



Wildlife Management Advisory Council (North Slope)
P.O. Box 31539, Whitehorse, Y.T. Y1A 6K8 Canada
Telephone: (867) 633-5476 Fax: (867) 633-6900
E-mail: wmacns@web.ca www.taiga.net/wmac

MINUTES
WMAC(NS) Meeting

February 15, 1996
Whitehorse Westmark Hotel
Whitehorse, Yukon

Present: Lindsay Staples (Chair) Joan Eamer - Gov't of Canada, CWS
Hugh Monaghan - Gov't of Yukon Billy Archie- IGC
Nelson Green - IGC Vicki Sahanatien - Parks Canada

Dorothy Cooley- IFA Biologist, YTG Renewable Resources
Aileen Horler - Secretariat (recording secretary)

Guests: Lori Craven- Acting IFA Implementation Co-ordinator, Gov't of Yukon
Harvey Jessup- YTG Renewable Resources
Gary Kofinas- Consultant

A. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 10 AM. Welcomes were extended to WMAC(NS) members, to Dorothy Cooley and to guests Lori Craven, Harvey Jessup and Gary Kofinas.

B. Approval of Agenda

The Chair briefly reviewed the individual items on the agenda.

Motion:

To adopt the agenda.

Moved: Vicki Sahanatien

Seconded: Billy Archie

Motion carried

C. National Science Foundation Community Sustainability Study

The Chair introduced Gary Kofinas, a graduate student and consultant, who has spent a number of years working in northern communities on co-management issues.

Gary began his presentation by introducing himself as part of a team, associated with the University of Alaska, Fairbanks and Anchorage, involved in the study. The full title of the study, which is already underway, is 'Sustainability of Arctic Communities: Interactions Between Global Changes, Public Policies and Ecological Processes'. It is being funded by the National Science Foundation and has been adopted as part of the North Yukon Ecological Knowledge Co-operative's ecological monitoring (EMAN) program. Gary asked the Council members for their endorsement of the study and also asked for the support of those members who are from the communities.

The study will address policy questions about the ability of Arctic human communities to sustain themselves in the face of development and global climate change. Part of the project will look at the effects of development in ANWR which will have a significant impact on the North Slope. The communities which have been invited to participate in the study are Kaktovik, Arctic Village, Fort MacPherson and Old Crow, each of which are living under different economic, political and institutional conditions. Local people will have the opportunity to contribute at all levels and have already begun to do so during the study's design phase. It is hoped that there will be a component which will provide funding directly to the community for such things as training. Gary's role will be primarily at the community level.

Both the scientific and local communities will benefit from the study. The scientific community will gain a better understanding of the ecological relationships in the north. The local communities will gain the experience of working with and learning from the scientific community. The study will get the local communities to ask questions about what they want in the future and how they can go about getting it.

When asked how this project will benefit the Inuvialuit, Gary replied that their exclusion was an oversight that he hopes to see corrected. It is his intention to include Aklavik as part of the study.

The Chair asked how the work of the EMAN project is to be factored into this study, as he would not like to see two different studies asking the same questions of the same people. The relationship between the EMAN and the Sustainability Study needs to be clear and well defined. The communities need to understand who's doing what between the two projects.

The Chair asked Gary to prepare a letter for WMAC(NS) members which clearly defines the relationship between EMAN and the Sustainability Study and identifies the institutional relationships involved. Gary agreed to produce such a letter.

Joan Eamer commented that this project will provide additional resources to the work begin conducted by the North Yukon Ecological Knowledge Co-operative. Gary proposed presenting the indicators developed at the recent EMAN workshop in Whitehorse to the study's co-ordinators for possible inclusion in their project.

Billy Archie said that it will be critical to get community support for the project. Gary will be traveling to all the communities in April to presentations. He will also be doing a presentation to the Inuvialuit Game Council.

The Chair thanked Gary for his presentation and proposed that the Council consider preparing a letter of support for the study.

Action 96-02-01: WMAC(NS) Secretariat will prepare a letter of support for the work being undertaken as part of the National Science Foundation Community Sustainability Study. The letter is to include references to the recognition of Inuvialuit interests and the Yukon North Slope Conservation and Management Plan, and the explicit relationship with the ecological monitoring project (EMAN) and institutions involved. It is also to request that the communities themselves are consulted and well informed of the implications of the study before proceeding.

