

**YUKON FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING**  
**February 15 to 17, 2022**  
**MINUTES**  
**Zoom Video Conference**

---

---

**DAY 1: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 – Regular Meeting**

---

**PRESENT:** Carl Sidney (Chair), Randy Taylor (Vice-Chair), Ken Taylor

**ZOOM:** Blanche Warrington, Sebastian Jones, Tas-Tsi Catholique, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, John Burdek, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Franklin Patterson Jr., Danny Creswell, Cheyenne Bradley

**REGRETS:** Dennis Dickson

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

**SUPPORT:** Sharon Kerr (Minute Taker)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Marc Cattet, Catherine Pinard, Janice Sibbeston, Shawn Wasel, Karlie  
**(ZOOM)** Knight

---

**WELCOME AND OPENING PRAYER**

Carl Sidney welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed quorum. Ken Taylor said the opening prayer.

---

**ADMIN AND FINANCES (TAB 01)**

**A. AGENDA REVIEW— C. Sidney**

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

**Motion – 2022-01:** That the Board accept the February 15 to 17, 2022 agenda as presented.

**Moved by:** Dawn Kisoun

**Seconded by:** Ken Taylor

**Passed by:** Consensus

---

**B. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT ACTIONS/CHANGES 2022/23 – Catherine Pinard – IN CAMERA**

No minutes were recorded.

---

### **C. SUMMARY OF THE SHEEP MANAGEMENT CHANGES IN GMZ 7 EAST – Meghan Larivee – IN CAMERA**

No minutes were recorded.

---

### **D. ADMIN AND FINANCES: EXECUTIVE REPORT (TAB 04) – C. Sidney, R. Taylor, G. Van Tighem**

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

- The Board agreed that members would participate in the Porter Creek School bison hunt from February 28, to March 4, 2022. Members were not yet identified.
- The Fish and Game Association was concerned that the Sheep Management Changes discussion was held in camera. Graham will provide a response and copy Mark Cattet.
- The wetland policy is included in the report prepared by Steve. Carl commended Steve on his work.
- Carl is still trying to get on the CYFN Leadership meeting agenda. It is difficult, but he is working on it.

#### **Comments/Discussion:**

- ARRC Letter – Solutions: Michelle Dawson-Beattie asked about the meeting and whether she would be invited. Graham Van Tighem put her name forward. The meeting was changed to the evening of February 18. Graham will send Michelle the invite and information.

### **FINANCIAL UPDATE (TAB 05) – G. Van Tighem (Motion required)**

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the financial update provided in the meeting kits.

**Motion – 2022-02:** That the Board accept the financial update as presented.

**Moved by:** Randy Taylor

**Seconded by:** Cheyenne Bradley

**Passed by:** Consensus

There were no comments or discussion.

---

### **E. CORRESPONDENCE REVIEW (TAB 06) – G. Van Tighem**

Graham Van Tighem reviewed correspondence to and from the Board. The correspondence and the correspondence list were provided in the meeting kits.

#### **Comments/Questions:**

- Letter #1 – Porcupine Caribou Annual Harvest Meeting 2022
  - The Board did not send anyone.
  - The letter from the PCMB was not sent out to members. Graham had a discussion with Deana Lemke who said that nothing specific to the Board would be raised at the meeting. In the future this type of information will be on the new website.

- Letter #6 – YFWMB Travel Reimbursement — Ken Taylor asked to have time to speak to this on the April agenda. Graham Van Tighem confirmed that this would be discussed at the next meeting.
  - YFWMB website and correspondence — Graham Van Tighem and Steve Hossack provided a brief update on the new website which will comply with a recommendation from the Stratos report. Steve said there will be secure space on the new website for correspondence. Randy Taylor said that, when it comes launching the new site, there should be a survey or something so that people will see the new website. Steve confirmed that the new website will be promoted.
- 

#### **F. DECEMBER YFWMB MINUTES (TAB 07) – G. Van Tighem**

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the December 2021 minutes provided in the meeting kits. The following changes were identified:

- Add Marc Cattet to the attendance list.
- Carl Sidney will provide a list of corrections to Diane.

