May 19, 2015

Re: Your request for access to information under Part II of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act [MIGA-11-2015]

On March 17, 2015, the Department of Municipal and Intergovernmental Affairs received your request for access to the following records/information:

Any and all information contained within the records of Deputy Minister Sean Dutton concerning the George River caribou herd. Information to include, but shall not be limited to, all briefing records and materials/information notes/discussion papers/reports or plans of any kind/electronic messages of any kind, including Blackberry, between Mr. Dutton and John Blake, Wildlife Director. Information to further include, but shall not be limited to, any involvement of any nature, by the Government of Canada, with respect to the George River Caribou Herd.

Through our subsequent conversations you clarified the request to 2009 and 2010 in relation to the first closure (suspension of commercial operators) and then the lead up to the Hunting Ban (complete closure) that was announced in January 2013.

I am pleased to inform you that your request for access to these records has been granted in part.

Access to the remaining records, and/or information contained within the records, has been refused in accordance with the following exceptions to disclosure, as specified in the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the Act):

18. (1) In this section
(a) "cabinet record" means
(ix) that portion of a record which contains information about the contents of a record within a class of information referred to in subparagraphs (i) to (viii);

20. (1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose to an applicant information that would reveal
(a) advice, proposals, recommendations, analyses or policy options developed by or for a public body or minister;

21. The head of a public body may refuse to disclose to an applicant information
   (a) that is subject to solicitor and client privilege; or
   (b) that would disclose legal opinions provided to a public body by a law officer of the Crown.

22. (1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose information to an applicant where the disclosure could reasonably be expected to
    (c) reveal investigative techniques and procedures currently used, or likely to be used, in law enforcement;
    (e) reveal law enforcement intelligence information;

23. (1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose information to an applicant if the disclosure could reasonably be expected to
    (a) harm the conduct by the government of the province of relations between that government and
        the following or their agencies:

30. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where
    the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.

Section 43 of the Act provides that you may ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review this partial refusal of access or you may appeal the refusal to the Supreme Court Trial Division. A request to the Information and Privacy Commissioner shall be made in writing within 60 days of the date of this letter or within a longer period that may be allowed by the Commissioner.

Records that are refused on the basis of section 21 (legal advice) or section 18(2)(a) (official cabinet record), you must appeal directly to the Supreme Court Trial Division within 30 days after you receive the decision of the public body, pursuant to section 60. You may also contact the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner who may decide to initiate an appeal pursuant to subsection 60(1.1).

The address and contact information of the Information and Privacy Commissioner is as follows:

Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner
2 Canada Drive
P. O. Box 13004, Stn. A
St. John’s, NL A1B 3V8
Telephone: (709) 729-6309
Facsimile: (709) 729-6500

In the event that you choose to appeal to the Trial Division, you must do so within 30 days of the date of this letter. Section 60 of the Act sets out the process to be followed when filing such an appeal.
If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact the ATIPP Coordinator at 709.729.2839.

Sincerely,

\[Signature\]

SEAN DUTTON
Deputy Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs
Department of Municipal and Intergovernmental Affairs

Encl.
Hey Melony:
As requested – here are KMs:

Issue: as per Opposition News Release 10 January 2012

_Double standard for caribou hunting unacceptable: Edmunds_

- The law, when it comes to Aboriginal harvesting is simple: Aboriginal people are _first in, last out_.
- We know the GRCH is a trans-boundary herd, spanning both provinces.
- We have engaged, and continue to consult, the Quebec Innu. We have been working cooperatively and they have agreed to focus hunting activities in open zones away from the Red Wine Caribou herd.
- _This is major progress_. We have not seen a major protest hunt over the last two years.
- We must work collaboratively - Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people alike - in order to preserve the herd for future generations.

CA

Carol Ann Carter
Director of Communications
Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs
Labrador Affairs
Voluntary and Non-Profit Secretariat
carolann.carter@gov.nl.ca
709.729.1674, 631-9505
Quebec Innu Meetings and Consultations

- January, 2011 provincial officials from ENVC, LAA and Justice met with Quebec Innu bands in Sept-Iles to discuss GRC management and conservation.
- November 22, 2011, ENVC officials met with members of Quebec Innu in HVGB. ENVC provided a presentation on & discussed issues of GRC herd status with band members.
- In March, 2012 letters were sent to Aboriginal groups in Labrador and Quebec requesting consultation regarding management of the GRCH, including consideration of a TAH. Timelines for both aboriginal and government response were provided.
- Information packages were sent out to all Aboriginal groups providing a summary of the GRC status.
- Meetings to discuss GRC management were held in Sept-Iles on May 7, 2012 with representatives from the Naskapi Nation and on May 8 with representatives from four Quebec Innu communities.
- Aboriginal groups were requested to provide a written response, including a proposal for an appropriate TAH and information on their community’s Basic Needs Level, within 45 days of the consultation.
- Reminder email seeking reply sent to six Quebec Innu communities May 28, 2012
- Due to the lack of responses received, a further request for comment was sent to five Quebec Innu communities in early September, 2012.

- Consultation response status is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Date of Consultation</th>
<th>TAH Recommendation received</th>
<th>Gov’t Response</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWPCB</td>
<td>17 April</td>
<td>Original reply received 4 July.</td>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>TAH recommendation 220 (revised from original submission of 350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised recommendation rec’d 28 November</td>
<td>In preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NunatuKavut</td>
<td>17 April</td>
<td>8 June</td>
<td>27 June</td>
<td>No recommendation provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>18 April</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innu Nation</td>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekuanitshit</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>June.</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natashquan</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITUM</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamen Shipu</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakua Shipu</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matimekush</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On September 12, 2012 a meeting was held in Montreal to discuss future management of the GRCH. This meeting was hosted by the Government of Quebec, the Hunting Trapping Fishing Coordinating Committee, and the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co Management Board and represented Quebec-aboriginal consultations. Participants included the Nunavik Inuit, Makavik, Cree of Eeyou Istchee, Nunatsiavut government, NG Beneficiaries, Naskapi Nation, Ekuanitshit, Uashat mak Mani-Utenam, Nutashkuan, Innu Nation, and NunatuKavut, Torngat Wildlife Plants Co-Management Board and officials from the Department of Environment and Conservation and the Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat. ENVC presented on GRCH population monitoring/projections.
Honorable Kathy Dunderdale  
Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador  
P.O. Box 8700  
Confederation Building  
5th floor  
Elizabeth Ave  
St. John’s, NL A1B 4J6

4 December 2012

**RE: Hunting Closure For The George River Herd**

Dear Premier Dunderdale,

In our initial correspondence with you as the Minister of the Department of Natural Resources on 21 November 2010 shortly after the formation of the Labrador Hunting and Fishing Association Inc. (LHFAA) I advised you of our Association’s dedication to conservation and collaboration with the government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Over the past two years, we have had several presentations from the Department of Environment and Conservation’s, Wildlife Division on the monitoring of the George River Caribou Herd. We have also participated in and contributed to several consultation meetings hosted by your government representatives. The LHFAA held its 3rd Annual General Membership meeting on 15 November 2012 with approximately 40 members in attendance. The Wildlife Division accepted our request for a presentation from Project Biologist Mr. David Elliott, to provide a presentation on the most recent information related to the George River Caribou Herd. At this time we were informed that Government has not made any announcement relating to the Management Plan or whether there would be a hunting season for caribou in Labrador in 2012-13.

Based of the past 10 years of population monitoring by the Wildlife Division showing a continued rapid decline of the herd and the dismal 2012 data indicating only a 75% survival rate of adult caribou, a mere 74% pregnancy rate, nearly no (5%) calf survival and a 2011-12 harvest rate of 2,300 caribou from a herd that is now projected to contain a mere 20,000 caribou, our Association has taken the position that the continued harvest of caribou by both non-aboriginal and aboriginal hunters is not biologically sustainable. We are supporting the close of hunting for the George River Caribou Herd until a time at which the herd begins show positive signs of population growth.

The LHFAA urges the provincial government to implement a long term management plan for the George River Caribou Herd that includes continued stakeholder consultation, a closed hunting season until numbers increase, frequent population monitoring and censuses,
enforcement of conservation measure and the examination of alternate management tools (i.e. predator reduction) that have not currently been implemented to rebuild the herd.

Although caribou is an important culturally significant resource to most Labradorians, the LHafa supports a "No Harvest" policy for everyone for 2012/13. Continued harvesting pressure will only exacerbate an already unprecedented rapid decline.

Our organization will continue to work effectively with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and all other stakeholders on wildlife conservation issues in Labrador and we look forward to further discussions with representatives of your Department.

Sincerely,

Tony Chubbs
President
Labrador Hunting and Fishing Association Inc.
(709) 896-2691
labradorhuntingandfishing@gmail.com

cc. Minister Nick McGrath, Labrador Affairs
    Minister Tom Hedderson, Department of Environment and Conservation
    MHA Keith Russell
    Mr. John Blake, Director of Wildlife
Notes from telephone conversation between Ross Firth and [Redacted]
Wednesday, December 05, 2012

- [Redacted] advised that members of his community were preparing to go and hunt caribou in Labrador
- Asked about the position of NL regarding the desire of Quebec Innu to hunt caribou this winter
- Word is that Labrador Innu are hunting caribou now
- [Redacted] stated that there hasn’t been discussion with NL since May.
- RF advised [Redacted] of the consultation process undertaken by NL at that time including the request for information from the QI on the possible establishment of a TAH.
- RF advised [Redacted] that NL did not receive the requested information from the QI communities
- [Redacted] stated that they thought they did not have to respond to NL on these questions and that they thought that there would be further discussion with the province.
- [Redacted] stated that they hold meetings with the province but arrive at no solutions
- The QI want to be part of management decisions
- [Redacted] has not had discussion with the other band chiefs since May. He has been dealing solely with his community in that time period.
- [Redacted] enquired about receiving the GRCH collar location map. According to [Redacted], Don Burridge supplied him with the map last year. [Redacted] indicated that he forwarded copies of the map to QI hunters.
- RF replied that NL was not willing to supply collar location maps to QI
- RF advised [Redacted] of population estimate of 22,000 and of the seriousness of the current population decline and the need for the province to consider serious actions to ensure the sustainability of the herd.
- RF further advised [Redacted] that the province was, at present, considering management actions for this season and hoped to have a decision in the coming weeks.
- [Redacted] wanted to know what sort of a TAH it was considering for the QI.
- [Redacted] suggested that NL needed to be reasonable this year and permit harvest of caribou for the QI. To stop the QI for harvesting caribou will result in some people going out and shooting caribou anyway.
- [Redacted] wanted to know who would be his NL contact since the departure of DB
- RF advised him that, for the moment, he would be the contact
- [Redacted] advised RF that his brother in law was planning on going to hunt and kill “only” 10 caribou
- [Redacted] had not heard of the NG Aboriginal Round Table proposal
- Thought the idea was a good one
- [Redacted] had not attended the Montreal workshop but thought people from his community had attended
- [Redacted] not sure where to go from here
- RF advised [Redacted] that he needed to confer with other NL officials and that he would get back to him this week
Information Note
Department of Environment and Conservation

Title: George River Caribou (GRC)

Issue: To provide an update on the management of the GRC herd

Background and current status:
- The GRC population has declined from an estimated 775,000 in 1993 to 385,000 animals in 2001 to 74,000 animals in 2010 and to 27,000 animals in July 2012.
- Population projections based on adult mortality of collared animals, age and sex ratios collected during fall classification surveys, indicate that the GRCH will continue to decline and reach less than 22,500 animals by October 2012.
- The October 2012 projection represents a 70% population decline since the 2010 census and a 97% decline since 1993.
- The census projection is supported by other biological indicators of herd health; including low calf recruitment, low adult survival measured from collared caribou, and reduced size of the calving area.
- Reasons for the decline remain unknown. Biologists believe the current decline was not caused by hunting. However, as the population becomes smaller, hunting adds to natural mortality, leading to a faster decline and impeding recovery efforts. This, along with the historically low recruitment and adult survival, suggests that from a biological perspective all human harvest must be eliminated.
- Continued harvest, even in the short term, significantly increases the risk for extirpation of this herd.

Labrador Caribou Initiative
- As part of the 2011/12 budget process, the Labrador Caribou Initiative was approved with funding of $1.9 million over 3 years.
- The objectives of this initiative are to enhance monitoring and conservation efforts for the herd to include: increased biological monitoring and research efforts, increased harvest monitoring, enhanced licensing administration, education and stewardship programs, the formation of stakeholder working groups, advisory and technical committees, and the development and implementation of a management plan for both the short- and long-term conservation of the GRC.
- Activities carried out so far include:
  o Spring calf condition survey and yearling collaring effort
  o Purchase and deployment of 90 Iridium collars for adult and juvenile caribou
  o Fall classification surveys
  o Complete photo census of the herd
  o Mortality retrievals – however, cause of mortality for all retrievals can not be established
  o Development of stewardship and education materials
  o GRC management plan in development
  o Filling of one vacant Wildlife Biologist position
Fuel cache deployments throughout the GRCH range

Harvest Restriction and Numbers
- Provided direction to maintain harvest restrictions implemented:
  - the limiting of one caribou per resident licence,
  - no transfer of licences,
  - no commercial or outfitter harvest.
- Additional conservation measures for the 2011/2012 hunting season included:
  - a reduction in the season length for resident harvest,
  - limiting license sales to government offices only,
  - mandatory herd health monitoring program where successful hunters were required to collect and submit biological samples from their animals.
- The start of the 2012/2013 season has been delayed pending a decision on management actions by government.
- Harvest estimates for 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harvest Group</th>
<th>2010/11 Estimated Harvest</th>
<th>2011/12 Estimated Harvest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Innu</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Innu in Labrador</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Licence Holders</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>493*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG beneficiaries</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Outfitters</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Sport Harvest (Outfitters)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>2425</td>
<td>2243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*combined NG beneficiaries (12E) & regular provincial licences

- The majority of harvest by NG beneficiaries generally occurs in March and April.

Stakeholder Meetings and Consultations
- The Wildlife Division hosted stakeholder workshops in June 2011, November 2011, and June 2012 in Happy Valley – Goose Bay to discuss updates, options and future needs for GRC management. The information gained from these workshops continues to inform the ongoing management process for GRC.
- Representatives from the following organizations were invited to attend:
  - Labrador Innu Nation
  - Nunatsiavut Government
  - NunatuKavut Community Council
  - Province of Newfoundland and Labrador
  - Labrador Hunting and Fishing Association
  - Newfoundland and Labrador Outfitters Association
  - Tungat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board
- In January, 2011 provincial officials from ENVC, LAA and Justice met with Quebec Innu bands in Sept-Îles to discuss GRC management and conservation.
• On November 22, 2011, ENVC officials met with members of Quebec Innu in HVGB. ENVC provided a presentation on & discussed issues of GRC herd status with band members.

• Further meetings to discuss GRC management were held in Sept-Iles on May 7 with representatives from the Naskapi Nation and on May 8 with representatives from four Quebec Innu communities.

• Discussions were held on June 28, 2012 between the Innu Nation and the Province through the ATIK committee; established under an MOU with the Labrador Innu Nation.

• On September 12, 2012 a meeting was held in Montreal to discuss future management of the GRCH. This meeting was hosted by the government of Quebec, the Hunting Trapping Fishing Coordinating Committee, and the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board and represented Quebec-aboriginal consultations. Participants included the Nunavik Inuit, Makavik, Cree of Eeyou Istchee, Nunatsiavut government, NG Beneficiaries, Naskapi Nation, Ekuanitshit, Uashat mak Mani-Utenam, Nutashkuan, Innu Nation, and NunatuKavut, Torngat Wildlife Plants Co-Management Board and officials from the Department of Environment and Conservation and the Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat.

• Aboriginal groups requested government provide funding to establish an aboriginal round table to act as a forum for exchange and support in view of finding solutions, actions and recommendations built upon consensus and respect.

• Aboriginal groups are interested in the establishment of a Co-Management Board that includes representation from the provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec.

Government of Quebec

• The Province of Quebec has taken management action by reducing outfitter harvest on GRC by 50% (compared to 2009 levels) for the 2011/12 season and closing the sport hunt for the 2012/2013 season.

• Province of Quebec officials will be hosting a meeting with Quebec Innu community leaders on October 31 – November 1 in Sept Iles to discuss management of woodland migratory caribou.

• Quebec officials have indicated that they will participate in a larger multi-stakeholder working group.

Consultations on Establishment of a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH)

• In March, 2012 letters were sent to Aboriginal groups in Labrador and Quebec requesting consultation regarding management of the GRCH, including consideration of a TAH. Timelines for both aboriginal and government response were provided.

• Information packages were sent out to all Aboriginal groups providing a summary of the GRC status.

• Aboriginal groups were requested to provide a written response, including a proposal for an appropriate TAH and information on their community’s Basic Needs Level, within 45 days of the consultation. Response status is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Date of Consultation</th>
<th>TAH Recommendation received</th>
<th>Gov't Response Due</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWPCB</td>
<td>17 April</td>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>Draft - 17 July</td>
<td>TAH recommendation 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NunatuKavut</td>
<td>17 April</td>
<td>8 June</td>
<td>27 June</td>
<td>No recommendation provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>18 April</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innu Nation</td>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekuanitshit</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>Draft – 19 June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natashquan</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITUM</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamen Shipu</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakua Shipu</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matimekush – Lac John</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions Being Taken:**

20.1(a), 18.1(a)(i)

Prepared / Approved by: C. Doucet, K. Mehl, J. Blake, R. Firth
Approved by: October 16, 2012
Chief François Bellefleur
Montagnais de Natashquan Council
PO Box 8000
Sept Îles, Québec
G4R 4L0

Dear Grand Chief Bellefleur:

I am writing concerning the future management and conservation of the George River caribou herd (GRCH). As you are no doubt aware through your organization’s participation in consultations with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the population of the GRCH has drastically declined. In the last decade the GRCH has declined from 385,000 to 27,600 animals in 2012. The Department of Environment and Conservation is concerned that the continued harvesting of the GRCH at present levels will severely jeopardize any recovery efforts. If the herd is to be conserved for use by future generations of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, immediate action is required.

On March 22, 2012 the Province wrote to your organization outlining a consultation process for the GRCH. At that time we indicated that we would need to advance the consultation process quickly because of the rapid decline in the herd’s population. On May 4, 2012, we provided your organization with an information package containing the most recent population data and outlining the future challenges facing the GRCH. This was followed on May 8, 2012 with a meeting between provincial officials and members of the Montagnais d’Unamen Shipu Innu Council. Pursuant to the consultation plan your organization was asked to provide a written response to the information including: 1) your community’s Basic Needs Level (BNL) of caribou, and 2) a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) for 2012-2013. We are disappointed that we have not yet received a response regarding your community’s BNL or recommendations for a TAH.

The Province values the input of the Innu of Montagnais d’Unamen Shipu on the management the GRCH, so despite the expiration of the deadline for a BNL and TAH submissions, we would like to make one final request for Montagnais d’Unamen Shipu’s input. If your organization wishes to make a submission on a BNL and TAH, please provide this to me by September 21, 2012. The short timeline is necessary in order to allow time for conservation measures to be implemented in advance of the opening of 2012-2013 season. The population is now at a critical level, and further delays in taking additional conservation steps may have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of the herd.
We look forward to continuing to work with your organization in order to ensure the long term sustainability of the GRCH.

Kindest regards,

Bill Parrott
Deputy Minister
Grand Chief Joseph Riche  
Innu Nation  
PO Box 119  
Sheshatshiu, NL  
A0P 1M0

Dear Grand Chief Riche:

I am writing concerning the future management and conservation of the George River caribou herd (GRCH). As you are no doubt aware through your organization’s participation in the Atik Committee, the population of the GRCH has drastically declined over the past two decades. In the last decade alone, the herd has declined from 385,000 to 27,600 animals. The Department of Environment and Conservation is concerned that the continued harvesting of the GRCH at present levels will severely jeopardize any recovery efforts. If the herd is to be conserved for use by future generations of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Labradorians, immediate action is required.

The input of the Innu on the future management of the herd is of critical importance to the Province. For that reason, on March 30, 2012, the Province signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Innu Nation to provide funding to assist with the conservation and management of the GRCH. Under the MOU, your organization agreed to monitor the community’s harvest and provide the Province with a report of the total number of caribou harvested by its members during the 2011-2012 season. Pursuant to the MOU, the Innu Nation was required to provide the information by June 30, 2012. We are disappointed that we have not yet received this report. Information of this nature is of great assistance in the effective management and conservation of the herd. I strongly encourage Innu Nation to submit this report as soon as possible.

On March 22, 2012, the Province wrote to your organization outlining a consultation process for the GRCH. At that time we indicated that we would need to advance the consultation process quickly because of the rapid decline in the herd’s population. On April 27, 2012, we provided Innu Nation with an information package containing the most recent population data and outlining the future challenges facing the GRCH. This was followed on April 30, 2012 with a meeting between provincial officials and the Atik Committee. Pursuant to the consultation plan your organization was asked to provide a written response to the information including: 1) the Innu Basic Needs Level of caribou, and 2) a Total Allowable Harvest for 2012-2013. Unfortunately, no response was received from Innu Nation by the June 14, 2012 deadline. A second meeting was held with the Atik Committee on June 28, 2012 in which provincial officials reiterated the importance of receiving a BNL and TAH recommendation. Despite this reminder, we have yet to receive any response from your organization.
The Province values Innu Nation's input on GRCH management, so despite the expiration of the deadline for a BNL and TAH submissions, we would like to make one final request for Innu Nation's input. If your organization wishes to make a submission on a BNL and TAH, please provide this to me by September 21, 2012. This timeline is necessary in order to allow time for conservation measures to be implemented in advance of the opening of 2012-2013 season. The population is now at a critical level, and further delays in taking additional conservation steps may have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of the herd.

We look forward to continuing to work with your organization in order to ensure the long term sustainability of the GRCH.

Kindest regards,

Bill Parrott
Deputy Minister
Chief Rodrigues Wapistan
Montagnais de Natashquan Council
PO Box 8000
Sept Îles, Québec
G4R 4L0

Dear Chief Rodrigues Wapistan:

I am writing concerning the future management and conservation of the George River caribou herd (GRCH). As you are no doubt aware through your organization's participation in consultations with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the population of the GRCH has drastically declined. In the last decade the GRCH has declined from 385,000 to 27,600 animals in 2012. The Department of Environment and Conservation is concerned that the continued harvesting of the GRCH at present levels will severely jeopardize any recovery efforts. If the herd is to be conserved for use by future generations of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, immediate action is required.

On March 22, 2012, the Province wrote to your organization outlining a consultation process for the GRCH. At that time we indicated that we would need to advance the consultation process quickly because of the rapid decline in the herd's population. On May 4, 2012, we provided your organization with an information package containing the most recent population data and outlining the future challenges facing the GRCH. This was followed on May 8, 2012 with a meeting between provincial officials and Innu members. Pursuant to the consultation plan your organization was asked to provide a written response to the information including: 1) your community's Basic Needs Level (BNL) of caribou, and 2) a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) for 2012-2013. We are disappointed that representatives from the Montagnais de Natashquan Council were unable to attend the meeting held on May 8, 2012 and that we have not yet received a response regarding the community's BNL or recommendations for a TAH.

The Province values the input of the Innu of Montagnais de Natashquan on GRCH management, so despite the expiration of the deadline for a BNL and TAH submissions, we would like to make one final request for input from your community members. If the Montagnais de Natashquan Council wishes to make a submission on a BNL and TAH, please provide this to me by September 21, 2012. The short timeline is necessary in order to allow time for conservation measures to be implemented in advance of the opening of 2012-2013 season. The population is now at a critical level, and further delays in taking additional conservation steps may have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of the herd.
We look forward to continuing to work with your organization in order to ensure the long term sustainability of the GRCH.

Kindest regards,

Bill Parrott
Deputy Minister
Chief George Ernest Grégoire  
Innu Council of Takuaikan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam  
PO Box 8000  
Sept Îles, Québec  
G4R 4L0  

Dear Chief George-Ernest Grégoire:

I am writing concerning the future management and conservation of the George River caribou herd (GRCH). As you are no doubt aware through your organization’s participation in consultations with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the population of the GRCH has drastically declined. In the last decade the GRCH has declined from 385,000 to 27,600 animals in 2012. The Department of Environment and Conservation is concerned that the continued harvesting of the GRCH at present levels will severely jeopardize any recovery efforts. If the herd is to be conserved for use by future generations of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, immediate action is required.

On March 22, 2012 the Province wrote to your organization outlining a consultation process for the GRCH. At that time we indicated that we would need to advance the consultation process quickly because of the rapid decline in the herd’s population. On May 4, 2012, we provided your organization with an information package containing the most recent population data and outlining the future challenges facing the GRCH. This was followed on May 8, 2012 with a meeting between provincial officials and members of the Takuaikan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam Innu Council. Pursuant to the consultation plan your organization was asked to provide a written response to the information including: 1) your community’s Basic Needs Level (BNL) of caribou, and 2) a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) for 2012-2013. We are disappointed that we have not yet received a response regarding your community’s BNL or recommendations for a TAH.

The Province values the input of the Innu of the Takuaikan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam on the management of the GRCH, so despite the expiration of the deadline for a BNL and TAH submissions, we would like to make one final request for Takuaikan Uashat mak Mani-Utenam’s input. If your organization wishes to make a submission on a BNL and TAH, please provide this to me by September 21, 2012. The short timeline is necessary in order to allow time for conservation measures to be implemented in advance of the opening of 2012-2013 season. The population is now at a critical level, and further delays in taking additional conservation steps may have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of the herd.
We look forward to continuing to work with your organization in order to ensure the long term sustainability of the GRCH.

Kindest regards,

Bill Parrott
Deputy Minister
Chief Réal McKenzie
Innu Nation Matimekush Lac John Council
PO Box 8000
Sept-Îles, Québec
G4R 4L0

Dear Chief Réal McKenzie:

I am writing concerning the future management and conservation of the George River caribou herd (GRCH). As you are no doubt aware through your organization's participation in consultations with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the population of the GRCH has drastically declined. In the last decade the GRCH has declined from 385,000 to 27,600 animals in 2012. The Department of Environment and Conservation is concerned that the continued harvesting of the GRCH at present levels will severely jeopardize any recovery efforts. If the herd is to be conserved for use by future generations of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, immediate action is required.

On March 22, 2012 the Province wrote to your organization outlining a consultation process for the GRCH. At that time we indicated that we would need to advance the consultation process quickly because of the rapid decline in the herd's population. On May 4, 2012, we provided your organization with an information package containing the most recent population data and outlining the future challenges facing the GRCH. This was followed on May 8, 2012 with a meeting between provincial officials and a representative of the Matimekush Lac John Council. Pursuant to the consultation plan your organization was asked to provide a written response to the information including: 1) your community’s Basic Needs Level (BNL) of caribou, and 2) a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) for 2012-2013. We are disappointed that we have not yet received a response regarding your community’s BNL or recommendations for a TAH.

The Province values the input of the Innu of Matimekush Lac John Council on the management of the GRCH, so despite the expiration of the deadline for a BNL and TAH submissions, we would like to make one final request for input from your community members. If your organization wishes to make a submission on a BNL and TAH, please provide this to me by September 21, 2012. The short timeline is necessary in order to allow time for conservation measures to be implemented in advance of the opening of 2012-2013 season. The population is now at a critical level, and further delays in taking additional conservation steps may have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of the herd.
We look forward to continuing to work with your organization in order to ensure the long term sustainability of the GRCH.

Kindest regards,

Bill Parrott
Deputy Minister
Innu Council of Pakua Shipu  
PO Box 178  
Pakua Shipu, Quebec  
GOG 2R0  

Dear Grand Chief:

I am writing concerning the future management and conservation of the George River caribou herd (GRCH). As you are no doubt aware through your organization’s participation in consultations with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the population of the GRCH has drastically declined. In the last decade the GRCH has declined from 385,000 to 27,600 animals in 2012. The Department of Environment and Conservation is concerned that the continued harvesting of the GRCH at present levels will severely jeopardize any recovery efforts. If the herd is to be conserved for use by future generations of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, immediate action is required.

On March 22, 2012 the Province wrote to your organization outlining a consultation process for the GRCH. At that time we indicated that we would need to advance the consultation process quickly because of the rapid decline in the herd’s population. On May 4, 2012, we provided your organization with an information package containing the most recent population data and outlining the future challenges facing the GRCH. This was followed on May 8, 2012 with a meeting between provincial officials and members of the Pakua Shipu Innu Council. Pursuant to the consultation plan your organization was asked to provide a written response to the information including: 1) your community’s Basic Needs Level (BNL) of caribou, and 2) a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) for 2012-2013. We are disappointed that we have not yet received a response regarding your community’s BNL or recommendations for a TAH.

The Province values the input of the Innu of Pakua Shipu on the management of the GRCH, so despite the expiration of the deadline for a BNL and TAH submissions, we would like to make one final request for Pakua Shipu’s input. If your organization wishes to make a submission on a BNL and TAH, please provide this to me by September 21, 2012. The short timeline is necessary in order to allow time for conservation measures to be implemented in advance of the opening of 2012-2013 season. The population is now at a critical level, and further delays in taking additional conservation steps may have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of the herd.
We look forward to continuing to work with your organization in order to ensure the long term sustainability of the GRCH.

Kindest regards,

Bill Parrott
Deputy Minister
Ron

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Blake, John
To: Mehl, Katherine; Maloney, James
Cc: Bowles, Ron; Crowley, Shannon; Edwards, Herb; Firth, Ross; Gover, Aubrey; Harvey, Brian; Mellor, Justin S. C.
Subject: RE: GRC info update

Jim,

I fail to see how an operational plan can be effective if it is not intricately linked with the managing authority. A big component of consultations on future management actions will require that we have discussions regarding how any future restrictions might in fact be applied. To be sure the aboriginal groups themselves will be providing suggestions on how this might be applied. Am I reading you correct that the enforcement plan was and will remain a unilateral decision of your Division? Also, I am curious as to when this confidential plan became operational?

John

From: Mehl, Katherine
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 11:25 AM
To: Maloney, James
Cc: Blake, John; Bowles, Ron; Carter, Ruby; Crowley, Shannon; Edwards, Herb; Firth, Ross; Galgay, Taracetta; Gover, Aubrey; Harvey, Brian; Melindy, Shawn D.; Mellor, Justin S. C.; Simms, Herb; Watkins, Michelle
Subject: RE: GRC Info update

Thank you Jim – it is helpful to know this. I have copied the others in our working group, to share this information with them as well.

Once again, thank you for your time and reassurance that the enforcement aspect will be covered,

Katherine

Katherine Mehl, Ph.D.
Senior Manager of Habitat Game and Fur Management
Wildlife Division
PO Box 2007
117 Riverside Dr.
Corner Brook, NL A2H 7S1
Phone: (709) 637-2383
Fax: (709) 637-2004
Hi Katherine,

The Fish & Wildlife Enforcement Division have developed and implemented an operational plan to deal with situations as you described. The plan is confidential and cannot be shared outside our agency, for reasons I’m sure you would understand, security of officers, credibility of the plan etc. We are ready to respond if and when needed.

Jim

James Maloney  A/ Director
Fish and Wildlife Enforcement Division
Dept. of Justice
Corner Brook, NL
709 637-2972
jamesmaloney@gov.nl.ca

Hi Jim,

Thank you for your input. In speaking with Ruby about this and the larger process that we are all about to undertake, Ruby had raised some important questions that were absent from our previous group discussions. Specifically, the need for support from DOJ if a TAH is implemented. Of special concern is the necessity for enforcement, active charges for infringements if harvest by any one Aboriginal group were to exceed their established TAH. Your input on the matter, to include potential issues or implications, and the advice of Justin will be helpful.

Thank you, in advance for your contributions to the discussions and assistance in working through this process with us.

Katherine

Katherine Mehlf, Ph.D.
Senior Manager of Habitat Game and Fur Management
Wildlife Division
PO Box 2007
117 Riverside Dr.
Corner Brook, NL A2H 7S1
Phone: (709) 637-2383
Fax: (709) 637-2004


From: Maloney, James
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 9:19 AM
To: Mehl, Katherine
Subject: RE: GRC info update
Hi Katherine,
I agree, a great job done on putting this together.
Jim

James Maloney  A/ Director
Fish and Wildlife Enforcement Division
Dept. of Justice
Corner Brook, NL
709 637-2972
jamesmaloney@gov.nl.ca

From: Mehl, Katherine
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2012 10:32 AM
To: Blake, John; Bowles, Ron; Carter, Ruby; Crowley, Shannon; Edwards, Herb; Firth, Ross; Galgay, Taracetta; Gover, Aubrey; Harvey, Brian; Maloney, James; Melindy, Shawn D.; Meiller, Justin S. C.; Simms, Herb; Watkins, Michelle
Subject: FW: GRC info update

Hi to All,

Please find attached an updated version of the information packet to be mailed to Aboriginal groups prior to the upcoming bi-lateral consultations. Please review and provide comment – If I do not hear from you by Thurs, 5 April 2012, I will assume that you are OK with the current wording and format.