D. Inuvialuit Harvest Study Evaluation

The Inuvialuit Harvest Study has been subject to review over the last one and a half years. A number of questions have arisen over that time about its future. WMAC(NS) needs to consider its views in respect to an evaluation. The Chair welcomed Harvey Jessup who is a member of the Harvest Study Working Group and who attended the meeting to provide some background on the current status of the Harvest Study's evaluation.

Harvey reviewed the recent activities of the Working Group and presented an update on the various proposals that have been put forward in order to evaluate the Harvest Study. A discussion followed during which Council members agreed on points of discussion to be submitted to the Inuvialuit Game Council, for their consideration.

What is the need for the evaluation?

Council members agreed that there is an immediate need to evaluate the methodology, conduct, utility and adequacy of the Inuvialuit Harvest Study consistent with the requirements of the Inuvialuit Final Agreement. After 9 years of operation such a review is warranted. Concerns have been raised about the cost-effectiveness of the study, the level of effort required to conduct it, the reliability of the data, the response-burden on harvesters, the timeliness of reporting, the suitability of the software, overlap with other harvest reporting systems and inconsistencies in the reported harvest, divergent management needs and objectives, the nature of harvester participation in carrying out the study, and the limited range of economic benefits which flow to communities in conducting the harvest study.

What should the evaluation address?

Generally, the evaluation should evaluate current performance, and identify and recommend future options for its conduct. In part, the evaluation should be guided by the need for recommendations on the future conduct of the harvest study which will meet the needs of different government management agencies and Inuvialuit organizations.

More specifically, the harvest study evaluation should include the following tasks:

- identify and evaluate information requirements and related management needs
- evaluate the adequacy, accuracy and reliability of harvest data
- evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the study
- evaluate the timeliness of harvest reports and other IHS products
- evaluate the extent and nature of community benefits
- evaluate the administration and management of the study
- evaluate the role of HTC's in the conduct of the study
- evaluate financial and funding arrangements
- evaluate the data management and storage system (software)

How should the evaluation be conducted?

- the evaluation of the methodology and performance of the IHS should be conducted independently of an evaluation of the software program for data management.
- the evaluations should be conducted by an independent third party.
- Requests for Proposal to conduct an evaluation of the methodology and performance of the IHS should be sent to six to eight consultants with demonstrated knowledge of and experience with harvest studies. The list of consultants should include some who can bring a new or “fresh” perspective to evaluation.
- Consultations with affected communities and agencies should be treated as a key element of the evaluation. These could be conducted through individual interviews at the beginning of the evaluation to allow each individual and organization to state their views independently and without compromise.
- A workshop involving representatives of HTC's, the IGC, the joint committees, and affected government agencies could be held at the conclusion of the evaluation to review the evaluation report and its recommendations, and to consider options for implementation of accepted recommendations and findings.

How should the evaluation be funded?

- the harvest study should be funded from existing allocations; not with new funding.
- the Yukon could contribute \$25,000 in this fiscal year towards the cost of the evaluation, if the contract is awarded prior to March 31, 1996
- the costs associated with the suggested final workshop would be covered outside of the funds provided for the contract

Who should oversee the evaluation?

- to facilitate the initiation of the evaluation, and to remove the IHS Working Group from any potential conflict of interest in the conduct of the evaluation, it could be helpful if the chairpersons of the Inuvialuit Game Council, Wildlife Management Councils (NWT) and (North Slope) and Fisheries Joint Management Committee were to assume responsibilities for overseeing the administration of the contract
- the chairpersons could oversee all aspects of contract administration, assuming responsibility in approving the terms of reference for the evaluation and letting the contract and concluding their responsibilities with the transmittal of the final evaluation report to the parties as represented by the members of the IHS Working Group
- the chair of the WMAC(NS) will keep WMAC(NS) Council members informed of the progress of the evaluation

What should happen to the IHS while the evaluation is being conducted?

Current interim options which have been proposed for the conduct of the IHS while the evaluation is being conducted include:

1. continuing the full operation of the IHS during the evaluation
2. maintaining the collection of data without the supervision of the IHS coordinator
3. shutting down the IHS completely until the evaluation is completed

With respect to these options, the following comments were made:

1. Full Continuation

This is not a desired option, for the following reasons:

- requires that new funding be found to carry out the evaluation, something which Council members do not support
- maintenance of the status quo during the evaluation could bias the evaluation towards existing arrangements, and make implementation of new ones difficult

2. Low Level Maintenance

Concern was raised over this option for the following reasons:

- maintenance of the status quo during the evaluation could bias the evaluation towards existing arrangements, and make implementation of new ones difficult
- continues to use data collection techniques that are under serious questioning (most notably the burden on hunters to respond each month)
- wildlife management efforts would not be significantly effected with the loss of nine months of data

On the other hand, the following considerations were raised in support of this option:

- the greatest community concern appears to be the loss of economic benefits derived from the employment of field workers
- HTC's could assume responsibility of collecting data and supervising field workers while the evaluation is being carried out (this will require giving consistent direction to the HTC's)
- the GNWT appears willing to store the data after it is collected, but not to supervise the collection

3. Complete Shut Down

The concern raised against this option largely focused on the loss of economic benefits to the community.

