

**SUMMARY OF ACTIONS**  
**ALASKA JOINT BOARDS OF FISHERIES AND GAME**  
**October 5-8, 2007**  
**Anchorage, Alaska**

**DESIGNATED REPORTERS: Susan Bucknell, Sherry Wright, Rita St. Louis**

*This summary of actions is for information purposes only and is not intended to detail, reflect or fully interpret the reasons for the Board's actions.*

**PROPOSAL NO. 1**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure Ketchikan AC for game issues

**DISCUSSION:** Board members agreed it was not necessary to divide the committee into a committee for game issues and a committee for fishery issues. Board members preferred that the intent of this proposal be accomplished through a subcommittee process within the committee rather than through regulatory action.

**PROPOSAL NO. 2**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs on Western Prince of Wales Island

**DISCUSSION:** The boards recognized cultural differences between these two committees. It was noted that the committees are active when there are board proposals that impact their area. There is intention by the Klawock Advisory Committee to be more active.

**PROPOSAL NO. 3**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs on Northern Prince of Wales Island

**DISCUSSION:** Board members commented that public and advisory committee comments were all in opposition because the two communities have little in common, travel between them can be treacherous, and Edna Bay is becoming very active on its own.

**PROPOSAL NO. 4**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the Ketchikan area

**DISCUSSION:** While they saw the geographical rationale for consolidating, board members recognized cultural differences between the two communities, and the lack of any support for the proposal.

**PROPOSAL NO. 5**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs on Northern Chichagof Island

**DISCUSSION:** The board recognized that Pelican and Elfin Cove are active committees with a large amount of public participation, and neither committee supported the consolidation. The board commented that travel between the two communities will be difficult.

**PROPOSAL NO. 6**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the Upper Lynn Canal area

**DISCUSSION:** Board members recognized cultural differences between the communities. They did not hear any support from the public panel members for

combining the Klukwan and the Upper Lynn Canal advisory committees. They commented that Klukwan has been and intends to continue to be an active committee.

**PROPOSAL NO. 7****ACTION: Carried as Amended****DESCRIPTION:** Create a Parks Highway AC representing Big Lake to Trapper Creek**AMENDMENTS:** A new *Susitna Valley Advisory Committee* was created to represent the Big Lake, Houston, Willow, Talkeetna, Sunshine, Peters Creek, and Trapper Creek area.**DISCUSSION:** Board members concurred that due to the time and distance involved for members to travel to attend Matanuska Valley Advisory Committee meetings, a new committee would increase opportunity for public participation. There was discussion of whether seats on the new committee should be limited to a certain number and whether they should be designated by community. It was resolved to let the new committee work out these details. The board appointed an initial five members and the Department of Law confirmed the process wherein the initial five members can meet as an advisory committee with the first item of business as holding elections for additional members.**PROPOSAL NO. 8****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Create a new Copper Basin region AC with designated seats for Ahtna Villages**DISCUSSION:** The Joint Board took no action based on the proponent's written comment asking to withdraw the proposal due to amendments on Proposal 23.**PROPOSAL NO. 9****ACTION: Carried****DESCRIPTION:** Rename the Valdez AC to Prince William Sound/Valdez AC**DISCUSSION:** The board commented that this was a simple request by the Valdez Advisory Committee and that it is more important that the committee is active in the board process.**PROPOSAL NO. 10****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs on the Northern Kenai Peninsula**DISCUSSION:** Board members noted lack of support for this proposal, and recognized that there was an extensive amount of written comments submitted in opposition to it.**PROPOSAL NO. 11****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs on the Southern Kenai Peninsula**DISCUSSION:** The board acknowledged the large amount of opposition to this proposal. Both of the advisory committees are very active and both committees have differences on fisheries issues. The board supported leaving the committees as is which would allow them better representation before the boards.**PROPOSAL NO. 12****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the Nelchina Basin**DISCUSSION:** The board noted the lack of support for this proposal by the advisory committees and members of the public.**PROPOSAL NO. 13****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough

**DISCUSSION:** Board members noted the opposition by the advisory committees and members of the public.

**PROPOSAL NO. 14**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the Bristol Bay area

**DISCUSSION:** The board commented that this proposal lacked support from the public and the advisory committees. Conflicting issues between these advisory committees and their use of different fisheries lead the board to keep two separate committees.