Not to bias anyone’s opinion on the matter but I believe Linda, our Information & Publications Coordinator here at the WD did a great job on this!

Thank you for your time and thoughts provided on the previous version and, in advance, for your time in reviewing the revised version. Have a great weekend!

Katherine

Katherine Mehl, Ph.D.
Senior Manager of Habitat Game and Fur Management
Wildlife Division
PO Box 2007
117 Riverside Dr.
Corner Brook, NL  A2H 7S1
Phone: (709) 637-2383
Fax: (709) 637-2004

From: Skinner, Linda
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2012 3:52 PM
To: Mehl, Katherine; Blake, John; Crowley, Shannon
Subject: GRC info update

Latest draft with yesterday’s changes.

Linda Skinner
Information & Publications Coordinator
Department of Environment & Conservation
Wildlife Division
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL
A2H 7S1
(709) 637-2968
lindaskinner@gov.nl.ca

Read the current edition of Our Wildlife
Dear Ken

Thank-you for taking the time to meet with Government of Newfoundland and Labrador officials in Montreal on February 22 to discuss matters related to the management of George River caribou. You’ll recall that the province is interested in engaging with six Quebec Innu bands for the purpose of discussing:

1. Whether the respective bands feel that a total allowable harvest (TAH) may be necessary for the 2012/13 season
2. If yes, then what might be an appropriate TAH level
3. What is the basic needs level of each respective Quebec Innu band

The province will shortly mail a letter to the Innu Takuakan Uashat Mak Mani-Utenam (ITUM) First Nation, Unamen Shipu First Nation, Pakua Shipi First Nation, Nutakuan First Nation, Ekanitshit First Nation, Matimekush – Lac John First Nation seeking consultation on the above noted points.

In order to facilitate engagement with these bands, we discussed in Montreal bringing together representatives from each of the six bands to a meeting in Sept Iles in April. We further discussed that 3 or 4 representatives from each community might travel to Sept Iles and receive financial support from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for travel related expenses. You indicated at the meeting that you would be willing to facilitate arrangements to have community representatives’ travel to Sept Iles.

The province wishes to engage in a two part dialogue with Quebec Innu during our time in Sept Iles. Firstly, all community representatives will receive a presentation from Government of Newfoundland and Labrador officials on the current status of the George River caribou herd including current management actions and population trends. Secondly, time would be allocated for Government of Newfoundland and Labrador officials to meet bilaterally with each community to discuss the three questions posed above. As discussed on the 22\textsuperscript{nd}, the province will seek the participation of Government of Quebec officials in the presentation on George River caribou management at our meeting in Sept Iles.

I’d be grateful if you would please confirm your continued interest in assisting with organizing a Sept Iles meeting for April. Please also provide me with an estimated cost associated with bringing 3 or 4 community representatives to Sept Iles over a two day period for the purposes outlined above.

I look forward to hearing from you on this important issue.

Regards,
Ross
Note to File
Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs

Title: Montreal meetings on George River Caribou Management

Issue: Meeting with Quebec officials and Quebec Innu (QI) on February 22 in Montreal related to George River Caribou Herd (GRCH) management. NL Participants: Ross Firth, ADM Natural Heritage, ENVC; John Blake, Director wildlife division, ENVC; Aubrey Gover, ADM, Aboriginal Affairs, IGAA; and, Herb Simms, Senior Policy Analyst, IGAA.

Background and Current Status:
QC Officials Meeting
- Participants from QC included: Nathalie Camden – ADM, Wildlife (Ministry of Natural Resources and Wildlife, Province of Quebec); Denis Vandal – Director, Energy Wildlife Forestry Mining (MNRW); and Yvon Boilard (Native Affairs Division).
- NL officials provided an overview of action items regarding conservation measures for the GRCH for 2011/12 and 2012/13 which included: the continuation of 2010/11 harvest restrictions; additional measures effective December 19th 2011; an Aboriginal consultation process to establish Total Allowable Harvest (TAH); the formation of a Provincial advisory Committee; the continuation of bi-lateral engagement with QC; and new research and monitoring initiatives. For more detail see the attached annex.
- NL indicated there were several questions that needed to be answered with respect to aboriginal consultation: should there be a TAH, and, if so, what is the basic needs level of the respective aboriginal groups? NL further indicated that if a TAH was indeed established, it would likely be less than a thousand animals, which will all go to aboriginal peoples for food, social and ceremonial purposes.
- QC officials asked if the information packages to be sent to aboriginal groups as part of NL’s consultation process would contain information on sedentary (woodland) caribou. NL officials indicated that the Province had worked hard to establish sedentary and migratory caribou as distinct populations with distinct regulatory approaches. In NL’s view, there should be no directed hunt for woodland populations and NL had, as a consequence, directed harvest away from that population towards GRCH to take pressure off of endangered populations such as the Red Wine Herd.
- QC officials indicated that they are ending the sport hunt for GRCH for 2012/13 and will need to then establish a TAH and develop a strategy to approach users and engage in consultations. In their view, how such a TAH is implemented in the field is critical and will require buy-in by all user groups to be effective. QC also indicated that they were considering closing the aboriginal hunt but had received significant pushback on this matter.
- The process to implement a TAH is still at its early stages in QC and QC officials suggested that NL and QC will need to coordinate in order to determine how such a quota would be implemented. QC and NL officials discussed how a TAH would be implemented and QC asked whether a TAH should be split between provinces and managed provincially or should Provinces meet together with aboriginal groups?
- QC indicated that in their communications with Matimekush, there had been disagreement that the GRCH was in trouble. QC officials indicated that other aboriginal groups (Inuit, Naskapi, Cree) in the province including those involved in the Hunting, Fishing, and Trapping Coordinating Committee (HFTCC) are in agreement that the GRCH is in trouble.

23.1(a)...

- QC officials indicated that the QC Inuit and Naskapi are ready to accept a TAH. QC is working on a management plan with the HFTCC, which could include a TAH for the GRCH, but the plan is still about a
year from completion. NL asked if the delay related to the development of a management plan meant that there would end up being a season for GRCH in QC for 2012/13. QC said it depended on action taken by the HFTCC. In QC, a TAH is synonymous with the term “upper limit of kill”. In NL’s view, however, none of those aboriginal groups on the HFTCC are taking significant numbers from the GRCH.

- NL asked if there were figures for the Schefferville (Matimekush) hunt. QC said that they had been told that the Naskapi had probably taken more animals from GRCH than the QI and that discussions with Chief McKenzie were largely dominated by other issues including minerals. NL figures indicate about 300-500 animals have been taken in Schefferville area.

- NL is not engaging QC Inuit because they do not hunt caribou in Labrador. If they hunt in Labrador at all, their rights are confined to the Torngat National Park.

- QC officials suggested that the caribou workshop being organized by the HFTCC and proposed for May in Montreal would provide an opportunity to obtain buy in from aboriginal groups for the need for a TAH. NL officials, however, questioned if such a workshop would allow for a workable TAH process. Concern was expressed by NL officials regarding the ability for QC to reach a decision by August. NL also took the position that the establishment of a basic needs level would require a series of bi-laterals. QC officials suggested that the workshop could provide an opportunity for aboriginal groups to express their opinions and that aboriginal groups in QC see GRCH as a co-management (with aboriginal groups) issue. It is not clear as to the meaning of joint management in this context or if they see it as range-wide management by all affected groups in both provinces.

- NL officials provided a description of the current approach to consultation to QC officials (different letters to different groups) and indicated that letters would be sent in the near future. NL officials indicated that QC would be copied on the letters. QC officials had some concerns that if aboriginal groups received the consultation letter before the workshop they may not engage in the workshop, or wonder how the workshop relates to the letters.

- NL officials argued that such a workshop would not meet consultation requirements, but may be useful as an information sharing opportunity. QC officials noted that they would be reconsidering the scope of the workshop. QC would like NL to encourage NL users of the GRCH to participate, but NL officials indicated a clearer understanding of the purpose of the workshop was required before encouraging such participation.

- QC officials noted (supported by NL) the importance for the harmonization of QC’s and NL’s approaches and that the current interprovincial informal group is helpful.

23.1(a)(i).

The duty to consult, however, is not a recognition of such rights. The QI groups have asserted harvesting rights previously before the Lower Churchill Joint Review Panel. The CAM claim extended into Labrador.

- QC inquired about further information gathering planned in NL this year and NL said a new survey may only be needed if TAH was to be set at zero for 2012/13, which is scientifically defendable in NL’s view. QC officials suggested that a TAH of zero would be difficult to implement in QC, but they expected there would be some TAH for next year. QC asked if NL was considering compensation to caribou users and NL officials indicated that this was not part of the Province’s plans at this point.

- Both QC and NL agreed that further bilateral discussion needed to occur on the identification of critical population thresholds that would trigger specific harvest restrictions.

- There will be another meeting through conference call in March.
Meeting with QC Innu (QI) Counsel

- Participants included: Ken Rock – Counsel for Uashat; Nadir Andre – Counsel for Matimekush; and, Armand McKenzie and Patricia Ochman-Counsels for ITUM. Chief Gregoire and Chief McKenzie made a brief appearance but did not participate in the meeting.
- NL opened the meeting with the case for a curtailed harvest of the GRCH and the need to set a TAH. NL officials asked aboriginal counsel (Ken and Nadir) for advice on how best to carry out consultations in order to minimize the number of required meetings. NL specified that there was a desire to engage QI groups and that biological information points towards the fact that the GRCH is in danger and action is critical. NL asked what would be best approach to take.
- Ken Rock indicated that he envisions two levels of consultation:
  - Information on the NL management actions that led to the GRCH decline and why the QI had not been consulted before now?
  - What actions NL is planning to complete to ensure that communities continue to access caribou and there is a way to improve future management of the herd between Innu communities and NL?
- Nadir Andre (Counsel for Matimekush) said that he had been in contact with elders who are quite surprised by the decline and asked if there may be a better way to coordinate on the GRCH. He said that having QI involved in the process would help in getting buy-in from the people. Consultation was not enough in their view. They want to be part of the decision making process. Matimekush counsel said that they had been participating with the QC government in a co-management plan and they would seek QC’s permission to release the proposed MOU as a possible template for NL. This is a collaborative effort based in Schefferville between QC Department of Natural Resources and the Matimekush Band. NL officials indicated they would be interested in reviewing the agreement. Nadir indicated he would follow-up on this request.
- QI denoted that there would be a need for measures taken by NL and QC to match. Counsel for Uashat (Ken Rock) said that he would be willing to facilitate meetings but that NL would need to provide funding to offset costs. NL suggested they would be willing to defray some travel costs. Uashat Counsel further indicated that a single meeting could be arranged in Sept Iles and there would need to be a concrete proposal produced at that meeting. QI would like to see the announcement of joint measures that could be announced at that meeting.
- QI suggested that NL should consult with Innu Nation (IN) and QI at the same time in a parallel process and not consult IN first and then QI. QI said they were not sure, however, if incorporating Naskapi into the meeting was feasible due to issues related to the James Bay Agreement. They also were adamant that measures must be taken first to restrict non-aboriginal hunt and that QI needed information on that hunt to bring back to their people to support TAH.
- Innu counsel expressed an interest in having the Innu take on a greater role in monitoring of the harvest and asked how NL might assist the Innu in this capacity? NL did not commit to such a role or any capacity funding for such a role.
- NL was appreciative for the help organizing the meeting and committed to getting back to the QI with more details as developed. Such a meeting will be planned for the end of March, early April. The 2nd, 3rd, 4th of April in Sept Iles were discussed as potential dates with perhaps three or four people from each community. QI suggested that QC should cover some of the costs as well and said they would inform Chiefs of the meeting and set up process.

Prepared by: Herb Simms  
February 28, 2012
Interdepartmental Meeting
George River Caribou Management
January 26, 2011

Attendees: Mark Bugden [IGAA], Taracetta Galgay [IGAA], Herb Edwards [JUS], Justin Miller [JUS], John Blake [ENVC], Katherine Mehl [ENVC], Rob Bowles [LAO], Jim Maloney [JUS], Denise Woodrow [JUS], Herb Simms [EC]

Discussion points at the meeting included the development and management approaches for GRCH including a TAH for 2012/13. The respective role of each department was also discussed.

The meeting opened with a presentation on current biological indicators of the George River Caribou herd (GRCH)

Overview of ENVC Presentation:
• Current estimate is 50,000 animals in GRCH with a projected population of 33,000 by Fall 2012. The decline has accelerated.
• The Labrador Caribou initiative 2011/12 is ongoing with 90 new collars deployed and other information gathering underway along with staff recruitment, education, and the development of a management plan.
• Direction 10/11 continued the 2010/11 Harvest restrictions with additional measures that included:
  o Limiting licence sales to government offices
  o Initiation of herd monitoring program
  o Reduction of season length for licenced hunters
  o An announcement that a TAH is being considered for 2012/13 (2% of projected population) that would in effect end non-aboriginal hunt in Labrador.
• Direction also called for the formalization of advisory process to include a provincial advisory committee, bi-lateral communications with QC, bi-lateral discussions with QC Innu (in collaboration with IGAA); and the engagement of aboriginal groups to consult on TAH. ENVC was also directed to consult and engage IGAA and Labrador Affairs Office (LAO). It was agreed that the committee should meet on a regular basis.
• ENVC notes that they have given presentations on the current state of herd to QC Innu groups. They further note that current data is at odds with aboriginal harvest and that from a biological perspective, there should be no hunt at all in 2012/13.
• This year’s conditions are much better than last year in regard to hunters accessing the GRCH and pressure is greater than last season. Harvest update for current season:
  o 376 licences sold and 176 12E (special management area prescribed under Lilca for beneficiaries outside of land claims area) licences given out.
  o 910 caribou taken so far— Lab west and Schefferville-190; NW Grand Lake and SW Nipishish-720.
  o 57% of all harvest taken by QC Innu (QI); 25% by Labrador Innu (LI); 18% by other.
  o There have been some incidents of illegal harvest in closed and non-zones by LI and QI.
• With respect to TAH: ENVC asked for opinions on process needed to establish TAH and effectively fulfill duty to consult aboriginal groups. It was acknowledged that harvest
allocation was going to be a complex issue and that timelines were extremely tight with consultations needed to be completed by August if a TAH was to be in place for next season. ENVC further reiterated that harvest limits are critical and without them, the herd could be lost.

- **Suggested milestones:**
  - Feb 1 NL/QC Committee
  - Feb 15 Presentation for aboriginal groups complete
  - Mar 1 Consultation process agreed
  - June 30 Consultations complete
  - Aug 1 Recommendations

**Discussion:**
- ENVC asked which aboriginal groups they would have to talk to and

- Negotiations with aboriginal groups would also have to be held bi-laterally and separate from public process.

- In regard to departmental roles: LAO and IGAA have resources to help assist in the process while JUS indicated that they have a template that can lay out the process/broad principles. This would involve: drafting a letter to the affected groups, starting the consultation process, meeting with the groups, waiting for their response and then consideration of their response. Justice will draft a letter that will outline process, purpose, justification, timelines, and allowance for funding if necessary re TAH. ENVC said they would be seeking executive approval for the letter approach.

- In regard to the level of consultation required: It was agreed that the Grand Chief and Minister/Deputy Minister level would be engaged and they would identify appropriate staff to work through the consultations. It was proposed that a letter re consultations would come from the Minister/Deputy Minister to the Grand Chief.

**Current QC and Labrador Innu MOUs:**
- The same letter could be used for other groups. JUS will provide a template which will be populated by ENVC and IGAA and sent to broader group for comment.

Prepared by: Herb Simms
January 31, 2012
January 10, 2012

Hon. Terry French
Minister of Environment and Conservation
4th Floor – West Block
Confederation Bldg.
P.O. Box 8700
St. John’s, NL
A1B 4J6

Dear Minister French:

I wish to bring a matter to your attention which is certainly creating an issue with caribou hunters in the Upper Lake Melville area. This issue has been brought to my attention, on a number of occasions recently, since the hunting zones were opened for caribou in this area, and hunters want some resolve on it.

As you are aware, hunters come into the Labrador area from another province each winter to take what caribou they can get with no regard for conservation, etc. The same is happening again this year, and local hunters are becoming very frustrated with what seems to be a lack of enforcement and commitment on the part of the Provincial Government to deal with the issue, and feel their views are being ignored, and their livelihood being threatened.

Hunters have been telling me that they have been travelling up the Naskaupi River to hunt caribou, and when they get in they see that as in past years, Quebec hunters have been going all over the place, and taking what caribou they can find. They say there’s been no sign of any enforcement actions by Wildlife Officers, to deal with the hunters from the province of Quebec, and are extremely upset by it. They have seen caribou carcasses left behind, and they have had to go without themselves. Caribou populations are not what they were in the past, and some hunters have been unsuccessful in their endeavours to harvest caribou, and have had to look elsewhere, and were not always successful in finding any. It costs time and money to gear up for a caribou hunt into the
interior, and whatever support these hunters need for a successful harvest should be given, and any obstacles minimized.

During the George River Caribou Herd consultations this past fall, local hunters were informed of the decline in the numbers, and were willing to go along with the conservation measures that were put in place. Hunters from Upper Lake Melville area were willing to do their part, and adhere to the new harvest management measures, however, as in past years, hunters from another province are coming in and taking what caribou they want from this area. I ask you, where's the commitment of the Provincial Government to support their own measures and regulations. This is why local hunters feel short-changed by the Provincial Government to allow it to happen.

I am one of the Members of the Nunasiavut Assembly who represents Nunasiavut beneficiaries in this area, so I am making their views known to you on their behalf. I am also still waiting on a reply from a letter I wrote to Minister Nick McGrath last week requesting that the suspension on the transfer of caribou licences be lifted, so that Seniors or disabled persons could have an opportunity to get someone to harvest a caribou for them, as they are unable to do so. It is very important that we do not deny these people the right to have caribou meat in their diet, which they have always had and grew up with. To date, I have not had a reply on this request. The sooner the better would be best while there may be some caribou still in the zones closest to us.

I trust you will offer a positive response to this correspondence, and show some commitment to work together on the above mentioned issues, in the best interests of the Nunasiavut Beneficiaries.

Regards,

Gary Mitchell
Ordinary Member for Nunasiavut Assembly
Upper Lake Melville

c.c. Keith Russell M.H.A. Lake Melville
    Hon. Nick McGrath – Minister of Aboriginal Affairs
    Jim Lyall – President, Nunasiavut Government
    Glen Sheppard – Minister, Lands and Natural Resources, Nunasiavut Government
    Patricia Kemusigak – Ordinary Member, Nunasiavut Assembly – Upper Lake Melville
    Max Winters – Chairperson, Nunukatiget Inuit Community Corporation
    Ed Tutauk – Chairperson, Sivuniavut Inuit Community Corporation
Thank you for your email requesting the opening of extension zones in order to legally harvest caribou. Minister French has asked that I respond on his behalf.

As a member of the Labrador Woodland Caribou Recovery Team, you are aware of the rationale and operational protocols respecting George River caribou (GRC) hunting extension zones. These zones recognize sedentary woodland caribou conservation as a critical and primary factor in the management of GRC harvest, while allowing, to the degree possible, greater harvest access to GRC. To accommodate winter distributions of the GRC, extension zones were created on the southern fringes of the larger George River Zone (GRZ). These zones are located within the peripheral range of sedentary caribou but outside their core ranges. Only when significant numbers of George River caribou move into an area will an extension zone open.

A "closed" designation for any extension zone implies the absence or low occurrence of GRC and high risk to sedentary caribou if harvesting were to occur. Areas where caribou hunting zones are not established are outside of the GRC herd distribution or within core ranges of sedentary caribou populations. Therefore, under current policy, these areas are not open to hunting.

In specific reference to your request to open Orma North, Orma South, Nipishish and Grand Lake extension zones, our most recent telemetry data does not indicate significant numbers of caribou in any of these extension zones. However, recent movements and sightings suggest that some caribou may have moved into or adjacent to both Grand Lake and Nipishish extension zones. Consistent with Departmental protocol, confirmation of the location and quantity of caribou is required before a decision is made whether to open an extension zone. An aerial assessment was scheduled to occur on December 28, 2011. However, poor weather has delayed this flight and we do not anticipate it taking place until the weather has improved later this week. Any further decision on zone openings will be re-evaluated once additional telemetry downloads and aerial flights are conducted.

Thank you once again for your interest and input.

Regards,
Ross
Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage
Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 117
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, A2H 7S1
(709) 637-2199
I believe they had stopped putting new stuff up but there was some existing data still up. I can confirm with Ross on Tuesday if you like. I'm at a meeting tomorrow.

The issue was around data being used by hunters to track herd. Real time data was the problem.

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Dutton, Sean 
To: Simms, Herb; Cowan, John O.; English, Tracy 
Cc: Gover, Aubrey 
Sent: Sun Dec 11 20:19:22 2011 
Subject: Re: GRC TWPCB recommendation 

Does that mean they already stopped or will in the future?

Sean

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Simms, Herb 
To: Dutton, Sean; Cowan, John O.; English, Tracy 
Sent: Sun Dec 11 18:36:39 2011 
Subject: Re: GRC TWPCB recommendation 

Posting telemetry was discussed at cb meeting, and QC did say they were no longer going to be posting any new data.

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Dutton, Sean 
To: Simms, Herb; Cowan, John O.; English, Tracy 
Sent: Sun Dec 11 17:36:18 2011 
Subject: Fw: GRC TWPCB recommendation 

Please note the Torngat Board's recommendation for QC to stop posting collar telemetry data on its website. Herb, did this come up at the Corner Brook meeting with QC?

Sean

Sent Via BlackBerry
FYI
Folks

In a conversation this morning with Nathalie Camden - ADM for Wildlife with the Province of Quebec, Department of Natural Resources and Wildlife, she advised me of two recent resolutions passed unanimously last week by the Hunting, Trapping, Fishing Coordinating Committee. They are:

1. The closure of the sport hunt for George River caribou for the 2012/13 season.
2. To create a consultative committee consisting of government officials from QC, NL and all native users that will be asked to submit recommendations to both QC and NL Ministers on management and access to the GRCH.

Nathalie indicated that she will forward me a copy of an English translation of these resolutions as soon as one is made available. She further indicated that a letter from the QC Minister to Minister French will be forthcoming in which the proposal of a consultative committee will be addressed. I understand that no discussion took place regarding the implementation of an upper limit of kill (total allowable harvest). Nathalie stated that she anticipates a "political announcement" from her Minister referencing management actions from the HTFCC on both the GRCH and the Leaf River herd will be made prior to Christmas.

Ross

Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage
Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 117
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, A2H 7S1
(709) 637 - 2199
From: Firth, Ross
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 3:38 PM
To: Dutton, Sean; Parrott, William; Burrage, Don
Cc: Blake, John; Bowles, Ron; Gover, Aubrey
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Management

Sean

I think that the new information would be to convey our management approach for this season and highlight the need to begin discussion on the development of a total allowable harvest. It probably wouldn't hurt to repeat the presentation about the current status and population trend for the herd for the benefit of those who were not able to attend the HVGB presentation in November. As for "le paix de caribou" I'll leave that to Don to suggest whether this is an appropriate time and venue.

Ross

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 3:20 PM
To: Firth, Ross; Parrott, William; Burrage, Don
Cc: Blake, John; Bowles, Ron; Gover, Aubrey
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Management

I don't see a problem with it. Last year's meeting in Sept Iles turned out very well. Would there be an expectation of signing "le paix de caribou" agreement before or at that meeting? Would there be any new information imparted from NL that the Bands didn't already get from John and Shannon last month?

Sean

From: Firth, Ross
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 3:16 PM
To: Parrott, William; Dutton, Sean; Burrage, Don
Cc: Blake, John; Bowles, Ron
Subject: George River Caribou Management

Gentlemen

At a recent meeting to discuss George River caribou management, officials from the Province of Quebec indicated that they would be interested in co-hosting, with the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, a meeting with Quebec Innu Bands to discuss GRCH biology, population trends and management. QC has suggested that the meeting could be held in Sept-Iles in January.

I understand that there exists a bilateral agreement to establish a caribou committee between QC and the Matimekush-Lac John First Nation but this committee has never met and the agreement expires in March, 2012. I also believe that there is a growing realization at an Executive level within QC of the importance of a coordinated management approach with NL. The proposal to engage the Quebec Innu Bands in a joint provincial effort will send a clear message to the Bands that the provinces are engaged on this issue and that they acknowledge collectively the need for a coordinated response.
I think that there is value in this approach and would be grateful for your comment.

Regards,
Ross

Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage
Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 2007
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL
A2H 7S1

Ph. (709) 637-2199
Fax (709) 637-2180
From: Blake, John
To: Chris Montague; Jamie Snook <jamie.snook@torgatsecretariat.ca>; Jim Goudie <jgoudie@nunatsiavut.com>; Keith Payne; Kent, Todd; Norman, Katie; Richard Nuna; Roland Kemuksigak; Tony Chubbs; Watkins, Michelle; Jennifer Mitchell; Aaron Dale <aaron.dale@torgatsecretariat.ca>; Phillips, Frank; McCarthy, Sara; Baldwin, Chris; Barney, Wayne; Leboubon, Derek J; Mehl, Katherine; Carl McLean <carl.mclean@nunatsiavut.com>; 'grussell'@nunatsiavut.com; Yetman, Hollis
Cc: Firth, Ross
Sent: Fri Jun 10 13:38:08 2011
Subject: GRC workshop outcomes

Folks.

As promised at the GRC workshop in Goose Bay last week we've summarized some of the key discussion points from the session. The attached document also provides some of the background to the issue as discussed and also more detail respecting upcoming monitoring, research and management efforts that will be undertaken. We've taken this approach to help facilitate one of the sessions stated objectives of soliciting further input from stakeholders. We encourage and look forward to anything further you wish to provide in respect to GRC management.

I'd like to re-state how pleased we were with the open, honest and respectful manner that the meeting progressed. I look forward to further such opportunities.

John

John Blake
Director of Wildlife
Department of Environment and Conservation
Wildlife Division
P. O. Box 2007, 117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL A2H 7S1
Telephone: (709) 637-2008 - Fax: (709) 637-2033
Will do

-----Original Message-----
From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 12:04 PM
To: Parrott, William; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len
Cc: Firth, Ross; Gover, Aubrey; Bowles, Ron; Keats, Janet
Subject: RE: George River Caribou

I am happy to meet. I am in Labrador Friday for Combined Councils of Labrador AGM. Bill, if you could ask Cathy to contact Janet Keats she can advise on my schedule.

Sean

-----Original Message-----
From: Parrott, William
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 11:41 AM
To: Burrage, Don; Dutton, Sean; Moores, Len
Cc: Firth, Ross
Subject: FW: George River Caribou

Gentlemen

As you are aware, the province is currently engaged in discussions with the Labrador Innu Nation and select Quebec Innu Bands on the development of MOUs with respect to the conservation of George River caribou. As these documents continue to evolve, I suggest that we take the time to meet to discuss the following:

- Review of current management of the GRCH
- Consistency of approach between the two draft MOUs
- Financial considerations related to the drafts
- Caribou conservation and management considerations in the drafts
- Moving forward

I suggest that we convene the meeting as soon as possible.

Len when will you be in St. John's again or conversely you could join Ross Firth at Brakes cove and link in via the meeting camera.

Bill
September 23, 2011

Via E-mail: wparrott@gov.nl.ca

Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 8700
4th Floor West Block
Confederation Building
St. John's, NL
A1B 4J6
Attention Bill Parrott, Deputy Minister

Dear Mr. Parrott:

2011 George River Caribou Consultations and Stakeholder Meeting

As you may be aware, the Nunatsiavut Government, along with the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Environment and Conservation and the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board, were scheduled to conduct community consultations on the George River caribou on September 14-15, 2011 in the Upper Lake Melville region with consultations to follow in Nunatsiavut on September 18-22, 2011. The intent of these consultations were to provide updates to our Beneficiaries on the status of the George River caribou, a vital resource for the Labrador Inuit, and to discuss management options for the Labrador Inuit Settlement area as well as for the overall herd. This process allows our government to receive feedback that is crucial to our decision making process and also allows us to take a position on the topic.

On Monday, September 12, 2011, the Nunatsiavut Government received an e-mail advising that your government would not be able to participate in the consultation.
Carl McLean  
Deputy Minister, Lands and Natural Resources  
Nunatsiavut Government  
PO Box 909, Station B  
Happy Valley-Goose Bay, NL  A0P 1E0

Dear Mr. McLean:

Thank you for your letter dated September 23, 2011 concerning upcoming Nunatsiavut Government consultations with beneficiaries and Nunatsiavut communities on the status and harvest of George River caribou. I acknowledge that community consultations are very important for exchanging information and providing input into management strategies for the George River Caribou Herd (GRCH).

Given current provincial timelines, we will not be able participate in community consultations between October 16-24, 2011. However, department officials will be happy to participate in Nunatsiavut Government community consultations at a slightly later date once the Province has concluded its next GRCH stakeholder meeting in late October.

Staff from the Wildlife Division will liaise with staff from your department in order to arrange a mutually agreed format for provincial representation at the community consultations. The primary contact with the Wildlife Division on this matter is John Blake – Director of Wildlife, telephone at 709-637-2008, or by email at johnblake@gov.nl.ca. Thank you once again for your correspondence and I look forward to continued engagement on GRCH management.

Sincerely,

BILL PARROTT  
Deputy Minister

P.O. Box 8700, St. John’s, NL, Canada A1B 4J6  t 709.729.2572  f 709.729.0112
Finally, through discussions with your Wildlife Director, John Blake, we were advised that if we wanted the Province to participate, it would have to take place in the second half of October. Further to this, in discussion with staff from your Goose Bay office, we were advised of the Province's intent to hold a stakeholders meeting in Goose Bay and that preferably, this would take place prior to any consultations.

We would like to raise a few concerns with you. Firstly, I believe that the intent of a stakeholders meeting would be to discuss potential management options and present the views of our respective organizations. If the stakeholder meeting occurs before we complete our community consultation, the Nunatsiavut Government would have little to contribute to the meeting. It would be helpful to us if we can complete our consultations, with assistance from the province with updated science data on the herd. We would then be able to discuss the issue with our beneficiaries and review possible harvesting measures prior to attending a stakeholder meeting.

When conducting community consultations in 2010, the participation of the province was not only found to be an asset but essential. Though our staff has the ability to discuss management options and touch on the science, the majorities of the public's questions were very specific and addressed to the province regarding science, survey methodology, history, life cycles, etc. It was very apparent that the public was only ready to discuss conservation measures and management options once they felt they had adequate information on the status of the herd.

The Nunatsiavut Government would like to reschedule our consultations for the week of October 16-23 in Nunatsiavut and October 23-24, 2011 in the Upper Lake Melville area. In order to conduct a comprehensive consultation, the Nunatsiavut Government is requesting the participation of your local biologist. Please have your staff contact Rebecca Willcott, Director of Renewable Resources at 709-896-8582 or via email rebecca_willcott@nunatsiavut.com.

Sincerely,

Carl McLean
Deputy Minister of Lands and Natural Resources

CC. Rebecca Willcott, Director of Renewable Resources
CONFIDENTIAL

MEETING BETWEEN INNU TAKUAKAN UASHAT MAK MANI-UTENAM (ITUM), THE GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR (GNL) AND CHIEFS AND / OR REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER QUEBEC INNU COMMUNITIES

In Uashat
January 12, 2011
11:15am EDT

Attending the meeting:

For ITUM: Chief Georges-Ernest Grégoire, Deputy Chief Mike McKenzie, Councilors Ronald McKenzie, William Fontaine, Adélaïd Joseph, Marie-Marthe Fontaine and Marcelle St-Onge, Lynne Morissette, Ken Rock, Armand McKenzie, James O'Reilly, Patricia Ochman

For the GNL: Bill Parrott, Sean Dutton, Don Burrage, Ross Firth, Brian Harvey, John Blake, Shannon Crowley

A list of the other participants will be provided shortly. The communities represented either by their Chief or by other designated representatives were:

Pessamit, Ekuanitchit, Unamen Shipu, Pakuashipi, Nutashquan, Matimekush-Lac-John

******

Translation from Innu to English and English to Innu was provided by Ken Rock and Armand McKenzie.

