

PROPOSAL 1 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure Ketchikan Advisory Committee for game issues as follows:

Two years ago I approached the joint boards to split our committee. Maybe smaller number of seats to make a quorum possible for meeting on same issues. The boards turned idea down. We need some sort of shake up down here and once again I am asking for your help.

ISSUE: Advisory committee not meeting on game issues in Ketchikan.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo, no input from Ketchikan on game issues.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I rejected, after 36 years, thinking maybe I should forget these problems, but I do believe in the process and the opportunities it provides me, so I will hang in.

PROPOSED BY: Robert Jahnke

(HQ-07JB-001)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Robert Jahnek PC10

Anchorage AC6

*No one spoke For or Against,
"Internal issue that must be
deft with by the AC."*

↓
FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 2 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure advisory committees on western Prince of Wales Island as follows:

This proposal would create the "Western Prince of Wales Island Fish and Game Advisory Committee" by combining the Craig Advisory Committee, the Klawock Advisory Committee and the Hydaburg Advisory Committee.

ISSUE: The Craig Advisory Committee has been inactive since January 2000, the Klawock Advisory Committee has been inactive since 1998 and the Hydaburg Advisory Committee has not met since 1987. All of these communities are connected by a road system and in close proximity to each other. Craig is about 8 miles from Klawock and Hydaburg is about 35 miles from Klawock. These communities harvest the same fish stocks and game populations. The population of Craig is 1,417, Klawock has 780 residents and the population of Hydaburg is 137. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-011)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

← Seward AC13 "Inactive ACs"

"Klawock" is primarily Native; Hydaburg has its own culture. Craig is non-Natives.
Cont. "Respect the people from these areas," ~~the know the~~

↓
FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 3 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees on northern Prince of Wales Island and Kosciusko Island as follows:

This proposal would create a "Northern Prince of Wales Island/Kosciusko Advisory Committee" by combining the Edna Bay Advisory Committee and the Sumner Straits Advisory Committee.

Issue: The Sumner Straits Advisory Committee represents the community of Point Baker. Point Baker has a population of 22 people and the Advisory Committee has been inactive since 2002. Edna Bay, located on Kosciusko Island has a population of 41 and its Advisory Committee last met in June, 2004. These communities are about 40 miles apart and are NOT connected by road. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-012)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

**Anchorage AC6
Sumner Strait AC18
Edna Bay AC19**

Seward AC13

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # 

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 4 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the Ketchikan area as follows:

This proposal would create a new "Ketchikan/Saxman Advisory Committee" by combining the Ketchikan Advisory Committee and the Saxman Advisory Committee.

Issue: The Village of Saxman is adjacent to the City of Ketchikan. They share a school system and numerous city services. They harvest the same fish stocks and game populations. The Ketchikan Advisory Committee is active and has two seats reserved for residents of Saxman. Saxman has a population of 405 and its committee has been inactive since 1991. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-013)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Seward AC13

Anchorage AC6
Robert Jahnek PC10

use codified Regulations

RC42
"Lose AC, Lose Voice"

↓

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 5 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees on Northern Chichagof Island as follows:

Create a new "Northern Chichagof Island Advisory Committee" by combining the Pelican Advisory Committee and the Elfin Cove Advisory Committee.

Issue: The communities of Pelican and Elfin Cove are about 20 miles apart and they are not connected by road. Both committees are currently active. Elfin Cove has a population of 28 and Pelican has a population of 75. Both communities harvest the same game populations and fish stocks. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-014)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

Elfin Cove AC22

Pelican AC24

Both Active

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 6 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the Upper Lynn Canal Area as follows:

Create a new "Upper Lynn Canal Advisory Committee" by combining the Klukwan Advisory Committee with the Upper Lynn Canal Advisory Committee currently representing the communities of Haines and Skagway.

Issue: Klukwan is a community of 107 people located about 25 miles north of Haines on a paved road. Residents of Klukwan and Haines harvest the same game populations and fish stocks. Haines and Skagway fish the same marine waters. Klukwan has a population of 109 and its committee has been inactive since 1996. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-015)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Upper Lynn Canal AC1
Anchorage AC6

Seward AC13

*Loni Hirsch, Oppose. Number of voices contributing
more good better results.
Mike Turk, not Forwarded to Boards"*

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 7 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Create a Parks Highway Advisory Committee representing Big Lake to Trapper Creek as follows:

The creation of an advisory committee representing the Parks Highway corridor from Big Lake through Trapper Creek would allow greater participation by more citizens of the Valley area in the fish and game advisory process.

ISSUE: The Matanuska-Susitna Valley, an area the size of the state of West Virginia, is currently represented by only two advisory committees. Only the Mat Valley committee is located on the road system and is easily accessible. The Mt. Yenlo committee meets in Skwentna, which requires air access. The Mat-Su has the fastest growing population in the state and interest in the fish and game advisory process is increasing as a result. Distance to attend meetings is a concern. Thirteen of the present fifteen members of the Mat Valley committee live in the Wasilla and Palmer areas – only two members are from the Parks Highway corridor area. Travel to the meetings is a concern with one member driving 55 miles roundtrip and the other driving over 90 miles. The extended distance for traveling to meetings is limiting public participation.

The creation of an advisory committee representing the Parks Highway corridor from Big Lake through Trapper Creek would allow more public participation from citizens living along the road system in the Susitna Valley side of the Mat-Su.

By reducing time and travel cost commitments, this proposal will allow greater public participation in managing fish and game resources of the area.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Participation in the advisory committee process by residents of the Parks Highway corridor will continue to be limited because of the cost in both time and travel expenses to attend and work in this voluntary process.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The residents of the Parks Highway corridor from Big Lake through Trapper Creek would benefit from the opportunity for public participation in the fish and game regulatory process.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one should suffer from this expanded opportunity.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07JB-001)

FAVOR

**Anchorage AC6 (S/A)
Matanuska Valley AC5**

OPPOSE

Kenai/Soldotna AC14

7 Public Testimony.

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # 4

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 8 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Create a new Copper Basin Region Advisory Committee with designated seats for Ahtna villages as follows:

5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees.

...

(c) The following committees are identified as representing more than one community, or additionally, as having less than 125 members, and the following seats on the committees are designated for each community: Eight designated Ahtna Village seats and five members for the Tazlina Community and five members for the Glennallen Community on the Copper Basin Regional Advisory Committee.

ISSUE: The Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee would like the Joint Board of Fisheries and Game to have eight Ahtna Village designated seats on a newly created regional advisory committee entitled "Copper Basin Regional Advisory Committee". Instead of having a Copper Basin, Paxson, and Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road Advisory Committees, there would only be one regional advisory committee for the entire Copper Basin Region and surrounding communities.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The tribes within the Ahtna Region are not represented as well as can be. If there were eight representatives from the Ahtna Villages serving on a newly created Copper Basin Regional Advisory Committee, they would be better represented and likely participate more in a regional advisory committee.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The people in the Ahtna villages will be better represented by adding seats to a newly created Copper Basin Regional Advisory Committee.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. There will be better representation and participation on a newly created Copper Basin Regional Advisory Committee.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? No other solution.

PROPOSED BY: Ahtna Tene Nene' Subsistence Committee (SC-07JB-003)

FAVOR

Ahtna, Inc. PC7

Add 4 Copper River
1 Denali

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

2 Tok/Nabesna & Withdraw to 23

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 9 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Rename the Valdez Advisory Committee to Prince William Sound/Valdez Advisory Committee as follows:

The new regulations should rename the "Valdez Advisory Committee" to the "Prince William Sound/Valdez Advisory Committee."

ISSUE: The "Valdez Advisory Committee" title inadequately describes the region of concern for the committee.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Management board and the public will continue to be confused over this issue.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Citizens of Prince William Sound.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? While renaming the "Copper River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee" to "Cordova Advisory Committee" seemed most logical, it was rejected because it seemed unreasonable, and unlikely to actually achieve the goals of the Valdez Advisory Committee.

