

YUKON FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

April 25, 26, 27 2023

MINUTES

Yukon Inn & Zoom

DAY 1: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 – Regular Meeting

PRESENT: Michelle Dawson-Beattie (Chair), Sebastian Jones (Vice Chair), Randy Taylor, Dawn Kisoun, Ron Chambers, Janice Sibbeston, Cheyenne Bradley -am, Pearl Callaghan, Ken Taylor, John Burdek, Franklin Patterson

ZOOM: Blanche Warrington, Cheyenne Bradley - pm

REGRETS:

STAFF: Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Steve Hossack

SUPPORT: Sharon Kerr (CAH Services, Minute Taker)

IN ATTENDANCE: John Ryder (Fish and Wildlife, Environment), Robert Perry (Fish and Wildlife, Environment), Michael Draper (Land Management, EMR)

WELCOME AND OPENING PRAYER

Michelle Dawson-Beattie welcomed everyone to the meeting and called the meeting to order at 9:06 am. Dawn Kisoun said the opening prayer. There was a roundtable of introductions.

ADMIN AND FINANCES (TAB 01)

A. AGENDA REVIEW— M. Dawson-Beattie

Michelle Dawson-Beattie reviewed the agenda.

Motion – 2023-04: That the Board approve the April 25 to 27, 2023 agenda as presented.

Moved by: Franklin Patterson

Seconded by: Dawn Kisoun

Passed by: Consensus.

B. FINANCIAL UPDATE (TAB 02) – D. Sheldon

Diane Sheldon reviewed the financial statements to March 31, 2023, provided in the meeting kit.

Motion – 2023 - 05: That the Board accept the financial report to March 31, 2023 as revised.

Moved by: Randy Taylor

Seconded by: Dawn Kisoun

Passed by: Consensus.

Comments/Question:

- There was a question asked about the deficit of \$14,000 on the Ungulate Enhancement Working Group. After discussion Diane was asked to make the appropriate amendments and the budget would be recalled on Thursday.

Michelle Dawson-Beattie tabled the budget to Thursday.

C. DECEMBER/FEBRUARY BOARD MINUTES (TAB 02) – D. SHELDON

Michelle Dawson-Beattie opened the floor for comments and discussions.

Comments/Questions:

December 13-15, 2022

- Page 2 – “Ken Taylor recommended that the committee put the multi-year funding option back on the table and to ask for specific language, regulations, policy guidelines, and federal directives that indicate a multi-year agreement is impossible.”
 - Ken asked if this was done?
 - Graham said they put this forward.
- Page 3 — Annual Audit – “Sebastian Jones said the YSSC does not get audited annually like the Board does. An audit is \$9500 per year and takes significant work from staff. He suggested an audit every five years.”
 - Graham provided an overview. This is a YG requirement, not an UFA requirement which is where we get our strength in the negotiation. It's not just the issue of doing the audit, it's also the issue of paying for the audit. In our case, Diane does a really good job, and the cost is \$9,500 out of the \$670,000 budget. If the RRC has a complicated audit, and it costs them \$10,000 it can equate to one 14th of their annual budget. If YG wants the audit, it is for them, not for us and we feel they should pay for it.
- Page 5 – “Action Item 2022-15: Graham Van Tighem will draft a response to the Grizzly Bear Protection Society and send it based on challenges with their website and our position on the Grizzly Bear Conservation Plan.”
 - Graham sent an email to Grizzly Bear Protection Society. He will get back to the members regarding his response.
- Page 17 – “Graham Van Tighem will reach out to Selkirk RRC and Carmacks RRC to see where they are with engagement and discuss sensitive areas management, Klaza caribou range, or other issues. He also suggested having them at the RRC AGM as others are impacted.”
 - Graham reached out to the EDs of the RRCs, both in person and in writing, but has not yet received responses. He and Michelle were invited to present at the Northern Tutchone May Gathering and they can include this issue in their presentation.
- Page 2 – Cheyenne asked about the \$150.00 top up.
 - Michelle said DFO provides an honorarium of \$150.00 and YSSC provides a top up because it's only \$150.00.

Motion – 2023-06: That the Board accept the minutes for December 13 to 15, 2022 as amended.

Moved by: Ken Taylor

Seconded by: Franklin Patterson

Passed by: Consensus.

February 14-16, 2023 Minutes

- Page 4 — Ken asked about the etiquette poster that was to be made and posted at the meetings. Steve said the poster will be completed for the next meeting.
- Page 7 – Amendments to the Yukon *Wildlife Act* — Marc’s report indicated they were moving forward with the information from 2014. All the amendments were compiled. Have we reviewed those and do we agree? If the Department of Environment is only providing input into deciding what is necessary, then we're missing something.
 - Graham said the policy branch did the work already and this is a good question to ask Diane Gunter or Marc.
 - Ken suggested the Board should move on this before they come back and say they are ready to go.
 - Graham agreed, this was a challenge back in 2014. There was some conflict with Environment taking this on for First Nation governments because of the interpretation of the conformity issue among other things. First Nation governments should be part and parcel to those amendments.
 - Randy recalled that Marc discussed the work from 2014 which will be used as a starting point. It's a technical amendment.
- Michelle asked that the Action Items be reinstated and added to the minutes.
 - Graham said it was his responsibility and agreed that we need to bring it back.
- Amend Franklin’s name from “Franklyn” to “Franklin”.

