



## RC 13

### 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

#### Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

The Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G) Boards Support Section conducted a survey of Fish & Game advisory committee (AC) members from January through February 2014, and later reopened it during the fall of 2014 for additional response. The survey served two purposes, obtain input from the AC members on: 1) moving the Board of Game (BOG) meeting cycle from 2- to 3-years, and 2.) potential restructuring in the number, composition, and make up of advisory committees. The findings in this report address feedback received regarding moving the BOG meeting cycle from 2- to 3-years.

Introduction.....	2
Response Results.....	3
Advisory Committee Effort.....	4
Adequate Time to Conduct Meetings.....	4
Impacts on Game Management.....	6
Importance of Cost Savings.....	7
Direct Advisory Committee Input.....	7
Conclusions.....	8
APPENDIX A: Survey Questionnaire.....	9
APPENDIX B: Responses By Advisory Committee.....	17
APPENDIX C: Advisory Committee Effort on Boards of Game and Fisheries.....	18
APPENDIX D: Open-Ended Responses to Questions.....	19
APPENDIX E: Detailed Results for Advisory Committees with Four or More Responses.....	30
APPENDIX F: Advisory Committees Meeting Hours per Board Meetings.....	32
APPENDIX G: Advisory Committees Input on a 3-Year BOG Cycle.....	34



## Introduction

The BOG meeting cycle reviews regulations for its regions on a two year pattern. This cycle leads to approximately 19 to 20 days of meetings annually.

ADF&G is advocating moving to a three year cycle. This change would eliminate a meeting each year which would lower annual costs, provide more time to see and report on resource impacts from previous board action, and allow ACs more time to meet and review both BOG and Board of Fisheries (BOF) proposals.

Current Board of Game Two Year Meeting Schedule	Option for Board of Game Three Year Meeting Schedule	Board of Fisheries Three Year Cycle
FY16 Arctic / Western Region Interior Region Statewide, Cycle A	FY16 Statewide Regulations*	FY16 Bristol Bay Arctic/Kuskokwim/Yukon Area M/Chignik Statewide Finfish
FY17 Southeast Region Central / Southwest Region Southcentral Region	FY17 Arctic / Western Region Interior Region	FY17 Lower Cook Inlet Upper Cook Inlet Kodiak Statewide King and Tanner Crab
FY18 Arctic / Western Region Interior Region Statewide, Cycle B	FY18 Central / Southwest Region Statewide Regulations*	FY18 Prince William Sound Finfish Southeast Finfish Southeast Shellfish Statewide Shellfish
FY19 Southeast Region Central / Southwest Region Southcentral Region	FY19 Southeast Region Southcentral Region	FY19 Bristol Bay Arctic/Kuskokwim/Yukon Area M/Chignik Statewide Finfish
FY20 Arctic / Western Region Interior Region Statewide, Cycle B	FY20 Arctic/Western Region Interior Region	FY20 Lower Cook Inlet Upper Cook Inlet Kodiak Statewide King and Tanner Crab

Highlighted meetings in the current BOG and BOF cycles indicate years when advisory committees review proposals for each board.

\* Statewide topics are currently on a four-year cycle. The board will need to decide to consider statewide topics on a three- or six-year schedule.

In 2009, the BOG considered moving to a three year cycle and rejected the action. At the 2013 BOG work session, ADF&G again discussed the advantages of moving to a three year cycle. In its contemplation, the BOG did not alter its meeting schedule, but asked for AC input on the issue.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

### Response Results

There are 84 ACs with a total of 1,077 committee member seats. The number of AC members currently serving active ACs is 747. The survey received 178 responses, 161 of which indicated they serve or had served on an AC. Unless otherwise noted, results provided in this report are limited to the responses from current or previous AC members. Table 1.

Table 1: Advisory Committee Members and Survey Responses

Region	Advisory Committees	Committee Seats	Filled Seats	Number of AC Responses	% of Responses From Filled Seats
Arctic	9	134	79	11	14%
Interior	15	176	151	29	19%
Southcentral	17	211	186	73	39%
Southeast	23	315	140	21	15%
Southwest	13	180	132	15	11%
Western	7	61	59	5	8%
Total	84	1077	747	154	21%

Boards Support launched the survey in the middle of January and ran it through the end of February. The survey was mailed to every AC member on record and available on Survey Monkey, an online survey platform. The survey was answered by AC members from all six fish and game management areas. It later reopened the survey during the fall of 2014 for additional input. Appendix A provides the survey.

Response was strongest, with almost half, coming from Southcentral ACs. Appendix B provides a list of advisory committees and number of responses.

Limitations: In order for the results to be statistically significant at a level of 95% +/- 5%, at least 254 responses are required. As such, results offer an indication of perspective or value, but should not be relied on to indicate certainty.

There was one error in the survey reported during the response period that could materially impact results. In the hardcopy survey, in Questions 7 and 8, a field for the Arctic/Yukon/Kuskokwim fisheries meeting was inadvertently omitted. Boards Support received thirty-two of these surveys, nineteen of which came from the Interior (14), Arctic (2) and Western (3) regions. Due to this, there are certain data points assumed to understate activity for the AYK fisheries meeting.

Use of the web-based survey platform is a great convenience for individuals living in areas that have adequate internet access and tools. This may explain why significantly more responses were received by individuals in the Southcentral region.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

### Advisory Committee Effort

AC members were asked how much time they devoted to proposals for each board and other issues. ACs in the Interior and Arctic region predominantly focus on game issues. ACs in Southcentral and Western regions committed equal time to game and fish issues. ACs in Southeast and Southwest regions indicated a majority of their time was devoted to fish issues. Table 2.

