

# **Porcupine Caribou Management Board Minutes of Meeting September 18 and 19, 2013 Dawson City, Yukon**

---

## **In attendance**

### **Members/Staff**

Joe Tetlich, Chair  
Steven Buyck, Nacho Ny'ak Dun  
Jamie McLelland, Government of Yukon  
Mike Gill, Government of Canada  
Stephen Charlie, Government of the Northwest Territories (Alternate)  
Charles Pokiak, Inuvialuit Game Council (Alternate)  
David Frost, Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation (Alternate)  
Roberta Joseph, Trondek Hwech'in (Alternate)  
Wilbert Firth, Gwich'in Tribal Council

Deana Lemke, Executive Director

### **Presenters**

Mike Sutor, Environment Yukon  
Martin Keinzler, Environment Yukon  
Troy Hegel, Environment Yukon  
Don Russell, Cumulative Effects Project  
Kelly Milner, Communications Consultant  
Norman Snowshoe, Gwich'in Tribal Council

## **Welcome and Opening Prayer**

Chair Joe Tetlich called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Steven Buyck offered an opening prayer and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Roberta Joseph welcomed the Board members to the Trondek Hwech'in traditional territory and wishes them an enjoyable stay in Dawson.

## Review Agenda

The Agenda was reviewed by the Board and approved.

***Motion to accept agenda  
Moved by Roberta Joseph  
Seconded by Steven Buyck  
Carried***

## Review Minutes and Action Items

The Minutes of the July 8 and 9, 2013 meeting were approved by the Board and the action items were reviewed and discussed.

***Motion to accept Minutes of the July 8 and 9, 2013 meeting as distributed  
Moved by Roberta Joseph  
Seconded by Steven Buyck  
Carried***

## Chair's Report

Chair Joe Tetlich provided an update as follows:

- The photocensus was undertaken in early June. Mike Sutor added that the analysis of the photos will be done over the winter and the results should be ready by the upcoming Annual Harvest Meeting in February.
- Many have reported successful harvest of PCH. There have also been some reports of unethical hunting practices being used. Community responsibility and accountability were discussed.
- Many travelling the Dempster have reported significant grizzly sightings; harvesters have been encouraged to take only as many caribou as they can deal with reasonably at one time, to reduce potential of grizzly/human interactions or situations where grizzly come to claim the kills.
- Board members were reminded that the Board provides an additional day honoraria to members in the communities to have community meetings, reporting back information from the Board and gathering information from community members to bring back to the Board.
- Members were encouraged to mark their calendars when Board meetings are scheduled and make necessary arrangements to attend the meetings. Some members have called the ED to change or cancel travel arrangements at the last minute, making it very difficult and costly to make alternative arrangements with alternate members. Communication with the ED in response to her emails will help make things run more efficiently and orderly.

The International Porcupine Caribou Board has been accomplishing more work over the past year than in previous years. Many PCMB members attended the

IPCB meeting in Dawson over the past day and a half, which was a good opportunity to meet the IPCB members and get a sense of what their discussions entail. The PCMB Chair provided an update on the HMP and its Implementation Plan. There were some discussions about how a harvest management plan might be brought to the US side of the PCH.

Mike Gill commented that it's a good idea to promote the HMP to Alaskans, in cooperation with the IPCB.

Roberta Joseph said that it appears it would be very beneficial for the Alaskans to have a co-management regime in Alaska, similar to what we have in Canada. It appears that managers are not very aware of all of the issues at the local level, so community members would benefit from a forum for bringing their concerns forward.

Steven Buyck agreed that subsistence harvesting doesn't seem to be monitored adequately.

There was discussion about the relationship between the PCMB and the IPCB and PCTC, and how input is provided to each other. Joe's appointment on the Board is to represent the PCMB and Canadian user communities in the range of the PCH.

At the moment, there is no talk about development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The proposal for 3D seismic work was turned down.

Deana stated that IPCB are acknowledging the good work of PCMB, but are still sorting out the relationship. We advanced our concerns as much as possible regarding the PCTC, but they feel we should not be part of it as a full member since we are not a technical agency. Instead, they created a new category: "tenured observer" to allow PCMB or another organization be part of the group discussions. This allows the PCMB to be part of communications without being a formal member. It will allow the PCMB to maintain a relationship and get information flow back and forth and is the best we can do at the moment. There is also a provision for establishing working groups which could include other First Nation groups or management bodies.