Motion – 2023-07: That the Board accept the minutes for February 14 to 16, 2023 as amended.

Moved by: Dawn Kisoun

Seconded by: Ken Taylor

Passed by: Consensus.

D. EXECUTIVE REPORT (TAB 04) – M. Dawson-Beattie, S. Jones, G. Van Tighem

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the Executive report that was provided under Tab 4 in the meeting kit.

Comments/Discussion:

- Ungulate Working Group — Will the working group provide a written report? Michelle said this will be covered on Day 2. Lars prepared an update that was sent out to the group yesterday. They have only met with three RRCs and they want more RRCs involved. Steve has notes and will incorporate them into a report for the members.
- Wolverine National Management Plan
 - Ron Chambers discussed wolverine. People don't realize wolverine never had big numbers. People make decisions based on numbers. From his experience, wolverine numbers are low. It's important for people to be aware of that because they may think

they're going extinct if they don't see them every day. They'll make regulations that don't really meet the picture. We need to have trappers to verify those things so that we don't try to manage to what was never there.

E. CORRESPONDENCE REVIEW (TAB 05) — G. Van Tighem

Graham Van Tighem reviewed correspondence letters provided under Tab 5 in the meeting kit. He provided an overview of the letter from the minister in response to the Board's official letter regarding the *Yukon Wildlife Act* and bringing it into conformity with final agreements. The letter was not included in meeting kits as it was received after the Board kit was published. Graham suggested the Board follow-up regarding a potential partnership with the Yukon Forum Fish and Wildlife Working Group who may be tasked with this work.

Michelle asked the members to highlight the letters they wanted to address.

Comments/Questions:

- New Letter from the Minister – Pearl asked if the lands and resources managers meet on a regular basis.
 - Michelle said yes. It's part of that diagram Steve sent out. They're all supposed to be meeting. Melina Hogan is the chair of that group. They are not sure how often they meet.
 - Graham said they had a meeting last year to get a working group going but the attendance had declined from their first meeting. The land and resource managers are busy folks and don't want another working group to talk about priorities that are not their own. This initiative will spur some better interest in that working group.
- Letter 13 – 2023 Permit Hunt Authorization lottery
 - Ken said the cancellation of the permit hunt in the park/game sanctuary is not on the agenda and should be discussed.
 - Graham provided an overview on adaptive changes to the Sifton-Miners permit increase from 12 to 24, and the discussion with Kluane First Nation about shutting down their Kluane sheep hunt due to conservation concerns. Marc sent a letter to the Board requesting support. The plan was to discuss it at the April Board meeting, but the minister said it would be brought up with Cabinet before this meeting. The Executive wrote a letter in support of those two adaptive changes which weren't presented to the whole board. This is an after-the-fact situation. It had to be rushed through which is what the Executive does when there's a timeline.
 - Randy disagreed. There's a month between when we first received the letter and the deadline for support. It's a good example for why we need internal meetings. He cautioned the Executive about making unilateral decisions on regulations. The Board could have been advised and included by email.
 - Ken expressed concerns about this substantive policy decision which came out of an Executive meeting. We could have had a quick Zoom meeting. Ken provided an overview of a discussion he had with Jason Cunning and the Premier about concerns with the permit hunt cancellation. He knew nothing about this decision and it was not discussed by the Board. Graham told him it was discussed by the Executive and it needed a quick decision. He told Graham he was uncomfortable with the Executive

making a Board decision on policy matters. It's okay if the Executive decides to hire a contractor for something within reason because that's administration. But with policy, more information would have come to the table if we had a bigger discussion. We should talk about that at some point.

- Graham provided clarification on his discussions with Marc and the last-minute changes to the deadline. Graham assumed this was going to be discussed at the April Board meeting (based on the email Marc sent) but they were handed a shortened deadline by the Minister and the Executive responded. This is for one-year, and is not a major Policy Change, and this was supported by the Kluane First Nation. We could have brought it to the Board, but it would have been decided by the Minister if we had. The letter had one timeline, the Minister's office provided a second shorter timeline – so the Executive responded.
- Ken asked if they were going to talk more about this during Member's Time.
- Michelle said the biggest factor was that Kluane First Nation was supporting by not having their permit hunt. The wildlife survey showed the sheep were hit hard over the last two years and the populations were down. She confirmed the Board would have further discussion during Member's Time, but there is staggering evidence to support this change.
- Ken acknowledged the Executive Director job is tough. His point is that there is a lot of experience on the Board. If we don't have time for a discussion, we can say no to providing support.
- Michelle acknowledged the concerns raised regarding communications between Executive and the Board and the quick decision making. There's so much going on and she's working full time. It's hard to keep things straight and to get the information out to the Board. We will make a more conscious effort in the future.
- Sebastian appreciated this constructive criticism. It's a useful lesson.
- Letter 9 – YOA — Wolf Pelt Handling Incentive 2022/23 — Michelle provided an overview of the correspondence from Shawn Wassel regarding the Enhancement Trust funding cut and the Board's response in Letter #17. Michelle provided an overview of her discussion with Shawn. YOA will apply again. Cheyenne pointed out that other projects come to the table and no one can receive funding forever. Graham said this can be discussed further under the ungulate working group update.