Table 2: Effort on Board of Fisheries and Board of Game Issues

Region	Board of Game	Board of Fisheries	Other
Arctic	57.4%	21.4%	14.0%
Interior	64.1%	26.4%	9.5%
Southcentral	45.6%	49.2%	5.2%
Southeast	29.9%	62.3%	7.9%
Southwest	30.1%	58.8%	11.1%
Western	33.3%	38.3%	28.5%

Results from Question 2.

In regions like Southcentral, where there are differences in coastal versus landlocked geography among the ACs, ACs in coastal areas generally took more time on fisheries issues (the Homer AC was a notable exception). Respondents from Anchorage indicated slightly more attention to fish issues (50 percent to 48 percent) while Mat-Su respondents focused slightly more attention on game issues (50.5 percent to 44.5 percent).

Appendix C provides detailed information on responses by AC. Appendix E provides detailed information on those ACs that submitted four or more responses to the survey.

### Adequate Time to Conduct Meetings

In contemplating the benefits of moving to a three year cycle, the department offered there would be more time for ACs to review proposals. In seeking input on this question, the survey queried respondents about how difficult it was to get through proposals by region meeting, and how much actual time it took to conduct business for each meeting. The survey also asked to what extent having the same region up for review in both the BOF and BOG impacted their ability to complete their work.

The responses generally indicated ACs currently have adequate time to review proposals. In providing feedback on a continuum that attempted to gauge “how difficult” it was to review game meeting proposals, a majority of the responses said it was “not difficult”. In assigning a numeric weight to the answers, the results indicated an average difficulty of 1.30 which would be slightly above “not difficult”. The highest average weight among all the regions was Southcentral at 1.45, but that measure was just above other averages.

ACs reported getting through proposals for their regions was slightly more difficult than other regions. (See yellow highlights in Table 3.) Even at that, all average scores fell below the “somewhat difficult” threshold. Table 3 shows how ACs in each region viewed the level of difficulty required to get through game meetings. A scale provides the choices respondents could make.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

Table 3: Difficulty Level for Reviewing Game Proposals

Meeting	Average of All Regions	Arctic	Interior	Southcentral	Southeast	Southwest	Western
Statewide	1.37	1.42	1.48	1.29	1.26	1.62	1.50
Interior	1.36	1.50	1.57	1.24	1.00	1.00	--
Arctic/Western	1.37	1.71	1.35	1.32	1.00	1.00	1.00
Southcentral	1.45	1.00	1.18	1.54	1.00	1.50	--
Central/Southwest	1.36	1.00	1.21	1.33	1.00	1.75	1.67
Southeast	1.35	1.00	1.21	1.35	1.50	1.00	--

Results from Question 6.

Scale:	
Not difficult -	1
Somewhat difficult -	2
Difficult -	3
Very difficult -	4

To the question of whether moving to a three year BOG cycle would lessen the AC workload, most responses indicated it would. There were many that thought it would not, and almost as many still who thought it would depend on a variety of factors. Table 4.

Table 4: Would Advisory Committee Work Decline in a BOG 3-Year Cycle

Yes	No	Maybe
55	51	50

Results from Question 10. Of 161 responses, there were 5 no answers.

The survey asked whether or not the AC reviewed proposals from each of the regions. The least focused on game meetings were Southeast and Arctic/Western, while most all ACs, 99 percent, delved into the Statewide meeting. Table 5 provides the effort given by ACs on meeting from all the regions.

Table 5: AC Effort on Meetings – (The percentage indicates the ACs that review proposals from the regions.)

Meeting	Average	Arctic	Interior	Southcentral	Southeast	Southwest	Western
Statewide	99%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	100%
Interior	66%	33%	100%	79%	11%	29%	0%
Arctic/Western	58%	100%	71%	61%	11%	38%	75%
Southcentral	73%	25%	74%	99%	11%	50%	0%
Central/Southwest	62%	18%	58%	78%	16%	100%	100%
Southeast	59%	9%	61%	58%	95%	29%	0%

Results from Question 6.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

An additional question was posed to members about the difficulty of reviewing proposals in years when BOG and BOF meetings in their regions coincide. While a majority found it was “somewhat easy” (64 out 135) to get through proposals, the remaining input found it was more difficult than easy. Table 6 provides the scale, the responses, and the average response.

Table 6: AC’s Rating on Difficulty During Years When Their Game and Fisheries Region Meetings Occur

Scale	Responses	
Easy - 1	13	Average response= 2.45
Somewhat easy - 2	64	
Difficult - 3	42	
Very difficult - 4	16	
Total	135	

Results from Question 12. There were several non-responses and five no opinions.

Respondents were asked to estimate how many hours they spent on each BOG and BOF meeting. Survey results were averaged and computed to determine what the difference in hours worked would be for advisory committees between a 2- and 3-year cycle using the schedule provided in the report Introduction.

Table 7: Comparison of Average AC Meeting Hours in 2 v. 3-Year BOG Cycles

In a BOG 2 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for all Board Meetings						
Year	Arctic	Interior	Southcentral	Southeast	Southwest	Western
FY16	20.6	28.6	20.9	9.9	24.4	9.6
FY17	3.0	14.2	36.4	12.2	17.1	7.8
FY18	14.7	25.6	21.7	23.5	6.5	3.6
FY19	8.6	11.0	26.4	16.6	31.3	13.8
FY20	14.9	26.1	31.0	5.5	10.3	3.6

Based on fewer meetings in a year in a 3-year cycle, on average an AC would annually save from a low of 1 hour (Southeast) to 5 hours (Southcentral). Summary results are provided under Table 7.