**Motion – 2022-03:** That the Board accept the December 2021 meeting minutes as amended.

**Moved by:** Sebastian Jones

**Seconded by:** Blanche Warrington

**Passed by:** Consensus

#### Comments/Questions:

- Some members have difficulty downloading documents, reports, minutes, et cetera, from SharePoint. Documents should be sent out by email in advance so members can review them before the meeting. Graham Van Tighem informed the Board that documents will be moved from SharePoint to Google platform which should improve things.
  - A request was made for minutes to be emailed out when they are first received. It is difficult to remember if too much time passed between the meeting and the time the minutes are reviewed.
  - Steve Hassock discussed difficulties with the SharePoint system which should be fixed with the new Google platform. One main concern with emailing out the information is the size of the documents. The limits of each member's email service cause many emails to be sent back undelivered and results in extra work and time. The new platform will be easier to access. Steve will provide training to Board members.
- 

#### **MEMBERS TIME — IN CAMERA**

## DAY 2: Wednesday, February 16, 2022 – Regular Meeting

---

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Carl Sidney (Chair), Randy Taylor (Vice-Chair), John Burdek, Ken Taylor
<b>ZOOM:</b>	Blanche Warrington, Danny Cresswell, Cheyenne Bradley, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Franklin Patterson Jr.,
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Dennis Dickson
<b>STAFF:</b>	Graham Van Tighem, Steve Hossack
<b>SUPPORT:</b>	Sharon Kerr (Minute Taker)
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	Cassandra Wheeler, Karlie Knight, Janice Sibbeston (YFWET, Manager), Steve Buyck – (FNNND), Debborah Donnelly (YCS), Marc Cattet (YG – Environment), Randi Newton – (CPAWS), Gillian Rourke -TTC

---

Carl Sidney welcomed the participants back to the meeting for day two. He confirmed quorum and reviewed the agenda for the day.

---

### **BOARD/TRUST DIRECTED CONSERVATION PROJECTS – C. Sidney, K. Taylor**

Ken Taylor reviewed the Board/Trust Directed Conservation Projects. They have a budget of \$50,000 to spend by the end of the next fiscal year. In terms of the predator-prey dynamic projects Ken Taylor raised the following questions:

- We need to narrow and define the scope. Is it bears, wolves, or both?
- Will we hire a contractor to survey existing literature?
- Will we partner with the department or do this on our own?
- Will we hire a contractor, or do this in-house?
- If we hire a contractor, will it be a sole source contract?
- Who will take the lead?
- What is the timeline — this summer, next summer, or fall?
- Will there be some fieldwork? Will we hire someone to do some of the work?

Graham Van Tighem referred board members to the *Wolf Ungulate Discussion – Notes Dec 2021* document, under tab 8, which summarizes the Board Trust Directed Ungulate Discussion from December 2021. He also provided a summary of the Enhancement Trust annual funding for pelt handling incentives through the Yukon Outfitters Association. The emphasis has been to help offset the cost of processing a wolf versus processing a marten. Those who have experience processing either of those animals know that the time it takes for a wolf is much greater than a marten and the financial outcome is about the same. It is more advantageous to deal with marten than wolves. However, trapping marten doesn't do anything to benefit the ungulate populations.

Graham provided a brief overview of the discussion from the December 2021 meeting and the meeting between Executive and Marc Cattet. Is there an interest in restricted access to off-road vehicle areas or habitat work like prescribed burns? At the last meeting there was a suggestion

to focus on specific areas such as Southern Lakes and Haines Junction. The Enhancement Trust has spent considerable money on wolf-snaring initiatives with Frank Johnstone. There are thousands of snares. Trappers have been trained and are already out in the field. It is possible to combine some of the Trust's work with research work. CTFN is looking into moose recovery in very specific areas on a rotational effort and off-road vehicle special management areas to restrict access into places to help moose recovery.