F. YFWMB AND YFWET SIGNING UPDATES (TAB 06) – D. SHELDON

Diane Sheldon set up the signing authority at the bank during the meeting.

G. Yukon *Wildlife Act* Regulation Change Process Review Update and Plan for 2023-2024 – G. Van Tighem

Graham Van Tighem reviewed the Yukon *Wildlife Act* Regulation Change Process Review Update and Plan for 2023-2024 provided under Tab 7 in the meeting kit. The information included a legal opinion from Dave Joe dated July 2007, *Harvest Regulation Process Jurisdictional Review*, and a *Regulation Change Process Review YFWMB Project Proposal 2022-23*. Graham provided background on the review as part of the Board's strategic goals, the regulation change process,

challenges/difficulties, and communication with YG. YG will not continue with their analytical process until this review is done. The Board has not had any meaningful dialogue with YG and we have been informed that they have conducted an internal review and have sought a legal opinion. The Board is unaware of the implications and proposed changes. The Board tried to reinstate and revitalize the process in the interest of fish and wildlife and conservation concerns. Timing is a concern due to the four-year gap and the five-year review. Regulation changes are now nearly a decade behind. He suggested regular meetings between the Board's working group and YG to help sort out important issues. He also suggested that a contractor could facilitate the academic review and assist with the abstract issues. We need to improve the process as it is not transparent. We need to get this moving again because of conservation concerns.

Comments/Questions:

- YG has to be better prepared and provide a template to the public when a member of the public wants to propose a regulation change. It is not the job for Steve or any member of the Board to do that.
- The reason why this is in the UFA is to have more people at the table making the decisions. It was not to be just one party or the other. One suggestion is to get legal advice about the jurisdictional level that the Board is operating under. We need to set our process on what is required and vet the proposed regulations to meet that requirement. Sam Johnston, an elder from Teslin, said that to deal with problems is to make sure you have procedures and to follow those procedures.
- What are the next steps for the Board? Should the Working Group have a half-day meeting? Should the Board meet with Paul and reiterate what we heard from Board members? Should we have a working group meeting?
- The Board should decide who will be on the committee or group to meet with YG and Marc.
- Graham suggested he and Steve meet with the working group to review the next steps and meet with Marc, Robert, and others as necessary.

H. Environment Yukon Update – John Ryder, Robert Perry

- **Habitat Management Update and Cumulative Effects**
- **Habitat Management and Ungulate Working Group**
- **Wildlife Surveys (2022 and 2023)**

Robert Perry provided an overview of his presentation *Completed and Planned Wildlife Surveys from 2022-2024* provided in Tab 8 of meeting kits.

Robert Perry gave an update on the current status of the Sifton-Miners range moose management unit for the 2023-24 hunting season. The Government of Yukon has doubled the moose permit hunt authorizations from 12 to 24 for the Sifton-Miners Range moose management unit. The increase in permit numbers was made possible by recent survey results indicating that the estimated population size is higher than expected.

John Ryder provided an update on: the Tagish habitat protection implementation committee; the HPA within the Kluane and White River traditional territories; Kwanlin Dün and Whitehorse hydro generation station agreement negotiation; the Teslin Tlingit Council, Champagne and Aishihik First Nations, and the First Nation of Nacho Nyak Dun fish and wildlife work plans; the cumulative

effects program; the Canada-Yukon bilateral nature agreement; the activity in Beaver River area and Clear Creek; and increased capacity. They've hired a cumulative effects senior biologist and a cumulative effects technician.