In a BOG 3 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for all Board Meetings						
Year	Arctic	Interior	Southcentral	Southeast	Southwest	Western
FY16	12.3	14.6	16.2	9.6	23.6	7.8
FY17	11.1	21.3	27.4	12.0	6.9	3.4
FY18	1.4	10.1	23.7	19.8	13.0	6.2
FY19	13.7	18.3	19.6	20.0	24.0	9.4
FY20	9.7	17.7	24.0	1.6	6.5	1.8

A detailed list of the AC regions average meeting hours by meeting region in comparison between a 2- and 3-year cycle is provided in Appendix F.

Total Hours From FY16 - FY20						
	Arctic	Interior	Southcentral	Southeast	Southwest	Western
2-Year	61.9	105.5	136.5	67.6	89.6	38.4
3-Year	48.1	82.0	111.0	63.1	74.1	28.6

Results from Questions 5 and 7.

### Impacts on Game Management

The Divisions of Wildlife Conservation and Subsistence stress the information they can provide the BOG would improve with more time allowed for management measures to take place before re-evaluating the measures. AC members were asked their opinion in this matter.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

While not overwhelming, results more frequently indicated more time would assist in reviewing the impacts of management actions. To the question, is there adequate time to see the impacts on a region's game resources resulting from a two year cycle, the responses were:

Table 8: Currently Adequate Time to Review Impacts of Management Actions

Yes	No	Maybe
43	55	59

Results from Question 9. Of 161 responses, there were four non-responses.

AC members provided several supplemental thoughts to the question which are available under Appendix D.

### Importance of Cost Savings

The Department found the potential cost saving of moving to a 3-year cycle is up to \$50,000 a year for Boards Support alone. Rule-of-thumb calculations estimate costs at \$10,000 per day depending on a variety of factors. The shift from a 2- to 3-year cycle would reduce meeting days from an average of 19 to 15 days, by eliminating one meeting per year once the transition is complete.

Respondents were asked how significant costs savings to ADF&G should factor into a decision to shift BOG meetings to a three-year cycle. The majority of responses indicated it was "somewhat significant". In determining an average response, on a scale from 1 (insignificant) to 4 (very significant), the average was 2.15, or slightly above "somewhat significant".

### Direct Advisory Committee Input

Several ACs independently discussed the pros and cons of moving to a three year cycle. In some cases, the AC's voted on the subject. Appendix G provides excerpts of AC minutes. These ACs include –

Advisory Committee	Action
Kodiak AC	Support
Togiak	Support
Fairbanks	Oppose
Matanuska Valley	Support
Middle Nenana River	Comment
Nushagak	Support
Lower Bristol Bay	Support
Bethel	Support
Craig	Support
Eagle*	Support
Grayling Anvik Shageluk Holy Cross	Oppose
Lower Kuskokwim	Support
Mid-Lower Yukon	Support
Stony Holitna	Oppose
Upper Tanana Fortymile	Oppose
Delta	Support

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

Advisory Committee	Action
Anchorage	Oppose
Paxson	Oppose
Seward	No Action

\* The Eagle Advisory Committee previously voted to oppose the move to a 3-year cycle. A more recent vote confirmed support.

### Conclusions

The information received from the AC survey is helpful for the BOG in determining the value of moving to a 3-year cycle. ACs generally reported they are able to handle the level of work currently required, but in years of handling both board's meetings for their region it becomes an issue. The results also found meaningful time savings for some AC in a 3-year Board of Game cycle and confirmed many believe it will cut down on AC workload.

AC member responses provided modest support that greater time would improve the ability to determine the impacts management actions had on resources. They also offered cost savings is somewhat significant in making a determination to move to a three years cycle.

In evaluating pros and cons for making this move, respondents provided a number of interesting comments and perspectives. It is reasonable to conclude that many AC members would say moving to a 3-year cycle depends on a variety of factors that go beyond cost and time. These comments may be found in Appendix D.



# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

### APPENDIX A: Survey Questionnaire

#### Introduction

The Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G), Boards Support Section, is conducting an Advisory Committee (AC) member survey to determine:

- 1.) The potential impacts of moving from a two-year to three-year Board of Game meeting cycle, and
- 2.) Whether there are potential changes in AC structures that would streamline and improve functions.

#### Board of Game Meeting Cycle

ADF&G is encouraging the Board of Game to move to a three-year meeting cycle. This shift will lower costs to the Boards Support Section by an estimated \$50K annually, greatly reduce ADF&G resources on meeting preparation, provide greater time to analyze management actions, and ease AC workload.

More information on anticipated benefits are provided at

<http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.main>. (Copy and paste web address to view 3-year cycle information.)

#### Advisory Committee Structure

At the October 2013 Joint Board meeting there were many proposals, several of which were accepted, requesting changes to the AC membership and functionality. From those deliberations, the Joint Board requested additional information from ACs to identify potential improvements.

To this end, Boards Support is seeking AC input on both of these subjects. Please take a moment to complete the following questionnaire. The survey is 22 questions and estimated to take 10 minutes. We appreciate hearing your feedback.

The survey will close February 28, 2014.

#### General Information

**1. Please check the appropriate box that best describes your participation. "I am ...."**

- ... a current/former AC member."
- ... not a current or former AC member, but would like to take the survey."

