

JOINT MEETING  
OF  
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL (NORTH SLOPE)  
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL (NORTHWEST TERRITORIES)  
FISHERIES JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

August 29, 1989

In attendance:

Lindsay Staples - Chair, WMAC(NS)  
John Banksland - WMAC(NS) Member  
Frank Elanik - WMAC(NS) Member  
Art Martell - WMAC(NS) Member  
Hugh Monaghan - WMAC(NS) Member  
Laurie Henderson - WMAC(NS) Secretariat

John Bailey - Chair, WMAC(NWT)  
Roger Binne - WMAC(NWT) Member  
Andy Carpenter - WMAC(NWT) Member  
Albert Elias - WMAC(NWT) Member  
Nelson Green - WMAC(NWT) Member  
Bill Mair - WMAC(NWT) Member  
Kevin McCormick - WMAC(NWT) Member  
Leslie Treseder - WMAC(NWT) Secretariat

Bob Bell - Chair, FJMC  
Alex Aviugana - FJMC Member

Norm Snow - Joint Secretariat  
Marshall Netherwood - Joint Secretariat

1. Introduction - Norm Snow welcomed everyone to this first joint meeting of the IFA-established fish and wildlife resource committees. Dr. Snow commented that although the specific mandates and responsibilities of the three committees varied, they all had some common elements and that there was a need for some consistency and cooperation between the three groups.

As this was the first meeting, it was not expected that all of the issues would be fully resolved. Rather, the meeting should establish a link between the groups and open discussion for the future.

2. Approval of the Agenda - Four items were added to the agenda:
  - i) input from the three committees to the screening process;
  - ii) wildlife compensation;
  - iii) joint efforts on public hearings and reviews; and,
  - iv) 1991-94 budgeting and long term funding.

3. Wildlife Research - It was recognized that research and monitoring of wildlife populations must be done according to certain priorities. The priorities identified by each group varied according to the mandate of the organization and the availability of existing data.

The criteria used by the WMAC(NWT) in assessing research and monitoring proposals are primarily those developed by the Inuvialuit Game Council. The criteria reflect the importance of the wildlife/fish species as food or as a source of income; the existing availability of data; the status of the species and the likelihood of gaining management information from the research. To a large degree, the need to establish total allowable harvest or harvest quotas are the main factors considered in assessing and recommending research and monitoring activities.

The WMAC(NS) reported that they used many of the same criteria when assessing proposals. However, they noted that the federal and Yukon governments had a good data base on North Slope wildlife and thus further acquisition of baseline data was not a present requirement. This, combined with the presence of the two parks on the North Slope, meant that the Council was also considering the need for environmental management. Other considerations were economic opportunities, Inuvialuit participation and cultural identity.

The FJMC reported that they assess proposals based upon community input and other input received from the scientific community, housed largely within Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Of primary concern was the importance of the species as a food source. Of secondary importance was the economic value of the species.

Overall, it appeared that there was considerable agreement on the research assessment criteria. Using these criteria to prioritize research, adequate data should be gathered to soundly manage regional wildlife populations. However, it was also noted that the three groups needed to increasingly focus on long term environmental impacts on the region to consider such things as air borne contaminants and global warming. The effectiveness of the three groups in addressing these concerns was recognized as being quite limited.

To address the longer term concerns, several options were discussed. These included establishing the Research Advisory Council, working with the Science Council of the Northwest Territories and/or establishing a subcommittee of the three IFA fish/wildlife groups. It was recognized that the three groups needed to establish a greater profile, not only within the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, but also nationally and internationally.

**ACTION:** The research and monitoring criteria used by the WMAC(NS), WMAC(NWT) and the FJMC to assess and prioritize projects will be reviewed annually at a joint meeting of the three groups.

ACTION: A pamphlet/booklet/brochure outlining the responsibilities, mandate and objectives of all of the IFA Renewable Resource Committees will be prepared. The WMAC(NS), through its Secretariat, will prepare a draft of the document by December, 1989.

ACTION: The FJMC, WMAC(NS) and WMAC(NWT) will individually prepare a one page newsletter, primarily for distribution in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region, outlining research, programs and activities of each respective group. The newsletter should be distributed three times a year.

ACTION: Following initiation of these two publications, a subcommittee, with membership drawn from at least the three IFA fisheries/wildlife groups, will develop a strategic plan to assist with long term planning and research.

4. Wildlife Compensation - Norm Snow reported that the Inuvialuit Game Council has identified a need for a wildlife compensation policy. The IGC would like to adopt a policy that developers would adhere to and that would be of use in a variety of situations. How this policy would be enforced and its relationship to other compensation policies, such as those prepared by COGLA or the GNWT, must also be addressed.

