

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES: REGULAR MEETING NO. 12

26 - 29 AUGUST 1996
ARVIAT, NT

Members and Staff

Ben Kovic	Chairperson
David Aglukark	Member
Malachi Arreak	Member
David Igutsaq	Member
Joannie Ikkidluak	Member
Gordon Koshinsky	Member
Kevin McCormick	Member
Meeka Mike	Member
Jim Noble	Executive Director
Keith Hay	Bowhead Knowledge Study Biologist
Phillippe diPizzo	Keewatin, Regional Liaison Officer
Michael d'Eça	NWMB Legal Advisor
Mary Nashook	Interpreter
Rebecca Mike	Interpreter

Not Available

GNWT Appointee	Vacant
----------------	--------

Guests and Other Participants

Robert Moshenko	DFO, Winnipeg
Brian Wong	DFO, Ottawa
Gary Weber	DFO, Iqaluit
Ron Graf	RW&ED, Yellowknife
Anne Gunn	RW&ED, Yellowknife
Glenn Williams	RW&ED, Iqaluit
Graham Dargo	RW&ED, Keewatin
Tim Devine	RW&ED, Keewatin
John Angel	Canadian Association of Prawn Producers
Helen Klengenber	NTI, Wildlife Coordinator

Several members of the public at large

Monday, 26 August 1996

1. Call to Order and Opening Prayer

Ben Kovic convened this the twelfth meeting of the NWMB at 2:00 P.M. Ben called on Pastor Hattie Alagalak to offer an opening prayer. Ben referred to the recent bowhead harvest at Repulse Bay. This was a joyful occasion as it was the first legal hunt of a bowhead whale by Inuit. It was also a sad occasion due to the problems that occurred.

2. Greetings From Community Representative

David Alagalak welcomed the Board to the community of Arviat. David was surprised by the smallness of the room, for a “public meeting” (as it was advertised). David went on to say that he realized that it is not really a public meeting, but rather a meeting open to the public. The public in Arviat recognize the importance of the NWMB as a creation of the NFA. David suggested that there is a need for a closer working relationship between the communities, RWOs and the NWMB. Communities are looking to take over certain government functions and responsibilities, such as enforcement of laws. David offered the local museum as a place for Board members to visit during their stay in Arviat.

Note: Problems with the translation equipment required that the meeting be postponed to the following morning.

Tuesday, 27 August 1996

Call to Order and Opening Prayer

The Chairperson convened the meeting at 9:00 A.M. Joannie Ikkidluak led in the opening prayer. Ben Kovic introduced guests and other meeting participants. Ben noted that Henry Alayco (Makivik Alternate) was scheduled to arrive later in the meeting.

3. Approval of Agenda

Joannie Ikkidluak noted that quite a few documents were missing translations. Ben Kovic suggested that generally, such items will be deferred to the next meeting. Items 8 (part), 14,15,16, and 18 were noted as missing translation; item 12 was noted as a “draft only”. Items 27 and 40 were deferred to the November meeting. Item 44 was added as a miscellaneous information item. Item 45 was added as an item for the Trust meeting. Jim Noble noted that translations for some items would arrive later in the meeting. The agenda was accepted with noted changes. **(Motion 97-061)**

4. Approval of Minutes

4. A Minutes of Yellowknife Special Meeting, 11-13 June 1996

Joannie Ikkidluak questioned if there was any further information on item 6A2. Ben Kovic advised that he would ask DRR for an update as only a verbal report was received during the Yellowknife meeting. David Igutsaq noted that the translation of Motion 97-032 was not clear. Gordon Koshinsky requested time to make editorial comments. The Board approved the minutes with noted editorial requirements. **(Motion 97-062)**

4.B Minutes of Conference Call, 24 June 1996

Minutes accepted as presented. **(Motion 97-063)**

4.C Minutes of Conference Call, 28 June 1996

Minutes accepted as presented. **(Motion 97-064)**

4.D Minutes of Conference Call, 29 July 1996

Minutes accepted as presented. **(Motion 97-065)**

5. Financial Reports

5.A 1995/96 Audit Statement

Gordon Koshinsky noted that in future items identified in the financial reports should be titled correctly. Malachi Arreak questioned if employee use of vehicles had income tax implications. Pierre Chartrand advised that any implications would not be significant. Meeka Mike questioned why the RWOs/HTOs were significantly over budget. Pierre advised that this was partly a result of the loan made to KHTA and partly from the economic (FIDIPPI) adjustments for three years paid to the RWOs and HTOs. David Aglukark noted that in the next budget session, more funds may need to be allocated for the Bowhead Traditional Knowledge Study, over and above the \$500,000 budgeted initially. This stems from the fact that salary dollars are now being paid via the project. Pierre Chartrand noted that the Auditor's "Management Letter," observations, recommendations and management responses were included with the statement. David Aglukark questioned if Pauktuutit had returned the \$15,000 that was contributed to them. Pierre advised that Pauktuutit had requested to roll-over the funding and were attempting to locate additional funding. In the event that they are unsuccessful, they will return the funds prior to current fiscal year-end.

The Board approved the 1995/96 Audit Statement and Management Letter with noted changes to the financial reporting format. **(Motion 97-066)**

6. Incoming and Outgoing Mail

Gordon Koshinsky noted that the system is working very well, except that there is a need to distribute outgoing lists more regularly. Jim Noble noted that a computer programmer was contracted to develop a system of tracking mail for the NWMB.

7. Chairman and Staff Reports

7.A Chairman's Report

7.A.1 BRIA concern about walrus sport hunt approvals for Nunavik

Ben Kovic advised that he had visited Kimmirut to discuss the NWMB's approval of the Nunavik walrus sport hunt. Ben noted that residents there were generally supportive after the plans for the hunt were explained. Ben noted that a letter to Cape Dorset explaining this approval had not received a response from the community.

7.A.2 Assignment of harvesting rights and NWMB involvement

Ben Kovic advised that he had met with the NTI President to discuss the matter of Assignment of Rights. NTI had offered to help. Michael d'Eça advised that he had spoken with Laurie Pelly, who had offered to draft a letter to the RWOs/HTOs requesting no assignments be made until the major issues in this matter are resolved. Michael also noted that NTI is indicating a responsibility to/for NITC to help in working through this issue. Helen Klengenbergh advised that she would be stopping off in Rankin Inlet to discuss the issue with NITC and will take the lead on any further discussion on this matter. Kevin McCormick agreed that NTI should take the lead and the NWMB act as support only. Ben Kovic noted that the NTI President had also suggested this approach. David Aglukark agreed that the NWMB is not the designated body to deal with specific beneficiary issues; it is up to NTI and the RWOs/HTOs. Ben Kovic noted that the NWMB has known all along that they are not the lead, however this issue has been "idling," while our clients have been concerned about it. Members generally agreed that the NWMB should defer to NTI as the lead agency for this matter.

