

# Porcupine Caribou Management Board Minutes of Meeting

May 30-31, 2018

Alpine Bakery Meeting Room  
Whitehorse, Yukon

---

## In attendance

### Members/Staff

Joe Tetlich, Chair  
Ian McDonald, Government of Canada  
Steven Buyck, First Nation of Na-Cho Ny'ak Dun  
Karen Clyde, Government of Yukon  
Alice McCulley, Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in  
Phillip Kaye, Gwich'in Tribal Council  
Hal Frost, Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation  
Billy Storr, Inuvialuit Game Council  
Marsha Branigan, Government of the Northwest Territories  
Kirby Meister, (alternate) Government of Yukon  
Deana Lemke, Executive Director  
Matthias Lemke, Assistant

### Presenters/Guests

Mike Sutor, Environment Yukon  
Kai Breithaupt, PCMB Summer Student  
Shannon Stotyn, Canadian Wildlife Service  
Kelly Milner, Communication Consultant

## Welcome and Opening Prayer

Joe Tetlich welcomed all present and opened the meeting with prayer at 9:15 a.m.

Joe stated that during discussions at this meeting, the Board will need to think about PCMB's role in dealing with current concerns about resource exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and specifically how the Board might support conservation and protection without getting politically involved.

## Review Agenda

The agenda for the meeting was reviewed. Kirby Meister requested the addition of a brief discussion about harvest sharing in terms of the Northern Tutchone Sharing Accord. Phillip Kaye requested adding a review of a letter from GTC regarding letting the caribou leaders pass.

***Motion to accept agenda as amended***  
***Moved by Billy Storr***  
***Seconded by Ian McDonald***  
***Carried***

## **Review Minutes**

The Minutes of the February 12, 2018 meeting were reviewed.

***Motion to accept minutes of February 12, 2018 meeting***  
***Moved by Marsha Branigan***  
***Seconded by Billy Storr***  
***Carried***

## **Action Items**

Deana Lemke provided copies of PCMB's previous submissions regarding the potential listing of barren-ground caribou as threatened to members and reviewed these, as outlined in action item 18-1 with the Board.

Parties' responses regarding PCMB's correspondence about the SARA process were reviewed. Deana noted that responses have been received from IGC, TH, GNWT, EC, and YG. Steven Buyck acknowledged that NND still needs to submit responses.

Kirby Meister informed the Board that he has completed his review of 'let the leaders pass' practice and regulation. His summary will be sent to Deana for review and circulation.

## **Chair's Update**

Joe Tetlichy summarized the movements of the Porcupine Caribou herd (PCH) over the past months. He noted that Old Crow residents are usually able to harvest many caribou right after the ice breaks up but that was not the case this year. He stated that some of the caribou were not in good shape this spring. It appeared that weather conditions during the winter had taken on toll on them.

Joe discussed the implications of oil and gas exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge on the Gwich'in people. He related that he attended a follow-up summit meeting about potential responses, hosted by GNWT, in Inuvik April 4 to 6, 2018.

Joe also attended Caribou Days in Old Crow from May 21 to 24, 2018 and took part in a PCMB-sponsored breakfast in conjunction with Parks Canada. Community members expressed concerns about the lack of access to the herd and wondered why the caribou were not coming back.

Deana related that she attended a Porcupine caribou workshop at the Westmark Hotel in Whitehorse on May 16 and 17, 2018. The science-focused workshop was held to review the science related to impacts of disturbance on caribou to gain understanding of the potential impact of proposed development on the North Slope on the PCH. The workshop was facilitated by Mike Suitor and was attended by scientists and biologists from the US and Canada.

On May 18, 2018, a facilitated session of the Canadian participants was held to prioritize aspects of the work required to develop a Canadian response to the environmental impact statement being developed by the Bureau of Land Management in Alaska.

Deana informed the Board that Joe was re-appointed to the International Porcupine Caribou Board (IPCB), and that the IPCB is planning to meet in Kaktovik, Alaska in September 2018.

Joe stated that Hollis Twitchell from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska has received funding for community engagement work. He has invited Joe to visit Gwich'in and Inupiat communities in Alaska to share information about the Harvest Management Plan.

## **Administrative and Financial Report**

Deana Lemke noted that the audit of the Board's past fiscal year is in progress at M. McKay & Associates Ltd. An interim report on the total expenditures was made available. Deana noted that only \$16K has been spent for the current fiscal period, and no variance report has been created to date.