Some of the questions raised regarding the scope of this work were: Should it be moose, caribou, and/or sheep? Is it ungulates all together, or just moose? Should we look at wolves, bears, or both?

Graham suggested that the easiest thing to focus on is wolves by utilizing the guidelines established within the Wolf Conservation Management Plan. If we focus on moose, the caribou will also benefit. Focusing on two major areas can help us achieve realistic results. It could be possible to set up a multi-year project.

Janice Sibbeston provided an update on the funding. The Trust has spent \$160,000 for the wolf incentive program for the Yukon Outfitters Association, and \$70,000 for Blue Moon Trapping for snare setting. As a registered charity, we must ensure that \$50,000 is spent within the upcoming fiscal year. This may be for a longer period, but we must follow charity constraints.

Carl Sidney said the next step is to put this forward to Marc Cattet. The working group will include Graham Van Tighem, Ken Taylor, Randy Taylor, Danny Creswell, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, and Sebastian Jones. Sebastian can be part of the initial discussions and/or be on the working group.

#### Comments/Questions:

Members suggested several ideas to move forward, including:

- Hiring a facilitator and developing a strategic plan on how to move forward with this project.
- Developing a request for proposals to put out to tender to examine what the Board wants for this project.
- Establishing a working group to develop a request for proposals.
- Working with Yukon Government to develop a plan.
- Supporting trappers to focus on wolves starting with two main projects for ungulate restoration with predator and habitat management as a part.
- These things can happen concurrently.
- Janice and the Trust have laid some of the groundwork for people to do some intensive trapping in all the road-accessible trap lines from Morley Lake all the way to Carcross. We need a trapper like a Frank Johnstone or Ken Reeder involved in this discussion to set a project in place to expand trap lines or make trails. Snares are paid for and supplied. Trapper training is facilitated either through Ken or Frank.
- Finlayson recovery program is considered a failure, in some ways, because government went in and did wolf culling and things like that. There was a huge recovery of the caribou. Then they pulled up stakes and left. What's different with this idea is that these trap lines are already in place. The trappers are already there if the trails are set, the snares remade, and the project starts. Hypothetically, a band of trap lines follow the highway from Jake's corner all the way to Carcross. If this works, we won't need to helicopter people in or set up a big base camp. It's not a big aerial operation. The

trappers are already in there doing their job. Part of this is supporting the trappers who are in place and getting trappers like Frank Johnstone, Ken Reeder and others who can go in and help. Part of this is training the young trappers who potentially have lines but don't have the expertise. This as a multi-faceted and a multiyear project that may cost more money upfront in the first year or two. We have been poised to make this happen for a long time.

