

Note: Survey responses are still being received.

Questions 1-4. Characteristics of Survey Respondents

Survey respondents provided their level of activity in various aspects of Alaska fish and game management. They were also asked to identify which category they most closely aligned their survey responses.

Questions 1 and 2. Interest in Role in Alaska Fish and Game Management				
Options	Number of Responses	% of Total	Main Interest	% of Total
I am an Alaska resident.	66	96%	<i>Not asked</i>	
I am a current/former advisory committee member.	25	36%	12	19%
I am a subsistence user.	32	46%	2	3%
I am a personal use and/or sport fisherman.	58	84%	6	10%
I am a hunter.	59	86%	17	27%
I am a commercial fisherman.	12	17%	3	5%
I am a hunting guide.	2	3%	0	0%
I am a non-consumptive user.	20	29%	0	0%
I represent an advocacy organization.	9	13%	6	10%
I am a current/former board member.	5	7%	1	2%
I am a current/former ADF&G employee.	24	35%	16	25%
Total	69		63	

The survey omitted the category “Trapper” from the list of options.

Question 3. Involvement in the Boards		
Involvement in the Boards	Responses	% of Responses
100% Board of Game / 0% Board of Fisheries	14	22%
75% Game / 25% Fisheries	11	17%
50% Game / 50% Fisheries	20	31%
25% Game / 75% Fisheries	12	18%
0% Game / 100% Fisheries	8	12%
Total	65	

Question 4. Experience at Board Meetings							
Board of Game	None	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20+	Total
How many meetings have you attended?	15	22	16	4	2	4	63
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	24%	35%	25%	6%	3%	6%	
Board of Fisheries							
How many meetings have you attended?	21	16	11	4	3	7	62
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	34%	26%	18%	6%	5%	11%	

Questions on Board Process

Question 5: To gather respondent’s initial opinion about board process, an initial question asked for a general opinion about the adequacy of the board process.

Question 5. Rate the Adequacy of Board Process							
Questions	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	No opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Weights	1	2	3	4			
The Board of Game process is adequate	5	12	22	14	2	55	2.75
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	9.09%	21.82%	40.00%	25.45%	3.64%		
The Board of Game process should not change because of budget reductions	4	12	12	23	3	54	3.06
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	7.41%	22.22%	22.22%	42.59%	5.56%		
The Board of Fisheries process is adequate	3	8	18	12	12	53	2.95
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	5.66%	15.09%	33.96%	22.64%	22.64%		
The Board of Fisheries process should not change because of budget reductions	4	9	11	16	12	52	2.98
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	7.69%	17.31%	21.15%	30.77%	23.08%		

Open Comments to Question 5

- The board spends far too much time on issues that are frivolous. There should be a thorough vetting process on proposals before they ever reach the board level.
- Board members should be held to a higher standard of knowledge of the Alaska State Constitution, Article VIII natural resource, Alaska Statutes 16, and Alaska Administrative Code Title 5. When board members substitute their own personal aesthetic values for current laws and regulations they should be recalled by the governor.
- I'm sure some changes can be made, no coffee, shopping for cheaper meeting rooms.
- BOF members need staff dedicated to their better understanding of the complex issues that are before them. Not F&G staff dedicated to the administrative duties such as board support.
- This is a good opportunity to refocus the Boards toward individual users rather than commercial users
- The Boards, Advisory Committees and The Public are all part of the process that is mandated by Alaska Statute. This is the law, and how the legislature determined that BOG and BOF should conduct business.
- The board process has been changed to make attendance and avocation by State local advisory committees already. Members are not allowed to attend enough meetings nor able to represent their communicate interests adequately. AC members are voted in by the community to represent them their voices are not heard or listened to at the BOG process, and often over ridden by BOG members with agendas
- The new 3-yr BOG schedule doesn't work for people in my area, they have lost interest in wildlife issues already. Go back to a 2-yr BOG schedule and cut some Deputy and Assistant HQ positions.
- Commercial fisherman shouldn't have any more votes/say than sports fisherman

- Carefully review or reconsider the necessity of the boards providing travel and per diem for members of AC's to attend the Board meetings (it should be more than just a free trip into town). Perhaps some of this participation can be provided (telephonically, streamed, etc) through LIO offices or ADFG offices and thus reduce the travel cost.
- Public testimony is limited and not always conducive for meaningful contributions especially when those testifying are speaking in their second language or are elderly. There is a huge volume of documents printed during board meetings. Most either sit on back tables or are only briefly looked at. This is an area where waste and cost could be reduced.
- More emphasis should be placed on AC support rather than superfluous groups, committees, task forces et al.
- The BOG meets too frequently. Their process appears more subjective than the BOF process. The BOF process could move more quickly by combining proposals more broadly. For example, take several subsistence proposals for one fishery and combine them to address the underlying issue.
- If you change to longer cycles, then there will be a shift to more "emergency" meetings out of cycle to deal with conservation and also allocation issues as they arise.
- The Board of Game needs to have less negative bias towards wildlife viewing and the interests of non consumptive users. The Board really doesn't recognize the value of this resource or user group.
- Budget reductions reduce participation by rural ACs and Alaskans. The AC process provides a periodic meeting of local fish and wildlife consumers and the F&G staff to work out issues and distill issues to bring to the Boards. It is essential to have 2 meetings /year to keep the AC active and involved.
- ADFG Staff time could be better spent managing resource rather than vetting new proposals. Board process should be responsive to the needs of the resource, not the whim of any individuals with an ax to grind.

