

Northwest Species at Risk Committee: Agenda

**Town of High Level Office
High Level, AB**

Wednesday, May 1, 2018 at 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Call Meeting to Order
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Adoption of the Minutes Page 3
4. Budget Update Handout
5. ACP Grant Update Handout
6. Communications Plan
 - a) Items to be Completed In-house Page 9
 - b) DMC Consulting and RSG Consulting Quote Page 11
 - c) Administration Point-of-Contact During May 2018
7. FCM Annual Conference
 - a) NWSAR Meetings
 - b) Resolution Page 15
 - c) Resolution Support Page 23
8. FRIAA Grant
 - a) Information Page 31
 - b) Global Restoration Updated Quote Page 33
 - c) ABMI Conference Call
 - d) FRI Research Conference Call

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

- 9. Government of Alberta Ottawa Delegation Page 35
 - a) Presentations: Slide Decks and Notes Handout
- 10.
- 11.
- 12. Committee Member Updates: (Short) Round Table Discussion
- 13. Terms of Reference: For Information Page 43
 - a) Financial Terms of Reference Handout
- 14. Next Meetings Date(s)
- 15. Meeting Adjournment

Northwest Species at Risk Committee: Minutes

**Town of High Level Office
High Level, AB**

Wednesday, March 28, 2018 at 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Lisa Wardley Chair, Deputy Reeve, Mackenzie County
Crystal McAteer Vice Chair, Mayor, Town of High Level
Terry Ungarian Reeve, County of Northern Lights
Eric Jorgensen Councillor, Mackenzie County
Linda Halabisky Councillor, County of Northern Lights
Mike Morgan Councillor, Town of High Level
Miron Croy Councillor, Clear Hills County
Jacquie Bateman Councillor, Mackenzie County
Jessica Juneau Councillor, Town of Rainbow Lake
Amber Bean Councillor, Clear Hills County (via teleconference)

REGRETS: Michelle Farris Mayor, Town of Rainbow Lake
Chris Mitchell Councillor, Town of Rainbow Lake
Jason Ruecker Reeve, Clear Hills County
Keith Hutchinson Councillor, Town of Manning
Sunni-Jeanne Walker Councillor, Town of Manning

ADMINISTRATION: Byron Peters Deputy CAO, Mackenzie County
Dan Fletcher CAO, Town of High Level
Hayley Gavin Regional Land Use and Environmental Project Manager, Town of High Level
Laura Braun Administrative Assistant/ Recording Secretary, Mackenzie County

ALSO PRESENT: Dan Boisvert Councillor, Northern Sunrise County (via teleconference)
Diana McQueen DMC Consulting (via teleconference)
Maarten Braat Alberta Beef Producers

MOTION

1. Call to Order

Lisa Wardley called the meeting to order at 6:25 p.m.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

18-03-001

MOVED by Mike Morgan

That the agenda be adopted with the following amendment:

Move # 13. Committee Review of Draft Provincial Woodland Caribou Range Plan to # 8.

CARRIED

3. Adoption of the Minutes

18-03-002

MOVED by Terry Ungarian

That the minutes from the December 20, 2017 NWSAR Committee meeting be adopted as amended.

CARRIED

18-03-003

MOVED by Terry Ungarian

That the minutes of the March 6, 2018 NWSAR Committee Industry meeting be adopted as amended.

CARRIED

4. Terms of Reference

For information.

5. FCM Resolution

The committee has missed the deadline to bring forward an FCM resolution. It would still be possible to bring forward a resolution if it was classified as emergent. Since both the Alberta and Ontario governments have sent a letter to the federal government, the committee believes that this is grounds to apply for an emergent resolution.

Municipalities are mentioned in SARA under other parties. There needs to be something in the resolution where municipalities are actually stated.

There is opportunity to clearly and specifically add municipalities in the Species at Risk Act. Make sure to also mention Section 11 as this is important to change. Research Section 11 and have a draft ready to present at the next meeting.

Members thought of who they could work together with to help with the FCM Resolution.

18-03-004

MOVED by Linda Halabisky

That administration create a draft FCM Resolution to present at the next NWSAR meeting.

CARRIED

6. Next Steps

a) Inter-jurisdictional Strategy

How do we feel we need to work with other municipalities?

Collaboration of municipalities to form section 11 could be beneficial because it shows the government that we don't see the lines.

I think we need to find support for the FCM resolution. It would help on the political side of things. We also need to figure out who we need to talk to after the resolution is out.

b) Federal Strategy

Byron Peters went over the Proposal – Building on Momentum handout.

The province is saying that they're pushing back on certain areas. This could be where the committee could proactively push certain issues?

Mike Morgan left the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Not sure that any elected municipality representatives will be a part of the northern delegation.

From what I have gathered, this will be a non – political group.

It wouldn't hurt to put forward someone from administration along with an elected official. It'd be nice to get both to go, but even if we get one that'd be nice.

18-03-005

MOVED by Linda Halabisky

That the Northwest Species at Risk Committee submit three names to the provincial government to be a part of the Northern Delegation.

CARRIED

7. Budget/Expenses

Byron Peters went over the budget. The committee looked at different ways to manage their budget. Many agreed that adding communications to the ACP grant would make a difference in the budget.

18-03-006

MOVED by Crystal McAteer

That the committee go in camera.

CARRIED

18-03-007

MOVED by Crystal McAteer

That the committee go out of camera.

CARRIED

18-03-008

MOVED by Crystal McAteer

That the Town of High Level manage the budget.

CARRIED

Go through 2017, date back the associate membership and figure that all out. Let's also figure out what we can get out of the grant. For 2018, let's get all of the invoicing done to all the municipalities, associate members, and REDI. Get a letter out to Rainbow Lake as well and figure out where we stand after that.