- This is a good opportunity for the Board to have a different view on this. Trapping culls wolves is a key factor in ongoing restoration, but it's not the only factor. Many factors are involved including prescribed burning and habitat protection areas. The Board can look at many things rather than just focusing on wolves. The Trust has spent over \$200,000 on trapping wolves. Let's look at what else can be done.
- If we could recover the population without killing a single wolf, that would be my favorite way to do this, but that won't happen. I'm for looking at access. Access is clearly a major challenge for ungulate populations. We can look at habitat and burn areas. Ten years after a fire, there's a whole bunch of alders growing and the whole bunch of moose in there. I don't know the science on that but there was a lot of experience out there who felt that was a way to do it. We've been averaging \$22,000 a year, over the last number of years. We have money to put into it. It's not like we're taking away from anything else to invest in this. I expect the outfitters in the areas that we choose would be happy to kick some money in because they're going to benefit at business. YG has some money. We can make a partnership to get the right things done and wolves will just be part of it. Once in a while we could encourage folks to fill that bear tag if there are a lot of bears in the area.
- We've been talking about this forever. The Finlayson caribou was successful but had short-term success. We're doing well with the Southern Lakes caribou, but it has taken some 20-odd years of doing this. I started working on this caribou recovery program in the fall of '93. We looked at all possibilities. We set up a working group that involve six First Nations, BC, and territorial government with federal funding, and it is a success. We've done this with our urban caribou. With no bear hunting on the side of the road, we have bears coming out of our ears here. They're hit on the road every summer. What are we putting in place or supporting that goes against what we want? The Southern Lakes herd is still hard hit. We don't know the numbers. There was a survey this fall, and we probably won't know the numbers until summer.
- We talk about trapping and denning. Male bears are basically the regulators. Who else but a male bear will eat a grizzly cub with its mother standing right there? In different parts of the world, people started getting rid of the male bears because they were supposedly the ones killing all the calves. The bear population took off because of that. A lot of things have been done or tried. We need a working group on this and not with just within ourselves. We have a First Nation and RRC that are very knowledgeable. We also have a land management board. We have some young people who are up and coming.
- We have trap lines that haven't been utilized in years. I tried to turn them all into one community trap line or a group trap line so that if somebody is trapping on their trap line with three unused trap lines around, that person can go in there or we can take people in there.
- We had six First Nations with the Southern Lakes caribou recovery and now it is possibly a moose recovery. They're still hunting there. For the caribou recovery to work, we asked people not to hunt them. We've asked the government why there are eight permits in our

area. They said there were only two or three moose that were taken. That may be two or three moose too many. The First Nation right to harvest in our area must come first. When we know the numbers and when we work with the off-road vehicle access, we can get the First Nations onside to leave the area alone for four or five years. We can study this. We can do ground truthing and monitoring out there. There are a lot of ways we can do this without bringing in gunships. I have no problem with taking a helicopter into remote area and setting 2,000 snares and checking them or cutting the trail in there. I don't agree with the gunships. Everybody who was involved with that Finlayson gunship program are mostly gone now. I don't agree with that. That would be last "do or die" resort. Let's look at a working group and an area where we can work with the government. The Southern Lakes works well because it became a community herd. Everybody phoned in when they saw caribou. There were also a lot of non-First Nation elders who went out on the land for years and they had a lot of information. Let's get a working group, an area where we can work hand in hand with the First Nations, the locals, the RRC, and trappers. We must find a way to get this work in in different areas. Rotation is good. It's not a blanket no harvesting. Let's have a breeding ground where animals can flourish and then expand out of there and then go to another area.

- We won't have a lot of trappers utilizing the area in central Yukon. They can't make a living. Every area is different. There may be a lot a lot of wolves up in the Whitehorse area but here, on my trap line, there are not a lot of wolves. Wolves self-regulate.
- We need to recognize the traditional knowledge part of wolf management. If they're not self-regulating, why don't we just go into the dens and take a few wolves out of there. We don't need to go and take a whole bunch of wolves where they are self-regulating.
- We need to recognize the wildlife movement. Up in central Yukon, a lot of moose are moving. There is a lot of cows, but not a lot of bulls. We're also hearing from our brothers and sisters up north up in the Sahtu region up in the Gwitchin area over in NWT that they see a lot of moose up in their areas, which, historically, was caribou country. There were a few moose, but now moose are moving more. We need to look into that.
- Sometimes we shoot the bull before it has a chance to mate with the cows. Our bull to cow ratio is really low right now. That's the big issue in central Yukon. I agree with having a working group. It's an excellent start.
- For wolf predation, we really need to try and incorporate a little more TK from our First Nation elders on how they did it in the past.
- The caribou herd in our area at Ethel Lake is 250 strong. We have a voluntary no hunting of that caribou herd over the last 15 to 20 years. That caribou herd is staying sustainable. It may drop down to 10 or 15, but it always comes back up. The habitat is good, and the wolf population is fairly stable.
- We have a meeting with Marc Cattet on February 21, 2022. We could bring this forward to him and look to partner with Environment to set up a working group.
- Where does a trapper go to get protection from the hunters? A trapper in the Twin Lakes area, which is a big bison hunting area, said for the whole winter his traps were disturbed. Every time he went to check them, they were snapped. Do they go to the Minister of Environment? Do they go right to the conservation officer in Carmacks, Whitehorse, and Twin Lakes area?
- It's against the law to disturb trappers' traps. If the person has issues with that, they must go to the conservation officer. A conservation officer can press charges if there is any