Comments/Questions:

- New species observations — Steve asked about observational information for newer species in the Yukon such as mule deer which can be seen in different locations such as Kusawa Lake and between Tagish and Carcross. Robert Perry said Sophie is looking at developing a phone app for people to indicate when and where they see deer or elk. He didn't know the status of the app.
- Deer survey — Sophie brought up a statistician, Dr. Subhash Lele. They set up a camera grid to determine the major deer corridors. Once they figure out where those major corridors are, they will set out traps to collar deer. The collars will allow them to see where the animals are moving. They also hope to get some sense of what the population might be.
- Deer harvesting information — The department receives very little information, except for the heads to check for diseases like Chronic Wasting Disease.
- Deer locations — Ron hasn't seen deer around Haines Junction or Cultus Bay for the last two years. Robert Perry said a bad winter can knock the numbers back. He doesn't know how intensive the First Nation hunting is either. Ron said the value of information is that if he has a right to harvest something but knows the numbers are dwindling, he could decide to stop. We need that information out there so people can decide for themselves rather than the law telling them what to do. People oppose the law because harvesting is part of our heritage. If people are aware of the situation, then those with respect and ethics will step back. If they don't get the information, people will continue on.
- Clear Creek herd — Graham asked about Clear Creek. Will it be a habitat protection area? What will we do about Clear Creek to ensure that at least that part of the remaining habitat is protected? John Ryder said there is management direction in Dawson. Land use planning will help. It's difficult because a lot of the disturbances are associated with placer and lower river valley disturbances. We're not sure what the effects are to the herd and the extent to which the herd has potentially been displaced by those activities yet. There's some exploration work along there. We're starting off with a range assessment and will also determine the pressures and mitigation measures we need to protect that herd. This is an area of concern and there is a lot of work to do. The Dawson regional plan isn't adequate enough to protect those values there and we need to look at other mechanisms.
- Graham asked Robert if there is any plan to put that area for PHA for licensed hunters. Robert Perry said there are a lot of concerns around that area. We tried to put collars on the Clear Creek herd, and we couldn't find it. We're, doing a lot of work to try to locate those animals. They're under a lot of stress. He has not heard anything about a PHA yet.

I. Resource Roads Regulations – Michael Draper

Michael Draper reviewed his presentation, *Proposed Resource Road Regulation Engagement and Consultation*, provided in Tab 9 of meeting kits. Topics included: why we need a regulation; contents of the regulation; and other elements of the regulation.

There was a lengthy discussion on the following:

- Roads — The primary permit holder maintains the roads. That person can work out user agreements with the access permit holders who may agree to help with maintenance.
- Transfer of roads from one user to the next and users of resource roads — We would have to go through a consultation process. Maintained roads are used by everybody. When we receive an application, we must ask who will be affected — trappers, big game outfitters, the public at large who may want to fish, or camp are all other users who we need to consider.
- Access permits and access authorizations — Michael provided an overview of: the difference between permits and authorizations; maintenance; and transfer of leases and primary permits.
- Additional roads off the primary road — The primary permit holder would have to go through a review process to develop additional roads off the primary road. It would be subject to consultation and the public engagement process because it would change the dynamic of the activity in the area. Not all roads are created equal. What's in there right now? Are there unmaintained roads like public roads? That changes the dynamic. If I can drive on a public road, I will use that road as far as I can. If my claims are off the same public road, then I would need a primary permit from the public road to the claim.
- Enforcement — Q) Regarding the access authorization, how will EMR monitor and enforce who is using the roads? A) It will depend on the road. We're trying to build road standards and classes of roads as part of the implementation. If there is a new road for the Coffee Gold Project, there will probably be someone monitoring the road or there will be a gate with a code access, a chain across the front, or a sign. It will depend on the nature of the road. It would be decided during the review process. If people are not supposed to be there, then we will have ticketing powers. We are considering having the primary permit holder keeping an eye on things.
 - The only groups allowed to access the roads are scientists and First Nations. Michael is not perceiving any problems with scientists. In his conversations, he is encouraging First Nations to work government to government. First Nations who are exercising their traditional harvesting rights get the authorizations quickly without the red tape. At the same time, we would have an idea of who is out there and can manage it accordingly.
 - Q) To a hunter, it doesn't seem fair that scientists and First Nations only have access authorizations to these roads on Crown land. Access is probably the biggest enemy of healthy big game populations. Why can First Nations exclusively access this new road across Crown land? The presentation said that access authorization must conform with the operational plan in the primary permit. If Victoria Gold puts a road on Crown land, does their application have to state that First Nations can use it? A) No. If the ops plan said that the road must be closed for three weeks in the winter because of caribou wintering area, that would apply to the access permit holder and the access authorization holder. In the beginning, the primary permit holder must go through consultation, engagement, screening, et cetera. There may be recommendations for seasonal restrictions, vehicle restrictions, or other terms and conditions. As far as traditional harvesting, the key element is that we want to have a conversation with the First Nation through the consultation process of the application. We will work with First Nation governments to find out if there is traditional harvesting and the nature of that harvesting.

- Staffing — Part 2 of our discussion and implementation is staffing. It will depend on how many roads fall into this new regulation. Some of the RRCs have said certain parts of Yukon are riddled with existing unmaintained roads. Industry may look at existing roads that they can use without having to get a permit and then seek permits when necessary.
- They will soon have a draft regulation in place. Revisions may follow.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:22 pm.