Question 6. Respondents were asked for opinions regarding cost saving measures within the call for proposal process. The question asked for the respondents to indicate which statement best represented their opinion about the call for proposal process.

Question 6. Opinions on Changes to the Call for Proposal Process		
Statement	Responses	% of Total Responses
No change should be made to the call for proposal process.	35	66%
The boards should limit the call further (fewer species or regions).	7	13%
The boards should expand the call (more species or regions).	3	6%
The boards should no longer set a call (proposals should come in as petitions).	1	2%
None of these.	7	13%
Total	53	

Open Ended Comments to Question 6

- Board cycle should go back to what it was. Proposals should be required to be submitted through a regional AC (this does not mean the AC has to support them) therefore giving proposers the benefit

of the AC's experience in writing and present to the board. This would hopefully weed out duplicate and ridiculous issues

- Recent adjustments on the call for proposal process have already made it cumbersome and NOT responsive to the public. Don't make it even worse.
- The date prior to a Board meeting to accept the call for proposals has already been extended, so proposals must be submitted much more in advance of Board meetings. This has already created less proposals from being submitted by the public.
- Somehow, or some kind of pre board of game committee to weed through proposals that are very similar could be compiled into the main topics and have one discussion instead of going through each proposal individually? example: sheep being a big topic, out of all the sheep proposals most of it could be compiled into 5 main topics.
- Allowing a hand full of individuals a voice in the management of a natural resources is not putting the state in the red! This should not be taken away under any circumstances.
- The BOG could stop shelving the sheep proposals for this working group and listen to the concerns expressed by the residents. Example: every year there is a lot of proposals of limiting non residents. The majority of resident hunters want this. But the BOG is biased to the welfare outfitting industry and constantly ignores sheep proposals which are the majority of the proposals.
- currently the board has to take on state wide issues every meeting, many proposals are written by residents on the state wide section that in realty only pertain to their local problem. Juneau Residents suggesting Trapping regulations for Allakakit as a state wide prop is a waste of time and effort of the board. Reauthorization of antlerless moose hunts EVERY meeting is a waste of time and effort. Not listening to AC members from the region and establishing new plans or working groups to justify their positions on the board or to meet the agenda of the day is a waste of time and resources for the board the state and its residents.
- Reduce paper and on-air announcements; email all recent hunters/trappers/fisherman you have email addresses for to help increase awareness of the process
- Don't take recommendations from non-residents or federal employees.
- Implement a process to consolidate proposals (no need for multiple proposals that address the same issue).
- Somehow sift through proposals to reduce to overall number of proposals put forward to the Board of Game.
- Changing to a three year cycle has advantages; hopefully this produces cost savings. The downside to the increase in cycle length may be a cost to employee time and efficiency, if ACR's become more common.
- Make it online comments etc, no paper books for so many staff.
- Proposals should be consolidated by topic for a more organic deliberation.
- See above comments to combine similar proposals for consideration under one discussion point. Perhaps draft a proposal and include the user proposals as attachments for reference.
- The state should strongly consider the benefits of the state travel office and if having a printed itinerary is worth what we pay them. Perhaps developing our own version of an itinerary format

that looks professional would be prudent and working with an ID number of some kind with each airline in order to gain a specific rate would be appropriate. We lose a lot of money in the middle man, the contract with how Alaska Airlines handles unused tickets should be renegotiated to reduce of loss of money spend on tickets that are non-transferable.

- It takes a quite a bit of time to deal with individual proposals, especially if they are simply expressing frustration and give no direction to policy.
- If the board and staff had the ability to combine similar proposals prior to them being submitted to the public for comment it might reduce the workload and the amount of time needed for meetings thereby reducing costs.
- Stay with a three year cycle for the Board of Game. Go to a five year cycle for the Board of Fisheries
- Limit the number of proposals an individual can submit to three and 6 by organizations. Charge \$10 fee to submit a proposal
- There needs to be consolidation of proposals that for all intents and purposes, are identical. Consolidation needs to be done by someone who puts professional integrity over their own agenda. I would trust most ADF&G staff members with this, but not board members.
- The Call for proposals in somewhat confusing for the general public. I think fewer calls with more regions/ species may work better. Also public outreach/ education.
- The call process gathers suggestions for solutions. These suggestions need to be grouped to be considered by committee to bring to the board for final decision. Lots of time spent considering obviously dead on arrival ideas.
- Proposals should be vetted further before reaching the Board, and receive support from at least 3 AC's prior to being considered.
- I see the boards of fish & game as being the final judge & jury on the subjects of proposals. The advisory committees should be used as the filter & the separator of any and all proposals before the boards are made aware of said proposals to include proposals by A D F & G. I know head strong bureaucrats will quiver but we can no longer afford to continue this ineffective job.