evidence. If I were the trapper, I would put a trail camera up and figure out who's doing it. The COs deal with that.

- It is important to involve land stewards or guardians.
- This is a great opportunity for the Board to assert its primary instrument status. We need to absolutely be in control of this. A large group is least effective so we should keep our numbers low.

Graham Van Tighem discussed final points including:

- The Board needs to establish the working group and determine who will be involved in this conversation.
- Yukon government offered to have someone from the habitat branch sit on this working group.
- The Board must spend the \$50,000 within the year.
- It is very important to involve First Nation governments.
- This is an opportunity to set strategic priorities to spend funding. Graham would be happy to do that with working group representatives.
- Suggested members are Graham, Danny Cresswell, Randy Taylor, Ken Taylor, and Michelle Dawson-Beattie. Sebastian put his name forward for the scoping discussion, but he is also interested in participating on the working group as well. Graham suggested Frank Johnstone and/or Ken Reeder be included for discussions about outcomes.
- The board needs to scope this in a smaller group based on feedback. Then this can be opened up to working group meetings.

---

### **Yukon Forum Fish and Wildlife Working Group Steering Committee Update – C. Sidney, R. Taylor, G. Van Tighem**

Randy Taylor provided an update from the last meeting he attended.

The steering committee reviewed the pros and cons of virtual meetings. The result of the discussions was to plan for an in-person workshop, possibly on the land, when the pandemic and COVID restrictions ease up.

The next meeting date will be set for April, and they will re-evaluate the COVID situation.

Minutes from the steering committee meeting are under tab 9 of the meeting kit.

---

### **Setting Board Meeting Dates for 2022-2023 – G. Van Tighem**

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the suggested Board meeting dates for 2022-23. He suggested the April 26 – 28 in-person meeting dates should be set as other meetings will overlap if dates are changed. The dates were set as follows:

- April 26 – 28
- June 7 – 9 (Location to be confirmed)
- October 18 – 20



- December 13 – 15
- February 14 – 16

Several locations were suggested for the on-the-land meeting, including Cache Creek, Ross River area, White River area, and Fort Selkirk. Consensus was to focus on the Ross River area, possibly Francis Lake, with meeting support from Ross River Dena Council for cooks et cetera. Graham will make inquires and report back at the next meeting.

---

### **Caribou Harvest During the Rut – G. Van Tighem, S. Hossack**

Graham Van Tighem introduced this topic. The Board was asked to consider advancing a regulation change to adjust caribou seasons during the rut. People hunt moose during the rut without issue. However, caribou is a different animal. The Board has had discussions with the public, hunters, and associations about whether caribou meat harvested during the peak of the rut is edible.

Graham reviewed the *Caribou Harvest Distribution* document provided in the meeting kit. He asked if the Board is interested in working on this issue or speaking with associations about changing the mountain caribou hunting from August 1 to September 25, and reopening from October 5 or 10, onwards until the end of the year, potentially adding another 10-day closure at the end of October.

The primary concern is that outfitters need to make a living and the non-resident harvest is high during the time when the caribou are rutting, although it's not as high as the times in pre rut. This would restrict harvest of mountain caribou during the times when they would be seasonally abundant for some.

