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CHAIRMAN TOWARAK:  Good afternoon. I'm going to call this meeting to order on behalf of the Federal Subsistence Board.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK:  Thank you very much. I'll call this meeting to order now that we're on line. And I'm going to introduce myself, I'm Tim Towarak. I'm from Unalakleet. I still live in Unalakleet. I was recently appointed by the Secretary of the Interior as the Chairman for the Federal Subsistence Board and this is my very first meeting and I've made it through one day so far and I'm looking forward to ending this session today as our last day of meeting.

We don't have a written agenda but we're going to go through introductions first, and then we'll do whatever information exchange we have and then I'd like to maybe turn the rest over to Pete and Keith, to get the discussion started.

We're here specifically to discuss the MOU between the State of Alaska and the Federal Subsistence Board, and, with that, I'm going to ask the Federal people, starting from my right side, Kristin, if you could, introduce yourselves and who you represent.

MS. K'EIT:  Good afternoon, I'm Kristin K'eit. And I represent Bureau of Indian Affairs.

MS. DOUGAN:  Good afternoon. Julia Dougan with the Bureau of Land Management.

MS. PENDLETON:  Good afternoon. Beth Pendleton. I'm the Regional Forester for the Forest Service, Alaska Region.
MR. GOLTZ: Keith Goltz, Solicitor's Office.

MR. PROBASCO: Pete Probasco, Office of Subsistence Management.

MS. MASICA: Sue Masica, National Park Service.

MS. SMITH: Laverne Smith, Fish and Wildlife Service.


CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. And, Jim, we'll ask you to introduce your Staff.

MR. HILSINGER: Thank you. My name's John Hilsinger with Department of Fish and Game sitting in for Commissioner Lloyd, who sends his apologies. He had already had a prior commitment when this was scheduled. And I'll ask the State people to introduce themselves, starting with Ted.

MR. SPRAKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ted Spraker. I'm the vice-Chairman of the Board of Game and I live down in Soldotna.

MR. WEBSTER: I'm Vince Webster. I'm the Chairman of the Board of Fisheries and I'm from King Salmon.

MR. MITCHELL: Good afternoon. I'm Mike Mitchell and I'm with the Alaska Department of Law.

MS. CUNNING: Tina Cunning with Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

MR. JUDKINS: And I'm Cliff Judkins, Chairman of the Alaska Board of Game. I live up in Wasilla.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Welcome to the meeting this afternoon.

As all of you know and those of you in the audience, the two organizations, and, Pete, you could probably give a better background on the Memorandum of Agreement, but in that Memorandum of Agreement there's a
provision that this Board, along with the State would get
together, I don't know if it says annually or
occasionally, to review the Memorandum of Understanding
that was signed, I think, in 2008.

So, with that, I will turn the meeting
over to Pete and Keith.

MR. PROBASCO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I'll just have some opening remarks, very short, and then
I would go to my counterpart, here, Tina, and I don't
know if Keith had anything to say or not.

But as the Chairman stated, that we're
here on an annual basis to take the opportunity to
discuss this document, it's viewed as a living document.
It's been signed. The Memorandum of Understanding for
the two entities, the State and the Federal side, as they
deal with the Federal management and State management on
Federal lands dealing with subsistence.

Since the last time we've met, I think
everybody's aware that there have been some events that
have occurred, probably the most important one, as far as
the Federal side, is that, the Secretaries, both
Secretary of AG and Secretary of Interior have launched
and were near conclusion of the review of the Federal
Subsistence Program. As a result of that there's been
some direction given to the Federal Board, which the
Federal Board will be sharing with you, as it pertains to
the Memorandum of Understanding, and we'll be discussing
that with the State today.

So those are my opening remarks, Mr.
Chairman, and I'd like to turn it over to Tina.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. CUNNING: Thank you. We know that
all members that are here from the Board of Game, Board
of Fish and the Federal Subsistence Board are well aware
of the history of how we got here but members of the
audience may not be and since this is my swan's song, on
the way out the door towards retirement, I'd like to
recapture that history for people so that they're aware
of how we got here today.