8. Committee Review of Draft Provincial Woodland Caribou Range Plan

The committee voiced what they agreed with along with additional changes that would benefit the region.

There's a huge difference on the impact on what kind of disturbance in how it affects the habitat. ABMI might have availability on grants for research and restoration.

There is technology out there to see exactly what needs to be restored. It's a constellation of satellites.

Committee members will review the changes and send additional comments to Hayley Gavin.

9. Data – economics, Science, = Get Trappers, First Nations, etc.

Mike Morgan returned to the meeting at 9:51 p.m.

18-03-009

MOVED by Linda Halabisky

That administration research FRIAA grant application information: the restoration project could be completed under this.

CARRIED

10. Minister's Award

Mackenzie County is nominating the NWSAR Committee for the Minister's award. Committee members must have any additional changes to Dan Fletcher by 12:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 29, 2018.

11. Adjournment

18-03-010

MOVED by Linda Halabisky

That the Northwest Species at Risk Committee meeting be adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

CARRIED

These minutes were adopted this _____

Lisa Wardley, Chair

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

NWSAR Communications Plan: Spring 2018

The following list provides all communications items to be completed by NWSAR administration. Items highlighted in **green** have already been completed and items highlighted in **yellow** are underway.

1. Communicating success to NWSAR citizens

Communications	Create a communication plan Ex. Of products to use in the plan:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • News Release
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opinion Editorial
Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Media and Website Updates
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter to the federal government – post for the public (this letter would support Alberta’s letter and explain NWSAR’s position and research – building on our previous letter to Minister McKenna).

2. Influencing the Federal government

Communications	Create a communications plan Examples:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation materials/handouts for meetings.
Strategic Research	Examples include:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research impacts of a federal Emergency Protection Order. Ex: Sage Grouse in southern Alberta, as well as other provinces. • Legal review for recourse if an EPO is put in place. • Research section 11 of the Species at Risk Act (SARA) to plot out opportunities to have legislation changed to focus on species recovery rather than habitat restoration.

3. Working with Alberta government

Engagement	Create an engagement plan Examples:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure seat(s) on Alberta’s Ottawa delegation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage Environment and Parks new Deputy Minister and continue engagement with ADMs and staff as they

	will be directly engaging with Environment and Climate Change Canada.
Communications	Create a communications plan Examples:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation materials/handouts for meetings.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter to Minister Phillips supporting the government's recent approach and reaffirming NWSAR's position.

4. Cross-jurisdictional mobilization

Engagement	Create an engagement plan Examples:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and identify municipalities also impacted by caribou recovery to align advocacy to the federal government.
Communications	Create a communications plan. Examples:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation materials/handouts for meetings.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Re)Introductory/introductory letters.

5. Collaborating with partners

Communications	Create a communications plan. Examples:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication products to support FCM campaign.

DMC Consulting and RSG Consulting Estimated Costs

Continuing on from the above list of NWSAR administration communications items, the following provides a list of all communications items included in the below estimated costs from DMC and RSG Consulting.

Some notes are provided to explain costs. Items highlighted in **yellow** can/will be completed by NWSAR administration.

DMC: Diana McQueen will complete these tasks at her daily rate. Diana has already been working with NWSAR administration to review documents, letters and speaking notes.

RSG: Samantha Georgsen will complete these tasks – as you can see most are reviewing documents and some writing at her hourly rate.

2. Influencing the Federal government

Engagement	Create an engagement plan Examples:
DMC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meetings with key members of the federal Cabinet.
DMC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage Environment and Climate Change Canada and Natural Resources Canada: Deputy Ministers, ADMs and staff.
DMC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MP Engagement: Northern Alberta MPs, Western Canada Liberal MPs and Federal Cabinet Ministers. MP's in Quebec and Ontario where this had happened. Bordering MPs in NWT and BC. Key messages: 1. Provide money for caribou recovery. 2. Not put in place an emergency protection order. 3. Federal government to conduct socio-economic impact study.
DMC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposition Engagement: federal Conservatives need to push Liberals to 1. Provide money for caribou recovery. 2. Not put in place an emergency protection order. 3. Federal government to conduct socio-economic impact study.
Communications	Create a communications plan Examples:
DMC/RSG review at hourly rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation materials for meetings.
DMC/RSG 1 hour per set of questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions for Opposition for federal Question Period.

3. Working with Alberta government

DMC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All party MLA engagement: NDP Minister's will have direct engagement with the federal Liberal's and will be important advocates. UCP MLAs can be helpful to keep public pressure on the federal government because they have been an active voice on other national issues and have relations with the Official Opposition.
Communications	Create a communications plan Examples:
DMC/RSG review at hourly rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation materials for meetings.

5. Collaborating with partners

Engagement	Create an engagement plan Examples:
<p>RSG: Draft introductory emails to targeted municipalities to gain support. Introduce NWSAR's issues and ask for support (explain why it is important) Estimate: (just for writing, no research) 4 hours at hourly rate.</p> <p>DMC: other engagement for FCM?</p>	<p>Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketing and engagement campaign to get support for an NWSAAR emergent resolution at the FCM conference in June. Meetings/calls before FCM and at FCM to get support. EX. Other municipalities, officials and associations. <p>- Handout: double-sided one-pager - Templates have already been built for one-pagers</p>

Combined estimate for Samantha and I, is **\$15,000-20,000** depending on whether NWSAR would like me to join them in Ottawa for meetings and at FCM. If you would like printed materials completed by Samantha for FCM we can discuss this and provide a cost for you, before providing this service, as you may want to use in-house expertise.