Other options which could be pursued with the shut down of the harvest study and still maintain community economic benefits include:

- reallocating funding to HTC's to monitor the harvest of only a few key species either through recall interviews or through new and different approaches, such as the direct observation and monitoring of the harvest at key times of the year by HTC employees while harvesters are on the land (spring harvest counts, summer beluga monitoring, spring and fall caribou monitoring, collection of tag data, etc.)
- reallocate existing field worker funding to HTC's for new short term harvest-related wildlife management projects during the period of the evaluation (9 months)

All of these options should be considered by the IGC at its next meeting.

Action 96-02-02: The Chair will write-up the comments of the Council members in regards to the Inuvialuit Harvest Study and submit them to the Inuvialuit Game Council and the Yukon Government, for consideration. The Inuvialuit Game Council should receive the comments prior to its upcoming meeting in Sach's Harbour, February 25, 1996.

H. Next meeting date

It was recognised that topics to be considered at the next quarterly meeting should include a finalised version of Volume 2 of the Conservation and Management Plan and a recommendation on Muskox management (to be presented to the Inuvialuit Game Council at their April meeting). The next Muskox Public Meeting will be held in conjunction with the quarterly meeting.

The next WMAC(NS) quarterly meeting will be held in Aklavik March 14 and 15.

E. Grizzly Bear Resolution

The wording of the resolution was reviewed. Changes had been made to the previous resolution to reflect the increase in the total allowable harvest in Ivvavik National Park, and to reflect the fact that the Gwitchin are not hunting bears within the area under consideration. Clarification was given on the allocation of the additional two bears from Ivvavik to the Northwest Territories portion of the Aklavik Grizzly Bear Hunting Area.

Changes to the resolution were suggested, as follows;

1. a total allowable harvest on Herschel Island of zero bears, **to be added**.
2. the dates of hunting closures in Ivvavik National Park, **to be added**.
3. the paragraph beginning 'Whereas there is no historic or current harvest of grizzly bears...' **to be changed** to 'Whereas there is no recent harvest of grizzly bears...'
4. the paragraph 'Whereas there has been no interest to date by resident Yukon hunters to hunt bears in the Yukon North Slope, **to be deleted** entirely
5. the paragraph beginning 'the Council recommends a total allowable harvest of five bears from the Yukon North Slope...' the word 'entire' **to be deleted** from the phrase 'make the entire harvestable quota' and the word 'required' **to be changed** to 'requested' in the phrase 'as required by the Aklavik Hunters and Trappers Committee'.

6. in the paragraph beginning ‘ the Council recommends that the Minister close this area....’ the phrase ‘Yukon grizzly bear sport hunters’ **to be changed** to read ‘ Yukon resident grizzly bear hunters’.

7. in the paragraph beginning ‘the Council recommends that the Minister of Canadian Heritage...’ the word ‘required’ **to be changed** to ‘requested’.

Action 96-02-03: The Secretariat is to include the suggested changes to the Grizzly Bear Resolution into the final resolution.

Recognising that the revisions stated above will be incorporated into the resolution, the motion was presented.

Motion:

To adopt the resolution.

Moved: Nelson Green

Seconded: Joan Eamer

Motion carried

G. Proposed 1996-97 budget

The financial statement, dated February 13, 1996, was presented for consideration. Another document titled **Budget Review 1995-96 and 1996-96** was also presented. The projected revenue from all sources for 1996-97 is \$138,455.

Projections of expenses to 1995-96 year end were reviewed, with explanations given some on individual budget items. It is anticipated that WMAC(NS) will expend all funds allocated for 1995-96, for a total of approximately \$178,000.

