



Lines in the Snow

Thoughts on the Past and Future of
Northern Canadian Policy Issues

Edited by Clive Tesar and P. Whitney Lackenbauer

Lines in the Snow

© The authors, 2021

CANADIAN ARCTIC RESOURCES COMMITTEE

488 Gladstone Ave

Ottawa, Ontario K1N 8V4

<http://carc.org/>

All rights reserved. This ebook may not be reproduced without prior written consent of the copyright holder.

Tesar, Clive, and P. Whitney Lackenbauer

Lines in the Snow: Thoughts on the Past and Future of Northern Canadian Policy Issues

Issued in electronic format.

ISBN: 978-0-9684896-4-2 (pdf)

Page design, typesetting, and cover design by Jennifer Arthur-Lackenbauer

Cover photos by P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Ray Chiasson



Please consider the environment before printing this e-book

Lines in the Snow

Thoughts on the Past and Future of Northern Canadian Policy Issues

Edited by Clive Tesar and P. Whitney Lackenbauer



To all of the board and staff members who were CARC,
and in memory of

Terry Fenge (1950-2015)

friend and former Executive Director of the
Canadian Arctic Resources Committee

There is deep concern in Canada about dangers to the Arctic environment which may result from exploration for and development of natural resources. Concern has been expressed by northern native peoples, by the man-on-the-street throughout the country, by politicians, by conservation organizations and by a very diverse group of scientists and technologists...

Until the 1960's the development of the North was of little interest to Canadians as a whole. Our ribbon-like development of the southern perimeter of the country, our primary devotion to matters of regional interest and our lack of knowledge of the North mitigated against citizen involvement. As a consequence, decisions on how and when the North should be developed were left primarily to government and industry.

But Canadians have now become intensely aware of the North. The concept of the last frontier is no longer a play on words; we now recognize that the North is a region of the country that we have the opportunity to develop in special ways; we recognize that if it is developed carefully and wisely it could play a powerful role in the development of our culture; we recognize that it could greatly alter our dependency on the culture, the markets and the technology of other countries. We feel very strongly that its potential for moulding our nation, its potential to provide young Canadians with a region of their own must not be lost by precipitous development which could result in both social and environmental disaster. We believe that we are representative of a vast throng of Canadians who now want to be involved in decisions about how and when the North should be developed. We think we are also representative of a vast number of Canadians in our uncertainty about the adequacy of existing knowledge to serve as a guide to development and feel strongly that the public should be much better informed about the state of our preparation for future development.

The intense public interest which has developed over the possible construction of a pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley makes it imperative that dialogue on northern development be extended to include citizens' voices to ensure that Canadians are well-informed on the issues ...

Our deliberations have indicated that there is no existing citizens' organization in Canada which has the capability of performing these functions. Our objective is to form such an organization on an interim basis ...

Canadian Arctic Resources Committee letter to
Ministers Jean Chrétien, Jack Davis, and J.J. Greene, April 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In early April 1971, a small group of concerned individuals formed the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee (CARC) to provide objective information and research on Arctic development to government, industry, and the public. “Formed in response to the rapid pace of development in Canada’s Arctic that followed Alaskan oil discoveries,” a founding document explained, “CARC aimed to act in an honest broker capacity to help ensure that decisions on northern development are made in the light of adequate knowledge of social, economic and environmental considerations.”

We wish to acknowledge that founding committee of the CARC in 1971: Chair Douglas Pimlott and members Donald Chant, Maxwell Cohen, Ramsay Cook, Tagak Curley, Pierre Dansereau, John Deutsch, M.J. Dunbar, William Fuller, Roderick Haig-Brown, Kenneth Hare, Albert Hochbaum, Trevor Lloyd, Ian McTaggart-Cowan, Eric Molson, and Richard Passmore. The founding committee soon brought in additional members from Northern communities.

We thank all of those individuals who have played a leadership role with CARC over the last half century. As a CARC Review Committee observed in October 1981:

This is a time when single-issue interest groups are coming under increasing suspicion and attack. It is sometimes held that such groups are destroying any sense of the general will that used to guide governments. Furthermore, it can be rightly pointed out that groups purporting to represent the public interest, regardless of the excellence of the principles they espouse, are often representative of no more than a tiny fragment of an attentive public. If CARC were nothing more than an environmentalist pressure group, it would be very vulnerable to these criticisms, and it must in any case be very mindful of them. The high degree of credibility that CARC possesses within a number of constituencies does, however, make it possible for the organization to be much more than a pressure group. Its general acceptability enables CARC to be an honest broker, a point of contact for groups that are in conflict, a credible information source, and an advisor. It is undeniable that an orientation towards these more dispassionate roles, requiring balance and a sense of restraint, could conflict with an energetic and activist pursuit of CARC’s traditional goals, such as

protection of the natural environment. That does not have to happen, however, and to a considerable extent, whether it does happen will depend on the leadership of the organization.

