

Indian Preference hiring plan

Mr. Tony Mammoser
U.S. Dept. of Health &
Human Services
Office of Engineering Services
Region X
Seattle

RE: Alaska Native Medical
Center

Dear Mr. Mammoser,

Our review of Ellis-Don's response to the deficiencies in their original Indian Preference Subcontracting Plan indicates to us an apparent unwillingness to seriously address Indian Preference in a responsible manner. The cosmetic changes in their "revised plan" do little to alleviate our concerns regarding meaningful Indian Preference activity in the construction of the Alaska Native Medical Center by Ellis-Don.

It is obvious that, even after being made aware of the inadequacies of their Indian Preference Subcontracting plan, Ellis-Don did not substantially change their original plan, which was more an Affirmative Action plan rather than an Indian Preference plan. Ellis-Don apparently continues to feel that their fifteen (15%) "goal" for Indian Preference subcontracting is an adequate target. CITC does not accept this "goal" as an adequate Indian Preference target. This is particularly true, when we are told that other possible contractors claim that they will subcontract as much as 45% of the subcontractable amount to Native American companies.

Our concerns are primarily based upon Ellis-Don's apparent misunderstanding of the concept of Indian Preference. Their original "Affirmative Action" plan and their revised plan both seem to miss the mark in understanding what their responsibilities are to facilitate Indian Preference contracting. *This lack of understanding is our most fundamental concern.*

In our view, the 15% "goal" established by Ellis-Don for Indian Preference contracting represents our incidence in the general population. The logic appears to be that, "if Native Americans are 15% of the population, then they should get 15% of the subcontracts." It is this apparent viewpoint that distresses Cook Inlet Tribal Council because it reflects a total misunderstanding of Indian Preference. "Preference" does not mean "parity."

Additionally, the Ellis-Don plan continues to reflect criteria

for responsiveness or standards which had not been either established and/or communicated to potential Indian sub-bidders at the time of solicitation. Ellis-Don provides no evidence that this "criteria" is substantiated by experience and justified as a legitimate business necessity, then this "criteria" is no more than another *artificial barrier* to Indian Preference contracting.

CITC rejects as inadequate Ellis-Don's additions in Sec. 1.0 of their plan which addresses these barriers to meaningful Indian Preference opportunities. CITC has little faith in a vaguely articulated mentoring program applied, *"wherever we believe it is feasible"* (emphasis added.)

Cook Inlet Tribal Council is grateful for the opportunity to comment on this very important issue.

Respectfully,
Cook Inlet Tribal Council
Esther M. Combs
Executive Director

Thank you in our time of sorrow

Dear Editor:

Regarding: Marian Neeley/
Olinghouse

From all the sons and daughters of Marian Olinghouse. We would like to say a big thank you to all the family and friends that were there in the time of our sorrow for our mother.

Thank you to all the family and friends that were there at the hospital and her home after she passed away, with food, prayer and strength. For coming to her visitations in Anchorage and Gulkana. For everyone that came to her funeral.

Thank you to the family and friends that provided transportation, hospitality and babysitters for us in our time of need.

We want to thank the Gulkana Village Council for raising money to bring our sister to Alaska to see our mother one last time.

We want to thank our Ahlma Corp. for all the support they gave for our mother.

There is just not enough words to express our thanks to everyone that showed their love and caring for our mother and to her children.

Just a Big Thank You.

Debbie, Donna, LeRoy, Patty,
Ronald and Joyce

Many inconsistencies

Dear Mr. Stieglitz,

The traditional council's steering committee met to further discuss your Jan. 11 proposal. Your opening summation contained many inconsistencies that we felt needed to be pointed out and clarified by you before we can proceed with your offer.

For the past several months, we have been hearing over and over again from other non-Native media, your staff and now from you the sad state of affairs on Hagemeister Island. First, we hear the Reindeer are starving and that there must be mercy killings so they don't suffer. Yet the deer that were salvaged had layers of fat from one to two inches thick! Now we hear from your letter that "decades of overgrazing by the Reindeer herd has resulted in serious damage to the vegetation of the island." Mr. Stieglitz, have you gone to the island and seen the serious damage you allude to? Has your staff? We have read that in interagency memos, that the summer range vegetation is good to excellent.