An explanation was given for some items where there was a substantial difference indicated between the 1995-96 budget and expenditures and the proposed 1996-97 budget. It was noted that the expenses for room rental at regular meetings was much higher than budgeted due to an error in last year’s allocation of funds. Other items noted included an increase in the amount allocated to Secretariat fees, a reduction in the funds allocated to the purchase of assets, an increase in funding for the newsletter (based on four per year at \$1000 each) and a decrease in the funding for the term/ activity report as it is the less expensive activity report that will be produced in the upcoming year.

Funds for 1996-97 projects were not allocated at this time.

When asked to clarify the ownership of capital goods, if bought with IFA implementation funds, the chair explained that anything bought by WMAC(NS) Secretariat became the

property of that office. The practice regarding the sale of used office equipment has been based on two operating principles: 1) no Council members, staff or their dependants are eligible to purchase Council equipment; and 2) the revenue is to be returned to the secretariat's budget.

If anything was sold by the office the money was returned to the secretariat's budget.

The issue of the lumber purchased by YTG and removed from Canoe Lake by the Aklavik HTC was discussed. It was clarified that YTG gave the lumber to the Aklavik HTC in exchange for removing it, which saved YTG a considerable expense.

F. IFA Funding- Final Quarter Review

Lori Craven gave a review of the 1995-96 IFA Implementation Funds, noting surpluses and fully expended items. The Yukon has proposed the purchase of a new and superior communications system for Herschel Island at the cost of \$6600.

Nelson Green asked that YTG's contribution to the Inuvialuit Harvest Study should be determined at the beginning of the year and not at the end., to allow for proper financial planning.

Proposals for last quarter allocations

A review of previously allocated funds was conducted and a number of new proposals were considered.

Dorothy Cooley reported that the \$2000 previously approved for funding the Wolverine Carcass Recovery would not be required.

Lori Craven reported that the proposal to amend the Wildlife Act was undergoing some changes in its terms of reference and it was anticipated that there would be a reduction in the funding required from \$28,000 to \$15,000. Terms of the contract were to be finalised within a week.

In reference to the Muskox hunter's training in Paulatuk, a number of concerns were raised regarding the feasibility of this project happening before the end of the fiscal year. Time constraints, combined with the availability of suitable hunters, have now made it extremely difficult to set up this training in March. The secretariat reported having been informed by the Aklavik HTC that many of the potential hunters would be in Sach's Harbour on a guide training program during March and would therefore be unavailable to go to Paulatuk then. The option of conducting the training in April was discussed but this timeframe presented problems for the Paulatuk hunters. Dorothy Cooley said she would prefer to wait until next year. She wants to have time to develop the whole program with the community around the training. Billy Archie said that he would still like to see this training happen this year. The Aklavik HTC already has the names of 11 hunters who are able to go. The possibility was discussed for some of the Aklavik hunters who are going to Sach's Harbour for the guide training in March to go over a few days earlier and go out on a muskox hunt with the local hunters. The costs of this training

opportunity in Sach's Harbour was estimated at \$3000 and includes \$2500 for the expenses of 5 hunters at \$200 per day plus \$500 for guides.

Action 96-02-04 : Billy Archie is to pursue the idea of some Aklavik hunters going to Sach's Harbour a few days previous to the scheduled March guide training program to go on a muskox hunt, in association with the Sach's Harbour HTC. Billy is to discuss this possibility with the Aklavik HTC and proceed with the arrangements if it is agreed to by all parties.

Action 96-02-05 : At its next meeting, WMAC(NS) is to further consider the plan to develop Muskox hunting training opportunities for Aklavik hunters.

Dorothy Cooley reported that the Muskox learning package 4 (maps) would be completed as expected.

A contract for the completion of the Muskox Habitat Report has been developed by YTG. It was noted that the members were polled in January to recommend the expenditure of \$12,775. This figure was approved at that time. An additional \$1950 was requested to include the preparation of posters for presentation to the communities and other interest groups. This brings the total for the contract to \$14,725.

A discussion was held on the status of North Slope Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan. A colour proof of the cover of Volume 1 was shown to the members. Volume one is in its final production phases and should be available at the end of March. It was noted that \$3000 was approved for the printing of Volume 1, at the December 1995 meeting. An additional \$1300 was requested to increase the print run from 1000 to 2000 copies. The Chair suggested that it is no longer necessary to produce a Volume 3 (summary) as the same material is included in Volume 2. The final costs of production for Volume 2 have been quoted as \$15,000 for 1000 copies. The new funding requested for the Plan is \$16,300 for a total of \$19,300.

The proposal titled 'Key habitats of the Firth River Valley' will be completed as planned by Parks Canada.