That CARC has managed to maintain a credible advocacy role in the ensuing decades is a testament to a committed group of individuals dedicated to an organization that has sought to analyze power structures, critique policy, promote innovative solutions, and inform the Canadian public about a wide range of political, economic, social, economic, and scientific challenges. In this spirit, we wish to thank our colleagues on CARC's final Board of Directors for supporting this culminating project: Lois Little (chairperson), Robert Bromley, Rob Huebert, Ingrid Kritsch, and Ben McDonald. Their guidance has been instrumental as our organization, formed on an "interim basis" in 1971 to fill a void in Canadian citizen advocacy on Northern issues, has decided to disband, its purpose now effectively covered by other Northern and Indigenous advocacy groups.

As the editors of this book, we are particularly grateful to the chapter authors who generously shared their time and expertise to reflect upon the future of Northern Canadian policy issues.

A special thanks as well to Ryan Dean, an exceptional Ph.D. candidate at the University of Calgary, who conducted intensive research in the CARC fonds at Wilfrid Laurier University, thematically sorted the contents of *Northern Perspectives*, and produced a list of CARC publications. Trent University research assistants Grace Chapnik and Alicia Carefoote transcribed documents and proofread them. We are also grateful to Corah Hodgson for her careful copy edit of the manuscript, and to Jennifer Arthur-Lackenbauer for layout, design, and indexing.

The contributions made by CARC over the last fifty years were possible owing to the donors who kept CARC afloat. There were some government grants and several philanthropic organizations who supported particular projects, but most of the money that kept CARC going from day to day – the money that paid for the necessary and unglamorous tasks that make up much of an NGO's work – was contributed by extraordinary people who cared about the Canadian North, although most lived in the southern portion of Canada. Some of these individuals donated once, and some donated regularly for many years. Some left bequests, and one individual (Heinz Vollenweider) who donated a life insurance policy made possible the publication of this book, our valediction to Northern policy. All of our donors over the years now share in this valediction. They shared in creating innovative

policies for conservation; they shared in creating the knowledge base necessary for Northerners to be able to make informed decisions; they shared in helping to support Indigenous peoples' reclamation of their rights to land and governance; and they helped in negotiating international agreements to keep the Canadian North a healthier place. To those who helped, this book is a long letter of thanks.

Editors' Note

This book is based on a survey of issues that CARC has taken on over the past fifty years. Rather than producing a history of the organization, we wanted to make one last contribution to Northern policy. We have structured the book by providing a historical excerpt from CARC's journal, *Northern Perspectives*, then as editors we have written a "linking chapter" intended to provide brief historical context on each issue. This provides a launching pad for our contributors to share their ideas on where they think each Northern issue is going, and/or where it should go.

CONTENTS

Foreword	i
Introduction	iii
CARC Timeline	v
Indigenous Rights and Claims	1
INDIGENOUS LAND AND RIGHTS John B. Zoe, with Jess Dunkin	11
Environmental Assessment	23
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT Bram Noble	28
Oil and Gas Pipelines	39
HINTERLAND BLUES Doug Matthews	47
Climate Change	57
CLIMATE WARMING: THE PAST AND FUTURE ARCTIC Edward Struzik	64
Caribou	73
OPTIMISM FOR CARIBOU Anne Gunn, Aimee Guile, Laura Meinert, and Jody Pellissey	81
Security	93
CONCEPTUALIZING CANADIAN ARCTIC SECURITY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY P. Whitney Lackenbauer	104
Contaminants	115
FUTURE CHALLENGES OF CONTAMINANTS IN THE CANADIAN ARCTIC Derek C.G. Muir	123

Mining	139
NWT MINING REVENUES: FAIR RETURN FOR NATURAL CAPITAL OR RESOURCE GIVE-AWAY? Kevin O'Reilly	145
Marine Conservation	161
MARINE CONSERVATION – MANAGING THROUGH A PHASE CHANGE Clive Tesar	170
Northern Research and Indigenous Knowledge	179
A GLIMPSE INTO THE FUTURE FOR CANADIAN ARCTIC AND NORTHERN RESEARCH: A CASE FOR STRENGTHENING THE ROLE OF THE NORTHERN RESEARCH GATEKEEPER Jamal Shirley	188
Sovereignty	193
ARCTIC SOVEREIGNTY P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Suzanne Lalonde	202
The Arctic Council and Circumpolar Affairs	221
FROM AMBITION TO IMPLEMENTATION: A NEW STRUCTURE FOR THE ARCTIC COUNCIL Marc-André Dubois and Clive Tesar	231
CARC Publications	239
Illustrations	250
Contributors	251



OPTIMISM FOR CARIBOU

Anne Gunn, Aimee Guile, Laura Meinert, and Jody Pellissey

Will We Ever Get Past the Current Declines?