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

I am happy to adjust this estimate depending on the success of the Minister's committee that Crystal and Eric are on, but I believe we still need to push MPs, MLAs and municipal leaders on this file, so that we do not lose momentum.

I will be happy to answer any questions you have during the meeting.

Diana McQueen
DMC Consulting

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

DRAFT NWSAR Emergent FCM Resolution: April, 2018

In order for the NWSAR FCM resolution to be considered an emergency, the resolution must satisfy the following criteria from FCM's *Procedures for Resolutions*:

Section 1.5.1:

The resolution addresses an issue that imposes a significant, immediate and direct impact on municipal operations.

Section 1.5.2:

The issue can be resolved in the near term through an open federal decision-making window (i.e. legislative review is underway; pre-budget; etc.) that will close before the resolution could be considered as part of the next deadline period.

If the resolution does not qualify as an emergency (as per the above criteria) it may still be accepted, but will not undergo formal consideration until FCM's next Board of Directors meeting in September 2018.

Administration Direction from NWSAR (meeting date March 28, 2018):

- Add municipalities to the SARA legislation RE Section 11 agreements;
- Request that the legislation be focused on species first, not species habitat;
- We can use caribou for the background information/as an example – the resolution should be kept at a higher level; and
- Perhaps, an exemption could be added to the legislation for species like caribou that require large areas of intact habitat to be available/restored/protected.

Administration Reviewed:

- Species at Risk Act S.C (2002), c.29
- Recovery Strategy for the Woodland Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*), Boreal Population, in Canada (2012)
- Action Plan for the Woodland Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus caribou*), Boreal Population, in Canada (2018)

Considerations:

- In general to recover species at risk, critical/other habitat needs to be available to a species to ensure they can continue to carry out their necessary life cycles. Species may have difficulty surviving/recovering without their ability to regularly access the necessary: food sources, nutrients, calving, wintering and rutting grounds, etc. It makes sense why legislation is focused on habitat. However, perhaps there is an argument for the type of focus on habitat (i.e. the Act's focus on "protection" of habitat [regardless of current state] rather than perhaps, focusing

on more proactive measures such as habitat availability, quality and management RE restoration, monitoring and natural disturbance susceptibility, through the use of Section 11 agreements).

- Throughout the SARA (2002) most of the language pertaining to protection of lands is regarding Federal lands, the exclusive economic zone of Canada and the Continental Shelf of Canada.
- The identification of a species at risk (varying degrees of threat) and subsequent Listing of the species on *Schedule 1 of the SARA (2002)* is the responsibility of COSEWIC (Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada).
- The development of Recovery Strategies and Action Plans is the responsibility of Environment and Climate Change Canada.

Recovery Strategies provide:

- a) A description of the species and its needs;
- b) Identifies threats to the survival of the species and threats to its habitat;
- c) Identifies the species' critical habitat and activities likely to result in its destruction;
- d) A statement on the population and distribution objectives that will assist the recovery and survival of the species;
- e) Any other matters prescribed by the regulations;
- f) A statement about whether additional information is required; and
- g) A statement on when one or more Action Plans in relation to the Recovery Strategy will be completed.

Action Plans provide:

- a) A statement of measures that are proposed to be taken to protect the species' critical habitat, including the entering into of agreements under Section 11;
 - b) Identifies any portions of species critical habitat that have not been protected;
 - c) A statement of measures that are to be taken to implement the Recovery Strategy, including those that help to address the threats posed to the species and those that help to achieve the population and distribution objectives, as well as an indication as to when these measures are to take place;
 - d) The methods to be used to monitor the recovery of the species and its long-term viability;
 - e) An evaluation of socio-economic costs of the Action Plan and the benefits to be derived from its implementation; and
 - f) Any other matters that are prescribed by the regulations.
- Provincial and Territorial Recovery and Action Plans are usually encouraged but are not mandatory (unless species are *Listed* jurisdictionally). However, the Woodland Caribou Boreal Population Recovery Strategy mandated jurisdictions to provide Action and Range-specific Plans for caribou on non-federal lands.

The following 3 DRAFT FCM resolutions were developed with the above: FCM criteria, NWSAR direction and admin considerations in mind.

TITLE: Impact of the Canadian Species at Risk Act on Municipal Authority and Operations

PREAMBLE: Municipalities are Canada's ground-level, grassroots order of government; we are the closest governing level to the people and the communities of this nation. We play an integral role in contributing towards the protection of the environmental, economic and social values of our regions for the people, as well as supporting responsible growth, development and sustainable prosperity. Municipalities across Canada are uniquely well-positioned to assist all other levels of government in fulfilling national objectives at the local level, for the benefit of all Canadians and wildlife.

WHEREAS: The purpose of the federal Species at Risk Act, known as SARA, is to prevent wildlife species in Canada from disappearing. To provide for the recovery of wildlife species that are extirpated, endangered, or threatened, as a result of human activity, and to manage species of special concern to prevent them from becoming endangered or threatened; and

WHEREAS: Recovery Strategies and Action Plans developed under the SARA legislation, by federal ministries, has the ability to alter regional land-use activities and therefore impact the operations of municipalities across Canada; and

WHEREAS: Municipalities are reliant on jurisdictional governments to develop Action Plans in-line with federal Recovery Strategies for species at risk, that include locally-specific, regional knowledge from multiple stakeholders at the grassroots level; and

WHEREAS: Municipalities are reliant on other levels of government to evaluate socio-economic costs of Action Plans and any other benefits deriving from their implementation at the local level; and

WHEREAS: Municipalities do play a vital role in collating local knowledge and highlighting site-specific areas of concerns for species recovery planning; and

WHEREAS: Municipalities are well-positioned to assist other levels of government to achieve at-risk species' recovery objectives under sections 11 and 13 of SARA; Therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) encourage the Honourable Minister, responsible for Environment and Climate Change Canada to engage in consultation with potentially impacted municipalities prior to the development of Action Plans for all species at risk, and further to meaningfully consider the development of section 11 and 13 agreements

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

with regional municipal partners, impacted by recovery planning for species at risk.