PROPOSED BY: Valdez Advisory Committee (SC-07JB-004)

FAVOR

Anchorafe AC6

OPPOSE

Ahtna, Inc. PC7

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # 4

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 10 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees on the Northern Kenai Peninsula as follows:

Create a new "Northwest Kenai Peninsula Advisory Committee" by combining the Kenai/Soldotna Advisory Committee with the Cooper Landing Advisory Committee.

Issue: The Kenai/Soldotna Advisory Committee represents the communities of Kenai, Soldotna, Nikiski and Sterling. Cooper Landing is located about 30 miles to the east of Sterling. The communities are connected by a paved highway. Cooper Landing has a population of 344. This 12 person advisory committee has one representative from Sterling and one from Soldotna. The primary focus of both of the advisory committees is the fisheries in the Kenai River. They share the same game populations. Both committees are active. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-016)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6
Cooper Landing AC4
Central Peninsula AC7
Kenai/Soldotna AC14

7 Public Testimony

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # 

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 11 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees on the Southern Kenai Peninsula as follows:

Create a new "Southwest Kenai Peninsula Advisory Committee" by combining the Homer Advisory Committee and the Central Peninsula Advisory Committee.

Issue: The Central Peninsula Advisory Committee represents the communities of Ninilchik (population 785) and Clam Gulch (population 172). The Homer Advisory Committee represents the communities of Homer and Anchor Point. All of these communities are located along a 50 mile stretch of paved highway. They deal with fish stocks in the lower Cook Inlet and Deep Creek, Ninilchik River and the Anchor River. They share the same game populations. Both committees are active. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-017)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

Homer AC3

Central Peninsula AC7

Kenai/Soldotna AC14

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # 

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 12 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the Nelchina Basin as follows:

Create a new "Nelchina Basin Advisory Committee" by combining the Cooper Basin Advisory Committee, the Paxson Advisory Committee and the Tok Cut Off/Nabesna Road Advisory Committee.

Issue: The Copper Basin Advisory Committee represents the communities of Glenallen, Copper Center, Gakona/Gulkana, Lake Louise, Tazlina, Kenney Lake and Chitna. The Tok Cut Off/Nabesna Road committee has members from Slana and Gakona. Paxson Advisory Committee has members from Paxson and Gakona. All of these communities are connected by paved road. The population of these communities is Glennallen (589), Copper Center (529), Gakona (63), Gulkana (195), Lake Louise (91), Tazlina (186), Kenney Lake (417), Chitna (110), Slana (103) and Paxson (37). The population for the entire Copper River census subarea is 3,493. All of the communities harvest the same game populations and fish stocks. All three of these committees are active. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-018)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6
Upper Tanana/40M AC11
Ahtna, Inc. PC7

NOT supported as a Committee
FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. #

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 13 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough as follows:

Option 1. Create a new "Mat/Su Advisory Committee" by combining the Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee with the Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee.

Option 2. Create a new "Tyonek/Skwentna Advisory Committee" by combining the Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee and the Tyonek Advisory Committee. Provide one or more seats for Talkeetna on the Mat/Su Advisory Committee.

Issue: The Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee represents the communities of Skwentna and Talkeetna with each community having 4 designated seats and 7 seats are undesignated. Currently, there are 9 members on the Mt. Yenlo Advisory Committee, none from Talkeetna, but they do have representatives with addresses in Big Lake, Willow, Wasilla and Anchorage. The population of the Skwentna area is ~~11~~ and some residents reside in the area on a seasonal basis. The Village of Tyonek has a population of 199. These residents hunt primarily in Unit 16B. Residents of the Skwentna area hunt primarily in Units 16A and 16B. Tyonek is about 50 miles south of Skwentna. These communities are not connected by a road. Skwentna is about 50 miles southwest of Talkeetna and the communities are not connected by road. The Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee has representatives from Palmer, Wasilla, Big Lake and Willow, but no seats are specifically designated for any town. Talkeetna is connected by road to most other communities in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, but Talkeetna is about 100 miles from Palmer. About 875 people live in the Talkeetna area. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-019)

FAVOR

Seward AC13
Mt. Yenlo AC2
Ahtna, Inc PC7

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6
Matanuska Valley AC5
Arthur Solvang PC5

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 14 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the Bristol Bay area as follows:

Create a new "Bristol Bay Advisory Committee" by combining the Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee (King Salmon, Pilot Point, Port Heiden, Ugashik and Egegik) with the Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee (Levelock, Naknek, South Naknek and King Salmon).

Issue: The Naknek/Kvichak Advisory Committee has no designated seats, but includes members from the four villages shown above. The Lower Bristol Bay Advisory Committee has designated seats for the communities of Egegik, Pilot Point, Port Heiden and Ugashik and it also has eight undesignated seats. Several residents of King Salmon serve on the Lower Bristol Bay and other King Salmon residents serve on the King Salmon/Kvichak Advisory Committee. The communities on both of these advisory committees harvest the same fish stock and game populations. The larger communities (King Salmon 420 people and Naknek 577) are 11 miles apart and connected by a paved road. The smaller communities are not road connected and vary in size from 54 to 89 people. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-024)

FAVOR

Seward AC13
Nushagak AC21

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6
Lake and Peninsula Borough PC22
Lower Bristol Bay AC25

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 15 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the False Pass area as follows:

Create a new "King Cove/False Pass Advisory Committee" by combining the False Pass Advisory Committee and the King Cove Advisory Committee.

Issue: King Cove and False Pass are located about 40 miles apart, they are not road connected. They harvest the same fish stocks and game populations. King Cove has a population of 723 and the population of False Pass is 63. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-025)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 16 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Change number of representatives for each village as follows:

The Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee will be made up of nine members, made up of one member from each of the following villages: Lower Kalskag, Upper Kalskag, Aniak, Chuathbaluk, Crooked Creek, Red Devil, Sleetmute, Stony River, and Lime Village.

ISSUE: On the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (CKAC), there are differing numbers of committee members from each village, and an undesignated seat, for a total of 15 members. The committee thinks this should be changed for several reasons. It is unfair and inequitable to have some villages with two or three votes, and others with only one vote. It is often difficult to get a quorum at meetings due to weather. It costs the state and committee members more revenue than if there were fewer members. This proposal will be unnecessary when the Joint Board creates two new committees from the existing CKAC [see next proposal]. The proposed committees have one member from each village.

By enhancing the effectiveness of the advisory committee system, villages will take more care to select their single member on the committee. Each member will participate in the knowledge that their vote and input are important. Villages will be encouraged to educate and groom alternates and others to take the place of present members when they step down.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be imbalanced representation on the advisory committee.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fish and wildlife populations, habitat, and all user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Division of the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee is the preferred remedy of committee members. [see next proposal]

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (I-07JB-004)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 17 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Split Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee into two committees as follows:

5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees; by the dissolution of the Central Kuskokwim Fish and Game Advisory Committee: “(a) The following local fish and game advisory committees are established:”

(4) “ In the Western Alaska Region: Lower Kalskag/Upper Kalskag/Aniak/Chuathbaluk/Crooked Creek...”

(6) “In the Interior Region: Red Devil/Sleetmute/Stony River/Lime Village...”

ISSUE: Subunit 19A is a large area by itself, without even considering all of Unit 19. Most of the villages lying in Unit 19 – are within 19A.

The dissolution of the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee, (CKAC) and the creation of two separate committees. The first/Upriver Committee is made up of one representative from each of the following villages – Red Devil, Sleetmute, Stony River, and Lime Village (the “upriver villages”). All of these villages, except Red Devil, lie within the Interior Alaska Resource Management Region. There is somewhat confusing border between these two management regions, that the committee urges the Boards to rectify.

The second/Downriver Committee is made up of one representative from each of the following villages – Lower Kalskag, Upper Kalskag, Aniak, Chuathbaluk, and Crooked Creek, (the “downriver villages”). These five villages lie within the Western Alaska Resource Management Region.

As stated in the Joint Board call for proposals, “to enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system, and where a change in committee structure would better facilitate resolving resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards”, we believe these new committees would do exactly that.

The residents of the four upriver villages do virtually all of their subsistence hunting, fishing and trapping within the upper drainages of Unit 19A, including the Holitna and Stony Rivers. Residents of these villages rarely travel downriver past the George River to pursue their subsistence activities, and have limited first-hand knowledge of fish and game conditions and issues in that part of 19A, which is mostly in the Western Alaska Region.