**2. Please estimate the percentage of time your AC works on Board of Game issues versus Board of Fisheries.**

Board of Game	_____%
Board of Fisheries	_____%
Other (federal subsistence issues, NPFMC, etc.)	_____%

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

### 3. Which AC do you represent and/or most closely work with?

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Anchorage                                    | <input type="radio"/> King Cove                 | <input type="radio"/> Port Alexander          |
| <input type="radio"/> Angoon                                       | <input type="radio"/> Klawock                   | <input type="radio"/> Ruby                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Central (Interior Region)                    | <input type="radio"/> Klukwan                   | <input type="radio"/> Sand Point              |
| <input type="radio"/> Central Bering Sea                           | <input type="radio"/> Kodiak                    | <input type="radio"/> Saxman                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Central Kuskokwim                            | <input type="radio"/> Kotzebue                  | <input type="radio"/> Seldovia                |
| <input type="radio"/> Central Peninsula                            | <input type="radio"/> Koyukuk                   | <input type="radio"/> Seward                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Chignik                                      | <input type="radio"/> Lake Iliamna              | <input type="radio"/> Sitka                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Cooper Landing                               | <input type="radio"/> Lake Minchumina           | <input type="radio"/> Southern Norton Sound   |
| <input type="radio"/> Copper Basin                                 | <input type="radio"/> Lower Bristol Bay         | <input type="radio"/> St Lawrence Island      |
| <input type="radio"/> Copper River/Prince Wm. Sd                   | <input type="radio"/> Lower Kobuk               | <input type="radio"/> Stony-Holitna           |
| <input type="radio"/> Craig  | <input type="radio"/> Lower Kuskokwim           | <input type="radio"/> Sumner Strait           |
| <input type="radio"/> Delta  | <input type="radio"/> Lower Yukon               | <input type="radio"/> Susitna Valley          |
| <input type="radio"/> Denali                                       | <input type="radio"/> Matanuska Valley          | <input type="radio"/> Tanana/Rampart/Manly    |
| <input type="radio"/> Eagle  | <input type="radio"/> McGrath                   | <input type="radio"/> Tenakee Springs         |
| <input type="radio"/> East Prince of Wales Island                  | <input type="radio"/> Middle Nenana River       | <input type="radio"/> Togiak                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Edna Bay                                     | <input type="radio"/> Middle Yukon River        | <input type="radio"/> Tok Cutoff/Nabesna Road |
| <input type="radio"/> Elfin Cove                                   | <input type="radio"/> Minto/Nenana              | <input type="radio"/> Tyonek                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Fairbanks                                    | <input type="radio"/> Mt. Yenlo                 | <input type="radio"/> Unalaska/Dutch Harbor   |
| <input type="radio"/> False Pass                                   | <input type="radio"/> Naknek/Kvichak            | <input type="radio"/> Upper Kobuk             |
| <input type="radio"/> Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk,<br>and Holy Cross | <input type="radio"/> Nelson Lagoon             | <input type="radio"/> Upper Lynn Canal        |
| <input type="radio"/> Homer  | <input type="radio"/> Noatak/Kivalina           | <input type="radio"/> Upper Tanana/Forty Mile |
| <input type="radio"/> Hydaburg                                     | <input type="radio"/> Northern Norton Sound     | <input type="radio"/> Valdez / Prince Wm. Sd. |
| <input type="radio"/> Hyder  | <input type="radio"/> Northern Seward Peninsula | <input type="radio"/> Whittier                |
| <input type="radio"/> Icy Straits                                  | <input type="radio"/> North Slope               | <input type="radio"/> Wrangell                |
| <input type="radio"/> Juneau-Douglas                               | <input type="radio"/> Nushagak                  | <input type="radio"/> Yakutat                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Kake   | <input type="radio"/> Paxson                    | <input type="radio"/> Yukon Flats             |
| <input type="radio"/> Kenai/Soldotna                               | <input type="radio"/> Pelican                   |   |
| <input type="radio"/> Ketchikan                                    | <input type="radio"/> Petersburg                |   |

### 4. Is your committee able to meet often enough to address Board of Game and Board of Fisheries proposals in a typical year? If not, how many meetings would be necessary?

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### 5. Please estimate the hours your AC meets in a year to review proposals when each of the following Board of Game meetings are in cycle.

Meetings	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+	Unsure
Statewide Regulations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interior	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arctic / Western	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Southcentral	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Central/Southwest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Southeast	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### 6. How difficult is it for your AC to work through proposals for the following Board of Game meetings?

Meetings	0 - Do not discuss	1 - Not difficult	2 - Somewhat difficult	3 - Difficult	4 - Very difficult
Statewide Regulations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interior	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arctic / Western	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Southcentral	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Central/Southwest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Southeast	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments					

### 7. Please estimate the hours your AC meets in a year to review proposals when the following Board of Fisheries meetings are in cycle.

Meetings	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+	Unsure
King and Tanner Crab (except SE/Yakutat)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Cook Inlet Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kodiak Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lower Cook Inlet Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Chignik Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Statewide Pacific Cod	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Statewide Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alaska Peninsula/Aleutian Island Finfish (Area M)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arctic / Yukon / Kuskokwim (AYK) Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bristol Bay Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Statewide Dungeness Crab, Shrimp, Misc. Shellfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Southeast and Yakutat Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Misc. Shellfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prince William Sound / Upper Copper River / Upper Susitna River Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### 8. How difficult is it for your AC to work through proposals from each of the following Board of Fisheries meetings.