BACKGROUND:

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

TITLE: Impact of the Canadian Species at Risk Act on Municipal Authority and Operations (2)

PREAMBLE:

WHEREAS: The purpose of the federal Species at Risk Act, known as SARA, is to prevent wildlife species in Canada from disappearing. To provide for the recovery of wildlife species that are extirpated, endangered, or threatened, as a result of human activity, and to manage species of special concern to prevent them from becoming endangered or threatened; and

WHEREAS: Local governments serve as the closest order of government to the people, providing direct support and services to the majority of the citizens in the nation; and

WHEREAS: Local governments have in their possession, local knowledge and resources that could influence environmental and species at risk stewardship controls; and

WHEREAS: Local governments are the best positioned order of government to ensure environmental and species at risk stewardship controls are being implemented and used to the greatest effect within their respective jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS: Federal and provincial enactments, such as the Species at Risk Act (2002), include decision making authority that can and have superseded municipal authority, which has enabled the protection of lands directly impacting municipal operations without meaningful consultation with those municipal partners; Therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) urge the Government of Canada to endorse municipal decision-making, by amending and creating enactments that consider and support meaningful consultation with municipalities and the powers, duties and functions of a municipality, including the protection of lands that provide for the economic growth and viability of impacted municipalities, for the purpose of environmental and species stewardship.

BACKGROUND:

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

TITLE: Impacts Related to Municipalities' Inability to Partner on Federal Section 11 Conservation Agreements for Woodland Boreal Caribou Recovery

PREAMBLE:

WHEREAS: The purpose of the federal Species at Risk Act, known as SARA, is to prevent wildlife species in Canada from disappearing. To provide for the recovery of wildlife species that are extirpated, endangered, or threatened, as a result of human activity, and to manage species of special concern to prevent them from becoming endangered or threatened; and

WHEREAS: Woodland Boreal Caribou are listed as threatened under the federal Species at Risk Act, located in 51 ranges across seven provinces and two territories; and

WHEREAS: The "*Federal Action Plan for the Woodland Caribou, Boreal Population, in Canada, 2018: Federal actions*" lists only Provincial and Territorial orders of government as partners in exploring conservation agreements with; and

WHEREAS: Local governments serve as the closest order of government to the people, providing direct support and services to the majority of the citizens in the nation; and

WHEREAS: Local governments have in their possession, local knowledge and resources that could influence environmental and at-risk species stewardship controls; and

WHEREAS: Federal and provincial Acts of Parliament, such as the SARA, include decision-making authority that can and has superseded municipal authority, which has enabled the protection of lands directly impacting municipal operations without meaningful consultation with those municipal partners; and

WHEREAS It is anticipated that, final Caribou Range Plans for some local caribou populations across Canada, will be implemented later this year, with potential for new stringent regulations and permanent land-use designation changes; and

WHEREAS: Lands protected under conservation agreements or emergency protection orders under the SARA have the potential to remove or hinder growth and development within municipal economic areas; and

WHEREAS Municipalities are well-positioned to assist other levels of government to achieve at-risk species' recovery objectives under sections 11 and 13 of SARA; Therefore, be it

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

RESOLVED: That the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) urge the Government of Canada to endorse municipal involvement as recognized partners in the exploration of conservation agreements under sections 11 and 13 of the Species at Risk Act (2002).

BACKGROUND:

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

FCM Resolution Support

Administration has identified FCM municipal members who are also directly impacted by boreal caribou range planning, these members could be a good place to start garnering support for the emergent resolution.

Municipalities Directly Impacted (located within ranges) by Boreal Caribou Range Planning by Jurisdiction:

Alberta

Rural Municipality	City/Town/Hamlet
Big Lakes County	Hamlet of Anzac
Clear Hills County	Hamlet of Gregoire Lake Estates
County of Northern Lights	Hamlet of Red Earth Creek
Lac La Biche County	Hamlet of Zama City
Mackenzie County	
Municipal District of Bonnyville No.87	
Municipal District of Greenview No.16	
Municipal District of Lesser Slave River No.124	
Municipal District of Opportunity No.17	

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
 Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

Northern Sunrise County	
Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo	
Woodlands County	
Yellowhead County	

British Columbia

Rural Municipality	City/Town
Northern Rockies Regional Municipality	

Saskatchewan¹

Rural Municipality	City/Town/Hamlet
Rural Municipality of Connaught No.457	City of Meadow Lake
Regional Municipality of Loon Lake	Northern Hamlet of Michel Village
Rural Municipality of Meadow Lake	Northern Hamlet of Weyakwin

¹ Shapefile data is unavailable for Saskatchewan – municipalities were selected by their geographic alignment with Edmonton and north of Edmonton.