You then go on to state "a primary purpose of the Refuge, as outlined by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, is to conserve Fish and Wildlife and Habitats in their natural diversity. We went back and re-read these statements in ANILCA Sect.303(1)(b) and instead of a primary purpose, we found five "major purposes" for which the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge was established and shall be managed. (Note the word managed.) We also read "the opportunity for continued subsistence uses by the local residents" shall be provided. This is also a stated purpose of the Refuge.

The Reindeer placed on Hagemeister Island were there as a direct result of an Act of Congress. Congress declared there existed "a necessity for providing means of subsistence for the Eskimos and other Natives

Continued on next page

of Alaska." These Reindeer are that subsistence resource.

Reading on further, you refer to "when original grazing conditions were evaluated, a small herd on Hagemeister Island was feasible." We have read in old publications just yesterday when the herd was placed on the island "experts" believed a herd of 1000-3000 was possible.

Mr. Steiglitz, we also noted in your response you were "very pleased" with the staff's work and with Mr. Archibeque. The council hopes you will bring a different approach and attitude to the negotiations than Mr. Archibeque has portrayed while carrying out your orders "faithfully."

The Traditional Council of Togiak feels it is imperative we negotiate a solution in keeping with the intent of the Reindeer Act for the Native People of Togiak both for subsistence use and economic enterprise.

Sincerely,
Stanley Active, Sr., President
Traditional Council of Togiak

Unresponsive agency

Mr. Walt Stieglitz
Regional Director
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Anchorage

Dear Mr. Steiglitz:

The Traditional Council of Togiak is in receipt of your fax and counter offer for the Hagemeister Reindeer. We will be discussing it and it's implications and will respond as appropriate. We are giving it our utmost attention.

One point that needs to be addressed immediately though is your response to our request of returning the Hagemeister Island back to the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge and that Togiak National Wildlife Refuge personnel cease and desist from any further operations on the island.

You state and we quote, "Hagemeister Island was placed under the administrative control

of the NWR this summer in order to be more responsive to the local people's needs."

Mr. Steiglitz, this has been anything but the case. From the start, when this situation was turned over to Mr. Aaron Archibeque on May 20, 1992, he has been anything but "responsive to the local people's needs." Mr. Archibeque has been confrontal with the people of Togiak, unwillingly to negotiate and actively demonstrated a serious insensitivity in dealing with the local Native people. If he had been truly, "more responsive to the local peoples needs," this situation would not have resulted in such an ugly outcome.

It is because of Mr. Archibeque's demonstrated inability to work in an atmosphere which demonstrates cultural sensitivity that the Traditional Council of Togiak voted unanimously to work only with Fish & Wildlife Service in Anchorage on the Hagemeister Island Reindeer situation. We are hereby requesting and inviting you to come to Togiak so that all parties involved can negotiate in good faith and on a face-to-face basis. Your staff is also invited only when you are present and will not be welcome without your presence.

As you can see from these noted discrepancies which you may or may not be aware of, there are several points we need clarified by you before we can proceed. We are asking you to expediate your answers to we can evaluate the latest offer with all the facts on the table.

Mr. Stieglitz, we also noted in your final summation that we have until May 15 to remove the Reindeer from the island and total removal is your bottom line. It is not negotiable. We summarize from this statement that you are the principal person responsible for what has happened on the island to date. This being the case, we must reiterate our letter of Jan. 14, which stated that the Traditional Council of Togiak will only negotiate with you for a solution to the Hagemeister situation and we again are extending an invitation for you to

accomplish this.

Sincerely
Stanley Active, Sr., President
Traditional Council of Togiak

Retract blackmail threat

Dear Editor:

I'm writing to strongly urge the Togiak Traditional Council to retract their blackmail threat of wiping out the Nushagak caribou herd unless they get their way regarding the Hagemeister Island reindeer herd.