John Banksland indicated that the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation had a similar interest in seeing a compensation policy developed. He reported that the IRC would like to work with the Game Council by providing them any assistance required to draft the policy. It was recognized that the IGC should take the lead on developing the compensation policy.

The three IFA fisheries/wildlife groups could assist in the process by providing input on such things as habitat destruction and population recovery. Exactly how the three groups could assist the IGC was undetermined.

ACTION: Norm Snow will advise the Game Council of the support extended by the three fisheries/wildlife groups for preparing a wildlife compensation policy. The Game Council will be asked to prepare a timeline outlining the process for developing the compensation policy and indicating in what way the renewable resource committees may be of assistance.

5. Public Hearings and Reviews - In light of the increasing number of public hearings and reviews planned for the region, including the recent National Energy Board hearings on the licence application and the upcoming Tanker Safety Public Review, the need for collaborative approach between the IFA fisheries/wildlife management committees was recognized.

It was also noted, however, that in some instances the Inuvialuit Game Council should take the lead role with the joint committees providing

support and advice where required. To a great extent, the approach taken would reflect the exact nature of any given public review or hearing.

Overall, the Inuvialuit Game Council will be viewed as the lead group when making representations to any public hearings or reviews. Each of the IFA joint committees would have the option of simply advising and supporting the Game Council or making its own representation to the tribunal.

6. Environmental Impact Screening Process - Several individuals raised concern that their group had not been able to have any input to the Environmental Impact Screening Committee. Most people felt that due to the technical knowlegde within the FJMC, WMAC(NS) and WMAC(NWT), and in keeping with the spirit of cooperation between all of the renewable resource committees, an opportunity for consultation between the screening process and the resource management groups should be ensured.

Several solutions to this situation were discussed. Individually, the members of the resource management groups (i.e. WMAC(NWT), WMAC(NS), FJMC) could access the screening process through their agency's representative on the Screening Committee. For example, the federal representatives on the resource management committees would have their input to screening made by the federal representative on the Screening Committee.

Alternatively, assessment criteria could be developed by the Screening Committee and reviewed by the three resource management committees. Following this review, the Screening Committee would use these criteria in reviewing any submitted project description. The criteria would be reviewed annually. Throughout the year, the decisions of the screening committee would be distributed to all of the resource management groups.

ACTION: Norm Snow will inform the Environmental Impact Screening Committee and the Inuvialuit Game Council of the concerns of the three resource management groups regarding the lack of consultation and cooperation in reviewing development project descriptions. As well, he will inform both groups of the willingness of the FJMC, the WMAC(NS) and the WMAC(NWT) to assist the Screening Committee in anyway deemed appropriate.

7. Budgeting and Long-term Funding - The group was reminded that the budgeting process has begun again for the next three-year contribution agreement. When this next agreement ends, a decision will have to be made as to what type of funding arrangement would be most suitable: another contribution agreement or a contribution to government A-Base funding.

For the upcoming budgeting exercise, the three resource management groups should have funding responsibilities (i.e. government versus IFA implementation) regarding research clearly defined. The group agreed that they could not rely on the argument that an accelerated program of research was required to meet the high management standards called for in the

Inuvialuit Final Agreement. How each group defined the role of government versus implementation funding and how long they felt an 'accelerated' program was required would vary. To enhance communication, each group's budget should be circulated to all three groups.

With regards to long-term funding arrangements, all three groups agreed there was a need to have dollars committed and tied directly to IFA implementation. Should funds be contributed directly to any government's A-Base the ability to track funds and to ensure that the dollars are not re-prioritized by government would be lost. Thus, while another contribution agreement may not be the best funding arrangement, it was preferable to a direct A-Base contribution.

ACTION: For information, Roger Binne will circulate the GNWT wildlife research budget prepared for the 1988-1991 contribution agreement.

ACTION: Each group will circulate their budget, with funding rationales for research, to the other groups for review.

ACTION: At the next meeting of the three resource management committees, the issue of future funding arrangements will be reviewed again.

8. Conservation Strategies - Lindsay Staples reported that the WMAC(NS) has begun preparing the conservation and management plan for the Yukon North Slope. He requested the support and assistance of the Inuvialuit Game Council as well as the WMAC(NWT) and FJMC. All three groups agreed to assist the WMAC(NS) in any way they could.

9. Training - Item deferred.

Recommendations from the WMAC(NS)'s Human Resource Development Report were circulated for comment and future discussion.

10. Future Meetings - Tentatively scheduled for February-March, 1990.