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
 Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

Rural Municipality of Mervin	Northern Village of Buffalo Narrows
Rural Municipality of Moose Range	Northern Village of Cumberland House
Rural Municipality of Torch River No.488	Northern Village of Denare Beach
	Northern Village of La Loche
	Northern Village of Pinehouse
	Northern Village of Sandy Bay

Manitoba

Rural Municipality	City/Town
Municipality of Minitonas-Bowsman	City of Flin Flon
Rural Municipality of Kelsey	City of Thompson
Rural Municipality of Mountain No.318	Town of Lynn Lake
	Town of Snow Lake
	Town of The Pas

Ontario

Rural Municipality	City/Town
Municipality of Greenstone	City of Timmins
Municipality of Red Lake	Town of Cochrane
Municipality of Wawa	Town of Iroquois Falls
Township of Ear Falls	Town of Mossonee
Township of Hornepayne	Town of Smooth Rock Falls
Township of Mattice-Val Cote	
Township of Moonbeam	
Township of Val Rita-Harty	

Newfoundland and Labrador

Rural Municipality	City/Town
	Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay
	Town of North West River

	Town of Rigolet
--	-----------------

Northwest Territories²

Rural Municipality	City/Town/Hamlet
	City of Yellowknife
	Community Government of Whati
	Deline Chartered Community
	Hamlet of Aklavik
	Hamlet of Behchoko
	Hamlet of Enterprise
	Hamlet of Fort McPherson
	Hamlet of Paulatuk
	Hamlet of Sachs Harbour
	Hamlet of Ulukhaktok

² This is a list of the entire FCM membership for the Northwest Territories some may not be directly impacted by boreal caribou recovery.

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
 Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

	Town of Fort Smith
	Town of Hay River
	Town of Inuvik
	Town of Norman Wells

Quebec

Rural Municipality	City/Town
Regional Municipality of Minganie County (MRC de Minganie)	City of Marie (Ville de Ville-Marie)
	City of Saguay Lake (Ville de Lac-Saguay)
	City of Seven Islands (Ville de Sept-Iles)

Yukon³

Rural Municipality	City/Town/Village
	City of Dawson

³ This is a list of the entire FCM membership for the Yukon Territory some may not be directly impacted by boreal caribou recovery.

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

	City of Whitehorse
	Town of Faro
	Town of Watson Lake
	Village of Carmacks
	Village of Haines Junction
	Village of Mayo
	Village of Teslin

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

FOREST RESOURCE IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION OF ALBERTA (FRIAA)

Structure

FRIAA is a non-profit industry-association. As a “delegated administrative organization”, FRIAA is accountable to the Minister responsible for forestry; FRIAA is governed by a board of directors, which are elected by the membership and appointed by the Minister.

Mandate

FRIAA’s mandate is to establish and administer programs and initiatives as directed under the *Forests Act* and the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act*.

FRIAA’s mandate is further defined by its purpose and objectives, which are to establish programs and initiatives to:

- Enhance the forest resources of Alberta;
- Promote the enhanced management of the forest resources of Alberta;
- Improve the sustained yield of the forest resources of Alberta;
- Promote integrated resource management; and
- Reforest public land using reforestation values.

Forest Resource Improvement Program (FRIP)

As FRIAA’s cornerstone program, the FRIP most directly practices FRIAA’s mandate to sustain and enhance Alberta’s forests.

In Alberta, the forestry industry must follow a strict set of regulations regarding timber and timber harvest established by the government.

FRIP projects involve activities that are over and above mandated requirements of forest tenure holders.

FRIP projects cover a broad range of activities. These can include:

- Direct improvement to forest resources (i.e. planting or tending trees, improving habitat for wildlife);
- Applied research projects that contribute to better understanding of forest resources and better management of them;
- Improved inventory of non-timber forest resources (i.e. fish, wildlife or heritage resources), so that these resources can be better managed;
- Forest protection initiatives (i.e. management of insect infestations); and
- Public awareness and education activities.

Eligibility for FRIP

- All grant proposals must have a FRIAA industry member sponsor (none-financial).
- To determine the priorities for the project, the applicants may consider engaging or consulting with other local stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples.
- All grant proposals must be complete with:
 - a) Full subject matter details;
 - b) Detailed rationale and justification for the project;
 - c) Identify deliverables; and
 - d) Identify timelines of project.
- Grant proposals developed by third party consultants, which are then accepted and funded by FRIAA, may have their consultant fees reimbursed.
- FRIAA admin can help with reviewing draft proposals and may advise applicants to strengthen certain components of their proposals.

Grant Proposal In-Takes

- Proposals under FRIP are accepted throughout the year.

Funding

- FRIAA funding comes from a percentage of forestry sector stumpage fees;
- Forestry companies can direct a certain amount of their FRIAA membership fees to eligible project types under FRIAA's guidelines;
- Available funding at any given time depends on the North American Price of Lumber – which is currently at a very high rate (i.e. there are more FRIAA dollars available for projects than usual); and
- There is no cap on FRIAA funding – a solid proposal that is beneficial and a good use of FRIP funding will be funded at 100%.





Draft Restoration Plan Caribou Mountains, Chinchaga, Bistcho and Yates Ranges

I appreciate the opportunity to submit this cost estimate to prepare the restoration plan for the Chinchaga, Caribou Mountains, Yates and Bistcho caribou ranges.

As requested, draft plans will consist of all costs associated with restoration planning and execution of those plans, including time frame to complete the projects and number of personnel required.

In order to reduce costs, I have removed a few of components required in most restoration plans:

- Re-vegetation Plans (includes species per line segment).
- Total number of trees required per species.
- Treatment and density's per line segment.

Note; these all can be added back in at any time should you wish to go forward with a restoration project.

Draft plans will include the following.

Aerial reconnaissance to determine:

- Percentage of anthropogenic disturbances (linear lines) recovering naturally (no treatment required).
- Identify linear disturbances being used for game trails and recommended treatment regardless of natural recovery.
- Access planning.
- Identify creek crossings.
- Areas of high risk to equipment and operators.
- Type of site preparation that would be recommended.

Operational Plan:

Equipment required.

- Number of positions and skill required.
- Estimated time to complete.
- Estimated cost to complete each program.