The answer to whether we will get past the current declines is a guarded “yes”; guarded because it partly depends on our behaviour and our willingness to change. The point about human behaviour is, for example, in the excerpt quoted from the 2020 NWT barren-ground caribou recovery strategy (see the text box below), which firmly brings to the forefront Indigenous viewpoints on respecting caribou.

Getting beyond the current declines is likely for three reasons.¹ First, the caribou themselves: caribou are a superbly adapted and adaptable species. Their resilience, a measure of their ability to rebuild their numbers and re-occupy their landscape, is strong. Cows can have a calf every year, and under ideal conditions, numbers can double every three years, though hot, dry summers or exceptionally snowy winters can be interruptions to recovery. We see evidence of resilience, as caribou previously recovered from historic declines. Indigenous Elders tell us that caribou typically fluctuate in number, and we see the imprint of these cycles in the patterns of hoof scars left on exposed spruce roots as caribou follow their traditional pathways. The most recent historical decline was from the 1950s to 1970s, followed by increasing numbers until peaks in the late-1990s.

Regular fluctuations (cycles) are familiar from our knowledge of lemmings and their predators, and snowshoe hares and lynx. Surprisingly, given studies over some fifty years, the underlying mechanisms for these cycles are still incompletely understood.² In the past, caribou declines halted partly

Etthën huréthḡa (the caribou are listening to us) – we shouldn’t talk too much about ʔetthën; they are listening to us; we must speak good words for them; and we must help protect them. The ʔetthën have their own natural laws and, as such, we have to respect the ways of the ʔetthën and all other life forms.

One of the four Łutsël K’è Dēnesųłné values listed in Yúnethé Xá ʔetthën Hádı (Łutsël K’è Dene First Nation’s Caribou Stewardship Plan), 11.

because as herds declined, their seasonal ranges and migration routes shifted. Those changes to their seasonal ranges would have taken caribou out of reach of many people, and so harvesting was ‘self-limiting.’ This has parallels with wolf predation: as caribou

decline, after a time lag, wolf numbers decline as their recruitment drops.³ However, the twenty-first century brought many changes to Northern lives, and during the current declines, access to harvesting increased due to rapid communication on caribou whereabouts and improved transport. Harvesting effort was therefore uncoupled from caribou abundance, but, critically, we have recognized this now and know it requires addressing.

The second reason to be optimistic about recovery from the current declines is that the caribou's habitat on the tundra and Northern boreal forests is mostly intact at the moment. However, threats are growing in the shape of all-weather roads, increased development, and a warming climate.

The third reason to be optimistic is that the declines have triggered collaborative management planning. While on one hand, the declines occurred while most herds had some level of management planning, things are changing as awareness of the declines has brought the realization that we need to change our behaviour. We now have community-based planning, herd-specific management plans, and regional planning, which all contain ideas, values, and a sense of what to do.

Management planning, in a narrow technical sense, emphasizes harvesting and predator management actions that target the adult caribou's survival because adult survival largely determines herd size trends. Harvesting is complex spiritually and culturally. It is more than a caribou death and more than a statistic from balancing births and deaths. Harvesting regulation is an Indigenous rights issue that carries the burden of past and present wrongs and a lack of trust. As well as harvesting, wolf predation is a large part of caribou deaths. For herd recovery, targeted wolf removal (versus support for wolf harvesting) is also controversial and a complex clash of values and conservation gain.⁴

When the caribou harvest is restricted (during declines and early recovery) and harvest is allocated among different communities, misunderstandings, uncertainty, and perceived unfairness can occur, which is a typical problem for common pool resource management.⁵ However, co-management is effective for sharing a common resource such as a caribou herd whose seasonal movements expose them to different communities and land claim groups. We have learned during the caribou declines that co-management helps people to reconcile conflicts when caribou harvests are in short supply. In the Northwest Territories and western Nunavut, a transboundary advisory committee⁶ cooperates on annual monitoring and community information for the Bluenose-East, Bluenose-West, and Cape Bathurst

herds, and advises on management. In the Northwest Territories (NWT), two herds had recovery actions implemented early: the Bluenose-West and Cape Bathurst herds had harvest restrictions imposed in 2007. The two herds continued to decline before stabilizing at low numbers between 2015 and 2018, at less than three-quarters of their peak size in the 1990s. In Nunavut, herds have exceptionally high calf survival, potentially due to the high rates of wolf harvest by Indigenous hunters acting as a management action.⁷ The Beverly/Ahiak and Qamanirjuaq herds declined more slowly, and without caribou harvest restrictions.