7.A.3 Leadership Summit in Kimmirut

Ben Kovic advised that he had attended the Leadership Summit in Kimmirut on 21 - 23 June. No points of significance pertaining to the NWMB were noted.

7.A.4 Co-management Boards, Chairs Meeting - June 1996 - Yellowknife

Ben Kovic and Dan Pike attended the “first meeting” of Co-management Board Chairs, in Yellowknife in June. Ben advised there was a productive discussion with the Minister of RW&ED on consolidation of the Department. The Minister was advised that his obligations for public consultation on consolidation were not met by simply addressing this meeting.

7.A.5 Bowhead Hunt in Repulse Bay

Ben suggested that a formal independent review of the Repulse Bay hunt would be of benefit to future hunts. Malachi Arreak suggested that more community involvement, orientation for the hunters, use of elders knowledge and longer planning horizons would assist future hunts. David Aglukark suggested that the hunt generally went according to plan. David suggested that longer rope on the floats and possibly a satellite beacon attached to a float should be considered in future hunts. Gordon Koshinsky agreed that a review would be an appropriate conclusion to the hunt. Gordon suggested terms of reference for the review should be carefully phrased. Joannie Ikkidluak noted agreement with the plan for a formal review. Joannie suggested that long ropes were not used traditionally, he also noted that butchering requires a lot of work, and more people have to assist with butchering in the future. David Aglukark noted that KWF is planning to write a report on the hunt, and that this would probably complement the NWMB review. The Board decided to commission an independent review of the hunt.

(Motion 97-067)

7.B Executive Director’s Report

Jim Noble advised that draft reports from all programs had been submitted to Uqsiq for drafting of the three-year annual report. A draft mock-up of the finished report should be available for review at the November meeting.

7.C Wildlife Director’s Report

Keith Hay reviewed Dan Pike’s briefing note outlining his activities during June, July and August. Plans are well underway for the first phone-in (television) show, scheduled for October 8. Kevin McCormick requested to see the draft terms of reference for the Resource Centre (Item 9). Michael d’Eça suggested that he assist Dan with a review of the draft BNL pamphlet (Item 7). Malachi Arreak asked where the proposed tagging project for beluga and narwhal will be conducted. Keith Hay advised that the project will be conducted in Croker Bay (Devon Island). Gordon Koshinsky suggested that Dan be commended for the work he has completed.

8. Member' Reports/Concerns

David Igutsaq suggested that proper (marine) transmitters should be used for future bowhead hunts. David also suggested that use of transmitters should be a licence requirement. Gary Weber noted that DFO had provided information and suppliers for such equipment to the Hunt Planning Committee. Gary also noted that transmitters were not identified as part of the equipment list for licensing. Joannie Ikkidluak suggested that mistakes should be a window for learning. Michael d'Eça suggested that any technical conditions on the hunt would be considered as non-quota limitations.

Meeka Mike advised that bylaws pertaining to NWMB Committee membership need to be clarified and implemented. Malachi Arreak suggested that the Board review its entire Committee system in the near future. Kevin McCormick noted that it was a consensus of the Operations Committee that they bring forward a proposal for Committee consolidation and membership.

9. New Business

9. A Canadian Wildlife Service (DOE)

9.A.1 Endangered Species Legislation

Kevin McCormick advised that legislation drafting is scheduled for completion by September. Michael d'Eça advised that an NWMB submission was drafted and forwarded, with no further action to date. Kevin advised that there will be consultations on the legislation during the fall, and Boards would be included in the process. Kevin also noted that it was planned to introduce the legislation to the House in November. Ron Graf questioned if there will be consultation on the actual legislation prior to it being tabled in the House. Kevin clarified his earlier comment, saying that consultation would occur, but probably not on the actual legislation.

9.A.2 Wildlife Trade Act

Kevin McCormick advised that the Wildlife Trade Act was passed by Parliament in 1992. The Act required development of regulations which were recently completed; the Act and Regulations came into effect in June of 1996. David Igutsaq questioned how this would apply to the NWMB. Kevin advised that the Act refers to species listed by CITES and provides the regulations and actual list of species identified by the Convention. Michael d'Eça suspects there may be overlap or inconsistency with the NLCA; e.g. "Inuit are free to dispose of animals legally taken," etc.

9.A.3 Nunavut Updates

CWS had no updates to present.

9.B Department of Fisheries and Oceans

9.B.1 Walrus Management Plan

Gary Weber noted that a motion passed at the Iqaluit meeting in May, authorized a walrus sport hunt for Salluit in Northern Quebec but only if a management plan was in place. DFO initially indicated it would be difficult (impossible) to develop a comprehensive plan for 1996. Robert Moshenko, with assistance from DFO Laurentian Region, has managed to produce a draft for comment. Malachi Arreak noted that NTI should be included in the Communication Plan section and that walrus need to be placed high on the priority list for research. Gary replied that NTI could be included in the plan and that some research has been and is currently being done with the assistance of NWMB research funds. Michael d'Eça noted that he had provided comments to Dan Pike on the draft plan. Non-quota limitations would be established by this plan and a process for acceptance/rejection/variation needs to be incorporated and could take considerable lead time. Robert Moshenko noted that comments from the NWMB, Makivik and DFO Laurentian were received. Makivik's comments include a need to incorporate guaranteed needs levels as per the Makivik Agreement. Robert noted that Makivik was planning to fax a draft Hunt Plan to this meeting for review. Robert advised that there would not be time to complete a full scale Management Plan prior to a 1996 autumn hunt and questioned if a Hunt Plan would be satisfactory. Robert noted that Makivik interprets preparation of a hunt plan as the responsibility of the community and the outfitter. Michael d'Eça noted that under Article 40, Makivik is required to adopt the responsibilities of RWOs/HTOs. David Aglukark suggested that the first priority for use of resources such as walrus is to provide sustenance. Possibly the process should slow down and the NWMB should ensure this plan is in accordance with Section 5 of the NFA. Malachi Arreak suggested that the Board remind Makivik of their responsibilities, and what the responsibilities of RWOs and HTOs are, as per the NFA. NTI should be reminding Inuit of their rights and responsibilities. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the Board had two alternate opportunities;

- a) Place the hunt on hold, because the management plan is not completed; or
- b) Proceed on the basis of the draft, assuming it flags no conservation concern.