Similarly, residents of the downriver villages in Unit 19A have limited first-hand knowledge of fish and game conditions and issues in the upriver portion of 19A that lies above the George River, which is mostly in the Interior Region. Residents of these villages, who travel to the upriver portion of 19A, do so seasonally, and mainly for moose hunting and some sport fishing, and are not in the area year-round. The majority of their subsistence activities are naturally pursued near their respective villages. These nine villages are represented on the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee.

The Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee has become increasingly polarized on fish and game issues for several reasons, as evidenced by the recent split in the moose season regulations between upper and lower Unit 19A. At the March 2006 Board of Game meeting, due to their view that the moose population could handle no hunting pressure whatsoever, the Traditional Council representatives, (who are also CKAC reps), from Sleetmute and Stony River, advocated for the

Sleetmute and Department of Fish and Game proposals for closure, (rather than a registration hunt or Tier II), of at least the upriver portion of 19A. Committee members from Aniak and Chuathbaluk advocated for a Tier II hunt in the upriver portion of 19A and a registration hunt in the downriver portion. The Board of Game adopted the department proposal, which was supported by these traditional councils, as well as the Lime Village Traditional Council.

At that meeting department staff agreed that what locals from the upriver villages had been saying for several years in regard to the moose populations in upriver areas was correct, and an earlier closure would have been the best way to go, over the past years, rather than a registration hunt.

It took 7-9 hours, on two different days, of Board of Game time to resolve the moose season issues in Unit 19A. It also took the resources of individuals and village councils from small communities to get the problem resolved, that should/could have been taken care of at the advisory committee level.

Residents of the upriver village area have chosen to close moose hunting completely due the low moose population, while residents from the downriver villages preferred to continue a registration hunt.

CKAC members believe that it is important for the department, rather than Department of Natural Resources, to have over-riding management authority on the use and any development of the land and affected waters – particularly in this high subsistence use area, and that the health of the renewable resources and their habitat should be paramount to any other use.

Board of Game and Board of Fisheries could be confident that the representatives on both of these committees would advise and vote for what the residents of their respective areas believe is best for the resources and habitat in their areas.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The formation of two separate advisory committees will “enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system”. According to the following evaluation factors listed in 5 AAC 96.420;

- (1) Expansion of the CKAC would accomplish nothing, since there will continue to be unresolvable differences. Primary among these differences is what sort of industrial development is acceptable in the area, and whether the animal populations reach a level when there should be no harvest.
- (2) There is not enough representation on the CKAC from the upper portion of 19A to cover the issues from that part of this large geographic area. (All villages represented on the CKAC lie within 19A, and all but Lime Village is on the Kuskokwim River).
- (3) Local residents in both committees would most certainly be there to participate due to the fact that they would know that their one vote would have more weight on the committee and could help to directly affect the health and sustainability of fish and wildlife resources for the area they live in, and are cost familiar with.
- (4) Most of the people who live in these villages live there year round and are well acquainted with what is happening in regard to fish and wildlife in their respective areas.
- (5) Logistically it would be far easier for committee members to attend meetings, since they are comparatively close to each other, and would not have to rely on airplanes and decent weather to travel long distances to get to meetings. This would also save the state money on transportation to and from meetings. There were often meetings with no quorum or a quorum made up of the lower river villages, closer to Aniak, which is the area hub. A

large number of committee meetings have always taken place in Aniak, since that is where commercial air service is accessed for travel to all of the villages represented on the committee, except Lime Village. There have been quite a few meetings planned where not enough members showed up to make up a quorum. This has been a waste of revenue and time for the state as well as committee members.

- (6) The new committees would enhance participation in the decision-making process as is stated above in #3. At the March 2006 Board of Game meeting, representatives from upriver communities testified in support of a closure for moose hunting, which is the main subsistence resource other than fish. This voluntary closure for moose hunting was done in the hope that moose numbers will increase to former healthy levels, sufficient to meet the needs of all consumer groups. The villages in upper 19A are more rural, remote, and more dependent on subsistence, than some of the other villages that are closer to the hub – Aniak. Downriver communities voted to retain the registration hunt in the downriver portion of 19A, because they believed in providing as much hunting opportunity as possible. Both groups advocated strongly for their views on how moose and hunting seasons should be managed in their area. There was participation from committee representatives and villagers from both sides of the issue.
- (7) This proposal is being submitted and recommended by the Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee, and has its unanimous support.
- (8) Already addressed – (see 2; “what is the problem you would like the joint board to address?”) if the committees were not to be created, there would continue to be irreconcilable divisions between upriver and downriver 19A on what would be the best approaches for again gaining sustainable harvest and habitat protection. At this time, this is especially important in regard to moose. There would also continue to be issues that affect either the downriver or the upriver area of 19A, where the representatives from within the area affected by an issue will be outvoted. The upriver portion of 19A has fewer villages with fewer residents in them than most lower river 19A villages. They have often been outvoted on crucial issues that affect the area they live in and the animals they are the most dependent on. There is a different topography, different animal movement patterns, and human dependence levels and use patterns between upper and lower 19A. There are fundamental differing views and opinions, between upriver and downriver villages in regard to what types of industrial development are acceptable and will not be detrimental to fish, wildlife, and habitat in the area – particularly within 19A. As an illustration, (refer to numbers 6 & 7 also), due to these differences and divisions, the BOG spent seven hours one day, and two hours the next day wading through issue, and to arrive at a decision on moose hunting seasons in 19A. These issues could have been resolved at the advisory committee level, and the state, people and villages involved could have saved much time and money, had there been two separate committees.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Fish and wildlife populations, habitat, and all consumer user groups.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Divide Unit 19A into two separate Game Management Units.

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

Sleetmute Traditional Council PC8
Stony River Traditional Council PC9
Lime Village Traditional Council PC23

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 18 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees on the North Slope as follows:

Create a new "North Slope Advisory Committee" by combining the Eastern Arctic Advisory Committee (Kaktovik, Anaktuvuk Pass, and Prudhoe Bay) and the Western Arctic Advisory Committee (Barrow, Point Hope, Point Lay, Wainwright and Atkasak).

Issue: All of these communities are members of the North Slope Borough Wildlife Management Committee. They already met one a year and have expressed an interest in meeting more often as an official state-sponsored committee. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-026)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 19 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the Middle Nenana River Area as follows:

Create a new "Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee" by combining the Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee (Healy, Clear, and McKinley Village) with the Denali Advisory Committee (Cantwell).

Issue: Cantwell has a population of 218 and is located about 20 miles from McKinley Village and 40 miles from Healy. A paved road connects all of the communities and residents of these communities hunt and fish in the same game populations and fish stocks. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-020)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

**Anchorage AC6
Middle Nenana River AC9
Ahtna, Inc. PC7**

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 20 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the area west of Denali National Park as follows:

Dissolve the Lake Minchumina Advisory Committee and offer this community a seat on the McGrath Advisory Committee.

Issue: The Lake Minchumina community has 19 residents and their advisory committee has been inactive since 2000. This community hunts the same game populations as residents of the McGrath area. This change would address a committee that has been inactive for two or more years.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-021)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 21 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the Middle Yukon River area as follows:

Create a new "Middle Yukon River Advisory Committee" by combining the Ruby Advisory Committee with the Middle Yukon River Advisory Committee.

Issue: The Middle Yukon River Advisory Committee represents the communities of Galena, Nulato, Kaltag and Koyukuk. The population of Galena is 654, Nulato is 310, Kaltag 227 and Koyukuk has a population of 97. Galena is about 40 miles from Ruby. Ruby has a population of 185. All of these towns are located on the Yukon River. They share fish stocks and harvest similar game populations. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-022)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

OPPOSE

**Anchorage AC6
Ruby AC12**

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 22 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Restructure the fish and game advisory committees in the Lower Tanana River as follows:

Create a "Lower Tanana River Advisory Committee" by combining the Tanana/Manley/Rampart Advisory Committee with the Nenana/Minto Advisory Committee.