Mike Sutor suggested considering developing a MOU between the PCMB and the IPCB to outline the how the relationship is to be understood, just as one has been worked on outlining the relationship between the PCMB and Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board.

Joe felt that since he is a member of both that should be adequate.

# **Administrative and Financial Report**

## **Financial update**

Executive Director Deana Lemke provided an administrative and financial report. The variance report for 2013-14 to date was reviewed. The financial audit for the 2012-13 fiscal year has been finalized; copies have been sent to funding agencies. The funding agreements for this fiscal year have all been put in place.

In response to a question from Roberta whether any of the \$10,000 of funding allocated toward HMP would be accessible to First Nations for assistance, it was confirmed that this funding is available to be used toward meeting-related expenses, not for participant travel. Deana's assistance could be requested for coordination. Roberta expressed the need to get together to work on the Native User Agreements.

## **Administrative update**

Board member terms of appointment were discussed.

- VGG needs to confirm their appointments of David Frost (member) and William Josie (alternate).
- Marsha Branigan's (GNWT) term expired in August.
- Jamie McLelland's term needs to be confirmed by YG.

Work is underway on the 2012-13 Annual Report.

Johnny Charlie scholarship recipient, Andrew Sheriff, finished his term working as a summer student with Mike Sutor at the end of August.

Recent correspondence was provided in members' meeting information binders.

A short message regarding Dempster Highway hunting best practices, accompanied by a photo, was provided to the YFWMB for the calendar they are producing.

Deana reviewed the draft letter to PCMA parties regarding Sensitive Habitats and discussion arose around the correct list of who to send it to. It was agreed to send it to the International Board.

Deana reviewed the caribou satellite collar location letter with board. It was agreed to send it to the IPCB, copied to the PCTC. Martin Kienzler stated that currently no information is made public. Seasonal updates are done as time allows. Mike Sutor explained that management agencies get real-time data but this is not shared with the general public.

# **Herd Update**

## **Government of Yukon**

Mike Sutor reviewed his written herd update which was provided to the Board members.

- Pre-calving survey was done in late May by the US Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Calving survey took place between May 31 and June 2 by Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game.
- Calving distribution survey was completed in early June by Government of Yukon.
- Post-calving survey was done in late June by Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game.
- Photocensus was done in mid-July.
- Body condition monitoring is ongoing. In September samples from Old Crow residents were collected.
- North check station at the Peel River crossing opened July 29. There are plans to open a south check station in the fall if the caribou migrate to that area.
- Rut count is planned for October.
- Government of Yukon will be hiring a contractor to customize and install database on computers for harvest data collection in the communities.
- Assessment of Dempster caribou harvester and grizzly conflict has been done this summer. There has been a good response to hunter questionnaires. A highway monitor has been hired from Fort McPherson to patrol the highway and collect gut piles, as well as talk with hunters about reducing conflict by controlling attractants.

## **GNWT**

Stephen Charlie mentioned that GNWT is hosting sight-in-your-rifle (SIYR) workshops in Aklavik and Fort McPherson. The Inuvik SIYR workshop that was held recently was very successful.

The ferries may be kept in later this year for fuel delivery etc. Because of this, the check station will be kept open longer this year due to increased hunting pressure from ferry availability.

## **Grizzly Bear designation (SARA designation)**

Mike Gill reviewed the draft Board's species at risk designation letter. When this topic was initially mentioned at a past meeting, some Board members felt that grizzlies are doing quite well in the range of herd. Mike acknowledged that grizzlies do well in the north, but since they are vulnerable it is important to keep a close watch. We probably would not see any management actions in our area, but there would be actions in the south where grizzlies are facing greater threats.

The listing would not have any impacts such as hunting prohibitions; however, there are still concerns because the designation seems in conflict with the reality of grizzlies in the range of the herd.

Deana read Marsha's comments, in her absence. She noted that WMAC North Slope supported the listing of polar bears as special concern and pointed out that we can support a listing and still feel differently about management in a particular area.

Mike mentioned that in the south human population density is an issue, as is road access, and some poaching.

The Board needs to reply via letter. Options for replying were discussed as either full support, no support, or something in the middle. One option is to suggest splitting the designatable units in order to deal with the southern population of grizzlies separately than the northern population.