Opening prayer.

Introductions.

Bill Parrott: Thank you to ITUM and Chief Grégoire and the Chiefs and Elders. Thank you for traveling to be here. We appreciate the spirit and intent of everyone being here. Thank you for the hospitality of the Innu of Uashat and Mani-utenam. We look forward to this meeting. It is important to continue the dialogue on the caribou, and this is another step. We need to maintain an open and continuous dialogue as we move forward. It is the first step of future communication as we move forward on the issue of caribou management. We understand that the caribou is very important to the Innu people. Let's proceed with the presentation. Then we can open up the dialogue. We have senior biologists from Happy Valley – Goose Bay and they can answer any questions regarding the presentation.

Powerpoint presentation regarding the state of the caribou herds in Labrador.
The powerpoint was in French and copies were provided to most participants. The presentation was in English and was translated to Innu by Ken Rock.

The portion on the migratory herd (George River herd) was presented by Shannon Crowley, while the portion on the sedentary (woodland) herds was presented by John Blake. Please refer to the powerpoint for the minutes of the John Blake's and Shannon Crowley's presentations.

Georges Bacon (Chief of Unamen Shipu): Thank you for your welcome and your help. Hello to all the deputy ministers. It will be hard to establish a working relationship with you because our equipment was seized (by NL authorities) and it is very expensive, e.g. snowmobiles and firearms. I am not saying that I will work with you... This is not a consultation meeting. I have to let you know that one of the members of my community died in a very tragic way while hunting in Labrador, in confrontation with NL authorities. This case is in the hands of our lawyers. There was some sort of barricade to prevent us from getting to health services. I don't know if you're aware of this. Did anyone inform you? Give us an answer. We want you to be accountable. We also want an answer on the seized equipment. I'm not the only one affected by this situation, there are other communities too.

Jean-Charles Piétacho (Chief of Ekuaniutshít): Maybe you won't understand what we're saying... It will be hard to establish a working relationship with you if you don't understand. We received traditional teachings. We called our homeland Nitassinan. It's our school, our home, our hospital, and our grocery store. This is way before your presence on this land. If you don't understand that we're sovereign and have jurisdiction over these lands, it'll be hard to work together. It's a God-given right. Caribou is our way of life, this is who we are. We live with the caribou. That's how we survive. We never abandoned this tradition to hunt caribou. Now, we see that you don't listen to us, to our concerns. We told you about the state of the caribou years ago and the need to protect the environment. You do according to your own values and culture, even if we warned you about the environment. We said way back when that there won't be enough fish for all if we don't take conservation measures. Then, you went on to earn a livelihood out of farming and fishing. We hunt for our sustenance, while some people have the right to sell caribou. I was surprised to see caribou meat for sale in Happy Valley – Goose Bay. We gave the message to conserve wildlife. We live freely, like the caribou, abiding by our own rules. These are the teachings of our Elders and ancestors. Some others will add to my comments, I'm sure. We feel like someone's coming in our home, then taking our home and being the master and telling us how to live our life.

Rep. 1 for Nutashkuan: We have a lot of respect for the animal, the caribou. We always go hunt everywhere. You can see in this museum how important the caribou is to us. It's part of who we are. These are the teachings of our Elders and our fathers. We didn't have much restriction as to where to hunt, it's not our tradition. Thank you for sharing the information with us. We'll look at it.

Rep. 2 for Nutashkuan: I agree with Chief Piétacho... When we look at your experience with fishing, we see that there's less biodiversity. We see species at risk... There was so much cod before, but it wasn't caught for personal consumption. It was for sale. Of course, there's a decline in the population of caribou. There are a lot of challenges for the caribou. The equipment is better and faster, people can track caribou down more easily, etc. So the caribou can't eat properly. It's not healthy. If people were allowed to
hunt moose like caribou, there wouldn't be any moose left. This concerns all people, including the Innu. It hurts to hear all of this. I agree with the conclusions, we see a decline, and caribou are dying. This isn't good. But this is not our fault. We need to transmit our culture to other generations and I can't totally agree that you're in the best position to tell us how we're going to hunt. It's not the Innu who will kill all the animals. Let's agree on that.

Christiane Lalo (Chief of Pakuashipi): Greetings to you all. The reason why we have the Elders here is because they're the ones who gave us our teachings about our way of life. We're relying on this to hunt and live our way of life. Going back to the presentation, I don't think that the Innu hunt caribou in July and October. They don't do it from July to October. In the Innu way of life, they pay visits to one another during that time. In July, it's the biologists that are on the land and they bring us these papers about the caribou. They tell us that there's no caribou. I know about that. No one hunts caribou in July and October because we know that we have to let the caribou reproduce. We're not the ones chasing the caribou then. They have to have babies then. Our Elders tell us when to hunt. I think that helicopters are chasing the caribou and there's an impact. We don't know all the impacts. Running, chasing... The caribou get sick because they're being chased. Sometimes they fall and get hurt and they get tired. Why are we always blaming the Innu? Why aren't the biologists blaming their own actions and their own people, when they chase the caribou with cars or 4-wheelers? They track the animals. By chasing them like that, we risk endangering the caribou. The caribou get injured and sick. God gave us the right to hunt caribou and the right to live off it. We're close to the Labrador border. We call the woodland caribou, the George River caribou, the Barren Grounds caribou... We just call it "caribou". You create the distinction between the woodland and the barren land caribou. For us, it's just caribou. We can't go around to Baie Comeau and then to Labrador West and hunt caribou there. We just do a one day skidoo ride to get to the Mealy Mountain caribou. It's expensive for us to go to Goose Bay. Our only option is to go to the Mealy Mountain region. We have to consider our community, this is our way of life, this is our food. And we don't have money.

Christiane Lalo: One skidoo costs $12,000. We have a few that have been seized. We will start to talk about a working relationship once you give us back our equipment. Then we can talk about measures and laws. Stop harassing our people. My people were guinea pigs for you. The NL agents were trying to arrest people. The Innu were being chased. What about our way of life? I'm not angry, but I'm telling you the facts. You have your way of life and we have ours. We don't hate your chicken or your cows. We never ran after your cows or your chicken, but you brought them here. Some people say that they brought caribou in on the island of Newfoundland and that it tastes differently. We know that the caribou isn't good. We know what the caribou eats. We use lichen too, for our own purposes. We can even eat it. That's how close we are to caribou. We are sick from your food. Our lifestyle changed. We're getting sick. Our food is caribou, wild meat. You can't change that. I can't change the way you eat, and you can't change the way we eat. I'm hoping that we can find common grounds. We can stay here as long as it takes. I'm not trying to chase you away, but this is our food, this is our traditional life. That's our mandate, as Chiefs and Councilors. We have to be advocates for our people. We should try to come to an agreement. That's the first time that we meet together. We sent you letters and requests over and over... We're smart people, just like you, and we're taking the time to meet with you. We even tried to set up quotas for our own people, three caribou per family. We try to do our homework. We try to instruct our young people too.
And we make decisions. We are being challenged in our traditional way of life. We're being arrested for woodland caribou and now also for the George River herd.

Réal McKenzie (Chief of Matimekush-Lac-John): I'm not going to go back on what other people said. I highlight the fact that the equipment of some people was seized. The GNL took conservation measures for their own people and drew this map of places they can and can't hunt. The woodland and tundra caribou intermingle... What do we say about this? We've had meetings like that in the past. The Government representatives were always saying that they would report back to the Minister. You have the power to decide and make some decisions. The concern I have with the map (of where we can and can't hunt) is that there's Innu people lining up and waiting to go to Labrador to hunt. They're right outside the building. They took measures for their own people. Before they go back to hunt, we want to know, with a straightforward answer: (1) are we getting our equipment back? (2) do we allow our own people to hunt in the closed zones? (3) are you going to enforce a quota for Aboriginal hunts? The Elders are here, they have their own assessment of the situation. I'm hoping that people know that time is of the essence. Whenever the GNL makes decisions, it doesn't consult our communities. The GNL implemented closed zones, but they didn't ask us what we thought. We need to be frank and open and avoid the situations that happened last year. Perhaps we will give instructions to our hunters too... I think that we'll give the instruction to our people to go and hunt caribou, collectively. We need that food on the table. And I need a straightforward answer to my questions.

Adélaïd Benjamin (Deputy Chief of Pessamit): I received the instructions to be respectful to all races and of the land and the environment. Those are the teachings I received. We have a responsibility to take care of our land and its resources. People are coming over here and are telling us about the numbers. We had our own preparation meeting yesterday and we have good examples and best practices. We can manage our resources. E.g. Ekuaniishit restored the fish population in their river. We have the capacity to do that. We were given information at a late stage, that there's little caribou left. There's a number of factors explaining why there's less caribou: climate change, economic development (mining, etc.), tourism, outfitting, etc. There's a lot of pressure coming from everywhere. The Innu respect everyone and the land and the animals. We have our own responsibilities as well, to be careful about the way we hunt. Not everyone has the skills. We have to look at ourselves as well. Once we deal with our own attitudes, we'll be in a better position to act accordingly. We have the responsibility... We have sad experiences from the past, like the bison. It wiped out the Indian population. Let's be the first people to manage this resource. We want to be co-managers. It needs serious consideration. We need to improve our relations and our situation.

Georges-Ernest Grégoire (Chief of Uashat mak Mani-utenam): I'm happy to have heard the views of others. We are in the same situation. People have the same situation in the Northwest Territories, the Nunavut, and elsewhere. This is not just my people, this is all Aboriginal people. Look at the NL proposal... I'm willing to do that. I'm willing to work with NL. By establishing this relationship, we can deal with other concerns we have. I'm willing to take that leap of faith. Based on our goals and principles, let's work with those guys. I agree that they need to restitute the equipment. Maybe we can find a common ground with the GNL. Maybe we can do something. Let's give it a try. That's my view. I'm not giving you instructions, those are my views. I understand that our hunters are about to leave to Labrador and it's hard for them to stop and tell them not to go anywhere. It's their way of life. Some are leaving tomorrow morning, some have already
left. We can't stop them now. This is part of our tradition. At the same time, let's not waste the animal. This is our traditional teaching, this is what our ancestors told us, the instructions they gave us. Let's look at ourselves and our practices in the past. Our own people haven't always been respectful of our traditions. We need to do our own homework. And if we can't solve this, we'll just do things as we used to. Let's give it a try and let's try to get our equipment back. Let's get something positive out of this. A lot of our young people, if they get good education, will become good hunters with good practices. If there's a problem with the world economy, we're still going to be here. People will leave our region, but we'll still be here and we'll rely on the caribou. So we need the caribou around. And it's part of our homeland. Let's think of our future. We'll have to go back to our traditions and our traditional food if something happens. White people just go from one job to another, one place to another. That's not how we live. This is our homeland. This meeting is a precedent. It's the first time I see that, all of us together. Let's be engaged and committed. Let's hope we have more meetings and high level meetings, with elected officials. My hope is that they'll take up the recommendations that we're making. We're requesting a meeting with the Premier and the Minister, so they know who we are, and we can establish a relationship. We need to have that political meeting so we can solve this.

Ken Rock: Our guests need to leave by 4.15pm.

Bill Parrott: Thank you everyone for your comments today. We came here in the spirit of dialogue and we also realize the history. We won't be able to change it overnight, but we're willing to work at it, in a spirit of cooperation, and move forward. We respect and appreciate the Innu culture and knowledge and how essential the caribou is. We understand how central the caribou is and we want to move forward with the Innu to make sure that the caribou remains for generations to come. We've seen that today, at the Council building, and we see it in the museum here. The NL cabinet instructed us to move forward on the caribou, on the basis of a comangement board or agreement. As we move forward, that means that anyone who has a stake in the caribou, esp. the George River caribou, would be involved in the decision making. Communication in the past hasn't been that good. We hope that in the future, the zones would be drawn with the input of all people. With no preconceived notion on how it would work, the Nunavut and the Northwest Territories have comangement boards and we're looking at them to see what the best practices are. Certainly then, as we move forward, we hope we could get together and see how the comangement constitution would be set up. This past summer, there was a joint census on the George River herd and we felt that drastic measures were necessary to reduce pressure on the herd. These are for non-Aboriginal peoples. There are no restrictions on Aboriginal hunting, except in closed zones, which are closed specifically for conservation...Regarding Chief McKenzie's first question, we would like to obtain all the information on the seized equipment that you're referring to. On the second point, the hunt isn't restricted in open zones, but for the areas closed to hunting, we can't condone hunting there. This is for conservation purposes. There's too much intermingling between the herds and too much risk to the sedentary herds. We encourage Innu hunters to hunt in the open zones. There's currently George River caribou there. We acknowledge the need for communication as we move forward, and get better lines of communication. If we strive to get contact, we can get information out quickly to you.

Réal McKenzie: Could you ask your people not to arrest the Innu that are in the closed zone at this moment?
Sean Dutton: No, this is for conservation purposes.

Councilor from Ekuanitshit: You're encouraging people to go to the open zone, but would you be able to make a commitment to open a road to render access easier in the winter? It's hard to travel there during the winter.

Don Burrage: We can look into it.

Bill Parrott: That's a CFLCo. road, so we have to see with them.

Georges-Ernest Grégoire: We should have a meeting in the next few days or few weeks, it's very important that we do.

Bill Parrott: That's fine with us.

End at 4:15pm EST.
I am thinking that if we had one large meeting, we would be opening up a hornet's nest. Caribou hunting, in general, is a hot topic in Labrador. Resident hunters begrudge some of the assertion of aboriginal hunting rights. This past winter multiple charges were laid for hunting outside of the zones (charges later dropped) which received much media attention. Some wounds still aren’t healed with that one. I believe that in a large meeting we would not get the info that we are looking for and other issues may dominate the session. It would be difficult to facilitate.

I understand Val’s concerns about transparency. This issue is already public knowledge. 

Michelle

Michelle Watkins

Director, Labrador Affairs
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
Department of Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs
Mailbag 3014, Stn. B
Happy Valley - Goose Bay, NL A0P 1E0
tel: 709-896-1780 fax: 709-896-0045 mobile: 709-899-1582
e-mail: michellewatkins@ gov.nl.ca

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 9:36 AM
To: Watkins, Michelle; Gover, Aubrey; Oliver, Val; Tompkins, John
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan

Thanks.

I presume the selection of resident hunters can only come from licenses, so those Inuit and Innu hunters who aren’t required to have licenses.

Other issues:

I had the impression Minister Hickey favoured one big meeting with stakeholders rather than a series of bilaterals. There are pros and cons to the two options.
There’s an issue with Component 3 (Innu Nation) that Aubrey and I should discuss. 18.1(a)(ix), 20.1

Welcome your thoughts, esp. on the option of 1 Labrador meeting vs. bilaterals.

Sean

From: Watkins, Michelle
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 9:37 AM
To: Dutton, Sean; Gover, Aubrey; Oliver, Val; Tompkins, John
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan

Good morning,

I reviewed the plan last evening and have the following comments:

• Pg 3 - Target Audience component 5: It is an interesting approach to do random selection of resident hunters. I would suggest that there be a mechanism to ensure a proportion of non-Aboriginal representation from the selection, since there will be further consultation with Labrador’s Aboriginal groups. There should also be assurances that consultations target the regions in Labrador. Residential caribou hunting activity is heavy in Labrador West / Churchill Falls / Central Labrador. Of course the North Coast activity is strongly aboriginal based. South Coast and Straits residents travel to central to access caribou.

• Pg 4 – stakeholders / resident hunters: In light of the aforementioned, I suggest that 10 hunters is limiting. There may need to be consideration for resident hunter consultations in Labrador West and Central.

• Pg 4 – Stakeholder / Nunatsiavut Government: The plan recommends that elected official, William Barbour be consulted, but the Province’s own elected officials are suggested to not be present at these sessions. I would suggest that there needs to be consistency, one way or the other.

• Pg 5 – Approach: The methodology is sound. From past experience with facilitation, it may be helpful if consultation questions were prepared in advance and reviewed by TCR and LAA. Where possible, consistency in questions asked assists in analysis of feedback. Consulting experienced facilitators for advice may be helpful. LAA received input from the Centre for Learning and Development, in the past.

Michelle

Michelle Watkins

Director, Labrador Affairs
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
Department of Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs
Mailbag 3014, Stn. B
Happy Valley - Goose Bay, NL A0P 1E0
tel: 709-896-1780 fax: 709-896-0045 mobile: 709-899-1582
eemail: michelletwatkins@.gov.nl.ca

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 3:05 PM
To: Gover, Aubrey; Watkins, Michelle; Oliver, Val; Tompkins, John
Subject: FW: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan
Importance: High
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Could you please review the attached. I will do so as well, and we should look at consolidating comments to send back to ENVC.

Sean

From: Firth, Ross  
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 3:13 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean; Duke, Cathy  
Cc: Blake, John; Parrott, William  
Subject: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan  
Importance: High

Sean / Cathy

I've attached a draft consultation plan that engages both aboriginal and non-aboriginal stakeholders in a review of George River caribou harvest approaches in light of recent preliminary census results. Would you please review the plan and forward me your comments. Given the very tight timeline to deliver the consultations, your timely attention to this issue is greatly appreciated with a response this week preferred.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Ross

Ross Firth  
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage  
Department of Environment and Conservation  
P.O. Box 2007  
117 Riverside Drive  
Corner Brook, NL  
A2H 7S1  

Ph. (709) 637-2199  
Fax (709) 637-2180
Meaning you would delete the first sentence below? Did he agree?

-----Original Message-----
From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Mon 11/8/2010 6:45 PM
To: Tompkins, John; Gover, Aubrey
Subject: Re: Revised - Conservation Measures for GRCH.doc

Aubrey and I spoke with Bill late this afternoon and we suggested the wording from "Any" to "LILCA" should be deleted.

Sean

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Tompkins, John
To: Dutton, Sean; Gover, Aubrey
Sent: Mon Nov 08 18:42:55 2010
Subject: Fw: Revised - Conservation Measures for GRCH.doc

Any word from Don? I had a phone conversation with 10th regarding some of the concerns raised below. They are very anxious to move this along.
Department of Labrador & Aboriginal Affairs Government of Newfoundland and Labrador P.O.Box 8700 St.John's, NL Canada A1B 4J6

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Power, Glenda
To: O'Neill, Melony; Cheeseman, Josephine; Howard, Jacquelyn
Cc: Tompkins, John; Coffey, Tina
Sent: Mon Nov 08 17:50:21 2010
Subject: RE: Revised - Conservation Measures for GRCH.doc
Thanks Mel. John, I have concern with the following portion of the release which I understand was added by LAA and is pending a review by Don Burrage. I'm not sure the first sentence is clear enough, maybe some additional info to explain may help.

I understand this release is time sensitive as Que is coming out with info tomorrow but it's on the shelf until John gets back to us re LAA concerns and wording, and with approval of Minister Pottie's quote.

Glenda Power
Director of Strategic Communications, Planning and Priorities
Communications Branch, Executive Council
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

709.729.0329
c 709.685.4624
e glendapower@gov.nl.ca

From: O'Neill, Melony
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2010 5:00 PM
To: Releases, News; Power, Glenda; Cheeseman, Josephine; Howard, Jacquelyn
Cc: Tompkins, John; Coffey, Tina
Subject: Revised - Conservation Measures for GRCH.doc

Here is the revised news release for approval and distribution on November 9. Please note that I will give the go ahead tomorrow when this can be issued, so it needs to be held until then.
John, please advise when Minister Pottle has approved her quote and when the concerns with LAA and Justice have been resolved.

Environment and Conservation

Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs

November 9, 2010

Conservation Measures Announced for George River Caribou

Following the completion of field work and data analysis for the George River caribou herd census by biologists from both Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec, the Honourable Charlene Johnson, Minister of Environment and Conservation, today announced new conservation measures for the George River herd. The results indicate the current population estimate for the herd is 74,131 animals. This represents a significant decline from the previous census estimate of 385,000 in 2001. In 1993, a similar census estimated the herd at 776,000 animals.

"The results of this census clearly illustrate the need to implement immediate and alternative harvest management approaches to help prevent further decline of the herd," said the Honourable Charlene Johnson, Minister of Environment and Conservation. "The current liberal hunting regulations are not sustainable and, as a result of this census and the feedback we received from the people of Labrador during a series of public consultation meetings, immediate and significant conservation measures are warranted to ensure appropriate long-term management for the George River caribou."

Effective immediately, the commercial caribou hunt, non-resident caribou hunting and the resident caribou license transfer system for Labrador residents will be suspended. Hunting bag limits will be reduced to one caribou per licenced hunter from the current limit of two, and the season will open immediately and close on April 30 in open zones.
The Provincial Government will also establish a committee to review whether additional conservation measures may be required in subsequent years, after a more detailed assessment of the population and increased monitoring efforts are conducted. The intention is to work toward the implementation of a co-management board which has worked effectively in other jurisdictions.

On August 9, 2010, a delay to the start of the caribou hunt in Labrador was announced, pending final completion and analysis of a census of the herd. The post-calving census was conducted in July, in partnership with the Government of Quebec, Laval University, the Nunatsiavut Government, Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board and the Institute for Environmental Monitoring and Research. In addition, public consultations were held on October 12 and 13 of this year with targeted stakeholders.

"We thank all those who participated in our meetings, as well as those who provided written submissions," said Minister Johnson. "It was made abundantly clear by all stakeholders that conservation of the herd is the top priority."

The Honourable John Hickey, Minister of Labrador Affairs, also applauded the cooperative nature that was evident during the public consultation meetings recently held in Labrador.

"What I heard loud and clear from all stakeholders was that conservation of the resource must take priority over harvest," said Minister Hickey. "These measures are designed to recognize the considerable value and importance of this resource to all Labradors."

"Ongoing and enhanced management will be critical to safeguard the George River Herd into the future," said the Honourable Patty Pottle, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. "In the coming months, as we focus on a longer-term management strategy for the herd, we will be engaging and encouraging all partners and stakeholders with an interest in the George River caribou to come together in the interest of conservation to assist in the protection of this important resource."

-30-

Media contacts:

Melony O'Neill
Director of Communications
Department of Environment and Conservation 709-729-2575, 689-0928 moneill@gov.nl.ca
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Consultation Plan

George River Caribou Herd Harvest Management Plan – 2010/11

Issue
There is growing empirical evidence to suggest that the George River Caribou Herd (GRCH) has undergone a significant population decline. The magnitude of the decline has taken the population of the herd below the capacity to sustain existing harvest management strategies. Preliminary results of the GRCH post-calving aggregation census conducted in July, 2010 supports this assertion. In response, a revised harvest management strategy is required for 2010/11 to ensure that the current year’s harvest does not significantly or irreparably contribute to further population decline. Consultations are required with stakeholders and interest groups, within Labrador, prior to development of these strategies.

Public Environment Scan
There is increasing evidence to suspect that the GRCH, which migrates across the Québec-Labrador peninsula, has declined significantly. From the first systematic survey conducted in 1958, which revealed a population of 15,000 caribou, it is estimated the population peaked at nearly 800,000 by the late 1980’s. A 1993 estimate placed the GRCH population at approximately 775,000 caribou. By 2001, when the next survey was completed, this estimate had fallen to 385,000 animals representing a decline of approximately 50%. A preliminary result from a July, 2010 census has elevated concerns that this herd has declined to approximately 50,000 individuals (+/-25%). These results are very preliminary and a final population census estimate will not be available until late fall 2010. However, the final estimate will not likely be of a significant difference that would allow continuation of current, liberal harvest strategies.

The current management strategies employed for the GRCH were established in the mid 1980’s during a period when the population was both substantial and increasing. These liberal harvest strategies include the ability of Labrador residents to assign someone else to hunt on their behalf via a transfer licence system, long hunting seasons, two caribou per licence bag limits, and commercial caribou harvesting. Liberal harvest strategies are typically employed when recruitment exceeds harvest. In the absence of an updated survey since 2001, these liberal harvest strategies were maintained. Based on preliminary results of the July 2010 census, it is clear that these harvest strategies are no longer sustainable and, if left in place, would almost certainly contribute to continued decline.

Caribou are a dietary staple in the lives of many Labradors, including Inuit, Innu, NunatuKavut, and other area residents. In addition, there are three active commercial harvesting licenses and non resident recreational hunting activities that support outfitting. In recent years, commercial and outfitting harvests have declined dramatically. Aboriginal and resident harvest is influenced significantly by the southern migration patterns of the herd. During periods where access is readily available, the entire herd is vulnerable to hunter related mortality.
In order to facilitate the development and implementation of a harvest management regime for 2010/11, stakeholder consultations have been recommended.

Strategic Considerations

A revised management plan for 2010/11 will provide clear guidelines and legislative grant to the multiple user groups who partake in the harvest of GRCH. A 2010/11 GRCH Harvest Management Plan will be designed with conservation of the resource as its first priority recognizing the important and intricate nature of caribou to northern peoples and economies. It will adhere to the precautionary principle, which it involves acting to avoid serious or irreversible potential harm despite lack of scientific certainty as to the likelihood, magnitude, or causation of that harm.

Provincial wildlife staff are confident that the preliminary results of this survey (50,000 +/- 25%) are accurate to a degree that the final result will not be high enough to negate the need to revise existing management approaches. All evidence suggests that the magnitude of decline is significant and will require changes in the harvest management strategies to ensure the long term sustainability of the resource.

The results of these consultations will be used to help formulate harvest management strategies, evaluate the usefulness of proposed strategies and provide feedback in response to the future management of the GRCH. The short time period between the consultations will require immediate attention to this issue. Additionally, any harvest management plan for 2010/11 must be finalized and announced before annual caribou migrations bring the resource within access to most hunters which, lately, has been late October/early November.

Consultation Details

The Department of Environment and Conservation will lead the consultation process. The department will be represented by John Blake (Director), Wayne Barney (Species Management Coordinator), Christine Doucet (Senior Manager – Research Section) and Gerry Yetman (Senior Manager – Stewardship and Education). Representations from the Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation and Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs have not been finalized, but it is expected that representatives from both departments will be present for all meetings.

Invited representation will be solicited from user groups as outlined in the Target Audience section below. It is anticipated that selective meetings with component group
representation will be completed on an individual basis. Public announcements and open public meetings will not occur given the very short time frame required for completing this exercise. Larger scale public meetings may be considered following the receipt of the final estimate and in preparation for longer term (post 2010/11) GRCH management. In order to deliver a consultation within the timeframe provided, it is essential that this consultation plan be reviewed and approved in an expeditious manner and that participation in consultations is limited to key stakeholders. It will otherwise not be possible to meet the September deadlines.

2010/11 Objectives
1. To engage in stakeholder consultations in order to help inform the decision making process regarding recommended changes to the harvest of GRC.
2. To invite targeted public and stakeholder participation, within Labrador, in order to discuss both the current status of the GRCH and future harvest management approaches.
3. To invite representation from stakeholder communities within Labrador capable of providing input into and disseminating information required for future management decisions regarding the GRCH.

Potential Target Audiences
Component 1:
Nunatsiavut Government

Component 2:
Tornagt Wildlife & Plants Co-management Board

Component 3:
Innu Nation (pending LAA and ENVC review of ongoing bi-lateral discussions)

Component 4:
NunatuKavut

Component 5:
Labrador resident hunters. There is currently no association that represents the interests of Labrador caribou hunters. It is proposed that representation from this group be randomly selected from previous Labrador caribou hunting license holders and asked to attend one or more meetings.

Component 5:
Outfitters (selected from current operators)

Component 6:
Commercial Operators (selected from current operators)
Messages
Ongoing efforts by the Wildlife Division and its partners have detected indices suggesting a significant population decline in the GRCH. The scale of the population change since 2001 has not been fully quantified. However, preliminary results from the July, 2010 census suggest a population level that is substantially below that required to sustain the existing harvest management strategy. Input from stakeholders is required in order to help inform the development of a revised management strategy. The new management strategy must be implemented rapidly prior to the GRCH entering accessible areas where they become very vulnerable to harvest. In recent years, this has occurred in mid to late October when many individuals from the herd approach the Trans-Labrador Highway.

This consultation process is intended to capture stakeholder input within the Labrador region only. Larger scale discussions necessary to implement effective co-management with the Province of Quebec and aboriginal groups in Quebec will not be initiated at this time but will be set aside for future consideration. The proposed consultation process will provide information necessary for future co-management discussions.

Stakeholders
A list of stakeholder groups and respective contacts to be consulted includes but may not be limited to:

1. **Resident Hunters** - 10 hunters will be selected at random from various regions of Labrador to represent the interest of this user group. These hunters are selected from past activities in GRC harvest via licence sales.

2 **Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation**
Mr. Todd Kent
Industry Development Officer
Labrador City
Ph: (709) 944-5013
toddkent@gov.nl.ca

3 **Department of Natural Resources**
Mr. Derek LeBoubon – Regional Compliance Manager,
Mr. Colin Carroll – Regional Ecosystem Director
Happy Valley-Goose Bay
Ph: (709) 896-2732
derekleboubon@gov.nl.ca

4 **Nunatsiavut Government**
Mr. William Barbour
Minister of Lands and Forests
Nain
Mr. Jim Goudie,
Wildlife Manager
Postville Office
General Delivery
Postville, NL, A0P 1N0
Ph: (709) 479-9880
jgoudie@nunatsiavut.com

5 Innu Nation
Mr. David Hart – Community Policy Officer
Ms. Paula Reid
Sheshatshiu, NL
Ph: (709) 497-8398

6 NunatuKavut
Ms. Tammy Lambourne
Environmental Officer
370 Hamilton River Road
P.O. Box 460, Station C
Happy Valley-Goose Bay, NL, A0P 1C0
Ph: (709) 896-0592 ext. 229

Wayne A. Russell
Senior Fish and Wildlife Guardian
P.O. Box 198
Town Hall
Port Hope Simpson, NL
A0K 4E0

7 Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board
Mr. Bruce Roberts, Chair
Mr. Jamie Snook (Executive Director, Torngat Secretariat)
217 Hamilton River Road
P.O. Box 2050, Station B
Happy Valley-Goose Bay, NL, A0P 1E0
(709) 896-6786

8 Newfoundland and Labrador Outfitters Association
Mr. Dean Wheeler, President

9 Commercial
Drover’s Labrador Outfitters Limited
Mr. Alonzo Drover
P.O. Box 121
Labrador City, NL, A2V 2K3
Ph: (709) 944-6947

Uncle Sam’s Butcher Shop
Mr. Randy Batcock
13 Hillcrest Road
Happy Valley-Goose Bay, NL, A0P 1E0
Ph: (709) 896-3736

Northern Light Inn
Mr. Brad Letto
P.O. Box 92
Lanse Au Clair, NL
Ph: (709) 931-2332
Fax. (709) 931-2708

Approach
User group and stakeholder representation will be solicited to meet and discuss future harvest management options for the GRCH and to assist in formulating new strategies. It is proposed that the Wildlife Division staff meet with user groups and present findings on the status of the herd and solicit input on how conservation targets may be revised and/or achieved. Representatives from TCR and LAA will also be invited to assist in conducting the sessions. The results will be assembled by the Director of Wildlife and forwarded to the Executive to assist with the consideration of adopting revised harvest management plans for GRCH in 2010/11 and replace the previously approved plans as outlined in the 2010/11 Hunting and Trapping Guide. 18.1(a)(ix)

The Department will work with and accept recommendations from the Torgat Wildlife and Plants Management Board for the management of the GRCH within the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area.

Consultation Materials
Consultation materials will consist of presentations (mostly contained in Power Point format) of biological data, current harvest management strategies, and solicitation of input for discussion on future management options. Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) will be gathered from both stakeholder consultations as well as discussions between ENVC and local experts through ongoing collaborations. ENVC also gains TEK and LEK (Labrador Ecological Knowledge) from people on a daily basis through informal interaction with the public. The Division also has an excellent collaborative relationship with the NG through the Torgat Secretariat of the Wildlife and Plants Management Board.
A public advisory was placed in the 2010/11 Hunting and Trapping Guide that noted ENVC's plan to conduct a census of the GRCH in 2010, and requested public input and comment on the existing harvest management plan for this herd. This Guide was released in March, 2010 and distributed to over 100,000 qualified hunters in Newfoundland and Labrador. One submission was received.

Schedule

At the present time, exact scheduling dates cannot be established. Once approval in principle is received, the Wildlife Division will begin to arrange the necessary meetings. Given the restrictive timelines, some of the noted participants may be unable to meet, but attempts will be made to facilitate inclusion to the degree possible.

Communication with Stakeholders

Direct representation from stakeholders list will be garnered by direct invitation from the Director of Wildlife or Divisional representative. Stakeholder and user group meetings will be scheduled directly with the specific stakeholders/user groups. Open public meetings or co-management meetings with the province of Quebec will not be conducted at this time.