Robert Moshenko noted that the Board decided to proceed with the Coral Harbour hunt based on a draft plan and promise of consultation. Robert suggested that Makivik should be advised of either decision.

9.B.2 Nunavut Updates

Gary Weber noted that some communities are requesting increased narwhal quotas (Item 4). Some communities are allowing tags to be transferred between communities and quotas. The Scientific Working Group of the CGJC has called for no narwhal quota increases. Both the community request/actions represent quota increases. Gordon Koshinsky expressed concern about possible escalating loss rates and that there may be a need/opportunity for education. Malachi Arreak noted that loss rates are undoubtedly higher in the spring. This involves non-quota limitations and is an area in which the NWMB can legitimately get involved with respect to time of year, method (harpoon first) etc. David Igutsaq indicated that very few narwhal are seen in his area. David would like to see substantial narwhal reserves for communities, so they can take full advantage the odd occasion that narwhal do show up. Ben Kovic questioned if the NWMB is required to put management plans in place for all species.. Michael d'Eça replied that the NWMB does not require management plans for all species and in any event its role is to approve such plans not develop them. However, non-quota limitations and quotas are a major component of management plans and therefore the Board may wish to use the management plan format. Brian Wong noted that management plans are identified as important tools under the new Fisheries Act. These plans are visualized as public documents and a vehicle for co-management. DFO is moving towards management plans for all stocks. Kevin McCormick noted that the QWB has already asked DFO to start a management plan for narwhal. Ben Kovic suggested that if DFO has been getting requests for quota increases, they should forward them to the NWMB. Gary Weber advised that they have been suggesting this route during community consultations. Kevin McCormick suggested that requests for quota changes should have a standardized procedure.

9.B.3 Shrimp Fishery/Industry

Brian Wong introduced Mr. John Angel, Executive Director of the Canadian Association of Prawn Producers (CAPP). John thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak on the "Northern Shrimp Fishery." This was an opportunity for him to meet the members and to learn how the NWMB operates. John noted that Area 1 is shared by Canada and Greenland and that the stock is in poor shape. Area 2 has been productive; more P. montanum shrimp are caught in this area. These shrimp are smaller than P. borealis and are considered "industrial shrimp." Area 3 has been fished very little and is not a high priority area. Some of the vessels fish more than one licence and operators sell their own catch (no centralized market). The five Inuit licence holders do not own their own vessels, but rather joint-venture with other boat owners. John noted that the inshore shrimp fishery is not administered by CAPP. P. montanum used to be confined (apparently) to Ungava Bay. Last year more were caught in Area 2 and were even found in Areas 4 and 5. As of the end of August, no vessels have gone inshore near Resolution Island as catches have been very good outside the 12-mile limit. Conditions which are bad for cod

seem to be the reverse for shrimp. John suggested that the Board engage some experts to look into development possibilities for the inshore shrimp fishery. John explained that the current freezer/trauliers have the capability to fish in all zones at any time of the year. They are successful only because they all fish southern waters for part of the year. John Angel advised that under DFO's invitation for "partnering," it is proposed that CAPP take over virtually full management of the resource. John suggested that they "borrowed" their decision-making process from the Nunavut Final Agreement. DFO however has put this idea on the back-burner for awhile as it depends on passage of the new Fisheries Act. Jim Noble questioned if the licence holders will press for greater access to the Area 3 inshore. John suggested that they would. A condition of taking over management responsibility was that there would be no decrease in the TAC available and that they would receive a percentage of any increase. A \$20 million vessel is required to produce the required product to serve existing markets. There are no prospects for new (especially North American) markets. John suggested the NWMB should join the push for lowering or repealing tariffs (22%) into the European markets. Kevin McCormick noted that the Board had agreed earlier to examine the allocation question more fully. Brian Wong noted that with turbot, once an inshore allocation is established it could be protected; shrimp allocations to date have not had this protection. Michael d'Eça advised that once the BNL is established, it is up to the NWMB to decide how to allocate surpluses. John Angel suggested that there are lots of international precedents for jointly managing stocks. Michael d'Eça clarified that, per the NFA, if a matter is domestic interjurisdictional the NWMB needs to be involved; if it is international interjurisdictional Inuit need to be involved. Ben Kovic noted that the Minister had unilaterally established a 1996 quota of 3800 MT; whereas the NWMB had talked in terms of 1000 MT. Ben Kovic thanked John Angel for his presentation and trip to meet with the NWMB.

9.B.4 DFO Restructuring

Gary Weber advised that DFO had written to all the Co-management Boards about "renewal," and is planning a workshop on this matter. Most of the Boards requested short presentations on each branch. Gary noted that a draft agenda was sent out and the workshop is planned for Winnipeg, September 24-26. The purpose of the workshop is to provide an overview of DFO Arctic research and management and to get recommendations on re-designing programs to meet government downsizing. DFO posed a number of questions for consideration by the Boards prior to the workshop and will send out an information package in advance. Robert Moshenko noted that this item has been generally known for months and the Boards were alerted to incoming new frameworks nearly a year ago.

Science reductions were scheduled for June but this schedule has been set back a bit. Robert suggested that this is a good opportunity for Boards to input to designing DFO's core. It would be good for the Boards to go to the workshop prepared to declare what they interpret the respective mandates and expectations to be. Discussion followed on who should participate in the workshop. It was agreed to

defer the matter to Item 11 for decision. Michael d'Eça noted that a major partner in the co-management arrangement is in the process of cutting resources, and there is potential for significant negative impacts.

9.C Department of Resources, Wildlife and Economic Development

9.C.1 Nunavut Updates

Graham Dargo was introduced as the new Superintendent of the Keewatin Region. Ron Graf advised;

1. A proposal to downlist gyrfalcons (CITES), to permit trade will be tabled.
2. A polar bear gall bladder decision paper has been tabled. A similar paper is going to all Boards.
3. The draft Thelon Management Plan has been tabled. The Board may want to respond to the document by mid October, for input to the final plan (NWMB can always change the plan, later.) Kevin McCormick questioned who was obliged to implement the plan. Ron Graf advised that the plan will be submitted to the NWMB and then it would be up to the NWMB to have hearings, if deemed necessary. Any proposal (after approval) to alter the plan shall be subject to review. It was noted that the Board is not required to hold a public review just to institute the Management Plan.

9.C.2 Grants and Contribution Transfer

Item is under correspondence (with the NWMB/Minister) at present.