Meetings	0 - Do not discuss	1 - Not difficult	2 - Somewhat difficult	3 - Difficult	4 - Very difficult
King and Tanner Crab (except SE/Yakutat)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Cook Inlet Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kodiak Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lower Cook Inlet Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Chignik Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Statewide Pacific Cod	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Statewide Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alaska Peninsula/Aleutian Island Finfish (Area M)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arctic / Yukon / Kuskokwim (AYK) Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bristol Bay Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Statewide Dungeness Crab, Shrimp, Misc. Shellfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Southeast and Yakutat Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Southeast and Yakutat Crab, Shrimp, Misc. Shellfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prince William Sound / Upper Copper River / Upper Susitna River Finfish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments					

### Review of Board of Game's Two-Year Meeting Cycle

The following questions will provide AC opinions and advice on changes to the Board of Game's meeting cycle from two-years to three-years.

For more information on ADF&G's review of moving from a two- to three-year cycle, please visit us on the web at: <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.main>.

### 9. In a two-year meeting cycle, is there adequate time to see the impacts on a region's game resources resulting from Board of Game decisions from the previous meeting for that region?

- Yes
  No
  Maybe

Comments to this question.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

**10. Would changing the Board of Game meeting cycle from two- to three-years reduce your AC's workload?**

- Yes                                       No                                       Maybe

How?

**11. Does your AC review Board of Game and Board of Fisheries proposals in your region in the same year?**

- Yes                                       No

**If you answered "Yes" for question 11 -**

**12. In years when your AC reviews both Board of Game and Fisheries proposals for your region, please rank the difficulty level in accomplishing the workload.**

- 1 - Easy  
 2 - Somewhat easy  
 3 - Difficult  
 4 - Very difficult  
 5 - No opinion

**13. Please indicate how significant cost savings for ADF&G should factor into the decision to shift to a three-year Board of Game cycle.**

- 1 - Insignificant  
 2 - Somewhat significant  
 3 - Significant  
 4 - Very significant  
 5 - No opinion

**14. Did you have an opportunity to review the ADF&G information on moving to a three year Board of Game cycle available at <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=gameboard.main>?**

- Yes                                       No

Did you find the information useful? Comments?

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

### Review of Current Advisory Committee Structures

The Joint Board asked for a review of the current advisory committee structures for improvements in meeting efficiencies, working through proposals, and community groupings.

The following questions solicit opinions and advice about current advisory committee structures.

#### 15. In your current AC configuration -

	Yes	No	No opinion/Not applicable
Are you able to adequately fill member seats including designated and undesignated seats?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are the designated community seats adequately involved?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are there other communities that should have designated seats on your committee?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are there other communities that are lacking representation on advisory committees?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please offer any comments related to your responses to these questions.

#### 16. Does your AC use teleconference to conduct meetings?

Yes  No

Please describe the challenges in conducting teleconference meetings.

#### 17. Please rank how difficult it is to schedule and hold AC meetings.

	1 - Easy	2 - Somewhat easy	3 - Somewhat difficult	4 - Moderately difficult	5 - Very difficult
Scheduling meetings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Holding meetings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Are there changes in your AC structure and composition of members that would make it easier to schedule and hold meetings?

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

**18. How do the following factors contribute to difficulties in your AC's ability to conduct its business?**

	1 - Not a factor	2 - Somewhat a factor	3 - A factor	4 - A significant factor
Severe weather	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of financial resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Personal scheduling conflicts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of interest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ADF&G participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify)				

**19. Please rank how effective your AC is at representing the interests of your region.**

- 1 - Very effective
- 2 - Effective
- 3 - Somewhat ineffective
- 4 - Very ineffective
- 5 - No opinion

What changes in your AC structure would make it more effective at representing the interests of your region?

**20. Please comment on the following potential changes to the AC structure.**

	Strongly support	Support	Do not support	Strongly do not support	No opinion
There should be one AC per community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There should be a limited number of AC per region.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional thoughts on your answers or other changes?

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

### Questionnaire Completion!!

Thank you for participating in this questionnaire. Please provide any additional comments you may have related to any of these questions.

#### 21. Additional comments.

#### 22. Yes, I want a copy of the survey results sent to one of the following addresses:

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please return to:

Your regional coordinator

or

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Attn: Boards Support Section

PO Box 115526

Juneau Alaska 99802



# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### APPENDIX B: Responses By Advisory Committee

Region (# of Resp.)	Advisory Committee	# of Resp.	Advisory Committee	# of Resp.
Arctic (14)	Kotzebue	5	North Slope	1
	Lower Kobuk	1	Southern Norton Sound	1
	Noatak/Kivalina	2	St. Lawrence	--
	Northern Norton Sound	4	Upper Kobuk	1
	Northern Seward Peninsula	--		
Interior (29)	Central	3	Middle Nenana River	2
	Delta	5	Middle Yukon	--
	Eagle	2	Minto/Nenana	--
	Fairbanks	7	Ruby	2
	Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, and Holy Cross	1	Tanana/Rampart/Manley	2
	Koyukuk River	2	Upper Tanana/Forty Mile	3
	Lake Minchumina	1	Yukon Flats	--
	McGrath	--		
Southcentral (74)	Anchorage	8	Mt. Yenlo	2
	Central Peninsula	3	Paxson	2
	Cooper Landing	1	Seldovia	5
	Copper Basin	4	Seward	8
	Copper River/Prince Wm. Sd	5	Susitna Valley	--
	Denali	3	Tok Cutoff / Nebesna Road	--
	Homer	8	Tyonek	1
	Kenai/Soldotna	8	Valdez	--
	Matanuska Valley	11	Whittier	5
Southeast (22)	Angoon	--	Klukwan	--
	Craig	1	Pelican	1
	East Prince of Wales	--	Petersburg	4
	Edna Bay	--	Port Alexander	1
	Elfin Cove	--	Saxman	--
	Hydaburg	--	Sitka	4
	Hyder	--	Sumner Strait	--
	Icy Straits	--	Tenakee	--
	Juneau-Douglas	5	Upper Lynn Canal	2
	Kake	--	Wrangell	3
	Ketchikan	--	Yakutat	1
	Klawock	--		
Southwest (15)	Chignik	--	Naknek/Kvichak	2
	False Pass	--	Nelson Lagoon	1
	King Cove	--	Nushagak	2
	Kodiak	5	Sand Point	--
	Lake Iliamna	1	Togiak	--
	Lower Bristol Bay	3	Unalaska/Dutch Harbor	1
	Lower Kuskokwim	--		
Western (5)	Bethel	--	Lower Kuskokwim	1
	Central Bering Sea	2	Mid-Lower Yukon	2
	Central Kuskokwim	--	Stony/Holitna	--
	Coastal Yukon	--		