When the Federal Program was created in
1990 to '92, with the EIS process, there was a
responsibility for assuring the Federal subsistence
priority for wildlife on Federal lands by rural residents. The Federally-qualified. And the State still continue to provide subsistence and other opportunities on those Federal lands.

Those overlaid responsibilities through the evolution of the Federal Program, in 1999 were going to be moving into fisheries. And with the move into fisheries there was a lot of concern because of the complicated fisheries and the importance to the subsistence and economy of the state.

There were two years of negotiations that went on to try to enter into some kind of agreement of how these regulatory entities were going to coordinate together, and that cumulated in an agreement called the Interim Memorandum of Agreement that was initialed in 2000. It was not signed, it was initialed by all the members of representatives of the Federal Board, the State Board of Fisheries, the State Board of Game and the Department of Fish and Game. There were a number of provisions in there that hadn't been worked out that were left to be resolved by future protocols or future amendments to that agreement.

In that agreement there was a requirement also for annual meetings. There were some negotiations by task groups put together to enter into some of those difficult arenas. There was a protocol signed on information sharing and there was a protocol signed on how they were going to coordinate in-season activities on the Yukon River, which those issues are still with us today because of the complicated nature, entertainment of the commercial and subsistence fisheries throughout the Yukon River.

After those were signed there were no more meetings between the signatories despite the agreement to do so and by about 2005 there were becoming some serious conflicts where each of the Boards, the Boards at the time, and the Staff felt that there were some conflicts intruding with each others management authorities happening in their arenas to the point where the Board of Game wrote the Federal Board and withdrew from the IMOA in its frustration. After a period of time and some discussions, the Board of Game agreed to come back to the table if they could enter into some further efforts to try to improve relations because of the impacts that each of the regulators could have over the other, and the recognition there is in Title VIII,
multiple times throughout Title VIII, that requires consultation with the State.

So in 2006 the Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board wrote to the Governor and asked that we enter into discussions for how to improve relationships between our respective entities. And in 2007 we were having discussions along that line, whether we thought we could do that. And in 2008 the Commissioner's office wrote the Federal Subsistence Board and said, upon directions of the Governor, that we were anxious to come back to the table and work on trying to improve relations for the benefit of the resources and the benefit of the users.

So there was a meeting in March of 2008, in which the question was posed, a joint meeting of the Board of Game, Board of Fish, Federal Subsistence Board, in which the question was posed, do we want to have a permanent Memorandum of Agreement or Understanding that recognizes each others regulatory authorities and responsibilities and agree to try to make things work better for the resources and the users. There was direction from the Board to a group of us to negotiate some changes to the IMOA to make it work better. There were people from the Federal agencies and from our Department and the Board's representatives that were there, negotiated some changes, went back and forth for a long time, brought a draft back to the joint meeting of those signatories to see if that was adequate with those changes. It's very similar to the original agreement but cleans up some of the misunderstandings. That agreement was signed in 2008 and it agrees to annual meetings and annual renew to fix any problems in that agreement.

So that's where we are today, is one of these annual meetings.

You've just received on the Federal side, some directions, from the Secretary as part of the review, we, of course, don't know what's going to happen with a new Governor and a new Commissioner, and so we'll be awaiting any further instructions that come on the State side.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK:  Pete.

MR. PROBASCO:  Thank you, Mr. Chair. This may be an appropriate time for, either your or one of the Board members, to share where we envision going in
the very near term with this MOU.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We've been discussing
some of the Secretary directives that came through
recently. I think before we do any discussions on the
MOU we've been charged with, in some sense, changing the
way the Federal Subsistence Board has been operating in
the last few years.