Question 7. Respondents were asked to provide their level of agreement on ways to eliminate the number of proposals.

Question 7. Opinions on Ideas to Reduce Proposal Numbers							
Questions	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	No opinion	Total	Weighted Average
<i>Weights</i>	1	2	3	4			
All proposals meeting the call should be deliberated on (no change to current system). <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	11 20%	18 33%	14 25%	10 18%	2 4%	55	2.43
A limited number of proposals should be deliberated on each year. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	18 33%	9 17%	16 30%	9 17%	2 4%	54	2.31
There should be stricter requirements for a proposal to be deliberated on. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	3 6%	8 15%	15 28%	24 45%	3 6%	53	3.2
Proposals should be prioritized and handled in priority order. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	11 20%	7 13%	18 33%	16 30%	2 4%	54	2.75

Open-Ended Comments to Question 7:

- Issues of conservation must be dealt with in a timely manner, and should be addressed by the boards as a priority. Decisive action would save the time and expense of perpetually rehashing items that have been before the board for years (sheep management, kenai river conservation).
- Requiring that a proposal is sound, such as a pre determination that it would not likely be outside the authority of the board may save cost by time savings realized at the meetings. Public notice of this determination should be given.
- The process of access to a public trust resource through the proposal, petition and ACR process must not be impeded. Otherwise the extreme politics of the board member selection process will become even more contentious and corrupted then it already is now
- This may be about "money" for Boards Support, but for the rest of us, it's about responsiveness to the public.
- Possible ways to save money is to charge a small sum per proposal, in addition each proposal should be submitted by an organization or require a proposal to have five signatures before the proposal is submitted.
- Who decides all of the above??? This is a public process, and should remain unchanged. The SOA should provide the funds necessary to the BOG and BOF to accomplish their agendas as required by Alaska Statute. How can limiting proposals or prioritizing proposals even be considered? That would not follow the Statutes of the SOA, and be unlawful? This is all a PUBLIC process!
- Don't know? Do not know enough about current costs, and what are the big costs in the whole process.
- Proposals are a way for individuals to have a voice in the management process of limited resources. Natural resources with a high \$\$ value tend to have many outspoken advocates to keep a good thing going with legislative and local government input/support. The state has an obligation to hear from individuals who are being impacted by dwindling resources.

- Vetting of BS proposals is not strict enough it is clear when many are written by a person or group to advently support that person or groups singular interest. Proposals that are definitely " OUT THERE" should not be in the book. Regional issues should not be state wide issues (see above note) individuals or groups should not request state wide regs if they are unfamiliar with state wide issues. or the reg is related to a local problem. The Boards SHOULD NOT be able to submit a proposal of its own. That is the depts job. The AC of the area could better vet the process with a joint letter than the board support system currently does and would provide MORE AC input. When there are 200 props all repeating them self. The AC could pick several to carry forward to the board. The AC can also better identify.. that ONE proposal. That is put in every cycle just to appease that person or group.. that inundates the process for the purpose of inundating the process.
- When appropriate proposals meeting the call are not deliberated on, public animosity grows. Sheep. This costs more in the long run as each proposal ends up taking more time. Deliberate prudently and effectively and move on.
- shorter meetings
- Develop a process to consolidate/prioritize/ streamline the proposal system resulting in fewer proposals, less printing/ mailing costs, less time commitment by the board - all save money.
- If a proposal topic is repeated year after year after year & the board & ACs vote it down, find a mechanism to put a 6 year moratorium on that topic. We've spent countless dollars in the last few years on the same sheep proposals, and NOTHING changes in their proposals. It's like if one person yells long enough & loud enough they'll get their way. 2) be more stringent about not approving ACRs that don't fit the criteria.
- A stricter process for accepting proposals for consideration could decrease meeting times and staff time required. The devil is likely in the details on how this change would be perceived with the public. I wonder if trapping regulations could be considered on a different cycle; i.e. 5 years, vs. the normal cycle.
- Lump proposals dealing with similar issues to a greater extent than currently done. If all ACs commenting a proposal oppose it, then the BOG would have reason to not consider it.
- A stringent process should result in fewer proposals
- "House cleaning proposals" do not need to be dealt with at full BOF, perhaps in committee
- The board has to bring up every single proposal for deliberation. It would behoove the Boards Support Section to go through and group all like proposals into one proposal. My experience has been that there are usually multiple individuals who all submit the exact proposal just to get the BOG to see that a lot of people think something ought to change. However, this takes up the BOG's time to tell everyone they aren't going to consider "x" proposal because of action already taken on a different proposal for the exact same issue.
- prioritizing proposals could save time
- Topics should be grouped for organic deliberation rather than segregated for individual attention to each specific detail.