9.C.3 DRW&ED Consolidation Update

Minister Kakfwi undertook initial consultations, a new name was chosen, and the Department came into existence on 19 August. There will be some cut-backs, mostly in management and administration. Some new positions will be created. Officers will be placed in communities where there were none before. The Department is looking to ensure a minimum of at least a renewable resource officer and an economic development officer in every community. Approximately 125 layoffs are anticipated, mainly in Yellowknife. No Inuit are being laid off in the Keewatin. Total cuts of \$12 million are anticipated (\$7 million in salaries, \$5 million in operating funds). Michael d'Eça asked how all this would impact on the NWMB. Graham Dargo suggested the main concern is morale and flux; half the managers will be lost.

Kevin McCormick noted that Departments are de facto technical supports to the Boards and asked if this is being factored into the consolidation. Graham Dargo advised that this is factored into the changes. Malachi Arreak asked how a single department can promote development and protect the environment at the same time. Graham replied that the Department will have to pursue a balance; Economic

Development is not taking over Renewable Resources. Michael d'Eça asked if there are formal plans to consult on matters (in consolidation) that will directly affect the NWMB. Graham replied that the ADM had indicated she will do that.

9.C.4 Polar Bear Management Plans/Memorandums

Ron Graf advised that the Deputy Minister had signed all Memorandums of Understanding. Some communities, however, have yet to sign. Glenn Williams noted four recently-signed Management Agreements (MOUs) similar to the previous MOUs dealt with by the Board. The new agreements cover Foxe Basin, Gulf of Boothia, M'Clintock Channel and Davis Strait. These agreements have been evolving as they were developed. The last two (M'Clintock Channel and Davis Strait) include the addition of new reference to juvenile bears. The oldest bears that researchers have found with the female (mother) are 3 year-olds (by aging teeth); such may be larger than their mothers. Hunters (seem to) believe that such bears are up to 5 or even 6 years old. It is however unfair to hunters to be interpreting juveniles as up to 6 years old. Juvenile references are not included in the other two management zone agreements, because juveniles were not discussed in community meetings. Overlap provisions of 30 kilometers are not (of course) written in where the border is within another jurisdiction (e.g. Inuvialuit). In other agreements, the overlap provisions are invariably included (written in). Glenn noted that five polar bear adults were found dead last winter; an unusually high number. These deaths may have been caused by severe winter conditions and natural mortality. David Igutsaq questioned what could be done with nuisance bears in the communities? David suggested that the Department never seems to have positive suggestions for the community. Glenn suggested this was a topic for DRW&ED Regional Office to handle. Glenn noted that the MOU for the Western Hudson Bay population is the last remaining MOU to be developed (starting soon; interjurisdictional). These agreements are expected to be in place for 4-5 years. The next area of research will focus on the Gulf of Boothia. Glenn noted that Greenland has a lot of work to do, to gain acceptance of quotas by hunters. Michael d'Eça noted that there was a call in the MOUs for the NWMB to address compensation. Michael suggested that if the Board endorses/approves the MOUs, it would probably be interpretable as taking on these tasks. David Igutsaq questioned the scientific methods of determining ages of polar bears. He suggested the Inuit way of age determination may be better. Meeka Mike noted that the Iqaluit HTA was not happy with \$1,500 compensation, as described in the Davis Strait MOU. Glenn noted that Josie Papatsie had signed the MOU on behalf of the HTA.

David Aglukark questioned the matter of open/closed season dates. Glenn advised that the dates were left up to the HTOs participating in the meetings. Within a zone, individual HTOs have their own discretion. David noted that the condition of the fur prior to October is not very good. Michael d'Eça noted that the date issue is a non-quota limitation and is therefore under NWMB jurisdiction (if it needs to be changed). Gordon Koshinsky requested that the Board be provided an update on negotiations with the USA re importation. The Board approved in principle the

MOUs for Foxe Basin, Gulf of Boothia, M'Clintock Channel and Davis Strait. **(Motion 97-068)**

9.C.4.a) Regulation Changes - Foxe Basin (8 Extra Polar Bear Tags)

Glenn Williams noted that a decision was required on how to disperse the 8 extra tags allocated to the Foxe Basin. Glenn noted that regulations cannot be passed formally in time. The Department is requesting the NWMB to (in) formally endorse allocation to communities. It was noted that this allocation had been approved previously by the NWMB; 4 to each RWO. Glenn noted that this had caused problems because the RWOs are not formally recognized in existing GNWT legislation. The Board agreed to informally endorse allocation to communities. Michael d'Eça agreed to review all the correspondence and draft a response to the Minister re procedures (legalities).

9.C.4.b) Proposed Amendments to Big Game Hunting Regulations

Michael d'Eça noted that the last item on page 1 should refer to sport hunters directly, not by exclusion from GHL. It was decided that the Department would be advised of this in writing, as a decision of the Board. Ron Graf suggested changes such as the GHL wording should be undertaken when the amalgamation is completed and there is a new Wildlife Act. Ron suggested that it is probably unrealistic to make piecemeal changes before a full review of the Act occurs as the current Act is full of references to GHLs. Michael d'Eça noted that under present regulatory wording, polar bear hunters who do not hold GHLs must hunt by dog team. The intent being that the hunt be as traditional as possible. David Igutsaq noted that dog teams tend to be in poorer shape than they were years ago, and less practical to use for long-range hunts. In most cases, dogs need to be transported (by snowmobiles) to the hunt sites. David would like to see the use of snowmobiles legalized for polar bear sport hunting. Malachi Arreak noted that Inuit no longer renew their GHL cards. Glenn Williams noted that issuance of GHLs has increased in recent years. Communities find them useful, to indicate who their hunters really are. GHLs are also used for recording fur sales, assistance programs, etc. Glenn noted that they are vital for administration of government programs, quite aside from the connotation of "permission to hunt." The Board approved in principle the proposed changes to the Big Game Regulations/Wildlife Management Polar Bear Area Regulations, subject to approval by the RWOs. **(Motion 97-069)**

9.C.5 Action Plan To Implement Biological Diversity

Item deferred to the next regular meeting.

9.C.6 Polar Bear Gall Bladder Sales

Item deferred to the next regular meeting.

9.C.7 Effects of Research Methods on Polar Bears

Item deferred to the next regular meeting.