**PROPOSAL NO. 15**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the False Pass area

**DISCUSSION:** The board commented that there was both support and opposition to this proposal. Supporters noted that this area has a greater representation because it has four advisory committees and may have disproportionate influence on the boards. It was pointed out that there are different fish and game populations between these areas. The board also noted significant travel and logistical considerations for holding meetings if the committees were combined.

**PROPOSAL NO. 16**

**ACTION: No Action**

**DESCRIPTION:** Change number of representatives for each village in Central Kuskokwim AC

**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 17.

**PROPOSAL NO. 17**

**ACTION: Carried as Amended**

**DESCRIPTION:** Split Central Kuskokwim AC into two committees

**AMENDMENTS:** A new *Stony-Holitna Advisory Committee* was created to be composed of Sleetmute, Lime Village, Red Devil, and Stony River, with two seats for each community. The Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee was reformatted with two seats for each of Crooked Creek, Aniak, Chuathbaluk, Lower Kalskag and Upper Kalskag.

**DISCUSSION:** The board agreed that dividing the committee into two separate committees will reduce travel and logistical problems for committee meetings and improve the ability to achieve a quorum. Having two committees will result in better representation at the local level to provide input to the boards. The board understood that the intent of the proposal was that each village have equal representation. The new committee will start with members from the current Central Kuskokwim AC that reside in the communities.

**PROPOSAL NO. 18**

**ACTION: Carried as Amended**

**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs on the North Slope

**AMENDMENTS:** Create a new *North Slope Advisory Committee* with one seat for each of Barrow, Point Hope, Point Lay, Wainwright, Atqasuk, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut, and Anaktuvuk Pass, plus one undesignated seat.

**DISCUSSION:** The board recognized that state regulations listed two committees for this region. It also heard that an advisory committee has operated successfully for a number of years as a single committee representing all North Slope communities. This committee has been supported by the North Slope Borough. The board voted to modify the regulations to provide for a single North Slope advisory committee to facilitate

increased coordination between the Boards Support Section and the current committee. The board discussed the make up of the committee and the seat designations for the communities.

**PROPOSAL NO. 19****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the Middle Nenana River area**DISCUSSION:** The board noted the lack of support for this proposal and that the area consists of different game management units between the areas represented by the committees.**PROPOSAL NO. 20****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the area west of Denali National Park**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the pros and cons of the proposal and the potential value of insuring the community of Lake Minchumina representation on a neighboring advisory committee, whether it be the McGrath, Minto/Nenana or Fairbanks committee. The board noted that the Lake Minchumina AC has been inactive for over a decade. Combining it with the McGrath AC was considered, but concerns over travel logistics, use of a different watershed, and lack of local awareness of the proposal lead the board to conclude that no change was needed at this time. The board also discussed the process for dissolving inactive committees.**PROPOSAL NO. 21****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the Middle Yukon River area**DISCUSSION:** The board did not support the proposal since both of these advisory committees are active and the Ruby AC opposed the proposal. It noted the difficulty for the Ruby AC to achieve quorums for meetings, and noted that the Middle Yukon AC welcomed representation for Ruby on its committee.**PROPOSAL NO. 22****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Restructure ACs in the lower Tanana River area**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the pros and cons of merging these two active committees. There was discussion about whether the committees' vote in favor for the proposal was because the committees felt consolidation may be inevitable or because the committee members felt that they would have a stronger voice before the boards by combining.**PROPOSAL NO. 23****ACTION: Carried as Amended****DESCRIPTION:** Remove undesignated seats from advisory committees**AMENDMENTS:** Undesignated seats were reassigned as follows:*Edna Bay AC:* Converted the undesignated seat to an Edna Bay seat.*Copper Basin AC:* Added 1 seat for Tazlina, 1 seat for Copper Center, and 2 seats for Gakona/Gulkana.*Mt. Yenlo AC:* Converted the 4 Talkeetna seats to undesignated seats.*Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road AC:* Added 1 seat for Mentasta and 1 seat for Chistochina.*Lower Yukon AC:* Deleted 2 undesignated seats. Specified community name change from Sheldon's Point to Nunam Iqua.*Upper Kobuk AC:* Added 2 seats for Shungnak, 1 seat for Kobuk and deleted 8 undesignated seats.