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### APPENDIX C: Advisory Committee Effort on Boards of Game and Fisheries

Region	Advisory Committee	Board of Game	Board of Fisheries	Other
Arctic	Kotzebue	62%	4%	23%
	Lower Kobuk	90%	5%	5%
	Noatak/Kivalina	43%	27%	30%
	North Slope	80%	0%	20%
	Northern Norton Sound	50%	45%	5%
	Southern Norton Sound	40%	40%	20%
Interior	Central (Interior Region)	59%	27%	14%
	Delta	76%	17%	7%
	Eagle	48%	45%	8%
	Fairbanks	66%	29%	5%
	Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, and Holy Cross	40%	40%	20%
	Koyukuk	57%	24%	20%
	Middle Nenana River	97%	2%	2%
	Ruby	48%	47%	5%
	Tanana/Rampart/Manly	35%	53%	12%
	Upper Tanana/Forty Mile	78%	7%	15%
Southcentral	Anchorage	48%	49%	3%
	Central Peninsula	28%	65%	8%
	Cooper Landing	20%	75%	5%
	Copper Basin	89%	4%	7%
	Copper River/Prince Wm. Sd	28%	63%	10%
	Denali	94%	3%	3%
	Homer	52%	46%	3%
	Kenai/Soldotna	39%	56%	5%
	Matanuska Valley	51%	45%	5%
	Mt. Yenlo	40%	60%	0%
	Paxson	80%	8%	13%
	Seldovia	29%	68%	3%
	Seward	44%	49%	7%
Whittier	16%	78%	6%	
Southeast	Craig	25%	70%	5%
	Juneau-Douglas	39%	59%	2%
	Pelican	0%	90%	10%
	Petersburg	27%	65%	8%
	Port Alexander	5%	95%	0%
	Sitka	16%	73%	11%
	Upper Lynn Canal	35%	60%	5%
	Wrangell	38%	38%	25%
	Yakutat	20%	75%	5%
Southwest	Kodiak	33%	60%	7%
	Lake Iliamna	34%	33%	33%
	Lower Bristol Bav	27%	60%	13%
	Naknek/Kvichak	45%	45%	10%
	Nelson Lagoon	30%	60%	10%
	Nushagak	26%	69%	6%
	Unalaska/Dutch Harbor	1%	80%	19%
Western	Central Bering Sea	60%	40%	0%
	Lower Kuskokwim	33%	33%	34%
	Lower Yukon	20%	40%	40%

Totals higher than 100% reflect rounding errors.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### APPENDIX D: Open-Ended Responses to Questions