YUKON FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

April 25, 26, 27 2023

MINUTES

Yukon Inn & Zoom

DAY 2: Wednesday, April 26, 2023 – Regular Meeting

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| PRESENT: | Michelle Dawson-Beattie (Chair), Sebastian Jones (Vice Chair), Randy Taylor, Dawn Kisoun, Ron Chambers, Janice Sibbeston, Pearl Callaghan, Ken Taylor, John Burdek, Franklin Patterson |
| ZOOM: | Blanche Warrington, Cheyenne Bradley |
| STAFF: | Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Steve Hossack |
| SUPPORT: | Sharon Kerr (CAH Services, Minute Taker) |
| IN ATTENDANCE: | Amy Law (Fish and Wildlife, Environment), Mary Vanderkop (Animal Health Unit, Environment), Jess Walchuk (Animal Health Unit, Environment), Susan Skinner (Biologist/Project Manager, EDI), Chandni Kher (Casino), Jenna Bell (Ausenco), Monica Krieger (Executive Director, YSSC) |

J. CHISANA CARIBOU MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE (TAB 10) – A. Law

Amy Law reviewed her PowerPoint *Management plan for the Chisana caribou herd* which was included under Tab 10 in the meeting kits. Topics included: information on who is involved; past work; current work and next steps; summary of major changes; introduction and context; management goal; objectives; annual harvest allocation; population indicators; and implementation and review. Also included was the *Renewal of the Management plan for the Chisana Caribou Herd December 15, 2022*.

Comments/Questions:

- Ken asked if Amy had consulted with David Dickson, who is an outfitter in the area, regarding his concerns with the caribou. Has David received a copy of the draft and has he had any input? He would have a lot to offer as someone who is out on the land a lot. Amy will find out whether the herd range is in his outfitting area. She will mention this to Shawn Taylor, the Kluane Regional Biologist who is in close contact with David. Graham also indicated he spoke with David and provided him with a copy of the plan.
- Q) Are the people of Northway, Alaska involved? How involved are the First Nations people?
A) Amy said they're not involved in the planning or meetings, but they are engaged and consulted by the national park. She expects a similar level of engagement will happen with this plan. The parties are planning to engage with local communities. In Alaska, harvest on the herd is restricted to those communities that have federal subsistence. There are 10 communities who are allowed to harvest the Chisana caribou herd. More information is

included in the presentation. The only harvest is done within Wrangell National Park. The permits are issued by the park, and they manage who's allowed to harvest.

- You must understand the management between the two jurisdictions and countries. In the past, they didn't understand how things worked on the US side. You can't see if you're going in the same direction. It's the same for other boards like the YSSC. We have First Nations subsistence rights which is not the same in Alaska. People get subsistence rights after they become a citizen for some time. This issue was raised at a meeting in Tok, and they were told that everybody's equal there. The point is that there is a historical, a cultural, and a political understanding of what wildlife means. People on committees and boards in Alaska need to know how we work so that they understand who they're talking to. Amy Law agreed. One of the strengths is having a management plan for the two jurisdictions. We explained in the plan how each party works, and it's a way for us to make decisions together.

Amy is looking for every party to provide feedback on the plan. Her direct email contact is Amy.Law@yukon.ca.

K. AISHIHIK BISON MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW UPDATE (TAB 11) – G. Van Tighem, S. Hossack

Graham Van Tighem reviewed his PowerPoint *The Draft Aishihik Bison Plan: An Overview* provided under Tab 11 of the meeting kit.

L. ANIMAL PROTECTION AND CONTROL ACT REGULATIONS AG BRANCH INDUSTRY ENGAGEMENT AND WILD BOAR (TAB12) – M. Vanderkop, J. Walchuk

Jesse Walchuk and Mary Vanderkop introduced themselves and provided their background. Mary reviewed the changes to the legislation, including substantive punitive sanctions for failure to comply with the legislation.

Jesse reviewed the aspects related to control and standards of care for livestock species. Jesse also provided an update on wild boar.

The information was provided under Tab 12 of the meeting kit.

Comments/Questions:

- Classification of wild horses —In the legislation, feral means a domestic species that is capable of surviving outside the care of people. We have a couple of feral populations that are surviving, reproducing, and thriving in the wild. We wanted to have tools to deal with those populations in the new act. Currently, the only tool we have for feral horses is to scare them off the highway. We would like to have different tools like administering drugs to prevent the mare from coming into season to limit the growth of the population so that they don't take over. The other option is always lethal control. If Yukoners were to decide that we don't want them on the landscape anymore because they compete with wildlife or they shouldn't be there, then lethal control needs to be authorized somewhere. The new act does that if that's the decision and there would be a very broad public engagement to determine that. Beaver Creek had a huge population of feral cats that were being fed by individuals. They were massively reproducing. They decimated the songbird population and attracted wolves to the

community. We had no legislative power to deal with that feral population that is really a domestic species and probably should have some care and control.