Facilitation

Facilitation of the consultation process will be conducted by staff of the Wildlife Division, ENVC in collaboration with TCR and LAA. Secretarial support for the working group will be provided by the Wildlife Division of ENVC.

Minister/MHA involvement

The consultation process is considered to be an operational issue and neither the Minister nor MHA's are expected to be involved directly in this process.

Recording and Issues Tracking

Wildlife Division staff will record comments during discussions.

Media Policy

The media will not be in attendance at the meetings. There will be no media interviews originating from these efforts without prior departmental permission.

Post-Consultation Communications Activities

Communications Plan to be prepared after the 2010 survey results are known.
From: Oxford, Krista L.
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 9:45 AM
To: Dutton, Sean
Subject: RE: Commercial Caribou Harvest

I thought I would email you the correct spelling of [blacked out] last name in case you couldn't write it down when we spoke a moment ago.

Have a great day!
Krista

---

Krista Oxford
Executive Assistant to
Hon. John Hickey
M.H.A. Lake Melville
Minister of Labrador Affairs
T (709) 896-2364
F (709) 896-7283
E kristaoxford@gov.nl.ca

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 8:49 AM
To: Oxford, Krista L.
Subject: FW: Commercial Caribou Harvest

Krista:

I gather Minister Hickey is traveling and therefore may not be easily reached. If you are speaking with him could you ask his views on this proposed response and give me a call?

Thanks,

Sean

---

From: Firth, Ross
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 9:07 AM
To: Dutton, Sean
Cc: Parrott, William
Subject: Commercial Caribou Harvest

Sean

A fax was received yesterday from [blacked out] in HVGB. It addressed to John Blake and requested approval for the commercial harvest of [blacked out] in addition to Mr.'s remaining caribou allocation of 100 animals (letter attached). Commercial caribou harvest licenses are based on the calendar year and Mr.
current license expires 2010 allocation was for 100 licenses or 200 caribou. states in his letter that, thus far, he has harvested half of this allocation.

I have also attached a draft copy of a letter in response to under Minister Johnson’s signature. The letter prohibits further commercial harvest of caribou under current harvest allocation pending the review of our current harvest management approach for 2010/11. You’ll note in letter to John, reference to the province permitting outfitter harvest of caribou in the period beginning August 11, 2010. is seeking permission to harvest in the absence of the official opening of the season.

Wildlife Division is proposing that request be denied on the basis that to permit this harvest would run contrary to the recommended position of the Division as articulated recently. Further, a refusal to permit harvest at this time should not necessarily be considered a permanent cancellation of the remaining commercial licenses as the letter states that this position is dependent on government review of its current management approaches.

Bill has asked that I forward this information to you and that you seek the view of Minister Hickey on this matter. You should be aware that Minister Johnson has not yet been briefed on this issue although I hope to do so this week, once your department’s view has been obtained.

Please contact me should you have any questions.

Regards,
Ross

Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage

Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 2007
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL
A2H 7S1

Ph. (709) 637-2199
Fax (709) 637-2180
Thanks Sean. I have a couple of questions for you and will touch base next week.

Brian Delaney  
Cabinet Secretariat  
9th Floor, East Block  
Confederation Building  
A1B 4J6  
(709) 729-2845  
Cell: (709) 727-7938  
Home: (709) 229-7202  

From: Dutton, Sean  
Sent: March 26, 2010 3:36 PM  
To: Delaney, Brian  
Cc: Parrott, William; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len; Thompson, Robert  
Subject: RE: Caribou Consultation Plan GRCH Labrador  

One more thing: in the Messages for GRCH, the third-last bullet should probably reference non-Aboriginal hunters and businesspeople (e.g. outfitters, harvesters) as stakeholders (not just NL, QC and Aboriginal groups).

Sean  

From: Dutton, Sean  
Sent: Friday, March 26, 2010 3:21 PM  
To: Delaney, Brian  
Cc: Parrott, William; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len; Thompson, Robert  
Subject: RE: Caribou Consultation Plan GRCH Labrador  

Brian:  

As John Blake has indicated, there has been robust consultation by ENVC with IGAS and LAA on the consultation plan.  

Under Objective 2, it says management options would be discussed with Aboriginal interests in Quebec but then does not list Quebec Innu groups as either potential target audiences or on the proposed stakeholder list. I would be inclined to include them on both. They are:  

- Conseil des Innues d’Ekuanitshit  
- Conseil des Montagnais de Natashquan  
- Conseil Innu Takuaikan Uashat Mak Mani-Utenam  
- Conseil de bande des Montagnais d’Unamen Shipu  
- Conseil des Innus de Pakua Shipu  
- Conseil de la Nation Innu Matimekush-Lac John  
- Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach.
Also, the Institute for Environmental Monitoring and Research is not listed as a target audience/stakeholder even though they are participating in the George River caribou herd census (see http://www.releases.gov.nl.ca/releases/2009/env/0715n11.htm). The Institute has supported a lot of research on caribou in Labrador, so I would think it worthwhile to list them, as well. That would also capture the groups involved in the Institute (e.g. Department of National Defence).

In the Issue statement it proposes meeting begin in April 2010 to solicit input, but on p. 2 it recommends stakeholder consultations begin in March 2010 – if these two references are to the same thing they should both say April.

Under potential target audiences please replace “Metis Nation” with “Labrador Metis Nation” (also LMN do not put an accent on the e – shows up this way throughout plan). “Nunavik” is listed but as this is a region I presume what is intended is “Makivik Corporation” or “Nunavik Inuit”.

Sean

From: Delaney, Brian  
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 11:39 AM  
To: Burrage, Don; Dutton, Sean; Moores, Len; Thompson, Robert  
Cc: Parrott, William; Firth, Ross; English, Tracy; Chippett, Jamie  
Subject: Caribou Consultation Plan GRCH Labrador

Gentlemen:

Attached is a draft consultation plan from Environment and Conservation seeking to conduct a series of stakeholder meetings in relation to the management of the George River and Red Wine Caribou herds. There are potentially a number of broader policy issues here that likely warrant further discussion. Major projects, aboriginal consultation, intergovernmental affairs and enforcement are just a few. As such, could you please review the attached and let me know your views on next steps.

Regards,

Brian Delaney  
Cabinet Secretariat  
9th Floor, East Block  
Confederation Building  
A1B 4J6  
(709) 729-2845  
Cell: (709) 727-7938  
Home: (709) 229-7202
Melony.

We are operating from the assumption that we don’t necessarily know all of the relevant interested parties, and if we do mostly know the groups who might be participating, we might not know the specific individual best suited to participate in a working group. It would be premature for us to identify a representative from the group to participate. Therefore the notion is we hold a general meeting of interested parties to discuss the formation of a working group. In reality, we know most of the key players in this issue, as noted in the consultation plan, and the stakeholders identified in the plan will of course attend that first meeting, my apologies if an impression otherwise is read from the document. From the initial meeting the appropriate people will be identified from within their own ranks if possible and a working group will be established. It may also become apparent from that first meeting that a particular group, person, biologist or whatever could play a contributory role to the exercise and thus become a member of the working group. Once established, the working group will then determine, document and institute the process for larger discussions and drafting of a management plan.

Given the socio-economic, political and cultural issues with caribou in Labrador, the development of a revised management plan for GRCH will necessitate the involvement of a diverse group of individuals. This is a cross jurisdictional population that is in decline. New management approaches may be required as early as August, 2010. However, while there are many with an opinion and much to add to the development of the plan from whom we wish to hear, ultimately the Minister of ENVC is charged with making the necessary regulatory framework to ensure the herds sustainability while allowing access where appropriate. Its important and critical that we begin these discussions as soon as possible.

Regards,

John

Hi there,

I need some clarification for the communications branch around the initial working group meeting for the George River Caribou Herd consultations.

From reading the plan, it seems that an initial meeting will take place, and then the stakeholders will be invited to participate. If this is the case, who will attend that initial meeting? Are the stakeholders identified in the plan the people who will be a part of the working group? If so, why wouldn’t they be the individuals who attend the first meeting?

They need the process explained, namely who will attend the initial meeting of the working group, what it means that other interested parties may be identified at this meeting, etc.

Thanks,
Melony

Melony O'Neill
Director of Communications
Department of Environment and Conservation
4th Floor, West Block
Confederation Building
(709) 729-2575
(709) 729-0112 (fax)
From: Parrott, William  
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 4:59 PM  
To: Burrage, Don; Moores, Len; Dutton, Sean; Matthews, Elizabeth; O'Neill, Melony; Morrissey, Ken; O'Neill, Melony  
Subject: Update on ENVC briefing of the Opposition on the Labrador Caribou  

Folks  

For your update attached is an update on ENVC's briefing today of the Office of the Opposition regarding the Science of the management of Woodland Caribou in Labrador. You will recall that this briefing was set up last week after Ms. Jones' press conference.  

Please advise if you require any further details  

Bill  

From: Firth, Ross  
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 4:10 PM  
To: Parrott, William  
Subject: Labrador Caribou  

Bill  

Wanted to provide you with a synopsis of the meeting with [person] today regarding Labrador caribou. He asked questions related to the following:  

- What is the risk to Red Wine (RW) animals with the hunting that is taking place in the closed zone?  
- Can you tell the difference between a RW and a GR animal?  
- Have the Quebec Innu / Canada / NG been involved in the recovery plan?  
- Where does the number of 87 animals come from?  
- What would need to happen for RW to become uplisted to Endangered?  
- Will the Lower Churchill have an impact on the RW?  
- The frequency of aerial surveys?  
- What is causing the GR animals to change their traditional migratory patterns and timing?  

[person] did not attend. Apparently Kelvin Parsons was going to attend but was unable to do so. I left [person] with a copy of a Feb. 22 collar download map and a map of the respective ranges of the three threatened woodland herds. John Blake (Director of Wildlife) joined the meeting by telephone.  

[person] indicated that he found the meeting helpful and he was struck particularly with the collar location map with its depiction of intermingling of both RW and GR caribou.  

Ross  

Ross Firth  
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage  
Department of Environment and Conservation
Perfect David thank you very much. I will amend accordingly.

John

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Hughes, David
To: Blake, John
Cc: Harvey, Michael; Dutton, Sean; Bowles, Ron; Tompkins, John
Sent: Fri Nov 27 16:09:40 2009
Subject: Consultation Plan GRCH Management

John:

My apologies for the delay in providing my comments – they are minor.

2nd para Public Environment Scan

"... lives of many Labradorians, including Inuit, Innu, members of the Labrador Métis Nation, and area residents."

2) Allocation Limitations: I wonder about characterization of Priority 1) Aboriginal Basic Need Requirements may imply the LMN has an Aboriginal Need Requirement (since they are listed earlier in the Paper with the Innu and Inuit. I suggest that we use the term used in both the LILCA and draft Innu Treaty, thus:

"Priority 1) Inuit and Innu Domestic Harvest"

But don't feel strongly on this point.

4) Joint Management Responsibilities: There is no mention of the Consultation requirements in the LILCA. Perhaps this section should include a reference the obligations in s. 12.4 of the LILCA and to the co-management role of the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Management Board (Board) in LISA. Perhaps a simple sentence inserted at the end of this section might suffice. Thus:

"The Department will work with and consider recommendations from the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Management Board for the management of the GRCH within the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area."

Then I wonder if under Objectives the Board might be included under the members of the working group, but, with the mention of the Board above that might be sufficient to indicate that they may be included in the working group or Consulted in a separate process.

Stakeholders: I note the Board is included in the list of stakeholders. I think that is fine, but with respect to the comment above, I don’t think it is appropriate to imply it is a stakeholder under Objective 1.

Approach: Same issue. We have a formal relationship with the Board. Perhaps just repeating the sentence suggested above at the end of this section would suffice:

"The Department will work with and accept recommendations from the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Management Board for the management of the GRCH within the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area."
Hope this helps — overall I thought the paper was a fine.

Have a good weekend,

David
December 14, 2009

Denis Vandal
Regional Director
951, Boulevard Hamel
Chibougamau (Québec)
G8P 2Z3

Subject: Labrador-Quebec cooperation in George River caribou management

Dear Mr. Vandal:

I would like to acknowledge your correspondence of December 10th, 2009 regarding our respective department’s collaboration on the health and population demography of the George River Caribou herd, and specifically the fall classification, satellite collaring effort and body condition work. This endeavor has contributed immensely towards our collective effort in the management of this herd and positions us well for the upcoming census to be conducted in 2010.

As in the past, the Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Division values the collaboration between both provinces in the execution of our respective wildlife management programs. We have a long history of working closely on wildlife issues of mutual concern and it is my sincere hope that we can continue to evolve and cultivate this relationship. As managers of several trans-boundary caribou herds, we have the collective responsibility in ensuring that these populations are managed in a sustainable and effective manner. Our continued teamwork is essential to our future success.

This sharing of information and resources will become increasingly important as imminent management decisions are discussed relating to the George River Caribou Herd. The effective management of this herd is important to both provinces as an integral component of our northern ecosystems and as a cornerstone of the culture of the people of Labrador and Québec. We are in the early stages of developing a provincial working group to help inform the Labrador caribou management planning process, and we look forward to discussions on how best to ensure this process acknowledges and incorporates the inter-jurisdictional range use of this herd.

.../2
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I look forward to upcoming discussions and project cooperation between our departments in the ongoing management of caribou across the Ungava Peninsula.

Sincerely,

John Blake
Director, NL Wildlife Division

cc Mr. Vincent Brodeur, Le ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune du Québec (MRNF)

Mr. Réhaume Courtois, Chef du service de la biodiversité et des maladies de la faune
Ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune

/ French version follows
Honorable Tom Hedderson  
Minister of Environment and Conservation  
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador  
P.O. Box 8700  
St. John’s, NL, Canada  
A1B 4J6  

Wednesday, November 28, 2012  

Re: George River Caribou Total Allowable Harvest (Amendment)  

Dear Minister Hedderson,  

Allow me to first congratulate you on your recent appointment as Minister of Environment and Conservation. As you are aware, I have been recently appointed as Chair of the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board (hereafter ‘TWPCB’ or ‘the Board), and this letter is my first official correspondence. I look forward to an opportunity to meet and work with you on many files that are important to the people of Nunatsiavut.  

On February 7, 2012, your predecessor requested that the TWPCB develop a recommendation for a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) of George River Caribou for the 2012-13 season. The Board met with your officials on April 17, and after much analysis, deliberation, and consultation submitted a recommendation for a TAH of 350 on July 4. By way of this letter we wish to update our recommendation to incorporate recent policy and biological developments.  

Amongst these developments was an inter-jurisdictional caribou workshop, a population estimate confirming a continued decline to extremely low levels, and a recent TWPCB meeting on November 13. The inter-jurisdictional caribou workshop was held in September and in addition to our board representation, your Department was represented, as was the Government of Quebec, the Nunatsiavut Government, the Innu Nation, NunatuKavut, the Naskapi Nation, the Cree of Eeyou Istchee, the Innu of Ekuanitshit, Uashat mak Mani-Utenam and Nutashkuan, the Hunting, Fishing, Trapping Coordinating Committee and other governmental, non-governmental, and industry organizations.  

Aboriginal attendees met privately on the evening of September 12th and drafted a consensus resolution, which we’ve appended. They unanimously recognized the need for urgent action and supported restrictions if they are combined with a commitment to establish a co-management board. Everyone understands such a board would take time to organize, however it is important that these issues are linked if the goal is to create buy-in and compliance with harvest restrictions.
In addition to these stakeholder deliberations, the Board is alarmed by the continued steep decline of the resource. At the time of this writing, it is our understanding that the population estimate for the George River Herd, derived from the 2012 aerial census and adjusted by the fall classification, is 22,000. The Board-recommended TAH of 350 was reasoned to be 1% of the projected population estimate of 35,000. Accordingly, we hereby recommend a revised TAH of 220, in keeping with the same principles.

That said, arriving at this decision was by no means a straightforward matter of calculating the new TAH based on a predetermined principle. Rather, the Board approached the question anew and considered three options: 1) no harvest; 2) restricted harvest, and 3) unrestricted harvest. Option 3 was eliminated quickly, but there was a great deal of difficult discussion around options 1 and 2. There are reasonable arguments for an immediate moratorium and we expect to have this difficult conversation again at future meetings. However, at the present time the Board ultimately decided to recommend a greatly restricted harvest, as they did in July, given that a small harvest will:

1. be ecologically insignificant (if sufficiently small);
2. be consistent with the Principles of Conservation and the Precautionary Approach, as each is defined in Part 12.1.1 of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement;
3. increase the likelihood of buy-in and compliance;
4. provide important harvest information;
5. allow for social and cultural connectivity and continuity;
6. allow for intergenerational knowledge sharing;
7. allow an opportunity to be consistent with the priority of access established by the Sparrow decision and entrenched in the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement;
8. qualify as the maximum extent of legitimate infringement on the Aboriginal right to harvest.

In summary, the TWPCB has considered recent developments and decided that they do warrant a revised submission. We therefore recommend that the Minister establish a TAH of 220 immediately for 2012-13 and in the near term commit to establish a George River Caribou Co-management Board.

Sincerely,

Ron Sparkes
Chairperson
Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-management Board
APPENDIX 1
TWPCB TOTAL ALLOWABLE HARVEST RECOMMENDATION FOR GEORGE RIVER CARIBOU
4 July, 2012

Honorable Terry French
Minister of Environment and Conservation
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
P.O. Box 8700
St. John’s, NL, Canada
A1B 4J6

Re: George River Caribou Total Allowable Harvest

Dear Minister French,

Through the last several years the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board has been fully engaged with all aspects of caribou management, from research, to policy recommendations, to stewardship and education. Throughout this process we have consulted regularly with the Nunatsiavut Government, Nunatsiavut Beneficiaries, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, academic researchers, and stakeholders across the range in Labrador and Quebec.

On 21 November, 2011, the Board recommended that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador establish a Total Allowable Harvest for George River Caribou - the recommendation was not implemented for 2011-12. On 12 March, 2012, the Board received a letter indicating that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is contemplating a Total Allowable Harvest for 2012-13. The Board has considered the information prepared and presented by the Wildlife Division, and we have attached our recommended Total Allowable Harvest.

Sincerely,

Bruce A. Roberts
Chairperson
Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board
George River Caribou Harvest Management

Recommendation:

➢ Establish a Total Allowable Harvest of 350 caribou for the George River Herd.

Background:


➢ Subsequently, on 18 October, 2010, the Board submitted a series of immediate recommendations intended to reduce harvest pressure, and two intermediate recommendations intended to increase research capacity facilitate inter-jurisdictional decision-making.

➢ All of the recommendations were accepted, and all were subsequently implemented, except the last. As recently as 28 January, 2011, in a letter to the Nunatsiavut Minister of Lands and Natural Resources, the Minister of Environment and Conservation confirmed his commitment to “expedite the formation of a multi-jurisdictional body and facilitate the initiation of a co-management process”. We understand that this commitment has since been varied considerably, and the Minister is now supporting a “provincial advisory committee” (February 7 response).

➢ On 21 November, 2011, the Board submitted a primary recommendation – to establish a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) of 2000 – and several secondary recommendations, including the establishment of a co-management board, development of a comprehensive harvest management strategy, and development of a stewardship and education strategy.

➢ On 25 November, 2011, the Nunatsiavut Minister of Lands and Natural Resources recommended that a TAH be established, and recognized the need to identify an Inuit Domestic Harvest Level.

➢ In a response to the Board dated 13 February, 2012, the Minister of Environment and Conservation rejected the recommended TAH, but shortened the hunting season for licence holders from eight months to three months. The Minister also requested that the Board further assess the need for a TAH for 2012-13. As a part of that assessment, the Board met with Departmental Officials on 17 April, 2012, in Happy Valley – Goose Bay.

➢ This recommendation focuses on George River caribou, but the Board is equally concerned with the Torngat Mountains herd, and will be following up separately in the near future.
Recommendation: Total Allowable Harvest of 350

- First and foremost, the Board recognizes that the GRC herd has been in steep decline since at least the mid 1990's. For the purposes of this recommendation, we do not consider the cause of the decline, and we accept without prejudice the biological information presented by the Wildlife Division: the population is 35,0001, hunting is additive, and current harvest levels are unsustainable. We recognize several sources of uncertainty, and several fundamental assumptions, but in keeping with the Precautionary Principle (Part 12.2.1 of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement) our recommended actions are based on the best available evidence. We do, however, recommend that the best available evidence (including a discussion of survey and modeling methodologies) be publicly released in the form of a written report as soon as practicable.

- In 2011 the Wildlife Division modeled and presented two harvest scenarios – a harvest of 2,500 and a harvest of 0. An accompanying table illustrated the annual percent difference between these two scenarios. At the request of the TWPCB, the Wildlife Division has modeled a third scenario to illustrate the relative impact of a harvest of 350 (see Figure 1 and Table 1).

- If hunting is additive to natural mortality, than a declining population cannot be sustainably hunted, and the GRC have therefore been unsustainably hunted since at least the mid 1990's. (Although hunting may be more likely to compensate for natural mortality when the population is relatively high). But even when populations are very low and declining, the added impact of hunting trends to 0 as hunting pressure decreases. This point is simple and intuitive, but it legitimizes our recommended TAH of 350. The relative impact of a very small harvest will be negligible, and thus the added ecological benefit of reducing beyond this point will also be negligible. We submit that a TAH of 350 constitutes a ‘very small’ harvest.

- The recommended TAH of 350 will equate to 1% of the population, which is projected to be 35,000 in the fall of 2012.

- Inuit rights to harvest wildlife at all times of the year, throughout the settlement area, can only be restricted through Inuit laws, restrictions on seasons imposed for purposes of conservation, or federal laws on firearms control (Part 12.3.1). The Inuit right to harvest to the full extent of their non-commercial need can only be limited through a total allowable harvest (Part 12.3.2).

---

1 The population model presented by the Wildlife Division on 17 April, 2012, predicts a population of approximately 35,000 in the fall of 2012.
Figure 1: Projected Additive Impact of Three Harvest Scenarios

Figure 2: Percent Difference of Three Harvest Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Difference (No hunt/2500 hunt)</th>
<th>Percent Difference (No Hunt/350 hunt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatives:

No Additional Restrictions (Harvest ~ 2,500)

- Given the severity of the decline, and the social-economic importance of caribou to people across Labrador and Quebec, it must be our shared goal to slow the decline and enable recovery. In the near-term, this can only be accomplished by reducing harvest pressure. The Precautionary Principle, which is foundational to Chapter 12 of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement, demands action when there is a threat of serious or irreversible harm. We submit that harvest rates under the current regulatory regime constitute a threat of serious or irreversible harm.
The Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement prioritizes two principles in decision-making that directly affects wildlife in the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area (Part 12.2.1), each of which is defined in Part 12.1.1 and reproduced here for ease of reference. The principle of sustainable utilization is embedded in the principle of conservation, and both are implicit throughout Chapter 12.

"Conservation" means the management of Wildlife, Plants and Habitat, including the management of human activities in relation to them, to foster Sustainable Utilization and maintenance of natural populations, biodiversity and ecological processes.

"Precautionary Approach" means that, if there are threats of serious or irreversible damage to Wildlife or Plants, measures to prevent the reduction or loss of the Wildlife or Plants should not be postponed for lack of full scientific certainty.

No Harvest

- Complicating the foregoing analysis, the concept of sustainable utilization is embedded in the principle of conservation, and must therefore be considered as a principle itself.

"Sustainable Utilization" means the use and management of Wildlife, Plants and Habitat in a manner that does not impair their natural viability in order that the needs of the present may be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

In the context of caribou populations, which are highly variable and likely cyclic, we integrate the three principles defined in the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement into a single management goal – to identify a harvest level which does not impair natural viability, and variability, that the needs of the present may be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. This goal will not be achieved – our recommended TAH of 350 will fail to meet present needs. But the needs of the present may be partially met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own.

- Any harvest restrictions will have to be weighed against the likelihood of compliance, and the ability/willingness to enforce compliance. In the context of Aboriginal rights – recognized or asserted - compliance will be a challenge without buy-in from those affected. Community-supported modest restrictions will be more effective than unsupported severe restrictions: better to have total compliance with moderate restrictions than moderate compliance with total restrictions.

- The case of bowhead whale hunting in the Canadian arctic provides an interesting parallel in considering a 'no harvest' scenario. Bowheads were hunted sustainably by Inuit for 1000-1500 years and then unsustainably by European and American commercial whalers for several centuries, ending in 1915. Inuit continued to hunt bowheads intermittently to around 1980, when they were formally protected by the Government of Canada. Beginning around 1990 Inuit began to advocate for a small
subsistence hunt, which resumed in 1991 in the Western Canadian Arctic and 1994 in the Eastern Canadian Arctic. The effects of this hunt are considered ecologically negligible, and the Canadian bowhead population has been increasing. (COSEWIC 2009; COSEWIC 2005; NWMB, 2000; Mitchell and Reeves, 1986; DFO 1980).

- If there is no harvest, there is no harvest information. Harvesting provides important ecological information, and provides tangible benefits in the form of intergenerational knowledge sharing, and less tangible benefits in the form of social and cultural connectivity and continuity. It is important that traditional knowledge, skills, and values be maintained and reinforced through a small subsistence hunt. Again, bowhead provides a parallel:

  "The bowhead whale was very important to the ancestors of today’s Inuit. They were very knowledgeable about it. Nowadays, they do not pay any particular attention to the bowhead. This lack of interest and attention is attributed to the fact that Inuit have not hunted the bowhead whale for a long time. As a result, many Inuit fear that people now possess less-detailed ecological and behavioural knowledge about the bowhead, and that eventually there could be an overall diminution or loss of knowledge about the species" (NWMB, 2000; 55).

Key Considerations

- Access to fish and wildlife resources in Canada has been prioritized by the Supreme Court in R. v. Sparrow (1990). The Sparrow decision has become a landmark in Canadian Aboriginal-State relations, in that it establishes the primacy of Aboriginal rights over non-Aboriginal and commercial privileges. Although the Sparrow Test allows for an infringement on Aboriginal rights to achieve a legitimate legislative objective (which might include conservation), the infringement must be as minimal as possible to achieve the desired result. The negotiation of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement was concomitant with the Sparrow decision, and the two are consistent (see Part 12.5.3). This is not a legal analysis, nor have we sought legal opinion, but we do hope to draw attention to two points. First, decisions which have been made (or which were not made) have not reflected the priority of access established by the Sparrow decision and since reflected in Land Claims Agreements and management plans across Canada. We attach Appendix A as a social-ecological timeline linking ecological knowledge with management recommendations and action, and Appendix B, which prioritizes access in relation to GRC population dynamics. We hope that together these can serve as discussion-aids in analyzing the last management cycle (Appendix A), and planning for the next one (Appendix B). Second, the Sparrow decision allows for infringement of Aboriginal rights only to the extent necessary to accomplish a specified legislative objective (in this case, conservation). We have argued that a TAH of 350 is the maximum extent of legitimate infringement, and the effect of restricting beyond this will be negligible and therefore unnecessary.
Workshops and Consultations:

• The Board participated in stakeholder workshops hosted by the Wildlife Division in November of 2010 and June of 2011 – upon request, the Board prepared and submitted recommendations respecting the structure and function of a co-management board on 8 July, 2011.

• The Board partnered with the Nunatsiavut Government and the Department of Environment and Conservation to conduct community consultations throughout Nunatsiavut and Upper Lake Melville in December of 2010 and November of 2011.

• At the request of the Department of Environment and Conservation, the Board met with Departmental Officials on 17 April, 2012, to discuss the potential for a TAH.

• The Board is working with the Hunting, Fishing Trapping Coordinating Committee, the Nunatsiavut Government, and the Government of Quebec, to host a workshop involving all GRC stakeholders. The theme of the workshop is “Shared Concern; Shared Solutions” and it is scheduled for September, 2012.

• The Chair of the TWPCB and members of the Torngat Secretariat staff met with the Nunatsiavut Minister of Land and Natural Resources and staff on June 25, 2012, to discuss this recommendation.

• The TWPCB attended the George River Caribou Advisory Committee meeting in Happy Valley – Goose Bay on June 27, 2012, and presented the decision-support tools appended here.
(Adapted from Bergerud et al. 2008, "The Return of Caribou to Ungava")
APPENDIX B: HERD SIZE DYNAMICS AND PRIORITIZATION OF USES
References:


APPENDIX 2
ABORIGINAL RESOLUTION
12 September, 2012
Summary of Meeting of the Aboriginal Participants to the 2nd Caribou Workshop

During the evening of September 12, 2012, the aboriginal participants to the 2nd Caribou Workshop met to discuss their concerns and views on the status of the three caribou herds of Northern Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador; the Torngat, George River, and Leaf River herds. The aboriginal peoples have hunted caribou since time immemorial. All of the aboriginal participants stressed that the subsistence harvest of caribou is an issue of food security, and that any changes to the subsistence harvest have direct implications on the health and cultural preservation of the aboriginal populations. Equally, all of the participants recognized the critical situation and the need for urgent actions.

All aboriginal participants recognized the need to hold consultations in their respective communities to inform them of the status of the three caribou herds, and to receive feedback upon the best course of action to address the situations of the three herds.

The aboriginal participants reached consensus on their desire to continue discussions regarding the caribou situation. All of the parties are committed to further meetings to discuss possible actions that would address the evolving situations with the Torngat, George River, and Leaf River herds. To this effect, the aboriginal rightsholders who harvest from these herds would like to request financial support from the governments of Québec and Newfoundland & Labrador for the establishment of an aboriginal Round Table. This Round Table would act as the forum of exchange and support, in view of finding solutions, actions, and recommendations built upon consensus and respect. In view of the urgency of the situation, the Round Table would act to provide recommendations to management authorities until the establishment of co-management boards is formalized.

All aboriginal participants support the creation of an effective co-management board or boards to address the situations of the three caribou herds. However, any co-management process and the decisions that would flow from it must be given due respect and recognition by the bodies responsible for the management of the herds and reflect an equitable sharing of authority. Furthermore, any modifications of management measures would be conditional upon the establishment of a co-management board.

All of the concerned aboriginal parties agreed that there should be no reduction of the subsistence harvest of the Torngat caribou herd until such time as there is more information on the status of the herd. It was also agreed that there should be a formal elimination of the non-aboriginal (sport/resident) hunt in Labrador.

The participants to the evening session were:
The Inuit of Nunavik
The Cree of Eeyou Istchee
The Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikamach
The Innu of Ekuantsitshit, Uashat mak Mani-Utenam and Nutashkuan
The Inuit of Nunatsiavut
The Innu Nation
The Métis of Nunatsiavut
Information Note
Department of Environment and Conservation

Title: George River Caribou (GRC)

Issue: To provide an update on the management of the GRC herd

Background and current status:
- The GRC population has declined from an estimated 775,000 in 1993 to 385,000 animals in 2001 to 74,000 animals in 2010 and to 27,000 animals in July 2012.
- Population projections based on adult mortality of collared animals, age and sex ratios collected during fall classification surveys, indicate that the GRCH will continue to decline and reach less than 22,500 animals by October 2012.
- The October 2012 projection represents a 70% population decline since the 2010 census and a 97% decline since 1993.
- The census projection is supported by other biological indicators of herd health; including low calf recruitment, low adult survival measured from collared caribou, and reduced size of the calving area.
- Reasons for the decline remain unknown. Biologists believe the current decline was not caused by hunting. However, as the population becomes smaller, hunting adds to natural mortality, leading to a faster decline and impeding recovery efforts. This, along with the historically low recruitment and adult survival, suggests that from a biological perspective all human harvest must be eliminated.
- Continued harvest, even in the short term, significantly increases the risk for extirpation of this herd.