Initial management actions of restricting or halting the caribou harvest did not reveal much about the causes of the declines, and the declines continued. Caribou adult survival remained low, and so wolf predation was a likely cause. The delays in reducing predation compared to reducing harvesting⁸ added complexity to management. At least on the Bathurst herd's summer ranges, as the caribou numbers declined, so did the wolves.⁹ By 2018, adult caribou survival had increased, suggesting that the decline had likely halted. Despite the NWT government's emphasis on harvesting and predation, Indigenous communities identify mining exploration and development as partly causing the declines and changes in movement patterns.

Three herds had essentially collapsed by 2018 to just a few percent of their peak herd sizes, either because of delays in management actions (Bathurst and George River herds) or delays in monitoring and management planning (the caribou on Baffin Island). Indigenous Elders identified the extreme declines as having fewer animals than historically observed. Extremely low numbers reduce the likelihood of recovery, as not halting a decline early on prolongs the recovery time and increases the risk of bad luck, such as the herd experiencing an unexpected event such as a severe drought or icing. For example, the Fortymile herd in Alaska numbered about 6,000-8,000 in 1976, and it took forty years to reach 84,000 caribou (2017).

Caribou may change their behaviour when abundance declines to the point where they cannot maintain safety in numbers. At this point, cows may abandon their calving grounds,¹⁰ as calving is the time of the greatest need for the safety of neighbouring cows. After 2017, the overlap of the Bathurst herd with the neighbouring Beverly/Ahiak and Bluenose-East herds increased,¹¹ and some satellite-collared cows switched from the Bathurst to the Beverly/Ahiak calving ground.¹² The risk that numbers can decline to a threshold where the caribou's need for safety in numbers causes the remaining survivors to join another herd cannot be ruled out.

There are other possible consequences of extremely low numbers. An extremely low herd size reduces overall genetic variation,¹³ which may constrain future adaptability. Our reasoning is the recent discovery that Svalbard reindeer have different adaptations for body temperature regulation. Other traits that may be inadvertently lost include caribou memories and knowledge of their landscapes, such as the routes back to their traditional calving grounds. Recently, biologists are seeing how the caribou's learned and social behaviours underpin migratory behaviour. Disturbances from industrial development and harvesting reinforce each other and increase caribou responsiveness to traffic.

A large part of the caribou's behaviour is social. Phrases such as 'safety in numbers' and 'many eyes' capture the advantages of living in social groups. Social behaviour is how caribou share knowledge of their landscapes between individuals and generations. For example, calves stay with their maternal cow and learn the route to the calving ground where they were born. When migrating, caribou take their cues about where to go from the neighbouring caribou in their social group.¹⁴ The dependence on neighbouring individuals for cues during migration was revealed using video footage from drones and image classification to track the turns and twists of individual caribou. Not surprisingly, calves were more responsive than mature bulls to their neighbours.

Co-management has laid the groundwork for future recovery planning, and we know more about caribou and how we see our relationship with caribou through conversations documented during public hearings. During the hearings, people were clear about their sense of loss and grief and their fears about food security and future on-the-land knowledge and skills if caribou harvesting is lost. Co-management boards have compelling accounts of their efforts since 2007 to halt declines.¹⁵

Efforts to rebound from declines on the Arctic islands have had mixed results. The abundance of Peary caribou on the High Arctic islands has fluctuated, with a notable collapse in the late 1990s on the western High Arctic islands and a natural recovery by 2012.¹⁶ The communities of Resolute and Grise Fiord voluntarily reduced their harvesting. On the larger and mid-Arctic islands, the recovery of the Peary caribou has been slow or has not occurred, despite community-based harvest restrictions on Banks and northwest Victoria Island.¹⁷ The Dolphin and Union herd, which calves and summers on Victoria Island but crosses in the fall to the mainland for the winter, has sharply declined from a peak of 28,000 in 1997 to 3,700 caribou in 2018,¹⁸ and emergency harvest restrictions have been applied.