Issue: All of these communities (except Rampart) are located along or near the lower Tanana River and harvest the same fish stocks. Rampart, a community of 16 people is located up the Yukon River a few miles from Tanana. Tanana is located at the confluence of the Yukon and Tanana Rivers and has a population of 281 people. Manley is located up Tanana River and has a population of 74 people. This change would enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system by better facilitating the resolution of resource issues at the local level before coming to the boards.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-023)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Seward AC13

Anchorage AC6

Minto-Nenana River AC8

Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 23 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. Reassign the undesignated seats on advisory committees where multiple communities are represented as follows:

5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees.

...

(c) The following committees are identified as representing more than one community, or, additionally, as having less than 15 members, and the following seats on the committee are designated for each community:

(1) in the Southeast Alaska Region:

(A) Upper Lynn Canal *
Haines 8 representatives
Skagway 2 representatives
Klukwan 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 4 REPRESENTATIVES]

(B) Icy Straits
Hoonah 9 representatives
Gustavus 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 4 REPRESENTATIVES]

(C) Ketchikan *
Saxman 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 13 REPRESENTATIVES]

(D) Saxman *
Saxman 6 representatives
Ketchikan 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 1 REPRESENTATIVE]

(E) Edna Bay (7 members) *
Edna Bay 6 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 1 REPRESENTATIVE]
Amendment to
Positive of the Committee

(F) East Prince of Wales
Thorne Bay 1 representative
Coffman Cove 1 representative
Whale Pass 1 representative
Kassan 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 11 REPRESENTATIVES]

(2) in the Southcentral Alaska Region

(3) in the Southwest Alaska Region:

(C) Lake Iliamna
Iliamna 3 representatives

South Central
Copper Basin (+4)
Tazlina +1
Copper Center +1
Gulconda/In Kana +2
Contwell/Denali
Ahtna Contwell +1
Tok/Nabesna +1
2-1 Chistochina
1 Mentasta

Talkeetna 4
Skwentna 4
Undesignated 7

Matt Valley

Prop 48 Ahtna +4
Copper River
Denali
Tok/Nabesna

Nondalton 2 representatives
Pedro Bay 1 representative
Kokhanok 1 representative
Igiugig 1 representative
Newhalen 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 6 REPRESENTATIVES]

(D) Lower Bristol Bay *
Ugashik 1 representative
Egegik 2 representatives
Pilot Point 2 representatives
Port Heiden 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 8 REPRESENTATIVES]

(E) Nushagak
Dillingham 5 representatives
Clarks Point 1 representative
Ekwok 1 representative
New Stuyahok 1 representative
Koliganek 1 representative
Aleknagik 1 representative
Togiak 1 representative
Portage Creek 1 representative
Manokotak 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 2 REPRESENTATIVES]

(F) Togiak
Togiak 3 representatives
Manokotak 3 representatives
Twin Hills 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 8 REPRESENTATIVES]

(4) in the Western Alaska Region:

(A) Central Bering Sea
Chevak 1 representative
Chefornak 1 representative
Goodnews Bay 1 representative
Kipnuk 1 representative
Kongiganak 1 representative
Kwigillingok 1 representative
Mekoryuk 1 representative
Newtok 1 representative
Nightmute 1 representative
Platinum 1 representative
Quinhagak 1 representative
Toksook Bay 1 representative
Tanunak 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 2 REPRESENTATIVES]

...

(C) Central Kuskokwim *
Sleetmute 3 representatives
Crooked Creek 2 representatives
Lime Village 2 representatives
Aniak 2 representatives
Chuathbaluk 1 representative
Lower Kalskag 1 representative
Upper Kalskag 1 representative
Red Devil 1 representative
Stoney River 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 1 REPRESENTATIVE]

(D) Lower Yukon
Marshall 1 representative
Russian Mission 1 representative
St. Marys 1 representative
Andreafski 1 representative
Mountain Village 1 representative
Sheldons Point 1 representative
Scammon Bay 1 representative
Alakanuk 1 representative
Pilot Station 1 representative
Kotlik 1 representative
Emmonak 1 representative
Hooper Bay 1 representative
Pitkas Point 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 2 REPRESENTATIVES]

(5) in the Arctic Alaska Region:

(A) Northern Norton Sound
Nome 6 representatives
Elim 1 representative
Wales 1 representative
Golovin 1 representative
City of White Mountain 1 representative
Shishmaref 1 representative
Teller 1 representative
Brevig Mission 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 2 REPRESENTATIVES]

(B) Northern Seward Peninsula
Buckland 3 representatives
Selawik 2 representatives
Deering 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 8 REPRESENTATIVES]

(C) Upper Kobuk

Ambler 3 representatives
Shungnak 1 representative
Kobuk 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 10 REPRESENTATIVES]

(D) Lower Kobuk
Noorvik 3 representatives
Kiana 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 10 REPRESENTATIVES]

(E) Noatak/Kivalina
Noatak 3 representatives
Kivalina 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 10 REPRESENTATIVES]

(F) Western Arctic *
Barrow 2 representatives
Point Hope 1 representative
Point Lay 1 representative
Wainwright 1 representative
Atkasuk 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 9 REPRESENTATIVES]

...
(H) Southern Norton Sound
Unalakleet 6 representatives
St. Michael 2 representatives
Shaktoolik 2 representatives
Stebbins 2 representatives
Koyuk 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 1 REPRESENTATIVE]

(6) in the Interior Alaska Region:

(A) McGrath *
McGrath 6 representatives
Nikolai 3 representatives
Telida 1 representative
Takotna 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 3 REPRESENTATIVES]

(B) Middle Nenana River *
Healy 5 representatives
Clear 4 representatives
McKinley Village 2 representatives
Kantishna 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 3 REPRESENTATIVES]

(C) Upper Tanana/Forty Mile (9 members)
Tok 3 representatives

Northway 1 representative
Tetlin 1 representative
Dot Lake 1 representative
Tanacross 1 representative
Healy Lake 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 1 REPRESENTATIVE]

...

(E) Tanana/Rampart/Manley (9 members) *
Manley Hot Springs 2 representatives
Rampart 3 representatives
Tanana 3 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 1 REPRESENTATIVE]

(F) Middle Yukon *
Galena 4 representatives
Kaltag 4 representatives
Nulato 3 representatives
Koyukuk 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 3 REPRESENTATIVES]

(G) Koyukuk River
Allakaket 3 representatives
Huslia 3 representatives
Hughes 2 representatives
Alatna 2 representatives
Bettles 2 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 3 REPRESENTATIVES]

(H) Grayling/Anvik/Shageluk/Holy Cross (9 members)
Holy Cross 3 representatives
Grayling 2 representatives
Anvik 1 representative
Shageluk 1 representative
[UNDESIGNATED 2 REPRESENTATIVES]

(I) Minto/Nenana *
Nenana 5 representatives
Minto 5 representatives
[UNDESIGNATED 1 REPRESENTATIVE]

...

* Note, committee composition also addressed in another proposal.

ISSUE: There is uncertainty about which area residents are eligible to hold the undesignated seats and where to hold the elections for undesignated seats. Often the undesignated seat goes to the community with the largest population or the community in which the election is held. In some cases, the seat goes unused. This has lead to frustration on the part of advisory committee members and has lead to a seat imbalance for some committees. Assigning these seats to specific communities at the recommendation of the advisory committee will reduce this area of confusion.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued uncertainty over committee makeup and where to hold elections for these seats.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All participants of the advisory committee system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? None.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07F-005)

FAVOR

Seward AC13

Middle Nenana River AC9 (S/A)

Kenai/Soldotna AC14

Nushagak AC21

Northern Norton Sound AC23

OPPOSE

Upper Lynn Canal AC1

Anchorage AC6

Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8

Koyukuk River AC10

Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11

Edna Bay AC19

Ahtna, Inc. PC7

Lower Bristol Bay AC25

Support, good idea.

23 Appears as deletion,

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 24 - 5 AAC 96.021. Establishment of advisory committees. 96.060. Uniform rules of operation. Institute a "town hall" system as follows:

Every voting age area resident in attendance at a meeting may be a committee member with no upper number limit to the number of committee member. A "town hall" type system would be followed.

