

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
Bethel Advisory Committee AC001	9	1	Support	<p>Unit 18 and unit 19 would be discussed at different cycles. 2 year cycle does not give biologists enough time to evaluate population data before having to make decisions about changing. It also conflicts with collecting data because every other year they have to prepare for board of game in January when research needs to be done.</p> <p>When the BOF and BOG cycles overlap, the AC's have to review all proposals for both which is time consuming.</p> <p>Things can be done out of cycle: thru Agenda Change Requests and Emergency Regulations. The main criticism is people like a shot at the board every two years</p> <p>Motion to support carried, but the dissenting vote was because of concern of a lack of control by the board, it was felt that they may have better control at 2 years than 3.</p> <p>This AC wants the Statewide A & B list to be taken up every 3 years <u>not</u> a 6 year cycle.</p>
Craig Advisory Committee AC002	8	0	Support	All Members were in agreement for a 3 year cycle
Eagle Advisory Committee	5	0	Support	At this time the Eagle AC unanimously supports that change,

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
AC003				<p>although we would encourage the board to continue their current Agenda Chang Request (ACR) process.</p> <p>If you live in a small community and would like to stay active with fish and game resource issues, you end up attending a lot of meetings and are away from home a lot. You need to be at those meetings in order to create and maintain connections and relationships in order to be effective. Having one less meeting a year would be nice so we could be at home more. The move could also help avoid meeting burnout.</p> <p>It is also our believe that if something is truly an emergency that it needs to be brought before the Board of Game out of cycle, then our area biologists will also think that it is an emergency and help us get either an ACR or an emergency petition written and submitted.</p>
Fairbanks Advisory Committee AC004	0	9	Oppose	<p>The Fairbanks Advisory Committee (FAC), is opposed to the Department's proposal to shift the BOG to a 3 year cycle. We believe the resource and public participation benefits of a 2 year cycle far outweigh any bureaucrat benefit to the Department. In support of it's effort to shift resources away from the public regulatory process, the department primarily cites to a slight budget cut. We believe that sustaining meaningful public participation in the regulatory process is one of the most important</p>

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				<p>uses of ADFG funding and believe that efficiencies can be found elsewhere that will help the department meet its budget while ensuring the long term viability of a public driven game management process that is the envy of most other States. The department proposal does not discuss the fact that game populations fluctuate much more rapidly than fish populations and often, hunting regulations need to be reviewed and often changed dramatically from cycle to cycle. We believe that emergency regulations and ACR's are a poor substitute for a reliable two year cycle with meaningful public involvement. Research and management practices should be designed to culminate in a predictable board cycle for various regions of the state. The FAC does not feel overburdened with the current board schedules. We take our local game issues very seriously as do many of our local constituents who actively participate in our meetings. Many of these people are focused on singular issues or a single species of game. With a cycle every two years, these folks can track the effectiveness of current regulations, changing population or harvest dynamics, and can follow proposals from the time of their drafting to final action by the board. having 3 years in between opportunities to manage 20(a) moose, or 40 mile caribou will alienate much of the public, especially if the department began imposing more emergency regulations. We do not believe the department is overburdened by having to prepare for and attend</p>

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				BOG meetings and we are not convinced that any cuts to the boards support budget will translate into more biology being practiced. Over the years, the department has undertaken various efforts to dilute the public process. This most recent effort is unwarranted and should be rejected by the Board. We believe the continued viability of local involvement in the BOG regulation process should be promoted by retaining the current 2 year cycle.
Grayling Anvik Shageluk Holy Cross Advisory Committee AC005	0	5	Oppose	We seem to work pretty good on a two year cycle would a three year cycle make management plans more solid, torn figure out the best for the area and everyone. The legislature talked about this and voted it down. Two year plan is in place and it is working, Save time and money, ACs stand to lose some clout- hard to get new folks involved in the committee, we are getting old and worn out, and it might be harder to lure folks in on a three year cycle. Sounds like a good idea, just a matter of implementing it.
Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committee AC006	9	0	Support	<p>Much discussion about the proposed savings if go to 3-yr cycle, they want to ensure that if \$50 000is saved, that it could go to the advisory committees..[Their RC] reiterated that in light of severe department budget cuts, saving that money may just help to continue to provide same services to the AC process.</p> <p>Members noted is Not easy to work for the people; AC. members want people to earn money for AC process, if cycles change just to save money, move the money to Advisory committee or members.</p>