- The Board should be involved. If we feel there's a conflict, then a red flag should go up with this Board because that's why we're here. The Yukon is not like the rest of the provinces that have a lot of agriculture. The Yukon is closer to the wildlife. We need to be part of these discussions. We're appointed by the minister so that gives us some political power to make the argument. We need more information to back up our argument. We didn't know Beaver Creek had a cat problem. We need to know that. If they're affecting the wildlife, that's a red flag for us. That's our mandate. If somebody wants to bring a whole herd of animals to the Yukon, and Yukon is not prepared for it or it is a threat to wildlife, does that person carry that weight to go and change who we are? They have bison in the Northwest Territories, and they can't harvest any of them because of anthrax. We have restrictions for bringing sheep into the Yukon because they affect our wild sheep.
- Wild boar — Q) Michelle said that, in 2018, the Board was very adamant against allowing wild boar in Yukon. She doesn't recall any follow-up discussion about the guidelines. Why did they meet with the Fish and Game Association and not the Fish and Wildlife Management Board. We come out of the *Umbrella Final Agreement*, and it's our mandate. A) Jesse said that at that time, they were developing the guidelines, not legislation. There was no regulatory situation. We were trying to develop guidelines that were consistent with other jurisdictional standards to increase safety on behalf of these animals. At that point, consultation with any board would not have been to activate change. We were not able to do that then, but we are now. Also, we were contacted directly by the Fish and Game Association to talk specifically about the Eurasian boar.
- Graham said this Board has written letters already with respect to this issue. It's positive that Mary is here because she works with Environment and with Agriculture. It's important that her position is not in a silo. We're talking about allowing one farmer to economically breed and sell wild boar. That individual has a lot of other activities on the go. It's not really an economic conversation; it's more of a personal interest conversation. People have talked about this being a food security issue. Mary mentioned that there were 36,000 wild boars in Canada compared to 14.5 million pigs in Canada. Statistically, that's not a viable reason to call it an industry when it borders on a hobby, particularly when it's just one farm and it's so unique. It is possible to still have wild boar meat in the territory without farming because it can be imported frozen. It's important to call it like it is and to remember that this Board has been very clear on this position. We'll probably have more discussion about it later to get some direction. But one key thing that was mentioned is that those fencing guidelines are just guidelines. At some point, we need to know if that will become an enforceable rule.
- Q) Can the Board say "no" at this point? A) We are putting this out for consultation and letting those voices be heard. We don't have the approval from our minister to be consulting. We're here because your timing provided us an opportunity we didn't want to miss. The intent is consultation. This was put on the table based on what we've heard for the last three or four years. It's an option that we're presenting.

Mary and Jesse appreciated the feedback and the input from the Board. She encourages groups to put their thoughts in writing to her and Jesse. There will be an invitation letter from the ministers by the end of this week. That provides an opportunity for you to invite us back for further discussions.

CASINO MINE BASELINE STUDIES – EDI – C. Kher, S. Skinner

Susan Skinner, EDI Environmental Dynamics reviewed her presentation *Casino Building Our Future Together*, provided under Tab 13 of the meeting kit.

A copy of the minutes for this presentation was provided to the Board by Casino. See Casino and YFWMB Meeting Summary

UNGULATE WORKING GROUP UPDATE – M. Dawson-Beattie, G. Van Tighem, S. Hossack

Graham Van Tighem provided a high-level overview of the working group. Graham reviewed the conceptual framework, soundbite statements, communications strategy, harvest data, and *A Review of Yukon Plans: Relevance to Moose and Caribou Management* document provided in the meeting kits. The main highlights were as follows:

- Membership — Danny Cresswell’s appointment expired, and he has not yet been reappointed. When he is, he will be a member of the working group.
- Outreach — As agreed at the last meeting, the working group will take a break from their meetings and will focus on outreach. They managed to book four meetings with the RRCs. Unfortunately, those meetings were cancelled but the RRCs are looking to rebook. RRCs provided comments on community goals, priorities, concerns, successes, and challenges.
- Michelle and Graham will present on ungulate management at the May Gathering.
- Lars Jessup will have his contract renewed for another year per the guidelines from the previous year including the funding amount.
- Michelle and Steve met with the Alsek RRC. There are a lot of the same themes around access, habitat, permits, and predator management. They will start meeting with the remaining RRCs and First Nations.

Comments/Questions:

- Q) Why haven’t they been to Mayo? They have the regulation changes and some big issues going on. A) Graham said Mayo asked the Board to delay meeting with them until after May. Michelle visited the office in Mayo. They only have four members and are waiting on appointments. Barb said they can’t meet as they don’t have enough members, this is something Graham will follow up with.
-

YUKON SALMON SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE – M. Krieger

Monica Krieger reviewed her YSSC update. A copy was provided for Tab 15 of the meeting kit. A press release from March 30, 2023, and a series of slides for the YFWMB were included in the kit.

