

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

DEAR REVIEWER:

January 2007

The Joint Boards of Fisheries and Game will consider the attached book of regulatory proposals at its **October 2007** meeting. The proposals concern changes to the state's local fish and game advisory committee system and the Joint Board nonsubsistence areas. Members of the public, organizations, advisory committees, and staff timely submitted these proposals. The proposals are published essentially as they were received.

The proposals in this book are presented as brief statements summarizing the intended regulatory changes. In cases where confusion might arise or where the regulation is complex, proposed changes are also indicated in legal format. In this format, bolded and underlined words are **additions** to the regulation text, and capitalized words or letters in square brackets [XXXX] are deletions from the regulation text.

You are encouraged to read all proposals presented in this book. Some regulations have statewide application and some regulations may affect other regions of the state. In this book the proposals are grouped by topic (see PROPOSAL INDEX). These proposal lists are not in roadmap order for the meeting. The Joint Board will generate a roadmap for deliberations prior to the meeting. The roadmap may be changed up to and during the meeting.

Before taking action on these proposed changes to the regulations, the Joint Board would like your written comments and/or oral testimony on any effects the proposed changes would have on your activities. After reviewing the proposals, please send written comments to:

ATTN: JOINT BOARD COMMENTS
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
Fax: 907-465-6094

Public comment, in combination with Advisory Committee comments and ADF&G staff presentations, provide the Joint Board with useful information to form decisions. Comments may be submitted at any time until the public testimony period for that proposal and/or its subject matter is closed at the meeting and the board begins deliberations. As a practical matter, you are encouraged to mail or fax your written comments to the above Juneau address at least two weeks before the scheduled meeting.

Written comment deadline: September 21, 2007

Receipt by this date will ensure inclusion in the board workbook. All comments received after that time will be presented to board members at the time of the meeting, but may not be printed in the board workbook. Written comments will also be accepted during the board meeting and public testimony during the public testimony portion of the meeting is always appreciated. Written comments become public documents.

When providing written comments regarding these proposals, list the PROPOSAL NUMBER to which your comment pertains and specifically whether you SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposal. This will ensure that your comments are correctly noted for the board members. If the comments support a modification in the proposal, please indicate SUPPORT AS AMENDED and provide a preferred amendment in writing.

Please briefly explain WHY you are in support or opposition of the proposal. Board actions are based on a complete review of the facts involved in each proposal, not a mere calculation of comments for or against a proposal. Advisory committees and other groups also need to explain the rationale behind recommendations. Minority viewpoints from an advisory committee should be noted in advisory committee minutes along with the majority recommendation. The board benefits greatly from understanding the pro and cons of each issue. A brief description consisting of a couple of sentences is sufficient. If making comments on more than one proposal, please do not use separate pieces of paper. Simply begin the next set of written comments by listing the next proposal number.

Written comments will be photocopied so please use 8 1/2" x 11" paper and leave reasonable margins on all sides, allowing for hole punches. Whether typed or handwritten, use dark ink and write legibly.

Pertinent policies and findings, proposals, written comment deadlines, meeting calendars and notices for the Joint Board meetings are posted on the Board Support website at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/>.

An agenda for the meeting will be available prior to the meeting. Also, the most current roadmap will be provided at the meeting, which will set forth the order in which proposals will be considered.

Persons with a disability needing special accommodations in order to comment on the proposed regulations should contact the Boards Support Section at (907) 465-4110 no later than two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting to make any necessary arrangements.

**JOINT BOARDS OF FISHERIES AND GAME
TABEL OF CONTENTS
2007 PROPOSAL BOOK**

INTRODUCTION SECTION

Page Number

Reviewer Letter	i-ii
Tabel of Contents	iii
List of Proposals:	iv-v
Tenative Joint Board Meeting Schedule	vi
Board of Fisheries and Board of Game Membership Rosters	vii-viii
Boards Support Section Staff Contact Information	ix
Draft Public/Legal Notice	x-xi

PROPOSAL SECTION

Page Number

Advisory Committees: Southeast Region	1
Advisory Committees: Southcentral Region	4
Advisory Committees: Southwest Region	9
Advisory Committees: Western Region	10
Advisory Committees: Arctic Region.....	14
Advisory Committees: Interior Region.....	15
Advisory Committees: Statewide	17
Nonsubsistence Areas	34