The Board discussed future implications and consequences of a species at risk designation, such as restrictions being imposed. Mike clarified that there is no ability for the federal government to step in and take jurisdiction away from groups currently responsible for managing grizzly populations. A management plan would be developed and would be focused on areas where populations are imperiled.

Joe commented that the issue is trying to protect grizzlies down south where they are threatened, while up north we have a totally different situation. He suggested that the Board would be fine with this as long as we have the right wording in the letter.

Wilbert added that in messaging to inform communities it should be pointed out that grizzlies are slow to reproduce. This has to be explained so that people understand, and to explain why they are threatened down south.

The Board discussed the draft letter. Wording regarding the ecological importance of grizzlies would be added as well as agreement that they are a concern due to low reproductive rates. While there are threats to grizzlies in the south there is no concern in the north. The deadline for submissions is October 4, 2013.

**Action 13-13:        *ED to update wording of draft letter re Grizzly bear designation under SARA and send to members for final review.***

## Communications Plan

The Board discussed the PCMB communications plan and having Kelly Milner involved to assist with the revising the plan. There have been many changes since the initial communication plan was done 10 years ago. As a past Board member and with a communications background and experience, Kelly has some great ideas and knows how to target the Board's main audiences and stakeholder groups. Kelly will be on conference call today to talk about her proposal. She knows what the issues are and who the parties, stakeholders, and communities are. The Board can ask questions and talk to her; there is no commitment to proceeding, however.

Kelly joined the meeting via teleconference and reviewed her proposal with the Board. The first part of the plan involves taking time to talk about what the main themes are that the PCMB wants to communicate. It includes a review of past material and talking to the Board about things like: Who is the board trying to reach? What are the things the board wants to focus on? What are some standard communication approaches for each year? What would be some measures of success? Kelly's goal would be to develop a three-year communication strategy aligned with the HMP. The Board members agreed that a three-year plan would be appropriate.

The next step would be to review and revise the plan and identify priority items within it and then move forward with the implementation and developing some of the materials. Members would provide input along the way regarding the audience and messages. It should also involve communications with the International Porcupine Caribou Board. Kelly offered to e-mail drafts to get feedback and noted that any members with particular interest who want to get more involved could be included more.

Joe said that communication is critical to the Board's work, and how we communicate to people is very important. We have a lot on our plate. The challenge is how to get the messages out.

Kelly replied that since different communities have different ways, it would need to be determined what works best for each one.

The Board thanked Kelly for her proposal and said she would be advised once the Board made a decision with respect to her proposal.

Following the conference call with Kelly, the Board discussed her proposal further and decided that it should proceed with contracting her to do communication planning, based on her proposal outline and cost estimate.

The Board agreed to increase the amount of surplus that would be allocated in this year's budget by \$5,000 to accommodate the communication planning contract, which will be a new line item.

***Motion to contract Kelly Milner as Communications Consultant***

***Moved by Mike Gill***

***Seconded by Jamie McLelland***

***Carried***

## **Dempster Hunting Regulations**

Joe reviewed past actions. There has been a lot of controversy around the recommendations. With participation from communities they were looked at it again and discussed in December 2012. The Board then made recommendations based on the Parties' input. At the last meeting the Board wanted to look again at the YG letter. We didn't get consensus on the use of off-road vehicles, but we recommended the corridor and letting the leaders pass being rescinded.

Deana pointed out that the two items are part of the consultation we will do with the Yukon Fish and Wildlife Management Board.

Stephen Charlie related that the GNWT supported the recommendations. They will be moving forward with consultations and there will be further discussion. A main focus is removing any hindrance on aboriginal rights and seeing where the co-management bodies stand on that, and what RRCs and communities have to say. The GRRB will have to work with them. Usage of vehicles on the tundra has been raised as concern and will probably be brought up in GRRB meetings.

GTC will make a presentation this afternoon regarding management of caribou harvest. Mr. Snowshoe will present options on how to deal with it. Likely, regulating will come from First Nations and Inuvialuit themselves. A precedent has been set via the check stations by allowing First Nations to regulate themselves. It seems to be working out pretty good, although there was initial criticism. Years from now check stations will likely be a good example of cooperative management. As self-government moves ahead there will be more demands, and solutions for regulating will likely come from First Nations and Inuvialuit themselves. Moving forward through native user agreements may be a way to get regulations in place.