9.C.8 Arviat Snow Goose Project (Research)

Tim Devine advised that 500 snow geese were collected at Arviat under the experimental harvest program. Liver and fat were sampled from 100, for contaminants. Steel shot was tested and proved to be effective. The Department is hoping to conduct the project/research again next summer. Michael d'Eça advised that doing it properly (as a harvesting decision) requires lead time. The assumption for 1996 was that this was not a harvest, but a distribution test. David Aglukark noted that the Migratory Bird Convention Act should be publicized. Inuit should know that it is their right to harvest whenever it suits them. Kevin McCormick replied that the amendments to the Convention have not yet been ratified by the USA. No announcements have been made to the public. David Aglukark noted that Peter Usher (ITC) advised in May that the Canadian federal government had agreed to the changes.

9.C.9 CITES Proposal to Downlist Gyrfalcon

Item deferred to the next regular meeting

9.C.10 Peary Caribou Die-off in the High Arctic

Anne Gunn provided a slide presentation on caribou, with particular reference to Peary caribou recovery (Bathurst Island). Elders say that winds have recently shifted, from predominantly Northwest in winter to more commonly from the East. Snowfall has been highest on record in recent years. There have been previous collapses and recoveries. About 1600 carcasses have been found over the past two years. South Victoria is the only Arctic island which still has significant numbers of caribou. High-Arctic-Island wolves are also a particular (rare) type; culling them is not politically popular. Feeding artificially is a consideration, but is not very practical in the High Arctic. Restocking is constrained by low availability of the right type of animals. Malachi Arreak asked what the population of caribou on Ellesmere and Axel Heiberg was at present. Anne advised that these islands have limited habitat, and are very difficult to survey.

She estimated that there may only be a few hundred animals on these islands. David Igutsaq noted that Resolute Bay HTA wrote to Taloyoak HTA asking for permission to hunt caribou in their area, and David questioned how to respond. Kevin McCormick asked what was the status of the "Recovery Plan." Anne advised that she wanted to do a second draft, incorporating new information, and go to further consultation. Anne suggested that one more bad winter could lead to extinction of the Peary caribou. David Igutsaq suggested that there might be an opportunity to

trade caribou for muktuk and/or fish. Resolute Bay have always (previously) insisted on sale rather than trade. Ben Kovic noted that the situation is too serious to ignore. The NWMB needs to join the recovery program immediately. David Aglukark agreed that this is an important matter. Kevin McCormick asked if any specific management action was contemplated. Anne replied that there is a need for community input, and surveys should be planned for next summer. NGOs would probably help fund work re endangered species. Joannie Ikkidluak expressed concern about climate change effects on caribou. At Kimmirut it rained last fall and this killed many caribou. This summer (1996) remaining caribou (near Kimmirut) regained their health, so the previous problem was obviously due to starvation. Joannie suggested that consideration be given to an air-dropping of food to the caribou. David Igutsaq noted that Prince of Wales Island caribou often migrate through the Taloyoak area in winter. These animals are generally too small to be hunted, and could be considered for capture and transplant. The Board agreed that Malachi Arreak and Dan Pike will be the NWMB contacts on this issue.

9.C.11 Regulation Changes

9.C.11a) Muskox quota for King Williams Island

Board members reviewed the requests brought forward by DRW&ED to:

1. Create a new muskox management area (MMA B/3-3),
2. Establish a muskox quota of 5 on King William Island, and
3. Increase the muskox quota in MMA H/1 (Adelaide Peninsula/Chantry Inlet) from 40 to 55 tags.

The Board approved the new management area and the quota of 5 muskox for King William Island. The Board also approved the increase from 40 to 55 tags for MMA H/1 with a tag distribution as follows:

1. Increase Gjoa Haven's muskox quota in MMA H/1-2 by 9 (from 36 to 45)
2. Increase Taloyoak's muskox quota in MMA H/1 by 3 (from 2 to 5)
3. Increase Pelly Bay's quota in MMA H/1-2 by 3 (from 2 to 5) **(Motion 97-070)**

9.C.11b) Muskox Quota Decrease West of Kugluktuk

The Board reviewed the briefing note provided by DRW&ED. Anne Gunn advised the Board that there are no indications of muskox leaving the area. Lungworm has been found in the muskox in the area and may be a factor in the decrease in population. Anne also noted that grizzly bears seem to have recently learned to kill

muskox calves. The Board approved a reduction in muskox quota in MMA C/1-1 (West of Kugluktuk) from 50 to 20 tags. **(Motion 97-071)**

9.C.11c) NR/NRA Caribou Quota Decrease Victoria Island

The Board reviewed the briefing note provided by DRW&ED and approved a decrease of Non-Resident (NR) and Non-Resident Alien (NRA) caribou tags in WMZ B/2 (Cambridge Bay) from 35 to 25. **(Motion 97-072)**

9.C.11d) Commercial Quota Increase, Qamanirjuaq Caribou

The Board reviewed the briefing note provided by DRW&ED and approved the recommendation of the BQCMB to increase the commercial caribou tags by 260 (Chesterfield Inlet -150, Whale Cove - 50, Rankin Inlet - 60) on the condition that the NWMB receive annual reports of harvest. **(Motion 97-073)**

Insert: Keith Hay noted that Dan Pike had recommended in favour of all the regulation changes (Tabs 20 thru 24).

9.D Nunavut Wildlife Management Board

9.D.1 Possible Public Hearing - Queen Maud Gulf Bird Sanctuary

The idea of a public hearing was discussed; such a hearing could incorporate two questions:

- a) Conversion from a Sanctuary to a Conservation Area
- b) Refusal of exploration access

Kevin McCormick noted that NPC is going to undertake consultations on the area. DOE has been directed (by NWMB) to consult further on the issue. Kevin suggested that if the NWMB holds a hearing, it would duplicate consultation in progress. Jim Noble advised that Mayor Wilcox followed up his verbal comments at the Yellowknife meeting with a letter. Kevin noted that Kennecott has been absolutely quiet on the issue and did not acknowledge the Board's letter. Gordon Koshinsky suggested the Board not intervene directly in the matter at present. Michael d'Eça suggested the Board advise the NPC and NIRB on the issue. The Board decided that the Executive Director and Legal advisor would be tasked with writing to NPC and NIRB. Kevin McCormick to assist with a letter to Mayor Wilcox advising that DOE will be planning further consultation meetings and that the NWMB has written to NPC and NIRB on the matter.

9.D.2 Review of BQCMB Relationship to the NWMB

Kevin McCormick noted that he had completed the draft position paper on the NWMB/BQCMB relationship and requested review by the Board. Ron Graf asked if the NWMB had considered what it might do if DIAND/DOE withdraw funding support. Kevin replied that this possibility had not been discussed.

9.D.3 NWMB Relationship With New Co-management Boards

Item deferred to the November meeting.