LIST OF PROPOSALS

Proposal	Author	Action requested
<i>Establishment of fish and game advisory committees (5 AAC 96.021)</i>		
1	Robert Jahnke	Restructure Ketchikan AC for game issues
2	ADF&G	Restructure ACs on western Prince of Wales Island
3	ADF&G	Restructure AC on northern Prince of Wales Island
4	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the Ketchikan area
5	ADF&G	Restructure AC on northern Chichagof Island
6	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the upper Lynn Canal area
7	Mat. Valley AC	Create a Parks Highway AC representing Big Lake to Trapper Creek
8	Ahtna Tene Nene'	Create a new Copper Basin region advisory committee with designated seats for Ahtna villages
9	Valdez AC	Rename the Valdez AC to Prince William Sound/Valdez AC
10	ADF&G	Restructure AC on the northern Kenai Peninsula
11	ADF&G	Restructure AC on the southern Kenai Peninsula
12	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the Nelchina Basin
13	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough
14	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the Bristol Bay area
15	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the False Pass area
16	Central Kuskokwim AC	Change number of representatives for each village
17	Central Kuskokwim AC	Split Central Kuskokwim AC into two committees
18	ADF&G	Restructure AC on the North Slope
19	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the Middle Nenana River area
20	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the area west of Denali National Park
21	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the Middle Yukon River area
22	ADF&G	Restructure AC in the lower Tanana River area
23	ADF&G	Remove undesignated seats from several advisory committees
24	Daniel Elliott	Institute a "town hall" system
<i>Qualifications for members (5 AAC 96.040)</i>		
25	Raymond H. Heuer	Add to qualification for members
26	ADF&G	Modify qualification for members

LIST OF PROPOSALS (continued)

Proposal	Author	Action requested
<i>Functions of local fish and game advisory committees (5 AAC 96.050)</i>		
27	Raymond H. Heuer	Delete reference to regional councils
<i>Uniform rules of operation (5 AAC 96.060)</i>		
28	George Siavelis	Designate one seat for each user group
29	Raymond H. Heuer	Allow advisory committees to modify procedures
<i>Review of requests for local fish and game advisory committees (5 AAC 96.420)</i>		
30	Raymond H. Heuer	Delete logistics as a factor in establishing new advisory committees
<i>Board assistance (5 AAC 96.440)</i>		
31	Raymond H. Heuer	Require board to schedule meetings
<i>Committee status and change of status (5 AAC 96.450)</i>		
32	Raymond H. Heuer	Reduce standard for active status to one meeting per year
<i>Advisory Committee participation at board meetings</i>		
33	Upper Tanana/40mile AC	Allow AC representatives a seat at the board table and an opportunity to contribute to deliberations
34	Fairbanks AC	Increase advisory committee participation during board meetings and in deliberations
35	Central Peninsula AC	Allow AC representatives a seat at the board table and an opportunity to contribute to deliberations
36	Middle Nenana River AC	Change timing of AC testimony during board meetings
<i>Joint Board nonsubsistence areas (5 AAC 99.015)</i>		
37	Phil Emerson	Remove Funtner Bay from Juneau Nonsubsistence Area
38	Mat. Valley AC	Include portions of Units 13, 14, and 20 in a non-subsistence area

**Alaska Joint Boards of Fisheries and Game
2007 and 2008
Tentative Meeting Schedule**

Local fish and game advisory committee system, and
Joint Board nonsubsistence areas

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: December 8, 2006

Dates [and Duration]	Topics	Location
October 5-8, 2007 [4 days]	Local Fish and Game Advisory Committee System; and initial review of Nonsubsistence Areas	Anchorage (Coast International Inn)
<i>***Written comment deadline: <u>September 21, 2007</u>***</i>		
October 2008	Regulatory action on Nonsubsistence Areas	Anchorage

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

(Revised July 2006)