Labrador Caribou Initiative
- As part of the 2011/12 budget process, the Labrador Caribou Initiative was approved with funding of $1.9 million over 3 years.
- The objectives of this initiative are to enhance monitoring and conservation efforts for the herd to include: increased biological monitoring and research efforts, increased harvest monitoring, enhanced licensing administration, education and stewardship programs, the formation of stakeholder working groups, advisory and technical committees, and the development and implementation of a management plan for both the short- and long-term conservation of the GRC.
- Activities carried out so far include:
  - Spring calf condition survey and yearling collaring effort
  - Purchase and deployment of 90 Iridium collars for adult and juvenile caribou
  - Fall classification surveys
  - Complete photo census of the herd
  - Mortality retrievals – however, cause of mortality for all retrievals can not be established
  - Development of stewardship and education materials
  - GRC management plan in development
  - Filling of one vacant Wildlife Biologist position
Fuel cache deployments throughout the GRCH range

**Harvest Restriction and Numbers**
- [18.1(a)(ix)] provided direction to maintain harvest restrictions implemented for the 2010/11 hunting season including:
  - the limiting of one caribou per resident licence,
  - no transfer of licences,
  - no commercial or outfitter harvest.
- Additional conservation measures for the 2011/2012 hunting season included:
  - a reduction in the season length for resident harvest,
  - limiting license sales to government offices only,
  - mandatory herd health monitoring program where successful hunters were required to collect and submit biological samples from their animals.
- The start of the 2012/2013 season has been delayed pending a decision on management actions by government.
- Harvest estimates for 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harvest Group</th>
<th>2010/11 Estimated Harvest</th>
<th>2011/12 Estimated Harvest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Innu</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Innu in Labrador</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Licence Holders</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>493*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG beneficiaries</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Outfitters</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Sport Harvest (Outfitters)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2425</strong></td>
<td><strong>2243</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*combined NG beneficiaries (12E) & regular provincial licences

- The majority of harvest by NG beneficiaries generally occurs in March and April.

**Stakeholder Meetings and Consultations**
- The Wildlife Division hosted stakeholder workshops in June 2011, November 2011, and June 2012 in Happy Valley – Goose Bay to discuss updates, options and future needs for GRC management. The information gained from these workshops continues to inform the ongoing management process for GRC.
- Representatives from the following organizations were invited to attend:
  - Labrador Innu Nation
  - Nunatsiavut Government
  - NunatuKavut Community Council
  - Province of Newfoundland and Labrador
  - Labrador Hunting and Fishing Association
  - Newfoundland and Labrador Outfitters Association
  - Torgat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board
- In January, 2011 provincial officials from ENVC, LAA and Justice met with Quebec Innu bands in Sept-Iles to discuss GRC management and conservation.
- On November 22, 2011, ENVC officials met with members of Quebec Innu in HVGB. ENVC provided a presentation on & discussed issues of GRC herd status with band members.
- Further meetings to discuss GRC management were held in Sept-Iles on May 7 with representatives from the Naskapi Nation and on May 8 with representatives from four Quebec Innu communities.
- Discussions were held on June 28, 2012 between the Innu Nation and the Province through the ATIK committee; established under an MOU with the Labrador Innu Nation.
- On September 12, 2012 a meeting was held in Montreal to discuss future management of the GRCH. This meeting was hosted by the government of Quebec, the Hunting Trapping Fishing Coordinating Committee, and the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co Management Board and represented Quebec-aboriginal consultations. Participants included the Nunavik Inuit, Makavik, Cree of Eeyou Istchee, Nuniatsiavut government, NG Beneficiaries, Naskapi Nation, Ekuanitshit, Uashat mak Mani-Utenam, Nutashkuan, Innu Nation, and NunatuKavut, Torngat Wildlife Plants Co-Management Board and officials from the Department of Environment and Conservation and the Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat.
- Aboriginal groups requested government provide funding to establish an aboriginal round table to act as a forum for exchange and support in view of finding solutions, actions and recommendations built upon consensus and respect.
- Aboriginal groups are interested in the establishment of a Co-Management Board that includes representation from the provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec.

Government of Quebec
- The Province of Quebec has taken management action by reducing outfitter harvest on GRC by 50% (compared to 2009 levels) for the 2011/12 season and closing the sport hunt for the 2012/2013 season.
- Province of Quebec officials will be hosting a meeting with Quebec Innu community leaders on October 31 – November 1 in Sept Iles to discuss management of woodland migratory caribou.
- Quebec officials have indicated that they will participate in a larger multi-stakeholder working group.

Consultations on Establishment of a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH)
- In March, 2012 letters were sent to Aboriginal groups in Labrador and Quebec requesting consultation regarding management of the GRCH, including consideration of a TAH. Timelines for both aboriginal and government response were provided.
- Information packages were sent out to all Aboriginal groups providing a summary of the GRC status.
- Aboriginal groups were requested to provide a written response, including a proposal for an appropriate TAH and information on their community’s Basic Needs Level, within 45 days of the consultation. Response status is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Date of Consultation</th>
<th>TAH Recommendation received</th>
<th>Gov't Response Due</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWPCB</td>
<td>17 April</td>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>Draft - 17 July</td>
<td>TAH recommendation 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NunatuKavut</td>
<td>17 April</td>
<td>8 June</td>
<td>27 June</td>
<td>No recommendation provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>18 April</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innu Nation</td>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekanitshit</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>22 May</td>
<td>Draft - 19 June</td>
<td>No recommendation provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natashquan</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITUM</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamen Shipu</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakua Shipu</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matimekush – Lac John</td>
<td>8 May</td>
<td>No response as of October 15, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions Being Taken:**

- 18.1 (a)(i)
- 20.1, 18.1(a)(ix)

Prepared / Approved by: C. Doucet, K. Mehl, J. Blake, R. Firth
Approved by: October 16, 2012
Status and Management of the George River Caribou Herd

WILDx Division
Department of Environment and Conservation
Newfoundland and Labrador
August 2012

Population Monitoring

* Indicators of herd health confirm the decline is continuing

- calf abundance: Low
- % large adult males: Low
- adult mortality: High

Population Monitoring

* Estimated annual mortality rate averaged over 3 years (2009-2011) is just above 30% (~ 8-9.7 ± 1.5 k ± 0)
* 2011-2012 annual mortality rate estimated at 32%
Impact of the Current Adult Mortality

Year 1

Year 2

Year 3

Collared Caribou Mortalities

- From July 1st 2011 - July 1st 2012
  - 24 of 80 NL collared caribou died
  - 5 of 24 mortalities confirmed hunter killed

- From mid April 2012 – June 27, 2012
  - 7 of 32 collars (QC+NL) collared caribou died
  - 6 of 7 mortalities confirmed hunter killed

Current Population Projections for the George River Caribou herd
### GR Harvest Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harvest Group</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Inuit</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Aboriginal Groups</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador License Holders**</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLA beneficiaries in LISA</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Outfitters</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec Sport Harvest</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1860</strong></td>
<td><strong>2343</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2011/12 still being updated  
**combined 12K & regular licences

### Harvest Demographics

- 65% of harvested animals were female  
  - 72% in 2010-2011
- 45% of hunters noticed that their harvested female was pregnant  
  - 62% in 2010-2011
- 86% of hunters didn’t see any parasites  
  - Beaufort, stouta, and flukes were noted in the remaining 14% (in decreasing order)  
  - Compared to 57% seeing no parasites in 2010/2011

### Collar Deployments

**Spring and Winter 2012**

- **Labrador (Winter and Spring)**  
  - 50 new collars deployed during winter  
  - 15 collars deployed in spring  
  - 65 active collars (June)
- **Quebec**  
  - 22 new collars deployed  
  - 38 active QC collars at end of winter
Biologists from QC and ENVC conducted an aerial photo census July 9-13th, 2012.
- The July photo census estimates the herd now stands at just 27,600 animals.
- Caribou aggregations were excellent during the survey period and confidence in the results are strong (90% CI = 24,500 - 30,300).

Consultations
- In February 2012 an aboriginal consultation process was developed jointly by ENVC, IGAAS and Justice.
- All aboriginal groups in PQ and NL were consulted with during April and May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Day of Consultation</th>
<th>Draft/Recommendation Ready</th>
<th>Date Recommendations Presented</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TNPCC</td>
<td>17 APR</td>
<td>DRAFT 17 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td>17 APR</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 JLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>12 APR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt River</td>
<td>12 APR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqaluit</td>
<td>22 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 3 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td>22 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 5 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNPCC</td>
<td>23 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 7 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td>23 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 9 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon Territory</td>
<td>24 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 11 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>24 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 13 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador</td>
<td>25 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 15 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaspé</td>
<td>26 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 17 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador</td>
<td>26 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 19 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaspé</td>
<td>27 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 21 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador</td>
<td>27 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 23 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaspé</td>
<td>28 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 25 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador</td>
<td>28 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 27 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaspé</td>
<td>29 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 29 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador</td>
<td>29 MAY</td>
<td>DRAFT 31 JLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultations

- In addition a GRCH Stakeholder Advisory Meeting was held in HV-GB on June 27. Representatives included ENVC, Nunatsiavut, NunatuKavut, TwPCB, Newfoundland and Labrador Outfitters Association and Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs.
- A stakeholder meeting planned for September in Montreal involving all interested parties across both jurisdictions, including industry.
- WD and IGAAS planning on attending.

Management Plan Timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Next Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

George River Caribou

Thank You!
Good afternoon John,

I attended the meeting on Aug 13, 2012 which provided an update on the current status of interdepartmental collaboration on the George River Caribou Herd (GRC). This e-mail provides a roll up of key points raised at this meeting, focused on IG aspects.

Brian and Taracetta also attended and provided input on aboriginal issues. I will defer to them on the Aborig consultation piece and have ccd Brian in case there is anything he would like to add.

1. The downward trend in the herd is continuing with the extirpation (local extinction) of the herd a real possibility if actions are not taken.
   a. It should be noted that the current situation is different from the collapse of the GRC in the 1950s in that current technology and accessibility of GRC makes extirpation more likely in the current decline.
   b. Estimated annual mortality for adult animals in GRC is 30% while the norm is in the less than 10% range.
   c. GRC is in worse shape than past predictions had suggested with GRC numbering around 30,000 in 2012 (This is a pretty solid estimate – 24,800 to 30,300 animals).
   d. ENVC indicates that the science mandates a hunt of 0 for the foreseeable future.
   e. There are very tight timeframes if recommendations are to be received from cabinet in time for 2012-13 season.

2. Caribou are currently under review by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (for more on process see; http://www.cosewic.gc.ca/pdf/assessment_process_e.pdf) and there is the possibility that GRC will be listed with impacts on land use, development, etc. ENVC notes that they could be declared endangered, but this is a complex issue.

3. Hunter mortality is showing a significant impact on herd with the spring hunt having greatest impact.

4. QC and NL cooperated on latest survey and have strong confidence in latest numbers.
   a. There was still a non-aboriginal sport hunt in small zone encompassing GRC in QC with 260 animals taken (was 360 in 2012).
   b. A stakeholder meeting under the auspices on the Hunting Trapping and Fishing Coordination committee established under the 1970s James Bay agreement will be held in Montreal on September and ENVC hopes to inform and brief their minster and executive on current status before that meeting.
   c. QC has indicated that they wish to issue a press release this week that highlights the current science.

5. Next Steps:
a. JUS will draft a letter to distribute for comment that will follow-up with abori groups that have not responded in order to reinforce record of attempts at consultation for potential court action in the future.

b. Update for Minister and [REDACTED] planned for Aug 15.

c. Montreal meeting will occur on Sept. 11-13; Brian will be attending with a couple of officials.

d. Intergovernmental consults will occur in mid-Sept with IGAAS, JUS and Lab Affairs.

e. [REDACTED] seeking authority for hunting restrictions for 2012-13 will be drafted around 30 Sept with fall classification set around the last week in Oct.

f. There will then be a second advisory meeting in November.

These are the key points of discussion in my view.

I’ll see you when I get back on the 27.

Herb Simms  
Senior Policy Analyst  
Resource and Fiscal Policy  
Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat  
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador  
7th Floor, East Block  
Confederation Building  
St. John’s, NL  
A1B 4J6

Tel: (709) 729-2839  
Fax: (709) 729-5038  
HerbSimms@gov.nl.ca
Mr. Bruce Roberts, Chair  
Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board  
PO Box 2050 Station B  
Happy Valley – Goose Bay NL A0P 1E0

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Thank you for your letter dated July 4, 2012 regarding the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board’s recommendation concerning a Total Allowable Harvest (TAH) for the George River caribou herd.

I will respond to your recommendation in accordance with section 12.9.7 of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement when I have all the necessary information to inform my decision on the TAH for the 2012-13 season. It is notable that, if a TAH is implemented, its allocation among multiple parties, across Quebec and Labrador, will be a complex process which must consider recommendations and input of all users, as well as biological concerns necessary to ensure sustainability of the herd.

The support by all stakeholders will be critical to the success of both short and long-term management strategies. We believe education and stewardship is pivotal to the success of this process, and we commend the TWPCB for their efforts and collaboration with the Wildlife Division staff and encourage continued communication throughout the process. As you are aware, provincial officials are planning to attend the proposed meetings in Montreal in early September, during which time I trust continued dialogue on this important subject will advance.

Thank you once again for your correspondence. If you should have any questions, please contact John Blake, Director of Wildlife, at 709-637-2008 or by email at johnblake@gov.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

TERRY FRENCH, MHA  
Conception Bay South  
Minister

cc Hon. Nick McGrath  
Minister of Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs
By E-Mail

Mr. Gary Mitchell
Gary.mitchell@nunatsiavut.com

Dear Mr. Mitchell:

Thank you for your letter dated January 4, 2012 addressed to my colleague, the Honourable Nick McGrath concerning George River caribou (GRC). As the Minister responsible for wildlife, your request is important to me.

Harvest restrictions that were put into place in 2010 were based on an extensive review of biological data, local and traditional knowledge and discussions with stakeholders. Of particular concern was the significant amount of harvest that was being accrued as a result of the licence transfer provision. As a result, elimination of the transfer system was a necessary and important means of reducing harvest pressure on this herd. After further review and consultations, along with our monitoring results which indicated a continued and severe decline of the GRC, additional conservation measures were announced in 2011. These included a reduced hunting season for regular licence holders from 8 months to 3 months, limitation of the sale of regular licences to government offices only, and implementation of a herd health monitoring program. All of these recent harvest restrictions are critical to conservation efforts for the long-term sustainability of the herd. Given the above we are unable to make any changes or accommodations to the current conservation measures.

As you mentioned in your letter, conservation measures are important to address the drastic and continued decline of the GRC herd if we are to stabilize the population. While the harvest restrictions do not apply to the subsistence harvest by beneficiaries of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement harvesting within the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area, we continue to be engaged with officials from the Nunatsiavut Government on finding ways to promote the conservation of this important resource.

Regarding enforcement, please know every effort is being made to enforce the conservation measures for the George River Caribou herd this winter. However, as you are aware, the large land mass makes this challenging. Therefore, the support of all stakeholders will be critical to the success of the conservation efforts.
If you would like further information regarding the management of the GRC herd, I encourage you to contact our Wildlife Division office in Happy Valley – Goose Bay by phoning 709-896-5107.

Thank you once again for your time and letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

TERRY FRENCH, MHA
Conception Bay South
Minister

cc Honourable Nick McGrath, Minister, Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs
Honourable Felix Collins, Minister, Justice
Honourable Glen Sheppard, Minister, Lands and Natural Resources,
Nunatsiavut Government
Mr. Keith Russell – MHA, Lake Melville
January 18, 2012

Minister Terry French
Minister of the Environment and Conservation
Confederation Building
West Block
P.O. Box 8700
St. John’s, NL
A1B 4J6

Dear Minister French:

I write to you today to bring forward a concern I have, regarding the George River Caribou Herd here in Labrador. I am afraid of what will happen to this herd of caribou if something is not done, and I am asking you, the Minister responsible for the environment and conservation to do something about this before the George River Caribou herd is nothing more than a memory. I also tried to make my concerns known to Minister Nick McGrath, Minister of Intergovernmental & Aboriginal Affairs, but to date, he has not responded to my calls.

Since December, the Innu of Quebec have been present here in Labrador hunting the George River Caribou Herd, before the Zone was opened and to this day, they continue to do so. It is a known fact that the numbers in this herd of caribou have been declining, and you, the Minister and your Government choose to do nothing to stop this yearly slaughter. I spoke to my MHA, Keith Russell yesterday regarding this matter and he told me that he has brought these concerns to you on behalf of a number of his constituents. He said you asked for proof that this is actually going on. I’ve been told by hunters from this area, that while they were being checked by the Provincial Conservation Officers, Innu from Quebec were driving by with their komatsiks full of caribou and nothing was done, they were not being monitored or stopped by the Conservation Officers. But who could blame these Officers for turning a blind eye after what happened in 2009 when 3 Conservation Officers were suspended by their own Government/Employer for trying to enforce the law on the Quebec Innu in on the Churchill Falls road. At that time, Kathy Dunderdale was Minister of Natural Resources and she chose to do what you are doing now, absolutely nothing. At that time I was asked to, and I provided photographs to your Conservation Officers of the hunt but nothing was ever done. So, if you need proof in order to do something about this now, the information is readily available from your own employees, the Conservation Officers.

The Quebec Innu are coming and taking as many animals as they want, while residents of this province are not permitted to transfer their licenses to have someone else hunt for them. Many people do not have the Hunter Capability card and even if they did, cannot hunt for themselves, take our Elders for example. I find this to be a total disgrace and injustice to the people of this province, and as far as I'm concerned the NL Government have turned their backs on these people. The Innu from Quebec can
come and take as many animals as they want while many of our own people have to go without. I would like to know if the Quebec hunters are reporting back to the NL Government the number of animals they are taking. Do they have to complete the same health monitoring sample packages as hunters from this area? I assume they have to abide by this as well, how else would the health of the caribou be determined if you didn't gather this information from everyone taking part in the hunt.

CBC Radio did an interview with a lady from Quebec and she reported that her husband took 12 caribou for her household and 3 other households. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador needs to revisit the legislation and put a limit on the number of caribou any person can take to protect the herd, to ensure it stays a viable herd. And the law needs to be enforced and adhered to, no matter who you are. A dead caribou is a dead caribou Minister French, it doesn't matter who is on the shooting end of the gun.

I would also like to tell you that I spoke to some residents of the community of Sheshathiu to see how they feel regarding the Quebec Innu coming here to hunt. An Elder told me she is ashamed of what is going on and prays the Innu from Sheshathiu are not seen in the same light as the Quebec Innu. Another person told me some community members are outraged by this and would like to see something done about it as well. It's up to you and your Government to do something Minister French.

My guess is this, the NL Government is not willing to take a stand regarding this issue due to the Lower Churchill project, for fear of jeopardizing that deal. No money is involved when it comes to our caribou so you are not willing to stand up and do what is right, treating us all the same and imposing the same set of rules and regulations. I'd like to point out Minister French, Labrador contributes greatly to this Province with our natural resources and you are obligated to do your job by protecting our resources as well. We deserve better than this.

I would appreciate a written response indicating what you are doing as the Minister responsible, in terms of protecting the George River Caribou Herd and I would like answers to the questions I have outlined in this letter.

At least I can say I tried to do something about this atrocity, which is more than I can say for you and your Government Minister French.

Sincerely,

CC. 
Mr. Peter Penashue
Mr. Keith Russell
Mr. Nick McGrath
Premier Kathy Dunderdale
Mr. Tony Chubbs, President, Labrador Hunting and Fishing Association
The Labradorian Newspaper
Simms, Herb

From: Firth, Ross  
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2010 3:06 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean  
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan  

Categories: Red Category  

Sean  

I'll take it that we need to ensure that hunters residing in CF are represented when engaging with the resident hunting stakeholder group.

Ross

From: Dutton, Sean  
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2010 3:00 PM  
To: Firth, Ross  
Subject: FW: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan

From: Hickey, John  
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2010 2:59 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean; Oxford, Krista L.; Watkins, Michelle  
Subject: Re: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan  

CF must have representation  
Tks  
Department of Labrador & Aboriginal Affairs  
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador  
P.O.Box 8700  
St.John's, NL  
Canada  
A1B 4J6  

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Dutton, Sean  
To: Oxford, Krista L.  
Cc: Watkins, Michelle; Hickey, John  
Sent: Thu Aug 26 14:00:07 2010  
Subject: Re: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan  

ENVC is asking if it would be sufficient to include Churchill Falls hunters in the group of selected licensed hunters to be engaged in consultations. They were not planning to hold a public meeting in Churchill Falls but rather a series of bilateral meetings in Labrador.

Sean
Sent Via Blackberry

From: Dutton, Sean
To: Oxford, Krista L.
Cc: Watkins, Michelle; Hickey, John
Sent: Thu Aug 26 13:47:12 2010
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan

Thanks, Krista. I will pass on these points to ENVC.

Sean

From: Oxford, Krista L.
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2010 1:27 PM
To: Dutton, Sean
Cc: Watkins, Michelle; Hickey, John
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan

Hi Sean,

I just finished meeting with Minister Hickey and he reviewed my draft copy of the consultation plan as you emailed me yesterday. He also reviewed the comments made by both branches of LAA.

Upon his review he suggested the following to both myself and Michelle Watkins:

- The first consultation meetings that should happen are with the 3 aboriginal groups followed by meetings with non-aboriginal groups, in that order.
- He advised that the people of Labrador are going to want to know what is being done on the QC side.
- He advised that Churchill Falls needs to be included in the consultations.

Thank you,
Krista

Krista Oxford
Executive Assistant to
Hon. John Hickey
M.H.A. Lake Melville
Minister of Labrador Affairs
T (709) 896 - 2364
F (709) 896 - 7283
E kristaoxford@gov.nl.ca

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 1:31 PM
To: Oxford, Krista L.
Subject: FW: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan

Krista:
Please see below our comments (both Branches of LAA). Minister Hickey is quite interested in this issue so when you have an opportunity could you let him know about this and advise if he has any different or additional comments?

Thanks,

Sean

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Wednesday, August 25, 2010 1:36 PM
To: Firth, Ross; Duke, Cathy
Cc: Blake, John; Parrott, William; Gower, Aubrey; Watkins, Michelle; Tompkins, John; Oliver, Val
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan

Ross:

Thanks for the opportunity to review. Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs offers the following comments:

PAGE 1
PUBLIC ENVIRONMENT SCAN
Paragraph 3 – should revise first sentence to say, “Caribou are a dietary staple in the lives of many Labradoreans, including Inuit, Innu, NunatuKavut, and other area residents, as well as Aboriginal people in Quebec, many of whom hunt on either side of the border.”

PAGE 2
STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS
Paragraph 1 – what does “legislative grant” mean? Line 5 - delete “it” before “involves”
CONSULTATION DETAILS
Paragraph 1 – change “Representations to “Representatives”. I would propose Michelle Watkins, Director of Labrador Affairs, and Val Oliver, Communications Specialist, both based in Happy Valley, attend all the bilaterals. Aboriginal Affairs Branch would be represented at the meetings with Innu Nation, Nunatsiavut Government and NunatuKavut – if they are held consecutively I would designate one official, but if they are at different times I might look at assigning different staff to each meeting.

PAGE 3
CONSULTATION DETAILS (continued)
The approach based on individual meetings is probably the better alternative to a single meeting with all stakeholders. By meeting together, everyone hears what everyone else has to say, so there is at least the potential that consensus might emerge. However, there’s the potential that stakeholder groups start pointing fingers at one another. Caribou hunting, in general, is a hot topic in Labrador. Resident hunters begrudge some of the assertion of aboriginal hunting rights. This past winter multiple charges were laid for hunting outside of the zones (charges later dropped) which received much media attention. Some wounds still aren’t healed with that one. In a large meeting we would probably not get the information that we are looking for and other issues may dominate the session. It would be difficult to facilitate. Meeting bilaterally would probably be favoured by the Nunatsiavut Government and Innu Nation, as they don’t want to be treated as ordinary stakeholders. However, no one would know for sure what the views were of the other stakeholders, and whether there is a consensus approach. So the suggestion that larger scale public meetings might be considered later on might become a necessity depending on how the bilaterals go.

Suggest deleting paragraph starting with “In order to…”

POTENTIAL TARGET AUDIENCES
Component 3: We suggest the bilateral discussions continue with Innu Nation regarding the open/closed zones, concurrent with the consultations on the George River herd census results and conservation, while reinforcing the conservation messages throughout. If we are not proposing to restrict Innu Nation harvest of GRCH at this time there doesn’t appear to be a good reason to discontinue discussions on the open/closed zones.

Component 5: It is an interesting approach to do random selection of resident hunters based upon previous license holders. There may need to be a mechanism to ensure non-Aboriginal representation from the selection, since there will be further consultation with Labrador’s Aboriginal groups/governments, and recognizing license requirements do not apply to Innu Nation members or Inuit in the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area. There should also be assurances that consultations target the regions in Labrador. Residential caribou hunting activity is heavy in Labrador West / Churchill Falls / Central Labrador. Of course the North Coast activity is strongly aboriginal based. South Coast and Straits residents travel to central to access caribou.

PAGE 4
MESSAGES
We would suggest a more comprehensive set of key Messages be drafted for media inquiries. There are no messages concerning the consultations themselves – purpose, goals, etc. This issue is already public knowledge - there has already been at least one news print story (Michael Johansen in the Labradorian on August 16) on the decline of the GRCH. Media will likely be seeking input from elected officials when the consultation process begins. If that if that does happen, there could be an impression that Government is rushing to complete the consultation process without engaging the stakeholders in a public forum. So that may need to be addressed in the key Messages. Government may want to consider updating the “public” (not just the stakeholders in the plan) sooner rather than later on where we are with this issue.

The second paragraph indicates “Larger scale discussions necessary to implement effective co-management with the Province of Quebec and aboriginal groups in Quebec will not be initiated at this time but will be set aside for future consideration. The proposed consultation process will provide information necessary for future co-management discussions.”

9) Based on a conversation with Matimekush-Lac John Chief Real McKenzie on August 19 where he said there were over 500,000 animals in the George River herd, it appears the results of the census have not been communicated widely in Quebec. Given QC Naskapi and Innu hunt in Labrador, to jointly meet with QC Aboriginal groups. This would be helpful (a) to reinforce the conservation message, groundwork that would be helpful should the harvest of Aboriginal groups need to be limited in the future (b) to have first hand knowledge of what they are told and what their views are, (c) to improve the relationship between Government and the Bands, (d) to be able to tell Labrador harvesters that the same messages have been delivered to Quebec Aboriginal groups.

since they have no Aboriginal rights in Labrador outside the Tombat Park, which is federal land (Nunavik Inuit have a treaty right to harvest in the Park – but does the George River herd habitat include the Park, and are caribou harvested there by their members?).
#2, #3 - It isn't clear why TCR and NR would be listed as stakeholders. Perhaps instead they should be invited to attend the appropriate bilateral meetings along with ENVC et al.

#4 - Nunatsiavut Government: The plan recommends that an elected official, William Barbour be consulted, but elected officials from other groups (e.g. Innu Nation) would not be the main point of contact, and the Province’s own elected officials are suggested to not be present at these sessions. There should be consistency, one way or the other. There is no one acting in the Deputy Minister position since Doug Blake's retirement. The most senior official in the NG re: wildlife matters is Rebecca Willcott, Director of Renewable Resources. Her phone number is 896-8582 and email is Rebecca_Willcott@nunatsiavut.com. We understand that she is not in until Monday, August 30.

PAGE 6

APPROACH
The methodology is sound. From past experience with facilitation, it may be helpful if consultation questions were prepared in advance and reviewed by TCR and LAA. Where possible, consistency in questions asked assists in analysis of feedback. Consulting experienced facilitators for advice may be helpful. LAA received input from the Centre for Learning and Development, in the past.

PAGE 7

COMMUNICATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS
The Plan does not explain the reasoning for the decision to exclude the Quebec Aboriginal groups.

MEDIA POLICY
It states the media are not allowed to attend the meetings but does not explain why this is preferable. On Page 3 it states that “public announcements and open public meetings will not occur given the very short time frame required for this exercise.” We’re not sure why a tight time frame is sufficient justification for keeping any meetings closed to the public.

Sean

From: Firth, Ross
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 3:13 PM
To: Dutton, Sean; Duke, Cathy
Cc: Blake, John; Parrott, William
Subject: George River Caribou Draft Consultation Plan
Importance: High

Sean / Cathy

I've attached a draft consultation plan that engages both aboriginal and non-aboriginal stakeholders in a review of George River caribou harvest approaches in light of recent preliminary census results. Would you please review the plan and forward me your comments. Given the very tight timeline to deliver the consultations, your timely attention to this issue is greatly appreciated with a response this week preferred.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Ross

Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage
Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 2007
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL
A2H 7S1

Ph. (709) 637-2199
Fax (709) 637-2180
Hi Sean,

I concur with your comments on questions posed in the deck. Val and I looked at it last evening and although questions need to be consistent, we need to be careful in what we ask depending on the target audience. I would like to see the questions be a little more structured b/c the discussion may not be focused. Val was really concerned that the deck appeared to be hiding the issue of the population decline of the herd. It is pretty much public knowledge, so we need to be transparent.

Michelle

Michelle Watkins

Director, Labrador Affairs
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
Department of Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs
Mailbag 3014, Stn. B
Happy Valley - Goose Bay, NL A0P 1E0
tel: 709-896-1780  fax: 709-896-0045  mobile: 709-899-1582
e-mail: michellewatkins@gov.nl.ca

I had a look at the deck. Just a few comments.

Background - if we describe GRCH as "woodland" when woodland caribou are listed on endangered species legislation might be confusing. Can we just say "migratory caribou"?

Population Cycles - this graph shows the time line but there could be a vertical line at left showing the numbers so people could have a sense of the scale. I haven't read Bergerud's book so I don't know if he reflected that in his text.

If we are proposing to ask at all meetings whether/how Aboriginal harvest should be limited, shouldn't we provide some information first about Aboriginal rights? This could get tangly. Not everyone will have an appreciation for Aboriginal rights and NunatuKavut will argue they hold such rights. Maybe say something along the lines of (subject to Aubrey's fine tuning):

ABORIGINAL RIGHTS
Aboriginal people in Canada have a right to harvest for food, social and ceremonial purposes. Such rights are site and fact-specific.
Conservation and safety take precedence over such rights, but the infringement must be reasonable.
Labrador Inuit rights are set out in Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement.
Labrador Innu rights are to be set out in a land claims agreement.
From: Firth, Ross
To: Dutton, Sean
Cc: O'Neill, Melony; Blake, John
Subject: Caribou Consultation Plan

Sean

I've made changes to the draft document and have attempted to incorporate your comments. The attached document has been revised based on your comments. I've left the document in track changes for ease of identifying my edits.

Would you please let me know whether you're content with the revised plan.

I have also attached, for your information, a copy of the proposed presentation to be delivered at the consultations. This may help illustrate our approach more fully.

Ross

Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage

Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 2007
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL
A2H 7S1

Ph. (709) 637-2199
Fax (709) 637-2180
Sean

I have made revisions to the Plan with the addition of the following:

- Under “Messages”: Preliminary 2010 census results of the George River herd indicate a significant population decline since the previous census in 2001. Consequently, Government is seeking input from stakeholders and Aboriginal groups/governments on caribou harvest management measures to be taken in the interests of conservation.
- Rebecca Willcott’s contact details have been added
- Under “Communication with Stakeholders”: It is understood that the Government of Quebec does not currently plan on revising their George River caribou management strategies until the final census results have been fully presented and analyzed. In all likelihood, this will result in no change to Quebec’s management approaches for the 2010/11 season. Most recently, the Government of Quebec has held consultations in relation to the 2004-2010 Nord-du-Quebec (Rangifer tarandus) Management Plan.

If you’re content with these additions I’d like to forward the Plan to Melony for her review and consideration by the 10th.

I also note the exchange of emails this morning regarding the contents of the draft presentation deck. ENVC will liaise with LAA staff to finalize the content of the deck to ensure that it incorporates the comments and concerns expressed by LAA. ENVC will rely on the expertise, knowledge and advice of LAA officials if, in the course of consultations, issues arise that are best suited to be addressed by LAA staff.

Ross

---

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2010 7:36 AM
To: Firth, Ross
Cc: O’Neill, Melony; Blake, John; Tompkins, John; Oliver, Val; Watkins, Michelle; Gover, Aubrey; Oxford, Krista L.
Subject: Re: Caribou Consultation Plan

Thanks, Ross.

The Messages are more fulsome but we might still want to say a bit more about why these consultations are occurring. It may be self-evident, but we might add something like, "The population decline necessitates management decisions to protect the herd, and Government is seeking input from stakeholders and Aboriginal groups/governments on the measures to be taken in the interests of conservation."

Rebecca Wilcott’s contact info was omitted but can be found in my earlier e-mail.
I take your point on the planning required for consultation with Quebec Aboriginal groups. We don't need to spell out that plan in this one, but concurrently we might still gather more information on what consultations Quebec has undertaken or plans to undertake. Is this something Wildlife Division could find out, or would you like me to ask IGAS staff contact our counterparts in Quebec?

Sean

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Firth, Ross
To: Dutton, Sean
Cc: O'Neill, Melony; Blake, John
Subject: Caribou Consultation Plan

Sean

I've made changes to the draft document and have attempted to incorporate your comments. The attached document has been revised based on your comments. I've left the document in track changes for ease of identifying my edits.

Would you please let me know whether you're content with the revised plan.