*Middle Nenana River AC:* Deleted 1 seat for Clear, deleted 1 seat for McKinley Village, deleted the seat for Kantashina, added a seat for Ferry, and deleted 2 undesignated seats.

*Middle Yukon AC:* Added 1 seat for Koyukuk, deleted the 3 undesignated seats

*Grayling/Anvik/Shageluk/Holy Cross AC:* added 1 seat for Anvik and 1 seat for Shageluk, deleted 1 seat from Holy Cross, and deleted 1 undesignated seat.

**DISCUSSION:** The board heard that some committees have difficulty with their undesignated seats such as determining where to hold elections for seats not assigned to specific communities. Board members found that the changes in the amended proposal were supported by the affected advisory committees and concluded the change will enhance their representation and effectiveness.

**PROPOSAL NO. 24**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Institute a "town hall" system

**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed a "town hall" type system where every voting age area resident in attendance would serve as a committee member at any given meeting. It concluded this would be impossible to manage, both for larger communities and for smaller communities where travel arrangements must be made in advance. The board also noted the current practice of committees allowing public testimony is sufficient for allowing input and recommendations from all in attendance.

**PROPOSAL NO. 25**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Add to qualification for members

**DISCUSSION:** Board members agreed that requiring candidates write a letter indicating their knowledge of and experience with fish and wildlife resources is not necessary and could be an added burden. The board noted that candidates can submit letters should they choose to and that committees typically allow candidates the opportunity to present an oral description of their knowledge and experience as part of the election process.

**PROPOSAL NO. 26**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Modify qualification for advisory committee members

**DISCUSSION:** Board members discussed the pros and cons of this proposal, which was deferred from March 2006. It noted that there were written comments that were in support and in opposition to the proposal. The board heard concern over the need to allow young residents to qualify if they have the expertise. It also heard concern that the proposed fine amounts for the fish and game violations are too low; that local communities should decide who is or isn't qualified for membership; and that in areas of overlapping AC jurisdiction there are instances where it is feasible to have one person on two committees. Board members expressed concern for placing too many restrictions on AC members.

**PROPOSAL NO. 27**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Delete reference to regional councils

**DISCUSSION:** Board members supported keeping the regulations in place in case the regional councils are needed in the future.

**PROPOSAL NO. 28**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Designate one seat for each user group

**DISCUSSION:** Board members were aware that many advisory committees do, by their own internal policy, designate seats for various user groups. Board members agreed that the ACs should be able to accommodate their own needs and situations and that this should not be specified through regulation.

**PROPOSAL NO. 29**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Allow advisory committees to modify procedures

**DISCUSSION:** Board members commented that the intent of the proposal was unclear. Roberts Rules of Order already provides a vehicle to suspend parliamentary rules if needed. Allowing advisory committees to modify other regulations, which provide the structure for AC operations, could lead to significant confusion.

**PROPOSAL NO. 30**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Delete logistics as a factor in establishing new advisory committees

**DISCUSSION:** Board members commented that logistics is not the lone factor when establishing advisory committees; it is one of eight factors to consider. The board agreed that the change was not necessary.

**PROPOSAL NO. 31**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Require board to schedule meetings

**DISCUSSION:** The board heard concern by advisory committees and the public over the deadlines for submitting game proposals occurring before the availability of the most recent survey data on game populations and suggestions that this proposal may be a way to improve upon the timing for providing public comment.

**PROPOSAL NO. 32**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Reduce standard for active status to one meeting per year

**DISCUSSION:** The board discussed the pros and cons of the proposal. The current standard for active status is two meetings per year, however, it is not being enforced and there are situations where only one meeting is necessary due to the board cycles or because of the difficulty in achieving a quorum. Board members also commented on the need for legislative funding to keep a viable and active advisory committee system in place for effective fish and game management.