Draft Restoration Plan Caribou Mountains, Chinchaga, Bistcho and Yates Ranges

Estimated cost for the four ranges; each range consisting of two townships.

Caribou Mt. Range:	\$21,565.00
Chinchaga Range:	\$58,120.00
Bistcho Range:	\$58,120.00
Yates Range:	\$35,300.00

Costs associated with drafts or final report documents to be determined.

Caribou Mt. Range:	130km
Chinchaga Range:	1,425km
Bistcho Range:	1,193km
Yates Range:	445km

Sincerely,
Dave Larsen
Global Restoration Corp

Summary: NWSAR Vice Chair's Speaking Notes for Alberta's Ottawa Delegation

Point/Issue 1: Federal and Jurisdictional Transparency

Recommendation 1: Be honest and transparent with all stakeholders

Point/Issue 2: Historic \$1.3 billion announced in 2018 Federal Budget

Recommendation 2: Prioritize some of this funding for proactive caribou recovery measures in existing Federal parks

Point/Issue 3: Conservation Areas and EPOs are not the only solution to caribou recovery

Recommendation 3: Expand the opportunity for section 11 conservation agreements to recover boreal caribou to municipalities and all other stakeholders

Point/Issue 4: Funding for habitat restoration

Recommendation 4: Deliver Federal funding for strategic caribou habitat restoration – utilize the opportunity to extend legally-binding section 11 conservation agreements to all stakeholders under SARA

Point/Issue 5: Impacts of Caribou Range Planning on socio-economics

Recommendation 5: Refrain from recommending an EPO for boreal caribou and discourage the establishment of large conservation areas for boreal caribou

Point/Issue 6: Flexibility in the 65/35% habitat disturbance threshold requirement

Recommendation 6: Collaboration from the Federal level to the grassroots level is key to balancing boreal caribou recovery, jobs and the economy

Point/Issue 7: In Alberta, Caribou Range Planning is superseding Regional Land-Use Planning

Recommendation 7: To assess the cumulative effects of future activities likely to impact caribou habitat in all caribou ranges (some may vary)

Additional Info and Examples for Each Point/Issue and Recommendation

Point/Issue 1: Federal and Jurisdictional Transparency

- Timelines on releasing Range Plans/updates are ever-changing
- Evidence of jurisdictions working together on recovery of “shared” caribou does not exist in the public realm
- Several multi-stakeholder sessions with no/limited follow-up creates uncertainty (what is government getting out of these sessions?)

Examples:

- Alberta has held several multi-stakeholder sessions; public open houses; meetings with industrial sectors. What has been learnt? What do they still need to learn? How can we help?
- Several stakeholders from Alberta have travelled to Ottawa on various trips. What has been learnt? What do they still need to learn? How can we help?

Recommendation: Be honest and transparent with all stakeholders

- Select release dates for plans/updates and commit to them
- Release inter-jurisdictional collaborative working updates into the public realm – people want to know how governments are working together to recover “shared” caribou herds
- All governments should provide follow-up emails summarizing the value of the sessions, what was learnt, what still needs to be worked on, etc.

Point/Issue 2: Historic \$1.3 billion announced in 2018 Federal Budget

- Historic federal investment for the natural environment
- Help to create additional conservation areas
- Help to protect species at risk

Examples:

- Alberta/NWT is home to Canada’s largest national park – UNESCO may be enlisting WBNP on their “heritage sites in danger list”.

Recommendation: Prioritize some of this funding for proactive caribou recovery measures in existing Federal parks

- Invest in existing federally-protected areas – through critical habitat restoration for multiple species at risk (caribou, wood bison, whooping crane, etc.)

Point/Issue 3: Conservation Areas and EPOs are not the only solution to caribou recovery

- Designating a conservation area or establishing an EPO today, does not make the area sustainable for caribou tomorrow
- Protected areas will continue to be susceptible to natural disturbances (wildfire, insect infestations)
- Caribou in newly established protected areas will continue to be susceptible to the effects of human disturbance (increased predator-related mortality)
- Caribou require proactive land management action today

Examples:

- The Federal Action Plan for the Woodland Caribou, Boreal Population (2018) only lists Provincial and Territorial governments (and other parties, as appropriate) as partners in exploring conservation agreements with
- Municipalities and Indigenous Peoples should also be listed as meaningful partners to explore conservation agreements with under SARA
- In Alberta, conservation agreements are legally binding under other Parliamentary Acts (i.e. ALSA) making them effective tools when offering legal protection to at-risk species or their habitat – through the course of proactive action (research, monitoring, strategic restoration, other wildlife management, etc.)
- Northwest Albertans (including First Nations, municipalities, trappers, recreational land user, etc.) want to help achieve caribou self-sustainability – grant them the opportunities to do so, empower them to play a vital role in northwest caribou recovery

Recommendation: Expand the opportunity for section 11 conservation agreements to recover boreal caribou to municipalities and all other stakeholders

- Municipalities are Canada's grassroots order of government – the closest governing level to the people and communities
- Municipalities are uniquely well-positioned to help other levels of government to achieve at-risk species' recovery objectives under sections 11 and 13 of SARA (conservation agreements s.11 and funding agreements s.13)
- Municipalities play a vital role in collecting local knowledge and highlighting site-specific areas of concern for species recovery (i.e. issues not highlighted in Fed/Prov. Recovery Strategies/Action Plans)

Point/Issue 4: Funding for habitat restoration

- Northwest Alberta has limited active industrial operations – obtaining funds from industry for habitat restoration will be difficult/a none-starter
- Biophysical inventories have not been completed in northwestern caribou ranges – there are hundreds of un-reclaimed, abandoned well sites and thousands of kms of seismic lines (which may/may not have accumulated some natural regrowth)
- Orphan Well Association (unique to Alberta) has limited funding capacity to reclaim wells – all abandoned, non-viable (extraction of other substances after well “dries up”) wells cannot be reclaimed with orphan well funding