I have also attached, for your information, a copy of the proposed presentation to be delivered at the consultations. This may help illustrate our approach more fully.

Ross

Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage
Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 2007
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL
A2H 7S1

Ph. (709) 637-2199
Fax (709) 637-2180
From: Firth, Ross  
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 9:07 AM  
To: Dutton, Sean  
Cc: Parrott, William  
Subject: Commercial Caribou Harvest  

Sean

A fax was received yesterday from [redacted] in HVGB. The letter was addressed to John Blake and requested approval for the commercial harvest of [redacted] remaining caribou allocation of 100 animals (letter attached). Commercial caribou harvest licenses are based on the calendar year and [redacted] current license expires December 31, 2010. [redacted] allocation was for 100 licenses or 200 caribou. [redacted] states in his letter that, thus far, he has harvested half of this allocation.

I have also attached a draft copy of a letter in response to [redacted] under Minister Johnson’s signature. The letter prohibits further commercial harvest of caribou under [redacted] current harvest allocation pending the review of our current harvest management approach for 2010/11. You’ll note in [redacted] letter to John, reference to the province permitting outfitter harvest of caribou in the period beginning August 11, 2010. [redacted] is seeking permission to harvest in the absence of the official opening of the season.

Wildlife Division is proposing that [redacted] request be denied on the basis that to permit this harvest would run contrary to the recommended position of the Division as articulated recently. Further, a refusal to permit harvest at this time should not necessarily be considered a permanent cancellation of the remaining commercial licenses as the letter states that this position is dependent on government review of its current management approaches.

Bill has asked that I forward this information to you and that you seek the view of Minister Hickey on this matter. You should be aware that Minister Johnson has not yet been briefed on this issue although I hope to do so this week, once your department’s view has been obtained.

Please contact me should you have any questions.

Regards,
Ross

---

Ross Firth  
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage  

Department of Environment and Conservation  
P.O. Box 2007  
117 Riverside Drive  
Corner Brook, NL  
A2H 7S1  

Ph. (709) 637-2199  
Fax (709) 637-2180
Dear Mr. [redacted]

I am writing in response to your letter dated August 23, 2010 to Mr. John Blake, Director of Wildlife concerning your commercial caribou harvesting licence. First of all please allow me to clarify your licence allocation for 2010. You state in your letter your original quota for 2010 was for 500 caribou. As your 2010 Commercial Caribou Harvesting Licence clearly states, your total quota for 2010 was in fact 200 caribou, a reduction of 300 caribou compared to 2009. If you recall, government announced this 60% quota reduction applicable to all commercial licence holders prior to the 2010 season as a conservation measure in the face of mounting evidence to suggest a significant population decline was occurring with the George River caribou herd. I have been advised that you purchased your 200 tags authorized under your 2010 licence last January 22, but that you harvested 100 thus leaving you 100 tags remaining.

Recent further evidence corroborates government’s concern for this herd, and we are currently reviewing our harvest management approach for the 2010/11 season. This includes the disposition of any unused portion of the 2010 commercial caribou harvesting licence. Section 14 of your 2010 licence clearly stipulates additional harvesting restrictions can be applied. Therefore, until such a time as this review is complete we are unable to permit the use of any remaining tags.

A decision relating to harvest management in 2010/11 will be forthcoming in the coming weeks. Until then I trust you will accept and agree that conservation must take priority.

Sincerely,

CHARLENE JOHNSON
Minister
August 23rd, 2010

Mr. John Blake
Director
Dept of Environment & Conservation
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

Dear Mr. Blake;

...currently holds 100 caribou tags. These 100 tags are the balance remaining from the original purchase of 500 tags for 2010. Due to environmental circumstances such as caribou migration routes and Labrador weather conditions we were unable to reach our goal of 500 caribou in the 2009-2010 hunt. Our hope is to use up the remaining (100 tags) as soon as possible.

It has come to our attention that allowances were given to both Quecheo Outfitters as well as some located in Labrador to carry out and use tags previously purchased and/or booked as part of their operations... is asking for the same privilege. It is imperative to our operations.

Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me at the above-mentioned number or my cell at...

Regards,
1. Hunting must be conducted during Open Seasons and in Open Areas, as prescribed by the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

2. Section 47-51 of the Wild Life Regulations (Consolidated Newfoundland Regulation 1156/96) must be adhered to.

3. Hunting must be conducted in a manner to avoid interference with resident and non-resident hunters.

4. Hunting must be conducted at distances greater than 1 kilometre from any highway or access road. Also, there should be no harvest of caribou along the Trans-Labrador Highway, or the Esker and Schefferville Roads area of Western Labrador.

5. Harvesting must be conducted under the terms of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement, in the areas covered by this Agreement. Specifically, if hunting is to occur within the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area (LISA) the Director of Renewable Resources, Nunatsiavut Government should be notified of the approximate location. A map of LISA is attached for reference. The holder of this Licence should follow any additional requirements for hunting in LISA that may be required by the Nunatsiavut Government.

6. (a) Names of persons harvesting or transporting caribou on this Licence must be submitted, in writing, to the Labrador Regional Office of the Department of Natural Resources, prior to hunting, for review, approval and registration.

Wildlife Division
P.O. Box 2007 Conner Brook, Newfoundland, Canada, A2H 7S1, Telephone (709) 537-2007, Facsimile (709) 537-2033
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(b) Best efforts must be made to maximize employment of Innu and Inuit hunters. Particularly any hunt that occurs within the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area (LISA), beneficiaries of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement should be designated as hunters.

(c) Each person harvesting caribou on this Licence must have a copy of the Licence on his/her possession at all times while harvesting caribou. Also, designated hunters should be provided with the copies of enclosed map showing the boundaries of LISA.

(d) Hunting must be conducted in teams of not more than two (2) persons, and each team must conduct hunting activities at distances greater than one (1) kilometre apart.

(e) Harvest of caribou must not exceed 10 animals per registered hunter, per day.

7. Caribou which are harvested must be relocated to a holding area to be identified in consultation with regional staff of the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Environment and Conservation.

8. Biological information on harvested animals must be collected and supplied to the biological staff, Department of Environment and Conservation, located in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, as per attached instructions and procedures outlined in Schedule "A".

9. Not more than 200 caribou may be harvested.

10. Tags will be released upon submission of official receipt of payment in the amount of $35.00 per 2 sets of tags, plus applicable HST.

11. Tags are required to be used with this Licence, and must be affixed to harvested caribou before the animals are removed from the site of kill. These tags are available from the Labrador Regional Office of the Department of Natural Resources.
12. Upon expiration of this Licence, a full report of the 2010 harvesting operations must be submitted to the Department of Environment and Conservation. This report must include details on the location of the harvest, number of animals harvested, animals struck, wounded and lost, and distribution of animals harvested by sex and approximate age, and information respecting extent of utilization of meat and skins and methods for disposal of remains. All unused tags must be returned to the Labrador Regional Compliance Manager, Department of Natural Resources, and requests for refunds must be submitted no later than 30 days of the expiration of this Licence, before any new Licence is issued.

13. The hunt must be conducted respectfully; animals must be fully utilized, and remains must be disposed of in a manner consistent with Innu and Inuit cultures and traditions. Parts of harvested animals which are not utilized for commercial or research and management purposes must be made available to Innu people, as requested by the Innu Nation and/or to Inuit people particularly in areas within the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area (LISA).

14. Any additional harvesting modifications and restrictions required by regional officials of the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Environment and Conservation, must be complied with.

15. Failure to comply with the Terms and Conditions of this Licence, as outlined above and contained in Schedule “A”, may result in the cancellation of this Licence.

This Licence is issued under Section 46 of the Wild Life Regulations (Consolidated Newfoundland Regulations 1156/96).

This Licence expires on December 31, 2010.

DATE 1-21-10

JOHN BLAKE, Director

Wildlife Division
P.O. Box 2007 Corner Brook, Newfoundland, Canada, A2H 7S1, Telephone (709) 837-2007, Facsimile (709) 837-2033
Schedule “A”

Biological Sample Procedure and Instructions
as required under
Section 8 of the 2010 Commercial Caribou Licence

1. The collection of biological samples and data is a direct requirement of your Commercial Caribou Licence.

2. Prior to the commencement of hunting activities on this Licence, the Department of Natural Resources, Regional Compliance Manager, at the Happy Valley-Goose Bay office, must be provided advance start-up notice. This notice will allow opportunity for the approval of, and certification of, hunters for the collection of biological samples and requested data.

3. Only those hunters who have been approved and have demonstrated their understanding and ability to collect biological samples and data for the Department will be permitted to participate in the harvest of caribou under this Licence.

4. Pre-numbered sample and data collection materials will be supplied by the biological staff of the Wildlife Division at Goose Bay, Labrador. Samples and data collected shall be preserved and provided to the biologists at the earliest possible convenience.

5. Individual hunters that have been certified and approved by the Regional Compliance Manager, will be issued, in series, with valid Commercial Caribou Licence tags.

6. Hunters found to be in contradiction of the terms of this Licence and these agreements may be prohibited from further participation on this Licence.
46. (1) The minister may, upon application by a person, company or corporation, issue to that person, company or corporation a commercial caribou harvesting licence for the hunting, taking, processing, storing, shipping and selling of caribou and caribou by-products.

(2) A commercial caribou harvesting licence shall expire on December 31 in each year.

(3) Applications for commercial caribou harvesting licence renewal shall be reviewed annually, after evaluation of the health of the herd.

229/88 s 12

47. The holder of a commercial caribou harvesting licence shall maintain records of

(a) the number of caribou taken;

(b) the weight of the caribou meat;

(c) the name and address of the person, wholesale or retail business, purchasing caribou;

(d) the date of the sale of caribou meat to a person, wholesale or retail business; and

(c) the weight of caribou meat sold to a person, wholesale or retail business.

229/88 s 12

48. The holder of a commercial caribou harvesting licence shall produce the records when requested to do so by a wildlife officer.

229/88 s 12

49. The holder of a commercial caribou harvesting licence shall affix and lock a tag between the tendon and the bone and around the bone of each quarter of caribou meat before it is shipped from the processing facility.

229/88 s 12

50. The holder of a commercial caribou harvesting licence shall package caribou meat sold in less than quarter lots in packages labelled or marked for future identification.

229/88 s 12

51. The holder of a commercial caribou harvesting licence shall not sell caribou meat to a wholesale or retail business that is not in possession of a wholesale caribou meat licence, a retail caribou meat licence or a wild meat service licence.

229/88 s 12
Good evening,

I hope everyone settled away, ready for some productive meetings and the trip was uneventful.

I wanted to provide a little more detail on the meeting regarding the GR herd today. I’ve attached a draft decision note that provides some more detail on the situation. I’ve provided some suggestions for Ross but this is the version I received.

As to the meeting: Everyone was hit by this news as quite a surprise. Particularly John Blake (director at ENVC in charge of Wildlife) and TCR who reacted with some surprise and were somewhat concerned regarding tourism materials already in circulation and wondered about the impact on outfitters in Lab given the proposal for a complete end to non-resident licensing for the foreseeable future. JB made the point that outfitters in Lab mostly broker their licences to QC outfitters.

You have the rational and suggestions already so I won’t belabor the points but one key issue is that the hunt is due to open on August 10 so the delay has to happen fast and they want the note In Min J’s hands by Monday. However, the QC hunt opened on July 31 and is going ahead as normal. It is true though that 90% of the animals killed from GR are killed in the Lab hunt by aboriginal and resident hunters. But no good data exists. This may become a bit of a sticking point nevertheless if QC hunt goes ahead and NL’s is severely curtailed. One issue not addressed at any length was the notion that licences will no longer be transferable. This is not an IG issue but it may become a Lab issue. After all when the grandmother or other old timer can no longer buy a licence over the counter and get her nephew or neighbor or whoever to go get it for her there may be quite a stink kicked up.

The long term strategy will have to be developed in conjunction with QC. Wildlife and QC have a good working relationship but Ross noted to me after the meeting that it is always IG people that end up in the meetings with them, not ENVC officials (Ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune). He asked me if we might have a contact for him and Michael indicated he would have a look around at COF to see what we can find out.

Most of the specific details were sketched out in my last e-mail below and are fully explained in the attached note.

Please let me know if you need anything else on this or if you have any specific direction on this file. I will continue to work with our colleagues and will reach out to you for advice if need be. I will also make sure that all of you are kept in the loop unless you wish otherwise.

That’s it for now.
From: Dutton, Sean  
Sent: Tuesday, August 03, 2010 3:34 PM  
To: Simms, Herb  
Cc: Harvey, Michael; Scott, Paul G.  
Subject: Re: George River Caribou

Thanks.  

Sean  

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Simms, Herb  
To: Dutton, Sean  
Cc: Harvey, Michael  
Sent: Tue Aug 03 12:59:13 2010  
Subject: RE: George River Caribou

Hi Sean,  

I hope the trip goes well.  
This e-mail is a quick heads up. More detail will be coming later this afternoon.  
The preliminary results of the GR census are not good-50,000 animals from 385,000 in the last census.
Therefore ENVVC is proposing drastic action. The hunt starts on Aug 10 but Minister Johnson will be asked to postpone until mid September. (She has the legislative authority.) QC’s hunt opened July 31st so it was too late to delay. 90% of the total harvest occurs in Labrador. Outfitters make up a small proportion of harvest.

This will cut across departments and will obviously be complicated by issues with the QC Innu and the Labrador Métis.

This issue will have to move very fast and there is a draft decision note going around later today vis-à-vis delaying the opening. They are aiming to have ready for Johnson by Monday.

I will send you a complete meeting synopsis this afternoon. FYI, I will be on vacation next week.

Herb Simms
Senior Policy Analyst
Resource and Fiscal Policy
Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
7th Floor, East Block
Confederation Building
St. John's, NL
A1B 4J6

Tel: (709) 729-2839
Fax: (709) 729-5038
HerbSimms@gov.nl.ca

From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 3:46 PM
To: Parrott, William
Cc: Gover, Aubrey; Simms, Herb
Subject: RE: George River Caribou

I am copying Aubrey and Herb to join you in my absence.
From: Parrott, William  
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 2:45 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean; Edwards, Herb; Mellor, Justin S. C.; Delaney, Brian; Moores, Len  
Subject: George River Caribou  

Folks  

I'd like to call a meeting tomorrow at 11 in the ENVC Minister's Boardroom on the 4th Floor West Block.  

The topic for discussion is the George River Caribou census.  

Bill
Caribou Management in Labrador

Biological context and management challenges

J. Blake
June 18, 2010
Primary Topics for Discussion

- Status of Caribou Populations in Labrador
- Access to George River caribou
- Geographical overlap between threatened sedentary and migratory populations during winter
- Aboriginal harvest of protected (Sedentary) populations
- Operational considerations
- Direction Required
- Status and Research
Caribou distributions in Labrador

- Migratory caribou (George River Herd) spend much of the year above the tree line
- Sedentary caribou (Lac Joseph, Red Wine, and Mealy Mountain Herds) remain below the tree line
- During the winter, migratory and sedentary herds often overlap
### Primary Differences between Migratory and Sedentary Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sedentary Ecotype</th>
<th>Migratory Ecotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonized areas below the treeline, and disperse at calving using open water as escape habitat</td>
<td>Colonized areas above the treeline and migrate to calving grounds in the tundra each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live year-round in the forest</td>
<td>Live above the treeline but winter in lichen Woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility: travel short distances (&lt; 100 km) between calving and wintering areas</td>
<td>Travel several thousand kilometres per year (~4000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density: Occur at low densities (3 caribou per 100 km²) densities</td>
<td>Large populations (&gt;300 000 animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are solitary except during winter</td>
<td>Are gregarious and occur in large groups year-round, including calving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
George River Caribou Status

- Population level has allowed for liberal harvest during last 25 years

- Population estimates of 785,000 (1993) and 385,000 (2001): current status likely in significant decline (survey July 2010)

- Harvest management restrictions will have to be applied if decline quantified and significant

- Harvest may approach 30,000 animals/yr during years of intensive harvest
Sedentary Caribou Status

Newfoundland Labrador
On-Going Research And Management

non-responsive
On-Going Research And Management

George River Herd

- July census will be 3rd post-calving census completed on this population (1993; 2001)
- Cooperative venture with Quebec and Nunatsiavut Governments
- Logistically challenging: requires 1.5 years advance preparation
- To date, 85 ARGOs collars have been deployed, an extensive fall classification has been conducted, and all preparations are being finalized for a July 2010 census involving two separate survey crews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Estimate (yr)</th>
<th>Trend (# yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George River</td>
<td>385,000 (2001)*</td>
<td>Decline (17 yrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census planned for summer 2010*
Constraints to completion of RWM census

- Survey can only occur if GR caribou do not winter within RWM range
- Currently no funds dedicated toward survey for 2010/11 fiscal year.
- Survey would include 30 000 km², and cost approximately $100 000. Tentatively scheduled for March 2011.
- It would need to be paired with a collaring program to ensure adequate coverage of collared animals within the traditional range (currently a collar deficit there), est $50,000.
• Access to George River Caribou
Application of the Caribou Harvest Strategy

- Hunting opportunity have been maximized for managed herds
- Hunting areas have not been established within core ranges of Sedentary caribou
- Strategy mitigates incidental take of sedentary caribou while maximizing opportunity for harvest of GRC
Migratory Caribou Management Strategy

Zone Management:
- George River Caribou Zone (August 10-April 30)
- Torngat Mountain Zone (Aug 10-April 30)
- Extension Zones (created on the periphery of sedentary ranges and based on presence of large numbers of GRC).
Management Implications of Small Population Size in the GRCH

- Under the current management regime, under favorable hunting conditions, up to 30,000 GR caribou could be taken in one season between Labrador and Quebec.
- Harvest levels have been lower the past several years (Labrador portion of harvest approximately 7,500 in 2008-9; and 6,000 in 2009/10).
- Over 2009/10, there has been 9 of 85 collared animals shot and another 13 lost to natural causes (22 of 85 collars lost in one year).
- Only 5,000 caribou recorded on calving grounds.
- Survival estimates - .5 males, .6 yrling, .8 females
- Hunting is currently likely additive to population decline.
Management Implications of Small Population Size in the GRCH

- It is highly likely that quota adjustments and possibly elimination of some hunting will be required.
- Shared allocations, including co-management agreements, will be necessary, requiring inter-jurisdictional agreements.
- Basic harvest needs will need to be determined.
- There will be increased pressure to allow hunting of sedentary populations.

A management plan for George River caribou is necessary.
Illegal Hunting
Implications of continued harvest
The Innu Nation has proposed the establishment of a new Committee which would broadly address caribou harvesting in Labrador.

The committee would be comprised of representatives from the Innu Nation and the Province.

Presumably the committee would establish hunting zones to maximize Innu access to GRC and reduce conflict.
Drawbacks:

- Any board addressing harvest of GR caribou must also include Nunatsiavut Government, and all other affected stakeholders, including local hunters, the Métis, commercial outfitting, and possibly also Innu and residents from Quebec.
- Any committee which did not include the above groups would create a significant public backlash and further polarize the issue. It may infringe on existing land claims.

- [Redacted]

- There is no legal requirement or procedural precedent in the absence of a formal land claim agreement.
An Alternative:

- A Consultation Plan for harvest of George River Caribou which involves all stakeholders, honours existing land claims, and discusses population surveys and biological data in an open and transparent manner.

- A framework for this plan had already been developed and submitted to executive for review

- This process is essential in the face of possible harvest restrictions which may require a co-management agreement between all parties
• Operational Considerations and Constraints
Building Capacity in the Labrador Region

- There are currently no dedicated long term funds for Labrador caribou management (currently all research/monitoring is completed via redirection of funds from other areas).
- Leased, inadequate office/lab/storage space.
- There are currently 3 vacant Bio positions (2 unfunded).
• Direction Required
• Approval to move forward with the communications plan for the GR caribou herd
• Formal engagement of Quebec regarding co-management of GR caribou.
• Discussion of government policy in the event that GR caribou winter within core RWM range.
Chibougamau, le 10 décembre 2009

Monsieur John Blake
Directeur
Wildlife Division
Department of Environment and Conservation
117, Riverside Drive
Case postale 2007
Corner Brook (Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador) A2H 7S1

Objet: Collaboration Labrador-Québec dans la réalisation des travaux de suivi de la population de caribous migrateurs du troupeau Rivière-George

Monsieur,

La population de caribous du troupeau Rivière-George est de grande importance, tant pour les résidents du Nunatsiavut, du Nunavik, de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador et du Québec. La dimension inter juridictionnelle de son aire de répartition résulte en un défi grandissant pour les gestionnaires de la faune des différents gouvernements.

Les gestionnaires et scientifiques des provinces de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador et du Québec ont depuis longtemps collaboré dans le cadre de leurs travaux de recherche et de gestion du caribou migrateur. Le succès de ces collaborations étant parfois mitigé par le manque de communication entre les parties.

Le ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune du Québec (MRNF) a toujours comme objectif, d'établir davantage de contacts entre les deux provinces dans son Plan de gestion du caribou « Rangifer tarandus » de la région Nord-du-Québec 2004-2010, afin d'améliorer son efficacité dans la gestion de l'écotype migrateur.

Bien qu'aucun comité d'échanges formel ne soit en place présentement pour aborder les aspects inter juridictionnels de la gestion du caribou migrateur, les gestionnaires des deux provinces se sont récemment investis afin de coordonner leurs efforts dans les travaux d'acquisition de connaissances sur le troupeau Rivière-George.

Ainsi, je souhaite remercier le personnel de la Wildlife Division du Ministry of Environment and Conservation du gouvernement de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador pour leur collaboration dans les récents travaux sur le caribou migrateur, notamment M. Wayne Barney qui a catalysé le rapprochement entre les juridictions.
Je désire aussi souligner le professionnalisme et l'expertise de M. Tony Chubbs. Grâce à la participation récente de son équipe, les travaux d'acquisition de connaissances sur la dynamique de population du caribou se poursuivent conformément au protocole de recherche du projet Caribou Ungava.

Je crois sincèrement qu'il est dans l'intérêt de tous que nous poursuivions la collaboration entre les provinces de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador et de Québec afin de maximiser les retombées et le partage de données issues de nos investissements dans la gestion du troupeau Rivière-George.

Veuillez recevoir, Monsieur, l'expression de mes sentiments distingués.

Le directeur régional,

Denis Vandal

DV/la

C.c. MM. Wayne Barney, Department of Environment and Conservation, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
Tony Chubbs, Department of Environment and Conservation, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
December 10, 2009

Mr John Blake
Director
Wildlife Division
Department of Environment and Conservation
117 Riverside Drive
P.O. Box 2007
Corner Brook (Newfoundland and Labrador) A2H 7S1

Subject: Labrador-Québec cooperation in George River caribou migration monitoring

Dear Sir:

The George River caribou herd is of tremendous importance to the residents of Nunatsiavut, Nunavik, Newfoundland and Labrador and Québec. The herd’s transboundary distribution poses an increasing challenge for the governments’ wildlife managers.

Managers and scientists from Newfoundland and Labrador and Québec have for long worked collaboratively to conduct research on and manage migratory caribou populations. However, they have sometimes met with mitigated success owing to a lack of communication.

Under its Northern Québec caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) management plan 2004-2010, the Ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune du Québec (MRNF) set the objective of fostering greater contact between the two provinces so as to manage migratory caribou more effectively.

Although there is currently no official forum for addressing interjurisdictional management of migratory caribou, wildlife managers from Newfoundland and Labrador and Québec recently coordinated their efforts to acquire knowledge on the George River herd.
I would thus like to thank the staff at the Wildlife Division of the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Environment and Conservation for their cooperation in the recent monitoring of migratory caribou. I am especially grateful to Wayne Barney for instigating the rapprochement between the two governments.

I would also like to acknowledge the professionalism and expertise of Tony Chubbs. Thanks to the recent participation of his team, the acquisition of knowledge on caribou population dynamics is continuing in accordance with the research protocol of the Caribou Ungava project.

It is my sincere belief that continued cooperation between Newfoundland and Labrador and Québec is in everyone's best interest and that both provinces will derive maximum benefit from working together and sharing the data obtained through our efforts to manage the George River caribou herd.

Sincerely,

Denis Vandal
Regional Director
DV/am

c.c.: Wayne Barney, Department of Environment and Conservation, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
      Tony Chubbs, Department of Environment and Conservation, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
Thanks Michael. After our exchange I did much the same thing...reviewing the document with an air of making it two approaches...a provincial one first that may lead to the need for co-management and the associated need to go to cabinet. I will incorporate your comments. Thanks again.

John

Sent Via BlackBerry

---

From: Harvey, Michael
To: Blake, John; Simms, Herb
Cc: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Fri Nov 27 15:16:40 2009
Subject: RE: consultation plan GRCH

Agreed.

I've talked about this matter with Sean and we think that the most prudent approach would be to flag this issue in the communications plan. The attached plan has some edits to that effect.

I hope this helps. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,
Michael

Michael Harvey
IGAS Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
709 729 6287

---

From: Blake, John
Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2009 10:48 AM
To: Harvey, Michael; Simms, Herb
Subject: RE: consultation plan GRCH

No, I think you are right, there are many sensitivities here. To my knowledge no formal relationship has ever existed in terms of joint management of the GRCH. From an official level we have of course been working with quebec on research and management of this herd, but in all likelihood we are entering an era when distribution of available licences will have to be partitioned somehow. How this manifests itself is open for discussion. However, in the meantime, we HAVE to begin discussions with our own stakeholders about what might be possible options in addressing any declines in this herd. So while I believe some high level agreement on distribution of licences between provinces may be required AFTER we get the census completed, I see this document as seeking approval more or less to hold provincial consultations and stay in tune with quebec on a biological front. Seem reasonable?
John,

I'm not sure about the process for submission of a consultation plan. Melony would be best placed to advise.

I'm not trying to suggest that it's not a good idea. Quite the contrary. Just that it is sensitive.

That said, it may be that there is background on the subject that of which IGAS is unaware and that you already have some direction to proceed in this matter and/or that our interpretation of your draft plan is not accurate and that co-management is something else.

Michael

Michael Harvey
IGAS Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
709 729 6287

From: Blake, John
Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2009 10:31 AM
To: Simms, Herb
Cc: Harvey, Michael
Subject: RE: consultation plan GRCH

I'll get back to you guys with more detail. I will presume the following process...I respond to your questions, I await until you have considered my responses and return a "edited" version of the consultation plan to me, and then I submit the consultation plan to my DM/comm. director for consideration. Is that correct? Thanks.

Ps, had a few goes at the geese and did OK. I was off a few days last week hunting eiders in New Brunswick from my layout boat...did great.

From: Simms, Herb
Sent: Thursday, November 26, 2009 9:37 AM
To: Blake, John
Cc: Harvey, Michael
Subject: consultation plan GRCH

Good morning John,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan. Sorry for the delay.

We have a few questions we would like to ask.

What do you mean by co-management? What are our options? What type of mechanism are you considering and is there a preference? Has QC approached us on this; or us them? Does QC have a preference? Is the QC based meeting in January also QC led? Where do they want to go in regard to co-management?

We were also wondering what the range of possibilities we have open to us on this. It will facilitate us in seeking direction from higher up. Are we considering an MOU or a joint board for example; and who would be on that board? How would it
be organized and funded and so forth? Would aboriginal groups, resident hunters and outfitters be consulted or would they have a formal role?

How were the geese? Still no moose (no time) but sea ducks ( oldsquaw and eiders) start this weekend. Good chance to heat up the barrel.

Take care.

Herb Simms

Senior Policy Analyst

Resource and Fiscal Policy

Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

7th Floor, East Block

Confederation Building

St. John's, NL

A1B 4J6

Tel: (709) 729-2839

Fax: (709) 729-5038

HerbSimms@gov.nl.ca
John,

We have not been able to deploy collars into the 'traditional' (north of the TLH) area since 2005 (due to incursion of GR caribou and lack of $ and effort to get collars out prior to these incursions), and we have a serious gap in our ability to mitigate there as a result. Currently only 4 collars are (all from animals collared prior to 2005) reporting from this part of the range. We just plotted the locations and these animals have been swept up and are moving with the GRC—still within the heart of the traditional range. One caribou moved 60 km on November 20. This was the day of intensive hunting during which the GRC turned away from the road and toward Grand lake. WE have another RWM caribou that was just south of the TLH. She crossed the road and must have been in the middle of the hunting as it was going on...miraculously, she survived and is also now moving with GRC, but still in traditional RWM range. I strongly advise against using the presence of collared animals (or lack of) as a rationale for opening that zone.

IS

Sent Via BlackBerry
Simms, Herb

From: Moores, Len
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2009 11:41 AM
To: Parrott, William; Chippett, Jamie; Dutton, Sean
Subject: Fw: Additional Information

Categories: Red Category

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Furlong, Nancy
To: Moores, Len
Cc: Burragle, Don
Sent: Mon Nov 23 11:33:05 2009
Subject: RE: Additional Information

Hi Len,

I have reviewed the *Species at Risk Act* (the “Act”) in relation to your question below. Section 32 of the Act outlines general prohibitions with respect to extirpated, endangered and threatened species such as killing, harassing, and possessing the animals. Section 34 of the Act states that with the exception of aquatic species and species of migratory birds protected by the *Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994*, the prohibitions outlined in section 32 of the Act “do not apply in lands in a province that are not federal lands unless an order is made under subsection (2) to provide that they apply.”

Section 34(2) of the Act allows the Governor in Council, on recommendation of the Minister, to order that section 32 of the Act applies to lands in a province that are not federal. Section 34(3) of the Act requires the Minister to make the recommendation if, in the opinion of the Minister, the laws of the province do not effectively protect the species. Before making such a recommendation, section 34(4) requires the Minister to consult with the appropriate provincial Minister and any existing wildlife management board.

21(a)

If you have any further questions, please let me know.

Nancy

Nancy Furlong
Solicitor
Civil Division
Department of Justice
Telephone: (709) 729-0273
Fax: (709) 729-2129

This e-mail is confidential and may be solicitor-client privileged. It is intended only for the person(s) named above. Disclosure to anyone other than the intended recipient(s) does not constitute a waiver of privilege. Any other distribution, copying or disclosure is prohibited. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the undersigned immediately by telephone at (709) 729-0273 and delete the e-mail without making a copy or printing the e-mail. Thank you.
Please review below. The question was what role the fed species at risk legislation has in the current situation in Labrador

Len

Sent Via BlackBerry

---

fyi

---

Hi Ross,

Do you want review and to forward the following information to Melony dealing with earlier questions from DNR communications and Len.

The legislation that Caribou falls under depends on what type of Caribou you are talking about....

- Migratory George River Caribou fall under the Wildlife Act... so any hunting/harvesting activities would be regulated under the regulations and orders associated with that act. I believe the closure of specific areas where the Migratory and listed caribou intermingle would be under this act.

- Sedentary (non-migratory) Boreal Woodland Caribou (listed as Mealy Mountain, Lac Joe or Red Wine Mountain herds) are listed as Threatened under the Endangered Species Act (Regulations). Under the act there are clear prohibitions on the disturbance, harassment, injuring or killing of a species that has been listed as threatened... so the closures of an area to hunting where the 2 types of caribou intermingle reduce the probability that a listed animal is mistaken for a George River animal.

- Boreal Woodland Caribou are also listed under SARA (Federal Species at Risk Act) - Schedule 1 species Threatened. Once a species is placed on the legal list the following SARA prohibitions come into immediate effect: Species listed as Extirpated, Endangered, or Threatened cannot:
  1) be killed, harmed or traded (including parts)
  2) have their "residence" damaged or destroyed

As SARA is a federal law it is often interpreted that these prohibitions only apply on federal lands, and to aquatic species and migratory birds listed under the Migratory Birds Convention Act.
We have reviewed SARA legislation and cannot determine why it is interpreted as only federal lands. If the species was to be transported across jurisdictional boundaries then WAPRIITA
Please let me know if you need anything else. I am not sure this will clarify the SARA/ESA questions.

Shelley Pardy Moores, M.Sc.
Senior Manager
Wildlife Division
Ph 709 637 2018
Fax 709 637 2080

Melony O'Neill
Director of Communications
Department of Environment and Conservation
4th Floor, West Block
Confederation Building
(709) 729-2575
(709) 729-0112 (fax)
From: Carroll, Colin  
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 6:42 PM  
To: Blake, John; Chubbs, Tony; Bowles, Ron  
Subject: Fw: update

Fyi

Sent Via BlackBerry

---

From: Carroll, Colin  
To: Deering, Keith; Moores, Len; Barron, Tracy B.  
Sent: Fri Nov 20 16:29:37 2009  
Subject: update

Summary of events November 20, 2009

- Divers Brook area (closed hunting area):
  - Sheshatshui Innu hunting in this area for the third day (day 2 of protest hunt)
  - At least 280+ Innu present
  - 80 vehicles (1 Quebec License plate)
  - At least 165 caribou kills (more kill sites than Nov 19th)
  - Hunting taking place on and along the TLH
  - Lots of blood on the TLH.
  - Very few snowmobiles in the area.
  - Mostly hunting on foot along the bogs and ponds in the area.