Given the events of the last fifteen years, when declines were detected and management actions were undertaken, we have likely learned enough about the resilience of caribou and our responses to the declines to get beyond the current declines and move towards recovery. We have also seen what happens when actions are delayed and slow declines accelerate into collapses. We know that severe declines lead to delayed and slow recovery. So, yes, the potential exists for the current declines to halt and for caribou herds to recover and re-occupy their seasonal ranges. There are reasons to be optimistic and reasons to be cautious.

Can Caribou and People Successfully Share Northern Landscapes into the Future?

Caribou use of Northern landscapes revolves around migration, especially for barren-ground caribou. Migration and abundance are inextricably linked, and social behaviour is a large part of why migration is feasible. Migration is an adaptation to annually variable foraging. The Arctic, while not pristine, does have a relatively unfragmented caribou habitat,¹⁹ and we know how to keep the caribou habitat intact, if we apply what we have learned.

Roads are a growing threat to whether we can successfully share Northern landscapes.

All-season and ice roads create two threats that in theory are easy to manage, but in practice are not well managed. These threats are high traffic frequency and increased exposure to harvesting. The high frequency of traffic is manageable by creating predictable gaps in traffic for caribou to cross – temporary closures are a proven solution, such as at the Meadowbank gold mine in Nunavut.²⁰ Road access increases local harvesting and increases disrespectful harvesting.²¹ Hunting along roads also increases caribou fear and hesitancy in crossing roads.

The *Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act* (1998), the *Inuvialuit Final Agreement* (1984), and the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement Act* (1993) give Northern communities a stronger voice in environmental assessments, which has led to increased monitoring and mitigation. But in practice, mitigation effectiveness often wavers and needs more review and revision (adaptive mitigation). A useful step would be to build in mitigation costs more transparently during mine feasibility costing. This would mean the costs of, for example, road closures to allow caribou migration being included in the costing of mine economic feasibility. As mines develop, a common pattern

is that longer roads are built, as more remote pits require their ore to be trucked to a central processing plant. We are finding that caribou delay their crossings of, and do not always cross, these roads. This indicates the need for improved traffic management to create predictable gaps for the caribou, and as Indigenous Elders suggest, let the lead caribou pass. Again, it comes down to fine-tuning mitigation effectiveness and sharing experience between mine companies. Fortunately, advisory bodies that review project-specific monitoring and mitigation can prompt and prod the mines to improve their monitoring and mitigation. The NWT has independent environmental oversight bodies.²² In Nunavut, the Nunavut Impact Review Board recommends technical advisory committees for mines to advise on monitoring and mitigation. The presence of Indigenous organizations on the technical committees gives a voice to the communities.

Thus, we are in a position to both apply and increase our knowledge, which improves the likelihood that we can share the Northern landscape with caribou into the future. The urgency for this is increasing as global warming intensifies. More and more, we will need to leave caribou enough room to make their decisions, to adapt and move in response to conditions such as rain-on-snow that limit their access to food. Leaving caribou room means ensuring their free passage across transport corridors and respecting their use of habitats where they are the most vulnerable, such as calving grounds. Freezing rain and rain-on-snow events are increasing in frequency, and caribou respond by moving to areas where they can more easily find forage by digging through the snow. We theoretically know enough about mitigation to allow caribou to freely cross roads, and perhaps enough to know how to protect calving grounds and other seasonal ranges. Putting mitigation and innovative landscape management into practice is, however, a complicated story.

The complications for land management arise from people's paradoxical wishes about how they want to live, which often come down to wanting to perpetuate hunting and fishing cultures without precluding economic development. Communities, regional groups, and agencies are faced with diverging needs, differing priorities, and private versus public interests. Efforts at landscape management using conventional tools can run into difficulties when attempting to resolve the conflicting objectives of caribou conservation and economic development. A useful tool is to follow up on describing the economics of Arctic biodiversity.²³ There have been initial moves toward this for Northern caribou. For instance, the Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou

Management Board described the annual harvest value of the two herds as \$20 million in 2013. However, a more detailed approach to evaluating caribou as natural capital would be useful. It is common to be faced with economic arguments in environmental assessments, such as mining companies arguing the relative economic risks when mine roads are temporarily closed for caribou migration. Although Indigenous knowledge and cultural values are intangible, an analysis using a natural capital approach would help contribute additional information on the other side of the economic arguments put forward by developers.