#### **Comments/Questions:**

- Odour – Is there any way to mitigate the odour? We don't know of any way to mitigate or deal with the smell. No matter what you try to do to cure the meat (smoke, hang, or age) or how you prepare it (chili or sausage), the taste will still be there.
- Rutting periods – Different herds rut at different times and we're not sure the season can be shut down and then reopened. There may not be a 10-day window because, where they're located geographically, north or south, could affect the rutting period. Physiologically, caribou don't go through the rutting process the same way as other ungulates. There is also a difference in the age of the caribou. Big mature bulls will run a lot harder than the younger bulls.
- Educational campaign — Many hunters are choosing not to hunt during the rut. We could choose to have an educational campaign rather than to close the harvest.
- First Nation perspective — The First Nation of Nacho Nyak Dun's perspective is that if you are harvesting a caribou in the rut, you should be consuming it also.
- Data – Can the data be separated by herds because of the different rutting times? The Caribou Harvests – Seasonal Distribution graph from the *Caribou Harvest Distribution* document could show more harvest during the rutting time. Mountain caribou season is from August 1 to October 31. This implies that a substantial proportion of this harvest includes the Porcupine Caribou. This graph might show substantially more significant harvest during the rut. Take out the Porcupine Caribou which has the rut after November.

It is basically irrelevant to this data. That proportion of harvest between the September 25 and November 10 becomes considerably more significant.

- This conversation came about from addressing an education campaign before looking at making regulation changes. Taking the 10 or 20 caribou during the rut is not a huge number, but people tend to target larger caribou and they're harvesting caribou that are inedible due to lack of education or otherwise. They are harvesting caribou within herds that are either threatened, endangered, or at risk. Woodland caribou are not generally doing as well as barren ground caribou like Porcupine Caribou. Twenty bulls taken out of the rutting season, or before they rut, is not necessarily an insignificant number, even if it's spread out over a few herds.
- Historically, when Porcupine caribou tend to come down the Dempster, they do occasionally overlap as far south as the Hart River herd. When licensed harvesters are going up, to target Porcupine Caribou, it is not always after the end of the woodland caribou hunting season, after October 31. There are a few caribou hunters who go up toward the border earlier in the season to target bull caribou. That might be captured in the data in the *Caribou Harvest Distribution* graph. Considering the historical trends, it is, quite likely that there's only a few Porcupine Caribou being captured in the data between September 19 and October 2.
- This could be an educational campaign with the help of the outfitters and the Fish and Game Association. We should provide the opportunity for people to make the right decision. If the number of caribou harvested by resident and non-resident hunters during the rut drops, then this is the desirable outcome.
- Involve First Nations and RRC's in this discussion to get their perspective and information. We can also include a caribou biologist to see what information they can provide. Some of the questions to consider are: What does targeting young caribou do to the overall herd? Is it beneficial to educate and redirect licensed hunters to target younger caribou? Will harvesting younger animals potentially hurt herd population?
- For a lot of animals and ungulates over two years old, their chances of survival go up astronomically. If people harvest all the younger animals and ungulates, it could potentially harm the herd. This goes into recruitment, age, and sex ratios. A biologist would have a better understanding of that.
- Consider looking at the moose harvest and compare it with this graph. Most of the moose are harvested between September 15 to October 1. The caribou harvest may have a lot to do with opportunity. If people don't harvest a moose and a caribou comes along, they take it. Education could address that situation.

Graham Van Tighem concluded by saying that issues like these are driven by board members and Board meeting discussions. Staff started to research this issue within the office, and then posed it to the Board. He asked for approval from the Board to follow up on this issue with an educational component, website, and communication. Graham suggested that the Board could partner with the Yukon Outfitters Association and Yukon Fish and Game Association to do some of this work. Something could be included in the hunting synopsis to address the quality of meat of caribou harvested between the rutting dates.

This topic will be brought back to the next meeting. Shawn will obtain further information and more detailed figures to supplement the information that was presented including, historic data.