The draft budget for the current fiscal year was reviewed. It was noted that IFA funding from YG toward the first phase of the traditional knowledge project has been approved in the amount of \$24,000. This may increase to \$40,000 if approval is received from Canada.

## **Species at Risk designation and process**

Shannon Stotyn explained that the opportunity for the Board to provide comments is still open until the end of October 2018.

Shannon reviewed the listing process under the federal *Species at Risk Act*. Currently the process is in the consultation phase. A joint consultation with GNWT was undertaken in January.

After reviewing submissions and responses, the minister will make a recommendation on whether barren-ground caribou (BGC) should be listed. This recommendation will be considered by Cabinet and a decision will be made within nine months. The three potential outcomes are: (1) to list barren-ground

caribou as threatened, (2) not to list, or (3) to refer the matter back to COSEWIC for further consideration. If it was decided that BGC be listed, the listing would be effective no sooner than the fall of 2020.

Shannon noted that some feedback has already been received in full support of the listing, citing a relationship to increased support for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, while others have expressed concerns about harvesting rights if BGC were to be listed. Regarding these points, Shannon stated that if BGC are listed as threatened, there will be a requirement to identify critical habitat. Activities likely to destroy critical habitat would also need to be identified, and these studies would be tools to enhance the conservation of the herd's habitat. Therefore, BGC being listed would result in a higher profile for any environmental concerns. Subsistence harvest rights for the PCH will not automatically change if BGC are listed under the Species at Risk Act. This is because land claim hunting rights, including those recognized by the PCMA, take precedence over Species at Risk prohibitions on killing threatened and endangered species. Any limits on PCH subsistence hunting would have to be put in place through the Harvest Management Plan. Licensed PCH hunters would also not be immediately affected as Species at Risk prohibitions only automatically apply to federal lands. With respect to the PCH federal lands are Vuntut and Ivvavik national parks where licensed hunting is already not allowed

Shannon provided a brief overview of a harvest evaluation estimate that was completed for the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq (BQ) herds. The goal of the project was to place an annual economic value on the BQ caribou harvest. The report attributed an annual value of \$20 million. Shannon felt that this may be a useful tool to contribute to an environmental impact statement for the PCH.

Ian McDonald felt that the financial figures are very much related to the cost of replacing the meat from the traditional harvest and thus expressed reservations about assigning a financial value on PCH harvest. He felt that a resource company could be inclined to simply focus on offsetting the financial value of potential lost harvest.

Deana stated that the Board's original position was that the PCH should not be included in the BGC designatable unit (DU) and that it would be good to get a sense from members about what their current position on this is.

Ian felt that the Board recognizes that the entire DU across North America is threatened, but that there is some confusion about why the PCH is being listed as threatened given that the 2017 PCH population estimate of 220,000 caribou is the highest on record. He stated that the Board needs to be clear why the PCH is different, while recognizing the national concern about BGC in general.

Kirby Meister reiterated that some Parties are concerned about subsistence rights if BGC are listed. He noted that it should be made clear that even if BGC

are listed, restrictions can only be imposed if there was a direct conservation concern for the PCH. This would be separate from the national plan and is already covered by the PCH Harvest Management Plan.

Shannon clarified that harvesting prohibitions can only occur on federal land — national parks, for example. However, subsistence harvesting in national parks would continue.

Billy Storr felt that the Board should leave politics to the Parties and focus on the Board's position regarding conservation. He stated that conservation in general is of benefit to the PCH, and there are already strategies and plans in place to address these matters.

Deana suggested that the Board's response, due by the end of October 2018, could: (1) restate the Board's position regarding the PCH; (2) explain that the Board is moving forward with a conservation plan, and that this be considered in the national strategy; (3) address the local confusion about the PCH's status compared to other herds and the difference between local and federal approaches; and (4) comment on the fact that information provided by PCMB was not adequately considered and represented in the COSEWIC report.

The Board agreed to revisit this topic in September.

***Action 18-2: Executive Director to draft a letter outlining the Board's position regarding the SARA listing for consideration at the next PCMB meeting.***

## **Herd Update**

### **GNWT Update**

Marsha Branigan provided the following update:

- Marsha has been actively involved in providing a scientific response to development in 1002 lands; and
- Some body-condition samples are being processed. There was a limited number available due to low harvest.

### **YG Update**

Mike Sutor provided a presentation showing herd movements using GPS collar information. He noted that the majority of the herd spent the winter near Venetie and Arctic Village, Alaska. It appears that calving will take place in northern Yukon this year. It was noted that most cows are pregnant, but there is still a lot of snow on the ground, which will have negative implications for calf survival.