The debate about conservation and economic development is foremost in discussing permanent protected areas for landscape management. This is a long-standing and still unresolved issue, as most calving grounds remain unprotected. Conserving caribou ranges will require innovation and drawing on experience from elsewhere, including fisheries and their range of area- and time-based tools to conserve, for example, spawning areas. In that context, other potential approaches are to be found in the International Union for Conservation of Nature's (IUCN's) approach to defining "other effective area-based conservation measures" as part of the progress toward meeting the international Convention on Biological Diversity.²⁴

A glimpse into the future of sharing caribou landscapes is available through the Bathurst Caribou Range Plan.²⁵ The Range Plan is innovative and collaborative, with thresholds to limit the amount of development at any one time with flexible mitigation. The extent of its implementation depends on how people choose to balance Northern biodiversity and economic development. The collaboration and innovation in the Bathurst Caribou Range Plan should be scaled up to other herds, including by applying area-based tools and trade-offs to offset cumulative effects. These will be key to building the adaptive capacity of the landscape and the caribou so we can share the land in the future.

What Do We Need to Do Now to Ensure that Recovery Can Happen?

To move beyond the current declines and to share the landscape with caribou, we need to invest in recovery planning and be prepared to learn from elsewhere. Herd management planning does not yet always specify herd recovery goals and actions. Recovery planning depends on remembering the past and preparing now for the inevitable hard choices about caribou, harvesting, and land use. We can gain useful lessons from fisheries management, given their experience with declines and recoveries.²⁶ One of these

lessons is that for caribou recovery, we need to move assertively earlier in the declines and not let the remaining herds collapse. We need to collaboratively set recovery goals early in recovery planning. These goals must aim for a fast rate of recovery, and keep in mind the many roles that caribou play in the ecosystem, instead of just the goal of returning to harvesting. The key lesson from the Fortymile herd's recovery experience was that it took collaborative planning among the different user groups to kickstart recovery.

Determining recovery goals should be collaborative and consider harvesting relative to building herd size. Sharing the harvest and deciding on, if necessary, additional actions to support recovery will be helped by learning from the experiences with different herds. The NWT herds were recognized in 2017 as Threatened under the *Species at Risk (NWT) Act*. The Act also established a Conference of Management Authorities (CMA) to coordinate and lead recovery activities. CMA has already completed a barren-ground caribou recovery strategy.²⁷ The Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) categorized barren-ground caribou as Threatened in 2016. If this is followed by a listing in the *Species at Risk Act (SARA)*, it will lead to a national recovery plan. National recovery plans are high-level plans that are useful to leverage support, but to date, SARA recovery planning is slow and unresponsive. The Dolphin and Union herd was assessed and listed as being of Special Concern in 2004, with a requirement for a management plan. The plan was completed in 2017, by which time numbers had plummeted, and the herd was reclassified as Endangered also in 2017.²⁸

Tłı̄chǫ Elders have described the role of caribou in ecology, and this ecological approach is also reflected on a more global scale, such as in the IUCN's approach. The IUCN's approach to recovery planning is through its Green Status of Species – a complementary initiative to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. The Green Status of Species emphasizes recovery goals for a population sufficient in size to rebuild ecological functionality.

To not forget the past is to remember when caribou were abundant and appeared as 'living tides' across Northern landscapes, while also penetrating deep into the Northern boreal forests. Each generation forgets how wildlife used to be and redefines what is natural, which can lead to shrinking expectations for recovery.²⁹ Specifically, we should not be trapped into thinking that because caribou do not use a particular area now, they will not use it in the future. When caribou decline, their use of seasonal ranges changes, especially the winter ranges. This is why initiatives such as Ya'thi Néné Lands and Resources' to create Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (IPCAs)

in Nuhenéné, the traditional territory of the Athabasca Denesuliné and the winter range of the Qamanirjuaq and Beverly herds, are so important.

A wild card in recovery planning is climate change. Some changes may be beneficial, such as increased plant growth and flowering and a shorter snow season. Other changes are detrimental, including high summer temperatures, as caribou are not adapted to heat. Conditions that reduce the availability of forage, or increase the energetic cost of foraging, such as ice on and in the snow layers, are also detrimental to caribou. It is the extremes of annual conditions that affect survival or movements. Adaptive co-management can be used to accommodate recovery actions to the caribou's responses to climate extremes, as the probability of detecting changes is high through community and technical monitoring.

To move beyond the current declines and renew the Arctic landscape with living tides of caribou will require us to collectively speak up to ensure that herd recovery and landscape plans are implemented. We should not forget that the current declines and collapses were known as they unfolded, but effective actions were stalled. We cannot let a similar inertia inhibit action. The grief and shock of the current declines are in themselves an incentive that we can channel towards recovery. The declines have brought us together, and now we can use that collaborative groundwork to shepherd the current low numbers toward again seeing streaming lines of migrating caribou. The key, especially as global warming takes hold and infrastructure proliferates, is to keep the landscape open for unfettered passage. Room for a migratory species will be the pathway for recovered abundance.

