

Page 1 of 5

Good afternoon to the Board members and staff. My name is Gloria Stickwan. I am here to testify on Proposal 54, Proposal 55, Proposal 56 and Proposal 57.

I am opposed to modifying the Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system.

I am opposed to changing the location of purchase of most of the applicant's gasoline and groceries during the last year and number of days in the local hunt area spent on subsistence activities.

The Board must ensure that Tier II is applied for a wildlife population when there isn't enough resources to provide for a reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses of that population. Statutes states two criteria must be applied. Two criteria is customary and direct dependence on the Tier II game population by subsistence user for food as mainstay of livelihood and the ability of the subsistence users to get food if subsistence use is restricted or eliminated. This proposal would do away with scoring system that is fair, precise, and lawful to measure these two criteria.

I oppose adding points for each living generation to Tier II subsistence hunting permit point system. Current measures in place to show customary and direct

dependence on game population by the subsistence user for food and to show reliance as a mainstay of livelihood is better than asking how many living relatives a person has. Scoring points for how many relatives one has would be unfair to applicants. Parents or grandparents may be deceased for some applicants, these applicants would not get points for deceased relatives.

This proposal asked the Board to consider all the subsistence activities for all hunt-fish-pick berries subsistence reliance and dependency of the applicant, no matter where the applicant lives in the state or exercised subsistence use rights. This doesn't measure customary and direct dependence upon the resource that the applicant is applying for. Asking questions about where the applicant has hunted, fished or picked berries in a Game Management Use area that is different than the GMU that one is applying for does not show reliance upon that resource. Answering questions about how many years an applicant has eaten from or hunted for a Tier II resource that is one applying for in a GMU shows reliance upon that resource.

A third question asked the Board to consider the applicant's number of years for hunting or applied for the Tier II species hunt being applied for, along with any other Tier II and Tier I general hunts for other big game species hunted or applied

for and used for subsistence reliance and dependency. This suggestion by the proponent will only show how many years the applicant filled out a Tier I or Tier application. It will not show reliance and dependency upon the resource. Asking the applicant's number of years for hunting for Tier II species will eliminate those who cannot hunt for themselves and will take away points for them. Those who apply for Tier II and do not hunt still rely upon the resource as a mainstay for their livelihood.

Lastly Tier II Subsistence Permit point system is not a racially based system, nor is it based upon where one resides or is "geared toward a rural preference".

I am opposed to Proposal 55 to combining the regulations to allow the take of big game for religious ceremonies and ceremony potlaches. Regulation 5 AAC 92.019 is protected under First Amendment of the US Constitution and Article 1. Section 4 of the Alaska State Constitution.

This regulation has special meaning to Alaska Natives. It should not be combined with other ceremonial potlach regulations.

The intent to repeal 5 AAC 92.053, 92.017 and 92.055 are not on the Call for Proposals. Any comments or hints of a discussion on these three regulations to merge it into 92.019 should not take place at this meeting.

Current wording in regulation 5 AAC. 92.019 is doable and workable. Keep this regulation in place, do not combine other ceremonial potlach regulations with 5 AAC9.019.

I support Proposal 56 and Proposal 57 as written. These two proposals should be deferred to the Central/Southwest Region meeting.

Community subsistence hunt should be modified to show that a group is community in which C&T use patterns are practiced by the members of a group.

Every group should have to do an annual report, a scoring system should be in the community subsistence hunt. If a groups proves that they practice C&T use patterns as written in board findings, they shouldn't have to do a report for 5 years. If a groups fails to do a report that groups should not be allowed to participate for 2 years, an appeal process for failure to report should also in the community subsistence hunt.

The definition for community should be re-dined to show that group is a community, and not a group of 25 individuals who signed through internet.

Proposal 57 provides a definition of how a community could be re-defined.

Community definition should have meaning that shows that a group shares with

each, complies with Board findings on C&T uses and patterns, connects with each other, physically, socially, nutritionally and economically.

Thank you for listening to me.