<b>4.) Is your committee able to meet often enough to address Board of Game and Board of Fisheries proposals in a typical year? If not, how many meetings would be necessary?</b>
I feel that the Southern Norton Sound AC meets enough...I am pleased that we meet in one of the communities in the Southern Norton Sound (a different community each meeting).
Yes, often times we need two to three meetings a month to prepare comments on time.
We meet enough to discuss issues that concern board and community members.
Yes, but we work in sub committee's or we would never get the work done in a once-a-month meeting. During proposal reviews, we normally meet an extra 3-7 times.
Most cycles the KRAC meets often enough to address the most important issues.
Generally not.
At least two.
We are able to meet enough.
Yes I feel we meet often enough to address Board of Game proposals. We do not do a lot of work with the Board of Fisheries.
Yes, monthly plus sub-committee meetings as needed.
Yes, monthly with working committees for game, fish, trapping each.
We address the ones relative to us - some years more - some less. I have only been on the board about 2 years so guessing from that time period.
Yes we typically cover most all of the proposals in all areas
Two is normal.
It's a challenge for us to maintain a quorum.
Four meetings a year would be good.
Four would be necessary.
Usually though this year was a challenge with the BOF.
We meet about eight times a year.
Yes, we generally have enough people in town to hold meetings.
Yes, we meet as a subcommittee then take it to the full AC for a vote. It works great.
We usually meet two times a year which is sufficient.
We are able to meet often.
Yes. We meet eight times per year.
Within a typical year, yes.
Yes, usually several long (3 hours) meetings.
Yes, can be very busy.
Yes, we meet monthly.
Yes, it can meet often enough.
Most years and yes especially in the last 3-4 years - prior to that there was not enough funding for enough meetings.
Yes, though the lack of input from the department via timely A&RS has been getting annoying.
Yes, however a lot of time is put into this effort with little perceived acknowledgement by the board.
For at least the past 10 years we have had adequate meeting time to cover all relevant BoG & BoF proposals, often at considerable length. This is not to say that this is an easy task.
It is difficult when the two areas come up the same year
We meet often and basically have summers off. There have been times we have met twice a week and usually we meet two times per month starting in September and continuing through April/May.
Yes, three.
At least four meetings in a year.
Yes, we meet six to eight times per year.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>4.) Is your committee able to meet often enough to address Board of Game and Board of Fisheries proposals in a typical year? If not, how many meetings would be necessary?</b>
Yes, we meet as necessary to deal with Board matters and local issues associated with fish and game.
Yes, although it takes a couple long meetings.
I was very pleased with the way meetings were set-up, conducted, and supplied during this calendar year. The committee members were well taken care of and made aware at all times of up-coming proposals to be discussed and decided upon.
Yes, two meetings are enough to get our information and prepare for state meetings.
It's good the way it's run now.
Yes - except on "double whammy" years.
Two meetings a year when we have to or once a year.
Yes, we meet at least three times a year even on out of Board cycle years.
Yes - but have had to meet twice a week (4 to 5 hours per meeting) quite often mostly for commercial fish and sport fish proposals.
Seven or eight.
Depending on the proposals we may not meet annually. We are a small community but will be vocal when issues arise that concern us locally. We only meet and address issues when we feel as a community we need to comment.
3 times per year.
Minchumina AC has not met in years due to – 1.) no pressing issues in the area and 2.) decreasing population (down to 12 residents)
Yes mostly Yukon area issues.
No, four meetings per year.
Yes about twice per year.
Not always, should have at least two.
We meet Oct-Apr at least once a month. Sometimes special meetings such as moose last month last a full day. Our fish and game subcommittees have two or three meetings addressing proposals and to prepare proposals.
J-D AC is able to meet enough to address both BOG & BOF proposals
It is a stretch when both groups are meeting in the same year.
Depends on cycles. Two meetings for each cycle. Often fish and game meetings can combine but not always. Synchronizing fish a game cycles would allow for savings
4 meetings a year. with global change and population changes /decline maybe 6 meetings to address issues
Yes, I believe we have enough meeting time available.
Yes, we meet monthly from October to April.

<b>6.) How difficult is it for your AC to work through proposals for the following Board of Game meetings?</b>
In areas other than Southcentral we look for proposals that we do not want to migrate into our area or may impact our member area.
Support is good for our AC on both fish and game related issues.
All AC members are in agreement of a 3 year cycle.
At times members are uninformed as to the local issue. As a result we TNA on a proposal we feel we as a group don't have adequate information to make an educated comment on specific proposals.
The difficulty sometimes comes in arguing the pros and cons of proposals given to us to evaluate knowing what the outcome will be when the board meets.
Fifteen AC members is too many. It takes too many hours for everyone to speak + public + F&G.
We feel that our efforts fall on deaf ears!

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>6.) How difficult is it for your AC to work through proposals for the following Board of Game meetings?</b>
Again my experience is limited here. I am subsistence representative.
We get good support from the Department making it easier to make informed decisions.
The antlerless hunts are a big hurdle.
What does difficult mean? BOG are easy compared to BOF.
We have people that hunt all over so it's easy to talk about most of the proposals.
The AC meets during SE or statewide salmon proposals - important to our way of life.
We try to concentrate on issues that affect the Interior.
Working through proposals outside our region are not discussed or hard to work through without added info for the rationale in some cases. Proposals of other regions are not discussed unless someone hunts that area and has a reason to comment.
We don't usually take up proposals for other regions unless there is some relevance.
Not difficult, but at times lengthy and time consuming. In general we do not review proposals for other AC's unless it is perceived to have an effect on our AC's area.
For issues close to home the work can be complex from understanding data, variety of viewpoints and coming up with solutions we can agree to support.
I feel that we need to stay the course. Less is not a good thing! Game and fish resources can change in a season. Three years is taking our eye off the ball. I say no.
We tend to stick to issues that are of relevance to the area around us, and statewide proposals. If members of the public bring issues to us that they would like us to address then we will weigh in.
Many proposals are difficult to comment on due to complexity of the proposal and similarities in actual proposals.
Very time consuming.
The 2 year BOG cycle keeps us fresh with regard to game proposals. It also keeps the number of proposals down to a reasonable level. Hence the current 2 year cycle works well for us.
Get the politics out of board and listen to the community's AC. They know more what is going on than the biologists.
It would help to have the position of the Department on each proposal prior to deliberation, but this is impossible. Local biologists provide requested information at our meetings, which certainly is appreciated. We tend to concentrate on proposals (Statewide and Interior) that affect us and which we are familiar.
Interestingly, there is a good working group on the Whittier AC. Longliners, gill netters, a dragger (shrimp), charters, etc. and we all seem to be able to work together and understand positions.
Only a crunch when cycles overlap.
There is a large volume of proposals in Southcentral of uneven relevance to the problems. It takes lots of time to focus on those we consider important.
Some individual proposals are difficult - some regional issues end up at statewide so affect us when they should have been regional or area specific.
If there were no Statewide proposals allowed the State and ACs would lighten the workload considerably. Statewide proposals rarely work.
Not enough meetings to discuss the subjects as the agenda, also need more meeting to understand the subjects or make good effective proposals.
We are a local advisory committee. As a rule we vote Southcentral and Statewide. If another region has a controversy, staff might request a vote from our AC.
Main problem is lack of time. When issues affect this area I discuss with others in the community before writing the comments.
Mainly focus on Lower Yukon fisheries areas.
Rarely consider precedent setting proposals outside Arctic/Western.
We don't discuss other areas concerns unless it has an impact in our region.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