- The ability for any Alaska resident to propose changes to fish and game regulations is unique and important. Any changes that include prioritization of proposals or making proposal rules stricter thereby allowing F&G bureaucrats to limit the public input must be done with caution.
- A vetting process needs to be considered and a group should be established to vet proposals before they even come before the board. There should be certain criteria that the proposals have to meet in order to be accepted. Those criteria should be outlined in the proposal format much like they are for ACRs and should be specific. It may also be useful to have a deadline for proposal withdrawal to save time at the board meetings make the official process of proposal withdrawal happen prior to the meeting if the proposer wishes it to be so.
- Cluster proposals together that deal with the same issue, and prioritize issues based on conservation issues first then allocation issues second.
- See the comment box for question 6.
- The proposals should be grouped and acted upon by category
- A consent agenda would save money in the long term.
- Restrict proposals meeting the call to residents meeting Perm fund criteria. Advocacy groups with base headquarters outside Alaska should be restricted to proposals meeting the call after registering with the board process "consistently" for at least ten years. No grandfathering allowed.
- Money and time can be saved (especially by AC members) by segmenting meetings so that a proposal is presented, discussed and deliberated on all within a day or two. Having to stay through the whole board meeting to follow one or more proposals from beginning to end gives unfair advantage to those who can afford the time and money. These too often are those who have an economic interest in the results.
- Duplicate/ same intent proposals could be combining with all the authors names on the.
- might shorten meetings
- Limited proposals means less participation by staff at Board meetings, saving travel, lodging & per diem costs.
- Advisory committees are free all most and were designed and originally expected to do most of the area ground work and ferreting of worthy and not worthy proposals. Time is money except in the case of free advisory committees. Said committees also in my experience have much more area experience history and skin in the game. Just ask a committee member. Thanks.

Question 8. This question asked a series of “True/False” questions regarding potential proposal review criteria.

Question 8. State Level of Agreement to the Following Statements Regarding Proposal Criteria					
Statements	TRUE	FALSE	Maybe	No opinion	Total
All proposals should be included. A review process is not needed.	9	25	16	1	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	17.65%	49.02%	31.37%	1.96%	
The proposal has not been reviewed by an advisory committee.	18	20	14	2	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	33.33%	37.04%	25.93%	3.70%	
The proposal is not supported by an advisory committee.	15	27	11	1	53
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	27.78%	50.00%	20.37%	1.85%	
The proposal is not supported by ADF&G.	7	33	12	1	55
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	13.21%	62.26%	22.64%	1.89%	
The proposal was filed anonymously or by an unverifiable entity.	42	7	6	0	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	76.36%	12.73%	10.91%	0.00%	
The board has no authority to enact the proposal.	44	5	2	3	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	81.48%	9.26%	3.70%	5.56%	
The proposal is unclear.	34	6	13	1	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	62.96%	11.11%	24.07%	1.85%	
The proposal is a placeholder that provides no details.	35	7	10	2	55
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	64.81%	12.96%	18.52%	3.70%	
The proposal is identical to another proposal that will be included.	42	3	9	1	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	76.36%	5.45%	16.36%	1.82%	
The proposal addresses an issue that another proposal contemplates, although it may seek a different solution. (The board should take up the issue while recognizing the diversity of opinions on the issue.)	27	12	14	1	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	50.00%	22.22%	25.93%	1.85%	
The proposal was already considered at a prior meeting, and did not provide new information.	34	10	9	1	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	62.96%	18.52%	16.67%	1.85%	
The proposal is not categorized as regional or statewide.	23	13	12	6	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	42.59%	24.07%	22.22%	11.11%	
The proposal is not actually seeking regulatory change.	34	8	10	2	54
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	62.96%	14.81%	18.52%	3.70%	

Open Ended Comments to Questions 8 include:

- If the proposal is unconstitutional or inconsistent with current statutes under AS 16 don't include it in the list of proposals for the board to deliberate on.
- Individuals should still have the ability to have a legitimate proposal heard by the board, but it must be complete and follow guidelines required.
- refer to comment in previous question, all proposals that are submitted by an organization or has five signatures should be considered.
- ALL proposals should be considered.
- Might be to taxing on the AC's but if a proposal was directed through at least 3 AC's maybe they would hash out the main talking points or ideas, and make it go faster for BOG??
- This question is complicated and very poorly written - good luck getting clear responses. How about not reviewing a proposal that does not offer clear regulatory details such as new season dates, hunt details/restrictions, hunt areas, etc. This means no place holder proposals as they eat up way too much time, and no vague proposals asking for change but without direction offered.
- I think the board process works very well and should not be tinkered with other than above
- Proposals from groups of sportsman like the AOC should take precedence to individual requests.
- If all ACs commenting a proposal oppose it, then the BOG would have reason to not consider it.
- Identify likely recurrent proposals and address prior to meeting. E.g. Any proposal banning sport fishing for kings in the Copper Drainage, or changing proposal calling for removal of all fish wheel. These types of proposals/issue can be dealt with ahead of time, or the board have authority to simply not address them by never making it into the proposal book.
- This question is going to be confusing for people. "True" and "False" will never take the place of "yes" and "no." The question is "Should any of the statement above be used to eliminate proposals?" Yes or No.....not True or False.
- Again, if similar proposals are made and with different solutions presented, combine the deliberation into one discussion, but have original proposals included as addendum to ensure a proposed solution is not forgotten or just shined on or glossed over by a single person in the process.
- Does the board have the authority to do anything about the proposal? 2) Is there a biological conservation concern? 3) Is there a user group that is going to be specifically targeted against in this proposal? 4) Is the proposal logical and have a clear and specific intent? 5) Has the reasoning behind the proposal been explained thoroughly? 6) Does the proposer have a history of generating large numbers of proposals that are generally against what the rest of the state normally does? Is there merit in the proposal if they do?
- I can't think of any other criteria then what you've listed above. This list seems comprehensive enough that it should whittle the proposals down
- Stick to the proposal as written, unless public comment before the Board is again allowed.
- Should only address one regulatory change.
- To improve quality, proposers should be encouraged to talk to a ADF&G biologist before submitting a proposal, but this should not be mandatory. This could be presented on the basis that a proposal stands a better chance of being adopted if it has had some professional review.