ISSUE: There is a flaw in the advisory committee system. The election process can lead to a form of "tyranny of the majority" and subject the intent of the system. There is no mechanism to ensure a wide range of fish and wildlife user groups having representation. A majority of attendance at an election can elect a slate of candidates that are of like mind, leaving no representation for many other user groups. For instance, in some areas, while all members may be fine people and sportsmen, it is possible that no one would get elected if he/she was not mainstream and were to advocate say an archery-only season or a non-motorized area, or say were in favor of a subsistence priority or not in favor of land and shoot hunting, or say if he/she was a Native or commercial fisherman. Many committee votes are unanimous while in attendance are members of the public who have not been elected whose opinions are not represented nor reflected in the vote.

This would give credibility to the advisory system that it now lacks.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The credibility of the advisory committees is at risk.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Those who would like a better system and those who are not being represented now.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those who like being able to control the system.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? I considered appointed positions but that seemed too cumbersome and subject to weakness.

PROPOSED BY: Dan Elliott

(HQ-07JB-002)

FAVOR

Elfin Cove AC22

OPPOSE

**Upper Lynn Canal AC1
Anchorage AC6
Homer AC3
Cooper Landing AC4
Matanuska Valley AC5
Minto-Nenana AC8
Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8
Koyukuk River AC10
Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11
Central Peninsula AC7
Kenai/Soldotna AC14
Delta AC17
Fairbanks AC15**

**GASH AAC16
Ahtna, Inc PC7
Nushagak AC21
Lower Bristol Bay AC25**

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 25 - 5 AAC 96.040. Qualifications for members. Add to qualification of members as follows:

5 AAC 96.040. Qualifications for members.

To qualify for membership on a committee, a candidate must write a letter to the committee they are applying for membership of that shows they have knowledge of and experience with the fish and wildlife resources and their uses in the area, and have a reputation within the community consistent with the responsibilities of committee membership.

ISSUE: Qualifications for members. A letter from an advisory committee candidate declaring their experience should be sufficient since the joint board is required to confirm advisory committee members:

5 AAC 96.060 Uniform rules of operation.

(e). Membership.

(2) The joint board will appoint the original five members of each committee. An additional member will be confirmed by the joint board from names submitted to it after a committee election.

(5) A newly-elected or re-elected member loses membership status if he or she fails to submit a new member form within 14 days after the election, or if his or her confirmation is refused by the joint board.

The Fairbanks Advisory Committee is coordinating a joint meeting with other advisory committees in an effort to provide more reasonable opportunity for public participation in providing the Joint Board with proposals to enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system. The input from a joint advisory committee meeting is anticipated to be invaluable to the Joint Board as many of the expected advisory committee members who will attend this meeting have been involved in this process for many years and are, to an extent, subject matter experts on this system. The anticipated outcome is proposals for the Joint Boards consideration that facilitate a more effective Advisory Committee and Regional Fish and Game Council system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo remains.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If recommendations from the joint advisory committees are followed all of Alaska's citizens should benefit from a more effective Advisory Committee/Regional Fish and Game Counsel system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to requesting an extension of the proposal deadline. This was dismissed as board support staff stated it was not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer

(I-07JB-011)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Upper Lynn Canal AC1

Anchorage AC6

Homer AC3

Matanuska Valley AC5

Minto-Nenana River AC8

Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8

Koyukuk River AC10

Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11

Central Peninsula AC7

Kenai/Soldotna AC14

Delta AC17

Fairbanks AC15

GASH AC16

Elfin Cove AC22

Nushagak AC21

Northern Norton Sound AC23

Mike TinkerPC20

Ahtna, Inc. PC7

Lower Bristol Bay AC25

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

Note: The following proposal was deferred from the March 21, 2006 Joint Board meeting. The proposal presented here incorporates amendments previously adopted by the board.

PROPOSAL 26 - 5 AAC 96.040. Qualifications for members. Modify the qualification for members as follows:

5 AAC 96.040. Qualifications for members. To qualify for membership on a committee, a candidate

(1) must be a voting-age resident of the area of committee jurisdiction under 5 AAC 97.005,

(2) must have knowledge of and experience with the fish and wildlife resources and their uses in the area, [AND HAVE A REPUTATION WITHIN THE COMMUNITY CONSISTENT WITH THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP]

(3) may not be a member of another fish and game advisory committee,

(4) may not have either been convicted of:

(A) a violation of a state hunting, sport fishing, subsistence fishing, or personal use fishing statute or regulation within the last five years for which the person was fined more than \$1,000, unsuspended, or imprisoned for more than five days;

(B) a commercial fishing violation within the last five years for which the person was fined more than \$3,000, unsuspended;

(C) a felony within the last five years; or

(D) a felony offense against the person under AS 11.41 (offenses against the person) within the last 10 years;

(5) may not be subject to a suspension or revocation of the candidate's right to obtain a hunting or fishing license in this state or another state.

ISSUE: The advisory committee system has been a longstanding, highly respected system that plays a key role in Alaska's fish and game resource regulatory process. This proposal aligns membership qualification regulations with those for other state boards. It also eliminates the confusion and concern of persons serving on advisory committees who do not live in the area of committee jurisdiction.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Persons who do not even live in the area of committee jurisdiction will be able to represent the area on the committee and vote on recommendations to the boards. Persons will be able to serve on more than one committee. Those with material and serious criminal convictions will be able to serve on committees, including serving as officers and attending board meetings as official spokespersons for the committee and local communities, lowering the high standard that Alaskans expect of elected members representing the public.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The boards and the integrity of the regulatory process itself because only local residents without serious criminal records will be official spokespersons for the local advisory committees.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Non-locals and convicted felons who would like to participate on the committees. Persons who would like to serve on more than one advisory committee at the same time.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? The status quo, which seems unsatisfactory and inconsistent with the idea of encouraging local resident participation in the advisory committee process and ensuring that only those without serious criminal records be official spokespersons for local areas.

PROPOSED BY: Alaska Department of Fish and Game

(HQ-07JB-028)

FAVOR

Upper Lynn Canal AC1

Homer AC3(S/A)

Matanuska Valley AC5(S/A)

Kenai/Soldotna AC14(S/A)

Ahtna, Inc. PC7

Nushagak AC21 (S/A)

Elfin Cove AC22

Chugach State Park Citizens' Advisory Board PC16

Anchorage AC6

Cooper Landing AC4

OPPOSE

Minto-Nenana AC8

Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8

Middle Nenana River AC9

Koyukuk River AC10

Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11

Central Penunsula AC7

Delta AC17

Fairbanks AC15

GASH AC16

Mike Tinker PC20

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 27 - 5 AAC 96.050. Functions of local fish and game advisory committees.
Delete reference to regional councils as follows:

5 AAC 96.050. Functions of local fish and game advisory committees. A committee may:

- (1) Develop regulatory proposals for submission to the appropriate board;
- (2) Evaluate regulatory proposals submitted to them and make recommendations to the appropriate board;
- (3) Provide a local forum for fish and wildlife conservation and use, including any matter related to fish and wildlife habitat;
- [(4) ADVISE THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL COUNCIL REGARDING THE CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE OF FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES;
- (5) WORK WITH THE APPROPRIATE REGIONAL COUNCIL TO DEVELOP SUBSISTENCE MANAGEMENT PLANS AND HARVEST STRATEGY PROPOSALS; AND]
- (6) Cooperate and consult with interested persons and organizations, including government agencies, to accomplish (1) – (5) of this section.

ISSUE: Functions of local fish and game advisory committees. I would like to see the Regional Councils reestablished or the reference to them removed altogether, and then the AC assume this function.