Name / Address	Term Expires
Art Nelson (Vice Chair) 2132 Clark St. Anchorage, Alaska 99504	06/30/2007
Jeremiah Campbell PO Box 1586 Seward, AK 99664	06/30/2009
Rupe Andrews 9416 Long Run Dr. Juneau, Alaska 99801	06/30/2008
Bonnie Williams PO Box 82812 Fairbanks, Alaska 99708	06/30/2009
Robert Heyano PO Box 1409 Dillingham, AK 99576	06/30/2007
John Jensen PO Box 681 Petersburg, AK 99833	06/30/2008
Mel Morris (Chair) 917 Mill Bay Road Kodiak, Alaska 99615	06/30/2008

Alaska Board of Fisheries members may also be reached at:

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
PHONE: (907) 465-4110
FAX: (907) 465-6094
www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

(Revised December 2006)

Member's Name and Address	Term Expires
Ron Somerville, Chair 4506 Robbie Road Juneau, Alaska 99802	3/1/2008
Cliff Judkins, Vice Chair PO Box 874124 Wasilla, Alaska 99687	3/1/2009
Ben Grussendorf 1221 Halibut Point Rd. Sitka, AK 99835	3/1/2007
Richard Burley 1165 Coppet Street Fairbanks, Alaska 99709	3/1/2009
Ted Spraker 49230 Victoria Ave. Soldotna, Alaska 99669	3/1/2008
Paul Johnson PO Box 329 Unalakleet, AK 99684	3/1/2008
Bob Bell 801 West Fireweed Lane Anchorage, AK 99503	3/1/2007

Alaska Board of Game members may also be reached at:

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Boards Support Section
P.O. Box 115526
Juneau, AK 99811-5526
PHONE: (907) 465-4110
FAX: (907) 465-6094
www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us

Boards Support Section – Staff Contact Information

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

PO Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

(907) 465-4110

(907) 465-6094 Fax

HEADQUARTERS

Board of Fisheries

Jim Marcotte, Exec. Director II 465-6095

Gerry Bigelow, Pub. Tech. II 465-6097

Board of Game

Kristy Tibbles, Exec. Director I 465-6098

Scott Crass, Pub. Specialist II 465-4046

Olivia Orsborn, Administrative Manager 465-6096

Lindsay Terry, Administrative Clerk III 465-4110

REGIONAL OFFICES

Arctic Region

Charlie Gregg

PO Box 689

Kotzebue, AK 99752

Phone: (907) 442-1717

Fax: (907) 442-2420

Southeast Region

Gerry Bigelow

PO Box 115526

Juneau, AK 99811-5526

Phone: (907) 465-6097

Fax: (907) 465-6094

Interior Region

Rita St. Louis

1300 College Road

Fairbanks, AK 99701-1599

Phone: (907) 459-7263

Fax: (907) 459-7258

Southwest Region

Joe Chythlook

PO Box 1030

Dillingham, AK 99576

Phone: (907) 842-5142

Fax: (907) 842-5514

Southcentral Region

Sherry Wright

333 Raspberry Road

Anchorage, AK 99518-1599

Phone: (907) 267-2354

Fax: (907) 267-2489

For updated information on the progress of an ongoing Board of Fisheries or Board of Game meeting,
call: Juneau 465-8901; outside Juneau 1-800-764-8901

Website address: <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us/>

(Updated November 2006)

DRAFT
NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE REGULATIONS
OF THE ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES AND ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

The Alaska Board of Fisheries and the Alaska Board of Game, propose to jointly adopt, amend, or repeal regulations in Title 5 of the Alaska Administrative Code, dealing with the following: Regulations concerning the local fish and game advisory committees, 5 AAC 96 and 5 AAC 97; and regulations concerning Joint Board nonsubsistence areas, 5 AAC 99.015 including, but not limited to the following:

DISTRIBUTION AND COMPOSITION of local fish and game advisory committees.

QUALIFICATION FOR MEMBERS, including limits on committee membership for a person with a conviction for violating fishing and hunting laws or a felony conviction, a person whose residence is outside of the committee's area of jurisdiction, and a person who is a member of another committee.

FUNCTIONS AND UNIFORM RULES OF OPERATION of local fish and game advisory committees.

ADMINISTRATION of local fish and game advisory committees.