Mike summarized additional activities as follows:

- Spring collar deployment was based out of Coldfoot, Alaska on the Dalton Highway and focused east toward Arctic Village
- 20 adult females captured (recaptures)
- 12 adult bulls
- 20 short yearling cows
- 10 camera collars deployed (to study diet and calf survival)
- Calving surveys are currently underway
- Post-calving survey will be undertaken at the end of June
- Hunter-based sampling will continue during harvest opportunities

Mike used distribution-over-time data to provide a visual representation of the most frequent historical calving locations near the 1002 area.

Muskox-caribou interaction studies are being updated. A graduate student is studying grazing and trampling effects and 12 additional collars were deployed on muskox.

Shrub and lichen modelling is ongoing by the universities of Montana and Idaho. Summer habitat selection is being examined and potentially modelled, along with analyses of potential reasons for shifts in the PCH's range.

## **Harvest Management Strategy**

Deana Lemke reviewed correspondence from Parties in response to the recommendation sent out by the Board following the February 2018 AHM. Na-Cho Ny'ak Dun's response is expected shortly.

The Board discussed the content of a letter from IGC recommending mandatory harvest reporting for resident PCH hunters. Billy Storr related that a recommendation was put forward by IGC that there be consistency in reporting of harvest numbers by using the same process as GTC.

***Motion to support IGCs recommendation regarding a mandatory harvest reporting by resident PCH hunters in the Northwest Territories***

***Moved by Billy Storr***

***Seconded by Ian McDonald***

***Carried***

***Action 18-3: Send letter to GNWT providing Board approval of IGCs recommendation regarding mandatory harvest reporting by resident PCH hunters in the Northwest Territories***

### Native User Agreement (NUA) update

Deana explained that a final NUA has been drafted. The joint working group collaborated on a range-wide agreement. The Parties are working with their membership to get approval and buy-in over the summer. It is hoped that the agreement will be finalized and adopted in September 2018.

To-date costs allocated to NUA expenditures were reviewed. We are within the budgeted allocation.

### GTC recommendation re implementing measures to let the caribou leaders pass

Phillip Kay explained that GTC would like to follow through with a closure of harvesting on the north side of the Dempster Highway this fall. The hope is to use satellite collar data to anticipate when the caribou will arrive on the highway and close harvesting on the north side for long enough to let the leaders pass.

Kirby Meister stated that while the Board could support this concept, conservation officers would not be able to take part in enforcing it because it is not required by legislation. He also noted that licensed harvesters could not be restricted from harvesting within the current regulations. Kirby suggested that the wording in the Board's letter could note that the Board supports GTC's initiative but it cannot be enforced.

It was noted that aspects of the draft NUA, also referred to as a "range-wide access and consent agreement", address the concepts of enforcement on traditional territories. This fact could be referenced in a written response by the Board.

Joe stated that he is willing to go to Fort McPherson to discuss the matter at a meeting in the near future. Billy recommended that someone from IGC be included in the discussion as well.

Members agreed that GTC's letter was lacking in details and clarity about how the proposed change would be implemented and what GTC's expectations of PCMB are.

***Action 18-4: A response to GTC will be drafted requesting clarification about its correspondence to the Board re caribou harvesting and letting the caribou leaders pass.***

### Northern Tutchone Sharing Accord

Kirby Meister related that PCH-related questions have been raised about how the *Northern Tutchone Sharing Accord* affects harvesting rights under the Porcupine Caribou Management Agreement (PCMA).

Na-Cho Ny'ak Dun, a Party to the PCMA, is also part of the *Northern Tutchone Sharing Accord* which allows any member of the accord to harvest in non-overlap areas without permission. The questions are: (1) If PCH were on NND's territory, would Selkirk First Nation have the right to harvest PCH on NND's land? (2) Does NND have the right to grant permission to harvest PCH?

It was agreed that the matter should be brought up for discussion at the NUA meeting in Dawson City in September 2018.

## **PCH Conservation Plan**

Mike Sutor presented an overview about the main components of a conservation plan, which are:

- Species information
- Threats
- Population and distribution objectives
- Strategies and approaches to achieve objectives
- Critical habitat

Species information includes data such as population census, herd growth rate, herd range and distribution through time, biological data, and habitat diversity. Mike noted that location and distribution data using modern techniques is available for the PCH beginning in 1970.