**PROPOSAL NO. 33**

**ACTION: Failed**

**DESCRIPTION:** Allow AC representatives opportunity to contribute to deliberations

**DISCUSSION:** Board members discussed the current policy for providing advisory committee members more time to testify during board meetings, the option of testifying at the beginning or the end during public testimony, and the boards' ability to inquire with advisory committee members during other portions of the meeting if needed. They also commented on the past practice of providing a separate table in the meeting room for AC members. The sentiment by some advisory committees that the boards do not listen to the committees' concerns was recognized, but board members expressed the contrary view because they take careful notes during public testimony and they have the opportunity to talk with representatives during breaks. The board also discussed the difficulty of implementing this practice in a manner that is fair and equitable for all without being cumbersome. The Department of Law explained that the procedures for

conducting board meetings are not in regulation and that each chair has authority to implement changes like this without regulatory action. They also pointed out that the Joint Board does not have authority to tell each individual board how to conduct its meetings.

**PROPOSAL NO. 34****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Increase AC participation during board meetings and in deliberations**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 33.**PROPOSAL NO. 35****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Allow AC representatives opportunity to contribute to deliberations**DISCUSSION:** The board took no action based on the action taken on Proposal 33.**PROPOSAL NO. 36****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Change timing of AC testimony during board meetings**DISCUSSION:** Board members discussed the concerns expressed by some advisory committee members for having the ability to testify at board meetings at or near the time the board deliberates on proposals. They recognized the perception by advisory committees that board members do not listen to the committees' concerns. Board members commented on potential benefits and drawbacks of adopting the proposal and they reiterated that the boards can provide this opportunity by policy without taking regulatory action. The board expressed appreciation for the hard work of the advisory committees and agreed that a letter from the joint board chairmen to the AC chairs will be sent explaining that these issues were discussed that each board will seriously consider them separately under each board's policy.**PROPOSAL NO. 37****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Remove Funter Bay from Juneau Nonsubsistence Area**DISCUSSION:** Board members recognized that this area has become more of a recreational use area by Juneau residents over the past 15 years since the nonsubsistence area was first determined. An increased number of Juneau residents are utilizing this area for fish and game resources. There was discussion over the intent of the proposal of protecting the subsistence lifestyle of those living in the area.**PROPOSAL NO. 38****ACTION: Failed****DESCRIPTION:** Include portions of Unit 13 in a nonsubsistence area**DISCUSSION:** Board members were provided information on the work over the past few years by the Board of Game to make improvements to the Tier II moose and caribou permit hunts in Unit 13. Comparisons were made on the moose and caribou harvest data in the proposed nonsubsistence area and the percentage of harvest on federal land. Board members debated whether socio-economic data has changed since the Joint Board created the existing nonsubsistence areas in 1992. Concerns were expressed that the data presented by the department should have been focused on the communities within the proposed nonsubsistence area, rather than all communities in Units 11 and 13. Board members inquired about the communities that were considered by the Joint Board in 1992 when the determination was made. There was discussion about the boundaries for the proposed nonsubsistence area. A concern expressed was

that the area encompasses three river systems and that some communities would not be able to hunt in their own backyard.

**PROPOSAL NO. A****ACTION: No Action****DESCRIPTION:** Limit volume of comments submitted by single entity

**DISCUSSION:** The Department of Law described a recent situation of lengthy comment submitted by a single group during a Board of Game meeting and how the boards are required under the Alaska's Administrative Procedures Act to consider every comment before making decisions. It noted a potential for an advocacy group to prevent the board from acting by manipulating the board policy of accepting public comment throughout the meeting. The Department of Law also presented various options for public comment that the boards may consider. Board members expressed a desire that department comments be treated differently from public comments. Board members agreed that each board will discuss the topic at future meetings.

**Wildlife Violator Compact**

Representative Craig Johnson submitted information on proposed legislation for Alaska to join with the 27 other states that participate in a Wildlife Violator Compact. Board members supported the idea and will follow up with a letter of support.

**BOG / BOF Procedures**

The board reviewed the differences between the procedures used by each board and discussed public participation and difficulties resulting from those differences. No action was taken.