9.D.4 Wildlife/Overlap Issues - Nunavut/Nunavik

The Board discussed two alternative draft letters to Makivik with no mention of government(s) in either draft, although they are legitimate players also. Malachi Arreak suggested that he would like to include BRIA instead of NTI as they are the land owners. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the Board would have to be well prepared for such a meeting. Kevin McCormick noted that the original purpose had to do with two or three specific issues. Kevin suggested that the initial contact be made with Makivik only, and that leads to the question of who should attend. Ben Kovic offered that NTI may need to attend and the Keewatin also has a claim to the islands (historically). Helen Klengenberg advised that NTI is planning to discuss joint responsibilities with Makivik and that the Board might like to be involved at the same time.

Wednesday, 28 August 1996

9.D.5 Fisheries Act/NWMB Submission

Michael d'Eça advised that he had drafted a submission, with Laurie Pelly's (NTI) input. Michael had also received copies on NTI's submission, which fit well together. Michael noted that the concern raised was/is to flag NWMB jurisdiction to alert the reader/user so as to avoid late disputes and confusions. All of the proposed amendments merely serve to insert this reminder. Brian Wong noted that NWMB concerns are valid to a point. The intention of the (new) Act is to devolve the management process as much as possible. Brian questioned if it was really necessary for the Board to get involved in the issuance of every licence. Michael noted that the NWMB has no choice except to exercise its jurisdiction, whatever the workload. Practically-speaking, "arrangements" may have to be made. But the legislation per se has to respect other legislation in existence.

Brian noted the aim is to manage the fisheries through conditions of licensing, and does the Board want to be involved in conditions for all licenses? Michael suggested that conditions would be set generally for a fishery, not separately for each licence. Malachi Arreak noted that in negotiations of the NFA, "impracticalities" of power sharing were recognized, but it was deemed important/essential to entrench the powers for Inuit regardless. Inuit wanted to ensure they were consulted on everything that affected their relationship with wildlife. Brian noted that he was not aiming to

dispute the Board's authority. In the past DFO managed fisheries via regulation. Under the new Act, DFO wants to drop that step and regulate via conditions of licensing. Kevin McCormick asked if DFO would be able to bring a "set" of licensing conditions to the Board for approval. Brian acknowledged that this was a distinct possibility. Gordon Koshinsky questioned if the NWMB's concern were relevant to other land claim entities. Gordon further questioned if any of the other organizations (e.g. Inuvialuit) responded to the NWMB's response to the Oceans Act. Michael d'Eça and Jim Noble could not remember receiving any response from the other entities even though they are relevant/interested. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that a fall-back might be to identify the NWMB jurisdiction at the end (rather than at the beginning) of specific clauses. Michael agreed that this might be a reasonable response to a DFO rebuttal. The Board approved the NWMB submission to the Minister of DFO on the proposed Fisheries Act Amendments as outlined by the Board's Legal Advisor. **(Motion 97-074)**

9.D.6 Atlantic Fishing

Brian Wong advised the Board that both the turbot and shrimp fisheries are being seriously changed for 1997. The current turbot quota of 5,500 MT is made up of the following allocations:

- 1000 MT - Nunavut inshore fishery
- 500 MT - Nunavut offshore fishery
- 1500 MT - Competitive (gillnetters from Newfoundland)
- 2500 MT - Developmental (foreign/Canadian trawlers)

This year (1996), the competitive 1500 MT quota was fished early. When the foreigners came in, the Newfoundlanders complained to the media. Between August and January, there will be great pressure on the Minister to put the 2500 MT Developmental quota up for grabs. Brian suggested the Board should be prepared to submit a request for part of this quota. Brian noted that the latest 3-year shrimp plan ends in 1996. Fishing has been good; there is optimism that quotas can be increased. The Minister will be under pressure to (perhaps) increase licenses and/or quotas.

In this situation, Nunavut has good opportunities to establish:

1. An inshore quota, and/or
2. Addition licence(s), maybe shared with Makivik.

Brian suggested this might be appropriate work for the NWMB's fisheries advisor. Malachi Arreak noted that the principle of adjacency should be at the forefront to ensure that Nunavut people benefit. Malachi reiterated the concern about gill-netting

(NWMB does not support gill-netting at all). Brian noted that allocation of licenses in the Atlantic fishery is very much influenced by lobbying. Newfoundlanders are expert at, and very well positioned for, lobbying and the NWMB could learn from them. Michael d'Eça noted that the Board had made a quota decision in July about P. montaqui. The Minister responded promptly; he sort of accepted the NWMB decision, but then sort of rejected it (or at least varied it). Michael questioned why the quota had gone up to 3800 MT. Brian explained that for P. montaqui, there is quota only in Area 3 (1200 MT), but no quota in Area 2 or 4. There is no mechanism to stop the fishery with respect to P. montaqui in Area 2 or 4 as it is a by-catch in those areas. The Minister is using the season as the basis to close the fishery, as there is still no quota (1996) for P. montaqui in Area 2 or 4. Michael d'Eça advised that the season is a non-quota limitation in the NSA. This is the sole purview of the NWMB. The Minister can (ultimately) do what he did, but he slipped a couple of necessary steps. Brian advised that the shrimp areas do not correspond to the NSA. He suggested that the Board is asking for something which the Minister does not have a process in place to accommodate. Brian suggested that the Board wait until 1997 when the new 3-year shrimp plan is completed. Malachi noted concern as the NWMB already has jurisdiction within 12 miles. Michael noted that the Board was asking for a 1000 MT quota within 12 miles, leaving only 2800 MT outside. Malachi noted that the NFA is part of the Constitution, and should take precedence over any management plan. Brian replied that the present management plan carries the Board's endorsement. Michael advised that if the NWMB approved the 3-year shrimp management plan, it should not have given away its jurisdiction in that plan.

9.E. NWMB Funded Projects and Contributions

9.E.1.a) Western Hudson Bay Polar Bear Project

The Board reviewed a request for funding from CWS for the project "Selection of denning habitat and associated behaviour of adult female polar bears on the western coast of Hudson Bay." Joannie Ikkidluak advised that he would like to incorporate a condition requiring more research on the effects of repeated handling (capture, and especially drugging) on polar bears. Kevin McCormick noted that the trend to smaller sizes seems specific to Hudson Bay; is not apparent in other bears which are also extensively studied (including multiple handling.) Joannie agreed to rescind his condition, if use of tranquilizers is intended. Malachi Arreak noted that Inuit perceive impacts if bears are handled more than once. The study proposal suggest global warming may be the reason for the changes in bears. Malachi suggested that perhaps the study could focus more on resolving that debate. Joannie Ikkidluak noted that there are labour-intensive methods that are cheaper than using a helicopter. Kevin McCormick noted that this issue has been discussed. The item is on our agenda (Tab 16) but has been deferred (for lack of translation.) Kevin suggested that the Board may want to be careful not to ask the proponent to change the project. A detailed analysis is underway at present. The Board approved a contribution of \$15,000 in support of the

CWS research project concerning the denning of Hudson Bay polar bear, with the requirement that there be an analysis of effects of multiple captures and handling through the use of drugs, helicopters and satellite collars.