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				<p>[Some members] asked if there was any way they can be given stipends.</p> <p>Patrick Jones•(ADFG Wildlife),supports 3•yr cycle because [the Department] can miss surveys because they are at the meeting too much. Makes it easier for [the department] to get surveys done in more time in a timely fashion. Also gives us more time to evaluate, Changing regs every year- hard to make educated decisions about the effects.</p>
Mid-Lower Yukon AC AC007	5	0	Support	MOTION TO SUPPORT PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
Stony Holitna Advisory Committee AC008	0	7	Oppose	SHAC doesn't want to see public input reduced /If a proposal is not approved, SHAC doesn't want to wait 3 years rather than 2, for another chance to remedy issue.
Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committee AC009	Unknown	Unknown	Oppose	The AC also discussed the proposed shift from a 2 year cycle to a three year cycle for the Board of Game. The Upper Tanana Fortymile AC is against this shift at this time.
Delta Advisory Committee AC010	Unknown	Unknown	Support	While the AC believes that 3 years is too long to react to certain resource related issues, we understand that a 3 year cycle is probably a better time frame with which to evaluate the effectiveness of new regulations. We also recognized that in the event of some disaster, the emergency order option will remain valid, and we would still have the option of offering an Agenda Change Request if we felt that unusual circumstances were

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				developing or that something developed that had not been considered previously.
Anchorage Advisory Committee AC011	Unknown	Unknown	Oppose	<p>This letter is to inform the Board of Game of the Anchorage AC's opposition to the BOG going to a three year cycle. Our reasons are, but not limited to the following:</p> <p>1. The AC's already have less than adequate time to advise the BOG as is our responsibility under the Statutes of the State. Going to a three year cycle will cause even further delay in the Department having adequate information on a given subject (population, winter browse conditions, snow conditions) in a timely manner on a proposal written 2 years before it is to be considered . All these conditions may have changed by the time it would be before the board in a three year cycle calling for all the work to need to be done twice. The Department does not have the scientific data need by the AC's now I.E. The SE region has a proposal from the Department on the Archipelago Wolves yet on the website there are still no comments from the Department. This is a clear violation of regulations with no action from the BOG to correct the problem. Having comments on something 2 years out would become even more problematic . Another example would be the number of proposals that would be called "placeholders ". AC's and the public hate these as we are asked to make comments without knowing what the proposal really says at all. The Department and other Agencies would be tempted to write even</p>

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				<p>more of these which completely subverts the intentions of the Statute which is designed to get comments from a well-informed public body (the AC's and the public in general) We would also see a rise in the number of ACRs as the need to do something before the next cycle year would become more urgent.</p> <p>2. The reputed cost savings are unsubstantiated : Money allocated to board support is often redirected to other areas as the departments sees fit. Any savings that would occur would get directed to things such as focus groups or surveys which are not supported by Statute but often easier for the department to manipulate than ACs.</p> <p>The Process used in Alaska is intended to empower the public. Going to a three year cycle would only decrease the public 's ability have any meaningful dialog and would strengthen the Department even more than it already is. We have never had a member of the public speak in favor of this idea, to our knowledge AC's on the whole are opposed to it. It would also mean that it would be possible for all Board and Committee members could be different between one Cycle and the next, because of term lengths, which could further dilute the continuity of between cycles.</p>
Paxson Advisory Committee AC012	0	5	Oppose	<p>All Members Opposed this Change. Greg: Be as responsive as possible. Keep it 2 years Mark: 3 year BOF cycles are okay. Fisheries are</p>