JOINT BOARD NONSUBSISTENCE AREAS, these are areas of the state where dependence upon subsistence is not a principal characteristic of the economy, culture and way of life of the area or community.

The Joint Board established the current nonsubsistence areas 1992 as required by the state subsistence law. When considering proposed changes to the existing areas, the board will need to identify if any significant new information is available and it will need to address specific socio-economic characteristics.

A two-step approach will be used for the nonsubsistence area proposals. The board will first perform a preliminary review of the proposals during the October 2007 meeting. During this preliminary review, the board will conduct an initial assessment of the proposals, will identify the information needed for a full review of appropriate proposals, and will schedule appropriate proposals for further public review and department analysis. The second step will be regulatory action at a meeting planned for 2008.

Notice is also given that the Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game will discuss the need to schedule a joint meeting within the next year to consider regulatory changes to the nonsubsistence areas.

You may comment on the proposed regulations, including the potential costs to private persons for complying with the proposed changes. Written comments will be taken regarding the subjects in this notice as explained below. Written comments will be accepted on any subject in this notice and may be submitted to the Joint Board of Fisheries and Game any time before the proposal is voted on by the board in deliberations at the meeting scheduled below, but as a practical matter, comments submitted after the board begins deliberations on relevant proposals are likely to receive less consideration than comments submitted earlier. Written comments

should be submitted by **5 P.M. ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2007**, to: Joint Board of Fisheries and Game, Boards Support Section, P.O. Box 115526, Juneau, AK 99811-5526, or by fax to (907) 465-6094, to ensure inclusion in the board workbooks. Written comments are accepted by mail or fax; written comments become public records and are subject to public inspection. The boards will take oral public testimony at this meeting.

TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE

Coast International Inn
3450 Aviation Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska
October 5-8, 2007

Any changes to meeting locations, dates or times, or rescheduling of topics or subject matter will be announced by news release. Please watch for these announcements in the news media on the Boards Support Section website at <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us> or call (907) 465-4110.

If you are a person with a disability needing special accommodations in order to participate in this process, please contact Olivia Orsborn at (907) 465-4110 no later than September 21, 2007 to ensure that any necessary accommodations can be provided.

For a copy of the proposed regulation changes, contact the Boards Support section at the above address, or visit the website at: <http://www.boards.adfg.state.ak.us>

Anyone interested in or affected by advisory committee composition, membership qualifications, rules of operation, or Joint Board nonsubsistence areas is hereby informed that, by publishing this legal notice the Joint Boards of Fisheries Game may consider any or all of the subject areas covered by this notice. **THE BOARDS ARE NOT LIMITED BY THE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE OR CONFINES OF ACTUAL PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE PUBLIC OR DEPARTMENT STAFF.** Pursuant to AS 44.62.200, the boards may review the full range of activities appropriate to any of the subjects listed in this notice.

After reviewing written public comment, the boards may jointly adopt these or other provisions dealing with the same subject, without further notice, or amend, reject, supplement, defer, or decide to take no action on the proposed regulations. The language of the final regulations may be different from the proposed regulations. **YOU SHOULD SUBMIT WRITTEN COMMENT DURING THE TIME ALLOWED IF YOUR INTERESTS COULD BE AFFECTED.**

Statutory Authority: AS 16.05

Statutes being implemented, interpreted, or made specific: AC 16.258 and AS 16.05.260

Fiscal Information: The proposed regulation changes are not expected to require an increased appropriation.

Date: _____

_____/s/
Jim Marcotte, Executive Director
Alaska Board of Fisheries
(907) 465-4110

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: SOUTHEAST REGION

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: SOUTHCENTRAL REGION

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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 75 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)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: SOUTHWEST REGION

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 undesigned 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)

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 at 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)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: WESTERN REGION

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)

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.

PROPOSED BY: Central Kuskokwim Advisory Committee (I-07JB-005)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: ARCTIC REGION

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)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: INTERIOR REGION

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)

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)

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)

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)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES: STATEWIDE

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]

(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
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 led to frustration on the part of advisory committee members and has led 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)

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)

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)

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 Alaskan's 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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

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)

NONSUBSISTENCE AREAS

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)

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)