The Fairbanks Advisory Committee is coordinating a joint meeting with other advisory committees in an effort to provide more reasonable opportunity for public participation in providing the Joint Board with proposals to enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system. The input from a joint advisory committee meeting is anticipated to be invaluable to the Joint Board as many of the expected advisory committee members who will attend this meeting have been involved in this process for many years and are, to an extent, subject matter experts on this system. The anticipated outcome is proposals for the Joint Boards consideration that facilitate a more effective Advisory Committee and Regional Fish and Game Council system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo remains.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If recommendations from the joint ACs are followed all of Alaska's citizens should benefit from a more effective Advisory Committee/Regional Fish and Game Counsel system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to requesting an extension of the proposal deadline. This was dismissed as board support staff stated it was not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer

(I-07JB-012)

FAVOR

Upper Lynn Canal AC1

Cooper Landing AC4
Matanuska Valley AC5

OPPOSE

Anchorage AC6

Homer AC3

Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11

Central Peninsula AC7

Kenai/Soldotna AC14
Fairbanks AC15
Ahtna, Inc. PC7

Lower Bristol Bay AC25

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 28 - 5 AAC 96.060. Uniform rules of operation. Designate one seat for each user group as follows:

Every advisory committee must have at least one seat specifically designated for every user group that exists in the region and no one but a representative for that user group can sit in that specifically designated seat at any time. If there is no one interested or available to occupy a particular seat for a particular user group, then that seat remains unfilled until someone from that user group becomes available.

ISSUE: Advisory committees becoming special interest groups. One majority user group effectively eliminating any representation of any other user group. Also, advisory committee members being elected as a representative for a user group that they do not represent, or changing status with that user group during their service.

My proposal drastically improves the entire advisory committee process. My proposal eliminates loop-holes in present law that allows advisory committees to operate as single user group committees, or special interest committees as many see them today.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There will continue to be absolutely no representation on ACs for all the user groups in many areas. The advisory committee system will continue to not function in the spirit of the law. Some advisory committees will continue to be completely dysfunctional and have no credibility with the Boards of Game and Fisheries and with the legislature.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone in the state because advisory committees will operate not only technically legal, but also in the true spirit of what the law was originally intended to be.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Those members of user groups who have eliminated advisory committee representation of other user groups.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Statute indicating which user groups will have seats. Rejected because of course some areas do not have specific user groups in their area. But present system does not even allow representation of user groups that are there. Also could do like recent Federal Subsistence Board response to same problem. Subsistence Board mandated 30 percent representation of user groups other than subsistence on regional advisory committees.

PROPOSED BY: George Siavelis

(HQ-07JB-006)

FAVOR

Chugach State Park Citizens' Advisory Board PC16

OPPOSE

**Upper Lynn Canal AC1
Anchorage AC6
Homer AC3
Cooper Landing AC4
Matanuska Valley AC5
Middle Nenana River AC9
Koyukuk River AC10
Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11
Central Peninsula AC7
Delta AC17
Fairbanks AC15
Ahtna, Inc. PC7
Northern Norton Sound AC23
Lower Bristol Bay AC25**

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 29 - 5 AAC 96.060. Uniform rules of operation. Allow advisory committees to modify procedures as follows:

5 AAC 96.060. Uniform rules of operation.

...

(o) Meetings.

(1) Regular meeting. A committee shall meet at least twice a year to remain active under 5 AAC 96.450 A committee may meet at times appropriate to the process described in 5 AAC 96.610 and at other times to formulate regulatory proposals, review and comment on proposals, and consider matters appropriate to the committee's functions under 5 AAC 96.050. A chairman or a majority of the full committee membership may call a regular meeting. **A committee will, in its discretion, modify the procedures set out in 5 AAC 96.060 in conjunction with any regular meeting, if to do so would enhance public, committee, or council participation in the committee process.**

ISSUE: Uniform rules of operation. Committees need to have the latitude to adapt the process if it will enhance public participation.

The Fairbanks AC is coordinating a Joint AC meeting in an effort to provide more reasonable opportunity for public participation in providing the Joint Board with proposals to enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system. The input from a Joint AC Meeting is anticipated to be invaluable to the Joint Board as many of the expected AC members who will attend this meeting have been involved in this process for many years and are to an extent subject matter experts on this system. The anticipated outcome is proposals for the Joint Boards consideration that facilitate a more effective Advisory Committee and Regional Fish and Game Council System.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo remains.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If recommendations from the joint ACs are followed all of Alaska's citizens should benefit from a more effective Advisory Committee / Regional Fish and Game Counsel System.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to requesting an extension of the proposal deadline. This was dismissed as board support staff stated it was not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer

(I-07JB-013)

FAVOR

Anchorage AC6

OPPOSE

**Matanuska Valley AC5
Central Peninsula AC7
Fairbanks AC15
Ahtna, Inc. PC7
Lower Bristol Bay AC25**

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 30 - 5 AAC 96.420. Review of request for local fish and game advisory committees. Delete logistics as a factor in establishing new advisory committees as follows:

5 AAC 96.420. Review of request for local fish and game advisory committees. The joint board will review requests to create committees. Factors that it will evaluate include:

- (1) whether an existing committee could be expanded to include members who represent the interest of the persons making the request;
- (2) whether representation of all user groups on existing committees in the area is adequate;
- (3) whether residents of the local area are likely to participate actively on the proposed committee;
- (4) whether there are likely to be enough qualified people interested in serving on the proposed committee;
- [(5) WHETHER THE LOGISTICAL PROBLEMS WOULD MAKE IT DIFFICULT TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO THE PROPOSED COMMITTEE;]
- (6) whether the proposed committee would enhance participation in the decision-making process;
- (7) the recommendation of the appropriate council;
- (8) the efficiency of existing committees.

ISSUE: Review of requests for local fish and game advisory committees. I do not believe that difficult logistics is an acceptable reason for denying an AC request. In this modern age of communication there are very few areas that logistics can not be overcome in a cost effective manner.

The Fairbanks Advisory Committee is coordinating a joint meeting with other advisory committees in an effort to provide more reasonable opportunity for public participation in providing the Joint Board with proposals to enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system. The input from a joint advisory committee meeting is anticipated to be invaluable to the Joint Board as many of the expected advisory committee members who will attend this meeting have been involved in this process for many years and are, to an extent, subject matter experts on this system. The anticipated outcome is proposals for the Joint Boards consideration that facilitate a more effective Advisory Committee and Regional Fish and Game Council system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo remains.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If recommendations from the joint ACs are followed all of Alaska's citizens should benefit from a more effective Advisory Committee/Regional Fish and Game Council system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to requesting an extension of the proposal deadline. This was dismissed as board support staff stated it was not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer

(I-07JB-022)

FAVOR

Fairbanks AC15 (S/A)

OPPOSE

Upper Lynn Canal AC1

Anchorage AC6

Homer AC3

Matanuska Valley AC5

Koyukuk River AC10

Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11

Central Peninsula AC7

Kenai/Soldotna AC14

Ahtna, Inc. PC7

Lower Bristol Bay AC25

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 31 - 5 AAC 96.440. Board assistance. Require board to schedule meetings as follows:

5 AAC 96.440. Board assistance.

The boards will provide information regarding board meetings to committees so that committees may plan maximum participation in the boards' deliberations **and schedule meetings with the public to provide them an opportunity to provide input.** In addition, a board may request a committee to meet and to formulate recommendations on a subject or issue identified by the board.

ISSUE: Board assistance. ACs are representatives of their community, and it is important that they be allowed sufficient time to collect public comment for the boards consideration.

The Fairbanks AC is coordinating a Joint AC meeting in an effort to provide more reasonable opportunity for public participation in providing the Joint Board with proposals to enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system. The input from a Joint AC meeting is anticipated to be invaluable to the Joint Board as many of the expected AC members who will attend this meeting have been involved in the process for many years and are to an extent subject matter experts on this system. The anticipated outcome is proposals for the Joint Boards consideration that facilitate a more effective Advisory Committee and Regional Fish and Game Council System.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo remains.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If recommendations from the joint ACs are followed all of Alaska's citizens should benefit from a more effective Advisory Committee/Regional Fish and Game Counsel System.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to requesting an extension of the proposal deadline. This was dismissed as board support staff stated it was not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer

(I-07JB-023)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

**Matanuska Valley AC5
Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11
Central Peninsula AC7
Ahtna, Inc. PC7
Lower Bristol Bay AC25**

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 32 - 5 AAC 96.450. Committee status and change of status. Reduce standard for active status to one meeting per year as follows:

5 AAC 96.450. Committee status and change of status.

- (a) A committee is active if it forwards minutes from at least one [TWO] meetings per year to the appropriate regional office of the division of boards.
- (b) The joint board will, in its discretion, place a committee on an inactive list by committee request or joint board action. The committee may reactivate by holding a meeting and informing the joint board of its active status through committee minutes.
- (c) Committees may merge if each affected committee votes to request merger, and if the boards determine that the merger should occur, after considering the factors set out in 5 AAC 96.420.
- (d) The joint board will, in its discretion, merge an inactive committee with an active committee if the joint board gives the committees notice of the proposed merger, if the inactive committee does not express an intention to reactivate or if it does not do so within a reasonable time after notice, and if the joint board determines that the merger should occur, after considering the factors in 5 AAC 96.420.
- (e) The joint board will, in its discretion, dissolve a committee if the committee has been inactive for two years and fails to respond to joint board inquiries about its desire to remain in existence.
- (f) The joint board will, in its discretion, dissolve a committee for failure to act in accordance with the provisions of 5 AAC 96 and 5 AAC 97.