## Caribou population model

Troy Hegel from Environment Yukon joined the meeting by teleconference to make a presentation to the Board regarding the caribou population model.

The caribou calculator was developed in 2002 as an exploratory tool. Due to challenges with getting updated photocensuses, the tool was used more. Concerns about accuracy prompted development of a new tool. The new, current tool is a good balance between simplicity and complexity and is working well. The biggest difference between the new and old tool is that an uncertainty factor is included in the calculation. Probability and variability are both part of the calculation and the result is a range of values rather than a single number.

Mike Gill questioned whether similar results are achieved when running the models separately. Don Russell explained that if the input data is same, the models actually give the same results.

Joe recounted that in 2007, there was a challenging situation with using the calculator. The model indicated the population was low but communities said it was not. When the count was finally received it was in fact way up. We need to look at the uncertainty while ensuring we retain trust with the communities. Troy clarified that the old caribou calculator would only provide one number, which is less than ideal. The new model provides a range of values. If the range is really wide it will indicate we can't rely on the accuracy and should include other sources of information and weight them higher. Photocensus numbers are used as starting point. When census data is not available it is not incorporated into the model.

Don Russell explained that the original calculator went off the rails because the harvest management group requested using the worst-case mortality figures. This made the herd appear to be in decline. It had to do with inputs and assumptions, not so much with the model itself.

Stephen Charlie shared concerns about assumptions when there are unknowns. Who decides on the values or variables? The last model had consequences in credibility with First Nations and communities. Elders' feedback was not taken into consideration. There was reluctance to move away from restrictions which were based on assumptions. NWT did not accept the suggested restrictions, and would have had to backtrack if they had. There should have been more effort on the part of the developers to ensure the model was used properly.

Deana related she recalls the discussions around this and the harvest management plan. It was clear that the further away we got from a census, the less we accurate the predictions would be. The technical folks were asked to use worst-case scenarios. This was based on the Board's and communities' feedback to conserve the herd. It was clearly presented by technical folks, in

absence of census data. The PCMB was as complicit as anyone. Maybe we can help rebuild that trust, depending on how we present information, the limitations of the old model, and benefits of the new model.

Troy explained that this model should not be used to make all the decisions. It should be used as a piece of information, as part of the information the Board uses to make decisions. The model is only one tool in the toolkit and can be weighed according to how confident the Board feels about it.

Mike Gill expressed his support for it as long as we see it as one of the tools. The Annual Harvest Meeting would be a good opportunity to talk about the new tool. He suggested we have Troy or Don discuss it and its proper use at the next Annual Harvest Meeting.

Roberta elaborated on Stephen's comments. The caribou calculator was used as a management instrument in developing regulations. She recalled pointing out (page 17 of the HMP) that the reality of the indicators showed the herd was really going up. The calculator was used to make it look like the numbers were going down. When governments use tools to make decisions they should not use worst case; it should be based on reality. At meetings, First Nations recommended that they be part of discussions and to have a workshop to discuss variables and calculations. Until we have a workshop like that, there is just not enough information.

Troy reviewed the actual spreadsheet model and inputs and figures. The next step is a face-to-face meeting with the Porcupine Caribou Technical Committee (PCTC). A bit more work needs to be done on the front end to make the tool user friendly, and based on PCTC feedback maybe some other changes. Then it will be ready for documentation.

## **Cumulative Effects project update**

Don Russell's presentation showed the status of various herds from North America's tundra in context with the Porcupine Caribou Herd. The following questions were discussed: What are cumulative effects? Why is the PCH different?

Don provided historical statistics. Most herds were in a low value in the 1970s. The first consistent count of PCH was in 1972. By 1980 herds were increasing and in 1989 the PCH peaked. In 2000, the majority of herds were in decline, including the PCH. By 2010, herds were increasing again; the Bluenose East and PCH had the most significant increase. The Central Arctic Herd never declined, and yet has more development in its area than all other herds.

In order to measure cumulative effects on caribou, Don provided information on measurements that could be used. Statistics show that relative body weight in

the fall directly relates to the probability of cow getting pregnant in the rut. The resilience and productivity relationship was discussed. Some herds are more resilient but less productive, some are highly productive but less resilient. Both aspects combined affect overall herd growth.

The energy-protein model provides a linkage to productivity and herd growth. Via the tool it is possible to run statistics for 1,000 animals through the energy-protein model. This will allow assessment of impacts on a cross section of a herd's population.