Threats include disturbance and habitat loss, over-harvesting, climate change, contaminants, and cumulative impacts. Mike noted that a footprint map of disturbance and numerous studies and scientific papers are already available to support this aspect of a conservation plan.

Mike pointed out that the Harvest Management Plan (HMP) defines the population objectives, but that currently there are no objectives for PCH distribution. If certain factors were to limit the ability for the herd to occupy its range, this could be addressed through distribution objectives.

The HMP also provides the strategies and approaches to achieve its identified objectives. Examples of other initiatives that also relate to this component of a conservation plan are a technical analysis of oil and gas activity in the Eagle Plains region that identifies appropriate mitigation and monitoring techniques, a science summary of anticipated development in 1002 lands, and fire risk mapping analysis.



Mike explained that the identification of critical habitat is a challenge because it is still unclear which parts of the range the federal government would consider critical to barren-ground caribou. Efforts are underway to identify the relative value of habitat throughout the range.

Marsha Branigan pointed out that since it will likely take up to two years before barren-ground caribou are listed and requirements for recovery planning have to be met two years after the listing, there is still sufficient time to gather the remaining information. Marsha also stated that most communities have confirmed that they are agreeable to PCMB taking the lead on developing a conservation plan. What is needed now is a timeline and a plan for community engagement so that communities can feed into the process and help identify priorities.

Karen Clyde related that Environment Yukon recently undertook a similar initiative related to grizzly bears and that she also assisted with community engagement related to northern mountain caribou and several other projects. She noted that while the style of consultation was varied and different for each project, engaging communities early in the process was very important.

Members discussed the appropriate approach and process for community engagement. It was suggested that a similar approach be used as was for development of the HMP.

The Board agreed that initial steps should be taken to engage with communities and get input for the conservation plan. Subsequently, a contractor will be hired to see the project through to completion. Timelines will be established in the future, and the gathering of traditional knowledge will be dealt with separately.

Karen stated that she is willing to outline a potential structure and timeline for consideration at the next meeting (Mike Suitor and Marsha Branigan to assist).

***Action 18-5: Karen Clyde will lead the drafting of a PCH conservation plan development timeline and process for community engagement for discussion at the next meeting.***

## **Workload Prioritization**

Deana Lemke stated that the Board has three very significant items to take action on: the PCH traditional knowledge project, development of a conservation plan, and responding to plans for development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Since the Board has limited time and resources, there is a need to discuss and identify priorities. Deciding on how to respond regarding potential development in the 1002 lands seems to be the most urgent concern. The development of communication materials related to this will be important.

Alice McCulley stated that all Parties seem to be unified in their concerns about development in the 1002 lands. Since the Parties are already agreed, PCMB should be able to move forward without delay.

Marsha Branigan agreed, citing the agreement reached by the Parties at the caribou summit in which the Parties recognize the role of the International Porcupine Caribou Board and the importance of calving grounds, and call upon international community to join them in their position.

It was agreed that the Board can feed into the 1002 process without being political by supporting what the Parties have already decided. The Board will use its influence to help ensure exploration and any subsequent development happens in the most responsible way possible.

Ian McDonald felt that nothing is stopping the Board from communicating information about what is taking place in the 1002 lands.

Mike Sutor concurred, stating that the direction provided by the PCMA is for PCMB to provide information, identify threats, and make recommendations.

It was agreed that the Board will reply to the environmental impact statement when it is released. The reply will constitute the Board's position on 1002 development.

## **Arctic Refuge development**

Marsha Branigan, as a member of the Working Group, provided an overview of current and potential activities on the coastal plain in Alaska and the potential environmental impacts in the 1002 area.

The first Canadian summit took place on January 31, 2018, at which the Parties agreed to a common goal of ensuring the continuing health and protection of the PCH and the formation of a technical working group. A second summit meeting was held on April 6 and 7, 2018 at which a strategy was presented by the working group and was supported by the Parties. The strategy stated that Government of Yukon was to take the lead on a science summary related to potential environmental impacts.

The Alaska Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is already holding a public consultation related to the preparation of a formal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to implement an oil and gas leasing program within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge coastal plain. BLM will consider all comments and produce a scoping document, which will in turn be used to develop an EIS. The development process in Alaska was reviewed; beginning with lease sales, continuing with geophysical exploration, and culminating in actual development.

The EIS is likely to be released in October 2018. Responses to the EIS must be submitted within 45 days.

### Science summary of environmental impacts of development in 1002 lands

Ian McDonald related that on May 16 to 18, 2018, a workshop took place in Whitehorse to analyze the impacts of development in 1002 lands on the PCH.