ISSUE: Committee status and change of status. It is difficult for many advisory committees to meet twice a year.

The Fairbanks Advisory Committee is coordinating a joint meeting with other advisory committees in an effort to provide more reasonable opportunity for public participation in providing the Joint Board with proposals to enhance the effectiveness of the advisory committee system. The input from a joint advisory committee meeting is anticipated to be invaluable to the Joint Board as many of the expected advisory committee members who will attend this meeting have been involved in this process for many years and are, to an extent, subject matter experts on this system. The anticipated outcome is proposals for the Joint Boards consideration that facilitate a more effective Advisory Committee and Regional Fish and Game Council system.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Status quo remains.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? If recommendations from the joint advisory committees are followed all of Alaska's citizens should benefit from a more effective Advisory Committee/Regional Fish and Game Counsel system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Consideration was given to requesting an extension of the proposal deadline. This was dismissed as board support staff stated it was not an option.

PROPOSED BY: Raymond H. Heuer

(I-07JB-024)

FAVOR

**Upper Lynn Canal AC1 (S/A)
Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11
Central Peninsula AC7**

OPPOSE

**Anchorage AC6
Homer AC3
Matanuska Valley AC5
Koyukuk River AC10
Kenai/Soldotna AC14
Delta AC17
Fairbanks AC15
GASH AC16
Ahtna, Inc. PC7
Northern Norton Sound AC23
Lower Bristol Bay AC25**

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 33 - 5 AAC 96.XXX. New Section. Allow advisory committee representatives a seat at the board table and an opportunity to contribute to deliberations as follows:

Each advisory committee should have a seat at the table just as the Departments of Law, ADF&G, Subsistence, and Department of Public Safety. Their information and positions are fresh at that time, and not lost in testimony from several days ago. Furthermore, the ACs are available to provide further insight at the time of deliberation.

ISSUE: The advisory committees collectively gives thousands of hours of their time and efforts to provide information and expertise in the hope of improving the necessary game and fisheries regulations. The effort of these countless hours is condensed into a 15 minute testimony from each advisory committee then left to notes and memory on the part of the board members at later deliberations. During the many hours of public testimony covering a multitude of proposals and a huge geographic area, pertinent details regarding any given proposal can easily be overlooked or forgotten by the time it comes up for deliberation.

If the ACs were made more effective with their input during deliberations, more individuals and organizations would work through their local AC. It is just possible that the board would have fewer proposals that have not been well-considered. A lot of issues will have been worked out and compromises made before the board even sees the proposals. If time and expertise have been given to the proposals before they are ever submitted to the board, the boards would save time in deliberations. It would also cause fewer "bad" regulations because more consideration of ramifications will have been considered ahead of time during the AC process.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The valuable local information that the ACs bring to board meetings will not be fully utilized by the board members. Furthermore, the people of the ACs who spend so much time and energy become very frustrated, and feel that they are not being properly heard, and in many cases, feel they have wasted their time. It is hard to retain good people if they believe their efforts do not go toward good use.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The Boards of Fisheries and Game, the people of the regions, the members of the advisory committees, and ultimately the resources of fish and game.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one, except people who send in proposals that are not well considered, or proposals that benefit only a small user group.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Upper Tanana-Forty Mile Advisory Committee

(I-07JB-010)

FAVOR

Upper Lynn Canal AC1

Anchorage AC6

Cooper Landing AC4

Matanuska Valley AC5

Minto-Nenana AC8

Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8

OPPOSE

GASH AC16

Koyukuk River AC10
Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11
Fairbanks AC15 (S/A)
Kawerak, Inc. PC1
Ahtna, Inc. PC7
Northern Norton Sound AC23
Mike Tinker PC20 (S/A)
Lower Bristol Bay AC25

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 34 - 5 AAC 96.XXX. New Section. Increase advisory committee participation during board meetings and in deliberations as follows:

Advisory Committee Participation at Board Meetings.

The Joint Board should recognize the statutory responsibility of the ACs and give them more weight in the written and oral input portions of meetings and involve ACs in the deliberations, especially when significant changes are made to the proposed regulatory changes.

ISSUE: The present limitation on “input” to the boards process is considered a joke by many community advisory committees. They are lumped into the public involvement process only, putting them into competition with special interests and uninformed publics who espouse emotional regulation making/changing or outright theatrics. This “environment” is not what they expect in the pursuit of their statutory responsibilities. Most believe that the intent of the statute is for the department to provide the scientific testimony, the ACs to provide the local (political) viewpoint and the Boards to provide regulations that consider both. The present system wherein the department tries to be both technical and political is not working.

The requirement that the “board explain in writing” when in disagreement with a local AC is whitewashed by the Boards without any detail or reasoned answer. The concept that an AC’s input or request has been “considered under another proposal” is not adequate in most situations. This is one area where the consultation between interested ACs before a board meeting could help the entire process. The Board of Fisheries’ use of the “committee” system is better than input only through the public hearing portion of the meeting but still does not recognize the responsibility of the local ACs. Nowhere in statute does any special interest or expert opinion have equal footing with AC input. The Joint Board needs to consider the AC’s opinion when significant changes are made during deliberations.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? In recent years we have seen several multiple member (if not total) resignations because boards are not seen as listening to ACs. (Cantwell, Kenai-Soldotna, etc.) If AC members do not feel they are contributing to the context and language of the regulations proposed, deliberated and adopted, they will quit the process. The local knowledge that the Alaska Statutes wanted to be included in the process will be lost. The local AC members are “on site” experts on their environment and its fish and wildlife resources and their uses.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The entire system, especially the boards.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Requesting the legislature to amend the AC’s responsibilities. We prefer to have the Joint Boards recognize the problems and solve them “in house.”

PROPOSED BY: Fairbanks Advisory Committee

(I-07JB-008)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

Upper Lynn Canal AC1
Anchoage AC6
Homer AC3
Matanuska Valley AC5
Minto-Nenana AC8
Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8
Koyukuk River AC10
Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11
Central Peninsula AC7
Kenai/Soldotna AC14
Fairbanks AC15 (S/A)
Kawerak, Inc. PC1
Ahtna, Inc. PC7
Nushagak AC21
Northern Norton Sound AC23
Mike Tinker PC20 (S/A)
Lower Bristol Bay AC25

GASH AC16

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ **ABSTAIN** _____

DATE _____ **TIME** _____ **TAPE #** _____

PROPOSAL 35 - 5 AAC 96.XXX. New Section. Allow AC representatives a seat at the board table and an opportunity to contribute to deliberations as follows:

The solution is for the boards to recognize the ACs as representatives of their communities. They can do this by seating ACs at their own table and consulting the ACs before a final vote is taken by the board. Then the AC representative will feel he is contributing to the process.