Comments/Questions:

- PSSI — Q) Are the Salmon Stewardship Director and Habitat Restoration Centre of Excellence under one funding pot? A) Monica Krieger said she and others have been trying to get an answer about this. Almost three years ago, DFO made this big announcement. Several million

dollars was announced for the BC and the Yukon. The goal of this new initiative was to restore and rebuild the declining salmon stocks throughout the Pacific region. They've created a bunch of new departments and staff positions in Vancouver. They're trying to do stuff in the Yukon, but they don't know how things work up here. They're asking for advice and input and they want to have workshops. We're trying to determine whether the subcommittee can access some of this funding. We submitted a proposal which was rejected because it didn't fit into the PSSI pillars. We've also asked if these funding pots are available to First Nations or other community groups and whether there an application process. That has never been made clear and there doesn't seem to be anything formal in place. There are a bunch of big projects happening in BC that are being funded under this initiative, including new hatchery or enhanced hatchery projects. YSSC members are frustrated that this funding seems to all be going to BC and that there's nothing left for the Yukon.

- Hatcheries — The Yukon River Panel has had conversations about potential hatcheries. It has always been an old hope, but it was raised at the panel meetings as a desperate measure. Salmon are facing extinction events. We're starting to talk about it and we're not anywhere close to advocating for hatcheries or making any decisions.
- The subcommittee is not having conversations about hatcheries. That's probably a conversation for the Salmon Stewardship Alliance. We must be clear that when we say “hatcheries”, we don't mean a full-blown facility. It's not a fish farm. We must be strategic about how we present the information to the public.
- Monica Krieger said they would like to access PSSI funding for a Salmon Stewardship Alliance led project, with the support of the subcommittee, to get out to the communities to have a conversation about hatcheries with communities and leadership.

MEMBERS TIME — IN CAMERA

No minutes were recorded.

YUKON FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING

April 25, 26, 27 2023

MINUTES

Yukon Inn & Zoom

DAY 3: Thursday, April 27, 2023 – Regular Meeting

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| PRESENT: | Michelle Dawson-Beattie (Chair), Sebastian Jones (Vice Chair), Randy Taylor, Dawn Kisoun, Ron Chambers, Janice Sibbeston, Pearl Callaghan, Ken Taylor, John Burdek, Franklin Patterson |
| ZOOM: | Blanche Warrington, Cheyenne Bradley |
| STAFF: | Graham Van Tighem, Diane Sheldon, Steve Hossack |
| SUPPORT: | Sharon Kerr (CAH Services, Minute Taker) |
| IN ATTENDANCE: | Nathan Millar (Strategic Alliances, EMR), Morgan Pennycook (Strategic Alliances, EMR), Skeeter Wright (Resources and Governance Consulting), Sarah Chan (Bilateral Nature Agreement, Environment), Craig Machtans (Northern Region Canadian Wildlife Service) |

Yukon Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Trust – K Taylor

Refer to the Enhancement Trust minutes.

FINANCE WORKING GROUP – R. Taylor, D. Sheldon, G. Van Tighem

Graham Van Tighem provided an overview of the transfer payment funding agreement including background information; members of the working group; the legal review of the TPFA; and improvements to the financial process. He reviewed the TPFA Discussion document between the Board and YG. One big change is that the agreement is signed by Aboriginal Relations and the Minister of Environment is no longer a signatory.

Graham said that they are trying to make the Board's agreement with government easier, not just for the Board, but for future people who work with the Board, as well as Renewable Resources Councils and all other boards and councils created under the *Final Agreements*.

Randy Taylor is pleased with the changes made so far. There have been a lot of meetings to work through the frustrations and to come to the point of making this work. A big part of this exercise has been building a relationship with the people who are administering this agreement. He agreed with Graham about this not just being about the Board today. It is for future Boards and RRCs to help them with the process.

Comments/Questions:

- Next steps — We have an interim TPFA that we will sign within the next few days. We will set a meeting in May with our working group and YG reps to continue these negotiations to get

us closer to a final TPFA. We asked the group if they were aware that the Board intends to apply whatever comes out of this to the RRCs. They said that they understood that was the intention of this working group. Although the RRCs might not see any major changes this year, the new TPFA will be applied to the RRCs as well in 2024-2025.

MINING LEGISLATION ENGAGEMENT – N. Millar, M. Pennycook S. Wright

Michelle Dawson-Beattie welcomed Morgane Pennycook and Skeeter Wright to the meeting. Morgane reviewed her presentation *New Minerals Legislation* provided in the meeting kit.

Skeeter Wright provided information about the industry and NGO engagement. The socio-economic steering committee, which includes First Nations and YG, hired a contractor to do consultation with a multitude of organizations and to provide a report.