One of the higher recommendations, or
directives from the Secretary was to provide more
deerence to our relevant Regional Advisory Councils, our
RACs, throughout the state, we have 10 of them. And so
we've been searching for ways, here in the last day and
a half or so, to review at least that directive and some
others. And with that in mind, and if any other Board
members have other points to bring across, with that
deerence to the Regional Advisory Councils, we plan and
we hope it doesn't disrupt any timing that the State has,
but we would like to send out the changes that -- or
request the Regional Advisory Councils to review that
Memorandum of Agreement to see if they're, at that level,
any recommended changes that they would like to make to
our Board before we, in turn, make those changes on how
the Federal Subsistence Board operates.

Pete, if you've got more to add or any
other Board members from the Federal Subsistence Board.

MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. I think you
captured it very well, the directive we anticipate
going in the near future, from DC, a letter, that will
give direct direction to the Board on the various points
as a result of the Subsistence Review. However, I think
everybody has seen the news release and the news release
generally articulated some of the changes that the
Secretaries looking at.

Mr. Towarak pointed to the one asking the
Board to review deference given to the Councils.

In addition to that is a directive to
that is a directive from the Secretaries to take the
Memorandum of Understanding and put it back out to the
Councils so that they can have a more formal process to
review and comment on the MOU. The Board, this morning,
felt that time was important and are looking at possibly
as soon as this winter to do that. And we are seeking
input first from them on the MOU prior to the Board
taking action on any potential changes to the MOU, which
the Board would share with the State at that time.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Do any
other Federal Board members have any other comments
regarding our discussions this morning.

MS. K'EIT: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes.

MS. K'EIT: An additional topic related
to the MOU that we discussed was how the Board may need
to fit tribal consultation into the process of the
review.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: In some sense we felt
that it was timely to do this because of the directives
that the Secretaries came down with, along with the
election that we just had in the state and formalizing
the election of our new Governor, with him asking for
resignations from all of his Commissioners and he,
himself, taking some time to reorder his administration.
So I think it's timely that both sides are taking a seat
back to take a little more review of the MOU to get us to
the point where we think we will be in a few more months.

There is an interest to retain the MOU
and that, I think, is our long-term goal.

MR. JUDKINS: Yeah, Cliff Judkins with
the State Board of Game. Yeah, it's probably advisable
we could also send it out to our Advisory Committees and
allow them to review it at the same time.

I'd just like to comment that, you know,
basically this is an agreement that just stimulates our
Staffs to work together in their conservation concerns
and the subsistence concerns out there. I kind of want
to say, if it isn't broke, don't fix it, it seems it
works, today; I haven't heard any complaints, maybe I'm
missing something, but I haven't seen any problem within
the -- yeah, there's some problems with the people that
like to wordsmith but when you get into the people that
are actually having to work with the agreement, I don't
see any problems going on, I hadn't heard of any.

But I think that it's advisable, you know, to send it out to those Advisory Groups, we have 80 of them, I think, so it gets a pretty thorough review from our side, too, and then try and set some time limits on it so it doesn't go on forever and bring it back before you again with input from the other groups.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We'll take that suggestion and have our Staff work with the State Staff in finding a way to get it out the State Advisory; is that.....

MS. CUNNING: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. We send stuff out through all 82 Advisory Committees all the time and if we could work with your -- whoever's transmitting from your side, we'll be sure we have the same message that goes out to the 82 Advisory Committees.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Pete, have you got comments on that?

MR. PROBASCO: No, Mr. Chair, I agree.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. Pete will be our -- your contact on the Federal side for getting the information that we're going to send out to our RACs.

Pete.

John.

MR. HILSINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree. I think that that would be a great idea. It's a good opportunity to review it and get some feedback.

A couple suggestions, I guess, one thing that we might think about is some means of sharing the comments as they come back so that both sides can see the comments that come in.

Another thing that we thought of, and I don't know if this should happen before it goes out or after, but we did find one of the sections that we thought might benefit from a little bit different wording, and so we could talk about whether we would want to send that out as a suggestion, as a part of the review or just how we want to handle that. But we did note that there is some confusion that was not intended when the
MOU was written, but it would clarify that the Federal Program would work according to Federal law and the State Program would work according to State law, and the State wouldn't work according to Federal law and the Federal Program wouldn't work according to State law.