- The true and false is confusing in this question. There could be some type of vetting process before the proposals go into the book or before a board, but then you are adding another layer of time spent on the proposal. A lot of times people will put in proposals that the Board has no power to take action on, but sometimes that is the only way the public can bring it up for a discussion.
- Advisory committees inputs not political or financial but biological and local knowledge.

Question 9 seeks input on aspects of a board meeting that could be run more effectively.

Question 9. Input on Changes to the Board Meeting Format							
Questions <i>Weights</i>	Strongly disagree <i>1</i>	Somewhat disagree <i>2</i>	Somewhat agree <i>3</i>	Strongly agree <i>4</i>	No opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Public testimony should include participation by phone/teleconference. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	12 21.43%	10 17.86%	18 32.14%	15 26.79%	1 1.79%	56	2.65
Advisory committee testimony should include participation by phone/teleconference. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	10 17.86%	8 14.29%	23 41.07%	14 25.00%	1 1.79%	56	2.75
Ethics disclosures can be read ahead of time and do not need to be presented at meetings. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	13 23.21%	4 7.14%	13 23.21%	19 33.93%	7 12.50%	56	2.78
Staff reports can be read ahead of time and do not need to be presented at meetings. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	17 30.36%	18 32.14%	10 17.86%	8 14.29%	3 5.36%	56	2.17
Advisory committees and regional advisory councils should be limited to the same amount of time as all other public testifiers. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	28 50.00%	14 25.00%	7 12.50%	5 8.93%	2 3.57%	56	1.8
Public testimony for the entire meeting cycle could be held at one meeting. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	25 44.64%	10 17.86%	12 21.43%	2 3.57%	7 12.50%	56	1.82
The entire meeting cycle could be done at one meeting/in fewer meetings. <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	17 30.36%	8 14.29%	21 37.50%	3 5.36%	7 12.50%	56	2.2

Open-ended Responses to Question 9:

- I don't think that a per diem or parking costs for AC members is necessary. While, meetings need to have sufficient accommodations, the state should strive to use state, university or as cost effective spaces as possible.
- Meeting cycles have already been made longer. From two years to three years, and some thought of changing to 4-5 years I have heard to save money which is totally unacceptable to this public process to manage the fish and game resources of all Alaskans. It seems that that this is an attempt to not utilize Advisory Committee process and public testimony process which is mandated by State Statute. This is all VERY wrong, and seems to be an attempt to change legislative statute. This is a PUBLIC process, not just the ADFG staff, BOG member and BOF members.
- Do not know enough ins and outs of the process to give opinion.
- time is money, keep a time limit on everything but keep it open and fair to the public
- public safety should be required the same testimony process as AC for props they submit.

- Enforce existing public testimony rules, don't let multiple individuals from the same organization testify to the same topic. Actively review and eliminate bogus AC's such as Paxson. Less than 8 people live there year-round. The AC chair and a couple members only live there part-time. One doesn't even live there (Gakona).
- Public testimony is always an issue - I personally have waited multiple days to provide 5 minutes of testimony. Implement a more stringent Public Testimony schedule (set a time frame and stick to it - no exceptions).
- I don't see formatting changes having a large influence compared to the material that needs to be covered, which is mostly dominated by the number of proposals.
- BOG meetings need to include public input and this can only be limited so much before the public begins to be cut out of the process.
- Video conference regional staff, that's why we have the conference rooms right?
- Public testimony already drags out over 2-3 days. Don't make it last longer by adding telephonic testimony. People aren't going to know what you mean when you ask if the entire meeting cycle could be done at one meeting/fewer meetings.
- The idea behind the Board system was one of broad democratic participation in the process; however, the vast majority of Alaskans are represented by a handful of AC's while relatively few are represented by a large number of AC's. In order to create a fairer platform many of the smaller AC's should be eliminated which would reduce costs.
- Do not run 7 days a week. Skip Sundays. It is a day of rest and a needed break.
- I feel like the ethics disclosures could be posted on the meeting website ahead of time. Staff reports are posted online and so I feel they don't have to be presented but sometimes there is a need for staff presentations and those should still be done. While I feel that you can lower the amount of proposals you can't deny the public's participation in this process, it's what makes it such a great system. If you're thinking of diminishing the public process then you need to get the Dept. reports out much faster so people can use the latest information in their written testimony.
- Eliminate State per- diem for Advisory committees and councils, costs may come from outside sources. Written comments are still fine as long as they make the comment book at the Board meeting.
- Board meeting should be held in the region that is being considered. This gives the public more opportunity to participate.