Current age structure of a herd is a good indicator or predictor of the future size of the herd – whether it will increase or decrease.

Mike Gill expressed concern that we never really talked to various governments to see if they would use this to guide decision making. In an ideal world governments would actually use this information, and for it not to be just an academic exercise. We need to use the replies from parties to assess the Board's role in this in future.

Deana explained the challenge in deciding who to send the letter to. We hope YG will take it beyond their department and get others involved. Once we find out what the interest is from parties we can extend communication to more decision-makers, stakeholders or prospective funders.

Deana proposed a meeting to identify who would be interested with a view to following up to arrange a larger meeting/workshop. The concern is what we will do if we do not hear back from anyone. There are others beyond the parties – other decision-makers. How do we get our foot in the door to other departments? Mike pointed out that Don's presentation reflected that collaboration is one of the main reasons why cumulative effects are so hard to deal with. We have been working on a product but have not determined buy-in from others.

Jamie informed the board that YG will be having discussions on CE, on how YG will assess it, and how it aligns with the corporate framework. They intend on developing an approach that will feed info into the corporate process. It is being piloted on mountain caribou this year. Having a definitive way of measuring herd productivity is very important.

Don stated that a big challenge is that CE related to a landscape is different than CE which focus strictly on one species and does not affect all the others.

Mike Gill felt that we may be getting ahead of ourselves. It would have been good to write a letter like this to parties and stakeholders two years ago. This winter might be a great time to determine what the level of interest and buy-in is from the parties.

Joe stated that at the community level CE would be hard to grasp. How do we take it to them and explain it to them? Roberta stated that this type of information is valuable to land-use applications in the communities. It could be used for applications where PCH habitat is affected. Other communities probably don't feel as much of an impact from development activities on PCH as TH, but it would be helpful for TH. For the community we would have to put the information in layman's terms.

Don Russell related that there have been a couple of applications using this approach in North America. Baffinland Iron is one example. Applications now include requests to provide and include energetics models. Don was hired to produce such a model for the Baffin mine project since a proposed road was going to go right through a calving ground.

## **Gwich'in Tribal Council presentation**

Norman Snowshoe from the GTC was welcomed to the meeting. He presented a letter dated September 16, 2013 regarding the request for GTC to promote the Dempster Highway Strategy and how to deal with allowing caribou leaders to pass. Elders want the caribou leaders to cross the highway when on their migration route. They have checked locations of the harvest on the highway, the collar locations on caribou, and have even observed them, and noticed that they head west. They changed their migration pattern. A large number of caribou came to the road in July. They were harvested immediately despite recommendations from elders not to bother them. Even harvesters from the Sahtu region participated. Harvesters now have increased opportunities to get caribou during better weather. There were some efforts to allow caribou to cross the highway. A road closure was tried but it is but hard to regulate, determine the timing, and to enforce.

The challenge is how to allow caribou to cross the highway while still allowing a harvest. One can't tell someone not to harvest on the highway, due to their aboriginal rights. We don't want to participate in enforcement. We fear being part of an enforcement team and ending up in court due to a challenge related to encroaching on aboriginal rights.

From James Creek up to the border is a special management area. Everyone goes there to shoot caribou. One proposal coming around to all the co-management bodies is this: During the fall caribou migration going south, there should not be any harvesting of caribou on the north side of highway. Once they have crossed to the south (or east) side it would be acceptable to harvest them. This would not be saying not to hunt at all, but stating where to hunt them. It would be easy for youth to understand, and easy for elders to tell others. In the spring there are no problems. We don't see the caribou for the rest of year. Last year there was no caribou except for summer.

Right now no one is listening. We want to get feedback or thoughts whether this is a good idea or a wasted effort. If hunters see what we are trying to do then maybe they will listen. We want caribou to go to Caribou Mountain. Elders say there are no more caribou on Caribou Mountain anymore. The government rescinded the let-the-leaders-pass regulation, but didn't state that it is up to the various jurisdictions to manage the harvest. This will be going before all the RRC and the RRB for discussion.

Roberta Joseph stated that this is a good proposal for GTC's traditional territory and jurisdiction, as they have the authority to manage their citizens and manage harvest within their traditional territory. These types of management actions take time and require extensive effort to communicate to citizens in the traditional territory. Education and communication needs to be done at the beginning. This doesn't have an impact on TH citizens because they don't go that far up north to hunt.