Dorothy Cooley requested that consideration of the balance of the Muskox Learning Package, initially presented at the September quarterly meeting, be postponed until a later meeting.

Dorothy Cooley presented a revised proposal for the Muskox survey and composition count. The original proposal was for \$11,500. The current proposal is for \$19,850. The increase in costs is due to a need for more hours of fixed wing and helicopter time (to survey a larger area), the allocation of extra funds for flying in case of poor weather, and the cost of hiring an extra biologist to increase the confidence of determining age and sex.

The increase in costs was seen as acceptable by the members.

The Chair addressed the issue of having a representative from Kaktovik attend the next muskox public meeting, as was proposed at the last public meeting. The cost of airfare would be about \$6000. This was seen as a lot of money to spend for one meeting. There were also concerns that the meeting would get too busy with so many guests, as Dorothy Cooley, Nelson Green and Martin Raillard would also be there to address the issue. Billy Archie raised the possibility of a couple of people from Aklavik traveling to Kaktovik by snowmobile instead. He said that people in Aklavik want to know what's going on in Kaktovik, so he would raise this idea with the community. This might be a better way of getting the information that is needed without having to bring someone over from Kaktovik for a public meeting. It was suggested that Billy put together a proposal for the trip. Dorothy Cooley said that she would help him draft it. It was recognised that there is a need to figure out what kind of information a visiting group would hope to get in Kaktovik and how the information gained would be related to the community of Aklavik.

Action 96-02-06 : Billy Archie is to prepare a proposal, in consultation with the community of Aklavik, for a number of people to travel from Aklavik to Kaktovik by snowmobile as part of the overall muskox education initiative. Dorothy Cooley is to assist in the initial preparation of the proposal. The proposal is to include travel logistics, the names of participants, the goals of the exchange and the method by which the community of Aklavik will be informed of the results.

Joan Eamer requested \$5000 be approved to continue the preparation of the North Yukon Ecological Knowledge Co-operative database, which is being compiled under contract to the WMAC(NS) Secretariat. The initial funding for this database was provided through a Memorandum of Understanding between WMAC(NS) and Environment Canada. The task has proven to be bigger than was originally anticipated and more funding is required to gather and enter all the available information. The database, once completed, will be a valuable resource of information on the northern Yukon. The funds, if approved, could continue being administered to the contractor by WMAC(NS).

The WMAC(NS) Secretariat requested \$1500 to contract the preparation of a distribution list for the North Slope Conservation and Management Plan. The Plan should be distributed to a wide range of individuals and agencies, nationally and internationally. It was suggested that the Yukon Conservation Society be asked to do the work as they are aware of the variety of audiences to whom it would be appropriate to send the plan.

During a further discussion about funding for the Inuvialuit Harvest Study, it was suggested that \$25,000 be allocated as an initial contribution toward the evaluation.

A summary of funding for 1995-96 was presented as follows:

Funds available

Wildlife Management Project Allocation	\$141,300
North Slope Conference Allocation	\$52,000

Less

Travel costs	\$10,000
Salary- IFA Biologist	\$50,300

Net Funds Available \$133,000

Funds Allocated

Proposal	Funding Required
Wildlife Act Amendments	\$15,000
Muskox hunter training	\$3,000
Muskox learning package 4 (maps)	\$1,500
Muskox habitat report	\$14,725
North Slope Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan	\$19,300
Key habitats of the Firth River Valley	\$3,000
Muskox Survey	\$19,850
North Yukon Ecological Knowledge Co-operative Database	\$5,000
Preparation of Distribution list for Plan	\$1,500
Inuvialuit Harvest Study- initial contribution to evaluation	\$25,000
TOTAL	\$107,875

Motion:

To recommend funding for Wildlife Act Amendments (\$15,000), Muskox Hunter Training (\$3000), Muskox Habitat Report (\$14,725), North Slope Wildlife Conservation and Management Plan (\$19,300), Muskox Survey (\$19,850), North Yukon Ecological Knowledge Co-operative Database (\$5000), and Preparation of Distribution List for Plan (\$1500), Inuvialuit Harvest Study- initial contribution to evaluation (\$25,000).

Moved: Billy Archie

Seconded: Hugh Monaghan

Motion carried

I. Adjournment

Motion:

To adjourn the meeting.

Moved: Nelson Green

Seconded: Joan Eamer

Motion carried

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 PM.

WMAC(NS) Chair

Date

WMAC(NS) Secretariat

Date