(Motion 97-075)

9.E.1b) Tree River Charr Species I.D. Project

The Board reviewed Dan Pike's "Submission to the NWMB" on the Tree River Charr Species I.D. Project. Gordon Koshinsky suggested that the information learned would be useful to know and embarrassing not to know. Gordon noted that it is hard to justify a need to know for management in this particular context, especially if the true (total) cost is 25 K plus 39K. If other rivers are proved to be dolly varden (when peer-reviewed), it will be clearer that Tree River must be dolly varden based on meristics alone. The Board recognizes the importance of establishing the specific identity of Tree River charr, and encourages continuing efforts by DFO in that regard. The Board did not recognize this as an urgent management concern and accordingly denied funding for the project.

(Motion 97-076)

9.E. 2 NWMB Funded Projects

9.E.2a) Gjoa Haven Charr Tagging Project

Item deferred to the next meeting of the NWMB.

9.E.3 NWMB Funded Projects (Non-Research)

9.E.3a) Repulse Bay HTA Request For Funds (Bowhead Clean-up)

Ben Kovic advised that he had polled the Board members via phone regarding this matter. Ben requested that a formal motion be passed to approve up to \$2,000 to assist the HTA in the clean-up process. The Board approved the Repulse Bay HTA's request for funding assistance. **(Motion 97-077)**

The Board moved to go into an incamera session to hold the first Nunavut Wildlife Research Trust Meeting. **(Motion 97-078)**

The Board moved to return to regular session and adjourned for the day.
(Motion 97-079)

Thursday, 29 August 1996

9.F Other New Business

9.F.1 Keewatin Wildlife Federation Report

David Kritterdlik, Chairperson and Tommy Owljoot, Executive Director of KWF attended the meeting. David noted that the KWF was both pleased and not pleased with the results of the first bowhead hunt. David regrets that some of the most knowledgeable elders (e.g. from Coral Harbour) were not closely involved. David noted that this was the first time he had actually seen a bowhead. David noted that KWF will overspend on the \$100,000 provided (from various sources e.g. NTI: 15K, QWB: 5K, KIA: 15K, also Co-ops and Hamlets and funds provided by the NWMB for the Hunt Planning Committee). It was impossible to please everybody, in this first legal hunt. The Hunt Captain, and others, had gone to Aklavik to observe the hunt there. David suggested that all involved will learn from their mistakes. Perhaps training for hunters could start well in advance of the next hunt. David noted that cost on subsequent hunts should be reduced with the work and equipment that was purchased for the 1996 hunt. One bowhead really is not enough to share throughout Nunavut. David advised that KWF will provide a written report on the hunt; an outline has already been drafted, with a financial accounting (tabled). Ben Kovic offered congratulations to the Captain, despite all the problems. Ben noted that negative publicity cannot be stopped, and that it might be appropriate to respond to some of it. David Aglukark noted that many hunting tools were purchased by KWF; he questioned if these items would be available for future hunts. David Kritterdlik agreed that hunting items must be utilized in future hunts. David noted that the owner of a harpoon gun in Coral Harbour decided not to lend the gun when Coral Harbour was excluded from the hunt. KWF had to purchase a new gun (expensive, with difficulty) outside of Canada. David noted that he was sorry that they did not include provision for a transmitter radio(s). Joannie Ikkidluak noted that lances, guns, etc. were bought for all Nunavut and asked if the RWOs could chip in to cover costs. David Kritterdlik noted that KWF had to borrow funds from the bank to cover costs. He noted that the community of Repulse Bay would be the owner of the items they manufactured. Ben Kovic suggested that some of these items could be kept in local museums.

The current financial statement for the hunt shows:

Revenue	\$87,857.00
Expenditures	\$125, 536.02
Deficit	\$37,679.02
 Paid To Date:	 \$84,631.55
Donations Outstanding	\$40,904.47

David Kritterdlik suggested that there is a need for more/better liaison between the KWF and NWMB. Gordon Koshinsky on behalf of the NWMB offered his congratulations to KWF for their administration and management of the hunt.

10. Old Business

10.A Operating Procedures Manual

Pierre Chartrand reviewed his "Submission to the NWMB" on the NWMB Operating Procedures Manual. Pierre note that he had provided new binders with the latest version of the Operating Procedures. For review of such manual, Pierre suggested that the Board consider establishment of an Executive Committee. He noted that there are currently three committees; Finance, Personnel, and Policy and Procedures. Pierre suggested that if the Board amalgamated the three committees, a combined (Executive Committee) could be advisory to the full Board. Kevin McCormick noted that more or less the same individuals were/are on all three committees already; and it would be easy to consolidate them. He noted that there are no entrenched terms of reference to take into account. Malachi Arreak noted that previous committees were struck mainly to take the place of (then) non-existent staff. Considerable discussion followed on process, including availability of translated materials. Joannie Ikkidluak emphasized the need to have the Operating Procedures in place, as a matter of highest priority. Gordon Koshinsky requested that the current draft should be finished, translated, and mailed out (within a month) for review by members, and for final approval at the next Board meeting. It was resolved that the three committees (Finance, Personnel and Policy and Procedures) be dissolved, and reconstituted as an Executive Committee. **(Motion 97-080)**

10.B Employee Manual

To be reviewed by the new Executive Committee.

10.C RWO/HTO Status Report

Jim Noble advised that Pierre Chartrand had provided a "Submission to the NWMB" on this item, providing an overview of administrative concerns with the RWOs and HTOs. Jim reminded the Board of concerns he has previously voiced about the capacity of RWOs/HTOs being fundamental to the operation and success of the NWMB. The Board had requested Jim to scope out the problems and provide a report. Regional Liaison Officers assisted in preparation of the reports provided. Jim noted that Michael d'Eça had also prepared a paper on administrative concerns.

Pierre Chartrand has also prepared an administrative/financial capability analysis. Jim suggested that the Board had three options to consider:

1. Leave the training to NTI as the parent organization.
2. Pressure NITC to provide the training.
3. NWMB to take more of a lead role.