And so, you know, that's a suggestion maybe that might save some comment, because I think that was an issue with a lot of people, and we might actually make the process go a little bit smoother if we could clarify that before it went out.

Thank you.

And so, you know, that's a suggestion maybe that might save some comment, because I think that was an issue with a lot of people, and we might actually make the process go a little bit smoother if we could clarify that before it went out.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Pete, do you have anything.

MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. I think what Mr. Hilsinger is alluding to, that, both the Board and the State received, based on the initial MOU, once it was signed, comments from the public, some from Regional Advisory Councils and other entities, and it did focus on the need to clarify. I'm not too sure what language the State has, but that definitely was identified once the first draft was shared with the public, Councils, et cetera.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. With all of that said, where are we right now?

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there any other discussion that we want to take up at this point before we respectively go back to our Advisory Councils?

MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair. One point that I think would be helpful and that the Federal Board discussed this morning and then I think Tina did a great job, was giving a little bit of history on how we got to where we are now, so as we transmit the MOU for respective reviews, having a little bit of that history in the letter that accompanies the MOU, I think would be very helpful to the RACs and the Advisory Councils as they review this document.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Kristin.
MS. K'EIT: Mr. Chair, I have a procedural question. As we start talking about our next steps, the MOU does say that our parties agree to send out any policy and position statements related to the MOU are made by mutual consent of the parties, so I'm not really sure what that means or what that would look like. If anyone would care to elaborate on that.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Pete, you got anything. Go ahead, Pete.

MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. Ms. K'eit. I believe the intent of that section is that anything pertaining to the MOU, Ms. Pendleton spoke of a letter to accompany the review process; that letter would be done jointly and agreed upon so it isn't one side versus the other side independently sending out information -- just pertaining to the MOU, we do that jointly. So if, indeed, it's the wishes of the body here to send a letter along with maybe a briefing dealing with history, it would be a document done collectively and then endorsed by the signators.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Any other comments from anyone on the table here.

MR. HILSINGER: Mr. Chairman. I guess the only question I would have is if people would like to see that language now or how you would like to handle that. It just might help if people just kind of know what we're thinking. I don't know if we want to wordsmith it here, but we do have plenty of copies, and so if people wanted to see it now, while we're all together, that would certainly be possible.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: What's the wishes of the Board.

Go ahead, Pete.

MR. PROBASCO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not a Board member but I think it would be a benefit for the Board members to at least see from the State's perspective, an area that they think needs clarification. If nothing else it's just as an information exchange.

Mr. Chair.
MS. DOUGAN: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. DOUGAN: I agree. I think we could look at that and get a sense of what the State's thinking, but I wouldn't be in support of sending out any proposed language change along with the review. I think the MOU should go out as it is so that it does not appear we're trying to suggest certain change to our Advisory groups.

CHAIRMN TOWARAK: Is that agreeable with the rest of the Board.

MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair. That's agreeable for me.

CHAIRMN TOWARAK: Thank you.

(Board nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMN TOWARAK: Okay. We will plan on that then. We will go ahead and review what the State has and at least we'll be knowledgeable of what you've got so far.

(Pause)

CHAIRMN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. HILSINGER: Mr. Chairman. If the Board members look at the MOU on Page 3 near the top paragraph three, there's a paragraph that actually appeared in a very similar form in the original Interim Memorandum of Agreement, and it was carried over into the MOU in a little bit, I guess, kind of a streamlined form, it's a little bit shorter and tighter.

And it reads:

To provide a priority for subsistence uses of fish and wildlife resources and to allow for other uses of fish and wildlife resources when harvestable surpluses are sufficient consistent with ANILCA and Alaska Statute 16.05.258.
And so what we envisioned was striking that last clause: consistent with ANILCA and Alaska Statute 16.05.258 and replacing it so that it would say:

By the Federal Program consistent with ANILCA and by the State Program consistent with AS 16.05.258.