At a time when Alaskan Indians are striving for sovereignty and the right to manage wildlife on vast acreages of Alaskan land, such blackmail will definitely hamper their chances of achieving these goals. Destructive, senseless threats such as this only serve to disgust and alienate everyone else. It demonstrates Indians are not good stewards and conservators of wildlife, but are wild renegades, promoting and participating in wanton waste. Besides, this caribou herd was given to the Indians by the State and Federal governments in good faith they would preserve and maintain it. The same with the reindeer herd. However, the reindeer herd was basically ignored by the villagers for almost 30 years until it reached a point where the population outgrew the range. While I do not support the Fish & Wildlife Service killing those reindeer from airplanes, the Togiak area Indians did not want to lift a finger, physically or financially to move them off the island. The island will not support even the 200 that are still there. It will not support the inevitable growth that will occur over the next several years if any are left now.

I suggest the Togiak area Indians focus their attention on the ways and means to remove all the remaining reindeer from the island alive if they are truly interested in now finally starting a reindeer industry. The Federal government is willing to work with you and even provide manpower and financial

support in removal efforts. The villagers never have had the means to properly manage the herd while it was on the island, due to the expense and time involved. That is still true today.

In order to restore respect and protect the reputation of all Alaskan Indians, I also suggest the Council publically and formally retract their blackmail ultimatum of killing the Nushagak caribou. Stop acting like spoiled little children - because that is exactly what you appear to the rest of the State and country. If you kill any of those caribou, I can almost guarantee you will kill any chances for sovereignty or your own wildlife management goals.

Thank you,
Carol Jensen
Anchorage

Editor's note: The Togiak people are Yup'ik, not Indians. One of the issues involves the 1937 Reindeer Act not sovereignty. *Tundra Times* back issues regarding the Hagemeister reindeer are \$1 each with a \$2.90 self addressed stamped envelope.

Some call-in show

Dear Editor:

Seems the only way an ordinary citizen can be heard on the "closed and political" North Slope Borough is to send fax letters to the editor. On Thurs., the Public radio station, KBRW, sponsored a "call-in show" about taxicabs in Barrow but failed to invite

one cab driver not to mention the owner of Arcticab, who provided uninterrupted service to the community for ten (10) years, but KBRW did invite the city mayor who knows very little about the cab business, an egomaniac who volunteered to serve as "taxicab administrative assistant to the mayor", and a new cop in town who rode a taxicab in the Lower 48 at one time or another. This uninformed "group" with moderator Sereni proceeded to "trash" the taxicab owners and drivers with a few simple minded callers who never ride a taxicab in Barrow. One caller, Dale Stotts, who I have never seen in one of our cabs compared us to "Hong Kong drivers" to which Sereni quickly agreed though I have never seen or heard of her riding a cab, either.

The facts are:

1. Arcticab drivers have probably saved more lives than anyone in Barrow by giving free rides to disabled and intoxicated people to their homes.. Public Safety has called us to transport people home when they didn't want to put them on jail and we rarely get paid;
2. There has not been a fare increase in 15 years although freight, fuel, and other operating costs have quadrupled;
3. Eight cab companies have gone broke in the last 10 years due, in a large measure, to stupid and unnecessary Ordinance and selective enforcement by Public Safety and the City to punish anyone who dissents or disagrees;
4. Cab drivers perform one of the more important functions

Continued on page six

Continued from page 3

in this community for which they earn about "poverty income" for 60 hours a week;

5. Arcticab drivers did not have a chargeable accident in the first 8 years we were in operation;

6. On Thurs., there were 4 cab drivers in traffic court, no one else;

7. There has never been a personal injury in an Arcticab taxi; and

8. The Taxicab commissioner promised 2 vehicle inspections a year, there has been one in two years;

9. The City has "botched" and mishandled taxicab regulation; the Borough doesn't want it; so is is "dumped" on "deregulation, whatever that means. .