Notes

1. Conference of Management Authorities, *Recovery Strategy for Barren-ground Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus groenlandicus*) in the Northwest Territories* (Yellowknife, NT: Conference of Management Authorities, 2020).
2. Judith H. Myers, "Population cycles: generalities, exceptions and remaining mysteries," *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 285 (2018): 1-9, <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspb.2017.2841>.
3. Michael R. Klaczek, Chris J. Johnson, and H. Dean Cluff, "Wolf-Caribou Dynamics Within the Central Canadian Arctic," *Journal of Wildlife Management* 80/5 (2016): 837-849, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.1070>.
4. Paul J. Johnson, Vanessa M. Adams, Doug P. Armstrong, Sandra E. Baker, Duan Biggs, Luigi Boitani, Alayne Cotterill, Emma Dale, Holly O'Donnell, David J.T. Douglas, Egil Droge, John G. Ewen, Ruth E. Feber, Piero Genovesi, Clive Hamblen, Bart J. Harmsen, Lauren A. Harrington, Amy Hinks, Joelene

Hughes, Lydia Katsis, Andrew Loveridge, Axel Moehrensclager, Christopher O’Kane, Meshach Pierre, Steve Redpath, Lovemore Sibanda, Pritpal Soorae, Mark Stanley Price, Peter Tyrrell, Alexandra Zimmermann, and Amy Dickman, “Consequences Matter: Compassion in Conservation Means Caring for Individuals, Populations and Species,” *Animals* 9/12 (2019), <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/9/12/1115/htm>.

5. Elinor Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
6. See Advisory Committee for Cooperation on Wildlife Management (ACCWM), <https://accwm.com>.
7. Guillaume Szor, Malik Awan, and Mitch Campbell, “The effect of predation on the Qamanirjuaq and Beverly subpopulations of Barren-Ground Caribou (*Rangifer tarandus groenlandicus*),” Unpublished report (Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment, 2014).
8. Wekëezhii Renewable Resources Board (WRRB), *Reasons for Decisions Related to a Joint Proposal for Dìga (Wolf) Management in Wekëezhii* (Yellowknife, NT: WRRB, 2021).
9. Klaczek, Johnson, and Cluff, “Wolf-Caribou Dynamics Within the Central Canadian Arctic.”
10. Anne Gunn, Kim G. Poole, Jack Wierzchowski, John S. Nishi, Jan Adamczewski, Don Russell, and Adrian D’Hont, “Have geographical influences and changing abundance led to sub-population structure in the Ahiak caribou herd, Nunavut, Canada?” *Rangifer Special Issue* 33/21 (2013): 35-58; and Jan Adamczewski, Anne Gunn, Kim G. Poole, Alex Hall, John Nishi, and John Boulanger, “What happened to the Beverly caribou herd after 1994?,” *Arctic* (2015): 407-421.
11. Eliezer Gurarie, Peter R. Thompson, Allicia P. Kelly, Nicholas C. Larter, William F. Fagan, and Kyle Joly, “For everything there is a season: Analysing periodic mortality patterns with the cyclomort R package,” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 11/1 (2020): 129-138.
12. Jan Adamczewski, John Boulanger, Heather Sayine-Crawford, John Susumu Nishi, Howard Dean Cluff, Judy Williams, and Lisa-Marie Leclerc, *Estimates of breeding females & adult herd size and analyses of demographics for the Bathurst herd of barren-ground caribou: 2018 calving ground photographic survey* (Yellowknife: Northwest Territories Environment and Natural Resources, 2019).
13. Keri McFarlane, Anne Gunn, Mitch Campbell, Mathieu Dumond, Jan Adamczewski, and Greg Wilson, “Genetic diversity, structure and gene flow of migratory barren-ground caribou (*Rangifer tarandus groenlandicus*) in Canada,” *Rangifer* 36/1 (2016): 1-24.
14. Colin J. Torney, Myles Lamont, Leon Debell, Ryan J. Angohiatok, Lisa-Marie Leclerc, and Andrew M. Berdahl, “Inferring the rules of social interaction