Just to clarify that the Federal Program would not be bound by State law and the State Program would not be bound by Federal law.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: That seems to be fairly straightforward. It clarifies the sentence. Any other comments from anyone around the table.

Did you have something?

MR. PROBASCO: Not on the language, Mr. Chair, but more on the process. As, we, on the Federal side go to the Regional Advisory Council and following on Ms. Pendleton's comment as far as a briefing on the history to the Regional Advisory Councils, I also would like to suggest since this is an MOU of both the State and the Federal side that, at least, when we go to our 10 Regional Advisory Councils, that a briefing such as this would be done jointly to the Councils, so the State can provide their perspective versus a Federal person trying to interpret that and do it jointly.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are there any objections to that.

(No objections)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If not, then we will use that process.

Go ahead.

MR. HILSINGER: Mr. Chairman. Not completely tongue and cheek, I think you heard that we have 80 Advisory Committees and so I might just ask if Mr. Probasco was envisioning a joint presentation to each one of those as well.
MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair. Mr. Hilsinger.
That's why I said, very carefully, as far as the Federal side. 82 Advisory Committees may be a daunting task in this short timeframe that we have.

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think we'll leave it to the Staff to work that out.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think the best way we could convey that information out to all of the users in Alaska is desirable on both sides. I think with the convent of the computers and the telephonic systems that we have in Alaska now it's -- there's other ways to get information out, so I think mechanically that process, I think we could leave to the Staff and I think we're all agreeable that we would like to get this information out to as many people as possible to review and make it come from the bottom up.

I don't see any heads shaking in objection to that. So if there's no objection to it, I'm going to leave the method of getting information out and conducting meetings to the Staff level of both sides -- on our side, anyway, with the State's concurrence.

MR. HILSINGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Mr. Webster.

MR. WEBSTER: Just a comment on the Memorandum of Understanding. I've seen the process go from the two governing entities being almost hostile to each other and since we've had this MOU signed, there's been a lot closer relationship with the Staff, the research department and the Boards themselves.

For instance, the Federal Board postponed a decision on mesh size on the Yukon until the State took up the entire Yukon River and that was just last year. So that was unheard of in the past. And I just wanted to make sure that everybody understands that, you know, this is just a document saying that we acknowledge each other and we'll be working closer in the future.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: It's more like a
prenuptial agreement instead of a marriage agreement.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: But, yeah, I understand what you're saying.

Any others.

MR. SPRAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a comment on the level of cooperation and how it's changed over time. I just recently came back from a Ketchikan Board of Game meeting. We were there for about a week. And there were a couple issues that we dealt with that were on State and State side and, you know, having been in this business for a little while now, not forever but a little while, it has really changed and I want to report that to the group.

We're seeing a higher level of cooperation and kind of agreements and understanding between the -- we had a member there from the RAC, the Southeast RAC, Mike Douville, if I remember correctly, the gentleman's name, and I talked to him at length and he was very cooperative. You know we had a couple issues there that we were trying to implement a goat hunt on Federal lands and there was kind of the issue about who was going to get the permits, and we talked about, well, this is an opportunity to split the permits, you know, not have a hassle over who was going to get all the -- you know, limited number of permits.

And, anyway, I just wanted to report to the group that, you know, I've certainly seen a major change, and it's a change for the good and I'm really glad to see that cooperation increase.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr. Spraker. And we, ourselves, had that -- somewhat of a similar discussion this morning, about the positive things that we're getting out of this MOU and the good things that have been coming out of it and, we, ourselves, want to see that continue.

We're just bound a little bit by some of the changes that are taking place on the Federal side. So we're trying to kill two birds with one stone and we think it's doable. And we appreciate the State's willingness to work with our timeline and move forward with it, with the intention of getting another MOU
Any other comments from any other Board members in regards to the MOU in general.

MS. CUNNING: Mr. Chairman. You said another MOU signed, are you saying, another MOU signed or clarifications, are there options in that final outcome?