Examples:

- Alberta has requested an injection of Federal funding for habitat restoration
- Some caribou ranges have limited opportunities to utilize industry funding for restoration
- Independent industry association bodies, funded by industry (i.e. FRIAA funded by forestry sector) offer funding for natural resource improvement (i.e. improving Alberta’s forests) – Federal HSP funding could be used in conjunction with association body’s funding through conservation agreements with stakeholders for strategic restoration

Recommendation: Deliver Federal funding for strategic caribou habitat restoration – utilize the opportunity to extend legally-binding section 11 conservation agreements to all stakeholders under SARA

- Feds could dramatically increase funding to their Habitat Stewardship Program – conservation agreements between the federal government and stakeholders for at-risk species recovery can be meaningfully established here
- Funding and conservation agreements can be established directly with jurisdictional governments for at-risk species habitat restoration
- Could utilize some of the federal \$1.3 billion to increase HSP funding/establish agreements with jurisdictions

Point/Issue 5: Impacts of Caribou Range Planning on socio-economics

- Most caribou ranges encompass large areas of natural resource industries’ interests, assets and allocations
- Negative impacts to a company’s ability to: extract resources at certain times, extract allocated volumes, or extract resources at all in caribou ranges will have

further negative impacts to revenues, government taxes, employment, northern industry-service communities, etc.

- Large conservation areas and EPOs have huge socio-economic impacts to natural resource industries, regional growth and development, and southern influx of populations (should northern industry-service communities become unviable)

Examples:

- Alberta's draft caribou range plan (2017) proposes substantially altering forestry harvesting practices: changing to aggregated sequence harvesting. Producing larger cut-blocks over longer periods of time will most likely result in conflicts between the forestry sector and other land users (trappers, outfitters, Indigenous Peoples, etc.)
- Aggregating forestry harvesting (as proposed by Alberta) could render some forestry operations unsustainable – the harvest of sub-optimum and/or younger timber stands could be unavoidable if multiple companies are forced to harvest the same predetermined compartments for any given decade
- Alberta's draft caribou range plan (2017) proposes establishing multiple large conservation areas in Northwest Alberta – many stakeholders are concerned that Alberta is prioritizing the use of Canada's Target 1 (under their 2010 Convention Biodiversity Diversity commitment) for caribou range planning in Northwest Alberta. In 2017, Alberta subsequently committed to this target also (nationally, protecting 17% of terrestrial areas and 10% of marine areas)

Recommendation: Refrain from recommending an EPO for boreal caribou and discourage the establishment of large conservation areas for boreal caribou

- There are more common-sense solutions for caribou recovery
- Local stakeholders can help Canada to implement their Recovery Strategy objective – to halt caribou decline now, and get caribou on a trajectory towards self-sustainability
- Northwestern Albertans have a vested interest in improving the situation for caribou (Indigenous traditional use, hunting, trapping, outfitting, recreation, employment, access to the land, viable northern communities, etc.)
- Proactive land management tools will have little-to-no affect on socio-economics
- Research and monitoring efforts can be coordinated with local stakeholders to better implement strategic habitat restorative efforts

Point/Issue 6: Flexibility in the 65/35% habitat disturbance threshold requirement

- This has provided jurisdictions with a sole target to achieve –with little-to-no guarantee of caribou recovery success
- Facilitates a moderate long-term strategy with a very weak short-term focus – caribou declines need to halt today
- There are other proactive measures to assist halting caribou decline and to conserve biodiversity

Examples:

- Many Northwestern Albertans have lived and worked on the natural landscape for many decades – this wealth of knowledge and experience is paramount
- Alberta’s wolf reduction program is publicly controversial – incentivizing trappers trapping out in caribou ranges to strategically (after provincial-acceptable training) reduce wolf populations can be more humane (quicker death, less stress), less expensive and allows a traditional way of life to prosper
- In Northwest Alberta, various industry sectors have parallel roads leading to similar/exact same destinations – streamlining the road network with ILM and RAMPs is positive for caribou
- Recent ABMI research has shown that wolves dramatically reduce their speed on seismic lines that have regrowth of 50cm or more – this shows that the timelines for functional habitat recovery could be much shorter, than is currently defined under existing policies
<https://cmu.abmi.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/FactSheet-WolvesOnLinearFeatures2.pdf>
- Recent research published in the Forestry Chronicle Journal shows that transplanted lichen species suitable for caribou winter habitat is possible and successful <http://pubs.cif-ifc.org/doi/abs/10.5558/tfc2017-029>
- Natural Resources Canada receives the coordinates of all wildfires from Tanka (company in Vancouver) every 24 hours, along with information on: how large fires are, how fast they’re growing and what kind of fuels are in the area. How soon does NRC pass this information along to jurisdictions? Can wildfires with excess “fuels” be prioritized in caribou country?

Recommendation: Collaboration from the Federal level to the grassroots level is key to balancing boreal caribou recovery, jobs and the economy

- Canada and Alberta can build on their scientific knowledge with unique local Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge of: the landscape, animal movements, natural environment, economics etc.