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				more stable than Game. 2 Years makes sense for Game, especially given changing environmental conditions. John: We need to be very responsive to changing weather and hunt pressure. Keep shorter cycle Lee: Keep it 2 years.
Seward Advisory Committee AC013	N/A	N/A	No Action	Regarding the proposed three year cycle for the BOG, most felt the two year cycle was better. Seems more people and issues kept coming up that required attention. Two years allow better reaction time. There are issues such as the annual renewal of antlerless moose hunts that need to be authorized. The state will see significant budget problems in the coming years and the legislature and various agencies will have to decide what is of greatest importance and how to pay for those services.
Kodiak AC AC014	12	0	Support	[Kodiak AC] discussed the change and agreed with and supported the departments reasons for doing so. It would bring consistency to the board process as the BOF is in the three year cycle. Committee members felt that for the cycle A and B cycles it should be 3 years and not 6 years which is too long a time.
Lower Bristol Bay AC AC015	12	0	Support	Group discusses the merits of having the BOG meet every three years instead of two. Myra states it is a bigger workload than needed and other agree especially on years where the BOF and BOG meet in the same cycle.
Matanuska Valley AC AC016	13	0	Support	Andy Couch made a motion for the AC to approve switching the Board of Game cycle to 3 years per area rather than 2 years. 2nd

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				by Steve Bartelli. Todd Rinaldi said this would be partly to save money and that it would provide opportunity to see what happened from a changed regulation before it might be proposed to change again. Todd said in addition to saving money -- his time could be spent for other things rather than preparing for a board meeting every other year.
Middle Nenana River AC AC017	N/A	N/A	No Action	Pat – Things change too often too quickly. Don – One advantage is to work on issues and proposals. Would give more time. The BOG of been bogged down, spend so much time on antlerless hunts. Nan – Wasn't it suggested that it would give us time? Great to see the survey
Nushagak AC AC018	6	0	Support	Probably good to go to a 3 year cycle given the discussion earlier. The one condition is that BOG and BOF don't conflict. Having both in the same year is really burdensome to AC members and staff. Too often for wildlife issues, regulation changes have been made but not enough time has passed to evaluate the effect before the next round of Board meetings come around. This leads to place holder proposals which are not a good way to do business. Some comments that longer cycle might actually allow the BOG to be more responsive and effective.
Togiak AC AC019	8	0	Support	AC members Moses and Jonathan voice their support of this potential change. Jonathan notes a 2 year cycle is almost too short, the AC is consistently discussing changing hunts that haven't even

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				completed with harvest information to review when trying to make decisions. This would eliminate the BOF and BOG falling on the same year every six years, those “double whammy” years are far too exhausting, 2012-2013 was a good example of that. Three years would give more information to consider when talking about making changes. Gust Bartman agrees. Frank offers that it likely have a large savings for ADF&G, Susie provides AC a little more information about the cost savings estimated.
Ken Wegner PC001	N/A	N/A	Oppose	While I understand that this may save time and possibly some money, I do not feel it is in the best interest of hunting or the big game animals. Animal populations can change quite significantly in a given area over a three year period of time, and 3 years seems quite a long time to react to that with regulation changes. The current 2 year cycle feels much more appropriate. Thank you for your consideration of this perspective.
Jack Reakoff PC002	N/A	N/A	Support	After a lot of consideration I feel it is fiscally advantageous to the State to change the meeting cycle to three years. I also feel the AC's can be overwhelmed when the BOG and BOF overlap on the same year. For rural AC's that have higher travel costs, and time constraints, it would be better to concentrate on fish or game issues independently. The schedule portrayed in the Board Support Q&A on proposed changes has a clean transition. I do feel the ACR mechanism will allow AC's, the public and the Department to address unforeseen issues.

ALASKA BOARD OF GAME

**Work Session
Juneau, Alaska
January 8, 2015**

Advisory Committee and Public Comment Matrix on Proposed 3 Year Cycle

Advisory Committee Comment/ Public Comment	Support Change	Oppose Change	Action	Comments
				These are my opinions as the Koyukuk River AC has not taken a position on this issue.
Mike Peterson PC004	N/A	N/A	Support as Amended	My point is... a 6 year meeting cycle would be quite a long time between submitting and discussing statewide topics ...I urge the Board of Game to support a 3 year statewide topic cycle.
Denali Citizens Council PC007	N/A	N/A	Oppose	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be Reluctant to move to a three year cycle... <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. This decision has not been adequately analyzed, financially... b. This decision has troubling ‘public process’ implications... 2. Re-examine the management of Alaska’s resources under the IM Law... 3. Be willing to co-operate with the Federal Government land managers in the state of Alaska. Discourage use of damaging rhetoric, like the term “federal overreach.”...