The goal of this collaborative effort is to compile a complete summary of all scientific information available. The outcome will be a tool that can be used by PCMB and the Parties.

On May 16 and 17, the following were discussed at the workshop:

- Scientific background on the PCH
- Proposed development and the EIS
- Estimated effects and impact of development on caribou
- Baseline and monitoring considerations
- Mitigation successes, failures and opportunities
- Realistic industry development scenarios

On May 18, Canadian participants of the workshop developed a statement of work for a contract to produce a science summary. Governments of NWT, Yukon and Canada will be providing the funding for the development of a science summary.

The science summary will be based on a full development scenario and incorporate less extensive options. Key areas to be considered are the effects of development on:

- Caribou behavior and movements
- Caribou demographics (growth rate, survival)
- Caribou health
- Subsistence users

The contractor will be asked to highlight uncertainty and knowledge gaps in the evaluation and effectiveness of mitigations and monitoring.

The goal is for the public tender to be out in June, for the contract to be awarded in July, and the work to be completed by October. In addition to the science-based information, the final product will include plain-language explanations which will be available to PCMB and the Parties.

In response to a request from the working group that pcmb.ca be used as a repository for information related to the 1002 initiative, the Board agreed to facilitate this. An additional page will be created to house public documents and information related to development in the 1002 area.

**Action 18-6:**            ***Executive Director will discuss updating the PCMB website and including a section related to Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and 1002 Lands information.***

## **Traditional Knowledge project**

Mike Suitor stated that while additional details about the project still need to be defined, some funding has been committed to begin the initial phase of the traditional knowledge (TK) gathering project. Once the project has been defined further, obtaining additional third-party funding should not be difficult.

The requirement for the Board to incorporate some TK for PCH management has been raised at every AHM. While there are different potential approaches to this, the Board would like to find a way to incorporate TK in decision-making.

Billy Storr stated that TK gathering is usually focused on elders. However, things have changed and practices have been adapted due to weather and other unpredictable changes. It is important to talk to current active harvesters. The older ones know how it used to be done and still have good guidance and good ethics, but actual conditions are different now.

Joe felt that the vision statement for the TK project has to come from the communities. Some current practices do not incorporate TK. How do we get an outcome that people will actually use? Hopefully this project will do away with some of the bad hunting practices and bring back more respect.

Steven Buyck also noted that TK is changing. He stated that climate change is happening and the elders can no longer read the weather. If we all work together we can come up with an outline of what TK means to us. It is about respect and sharing, and taking care of the land.

Philip Kaye reflected on the difference in harvesting practices between today and many years ago. Long ago we used to hunt with a backpack; today everyone has four-wheelers and some even use drones. Philip stated that he would like the TK project to address this.

Hal Frost explained that TK is passed down from generation to generation by stories, and there is a message in every story. It always consists of teachings that get carried on, and a lot of that is lost. Today it seems more appropriate to call it "local knowledge". There is a lot of good local knowledge from modern-day hunting in addition to stories from when the elders were kids.

Joe noted that TK is not only geared toward harvesting but also entails other facets of aboriginal knowledge. Firearm safety is also part of it, for example.

Alice McCulley stated that new methodologies have been developed for collecting and documenting TK during the past 20 years. The TK that is already available in the communities should be thoroughly reviewed and the Board should then focus on collecting the missing needed information. The conservation plan and the TK study will likely mesh together. The project should share the available scientific knowledge with communities and explain what information is missing. Some of the old TK may no longer apply due to the changes in weather and climate, but the TK project can help document the changes.

Kirby Meister related that similar projects have incorporated social information in addition to scientific and traditional knowledge. It was found that this helps recognize positive connections to the land and that it broadens the scope beyond harvesting and wildlife, resulting in better strategies that link to social values.

Kelly Milner stated that she has worked on numerous projects which incorporated TK. Her advice was to first decide on the objective or the purpose for the project, to clarify whether traditional or local knowledge is being sought, and to be clear about who the consumers or the audience for the resulting TK will be.

Steven noted that one of the objectives should address how TK can be given equal weight to scientific knowledge.

Billy felt that there should be a focus on indigenous management, and that information about the herd's migration patterns is more important than herd size because sharing and availability is important for traditional management. Also, since so much is changing, it would be good to document the TK about how things used to be so that it can be compared to how it is now.

Kelly pointed out that youths need to be engaged differently than elders or scientists. Many previous TK studies have resulted in reports and books which many people do not find engaging. Other ways of making information accessible are through social media, databases, maps and timelines, computer games, videos, or multimedia presentations which can be shown at large gatherings.