Question 10 sought for thoughts on what impacts a 5-years Board of Fisheries cycle might cause.

Question 10. Responses Regarding Potential Impacts of a Board of Fisheries 5-Year Cycle								
Statements	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
Weights	1	2	3	4	5			
... creates more agenda change requests.	0	3	12	13	16	8	52	3.95
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	0%	6%	23%	25%	31%	15%		
... creates more emergency petitions.	1	4	10	14	16	8	53	3.89
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	2%	8%	19%	26%	30%	15%		
... is better for fisheries businesses.	9	10	10	10	5	9	53	2.82
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	17%	19%	19%	19%	9%	17%		
... saves money for members of the public who participate.	2	8	12	13	10	8	53	3.47
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	4%	15%	23%	25%	19%	15%		
... adversely impacts the health and sustainability of the resource.	6	9	11	6	13	8	53	3.24
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	11%	17%	21%	11%	25%	15%		
... reduces the opportunity for public participation.	4	7	11	7	16	8	53	3.53
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	8%	13%	21%	13%	30%	15%		
... is not justified for these cost savings.	9	5	9	5	17	8	53	3.36
<i>(percent to total responses)</i>	17%	9%	17%	9%	32%	15%		

Open-ended Responses to Question 10:

- Is reactive rather than proactive, diminishes public input, reduces sound management of resources
- A five year cycle is 2 years longer than a Board member or governor etc serves. There would be a lack of consistency and potential for in person knowledge limited.
- Allows the management plans previously adopted at a previous meeting cycle to better align with salmon cycles. Five year cycles make sense for the majority of the proposals as long as the the ACR, Petition and BGP process is fairly constructed to deal with current concerns and gives the public more direct involvement in the process.
- A longer 4 or 5 year cycle could be acceptable if the criteria for ACR and petitions did not change. While more might be submitted, if the criteria was strictly adhered to and board generated proposals were not created from ideas on ACR this would be a cost savings. The concern is if more single out of cycle proposal are considered that would ramp up the costs for both ADF&G and the public have people at a regulatory meeting where your interest is in single proposal.
- A four or five year meeting cycle will further exclude the public from the BOF process. This would allow the BOF and ADFG to make emergency decision further excluding the public knowledge of the resource changes and again not allowing public input.
- does not make sense to try and save \$100,000 by moving the meeting cycles to a 4 or 5 year cycle at the cost of public input and resources being neglected for longer periods of time
- Good practices require fewer changes and meetings
- Agenda change requests and Emergency Orders can still be used to address special issues.

- If proposals were handled as they come in without the call, there may not even be a need for a 5 year cycle.
- More care will be needed when choosing the meeting location to ensure opportunity for the broadest public participation.
- Will not save money - just end up with more unplanned issues being taken up - spend more money in the long run.
- My main reason for supporting a longer meeting cycle is that many of the salmon species that are the focus of these meetings have lifespans which are longer than the meeting cycle right now and so you can't accurately say if management plans are working or not.
- Under no circumstance should UCI be treated differently like being address every year!
- will cause rural ACs to be inactive ACRs will be the preferred method for addressing issues before the BOF
- I fear if the cycle is extended there will be another avenue found for change and not to digress much that is scary the closed door deals we all know about all in the name of good. NOT.

Question 11 asked an open ended question for revenue ideas.

- A fee may supplement some cost be deterrent of sorts. 100 dollars per proposal. Knowing money though could cost that much to account for it and no gain. More than 100 dollars could be too much for some citizens.
- A fee (to public only) would certainly eliminate the frivolity however fees to other agencies would affect their budgets and reduce the line item crap they often come up with. Federal users would have to pay higher fees.
- A small admin fee would be fine, ~20\$.
- A small fee such as \$5 or less plus shipping for a proposal book would help with the costs. Having printed proposal books is important to the public .Another idea would be as suggested a small fee \$5-10 for each proposal.
- A small filing fee for individuals to submit proposals would help defray costs. A fee of 10.00 per-proposal would eliminate some proposals that are filed spur of the moment. Advisory Committees do not have funding sources to pay filing fees, and should be exempt.
- Any large fee could create a barrier for the public. A small fee for processing of \$5.00 or less would seem reasonable and may deter multiple proposals on the same subject. IE the proposer may just list "options" under one proposal instead of submitting 5 different ones.
- Bad idea. how to discourage participation by those least able to pay
- Changing the structure of the ADF&G to be me proactive with this public process. An interactive approach to working with the proposers and petitioners to mediate solutions. Should have one science division for all of the Department. Management divisions should not control the science.
- Charge a few to submit and the cost of consideration and time.
- Charging for proposals favors those who are willing to pay more for the resource. Proposals should be an expression of the public, not an auction.