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

- Provincially incentivizing trappers within caribou ranges to ethically, strategically cull predators – reducing predator-related caribou calf mortality levels
- Integrated land and access management significantly reduces human footprint on the landscape (Alberta has proposed these in their draft caribou range plan)
- Strategic research can help us understand more about influences on caribou behaviours, predator movements, habitat availability and regrowth, etc. the northwestern boreal forest may be more accommodating than we know for caribou (65% may not be necessary in some ranges)
- Wildfire fighting response could be increased – claiming less caribou habitat annually, ultimately supporting the trajectory towards higher levels of un-fragmented habitat

Point/Issue 7: In Alberta, Caribou Range Planning is superseding Regional Land-Use Planning

- Regional Land-use planning evaluates a multitude of environmental, economic and social values – mapping out sustainable growth, development and conservation over a 50-year period
- They utilize locally-specific, culturally-unique information and knowledge from people who have lived, worked and used the local landscape for generations
- In Alberta, Regional Advisory Councils (RACs) established for each region, consist of members representing the range of perspectives and experience in the region – ability to appreciate the broad interest of a region and its place in the province
- RACs have a mandate to advise on the development of regional plans, provide advice on addressing trade-off decisions regarding land uses and on setting thresholds to address cumulative effects. They also advise and participate in public and stakeholder consultation

Examples:

- Alberta’s draft caribou range plan (2017) proposes developing interim regional planning documents to incorporate caribou range plans, which also meet basic requirements for a regional plan
- These interim regional plans look to be developed with: no RACs, no public or stakeholder consultation, no apparent shelf-life (essentially fulfilling no basic requirements of regional planning) – all to ensure caribou range plans can be accepted as Sub-Regional Plans under the ALSA

- Of Alberta's 7 Regional Land-use Plans, 4 are yet to commence preliminary planning stages

Recommendation: To assess the cumulative effects of future activities likely to impact caribou habitat in all caribou ranges (some may vary)

- Identify areas for long-term phased industrial development
- Prioritize areas more likely to develop into and sustain functional habitat for caribou over the longer-term
- Local stakeholders can help to identify underutilized/non-beneficial disturbances for reclamation, and develop trade-off mechanisms for future development
- Incentivizing multiple-industry coordination and reclamation (where feasible)
- Identifying areas for future infrastructure access, transportation corridors and major utility artery planning
- The above will help to reduce future conflict with current habitat restoration targets, long-term caribou habitat sustainability, habitat for biodiversity, and northern economic prosperity

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

TERMS OF REFERENCE

NORTHWEST SPECIES AT RISK COMMITTEE

Background:

The northwest region of Alberta encompasses high economic development value in a variety of natural resource sectors. Notwithstanding this, the region is requested to carry the highest burden of environmental protection of any other region within Alberta.

Current and proposed Provincial policy and strategies requires the Lower Peace Region to subsidize economic activity in other regions; to allow, both, the Federal and Provincial governments to achieve conservation targets for the natural environment. Cumulatively, multiple conservation initiatives and species at risk recovery strategies have the ability to negatively impact the rural communities of northwest Alberta.

We, the local tenants of this region have collaborated; in an attempt to secure smart economic growth, a sustained quality of life, and well-balanced environmental protection for our future generations. Through the use of optimal adaptive management, transparent stakeholder engagement, and effective environmental stewardship; we endeavour to achieve this purpose.

Purpose:

To collectively provide and share information, ideas and resources; relating to the continued and future prosperity of northwest Alberta. Instill effective regional adaptive management and transparency which allows all stakeholders to play a vital role in shaping our collective future. Develop tangible solutions founded upon an evidence-based approach, to ensure a balance of smart economic growth, a sustained quality of life, and an enhanced natural environment; for all of our businesses, communities and wildlife.

Responsibilities:

To ensure that any impending species recovery or conservation initiative, that has the ability to affect the smart growth of northwest Alberta; is prefaced with a thorough regional socio-economic impact analysis.

To proactively work with all other levels of government, including the First Nations; to create well-balanced working groups; with all key stakeholders relevant to impending conservation areas and species recovery.

Emphasizing that, northwest Alberta currently encompasses a vast amount of protected lands. Impending species recovery and conservation initiatives should aim to enhance the value of these areas for species at risk recovery and biodiversity, rather than seeking to protect unjustifiable additional areas of land.

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

Structure:

Two councillors and an alternate appointed by each of the founding municipalities.

Alternates may attend all meetings.

Founding municipalities consist of:

- County of Northern Lights
- Mackenzie County
- Town of High Level
- Town of Rainbow Lake
- Clear Hills County
- Town of Manning

Associate membership is available to other municipalities. Associate members shall not have voting rights.

Mackenzie County is the administrative lead for the committee, with administrative support from each of the founding municipalities.

The administrative lead will prepare and provide the agenda for all meetings.

Meetings are open to the public as per Section 197 and Section 198 of the Municipal Government Act.

Meetings may, in part, be closed to the public if matters to be addressed are recognized under; Section 197(2) of the Municipal Government Act, and/or Division 2 – Part 1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

The committee shall pursue grant opportunities to fund any larger projects, with Mackenzie County as the grant sponsor and/or lead.

Quorum and Costs:

Decisions shall be reached by consensus, consisting of two appointed members from each of the founding municipalities. Alternates shall not be considered for consensus unless standing in for an appointed member.

Meetings shall be hosted by the Town of High Level, at the Town of High Level Office, and meeting costs will be shared by the founding municipalities.

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County

Each Municipality and other delegates are expected to cover the costs of their members. Additional costs, such as those derived from committee motions, will be subject to additional discussion and approval from each of the founding municipalities. All decisions reached by consensus; which are within the scope of the Terms of Reference, are binding upon all municipalities.

Associate members shall pay a \$1000 annual Associate Membership fee.

Communication:

An electronic data sharing forum will be created and maintained, with access for all of the committee members, and meetings will be scheduled quarterly, or as required by the Chair.

Northwest Species at Risk Committee
Administration Lead: Byron Peters, Mackenzie County