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Well, yeah, I guess I was just thinking that there's going to be a request for changes on it and I have no idea what those might be, but I would assume, you know, if it's just a matter of tweaking the current MOU we won't need another one but if it comes out that there is major changes, you know, those, we'll have to see. So I didn't mean to impress one feeling or the other.

Any other comments anyone else would like to make.

Pete.

MR. PROBASCO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just on the process and, Tina, please jump in, but on the Federal side, if it is decided that we go forward either this -- I mean we are going to go forward, but if we decide as soon as this winter's meeting, then I see the tasks before my Staff and working through the Staff Committee on that side and then on the State side, to develop two documents that would accompany the MOU and that would be a letter explaining why we're going through this process, both from the Federal perspective and the State's perspective and then to also sort of take what Tina's swan song was and develop it into a briefing, I envision that once we have a draft that at our level agreed to, then we would send it out to the signatories for final approval.

Mr. Chair. Mr. Hilsinger.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is that everyone's understanding of the process that we're going to use?

(Boards nod affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. With that, is there anything else we need to discuss on the MOU.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If there isn't any, then that concludes our discussions, the communications will be in between the two of you at the Staff level.

MS. CUNNING: Mr. Chairman. That's fine. Just so you know, Jennifer Yuhas will be the coordinator for the Federal Subsistence Liaison Team, she's sitting in the front row. She will be assuming those responsibilities. Our coordinator position has been empty for quite awhile and I've been having to fill that as well as be the Commissioner's advisor on Federal issues, so it's been a double hat situation for awhile so I'm very glad to get a coordinator on board.

I just off -- unrelated to the MOU, because this is my last official meeting in the Federal subsistence arena, I would just like to share an observation of the changes I've seen since I've been involved, either directly or on the periphery of this issue since its inception in 1990. And one of the things that we witnessed early in the dual regulatory arena was initially a lot of very close cooperative work, but as the Federal Program became established there -- with some of the politics there have became some negatives. We even had a coordinator quit after a series of very nasty meetings in which there were derogatory comments, disrespect both from the public and from Federal Staff when they were there trying to provide data for the decisionmaking process and it was very uncomfortable. And this last year we had a coordinator quit right after a RAC meeting, in which he was abused, and that was an unfortunate situation, and it was rare, because most of the RACs in the last four or five years have been requesting our participation as much as possible. So we've been working very, very hard as a Department to be sure that we have wildlife and fisheries Staff present at every RAC meeting, and to be sure that they're working well in hand with the Federal Staff ahead of those meetings to be sure there's accurate information being provided, current updated reports. We're really working hard at it and it's been tough in a couple locations where we have either a public or certain members of RACs or certain Federal Staff that still carry a chip on their shoulder or think that the State is the evil empire.

So I'm so glad to see that has been dissipating in the last number of years. It's a much better arrangement now. There's very fair sharing of
information, a lot of research, a lot of cooperation
going on at all levels. We only have a couple residual
pockets we need to continue to work on.

So I appreciate the changes. It's a much
better world out there to work on and it's always to the
best for the resources and the resource users if we are
coordinating our efforts as much as possible.

So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Coming
from the user's side, myself, personally, on a personal
basis, I come from Unalakleet where I think 80 miles of
our Unalakleet River is part of the Federal Wild and
Scenic System, and then all of the lands surrounding that
are State lands, owned mostly by the village corporation,
and then beyond that it's Federal lands again, so we have
been very confused at times about some of the regulations
coming through. And I think part of my intent is to make
their lives easier and I think by sharing information,
which I have heard is -- and it's one of the bright spots
of this MOU, giving information to each other, for
ourselves to manage properly, has been, I think, one of
the bright sides I've seen so far on this MOU.

This is only my first meeting, but I look
forward to continued working with the State.

With that I will ask for a motion from
our Board to adjourn the meeting.

MS. PENDLETON: I motion that we adjourn
the meeting.

MS. DOUGAN: Second.

MS. MASICA: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
and the second, any discussion.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any, those
in favor of the motion say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those opposed, say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes. Thank you very much for attending our meeting.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
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