Philip stated that books and reports about TK should include pictures of elders, because if someone sees a picture they will want to know the story that is associated with the picture. The reports should not focus only on technical knowledge.

In order to focus the TK discussion on key management issues, Mike Sutor asked summer student Kai Breithaupt to review the Board's previous minutes and document and categorize all key management issues that have been discussed by the Board. Topics were individually posted on the meeting room wall and the Board took time to review each of them. Members were then divided

into three groups to discuss which of the noted issues they felt were of greatest importance and whether any other items needed to be added.

The following objectives were identified for guiding the Board's TK gathering initiative. The TK project should:

- help to strengthen and define appropriate modern harvesting practices
- assist the Board in management decision-making at Annual Harvest Meeting
- capture historical information for comparison with current conditions
- be tied to the PCH conservation plan
- be relevant and realistic in terms of modern conditions
- create a link between TK and science
- support outcomes that lead to sustainable management and conservation
- ensure the integration of TK into decision-making and assist in prioritizing Board activities
- include and engage communities early in the process
- help ensure caribou are respected, based on traditional practices
- support the continuation of TK use in the future

It was noted that the outcome of the project would likely result in various products which can be developed separately to address specific needs such as herd management and education.

Members discussed who the target audience of the project should be. Billy felt that the Board should be the target audience, so that the Board can share the information as needed. Ian stated that he would like to have a way to analyze TK for specific areas of interest — for example, migration route patterns.

Kelly pointed out that some of the documented TK data already exists but that it is hard to find and access. It may be necessary to make existing data more accessible without having to re-collect it. The data may need to be reformatted to make it useful.

The body of required TK knowledge was separated into three categories:

- (1) Habitat and its use (climate change, weather conditions, predation, interactions with other species);
- (2) Distribution (access, vulnerability, fluctuation of migration routes); and
- (3) Harvesting (methods, education, practices).

The following objectives were identified:

- Gain a longer term perspective on habitat, distribution and population
- Improve harvesting practices
- Identify the information needed to manage the herd and use this information to make management decisions

Marsha noted that she hoped to get TK to augment scientific work and fill information gaps — for example, identification of new illnesses, bugs, or parasites, and whether these are related to climate. TK information from throughout the range of the herd could offer some perspective about what has changed over time.

In order to take the next steps in the project, the Board agreed that a short summary of the Board's present goals and objectives should be submitted to YG so that the initial funding agreement utilizing the IFA funds can be concluded.

#### TK Project work plan

With the initial funding, a project manager will be hired to develop an overall budget, develop concepts further with Board direction, to create additional proposals, identify existing TK resources that are available, and prioritize project objectives.

Once additional funding is secured, an annotated bibliography of existing TK data will be created. Presentations about the project will be given to communities and a workshop with community and government TK specialists may be held to facilitate the development of the overall approach of the TK study.

***Action 18-7: A letter will be sent to Parties informing them that the Board is moving forward with the TK study.***

***Motion to discuss contract of project manager for the TK study in camera  
Moved by Marsha Branigan  
Seconded by Alice McCulley  
Carried***

***Motion to end the in camera discussion  
Moved by Billy Storr  
Seconded by Phillip Kaye  
Carried***

The Board discussed the contract position of project manager for the TK study and agreed to offer the contract to Kelly Milner.

***Motion to offer the contract position of project manager for the Board's PCH TK study to Kelly Milner  
Moved by Billy Storr  
Seconded by Steven Buyck  
Carried***

## **Environmental Impact Statement for oil and gas development on coastal plain**

The Board discussed drafting a submission to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in Alaska, regarding the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for oil and gas development on the coastal plain.

Members suggested that maps of the following be included in the submission:

- PCH range and historical calving locations
- Protected areas in Canada
- NPRA (national petroleum reserve of Alaska)
- Prudhoe Bay oil field
- Communities

It was also suggested that the submission refer to:

- Applicable wording of the PCMA and the international agreement
- Section 801 of ANILCA, stating that the situation in Canada is very similar
- Government of Canada's and territorial governments' financial support for PCMB

***Action 18-8: A draft submission to BLM re EIS will be written and sent to the Board for review prior to the submission deadline.***

## **Next Meeting and Closing Prayer**

The next meeting was scheduled for September 20 and 21, 2018 in Dawson, Yukon.

A closing prayer was offered by Joe Tetlichy and the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.