## **Moose Harvest Management Update – G. Van Tighem**

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the Moose Harvest Management Update. Letters from Minister Frost dated January 17, June 3, and December 15, 2020, and a letter to Minister Frost dated July 8, 2020, were provided in meeting kits.

Graham provided an update on the following:

- The Board received a letter from Minister Clarke regarding the status of his interest in advancing regulation changes, as well as the moose harvest survey work that was going to happen this fall. Graham was able to participate in one of the moose surveys.
- A few years ago, letters were sent to all Yukon First Nations and Renewable Resources Councils on reviewing and updating the *Moose Harvest Management Guidelines* document which is still outstanding. The guidelines are outdated. Is there interest in having that discussion to update the guidelines?
- Steven Buyck from First Nation of Nacho Nyak Dun is talking about moose management within the traditional territory of Nacho Nyak Dun. NND wants to talk to the Board about moose management measures to be applied in their traditional territory. NND said more and more hunters are out there and less moose is available.
- The competition for moose is certainly high and the First Nations have a close working relationship with Mark O'Donoghue and the RRC's which is positive. There is concern for the future of moose management in the territory. A lot of Dawson locals hunt around Dawson in the Goldfields. There is a concern that they are inundated by Whitehorse hunters. The same can be said for folks hunting in Teslin and Watson Lake.
- Carcross/Tagish First Nation has almost no licensed harvest in their traditional territory. They are looking at a moose recovery for certain areas. They are looking at a total allowable harvest model where people can't access certain areas for upwards of five years to help moose recover. Right now, they find that moose are not recovering.
- The regulation changes advanced last year are all going forward. We now have a whole suite of new PHAs in place. It means that those areas accessible by road and by ATV will be off limits to everyone except for those who successfully get a PHA.
- Sometimes just being there, traveling around, and camping in those areas is enough for people now. If they know that the area is closed, except for permits, that essentially moves a significant number of hunters out of those three major areas and into other parts of the Yukon.
- We need to meet with Marc Cattet and Sophie Czetwertynski to talk about our overall strategy for moose management in the territory.
- If we haven't already hit the critical threshold, we will see larger problems with congestion, competition, and First Nations inability to access their 16.2 harvesting rights.
- The hope is to talk about how we want to follow up with this concern and other ideas or concerns that folks wish to share.

### Comments/Questions:

- Q) When the moose survey was done, did the surveyors record whether the moose were male or female? A) Yes, adult male, adult female, two-year-olds, and calves.

- During the past hunting season, a lot of hunters saw a lot of cow moose. This could be because the bulls were higher in the mountain. It will be interesting to see the data.
- From the flight surveys, there were a lot of bulls, cows, and younger animals. The calculations will determine the actual ratios between the different sex and age groups. That will give a better idea of the sustainability of the individual populations.
- Another hunting pressure could come from the rapid population growth in Yukon. Yukon is one of the fastest growing jurisdictions, per capita, in Canada. Our population has grown by 5,000 since the last census.
- One of the biggest issues First Nations governments are dealing with is trying to get hunting information from their citizens. The Board could try to assist, but members are unsure how the Board should start the process. One suggestion is to contract a First Nation individual who is well respected in the area and have that person travel around and try to create some relationships with First Nations.
- This could be a good way to launch the new website to share this information and to try to get information to help First Nations gather harvest data.
- Trying to gather information from the First Nations is an issue of trust.
- One suggestion is to talk to the outfitters about their hunting practices and the moose they are harvesting.
- Harvest reporting is a challenging topic. Some nations in the Yukon do it well and have had good success. There are many ways to do it such as individual reporting and household reporting, et cetera. The information is unique and depends on what you are looking for. Are you looking for qualitative things like hunting effort, changes on the land, observations, subsistence needs? Or are you looking for quantitative information — just numbers. There's a trust aspect to the information as to how it will be used as well as confidentiality issues.
- Could this be considered part of the ungulate recovery to put some of those funds toward a larger ungulate management and recovery strategy? We could hire a contractor, or the Board could go forward with building relationships with First Nations.
- Marc Cattet provided an update on the Wildlife Management Advisory Council North Slope which is seeking a contractor to look at the harvest data reporting among Inuvialuit communities. The issues are very much the same. There is distrust from some harvesters. Community capacity is also an issue. Fish and Wildlife Branch has a contract with Fiona Schmiegelow of Yukon University. She is working with Paul McCarney who has several students working with him on a literature review on wildlife management in circumboreal and circumarctic communities around the world. They are looking at other ways to effectively manage wildlife populations without the heavy reliance on harvest data. They are also looking at innovative ways to get people to divulge harvest data using things like smart phone apps, high resolution complex games to show harvest data or different amounts of harvest data, and different ways to educate people. That project started a couple months ago. The first phase will be done in the summer, and it will likely continue to a second phase. Mark will report back at a later stage.
- Carl Sidney said this will be an ongoing agenda item. Regarding the Yukon University and the students attending the renewable resource training, it might be a good opportunity to use them to do presentations on the importance of recording harvest data.
- Regarding the discussion on trust, several years ago TTC collected data from their citizens. There is a trust issue with the actual First Nation hunter giving the information. It's not