David Frost agreed that this proposal from GTC is a good idea.

Norman said that since YG will be removing the Let the Leaders Pass regulation, they have encouraged other jurisdictions to look at appropriate management actions in their respective jurisdictions. This proposal is in response to that.

Steve Buyck said Norman's points are valid; it will come down to good communication and education for people to buy into it. There could be an implementation phase – for example making the first year a “volunteer” compliance. Suggest looking at assigning kilometre points to identify the boundaries.

Norman will be talking with other co-management bodies about this GTC proposal as well.

Joe Tetlich said that every First Nation has traditional hunting grounds and we don't always know what happens there. The Dempster is a public area so what happens there is more evident. It is good that GTC has taken the step of trying to address this issue. The PCMB supports the proposal on its face.

Mike Gill related that when the Board discussed the rescinding of the regulations, there was some apprehension because the issues that resulted in the implementation of the regulations were still there. GTC is encouraged to assess how it their proposal works out once it's implemented. Mike indicated that he fully supports this.

Wilbert Firth said he is in support of this proposal. Perhaps governments can work with the communities on monitoring this.

Charles Pokiak supports this proposal. In a few years, an all-weather road will be going to Tuk so accessibility will be greater for Inuvialuit harvesters. Communication in the community will be important.

Stephen Charlie said that under their new wildlife act, First Nations and Inuvialuit will have greater say on their private lands, and there will be new mechanisms for the department to enforce management actions or regulations on the private lands upon request.

**Action 13-14**      ***ED to reply to GTC with acknowledgement of their letter and support for their Dempster harvest management proposal.***

## **Harvest Management Plan update**

Deana reviewed the milestones table and pointed out tasks that should have been completed by to date. By the second week in April Parties should have responded with written comments. We are still waiting for everyone except TH, YG, GNWT and Canada. In August we should have been completing communications materials for distribution. The Communications Working Group met via teleconference to discuss messaging, media, etc.

Members were reminded that it is important for Parties to respond on time in order not to delay the process. In July everyone should have submitted harvest data reports and questionnaires. By the July 15, the PCTC should have all the data in order to produce a summary report. They are not able to do that when we are missing harvest data, and as a result, their work will be delayed. This is a critical piece to the AHM, and it is not fair to expect the PCTC to do that work on short notice each year.

Joe pointed out that IGC, GTC, NND, and VGFN need to submit harvest data. Deana noted that by November 15, in less than two months, PCTC should have its annual summary report ready. In December we send the report to all Parties and ask them to provide any further information.

The milestones come from the HMP Implementation Plan. The package that was sent out with the AHM recommendations included an activity list. We take time to review the activity list at each AHM.

Mike Gill expressed concern that we have not heard back and raised the following questions: Can we assume that the Parties who have not responded support the green zone? What is the problem with harvest reporting? Is the process breaking down? Are parties not interested in supporting the plan?

Joe offered that maybe the communities have come to depend on the Board to move forward, since we have always taken the lead. Maybe Board members

need to take the lead in their communities, talking to people and requesting a response.

Steve Buyk felt that with the latest numbers being in the green zone it may not be perceived as a big priority. NND is also understaffed and their Chief and Council have many other priorities they are working on, so it may be a missed step. A drafted letter in reply to the Board's AHM recommendations had been provided to Chief and Council for signature. It may have been misplaced. Steve will check on the status of that letter.

It was suggested that we may need to write into the letter that unless we hear back we will assume agreement, and that it should be discussed at the next AHM to find out what is working, not working, how we fix it, and whether there a better way.

Charles re-stated that there is a plan for harvest monitoring with IGC and PCH harvest data could possibly be included.

The Board was reminded that the AHM is in Dawson next February and will be scheduled for three days, from February 11-13, 2014. The public is invited to participate on the first day. The second day is for Parties and the Board. The third day is just for the Board with technical advisors. It might be condensed to 2.5 days depending on presentations.

## **Next Meeting and Closing Prayer**

The next PCMB meeting will be held in Whitehorse, Yukon on December 19 and 20, 2013.

IGC will be meeting in Whitehorse, Yukon September 26-29, 2013.

North America Caribou Workshop will be held in Whitehorse, Yukon May 12-16, 2014.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. and a closing prayer was offered by Stephen Charlie.