- Don't charge any fee for submitting proposals.
- Don't even think about going this way! This is a State public process mandated by Statute!
- go to regions advisory councils rather than area advisory councils.
- Good idea - nominal fee per proposal, to be reimbursed if the person or a proxy person shows up to the meeting to speak on behalf of the proposal. Nothing is worse than having a proposal where the proposer does not show up to discuss the proposal.
- I seriously hope that the example given in this question will never be considered. The State can't charge residents to participate in conversations that impact their lives. That is an outrageous suggestion.
- I think a nominal \$5.00 fee would keep people from flooding the board with lots of frivolous proposals.
- I think a small fee could be charged.
- I think charging a fee would add barriers to the public process and would do little to off set cost.
- I wonder if trapping regulations could be considered on a different cycle; i.e. 5 years, vs. the normal cycle.
- I would approve of a fee.
- I would rather see a fee placed on the commercial fisherman to help cover the costs of the BOF. They are profiting financially off of the resource, and in my opinion should pay for the management before those that don't profit financially off the resource.
- less paper
- Never should there be a charge for submitting a proposal.
- NO !!!!!
- NO fee for proposals. Possibly apply fee for ACR's though since they require special review.
- No, just need to stream line what actually makes it to the BOG.
- NO. There are no reasonable fees that will offset the administrative costs of the fee and still assure public access.
- Quit getting catered coffee.
- The boards should NOT charge a fee for proposals, but should receive monies from tourism commercial photography along with consumptive user license fees.
- The proposal books are available online so charge a fee for printed copies (printing and mailing costs).
- There need to be a filter/mechanism/pre-meeting dealing with for those proposals that are clearly not going to be adopted.
- Totally fair- request all proposals be charged a fee of \$100 per proposal and anyone who wants to comment on the proposals must submit a \$100.00 comment fee per proposal.
- unknown
- Yes, \$10 per proposal for individuals and \$30 for groups/associations

- You can't charge a fee for people to participate, that defeats the purpose of our whole system. I've read the memo Mr. Haight put out to the Boards and I agree with the measures he's laid out depending on the level of the cut that will need to be made.
- You can't charge a fee for submitting proposals because the legislature would have to approve and vote on collecting revenue for this. And that's never going to happen.

Question 12 sought to determine if respondent had any recommendations that could be made to the Legislature for cost saving ideas.

- Appropriate monies directly to the boards, perhaps assuming their functions through legislative affairs instead of the department.
- Can't think of any.
- Change legislation requiring annual antlerless reauthorizations and grizzly bear tag fee exemptions
- Define missions for the Divisions.
- Fund the Boards cost of doing business.
- I believe the legislature fully funded the Boards and Commissions budget, so I don't believe the legislature intended further cuts to this service.
- I don't think you want to go there quite yet. Once you open that door you may never get it closed again.
- If board members used electronic versions of documents and the public was given paper copies in addition to a kiosk being set up at board meetings for public access to documents all of the binders and paper waste would be dramatically reduced and so would associated costs. Many of the mandates on how we do bidding don't take into account peripheral expenses that add to additional costs. We really need to consider the whole big picture when we decide where Board Meetings take place and also consider choosing venues that allow our own staff to maintain beverages.
- In the budget process the Legislature could identify general fund expenditures that may not contribute to fishing or hunting opportunities. Those functions could be eliminated and the savings transferred to Board Support
- Legislators should honestly look at license and tag fees again to support the ADFG, they should also look strongly at the record of the board members to identify agenda items and that do not fall within the purview of the appoint of that member.. often as not a meeting is taken over by a board member and that member will have sufficient following on the board to push an agenda forward. (See Community harvest/ Nelchina caribou hunting? sheep proposals) the board should not be including its own proposals as the regulatory maker.
- Legislature should stay out of the process. Their involvement politicizes and pollutes the entire board member selection process. Their budget actions mute the open and free conversation between the Department and the stakeholders.
- Less meetings per year/ longer days. Do not drag it out, but don't cut corners either.
- less paper
- No

- No
- No but they could increase ADF&G revenue to cover this one public process we have left.
- No the legislature should not give more authority to the boards
- No thought on this.
- The governor shouldn't waste the departments money on asking them to relocate cute little bears, when it's none of his business
- The legislature could narrow the scope of what is required for a proposal to be accepted, and the division of authority between managers and the board could be adjusted at the expense of public process.
- The legislature should accept requests-for-changes and make a decision to act or not act.
- they need to reinstate the license fee for sports fishing charters and guides. Increase all fees for all resources
- unknown
- Yes. The legislature should locate the necessary funding to this public process. Cut out frivolous spending by the ADFG and other state agencies, but keep the BOG, BOF, Advisory Committees and Board Support funding in place.

Question 13 received input on cost saving measures regarding the use of staff.