10. If and when you deregulate be prepared for the following:
- a. Increased drug sales out of cabs by "outsiders" from foreign countries and other "trash" that is dumped on our streets;
 - b. There will be fare increases;
 - c. Cabs will be poorly maintained and unsafe, driven by strangers whose backgrounds may have been criminal, child molesters, rapists, etc. because anyone with \$25 can get a license and get into a very sensitive and responsible business. . . Contrary to the "expert egotists" on the call-in show, the taxicab business is not "just another business";
12. Presently, we are able to be

consistent with the subsistence lifestyle, as we can hire local Inupiat people for a short or long period when they are in need of cash for food and emergencies. . . Deregulate and there will be no Eskimo drivers at all. The Borough's drug testing policy and Commercial Driver's License requirement has already eliminated some Inupiat positions so, the City may as well "finish them off";

Regretfully,
John Danner,
Owner, Manager and driver
since 1982
Barrow

Editor's note: For a complete copy of above send a 52 cent stamped self addressed envelope.

Freedom of speech does hurt

Dear Editor:
Day after "ininaugural" day. My prayer is that our new leaders will lead us to better times.

I am originally from Point Hope. The home of late Howard Rock; and I take pride of what you are all doing. However, it is upsetting to read a letter from Mark Cooper, Dutch Harbor. I believe in freedom of speech, but it does hurt. I am one of the "Outsiders." I am sorry that you put us all in "one lump." I love "my home," Alaska, and hope and pray for the best for Alaska. It does effect me and my families in Alaska.

I read my *Tundra Times* from cover to cover, and look forward to getting it. Keep up the good work. To some of us, it is our only connection, and it is important to a lot of us.

I went "home" to Anchorage last summer. My sister and husband met me there, and it was good to be "home," we are trying to get a way to go "home" through my corporation.

Keep up the good work.
Happy New Year!
Madeline "Tooyak" Carl
Spokane

We're so glad

Dear Editor:
We're so glad that you've revived the *Tundra Times* and we'd like to subscribe.
Thank you.
Margaret E. Carlson
Tacoma

Southeast King salmon

The Honorable Ted Stevens
The U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Senator Stevens:

A thank-you has to be expressed to you, Sen. Stevens, for having Pres. Clinton's first official luncheon be Southeast King Salmon. It was real pride to know that our Southeast Alaska Salmon has received national attention. It comes at a time when our Alaska Salmon needs to be recognized and does deserve to receive national attention.

More attention needs to be given to our Alaska Salmon and we are seeking every avenue of marketing our Alaska Salmon. The attention that was given to the "Inaugural Salmon for the First Official Presidential Luncheon," it was fitting and is what needs to happen. Letting it be known to the rest of the United States of America that the source of excellent Salmon comes from Alaskan waters. Thanks Sen. Stevens for making us feel proud and giving our Southeast Alaska Salmon Presidential attention.

Sincerely,
Terrence H. Booth, Sr.
Metlakatla

Commend constituents

Dec. 29, 1992

Honourable George Jacko
Senator-Elect
Member
Alaska State Legislature
Pedro Bay, Alaska

Dear George:

I have read with continuing interest your participation and maturation within the legislative processes, particularly with respect to the organization of the Senate for which the leadership roles are simply authorship of policy and the subsequent authorization of expenditure.

I must commend your constituents who took the risk to elect you to represent them in their district which includes House Seats 39T with Lyman Hoffman and 40T with Carl Moses. A formidable trio. You have shown immediate results with your tenacity.

As a former legislator from the Nome area, I recognize only one master, the district constituency. Conversely, I know who isn't: Everyone else. With your best efforts to represent the constituency, everyone else can object to your decision to organize, but they really don't have any pull. They may attempt to sabotage your programs, but in the process will

Continued on page 8

Continued from page 6

shoot their own feet. Your constituency will see and understand. Make your reports to them.

My questions are simple: Where was Georgianna Lincoln's support for Water and Sewer Programs in the Bush at the end of the last session? Neutralized by her alliance with the Urban Democratic Majority. The last two people I heard who could were folks called Moses and Jesus, and although some may want to give the impression that he can part waters and walk on them, what was Al Adams doing at a Seahawks game in Seattle while the organization was being put together? Parting waters? Looking after my interests? His? Where was Fred Zharoff? Asleep at the wheel again?

Don't be fooled by the answers. If someone has sour grapes, understand it as such and get on with the work you have to do. You have chosen to lead with your own agenda, not follow someone else's. I appreciate your integrity, I urge you to maintain it.

In closing, I congratulate your constituents on their choice.

Sincerely,
Alfred C. Nakak
St. Michael