- Margs Brook area and east Metchin River (closed hunting area):
  - Quebec Innu were noticed here hunting Nov 19 around 6-8pm.
- Report came to Wildlife Division office in HVGB from a trucker who drove by the area.
- Not too many animals down but signs of two caribou in one truck and signs of several other kills.
- Three tents were set up in the area the evening of Nov 19th.
- As of 3pm today Nov 20 there is NO sign of anyone or any activity in this area.
  - Officers have been patrolling via helicopter and have been collecting info and doing surveillance on the TLH of hunters moving towards the Divers Brook area.
  - Outside agencies on standby and/or assisting include: RCMP, DFO, and recently CWS.

Quebec Innu

- NO sign of any activity today Nov 20th.
- 1 vehicle associated with hunt at Divers Brook.

Colin
Simms, Herb

From: Bowles, Ron
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2009 12:16 PM
To: Dutton, Sean; Hughes, David
Subject: FW: Caribou kill count

Categories: Red Category

FYI

Ron Bowles
Assistant Deputy Minister
Labrador Affairs

Government of
Newfoundland and Labrador

Department of Labrador and Aboriginal Affairs

21Broomfield St.
Mail bag 3014, Station B
Happy Valley – Goose Bay, NL
Canada A0P 1E0
t 709.896.2800
c 709.899.0961
f 709.896.4648
rabowles@@gov.nl.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Carroll, Colin
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 7:22 PM
To: Blake, John; Bowles, Ron; Coady, Craig G.; Wight, Corey; Hope, Bruce
Subject: Fw: Caribou kill count

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Carroll, Colin
To: Barron, Tracy B.; Moores, Len; Deering, Keith; Williams, Tina
Sent: Fri Nov 20 19:50:41 2009
Subject: Caribou kill count

The confirmation of 165 kills today would be a total from yesterday and today. Please make correction.

Senior wildlife biologist Tony Chubbs just called me and was speaking to Peter Penashue just now. He is just on his way down from the area. Peter speculates 60 caribou killed today. They plan to continue this hunt till Sunday.
Colin

Sent Via BlackBerry
FYI
Department of Labrador & Aboriginal Affairs
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
P.O.Box 8700
St.John's, NL
Canada
A1B 4J6
Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Carroll, Colin
To: Chubbs, Tony; Bowles, Ron; Blake, John; Coady, Craig G.
Sent: Fri Nov 20 15:33:29 2009
Subject: caribou update

Divers Brook area:
  - Sheshatshui Innu hunting in this area for the third day (day 2 of protest hunt)
  - 240+ Innu
  - 60 vehicles
  - More kill sites than yesterday at least 150 caribou kills today. Possibly more...hard to estimate.
  - Hunting from road. Lots of blood on road.
  - Very few snowmobiles in the area. Mostly hunting on foot along the bogs and ponds.

Margins Brook area and east Melchin :
  - Quebec Innu were noticed here hunting Nov 19 around 6-8pm.
  - Report came to Wildlife Division office in HVGB from trucker who drove by the area.
  - Not too many animals down but signs of two caribou in one truck and signs of several other kills.
  - Three tents were set up in the area the evening of Nov 19th.
  - As of 3pm today Nov 20 there is NO sign of anyone or any activity in this area.
From: Blake, John  
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2009 1:32 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean  
Subject: RE: N.W.T. First Nation cancels caribou hunt

thanks

From: Dutton, Sean  
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2009 12:46 PM  
To: Blake, John; Firth, Ross; Deering, Keith; Carroll, Colin  
Cc: Hughes, David; Bowles, Ron; Barney, Wayne; Doucet, Christine; Chubbs, Tony  
Subject: RE: N.W.T. First Nation cancels caribou hunt

There's a protocol for consultation process approvals in place. I don't have a copy handy of the protocol but you should work that through your Director of Communications who should be familiar with the process. It wouldn't ordinarily require Cabinet approval but would have to be approved by the Communications and Consultation Branch and the Premier's Office.

Sean

From: Blake, John  
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2009 9:14 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean; Firth, Ross; Deering, Keith; Carroll, Colin  
Cc: Hughes, David; Bowles, Ron; Barney, Wayne; Doucet, Christine; Chubbs, Tony  
Subject: RE: N.W.T. First Nation cancels caribou hunt

Premonitions?

This is a great intro into an issue we have to get on with here at home. Please refer to the attached correspondence from our species management biologist. It puts to paper what we've been saying for some months now concerning George River caribou, and was publicly announced via a press release this past summer. Wayne has chosen to refer to our need to discuss options as consultations, and in a way they are. However, I envisage establishing a formal "working group" comprised of representatives of all appropriate stakeholders...LAA, DNR, ENV, NL, Innu Nation, LMN, Quebec MNR to name a few, and to use this working group as a means to disseminate information related to progress on the GRCH survey/population status and to discuss management options as Wayne notes. I am not comfortable at this point suggesting we are in a position to consult with the public as a whole. I have informally discussed the need for such a group with most all necessary stakeholder contacts and all are willing to participate. This would of course be a separate group from the Labrador Woodland Caribou Recovery Team. While my preference would be to keep this at an official level and allow us (the Wildlife Division) to coordinate the effort, your opinion regarding whether such a process requires cabinet approval and an approved consultation plan is hereby requested and appreciated.

Thanks

John

From: Dutton, Sean  
Sent: Thu 17/09/2009 8:30 PM  
To: Blake, John; Firth, Ross; Deering, Keith; Carroll, Colin
Potential copyright material

If you wish to obtain a copy please contact the ATIPP Office at (709) 729-7072 or atipoffice@gov.nl.ca.
Dear Mr. Blake:

The ecological, sociological, and economical values of the George River Caribou Herd are entrenched in the culture of Labrador. For most of our active management history, this Herd has undergone a significant population increase from an estimated size of 5,000 in the mid 1950’s to 750,000 by the mid 1990’s. However since then, the population has declined to an estimated 385,000 animals in 2001. During this period and to current day, the employed management strategies pursuant to harvest have remained very liberal. Over the counter license sales, commercial harvesting licenses, transfer of licenses, multiple animals per license, etc. are just a few examples. In addition to provincially guided strategies, aboriginal interest by the Innu, Inuit and Métis communities collectively contribute to the overall harvesting effort exerted on the Herd. Similar harvesting strategies and aboriginal interests exist within the province of Quebec in relation to this Herd.

Recent fall classifications and body condition indices are suggestive of a continuing decline in the GRCH. While the evidence is inconclusive as to the scale of the decline, anecdotal evidence is in support of this conclusion. A new population estimate for the Herd is planned for the spring of 2010 through cooperative efforts by the provinces of Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador in partnership with the Torngat Mountains Plants and Animal Co-Management Board, Nunatsiavut Government and the Institute for Environmental Monitoring and Research. The results will likely not be known until fall of 2010.

A consultation process with the various stakeholders will be required prior to the formulation of any revised management strategies that may result from the findings of these efforts. It is anticipated that the 2010 population estimate is likely below a threshold that we believe can sustain existing harvest pressure and a new management regime may have to be implemented. This new regime will likely differ significantly from that of present day. In order to facilitate the rapid development and implementation of a new management regime, it is recommended that public and aboriginal consultations begin as soon as possible and prior to the 2010 survey results are known. In the event that the 2010 population estimate indicates that the population is capable of supporting the existing management strategies then the information can be incorporated in a press release announcing the results of the survey and the status quo for the management regime. This process and schedule will allow us to be proactive to the anticipated results of the 2010 census.
Over the long term we can expect to deal with fluctuation in the population of the GRCH. Even if the current population estimate indicates an ability to sustain current harvest levels, development of a management plan that outlines how management should change in the face of both increases and decreases to the population should be undertaken. Any consultations initiated in 2009/10 could be used in this manner and for that purpose.

Based on the above rationale, I am seeking your direction on how and when to proceed with the development of a consultation process inclusive of the stakeholder community in Labrador who have an interest in the future management of the GRCH.

Thank you;

Wayne Barney
SMC

cc. C. Doucet
From: Parrott, William  
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2012 11:38 AM  
To: Dutton, Sean  
Subject: RE: Nunatisvut Gov't and GRCH  

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Flagged  

From: Dutton, Sean  
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2012 11:34 AM  
To: Parrott, William; Firth, Ross; Gover, Aubrey; Noble, Paul; Lake-Kavanagh, Jackie  
Subject: Re: Nunatisvut Gov't and GRCH  

23.1(a)(v) Sean  

From: Parrott, William  
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2012 11:27 AM  
To: Dutton, Sean; Firth, Ross; Gover, Aubrey; Noble, Paul; Lake-Kavanagh, Jackie  
Subject: Nunatisvut Gov't and GRCH  

23.1(a)(v) Folks  
Had a call from Carl McLean DM Lands and Resources with NG yesterday and  

23.1(a)(v) I’m having my notes from the call typed and will forward when finished.  

Bill
Potential copyright material

If you wish to obtain a copy please contact the ATIPP Office at (709) 729-7072 or atippoffice@gov.nl.ca.
Submitted by:

[Signature]

Sheldon Anstey
Chief of Enforcement (A)
Submitted by:

[Signature]

Sheldon Anstey
Chief of Enforcement (A)
Current Status and Management of the George River Caribou Herd

Wildlife Division
Department of Environment and Conservation
Newfoundland and Labrador
Relative Abundance of George River Caribou, Quebec/Labrador

(Adapted from Bergerud et al. 2008, "The Return of Caribou to Ungava")
Population Monitoring

- In recent years, there have been indications of continued decline (i.e. calf abundance, adult survival, observations by hunters).

- Post-calving census July 2010

  Partners: Gov. Quebec, Gov. NL, Gov. Nunatsiavut, Laval University, TWPCB, IEMR
Photo Census

- Caribou form large groups during post calving
- In 2009 and 2010, collars were put on 102 George River caribou
- In July 2010, groups of caribou were located using radio collared animals
- Photos of caribou groups were taken from helicopter & number of caribou counted
- Mark-resight methods used to estimate total
Photo Census

- 102 collars deployed yr prior to survey
- 70 active at census
- July 8 – 17
- All heard by VHF telemetry
- 44 photographed for census
- 2 crews; 4 people/helicopter; 70 hours flying
- NL, QC, TWPCB
Population Monitoring

- Results confirm a continued decline.
  - Population estimate = 74,000 caribou (90% CI = 61,420 to 86,580)
Population Monitoring

Calf Abundance: Low

% Large Adult Males: Low

Adult Mortality: High
Calves per 100 Females by Year for the George River Caribou Herd During Fall Classifications from 1973-2010.
Average Calves per 100 Females by Decade for the George River Caribou Herd during Fall Classifications.
Percentage of Large Male Caribou in the George River Caribou Herd during Fall Classifications from 2001-2010.
Population Monitoring

- Estimates of adult mortality rates are still being calculated.
- From July 2010 – March 2011, 12 radio-collared caribou died out of 70, or a 17% mortality rate during a 9-month time period.
- Hunting mortality is additive to natural mortality.
Hunting Regulation Changes

Changes to the Labrador 2010-2011 Hunting Regulations

- Commercial caribou hunt suspended.
- Non-resident caribou hunt suspended.
- Caribou licence transfer system for regular/special licences suspended.
- Bag limit per regular/special licences for caribou reduced from two to one caribou per qualified licenced hunter.
The Government recently announced a new initiative that provides 1.9 million dollars over the next 3 years to the conservation and management of the George River caribou herd.
Caribou Initiative

- Population Demographics
- Improved understanding of herd demographics
- Cause of mortality
- Population and spatial modeling to examine potential impact of various management plans
- Improved tracking of licence sales & harvest data
- Enhanced communication
Management & conservation of the GRCH is dependent on the cooperation and input from many users.

**Objective** - To gather input from stakeholders regarding:
- Sustainable use of GRC
- Review of alternative harvest models and potential impacts
- The feasibility, function, and structure of a co-management process for the GRCH
- George River Caribou population has declined by 80% over the last 10 years
- The Government of NL is dedicated to conservation and management of the herd
- Working cooperatively for a sustainable future
Thank you
Thanks Ross, I will be attending on behalf of LA.

Ron

Sent Via BlackBerry

---

Folks

[18.1(a)(ix)]

The Department of Environment and Conservation intends to convene a meeting of stakeholders to discuss George River caribou herd management. Specifically, the stakeholder meeting will discuss two main issues:

a. Provide stakeholders with an update on the current and projected GRC population status
b. Explore future options for management of GRC, including possible mechanisms to ensure appropriate representation from stakeholders.

The meeting will be held in HVGB at a date in the near future. The intent of my email is to provide you with a "heads up" to this process and advise that your department has been identified as a provincial government stakeholder in this process and an invitation to participate will be forthcoming.

John Blake, Director – Wildlife Division will be leading this process and will be in touch with further information. I have included two attachments; the first is a copy of the PowerPoint presentation that will be given to the stakeholder group; the second is an information note for background purposes.

Regards,

Ross

Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage

Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 2007
117 Riverside Drive
From: Carroll, Colin
To: Blake, John; Deering, Keith; Firth, Ross; Moores, Len
Sent: Thu Feb 03 12:53:01 2011
Subject: Fw: Nk Caribou Hunt.

Sent Via BlackBerry

Colin,
As discussed,
NunatuKutut (Nk) members (some from as far away as the coast) have been in contact with CO’s in NWR regarding an upcoming caribou protest hunt. They have indicated to CO’s that they are being allowed 2 caribou each plus up to four others for elder/disabled people in their communities. This is not what you and I were told yesterday by Mr. Learning.
I spoke to George Russell (NR contact with Nk) and he indicated that the impetus for this hunt was to get a few caribou for elders/disable people in their communities, not to stage a large-scale protest hunt similar to situations we have had with the Innu in recent years.

He has indicated that the upper management of Nk has, in light of conservation, said they would be happy if they could get 20-25 caribou for elders/disable people without generating an incident similar to the situations we have seen in recent years. He would like us to “sanction” this number of caribou to avoid an incident.

He also indicated that people are beginning to mobilize and would like to get this addressed asap.

Craig

P.S. I take it this will involve Dept of Justice and Wildlife Division as well.?
Ok

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Dutton, Sean 
To: Parrott, William; Blake, John; Firth, Ross; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len 
Cc: Gover, Aubrey 
Sent: Fri, Jan 14 15:46:32 2011 
Subject: Re: NunatuKavut licences 

I think NR should write, further to Minister Pottle's letter. If Len could compel someone in his Department to prepare a draft we can review it.

Sounds like time is of the essence.

Sean

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Parrott, William 
To: Blake, John; Dutton, Sean; Firth, Ross; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len 
Cc: Gover, Aubrey 
Sent: Fri, Jan 14 13:12:50 2011 
Subject: RE: NunatuKavut licences 

I agree with John that we should advise NK that the licence is to no effect and they are bound by the Provincial licence and law

Len would you see this as something NR would do or do you want ENVC to follow up?

Bill

-----Original Message----- 
From: Blake, John 
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 12:36 PM 
To: Dutton, Sean; Firth, Ross; Parrott, William; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len 
Cc: Gover, Aubrey 
Subject: Re: NunatuKavut licences 

I suggest something specific to the use of an illegal licence...it would support any enforcement action that might occur.
John

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message -----  
From: Dutton, Sean  
To: Blake, John; Firth, Ross; Parrott, William; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len  
Cc: Gover, Aubrey  
Sent: Fri Jan 14 12:20:13 2011  
Subject: RE: NunatuKavut licences

Minister Pottle wrote them in November (see attached). Is this enough our should there be a more direct letter about the NCC licenses?

Sean

----- Original Message -----  
From: Blake, John  
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 12:05 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean; Firth, Ross; Parrott, William; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len  
Cc: Gover, Aubrey  
Subject: Re: NunatuKavut licences

thoughts on relaying this to them? I suggest DNR given the potential enforcement action, but am willing to have WD do it also.

Sent Via BlackBerry

----- Original Message -----  
From: Dutton, Sean  
To: Blake, John; Firth, Ross; Parrott, William; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len  
Cc: Gover, Aubrey  
Sent: Fri Jan 14 11:57:08 2011  
Subject: RE: NunatuKavut licences

Agreed, NunatuKavut licenses have no legal standing and their members must have a provincial license and must limit themselves to one animal as with other license holders.

Sean

----- Original Message -----  
From: Blake, John  
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2011 11:55 AM  
To: Firth, Ross; Parrott, William; Dutton, Sean; Burrage, Don; Moores, Len  
Subject: NunatuKavut licences

I had a call from Jim Goudie, wildlife manager with NG last night. He advised that NunatuKavut are issuing their own custom made licences with a quota of 2 caribou per household. Shannon has confirmed this with their office and that they note they have been handing these out for years and that it was 4 caribou per household previous to this year. I advised Jim last night that the province did not endorse those licences and that NunatuKavut members were treated the same as non aboriginals respecting recently announced harvest restrictions. From my perspective it might be appropriate to more formally advise the NunatuKavut office of this position. I await direction.
Information Note
Department of Labrador & Aboriginal Affairs

Title: Meeting with Quebec Innu organisations

Issue: On 12 January 2011, provincial officials travelled to Sept-Iles, QC to meet bilaterally with the Innu Takuakain Uashat Mak Mani-Utenam (ITUM) First Nation and multilaterally with seven QC Aboriginal organisations (including ITUM); this Note provides a debriefing of the two meetings.

Background:

- In 2010, the Department of Environment & Conservation (ENVC) advised the most recent scientific data had revealed a sharp decrease in the size of the migratory George River Caribou Herd (GRCH); this is in addition to the already-imperilled woodland, or sedentary, caribou herds in Labrador, such as the Red Wine Caribou Herd (RWCH).

- Subsequently, ENVC issued a News Release dated 09 November 2010 announcing the immediate suspension of the commercial caribou hunt, non-resident caribou hunting via the use of outfitters, and the resident caribou licence transfer system for Labrador residents will be suspended. There was no impact on the Aboriginal right to harvest caribou in open hunting zones.

- ENVC also announced that the Province “will ... establish a committee to review whether additional conservation measures may be required in [future] years, after a more detailed assessment of the population and increased monitoring efforts are conducted. The intention is to work toward the implementation of a co-management board which has worked effectively in other jurisdictions.”

- At a 10 December 2010 meeting in St. John’s between officials and legal counsel for ITUM and provincial officials, agreement was reached to convene a public meeting in Sept-Iles, QC with a multitude of QC Innu (QCI) organisations to discuss the status of the GRCH and sedentary caribou herds and to determine the willingness of the communities and their leadership to participate in discussions on co-management and possible participation in the Caribou Co-Management Board. ITUM also conveyed its willingness to participate in co-management discussions.

- ITUM assumed responsibility for liaising with the other QCI communities, and two meetings were scheduled for 12 January 2011 in Sept-Iles:

  i. a bilateral meeting at the ITUM Band Council offices with Chief Georges-Ernest Grégoire and Band Councillors and officials; and,
ii. a multilateral meeting with seven QCI Chiefs, representatives, councillors and community members at a local museum. The First Nations represented at the second meeting included ITUM, Unamen Shipu, Pakua Shipi, Nutakuan, Ekuanitsit, Matimekush-Lac John and Pessamit. Save Pessamit, these First Nations have all asserted Aboriginal rights in Labrador, and members from all communities hunt caribou in Labrador each year.

- Both meetings were conducted primarily in Innu-aimun and English, with two different ITUM officials providing translation services.

**Current Status:**

**Meeting with ITUM**

- The bilateral meeting with ITUM was attended by the Chief, the Deputy Chief Mike McKenzie, several Band councillors and Elders, and other officials. The Province was represented by senior officials from ENVC and the Departments of Justice (JUS) and Labrador & Aboriginal Affairs (LAA).

- ENVC provided presentations on the GRCH and migratory caribou, and on the RWCH and other sedentary caribou in Labrador. The information was well-received, and ITUM representatives expressed general agreement with the information and data being provided. Although two Elders did express disbelief that there was any difference between sedentary caribou and migratory caribou, it was notable that these statements were not acknowledged by the Chief, Deputy Chief or other senior ITUM officials; rather, ITUM was generally supportive of the Province’s position, and reiterated its support of discussions on and participation in co-management, emphasising the central and critical role that caribou play in their lives and culture. In fact, the Chief and other ITUM officials repeatedly noted their pleasure at the burgeoning relationship with the Province. The Chief did, however, express his position that outfitters and non-residents should not be permitted to hunt caribou, and noted that funding would facilitate ITUM’s participation in co-management.

- ITUM repeatedly noted the importance of respect and continued and open communication between ITUM and the Province. The Deputy Chief noted that arrests of and seizures of equipment from QCI can create difficulties, and the use of helicopters for surveillance or enforcement can lead to confrontations.

- The Deputy Chief also proposed QCI “monitors”, or wildlife officials, to observe the hunt and incorporate Innu traditional knowledge in enforcing hunting prohibitions, and also noted that it would be easier for the QCI to support and implement conservation measures if they were involved in the collection of the scientific data and the formulation of any requisite hunting prohibitions, such as the closing of hunting zones.
• However, the Deputy Chief did echo the Chief’s point that communication was crucial and that a forum to advise all QCI communities of the status of the herd and the rules by which they were expected to abide were clearly understood. The Province expressed its commitment to continued dialogue, and noted that the Province was not there to tell the QCI that they did not have the right to hunt, but rather were trying to encourage the QCI to hunt in a responsible manner. Indeed, the Province emphasised that any Innu, whether from Labrador or Quebec, can harvest caribou from an open hunting zone without a license and without fear of prosecution, so long as rules of safety are followed.

• It is notable that one of the Elders also relayed his belief that there is no caribou in the Schefferville region because the Province is using helicopters to chase them away from that area. The Elder also noted that certain caribou have changed, that the meat is not as good as it was before, and assumed that this change was due to stress from being chased by helicopters. The Elder also asked whether the Province was doing anything else, beyond using helicopters, to affect the movement patterns of the caribou, noting that the caribou always stop at the same geographical location.

• The Province decried using anything, helicopters or otherwise, to affect the movement or patterns of the caribou, and noted that not even traffic on the Trans-Labrador Highway seems to bother or affect caribou migration patterns. Rather, ENVC expressed that the caribou movement patterns seem primarily determined by searches for prime habitat, and the availability of lichen.

• The Province acknowledged ITUM’s funding request, and its proposal in respect of QCI monitors, and ENVC undertook to convey the requests to its Minister. Further, following Chief Grégoire’s formal request for a meeting between the Chief and the Premier, ENVC undertook to relay that request to its Minister.

**Multilateral Meeting**

• ENVC again provided its presentations on the GRCH and migratory caribou, and on the RWCH and other sedentary caribou in Labrador; the Province also took care to note that it was not there to tell the QCI that they did not have the right to hunt, but rather were trying to encourage the QCI to exercise that right in a responsible manner. The Province re-emphasised that any Innu, whether from Labrador or Quebec, can harvest caribou from an open hunting zone without a license and without fear of prosecution, so long as rules of safety are followed.

• The Province’s presentation was followed by statements and responses from each of the individual Chiefs and / or their representatives. They were generally very interested in co-management, and reiterated ITUM’s earlier expressions regarding the central and crucial role that caribou play in their lives and culture.
• However, concerns were expressed about the past seizure of weapons and snowmobiles from people accused of hunting in closed zones, and some, such as the Pakua Shipi Chief Christine Lalo, asserted that all such equipment would have to be returned before the QCI would engage in any discussions with the Province. Provincial officials formally responded to this position by requesting a complete list of all hunters, incidents, seizures, dates, and other relevant information, and undertaking to explore the viability or possibility of returning seized equipment. However, officials did note that it would be limited in those instances where charges were laid and trials pending, and would likely be unable to return related seized equipment until the judicial process had concluded, and only then if the court did not impose direction on the disposition of the equipment.

• Overall, ITUM was very supportive and helpful, encouraging others to make a leap of faith and work with the Province. Representatives from Pessamit and Ekuanitshit were also moderate, and in fact asserted that not all Innu hunters acted responsibly. Chief McKenzie from the Matimekush-Lac John First Nation was less moderate than may have been hoped, but was generally helpful, and did well to focus some of the discussions, identifying the three primary concerns of the QCI as seized equipment, whether there were any hunting restrictions on QCI, and how the Province would respond to QCI hunters in closed zones.

• Chief Lalo and Chief Georges Bacon (Unamen Shipu) were the most hawkish; these First Nations, from the eastern part of the QC North Shore, wanted to let their hunters go wherever they like, noting the easy accessibility of the closed zones and difficulties associated with traveling all the way to the open zones. These communities are not connected to Route 138, and instead leave trucks in Blanc Sablon for the winter and drive up Phase II of the Highway. Indeed, Chief Lalo expressly rejected any consideration of halting hunting of the imperiled sedentary caribou of the Jour River and Mealy Mountains herds.

• Provincial officials were asked to leave the room mid-afternoon to allow the QCI to discuss the Province’s request to encourage their community members to only hunt in open zones and not to hunt in the closed zones where the GRCH and the RWCH, which are visually indistinguishable, are co-mingling. Although it was significant to convene a meeting of seven QCI organisations, it was clear that such meetings do not transpire more frequently due to the difficulty to reach consensus on challenging issues, due to the variety of philosophies and approaches.

• Ultimately, the QCI did not resolve its debate on whether to take heed the Province’s and encourage their members to only hunt in open zones, but were scheduled to remain following the departure of provincial officials to continue discussions. Although the Province tried to explain how hunting in closed zones creates difficulties for the Province, and clearly advised that any hunting in a closed zone could not be ignored by enforcement officers, some Elders and Chief Lalo, in addition to their earlier-expressed
concerns, expressed doubts over the scientific advice that there are different herds of caribou and that there is a difference between migratory and sedentary caribou.

- There was general agreement around the table that more communication is needed, and the meeting ended reasonably well. However, some QCI hunters are apparently headed to Labrador now and it is unclear whether they will hunt in open zones or whether they might go to the easily-accessible closed zone adjacent to the Trans-Labrador Highway.

- A gentleman from Ekuanitshit suggested that if the CFLCO road along the East side of Smallwood Reservoir were ploughed in winter, more hunters might be persuaded to go to the open hunting zones of Orma North / South, instead of the closed zone on the Trans-Labrador Highway. JUS will engage Nalcor to explore the feasibility of same.

- There were no representatives of the Government of Quebec in attendance at either of the two meetings; however, Radio-Canada and other media were present; as such, there has been coverage in the French media, which has been picked up by the English media. ENVC has received requests for comment from its Minister. However, LAA officials note that some of the media are incorrectly portraying the Province as having reached an agreement with the QCI. This is not accurate, although ITUM officials did undertake to confer with the Province in the coming days, following conclusion of the QCI’s discussions, with the hope of convening a follow-up meeting in St. John’s in the near future.

- ITUM officials later advised that, since the meeting, all Quebec Chiefs have instructed their hunters not to hunt in the closed zones. As a sign of a new relationship, they are looking for a return of their equipment seized in the past and the withdrawal of changes. All Quebec Chiefs are also happy to participate in co-management.

Action Being Taken:
- ENVC will convey ITUM’s funding request and its proposal in respect of QCI Monitors to its Minister.

- ENVC will convey Chief Grégoire’s formal request for a meeting between the Chief and the Premier to its Minister.

- JUS, in consultation with the Department of Natural Resources, ENVC and LAA, will review the list, once provided, of seized equipment to determine what equipment may be returned.

- JUS will confer with Nalcor on the feasibility of ploughing the CFLCO road.
From: Dutton, Sean  
Sent: Friday, December 03, 2010 4:03 PM  
To: Melindy, Shawn D.  
Cc: Watkins, Michelle; Bowles, Ron; Keats, Janet  
Subject: RE: Lab Hunting and Fishing Assn dec.doc

I think the last "and" should a "but". Has ENVC seen this? We should run past Ross Firth before advancing for signature.

Sean

From: Melindy, Shawn D.  
Sent: Friday, December 03, 2010 4:20 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean  
Cc: Watkins, Michelle; Bowles, Ron; Keats, Janet  
Subject: Lab Hunting and Fishing Assn dec.doc

Sean, Good day!

Please review the Ministerial response letter to the Lab Hunting and Fishing Assn

Thanks

Sean

From: Melindy, Shawn D.  
Sent: Friday, December 03, 2010 4:20 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean  
Cc: Watkins, Michelle; Bowles, Ron; Keats, Janet  
Subject: Lab Hunting and Fishing Assn dec.doc

Sean, Good day!

Please review the Ministerial response letter to the Lab Hunting and Fishing Assn

Thanks

December 3, 2010
Dear Mr. Chubbs:

Thank you for your letter dated November 21, 2010. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you and your members on the formation of the Labrador Hunting and Fishing Association.

My department certainly looks forward to future discussions concerning issues and concerns raised by your membership on matters of wildlife conservation and resources use.

Further I commend you and your members for taking the initiative to request representation on future co-management boards making recommendations on wildlife management in Labrador including the Labrador Woodland Caribou Recovery Team. I will discuss the Association’s interest in participating on co-management boards with the Minister of Environment and Conservation, Ms. Charlene Johnson.

Unfortunately I was unable to attend your meeting on November 30 due to a previous commitment but I look forward to future updates from the Association.

With every best wish,

John Hickey, M.H.A.
Lake Melville District
Minister

Cc  The Honourable Charlene Johnson, Minister of Environment and Conservation
    Mr. Ron Bowles, Assistant Deputy Minister, Labrador Affairs
Good afternoon.

I have been asked by my ADM to solicit the input of relevant departments on a new initiative budget request that ENVC is taking forward. The initiative is a three year Labrador caribou management initiative, summarized below.

Three Year Labrador Caribou Management Initiative

Background

Since the 1950’s, the George River caribou herd has increased from an estimated size of 15,000 animals to an estimated 775,000 by the early 1990’s. The herd then declined to an estimated 385,000 animals in 2001. A liberal harvest strategy has been employed since the 1980’s including over the counter license sales, commercial harvesting licenses, transfer of licenses, and multiple animals per license. This strategy allowed maximum benefit and hunting opportunities for aboriginals, residents, outfitters and commercial operators. In July 2010, a post calving aggregation photo-census was conducted in partnership with the Government of Quebec, Laval University, the Nunatsiavut Government, Tomagt Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board and the Institute for Environmental Monitoring and Research. Results of the survey indicate the current population of the George River caribou herds to be approximately 75,000 animals. Based on herd size, recruitment and mortality rates, the George River herd can no longer support harvest pressure if the herd is to stabilize or to increase. Considerable harvest management restrictions were recently announced for Labrador - http://www.releases.gov.nl.ca/releases/2010/env/1109n03.htm

Moving Forward

To facilitate the appropriate science based management and monitoring of George River caribou there is a need to collect accurate and timely data on basic demographic parameters, range utilization, and current or possible sources of mortality. This data can only be gathered through a directed and properly designed sampling program that not only reflects the current distribution of GR caribou but also provides an adequate representation of the current demographic distribution of the population. The Wildlife Division has developed the appropriate design of such a program along with resource requirements (both material and personnel) and associated cost estimates. We have also identified other gaps in our management of this herd which we hope to address through this initiative. The Division is submitting a new initiative budget request for three years commencing 2011/12, for a total three year ask of 1.9 million, all operational. Resources allocated through this management program will provide for:

- Delineation of changing patterns of range and habitat use
- Improved herd demographics including sex ratios, age distributions, natural mortality rates for both sexes and all age cohorts and recruitment rates.
- Assessment of the effects of various sources of mortality including habitat degradation, predation, hunting and disease.
Population modeling and spatial modeling to examine the effects of different management option on recovery potential of the GRC.

- Development and implementation of co-management with all interested parties
- Development of long-term management plans
- Improved tracking of license sales and harvest data
- Enhanced ability to communicate and educate resource users on issues affecting George River caribou management.

Management of the George River caribou herd is the responsibility of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Province of Quebec. This management responsibility is operationally carried out by the Newfoundland and Labrador Wildlife Division and the Ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune (MRNF).

Quebec is currently engaged in a long-term research and monitoring program on the George River and Leif River caribou herds. Partnering with Quebec to achieve the research and management objectives will result in significant cost savings. Partnerships will also be pursued with aboriginal groups, the Institute for Environmental Monitoring and Research, the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-management Board and others interested in the long-term sustainability of the Labrador caribou.

