

- My preference is for a delayed cycle due to the many obstacles that both an in-person and virtual meeting would pose.
- Thanks for extending the opportunity to provide feedback on the BOF mtg from staff. I think the hurdles that we'd have to overcome in conducting an in-person mtg in the middle of a pandemic greatly outweigh the technological hurdles. Albeit there will be a learning curve with any virtual mtg, however, it will likely be more cost effective given our state's fiscal situation and the lowest risk for everyone's health and safety. If we planned for a virtual mtg whether it be on-time or delayed it would provide some certainty for staff and the public. Here are my suggestions for a virtual mtg:

BOF Virtual mtg

1. Hire tech positions or utilize OIT to run the virtual platform mtg;
 2. Pick a platform that everyone is familiar with
 - a. Zoom is readily available and is utilized by multiple agencies (i.e. industry, school districts, city assemblies, etc.) and is familiar to the general public;
 - b. MS Teams could still be utilized for ADFG staff for internal discussions, documents, etc.
 - i. i.e. create a BOF Team with various channels such as, finfish, shellfish, etc.
 - c. Need to have call-in option, someone to monitor chat windows, and muting audio;
 3. Create a sequence of training seminars for the public and staff on participating in a virtual mtg in preparation for the mtg;
 4. Create email for ADFG hubs (i.e. groundfish, shellfish, salmon, etc.) for communication with the public (i.e. recreate those situations where you may talk to a BOF member and an industry member in modifying proposals, regs, etc.);
 5. Be flexible. Likely a virtual mtg will go longer due to adaption to a virtual mtg, any tech issues may arise, and general fatigue of sitting in front of a computer all day;
 6. Create a virtual mtg expectations and agreements. We want to avoid crude, inappropriate, disruptive, and "trolling" behavior for a large public mtg;
- We are plowing ahead as if it will happen. In regards to the meeting, I can't see a virtual meeting working for the BOF process. Primarily, I can't see it working for the committee as a whole process. I also think the other big aspect that would be lost, is the ability for the user groups to get that critical face to face time with individual board members during breaks and before and after meetings. Both of these, in my view, are key to the board of fish process, allowing the board to make the most informed decisions possible.

I think going virtual would work for other aspects including staff reports, deliberations, and being available to answers questions during the committee as a whole process. As such, I think we could get by with not having as much in person staff participation as we have in past years. If staff don't feel comfortable or can't attend in person, they don't have to. They would still need to stand by to be available by phone or video. We would likely need folks

like yourself, regional sups, and coordinators to attend in person to make it work but other staff could attend virtually or telephonically. It would just take more coordination, good equipment and plenty of bandwidth.

What is the feeling of board members and board staff of having an in-person meeting? I guess if board members don't want to travel and meet in person, then that is out. Also we need a our board support staff to make it happen as well. Next, I would wonder how many of our staff our willing to travel and attend an in-person meeting. I think most, if not all, of my management staff would travel and meet in-person, but I know other F&G staff will absolutely not. I think a confidential poll (don't want peer pressure to influence folks) of staff would answer a lot questions on that front.

- I have given a fair amount of thought to this, despite the fact that it should be a light board year for my region. No EGs, and really only the shellfish (which is doubled up from last year). In light of this, I would be perfectly fine bumping out a year, but also recognize this might be less palatable for other areas.

There is so much interaction between the staff and the board off record as well as between the board and the public off record, I do not see how you have a meaningful meeting. You could build in time for the board to have additional lines of communication to the department, but this still seems like it opens the board up to more scrutiny of their decisions.

So, my first choice for process and clarity would be to postpone everything a year. My second choice would be virtual meetings with extra thought into how the board can virtually engage board members and how board members can virtually engage staff.

- To me it seems like postponing a year is the most logical solution for this. I'm not up to speed on the SE issues but PWS salmon would be fine given the current management structure. An additional year of data could be informative on the salmon side of things however, I'm not sure how sensitive GF/SF fisheries would be to waiting another year. Perhaps postponing some, but not all, proposals?