ISSUE: Neither board values the ACs as required. ACs are treated just like individual members of the public even though they represent their community and all the members who cannot attend a board meeting. The only difference is the length of time for testimony.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The general public as well as the AC members will feel more and more useless and that their time is wasted because of the board's attitude.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? The communities that the ACs represent and the AC representatives who take the time to come to a board meeting.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Special interest groups that wish to subvert the public process.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Central Peninsula Advisory Committee

(SC-07JB-005)

FAVOR

Upper Lynn Canal AC1
Anchorage AC6
Minto-Nenana AC8
Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8
Koyukuk River AC10
Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11
Central Peninsula AC7
Kawerak, Inc. PC1
Ahtna, Inc. PC7
Northern Norton Sound AC23
Lower Bristol Bay AC25

OPPOSE

Matanuska Valley AC5
GASH AC16

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 36 - 5 AAC 96.XXX. New Section. Change timing of AC testimony during board meetings as follows:

Advisory Committee representatives testifying at the Board of Game meetings will testify at or near the time the Board of Game deliberates proposals pertinent to that advisory committee and the community they represent. We note that the department can give testimony about specific proposals; we believe advisory committees should be able to as well.

ISSUE: When all of the testimony is given at the beginning of the Boards of Game of Fisheries meetings, it all becomes blurred. Furthermore, if the board has questions during deliberation regarding the testimony, that person is often not available to answer those questions. So that they have a stronger voice, advisory committees should have the opportunity to testify at or near the time the Board of Game or Board of Fisheries deliberates proposals pertinent to that advisory committee and the community they represent.

Testimonies from the advisory committee representative will have a stronger voice at the Boards of Game and Fisheries meetings.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? The advisory committees are not given the voice and proper time of their testimonies. Their testimony is not as timely as it should be. Furthermore, if the board, as they deliberate, has questions of the advisory committee member, it is often not possible to get answers to their questions. Granted, everyone's testimony is important, and granted advisory committees usually get 15 minutes instead of five that the general public gets, but even then, their testimony is just blurred with all the rest.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? All advisory committees and the regions they represent.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one will suffer. Perhaps the meetings will go on a little longer, because testimony is spread out more, but the voice of the people will be heard better.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Middle Nenana River Advisory Committee

(I-07JB-002)

FAVOR

Upper Lynn Canan AC1
Anchorage AC6
Minto-Nenana AC8
Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8
Middle Nenana River AC9
Koyukuk River AC10
Upper Tanana/40 Mile AC11
Kenai/Soldotna AC14
Delta AC17 (S/A)
Fairbanks AC15
Kawerak, Inc. PC1 (S/A)
Northern Norton Sound AC23
Lower Bristol Bay AC25

OPPOSE

GASH AC16
Ahtna, Inc. PC7

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 37 - 5 AAC 99.015. Joint Board nonsubsistence areas. Remove Funtner Bay from Juneau Nonsubsistence Area as follows:

We would like Funtner Bay and an area surrounding the entrance of the bay to be allocated a subsistence fishing area.

ISSUE: Funtner Bay was included in the nonsubsistence boundary of the Juneau Borough and Funtner Bay is not in the Juneau Borough. Under Title 16. Fish and Game, Sec. 16.05.258. Subsistence Use and Allocation of Fish and Game, your boards have the authority to resolve this problem due to our family's dependence, socially, culturally and economically, on fish and game. Our family more than meets the criteria stated in Sec. 16.05.258 on the dependence of fish and game in our lives. We have lived in Funtner Bay for over 30 years. There is no economic structure in Funtner Bay, our income is derived from seasonal commercial salmon trolling as there are no employment opportunities in Funtner Bay. Our children were home schooled through Alyeska Central School and attended high school at Mount Edgecumbe in Sitka because there are no services in Funtner Bay. The stability of the economy in Funtner Bay is dependent on my seasonal commercial fishing. We live off our garden in season and various fish and venison. There are no stores, roads or services in Funtner Bay. Funtner Bay has one service and that is a once a week mail plane. All goods and foods must be brought in by plane or my fishing boat. To charter a small float plane from Juneau is approximately \$200 one way, and it is a seven hour round trip, when possible, in our fishing boat. If you were to walk into our house today and look in our freezer you would find that about 90 percent of the food is venison or fish that we have attained through hunting, sport fishing, commercial trolling or supplied by friends. Halibut and other bottom fish, including shrimp are usually exchanged with these friends. I believe we meet all the criteria for the importance of subsistence use of fish and game both socially and economically as stated under the subsistence use and allocation of fish and game.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE?

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT?

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER?

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED?

PROPOSED BY: Phil and Donna Emerson

(HQ-07JB-008)

FAVOR

OPPOSE

**Upper Lynn Canal AC1
Anchorage AC6**

Pelican AC24

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL 38 - 5 AAC 99.015. Joint Board nonsubsistence areas. Include portions of Units 13, 14, and 20 in a non-subsistence area as follows:

5 AAC 99.015(a) would be amended to join (3) Anchorage-Matsu-Kenai Nonsubsistence Area with (4) the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence Area, using the Parks Highway as the new boundary to the west and the Glenn and Richardson Highways to the south and east.

ISSUE: Subsistence hunting being conducted in an area that no longer meets the criteria for a subsistence area under 16.05.258.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? Continued abuse and inequality of the subsistence system.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Current nonsubsistence users.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? Current subsistence qualified users.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? We have considered all of the options put forth by the Board of Game subsistence subcommittee as well as participated in both Board of Game meetings about this subject. The bottom line is that no other options fix the true reality that this particular area no longer meets the criteria to continue being a subsistence area under AS 16.05.258.

PROPOSED BY: Matanuska Valley Fish and Game Advisory Committee (SC-07JB-002)

FAVOR

Anchorage AC6
Homer AC3
Fairbanks AC15
Jim Gappert PC2
Unknown PC3
Kenton Braun PC6
Greg M. Hoppe PC11
Nancy Hemenway PC27
Mike Tinker PC20
Ron Petersen PC26

Native Village of Port Graham PC 4

Delta AC17

OPPOSE

Minto-Nenana AC8
Tanana/Rampart/Manley AC8
Ahtna, Inc. PC7
Robert J. Wolfe PC19
Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc. PC21

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____

PROPOSAL A - 5 AAC 96.XXX Procedure for Acceptance of Public Comments. Establish a board policy to limit the volume of public comments submitted by a single entity during the public comment period for board meetings.

Each board will accept no more than 100 pages of written or its electronic equivalent from a single entity during the public comment period at board meetings.

ISSUE: The Administrative Procedures Act for the State of Alaska requires the consideration of factual, substantive, and other relevant matter presented before adopting regulations. On occasion, the boards have received thousands of comments, usually form letters, on controversial topics which have been solicited, compiled and submitted by various organizations.

Most recently, the Board of Game received a compact disc by an organization during the public comment period of the meeting which contained 28,542 letters from around the country. At the request by the Executive Director, the organization summarized the viewpoints of the letters and provided the board with a sampling of the letters. The organization complied with the request because affirmative action by the board was necessary to benefit the organization's interest. However, in the future, if similar requests are not complied with, the volume of information submitted can bring a board meeting to a halt until the information is reviewed by board members. Without a policy in place in the regulations, the boards will also be vulnerable to legal challenge under these types of situations.

This policy will not diminish the reverence the Boards of Fisheries and Game have for the public input that is relied upon before the consideration of regulatory changes; however, it will prevent individuals from obstructing the system by taking advantage of the public comment process.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF NOTHING IS DONE? There is a potential that a large volume of comments will halt the board meeting process until board members have the chance to review all material as required under the Administrative Procedures Act.

WILL THE QUALITY OF THE RESOURCE HARVESTED OR PRODUCTS PRODUCED BE IMPROVED? N/A.

WHO IS LIKELY TO BENEFIT? Everyone involved with the fish and game regulatory process.

WHO IS LIKELY TO SUFFER? No one.

OTHER SOLUTIONS CONSIDERED? Accepting a lower page limit for written materials from a single entity, such as 50 pages.

PROPOSED BY: The Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game

FAVOR

OPPOSE

**Brian Okonek PC12
John Strassenburg PC13
Valerie Connor PC15
Dave Bachrach PC17**

**Nina Faust & Edgar Bailey PC18
Defenders of Wildlife PC 24
Multiple Comments (Form letter) PC25
(Names available upon request)**

FINAL ACTION: Carries Fails Tabled No Action See Prop. # _____

ABSENT _____ ABSTAIN _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ TAPE # _____