"jeff parker"
<gparker@alaska.net>
03/18/2011 12:14 PM

To Richard Parkin, Phil North
cc
bcc
Subject RE: Three or Four Tribal reps on Inter-governmental Tech. Team?

You might consider four reps., instead of three. I suggest this for these reasons.

(1) Doing so allows you to have an up-river rep and a down-river rep in each drainage. For the most part, the 21 subsistence use area maps bear out this distinction in use patterns, particularly in the Kvichak/Iliamna Lake/Newhalen River/Lake Clark drainage, where navigability for purposes of subsistence access is more of an issue than on the Nushagak/Mulchatna drainage. I am no expert on use patterns, but I hear differences in terms of focus between up-river and down-river communities. The up-river ones tend to focus on subsistence use of fish and game, while down-river communities tend to focus on the combination of commercial fishing, and subsistence use of fish and game. Given the location of mineral deposits potentially at issue, I would not sacrifice up-river information due to the dominance of commercial fishing as a potentially impacted use.

(2) Having three reps drives people to outcome-driven, and to think in terms of having two from the Nushagak because four of the six tribes are from the Nushagak. That has nothing to do with getting good information, and could create an unnecessary division between Nushagak and Kvichak tribes and problems in how tribes perceive EPA.

Thanks for considering this.

Jeff Parker