I completely agree that there will be considerable logistical hurdles to overcome if we try for virtual meetings. There's often problems with just the "live streaming" of the BOF audio. Virtual meetings would not eliminate the "after hours" discussions with board members but would keep the "public at large" from seeing it and therefore reduce accountability?

Postponement or virtual will have cost savings associated. When we're getting 20% reduction scenario requests.... can't ignore it. Just a few thoughts. Certainly not comprehensive. Thanks.

- Staff expressed an interest in understanding how a board meeting can be postponed and who has the authority? We recognize other agencies are involved (i.e., Dept. of Law) and decisions related to postponement will be based on DOL input.
- Staff expressed concern that the public will be disenfranchised if meetings are postponed. Several commented that Alaska's process provides folks an opportunity to have direct input to resource management.

- Several Staff asked about the logistics of postponing the meetings to include: Will there be a new call for proposals for the postponed meeting? Is the thought to simply shift this year's meeting to next and then pick up the schedule, essentially a year off from what we are working on now? We would very much like to avoid a series of super-BOG meetings.
- There are some proposals that have statutory requirements for annual renewal: antlerless reauthorizations; brown bear tag fee exemptions; and a couple Intensive Management Projects slated to expire (though we can manage without them in place and there are proposals for these when we get to the meeting) that should be addressed, or that we ensure we have the authority to not renew for a year. We are working to identify others that may need action or that we need to ensure we have authority to postpone.
- Several folks noted that other regulatory meetings both in-state and nationally are occurring in a virtual setting and they can be successfully accomplished.
- Recognizing there are many virtual platforms out there, Zoom seemed to be preferred over Teams.
- I think having an in-person meeting is very difficult. On a daily basis we learn of communities that prefer folks not visit during this time and (specifically hunters traveling around the state) and a virtual meeting, if meeting at all, is probably the best way forward. Also, I encourage us to move forward on making a decision for the BOG. There are two meetings planned and staff are fully engaged in AR prep and even presentations at this point but if things are going to be postponed that will free folks up to do things like hunt administration, surveys, etc. Depending on what happens we can adjust timeline internally for folks. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
- After some reflection: I try to imagine the meeting virtually and it's next to impossible. How many times do we talk to each other and have to quickly draft a document, or pull data or notes, etc. I get data requests non-stop. Many times from the commercial side of business on the fly in regards to a topic being discussed at the table, or a sub-committee. We also wouldn't be able to quickly submit RCs, talk to staff, or if a board member had a question or needed data, I can't imagine what a nightmare that would be to review from all ends, signoff on the data. This is a public process for a reason, I can't imagine trying to pull it off virtually. The public has a hard time with meetings in Anchorage the way it is. Limiting their participation any more wouldn't be fair to them. There is a giant advantage to having all staff present to quickly answer questions, or to be called on and have to clarify data or any other issues for Board members and the public.
- My thoughts on this would be to postpone. While technology does offer some avenues to conduct parts of the meetings, the in person aspect, especially committee of the whole, that builds in the small details and user perspectives for board members would be lost or at least diminished. This may also unintentionally disenfranchise users that are not technology savvy or have limited availability/access, which there are many as we have all experienced with license/permits/reporting all moving online. Additionally, any meetings that would take place in locations outside the major population centers could face significant internet available and speed issues.

- Recommendation is to delay meeting cycle for a year. Push the entire 3-year cycle back a year.
 - Past discussions have entertained the idea of a 5yr cycle so this isn't the first time the idea that the cycle be longer.
 - Rarely are there proposals that truly address a conservation concern that can't be addressed through our EO authority.
 - Regulations that need to be changed to address a conservation issue is generally submitted by the department.
 - Any proposal that is purely allocative can wait.

In lieu of conducting the meeting, continued use of the ACR and emergency petition process can be used to address conservation issues that require a regulatory change. This process will be much smaller and would be easier to facilitate via online/virtual meeting format.