Comments/Questions:

- Industry and NGO engagement — Q) This Board's mandate is the primary instrument for fish and wildlife in the Yukon. Why wasn't an invitation extended to this Board? A) Skeeter Wright said the Board was initially on list, as well as RRCs and the Yukon Salmon Sub-committee. But they are final agreement-based boards rather than organizations such as those in the industry and the NGOs. The Board and RRCs would have an opportunity but, at the time, we wanted to stay out of the government or government-established organizations, including the Board and RRCs. They wanted to separate the two.
 - The Board is not government. It is under the final agreement, and at arm's length. Skeeter said yes, that is what he meant. At the same time, we decided to go with the NGOs and industries. It was also noted that we must go to the RRCs and the Board, but not in the day-to-day part. The NGOs and industry were involved for months and attend multiple meetings. We wanted to ensure the Board has an opportunity to review and provide comments, but not be involved in the day-to-day at that point.
 - Q) Is YESAB involved? A) No. They met and had some input, but the direction at the time was to come back when there was more to discuss. We are doing that right now.
 - The Board would prefer to have the option of participating or not rather than have someone else decide that the Board should or shouldn't be involved. We're realizing the importance of these final agreements in the day-to-day operations of everything in the territory. The Board is supposed to demonstrate a leadership role. Where do we fit in if we don't even know something's happening. If someone says, "Don't worry; we're going to come and talk to you about all the work we've done so far," they won't include the spirit and intent of the *Umbrella Final Agreement* in the consideration and development.
 - Skeeter Wright said the spirit and intent has certainly been brought to the floor numerous times by the First Nation governments, but this is a very good point.
 - Sebastian is also involved in the Yukon Conservation Society, and he has not been involved in this file. Resources were provided for participation. A tremendous amount of work has been done. This indicates that consideration could have been extended to organizations such as the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board which could have found somebody to do the work if necessary.

- Nathan Millar said there was no intention to exclude anyone. They started the consultation phase knowing that it would be very important to engage this and other UFA Boards. During phase 2, we thought about organizations and stakeholders that would provide insight for the government. He recognized the Board's interest and hopes to work together to include the Board's comments in this phase.
- Timeline or timeframe for completion — We don't have a firm answer. Heading into this process, we recognized that this really needs to be done right. While it's a key priority for multiple governments across the Yukon, we want to ensure is done well and that we take the time to do the work properly. We hope it won't be another 125 years before legislation is reviewed. At the same time, we don't want to review legislation every year. We want to work with governments to ensure there's a robust process for public engagement. Those things take time. There is no firm timeline. This is a key priority for multiple governments across the Yukon. We're taking it seriously and we're committed to the work.

BILATERAL NATURE AGREEMENT – S. Chan, C. Machtans

Michelle Dawson-Beattie welcomed Sarah Chan and Craig Machtans to the meeting.

Craig Machtans provided an overview of the Canada-Yukon Bilateral Nature Agreement including: background information; budgeting for Environment Canada; objectives; and conserved areas in Canada.

Sarah Chan reviewed her presentation *Canada-Yukon Bilateral Nature Agreement* provided in the meeting kit.

Comments/Questions:

- Looking at the time frame and the work that needs to be accomplished, as well as other legislation that will be reviewed in conjunction with this work, it doesn't seem possible that all of it will be accomplished in the time frame outlined.
- Craig Machtans said their intention is to go back to Cabinet and ask for an extension. Sometimes those requests are predicated with questions like: What did you do with the money the first time? Did you get anything for it? He's confident there will be a lot to show for this in the Yukon. The wildcard is if there's a change in the federal government and whether this will be a priority and whether there will be a budget. Developing legislation in the Yukon is usually a two-term government job. If you don't have a government in place for two terms, it's hard to get a piece of legislation through. We hope to extend this agreement and continue the work, but it's up to the fate of the election cycles.

ADJOURNMENT

Dawn said the closing prayer.

ACTION ITEMS:

- 2023-1** Draft comments on Chisana Caribou Management Plan **(Complete)**
- 2023-2** Draft letter re: Yukon Outfitter Quota Guidelines Review **(Complete)**
- 2023-3** Complete and share “What We Heard” document for Aishihik Bison Plan Review **(Complete)**
- 2023-4** Set Meeting with Marc and Policy and Legislation Working Group in response to Yukon Wildlife Act Regulation Change Review **(Complete) – June 2nd**
- 2023-5** Request amendments to Yukon Wildlife Act to present to Policy and Legislation Working Group **(Complete)**
- 2023-6** Request Executive be involved in new Yukon Forum Fish and Wildlife Working Group **(Complete)**
- 2023-7** Draft and circulate letter re: Wild Boar in the Yukon **(Complete)**
- 2023-8** Set meeting with Yukon Outfitters Association to discuss Outfitter Quota Guidelines and Pelt Handling letter **(Complete)**
- 2023-9** Submit comments on Roads to Resources Regulation Review **(Complete)**
- 2023-10** Email N. Tuchone RRC’s regarding concerns around status of Klaza Caribou in reference to proposed Casino Mine **(Complete)**
- 2023-11** Send letter to Grizzly Bear Protection Society clearly outlining Board's stance re: Grizzly Bear Conservation Plan and issues with their websites **(Outstanding)**
- 2023-12** Submit comments on Mineral Legislation Review **(Outstanding)**