necessarily about the First Nation government having trust issues, it's the actual hunter out there on the ground. There should be an educational component so that the First Nation hunters are educated on the importance of the harvest data and its uses. We need to look at education on the importance of gathering the data for decision making.

---

**MEMBERS TIME — IN CAMERA**

No minutes were recorded

### DAY 3: Thursday, February 17, 2022 – Regular Meeting

---

**PRESENT:** Carl Sidney (Chair), Randy Taylor (Vice-Chair), Ken Taylor

**ZOOM:** Blanche Warrington, Danny Cresswell, Cheyenne Bradley, Michelle Dawson-Beattie, Sebastian Jones, Dawn Kisoun, Franklin Patterson Jr., John Burdek.

**REGRETS:** Dennis Dickson

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

**SUPPORT:** Sharon Kerr (Minute Taker)

**IN ATTENDANCE(ZOOM):** Marc Cattet (YG – Environment), James MacDonald, Monica Krieger  
Cassandra Wheeler, Karlie Knight

---

#### Yukon Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Trust

Refer to the Enhancement Trust minutes.

---

#### Yukon Salmon Subcommittee Budget Approval and Update – Monica Krieger

James MacDonald introduced Monica Krieger who is the new Executive Director for the YSSC. Monica Krieger introduced herself and provided her background information.

Monica Krieger and James MacDonald reviewed the DFO 2022 – 2023 Contribution Agreement.

**Motion – 2022-04:** That the Board approve the YSSC 2022-23 Budget as presented.

**Moved by:** Danny Creswell

**Seconded by:** Dawn Kisoun

**Passed by:** Consensus

James MacDonald provided a brief update on YSSC activities.

- The next YSSC meeting will be March 10 and 11, 2022.
- The Yukon River Panel pre-season meeting will take place in April.
- In May there will be pre-season engagement meeting with Yukon First Nations, RRC's, stakeholder groups, and the public. He also advised that Cathy Merkel is the new Executive Secretary for the board through DFO.

#### Comments/Questions:

- Q) Is the YSSC working on the salmon rehabilitation program with the salmon eggs? A) The Yukon River Panel is the decision maker for the restoration and enhancement fund. The YSSC does have a part to play, and many of the decisions are based on recommendations provided by technical analysis from the joint technical committee, which is a bilateral body between the US and Canadian fishery managers.

Graham Van Tighem welcomed Monica to the YSSC. Elizabeth MacDonald will be in touch with the YSSC through her new position at CYFN. There is a potential for partnerships on projects.

Closing Prayer was provided by John Burdek

Meeting Adjourned 11:35 am.