- I tried to work though how a virtual BOF would work, or if it could work in a larger space to allow social distancing but just couldn't see how it would work. So I agree we should just postpone and push the entire cycle back one year. We may want to consider if board members or board and staff identify proposals that address conservation, discuss them at worksession and take them up at a virtual meeting at some point. Would avoid using emergency petitions, give conservation driven proposals an airing in October to decide if they should be taken up (like the ACR process), and would let the public know what will be taken up and when.
- Could we consider giving the public the opportunity to submit something in writing as well that a staff person reads into the public record? For brevity, we could limit the reading time and/or word count. In that way, anyone with phone issues has a workaround.
- I think we are in this for another 2 years or so and pushing timelines will only get us so far. We really need to get out of the box in our thinking. There is no perfect way to recreate what happens in person and there are barriers inherent in what we do now just based on the public's ability (money, time, etc.) to participate in person. I'll keep thinking. I do know that in addition to appropriate technology and testing the system, what makes it breaks use of videoconferencing is the quality of facilitation.

SURVEY RESPONSES FROM ADF&G

Please explain your opposition to holding virtual meetings?

- virtual meetings would not allow for the standard process where public wait at the line to talk to board members to lobby them to advocate for certain actions. It would also not allow members of the public to meet with people of opposing positions and reach a compromise and develop substitute language.
- A large part of what make the system work is the person to person interactions, where individuals and group representatives interact directly with board members and each other. Many side meetings between parties allow compromises to be achieved that can then be presented to board members regarding a particular proposal that would be extremely difficult

or impossible at a virtual level. People not 'electronically fluent' may be shut out of the process if held virtually which goes against the very public nature of the process. Board decisions on contentious proposals could be challenged by parties feeling the process disenfranchised them.

- Limits participation and allows some people to be overlooked because of the virtual aspect.
- Discussions will not be as thorough in a virtual meeting. Many attendees will not know how or be capable of attending a virtual meeting.
- Without good internet or phone connection you can't meaningfully participate. Can't work collaboratively during breaks to craft compromises.
- limits public interaction, not everyone in Alaska has fast internet. Limited interaction with BOF and the process. BOF meeting should be postponed until the public can safely and reliably interact in the process.
- There are many important side conversations between and among board members, the public, department staff, etc. that would very difficult or impossible to replicate through virtual meetings. This would drastically change the way business is generally conducted.

Please offer any other thoughts you would like to provide:

- Postponing is the best option for public process and public safety
- Put the entire schedule off one year as if 2020 did not happen.
- I think due to the situation, all offerings need to be put on the table.
- Zoom does not function for me. MS Teams or other may work. As Zoom does not function for me, it is likely that using Zoom would create additional limitations to others that may bias participation.
- Without in person meetings, many people will be left out.
- For a change, there should be a long-term vision and not a knee-jerk reaction to this (covid) situation. This could be viewed as an opportunity to improve the Board process, not simply how to get through it. For example, more resources (e.g., research results) could be made available online than can be presented in person, improving our fellow constituents' understanding of the complexities of these ecological systems.
- Delay the process one year and re-evaluate situation. Have BOF take up in a special session issues which can not be postponed.
- the sooner people know how to plan for this meeting the better; that seems to suggest being conservative with decisions which is to say...this should not be an inperson meeting or it should be pushed to another year

Selected survey results from ADF&G Staff

1. What is your level of concern regarding contracting COVID-19? (0 no concern - 10 extremely concerned) (0=Lowest Concern, 10=Highest Concern)

Of the 23 that answered, the average was 7.1.

2. If current COVID-19 related conditions remain the same or worsen do you believe the board should:

Hold in-person meetings?
 Hold virtual & teleconferenced meetings?
 Postpone meetings until conditions allow?

	Yes	%	No	%	Maybe	%	Total responses
Hold in-person meetings?	0	0%	19	86%	3	14%	22
Hold virtual & teleconferenced meetings?	11	50%	5	23%	6	27%	22
Postpone meetings until conditions allow?	12	55%	8	36%	2	9%	22