Question 13. Best Use of Staff Resources								
Statement	Do much more of this	Do somewhat more of this	Adequate	Do somewhat less of this	Do much less of this	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
Weight	1	2	3	4	5			
ADF&G staff work with advisory committees <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	10 20%	15 29%	25 49%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%	51	2.3
ADF&G staff reportage (research, writing and production) <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	7 14%	12 24%	20 40%	7 14%	2 4%	2 4%	50	2.69
ADF&G staff comments at board meetings <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	6 12%	7 14%	27 53%	6 12%	3 6%	2 4%	51	2.86
ADF&G staff attendance at board meetings <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	4 8%	7 14%	25 49%	8 16%	5 10%	2 4%	51	3.06
Boards support staff at board meetings <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	4 8%	5 10%	34 67%	5 10%	0 0%	3 6%	51	2.83
Boards support staff work with advisory committees <i>(percent to total responses)</i>	8 16%	12 24%	26 51%	3 6%	0 0%	2 4%	51	2.49

Open-Ended Comments to Question 13:

- ADF&G reports and findings should direct board actions to a much greater extent. Board decisions should hinge on ADF&G science
- ADF&G staff are already stretched too thin to do their work as well as they know they need to do it. There are no reasonable cost cutting measures to use and still get the job done.
- ADF&G staff comment durations are very personality driven. Some talk too much...
- ADF&G staff tie with the AC would reduce proposal work loads and educate public on issues. Many proposals are the result of poor understanding on either staff or public. Compromises could solve many problems.

- ADFG staff reports could be abbreviated or provided to the Board prior to the meeting to shorten the meeting time factor. Have the biologists available for questions from the board regarding specific proposals to save everyone's time (Board and ADFG)
- Defer some ADFG staff projects and research until the SOA is through this current budget situation. Possibly staff layoffs if absolutely necessary.
- Getting annual reports done should be a priority. I don't feel that as many staff need to attend board meetings need to, as recognized by deputy commissioner Swanton at the work session. As far as board staff there I never see a lot of them, and those that are there are busy carrying out their support role to the board.
- Having staff comments and reports (guaranteed date by) published prior to public comment could in the end reduce staff time answering questions from the public and AC's if they were available 3 weeks before the public comments deadline, and you knew this information would be available prior to. This last cycle was better.
- Make good on the promise to get ADF&G comments out to the public early enough for the AC's and the public to actually use them. Put the detail back in the comments, add figures and graphs. Skeleton comments put out right before a meeting does no good for anyone.
- Many times there are multiple ADF&G staff at Board meetings that do not have a reason to be present.
- No experience no comment.
- Review staff commitments for proposals - sometimes staff travel to meeting to deal with one issue - this is where teleconferencing / video conferencing might reduce costs. If a staff person in Fairbanks has to travel to Cordova for a five day meeting to deal with a few proposals, is that the best use of staff time and expenses when a teleconference system could be a better use of time and resources.
- Some advisory committees only meet once a year or just before deadlines and often unprepared. Requiring that all proposals be presented to Advisory committee could make this portion of the process more involved, but also harder for people in remote areas. ADF&G staff attendance has dropped with the committee of the whole process. Committee reports required more staff. However, Area managers, Assistant Managers and pertinent research staff are vital to provide informed content to board members.
- Staff seems to be operating at a maximum level with a minimum amount of individuals. There is a point where inefficiencies due to too many cuts outweigh the cost savings of cutting man hours.
- Stop wasting time on "non-game" and other programs in an attempt to mollify non-consumptive users. We have serious game mgt issues to deal with.
- The Board process must rely more on Advisory Committees. Advisory Committees are closer to the public and more representative of public thinking which makes them more appropriate to handle some proposals. The Board process should be modified to provide the ACs with more authority to make decisions on fish and game regulations.

Question 14 sought any other comments by the respondents.

- Look at your accommodations costs and meeting places. We are holding government meetings, and no one needs to be pampered. If the hotels aren't to someone's liking, they can pay their own bills and go elsewhere.
- Abolish the non game and fish programs, and reallocate these funds to The Board process. It seems very clear that you are attempting to remove the Advisory Committee and public input process. Shame on the SOA!
- Again, I don't believe in the budget process that the legislature endorsed further cuts to the fish and game boards. I think they allocated money to do these essential services. It appears that cost savings on boards will be shifted to other departments within ADFG, which is not going to go over well with the Legislature or user groups.
- currently many AC are required to rent facilities to meet, look at new lower rent options. State offices that may be available in different areas. public facility etc
- Cut beverage service at meetings.
- Fire the executive directors. Have the BOF members do more of the work.
- I feel that the number of proposals accepted is pivotal to so many savings. Less proposals saves staff time in preparation for meetings, and less proposals means fewer days and lower costs for everything that goes along for these meetings.
- Increase fees by all users groups. Increase penalty fees by those who break the law.
- Most cost cutting measures limit public involvement and public service and that will eventually erode public support.
- No public coffee
- Stick with a free 10-survey questionnaire. Board has an "r".
- The ability to call into meeting would reduce travel costs for the AC's and the public dramatically. AC's with pressing proposal should still have the option of participating in person.
- The board process is meant to serve the public. So don't leave the public out of the process
- The entire tone of this exercise has seemed like the Dept is trying to find ways to disenfranchise the AC's. This is NOT a good idea and will end up torpedoing your credibility.