

For the Record, I'm Kevin Maier, representing the Juneau Douglas Advisory Committee.

Thank you Chairmen Burnett and members of the Board for the opportunity to testify. I also want to thank board support staff for getting me here, thanks to the ADFG Staff for this morning's excellent presentations, and to all of you for your engagement with this important work.

This is my first time attending a board of game meeting, so please forgive me if my report on our deliberations is too detailed or too brief. I'll be here through Monday, so can clarify as needed during your deliberations.

First, a bit on the the Juneau-Douglas AC:

Our 15-member advisory committee uses designated seats, ~~representing commercial fishing, sport fishing, hunting/personal use, guiding hunting, charter fishing, trapping, as well as non-consumptive users.~~ I've held the freshwater charter fishing seat since 2014, and work seasonally as a fly-fishing guide out of Juneau. Many of the members have served on the AC for several years, 9 of the 15 have in fact been on the AC longer than me. This gives us a lot of institutional knowledge, literal decades of experience with this process. Like a functional family, we disagree a lot, and sometimes deeply, but we all get along.

We typically stay in our lane—that is, we address proposals through the formal board process only as they apply to our constituents. It is worth noting, however, that we have been engaged with the Federal Subsistence Board Process, participating in the RAC and federal board meetings, testifying and submitting written comments at each stage. As we've noted at each meeting, we are open and willing to help facilitate dialogue between federally qualified and non-federally qualified hunters...

I would echo Tom Shcumacker's comments from this morning that the tensions between the Federal and state process are serving to create conflict between neighbors, fracturing management, and making all of this more complicated.

Bottom line: we like to use the AC process to insure sustainable, conservation-minded management of our fish and game populations.

I'll do my best to quickly encapsulate a couple of 2-hour meetings (with some substantial and robust disagreement) in a way that will clarify our intent and amplify our submitted minutes, I'll present on the proposals we discussed in order:

****We submitted and support an amended proposal 1, requiring hunter education.** We have members who are volunteer instructors and are passionate about hunter education. In response to department comments, we recommend amending the dates in the first paragraph from 2010 to 2007 for clarity.

****One of our members submitted proposal 4, and we support an amended version. We are in favor of changing the resident bag limit for brown bears, but based on departmental feedback, we recommend excluding unit 1D and Berner's Bay for regulatory clarity and population concerns.**

****we had two very long discussions of proposal 5, to create a split waterfowl season. We supported the idea, then tried to gather data to determine ideal dates, and had a difficult time arriving at any consensus, so we agreed to punt on the question of when. So... good luck?**

****Proposal 6 and 7 on otter and marten trapping seasons were also submitted by one of our members, and we support both.**

We had a short discussion of proposal 9, that'd extend wolverine season, and we oppose adopting this proposal, out of concern for female wolverines in dens.

We discussed proposals 10 and 11 together, which both suggest returning to a four deer limit for unit 4. Notably, one of these proposals was mine. We oppose adopting both these proposals. Discussion hinged on lack of biological concern for deer populations.

For Juneau area proposals, one of our members drafted proposal 28, which we support, as it clarifies an on-the-ground boundary for goat hunting on the Juneau road system.

We unanimously support proposal 32, adding key conservation measures to protect goats in Unit 1D seems to make good sense.

One of our members drafted proposals 36 and 37, and we support a reduction in bag limit for grouse and ptarmigan on the Juneau Road system. We had interesting discussions of each proposal. These reflect an effort to adopt more conservative management, as we received reports of localized depletion of these important game birds. As the proposals notes, these birds are important for young and new hunters. The license stat that Ryan Scott mentioned this morning, highlighting the importance of hunter recruitment and retention.

We unanimously supported proposals 38 and 39, amending the youth hunt and the hunter safety requirements on the Mendenhall wetlands. These seem like common sense revisions to create more opportunity.

We support an amended proposal 40, narrowing it to allow for taking of exotics only during waterfowl season by currently legal means of take.

Again, I want to thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process, and I will be here through this afternoon if you have any questions. I'll submit these summative comments as an RC as well.