as per the UFA (sections 16.7.6, 16.7.7.1 and 16.7.7.2); principles of Chapter 16; YFWMB Purpose/Mission; memorandum of understanding; YFWMB Vision for 2020; Board operations; where we go from here; and goals and finer points.

Comments/Discussion:

- Members discussed proposed facilitators and reservations. Graham Van Tighem provided history and background.
- Board appointments — Two positions are currently vacant. The Board has no idea what the plans are with government or CYFN. This is a long-standing issue with this Board, RRCs and other boards and councils.
- Q: How was the previous strategic plan used? All too often there is a lot of value in creating them, but they are not used afterward. For example, would our annual reports be measured against how we have achieved some of the objectives in the strategic plan? A: *When you develop a strategic plan you develop goals, objectives, and a workplan. The workplan has actions and identifies the lead, deliverables, timeframe, and is managed with a status. That is how the Board has used a strategic plan.*

Graham will send a copy of the strategic plan to the Board and will follow-up with Dennis Zimmerman.

The Board will have an in-person strategic planning session for a day and a half (preferably on the land) in July or August. Dawn Kisoun volunteered to have the session on Dog Island.

MEMBERS TIME AND RECAP — C. Sidney, R. Taylor, G. Van Tighem

Members discussed the following items:

- Predator management in the Yukon — A big comment from the public was that there should be more management of predators. Ryan provided clarification on his comments from day two by stating that there is no mandate for the department to do predator control. Ryan Hennings and David Dickson can setup a meeting to further discuss this issue. Ken Taylor and Graham Van Tighem will also attend with the Board Chair Carl Sidney.
- Trapping enhancement program in Haines Junction — Ryan Hennings said Peter was conducting work in and around the community to help enhance wolf trapping and to train trappers. He will get an update for the Board.
- Big Game Outfitter season — The seasons are not restricted. The department is still planning on having a season, subject to border restrictions that Yukon may have in place. Shawn Wassel said outfitters were planning on moving forward and are booking hunts. They are looking to speak to the government about border control and what mechanisms outfitters can put into place to mitigate cross-contamination.

Members moved in-camera. No further minutes were recorded.