Presumably as the request moves through additional opportunity to comment will be provided. At this point we are seeking support in principle. If I can provide any further information at this point please let me know.

John Blake
Director of Wildlife
Department of Environment and Conservation
Wildlife Division
P. O. Box 2007, 117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL A2H 7S1
Telephone: (709) 637-2006 - Fax: (709) 637-2033
Fyi

Sent Via BlackBerry

---

From: Firth, Ross
To: ‘carl_mclean@nunatsiatvut.com’ <carl_mclean@nunatsiatvut.com>
Cc: Parrott, William
Sent: Fri Oct 22 17:15:53 2010
Subject: Re: George River Caribou

Hi Carl,

Thanks for your message. We’re still awaiting final census results and a classification of calves in the population is currently underway. Once the classification is complete we’ll have a much clearer picture of the total population estimate. We anticipate having the final herd estimate completed by late October/early November.

I hope that your consultations go well next week. No doubt they will be helpful in informing the recommendations of your government. We continue to welcome these recommendations and I suggest you forward them at the earliest opportunity.

Thanks again for your email. I look forward to working together as this very challenging issue progresses.

Regards,
Ross

Sent Via BlackBerry

---

From: Carl McLean <carl_mclean@nunatsiatvut.com>
To: Firth, Ross
Cc: Blake, John; Jamie Snook <jamie.snook@tormgatsecretariat.ca>; Darryl Shiwak <darryl.shiwak@nunatsiatvut.com>
Sent: Fri Oct 22 14:59:53 2010
Subject: George River Caribou

Hi Ross, I gave John a call to discuss the George River caribou file but his office told me he is on leave until the end of next week. Your staff indicated you are in meetings in St. John’s but I may be able to reach you by email.

My staff requested participation from your Department and also asked the Torgat Board to participate. John indicated no one from the province would be available and I understand staff from the Board will participate to present the census protocol info and outline their role in this issue. My staff has indicated that the province is planning to release their recommendations and census information next Friday. We were hoping that NG would have the opportunity to provide our recommendations to the province on conservation measures for harvesting in LISA and Area 12E prior to decisions being made by the province. As we mentioned in our meeting last week we needed to consult with our beneficiaries before our recommendations can be provided to the
province. I am wondering if there is still opportunity for us to do this and what the provinces absolute deadline would be to receive our recommendation and have that considered before any announcements on this issue?

Related to this, through discussions with staff at the Torngat Board yesterday we found out that the Board had already sent a recommendation to the province a few days before. We were not copied on this recommendation letter and only received a copy of it yesterday. We will be reviewing this decision and recommendation as soon as we can.

Thanks Ross. I will be in touch.

Carl McLean
Deputy Minister / Director of Lands
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Nunatsiavut Government
1A Hillcrest Road, Box 909, Stn. "B"
Happy Valley Goose Bay, NL
A0P 1E0
Tel: 709-896-8582
Cell: 709-899-2574
Fax: 709-896-2610

This message (including any attachments) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is non-public, proprietary, privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law or may constitute as attorney work product. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, notify us immediately by telephone and (i) destroy this message if a facsimile or (ii) delete this message immediately if this is an electronic communication. Thank you.
Monday, October 18, 2010

Honourable Charlene Johnson
Minister of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 8700
4th Floor, West Block
Confederation Building
St. John’s, NL, A1B 4J6

Re: Management of the George River Caribou Herd

Dear Minister Johnson:

As Chairperson of the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board, and subject to the provisions of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement, I submit the accompanying recommendations on the continuing management of the George River Caribou Herd. These recommendations outlined herein were developed and approved by consensus of the TWPCB at a board meeting held on September 18, 2010.

The recommendations are intended to address immediate concerns relating to the relative scarcity of George River Caribou, and the relative intensity of harvests, as well as intermediate opportunities to improve the decision-making process itself.

I appreciate that action will have to be taken in the very near future if these recommendations are to impact the 2010-11 harvest, and myself and the Board are available should you or your staff require any clarification on the recommendations outlined herein, or the rationale that underpins each.

Your’s truly,

Bruce Roberts
Chairman
Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board
Torngat Wildlife & Plants Co-Management Board
Memorandum to the Minister of Environment and Conservation
George River Caribou Herd Management Recommendations
(October 18, 2010)

Issue: Management of the George River Caribou Herd

Recommendations:

Pursuant to Sections 12.9.1 (b) and 12.9.2 of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement, the Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board (TWPCB) submits the following recommendations respecting the management of the George River Caribou Herd (GRCH):

Immediate

➢ Reduce individual quota from 2 to 1
➢ No transfer of licences
➢ Do not renew commercial harvesting licences
➢ Do not issue outfitters licences
➢ Maintain/Enhance enforcement
➢ Implement an immediate communication strategy with all stakeholders
➢ Do not publicise collar locations
➢ No change to season dates

Intermediate

➢ Assess, and where feasible, enhance the human and capital resources available to conduct research.
➢ Initiate dialogue regarding the establishment of a co-management board specific to the GRCH.

The Torngat Wildlife and Plants Co-Management Board is developing a recommendation to the Nunatsiavut Government which details possible approaches to addressing knowledge gaps with respect to harvest pressure within Nunatsiavut. This recommendation, which will be submitted to the Nunatsiavut Government, also identifies options for reducing harvest pressure.

1.0 Case History and Context

➢ The TWPCB is the creation of the three negotiating parties to the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement and established under the Agreement in Part 12.8 of Chapter 12, with its roles, responsibilities and powers outlined in Part 12.9. For greater clarity, and ease of reference, the Board is empowered to recommend to the Minister, conservation and
management measures for wildlife, plants and habitat in the Labrador Inuit Settlement Area (12.9.1b).

➢ The Board is the primary body making recommendations on the timely collection, analysis, and sharing of data and information relevant to Inuit rights and the conservation and sustainable utilization of wildlife (12.9.1e).

➢ Evidence from various sources indicates that the GRCH is declining, and has been declining since the late 1980's or early 1990's (Bergerud et al., 2008; Couturier et al., 2004; Boudreau et al., 2003; Crête et al, 1994). Past declines (to a low of approximately 15,000 in the 1950’s) have been variously attributed to overhunting, range overutilization, predation, disease, parasites, emigration, climate fluctuations, fires, or some combination (Sharma et al., 2009; Bergerud et al., 2008; Messier et al., 1988; Bergerud, 1967). The intention here is not to refine an understanding of cause-and-effect in the case of this most recent decline, but to weigh policy options to respond to it, and recommend a course of action. The GRCH is one of several large migratory herds in the Canadian arctic/subarctic, and case studies of these herds have informed this analysis.

➢ In July of 2010 the Wildlife Division of the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Environment and Conservation, Ministere des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune, and the TWPCB partnered to conduct a post-calving digital aerial survey of the GRCH. Preliminary results indicate a continued decline, and warrant a crises-based policy response. The recommendations detailed herein have emerged from extensive scientific research, community consultations, and Board deliberations. Recommendations are classified as ‘immediate’, meaning they require immediate implementation to achieve the intended results, and ‘intermediate’, meaning they will not be effective in co-managing this season’s harvest, but will be essential for continuing co-management. Immediate recommendations are primarily intended for implementation outside of LISA, but some directions for future co-management within LISA are included as well.

2.0 Immediate Recommendations

➢ All of the following recommendations have been offered as temporary or stop-gap solutions, and are intended to be modified or eliminated in the event of a recovery, or through collaborative planning processes. The organization of the section (outside LiSA and inside LiSA) is intended to reflect the migratory nature of the GRCH.

2.1 Outside LiSA

➢ Harvest mortality is a contributing cause of the observed decline in the GRCH. Although several other factors are likely as significant, mortality is the only cause that can be manipulated in the near-term. All of the following recommendations are intended to
reduce (not eliminate) harvest mortality in a manner that is consistent with the cultural, economic, spiritual, and social significance of caribou to the people of the Quebec-Labrador peninsula.

- Currently, resident hunters are allowed to harvest two caribou. This should be reduced to one. Reducing the annual limit from two to one (a reduction of 50%) is a considerable cut to family-economies, but no smaller increment is possible.

- Licences should be non-transferable. This recommendation, more than any other, will drastically reduce this year’s harvest. Removing the right to transfer licences does not remove the inherent human right to share resources.

- Commercial harvesting licences, once they expire on December 31, 2010, should not be renewed. Any conservation strategy implemented should recognize and reaffirm the rights of Aboriginal and other resident hunters. The importance of caribou to Aboriginal and resident livelihood strategies and food-security should take precedence over commercial interests. Any scenario that restricts access for Aboriginal and resident hunters, but allows for commercial harvesting, will seriously undermine consultation efforts and compliance.

- No new outfitter licences should be issued. This recommendation further recognizes the primacy of public over private interests; of local over extra-local. Again, harvesting that restricts local access but allows for extra-local and commercial access will undermine social capital.

- The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador should maintain enforcement capacity at current levels and should consider any potential means of increasing capacity. Currently, the Department of Natural Resources employs approximately 20 permanent Conservation Officers throughout Labrador, with one stationed in Nunatsiavut in Hopedale. The Department of Environment and Conservation and the Nunatsiavut Government should explore opportunities to increase capacity to monitor and enforce through cooperation between Nunatsiavut Conservation Officers, and those of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

- People should be formally and informally encouraged to make every reasonable effort to retrieve wounded animals and reduce wastage of meat resulting from improper handling or storage. This might involve community outreach, and monitoring at roadside checkpoints and dumpsites.

- Preliminary population estimates should be immediately released. The Department of Environment and Conservation will be implementing decisions that will impact the 2010-11 hunt, and the user-community should be privy to the population estimate upon which decisions have been based. Transparency will encourage compliance, will
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eliminate misinformation that is currently circulating, and will greatly increase the likelihood of meaningful consultation when it occurs.

- Since the 1980's caribou have been fitted with radio and/or satellite telemetry collars to track their movements. Telemetry studies have identified critical habitat, calving grounds, summer and winter ranges, and migration routes. Telemetry studies are also an integral component of survey methodologies. Collar locations have been published by the provincial governments of Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec, and hunters are using this spatial information to plan and execute hunts. Aircraft-assisted caribou hunts greatly increased success rates in the 1960's and 1970's -- today, caribou hunting is satellite-assisted. The practice of releasing collar locations should be suspended.

- Season dates should remain the same. As a migratory herd, the GRCH is accessible to different communities at different times of the year. Altering the season would arbitrarily deny access to whole regions, and allow access to others.

2.2 Within LISA

- The Nunatsiavut Government will responsibly manage the harvesting by its membership within the LISA as per Chapter 12 of the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement.

- The TWPCB will issue a recommendation to the Nunatsiavut Government suggesting that, in consultation with the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Environment and Conservation, they devise and implement an ongoing harvest monitoring program to quantify and qualify harvesting in Nunatsiavut. The Torngat Wildlife, Plants and Fisheries Secretariat will be available to assist.

3.0 Intermediate Recommendations

- The following recommendations are not likely to impact the 2010-11 harvest of the GRCH, but are intended as a starting point in assessing the current decision-making process, and identifying potential areas of improvement. The goal, as with all governance models, is to increase efficiency, reduce costs, and improve outcomes. This will require an appraisal of existing capacity, and the design of a co-management institution that links managers and resource users across regions.

3.1 Capacity Inventory and Appraisal

- The Wildlife Division of the Department of Environment and Conservation and its co-management partners should inventory and appraise existing capacity to conduct biological, social, and policy research to effectively manage the GRCH - the Department and its partners should continue to look for opportunities to increase capacity through whatever means are deemed feasible.
3.2 Initiate Dialogue on the Establishment of a George River Caribou Co-Management Board

- Consistent with resource management theory, and the management of large migratory caribou herds in Alaska, the western Canadian Arctic, and the central Canadian arctic, it is the will of the Board that the GRCH be co-managed to safeguard comprehensive claims, ensure the sustainability of the hered and the regional economies it supports, and mitigate resource conflicts and related impacts on development. The Nord du Québec Caribou Management Plan released by Ressources naturelles, Faune et Parcs in 2004 (2) was intended as a “starting point for discussions with Newfoundland on the establishment of a joint management plan”. The preferred option outlined here is intended to further encourage discussions, but of a joint management board, including not only the provinces of Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador, but also representatives of each user-group.

- There is no widely accepted definition of ‘co-management’. In general, the term is used with reference to formal power-sharing partnerships between government (or governments) and resource users (who are often, but not exclusively, indigenous), and possibly a third party (industry). The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996: 665) defines co-management as “institutional arrangements whereby governments and Aboriginal entities (and sometimes other parties) enter into formal agreements specifying their respective rights, powers and obligations with reference to the management and allocation of resources”. Alternatively, Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (cited in RCAP, 1996: 665) defines co-management as “the blending of these two systems [Aboriginal and state] in such a way that the advantages of both are optimized and the domination of one over the other is avoided”.

- The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996) distinguishes between claims-based co-management, and crisis-based co-management. Claims-based co-management is driven by a desire on behalf of the State for legal certainty in pursuing development (e.g., James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement, Inuviat Final Agreement), or by a desire on behalf of Aboriginal people for regional autonomy and self-determination (e.g., Nunavut Final Agreement). Crisis-based co-management has emerged as a policy response to conflicts rooted in resource development/extraction (e.g., Barrier Lake Tri lateral Agreement), or concerns of resource depletion (e.g., Beverly-Qaminirjuaq Caribou Management Board).

- Co-management arrangements have been initiated by governments and by Aboriginal groups to facilitate development, mitigate the impacts of development, maximize benefits of development, pursue political autonomy, safeguard comprehensive claims, address long-standing conflicts, avoid litigation, and to address resource depletion. Several of these drivers are relevant to the GRCH caribou system. Co-management of the GRCH is envisioned as a crisis-based policy response to perceived resource depletion. It will safeguard comprehensive claims negotiations and industrial
developments, and will serve as a means to resolve longstanding conflicts between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal interests without resorting to litigation.

> Crises-based co-management bodies have been established to safeguard comprehensive land claims negotiations, and facilitate resource development, by formally addressing specific sources of conflict. The exclusion of Aboriginal resource-users from decision-making processes affecting wildlife management has lead to conflict across Canada (Castro and Nielsen, 2001; Notzke, 1995; Richard and Pike, 1993), but where “participatory policies and mechanisms are in place for dispute management, substantial potential exists for addressing both the immediate manifestations of conflict and its underlying causes” (Castro and Nielsen, 2001; 230).

### 3.2.1 Resource and Environmental Management Theory

> A literature review reveals a clear trend in the field of resource and environmental management with relevance to the co-management of the GRCH. There is increasing recognition of the importance of scale and scope, and recognition that where there is a mismatch between resource boundaries and jurisdictional boundaries, the latter must be modified to accommodate the former. Wide-ranging wildlife and fishery resources that are drawn upon by multiple, distant, and disparate user-communities, pose complex management challenges across Canada (see Richard and Pike, 1993). These challenges are compounded by uncertainty relating to abundance, demography, and harvest pressure (Armitage, 2005; Richard and Pike, 1993). To cope with complexity and uncertainty, authors advocate institutional arrangements that link managers, scientists, and resource-users across geographic space and organizational levels. Co-management allows for the establishment of linking institutions, and will allow for knowledge co-production and the evolution of an efficient decision-making process that shortens feedback loops between information and action and decreases transfer costs (the costs associated with making and enforcing decisions). In a presentation to the Migratory Caribou Workshop (Montreal, January 20-22, 2010) John Mameamskum, Director General of the Naskapi Nation of Kawawachikmanch, stressed: “separate management of shared resources benefits no-one – least of all the animals”.

### 3.2.2 Intergovernmental Considerations

> The GRCH crosses several jurisdictions. It is hunted by Cree, Naskapi, Inuit, Innu, and non-Aboriginal communities in Quebec, and by Inuit, Innu, Inuit-Metis, and non-Aboriginal communities in Labrador. The total annual harvest has been estimated, with low precision, at approximately 30,000 (Crête et al., 1990 cited in Crête et al. 1994, Bergerud et al., 2008), and more recently at approximately 9000. The Cree and Inuit in northern Quebec have some regulatory jurisdiction over the management of the GRCH through the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (1975; 24.4.30), the Naskapi through the Northeastern Quebec Agreement (1978; 15.6.7), and the Labrador Inuit through the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement (2005; 12.9.1(b)(i)). The Innu of
Labrador are negotiating a comprehensive land claims agreement, and the Inuit-Metis of Labrador have filed a claim. Presently, ultimate decision-making powers with respect to the GRCH rest with the Provinces of Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador.

3.2.3 Comparative Case Study

- Co-management of the GRCH would be consistent with the management of five of the largest herds in North America: the Western Arctic Herd in Alaska has been co-managed by the non-regulatory Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group since 1997; the Bathurst Caribou Herd in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories has been co-managed by the Bathurst Caribou Management Planning Committee since 2000; the Porcupine Caribou Herd in eastern Alaska, Yukon and the Northwest Territories has been co-managed by the Porcupine Caribou Management Board since 1985, and; the Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou Herd(s) in Nunavut, the Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba has/have been co-managed by the Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board since 1982 (see BCMPC, 2004; PCMB, 2010; WACHWG, 2003; BQCMB, 2005).

- The Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board (BQCMB) was established in 1982 as a “policy response to crisis” (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, 1996: 667). It is widely recognized as one of the most successful co-management institutions in northern Canada (Kendrick, 2000; Rusnak, 1997). The Beverly-Qamanirjuaq herds are hunted by approximately 23 user-communities of Dene, Inuit, Métis, and Cree located in the Northwest Territories, Nunavut, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. Its range covers portions of two territories and three provinces, and it is a central component of the traditional and contemporary culture and economy of approximately 23,000 people representing four Aboriginal cultures. The Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou Herd provides the best parallel to inform the management of the GRCH.

- The membership of Canadian co-management boards typically consists of an equal number of appointments by each Aboriginal and government signatory to the agreement, but deviations from this principle are common (Rusnak, 1997). The BQCMB membership consists of eight to ten community representatives, and five government representatives. The Porcupine Caribou Management Board has eight members, representing six signatories.

3.2.4 Membership

- Membership of the GRCH co-management board might consist of a senior official appointed by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, a senior official appointed by the Canadian Wildlife Service, a senior official appointed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Environment and Conservation, a senior official appointed by the Ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune, and one appointed official each representing the Cree of Quebec, the Inuit of Nunavik, the Inuit of Nunavut, the Innu
of Labrador, the Innu of Quebec, the Naskapi of Quebec, and the Inuit-Metis of Labrador. An appointee representing outfitters, guides, and commercial harvesters should be granted observer status. Although co-management institutions can include industry representation, they typically do not, as industry objectives are ultimately a function of governmental policy, and not the other way around.

3.2.5 Powers and Functions

- Like the BQCMB, the board could serve as an information clearing-house or ‘single window’ (Usher, 1993) into research and management of the GRCH. The Board will be empowered to design, implement, and monitor research programs; establish, vary, and remove total allowable harvests and non-quota limitations; regulate commercial activities and make allocation decisions; establish conservation areas and develop and implement conservation plans; respond to requests for information, research, and action; and communicate on conservation issues (see Winn, 1991).

3.2.6 Alternatives

- Status Quo – The immediate consequences of inaction are uncertain, and will depend on what actions (if any) are taken to address the decline in the GRCH. If limitations (quota or non-quota) are unilaterally imposed, there is a risk of conflict and civil disobedience. There will also be costs associated with monitoring, enforcement, and litigation. The imposition of limitations will erode social and political capital, and may affect industrial development and the negotiation of comprehensive claims. Further, a decline in the GRCH will likely co-occur with a range contraction – which would bring the GRCH out of range of more southerly user-communities, and may therefore shift harvest pressure onto smaller and more vulnerable sedentary herds (e.g., Mealy Mountain, Red Wine, and Lac Joseph). The increased scarcity and reduced range of the GRCH may also shift pressure onto the Torngat Mountains Herd in the north.

- Advisory Board – Collaboration is understood as a spectrum ranging from manipulation, through consultation and placation, to delegated power and citizen control (Arnstein, 1969), and in practice co-management takes all of these forms. An advisory board (towards the lower end of the spectrum) would include resource-users, add to the knowledge base, and might create local and regional ownership of decisions. Although the provincial governments of Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador would retain ultimate authority for caribou management in their respective jurisdictions, the GRCH co-management board would serve as a bridging institution linking federal and provincial managers and scientists with resource-users. The board would harmonize research, management, and sustainable utilization of the GRCH. The Beverly-Qamanirjuaq Caribou management board is strictly advisory, but in practice more than 80% of its recommendations are passed (Kendrick, 2000). That said, without legally
entrenched powers and responsibilities the legitimacy and relevance of the board may come into question - resource-users may feel, and may be, further marginalized. Co-management without empowerment has itself been a source of conflict (Castro and Nielsen, 2001).

- **Management Board** – A regulatory caribou co-management board, empowered to formulate, evaluate, and implement decisions, would retain all the benefits of an advisory board, and remove any question as to legitimacy and relevance. Such a board would build capacity and social/political capital across scales and jurisdictions.

4.0 Consultations and Meetings

- The TWPCB and the Torngat Wildlife, Plants and Fisheries Secretariat attended a Migratory Caribou Workshop in Montreal in January of 2010. Representatives from the Secretariat and the Board also attended planning meetings for the GRCH census in early 2009 in Labrador City and early 2010 in St. John’s. The Secretariat participated in the aerial census of the GRCH conducted in July of 2010, and is contributing to data compilation, analysis and interpretation on an on-going basis. Finally, the Secretariat led a user-based exploratory reconnaissance of the Torngat Mountain Herd in the winter of 2009/10 to delineate the northern range of the GRCH.

- The recommendations outlined herein were developed and approved by consensus of the TWPCB at Board meetings held September 15-18, 2010.

Prepared by: Torngat Wildlife, Plants and Fisheries Secretariat

Approved by: Executive Director

Approved by: Chairman
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Thank you

-----Original Message-----
From: Dutton, Sean
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2010 12:08 PM
To: Blake, John
Subject: FW: Innu Meeting with the Premier

John, here's what I have. This list did not include Jack Penashue, who was at the caribou meeting. It includes some people who only went to the meeting with the Premier and not the caribou meeting - Bart Jack and Greg Andrew. I'm not sure but a few others may have dropped off. Certainly you had the 4 Chiefs, two legal advisors, Garrett (Garry) and Marcel, Simon Pokue and the elders. I can't recall if Jerome and David were there.

Sean

-----Original Message-----
From: dpaddon@innu.ca [mailto:dpaddon@innu.ca]
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2010 9:16 PM
To: Dutton, Sean
Subject: Innu Meeting with the Premier

Sean,

FYI, for your information for tomorrow morning's meeting with the Premier, the Innu participants will be:

GC Joseph Riche, Innu Nation
DGC George Rich, Innu Nation
Chief Simeon Tshakapesh, MIFN
Chief Sebastian Benuen, SIFN

Elders:
Ponas Nuke
Sebastian Penunsi
Michel Jack Sr.
Joseph Pokue
Simon Michel Sr (was attending but not well - noting this as these are the five Elders with the Land Rights team).

Staff:
Bart Jack Sr., SIFN
David Nuke, Innu Nation (consultant hired for Tshash Petapen) Jerome Jack, Asst to Joseph Riche Gregory Andrew, Hydro Negotiator Simon Pokue, Hydro Negotiator (also MIFN) Garrett O'Brien, Legal Counsel, MIFN Marcel Ashini, SIFN

Legal Advisors:
Sent wirelessly from my BlackBerry device on the Bell network.
Envoyé sans fil par mon terminal mobile BlackBerry sur le réseau de Bell.
No we don't have a list yet. We only received notification that the consults were a go noon today. From what I am led to believe the meetings are Oct 12 and 13. That said there are no flights available for us to get to Goose so not sure how that will work. We will call hunters to secure the quorum which will include the names previously provided by minister hickey. Sean if you have other names by all means provide them. Wayne once you finalize the list ca you provide to melony.

John

Sent Via BlackBerry

---

Hi Sean,

By way of this e-mail, I will ask our folks to provide you with that information.

Thanks,

Melony
Melony O'Neill
Director of Communications
Department of Environment and Conservation
4th Floor, West Block
Confederation Building
(709) 729-2575
(709) 729-0112 (fax)

Sent Via BlackBerry

---

Melony:

Do you have a list of the 10 non-Aboriginal harvesters which we might run past Minister Hickey before invitations are sent out?

See also below regarding scheduling.

Sean
From: Oxford, Krista L.
Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2010 4:17 PM
To: Dutton, Sean
Cc: Tompkins, John
Subject: Trid to call

I spoke with Minister Hickey and he will attend the HVGB meetings as well as the meeting he is scheduled for on the 12th at 11am in St John's. He is hoping the meetings can be scheduled for the 13th in HVGB to ensure he is able to return from St John's in time.

Please give me a call when you have a chance on your other questions,
Krista

Krista Oxford
Executive Assistant to
Hon. John Hickey
M.H.A. Lake Melville
Minister of Labrador Affairs
T (709) 896 - 2364
F (709) 896 - 7283
E kristaoxford@gov.nf.ca
I had a look at the deck. Just a few comments.

Background - if we describe GRCH as "woodland" when woodland caribou are listed on endangered species legislation might be confusing. Can we just say "migratory caribou"?

Population Cycles - this graph shows the time line but there could be a vertical line at left showing the numbers so people could have a sense of the scale. I haven't read Bergerud's book so I don't know if he reflected that in his text.

If we are proposing to ask at all meetings whether/how Aboriginal harvest should be limited, shouldn't we provide some information first about Aboriginal rights? This could get tangly. Not everyone will have an appreciation for Aboriginal rights and NunatuKavut will argue they hold such rights. Maybe say something along the lines of (subject to Aubrey's fine tuning):

ABORIGINAL RIGHTS
Aboriginal people in Canada have a right to harvest for food, social and ceremonial purposes. Such rights are site and fact-specific. Conservation and safety take precedence over such rights, but the infringement must be reasonable. Labrador Inuit rights are set out in Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement. Labrador Innu rights are to be set out in a land claims agreement.

Sean

Sent Via BlackBerry

_____________________

From: Firth, Ross
To: Dutton, Sean
Cc: O'Neill, Melony; Blake, John
Subject: Caribou Consultation Plan

Sean

I've made changes to the draft document and have attempted to incorporate your comments. The attached document has been revised based on your comments. I've left the document in track changes for ease of identifying my edits.
Would you please let me know whether you're content with the revised plan.

I have also attached, for your information, a copy of the proposed presentation to be delivered at the consultations. This may help illustrate our approach more fully.

Ross

Ross Firth
Assistant Deputy Minister - Natural Heritage

Department of Environment and Conservation
P.O. Box 2007
117 Riverside Drive
Corner Brook, NL
A2H 7S1

Ph. (709) 637-2199
Fax (709) 637-2180
Hi Glenda,

Please find attached the revised consultations plan which reflects the input you provided yesterday, as well as feedback received from Aubrey Gover in LAA.

Thanks,

Melony

Melony O’Neill
Director of Communications
Department of Environment and Conservation
4th Floor, West Block
Confederation Building
(709) 729-2575
(709) 729-0112 (fax)

From: Power, Glenda
Sent: Monday, August 30, 2010 4:29 PM
To: O’Neill, Melony; Dutton, Sean; Blake, John; Moores, Len; Duke, Cathy; English, Tracy; Delaney, Brian; Howard, Jacquelyn; Cheeseman, Josephine
Cc: Parrott, William; Firth, Ross
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Communications Plan

Thanks Mel. Just a few comments this time around:

1. Pls move the last two bullets under Public Environment to the Strategic Considerations section.
2. I’m a little confused about the status of consultations with the Quebec Innu (which needs to be fleshed out under Strategic Considerations). Under the section Communication with Stakeholders, it is stated that engaging the Quebec Innu in this consultation process won’t be possible while the next paragraph states that it is anticipated that consultation with the Quebec Innu will begin in the Fall of 2010 – can you confirm that this is in reference to consultations for a longer-term strategy? Or is it more accurate to say that these are good-will meetings to discuss caribou management generally? I’m not sure.
3. Consultation Objectives – I’d remove #4 as it seems to relate to future consultations on a longer-term strategy.
4. Key Messages:
   - Please revise KM #3 as follows: Consultation sessions will be held with targeted stakeholder groups. In addition, interested individuals are encouraged to provide written input via email and regular mail.
   - Delete KM # 6.
5. Under the section Schedule, it is noted that some participants representing stakeholder groups may not be able to meet given time constraints. If this is the case, perhaps written input could be encouraged.

That’s it! Thanks.

G

Glenda Power
Director of Strategic Communications, Planning and Priorities
From: O'Neill, Melony  
Sent: Monday, August 30, 2010 11:41 AM  
To: Power, Glenda; Dutton, Sean; Blake, John; Moores, Len; Duke, Cathy; English, Tracy; Delaney, Brian; Howard, Jacquelyn; Cheeseman, Josephine  
Cc: Parrott, William; Firth, Ross  
Subject: RE: George River Caribou Communications Plan

Hi there,

Please find attached the most recent draft of the George River Caribou consultations plan which I have reviewed and edited based on the recommendations provided.

I look forward to your feedback at your earliest convenience.

Thanks,

Melony

Melony O'Neill  
Director of Communications  
Department of Environment and Conservation  
4th Floor, West Block  
Confederation Building  
(709) 729-2575  
(709) 729-0112 (fax) 

From: Power, Glenda  
Sent: Sunday, August 29, 2010 10:30 PM  
To: Dutton, Sean; Blake, John; O'Neill, Melony; Moores, Len; Duke, Cathy; English, Tracy; Delaney, Brian; Howard, Jacquelyn; Cheeseman, Josephine  
Cc: Parrott, William; Firth, Ross  
Subject: Re: George River Caribou Communications Plan

Hi everyone. I just learned that Melony O'Neill didn't review the latest draft before it came to us. I cannot review until the Communications Director has input and edits the plan based on the recommendations provided. Melony, as soon as that happens, review on our end will be a priority. Thanks.

G
Communications  
Executive Council  
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador  
P.O.Box 8700  
St.John's, NL  
Canada  
A1B 4J6

Sent Via BlackBerry
"Options that may include the development of a co-management model Aboriginal groups and Quebec will be considered for the period beyond 2010/11." - I think there's a word or two missing from this sentence.

Sean

Sent Via BlackBerry

From: Blake, John
To: O'Neill, Melony; Moores, Len; Dutton, Sean; Duke, Cathy; English, Tracy; Delaney, Brian; Power, Glenda; Howard, Jacquelyn; Cheeseman, Josephine
Cc: Parrott, William; Firth, Ross
Sent: Sun Aug 29 14:34:36 2010
Subject: George River Caribou Communications Plan

At the request of Ross Firth, I am forwarding a revised communications plan for the George River Caribou Harvest Management Plan 2010/11. This plan was substantively modified following the receipt of comments from the Communications Branch on Friday past. Mr. Delaney – our deputy asked that I note final sign off from our Minister will occur pending the receipt of any comment from other departments or communications. Ross also requested I attach an Information note on the consultations.

Regards,

John Blake
Director
NL Wildlife Division
Title: George River caribou herd

Issue: The Department of Environment and Conservation (ENVC) has developed a consultation plan to engage stakeholders in a discussion of caribou harvest strategies in light of a recent preliminary census results.

Background and current status:

- The George River caribou herd is a trans-boundary population shared with Quebec
- In July 2010, a post calving aggregation photo-census was conducted in partnership with the Government of Quebec, Laval University, the Nunatsiavut Government, Torngat Plant and Wildlife Co-Management Board and the Institute for Environmental Monitoring and Research.
- Preliminary analysis estimates the current population of the George River caribou herd to be approximately 50,000 adults, a decline of 335,000 in 9 years. A calculation of the final overall population size will be completed by October / November 2010.
- [Redacted] ENVC, LAA and TCR to consult with targeted stakeholders on revised caribou management approaches in light of the preliminary census results.
- A consultation plan has been produced that has been reviewed by ENVC, LAA and TCR. Subsequent review by Communications Branch resulted in further amendments. The revised plan has now been sent to CS, TCR, LAA, DNR and Communication Branch.

Next Steps:

- The draft consultation plan is being presented to Cabinet Secretariat (CS) for consideration and approval prior to the initiation of consultations.
- Once CS approval has been secured, consultations will begin.
- Information gathered from the consultations will be collated and provided to CS and all other relevant departments.

Prepared by: Ross Firth/John Blake
Approved by:
Ministerial Approval:
Date: 2010.08.29