David Aglukark questioned why some of the communities had received no funding yet. Jim advised that the communities not funded had not provided the necessary documentation. This documentation included; a budget for current fiscal year, a signed contribution agreement and an interim 31 March 1996 financial statement. Joannie Ikkidluak advised that some secretaries need more training. Joannie suggested that maybe more of the HTO responsibilities should be concentrated with the RWOs. Currently, secretaries have to report separately, to NWMB and to the GNWT. Jim noted that the Board has had under consideration the transfer of the funds from the GNWT. The GNWT responded quickly and favourably to the Board's last letter, and are relaxing requirements considerably. Jim noted that there was some discussion of block transfers of funds, however heavy funding cuts faced by the Government may reflect in transfers to RWOs/HTOs. David Aglukark suggested that better communication between NWMB and NTI/NITC is required to facilitate more training. Of course, the secretary/managers need to desire training at the same time. Gordon Koshinsky suggested the matter may be more one of motivational encouragement rather than progressively more refined and powerful accounting courses. The fundamental requirements are not all that onerous. Gordon feels it is hard to believe that officers could not do these things, for the most part. Kevin McCormick noted that the key building block may be to better define the role of the NWMB in the NFA; and the place of RWOs/HTOs in that role. Kevin suggested that this training will be an ongoing requirement. He suggested that there is a need for a manual and that there is obvious role for NTI and NITC. Malachi and Gordon suggested that the Board be prepared to spend the interest earned on withheld funds for a training program. David Igutsaq noted that wages of secretary/managers tend to be too low and trained individuals tend to take other jobs. Helen Klengenberg offered her assistance to get NTI and NITC involved. Kevin McCormick called for an outline of what is needed.

Malachi Arreak noted that there is a need to not overlook training for the Directors; if they are properly prepared they will generally get their staff to do what is required. Jim Noble noted that an outline of a training plan is well underway. The Board decided that the staff should develop a proposal which outlines the content of a training program for RWOs, HTOs and Secretary Managers, the options for delivery and projected costs, and that the NWMB approach NITC and NTI and other organizations as appropriate to seek their assistance in development and delivery. **(Motion 97-081)**

10.D Harvest Study - Status Report

Keith Hay presented a “Submission to the NWMB” prepared by Dan Pike on the Harvest Study. Jim Noble noted that there will be a “budget review” on the Harvest Study in September; this will include a budget analysis (for the November meeting). Joannie Ikkidluak “observed” (from the sideline) that not all harvesters are co-operating, some who should be are not included, and there are some complaints about the calendars (prefer lines in the squares). These problems should be addressed quickly, because the Study is so important. Ben Kovic noted that Dan Pike has indicated recognition of need for more and better publicity.

10.E Bowhead Knowledge Study: Status Report

David Aglukark advised that Keith Hay had provided a “Status Report “ for the Board’s information. Malachi Arreak asked if there were any plans to interview knowledgeable elders who were not included in the first round of interviews. Keith Hay advised that there are no plans to interview more elders; however they might try to get voluntary information. David Aglukark suggested this information could be obtained via/at planned workshops. Elders who were not interviewed usually participate in these workshops.

10.F Wildlife Compensation Policy

Michael d’Eça reviewed his briefing note on wildlife compensation with the Board. Malachi Arreak questioned whether Article 20 (NFA) refers only to water per se, or also to such things as spawning beds; he believes the latter. Michael d’Eça suggested that if there is a wildlife component, NWMB would deal with NWB on it. The whole subject seems to be a matter of discretionary participation vis-a-vis NWMB, nothing that the Board needs to lead. Gordon Koshinsky noted that he had assumed that the Harvest Study would provide a key evaluation input for a compensation payment in a developmental issue. Michael replied that it could, but was not required. The possibility was raised that Inuit, having sole access to polar bears, should perhaps be responsible for any damage they cause. In any event it seems reasonable that a hiker minding his own business on a hike and needing to kill a polar bear in self defense should not have to pay compensation. Michael noted that DRW&ED has developed a discussion paper which, although not well received, does represent a start.

10.G Strategic Plan Priorities Review

Jim Noble advised that he will continue to update the status of priorities.

10.H Contribution Policy

Item deferred to the November meeting.

10.I Review of “To-do-List”

Item deferred to the November meeting.

11. Other Business

11.A Upcoming Meetings and Events

Item deferred to the staff.

11.B Meeting Reports/Briefing Notes

Items left for member's review.

11.C Incamera Session

The Board moved to a second incamera session (**Motion 97- 082**)

The Board moved out of incamera session (**Motion 97-083**)

Motions from Incamera Session

Motion 97-084 - Establishment of an Executive Committee

Motion 97-085 - Selection of Fisheries Consultant for NWMB

Motion 97-086 - Ratification of removal of section 11.05 of Nunavut
Research Trust

Motion 97-087 - Approval of 2.9% cost-of-living increase for staff

Motion 97-088 - Approval of merit bonus for staff after appraisal March 1997

Motion 97-089 - Approval of consultant's report -Employment Equity Review

Motion 97-090 - Request increase in honouraria for Board members

12. Public Meeting

A public meeting was conducted at Arviat's "Mark Kalluak Complex" on Thursday evening.

Approximately 40 Arviat residents attended the meeting to discuss various wildlife issues. It was apparent that the Board should prepare an agenda for any similar/subsequent meeting.

13. Date and Place of Next Meeting

Jim Noble advised that DRW&ED representatives had asked that the Board consider Resolute Bay as the location for the next meeting, on account of the concern for Peary Caribou. Considerable discussion followed on alternative times and location. It was decided to hold the next meeting of the NWMB in Pelly Bay, the week of November 18. (**Motion 97-091**)

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at noon Friday, August 30. **(Motion 97-092)**

Minutes Approved By: _____
Chairperson

Date: _____

NUNAVUT WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT BOARD

RESOLUTIONS: CONFERENCE CALL NO. 12

21 June 1995

Resolution 96- 026

Resolved that the NWMB provide funding support in the amount of \$19,650 for ITC's "Spirit of the Arctic" exhibit at the forthcoming CNE; and,

That the NWMB request positive advertising (for the NWMB) as part of the exhibit; and,

That the NWMB develop a policy and budget for evaluating and funding special projects of this nature in future.

Moved by: Marius Tungilik Seconded by: David Igutsaq
Carried Date: 21 June 1995

Resolution 96- 027

Resolved that 300 metric tonnes of turbot from the residual Inuit quota be allocated to Broughton Island HTA for the 1995 season.

Moved by: David Igutsaq Seconded by: Malachi Arreak
Carried Date: 21 June 1995