- in migrating caribou,” *Philosophical Transactions of The Royal Society B* 373 (2018): 1-9, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0385>.
15. Sahtú Renewable Resources Board (SRRB), *SRRB Public Hearing Registry 2007 Bluenose West* (2007), https://www.srrb.nt.ca/index.php?Itemid=2402&id=372&option=com_content&view=article; WRRB, *Report on a Public Hearing Held by the Wek'èezhii Renewable Resources Board 9-11 April 2019 Behchokò, NT & Reasons for Decisions Related to a Joint Proposal for the Management of the Sahtì Ekwò (Bluenose-East Caribou) Herd* (Yellowknife, NT: WRRB, 2019); WRRB, *Reasons for Decisions Related to a Joint Proposal for the Management of the Kòk'èetì Ekwò (Bathurst Caribou) Herd* (Yellowknife, NT: WRRB, 2019); WRRB, *Reasons for Decisions Related to a Joint Proposal for Diga (Wolf) Management in Wek'èezhii*.
 16. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), *COSEWIC Assessment and Status Report on the Peary Caribou Rangifer tarandus pearyi in Canada - 2015* (Ottawa: Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, 2015), <https://sararegistry.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=D7477596-1>.
 17. COSEWIC, *COSEWIC Assessment and Status Report on the Peary Caribou Rangifer tarandus pearyi in Canada*.
 18. Lisa-Marie Leclerc and John Boulanger, *Population Estimate of the Dolphin and Union Caribou herd (Rangifer tarandus groenlandicus x pearyi) Coastal Survey, October 2018 and Demographic Indicators* (Kugluktuk, NU: Nunavut Department of Environment, Wildlife Research Section, 2020).
 19. COSEWIC, *COSEWIC Assessment and Status Report on the Caribou Rangifer tarandus, Barren-ground population in Canada* (Ottawa: Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, 2016).
 20. John Boulanger, Robin Kite, Mitch Campbell, Jason Shaw, and David S. Lee, *Kivalliq Caribou Monitoring Program - Analysis of Caribou Movements Relative to Meadowbank Mine and Roads During Spring Migration*, Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment Technical Report Series – No:01-2020 (Government of Nunavut, 2020).
 21. Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board (BQCMB), *Press release, 2019-2020 Annual Report* (2021).
 22. Natasha Affolder, Katy Allen, and Sascha Paruk, *Independent Environmental Oversight: A Report for the Giant Mine Remediation Environmental Assessment* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Faculty of Law, 2011), https://reviewboard.ca/upload/project_document/Independent_Environmental_Oversight_Report_1299265834.PDF.
 23. Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), *The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) for the Arctic: A Scoping Study* (Akureyri, Iceland: CAFF, 2015).

24. IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) Task Force on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs), *Recognising and reporting other effective area-based conservation measures* (Gland, Switzerland: IUCN, 2019).

25. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, *Bathurst Caribou Range Plan 2019* (Yellowknife, NT: Government of the Northwest Territories, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, 2019), [https://wrrb.ca/sites/default/files/2019.05.10 Bathurst Caribou Range Plan as Management Proposal.pdf](https://wrrb.ca/sites/default/files/2019.05.10_Bathurst_Caribou_Range_Plan_as_Management_Proposal.pdf).

26. Jeffrey A. Hutchings and John D. Reynolds, "Marine Fish Population Collapses: Consequences for Recovery and Extinction Risk," *BioScience* 54/4 (April 2004): 297-309.

27. Conference of Management Authorities, *Recovery Strategy for Barren-ground Caribou* (*Rangifer tarandus groenlandicus*) *in the Northwest Territories*.

28. COSEWIC, *COSEWIC Assessment and Status Report on the Caribou* (*Rangifer tarandus*) *Dolphin and Union population in Canada 2017* (Ottawa: COSEWIC, 2017), <https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/species-risk-public-registry/cosewic-assessments-status-reports/caribou-dolphin-union-2017.html>.

29. Daniel Pauly, "Anecdotes and the shifting baseline syndrome of fisheries," *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 10/10 (1995): 430.



Lines in the Snow

Thoughts on the Past and Future of Northern Canadian Policy Issues

Edited by Clive Tesar and P. Whitney Lackenbauer

Over the course of the past fifty years, CARC has encouraged a better-informed national conversation over aspects of northern development, providing opportunities for experts from diverse backgrounds to elaborate policy alternatives for the north and to comment on national policy initiatives. Starting with the Mackenzie pipeline proposal, CARC has supported the efforts of Indigenous peoples of the north to reclaim their land and governance rights and to ensure that northern voices were part of the policy conversations. This volume includes excerpts from past CARC interventions across twelve policy areas alongside original insights from expert commentators on future issues and opportunities for the Canadian North

Contributors: Marc-André Dubois, Jess Dunkin, Aimee Guile, Anne Gunn, P. Whitney Lackenbauer, Suzanne Lalonde, Doug Matthews, Laura Meinert, Derek Muir, Bram Noble, Kevin O'Reilly, Jody Pellissey, Jamal Shirley, Edward Struzik, Clive Tesar, John B. Zoe



**Canadian Arctic
Resources Committee**