<b>8.) How difficult is it for your AC to work through proposals from each of the following Board of Fisheries meetings.</b>
We spend two-four hours a year on high sea intercept / bycatch issues.
The three year cycle makes the most sense time and moneywise.
It's not rocket science, but takes some consensus building and lobbying. Lengthening the BOF cycle will let developing problems (like the declining Chinook run on the Yukon river as an example) get out of hand. Leave cycle as it is and find savings elsewhere.
The Anchorage AC had 7 meetings concerning the Upper Cook Inlet fishery, with more activity than ever from the public. My opinion and the opinion of ALL the members of the FISH Subcommittee that worked so hard at these meetings and public meetings, is that the BOF takes very little stock in what our AC brings to the table, and is more interested in listening to special interest/user groups. Our AC consists of working class residents of the Anchorage Bowl, and has little commercial influence in our voting record. I suspect that is why we are ignored.
Funding should be available to the Koyukuk River AC to allow at least two face-to face meetings per year. Many of the Athabaskan elders do not interact well on conference calls as do most other people. If the Board moves to a wider spaced cycle there will need to be the ability to address fish or game issues that arise out of cycle. Otherwise, I am very satisfied with the support our AC receives. Thank You!
We spend a lot of time listening to users and then put in quite a bit of time with the proposals only to find that we don't have a lot of say or are not listened to at the board of fish or game meetings. This year seems to have changed a bit but will not know until this summer.
A great deal of time and effort is expended by the AC each year and our efforts seem futile.
Depends on nature of proposals, allocative the most difficult.
Timely reports and comments from the Department would be helpful.
The issues are complex and require a lot of research and discussion.
Whittier AC is predominantly commercial fisherman so I feel the board is out of balance. Having said that, as a sport rep I have been given support on sport finfish issues from the AC by all parties.
This isn't a very good question. Asking for this level of detail is not relevant to how meetings are conducted.
Same as BOG - usually only discuss issues affecting our AC's region. Meetings are long sometimes as the number of proposals to review is large.
Working through the data, the proposals, considering the wide variety of opinions, solutions offered and developing a solution and or position can be very difficult. The WASSIP results especially put a lot of demands on AC's and members.
Again, we need to be diligent. We are the last best place on earth, why would we cheap shot our efforts?
SE fisheries issues are complex and proposals are numerous. (The recent change to allowing proposals to be submitted on-line will likely make this number increase further.) It takes a great deal of time to give each proposal due consideration.
We are too far away from this area to really make any real comments on these issues
Department positions of proposals would provide information, but not possible. ADFG biologists provide information when requested.
Most attention on CI and PWS where we see high stakes and local involvement.
By not difficult I mean that it is not difficult to take the issues up - the actual decisions and debates can be difficult. We have ADFG participation which helps although the official staff positions aren't always available when we meet.
We only see mostly chum salmon and king salmon issues with Pike, Sheefish, white fish.
I live way up Koyukuk River so I don't have that much Statewide influence.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>8.) How difficult is it for your AC to work through proposals from each of the following Board of Fisheries meetings.</b>
There are too many ridiculous proposals published in the proposal books. At least a third of the proposals should be trashed before being put in the proposal book. Too much time is spent on these ridiculous proposals. Even if a proposal is allocative to a specific group the department comments should give a yea or nay to help the board to make a positive decision.
Primarily concerned with subsistence fishing and salmon returns.
The budget we receive for one twice year meeting together doesn't cover some issues.
We have not met in over a year.
Yukon River - somewhat difficult / AYK 6-10.
Finfish and shellfish/shrimp proposals can sometimes, but not always, be quite complex in their scope and implications. Shrimp in particular.

<b>9.) In a two-year meeting cycle, is there adequate time to see the impacts on a region's game resources resulting from Board of Game decisions from the previous meeting for that region?</b>
Sometime we feel the impact immediately and other times not right away.
Especially bad decisions like community hunts.
It differs depending on regulations put in effect. Some have immediate effect, some take years to fully understand.
Three years would be better to see impacts.
In most cases...
With some issues there is adequate time, with others, even three years is inadequate.
I think most of the time there is.
My opinion is 2 years is better than 3 year cycle.
Usually 2 years is enough.
I do not want to change to 3 year personally.
You don't listen to what is needed!
If we moved to a three year cycle we would be hurting ourselves as far as predator and antlerless issues.
Sometimes there are times the issue should come up sooner than two years.
The calendar delay notwithstanding, it suffices.
Really depends on the regulation.
Over the last 25 years I've seen significant changes come about on regulations and the two year cycle doesn't allow for enough time for ADF&G to research the effect of them before the public screams for yet another change. A three year cycle will help some at least.
Believe two years is not enough time to assess impacts.
I understand results may not show in two years.
Each decision has a variety of variables that determine whether you can see impacts in two years or not. Some yes, some no.
Generally no - in some few cases maybe, but I support a longer cycle.
We need to keep working, not get lazy.
When writing proposals for this cycle we don't have the latest info from our biologists because the field season isn't done before deadlines.
Takes time for species to respond to changes.
In a two year cycle, you would only really have one year since the BOG meeting until your proposals are due for the following cycle. One season clearly isn't long enough to see these impacts.
Three years is fine when populations are stable. When there are conservation issues three years can be too long to wait.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>9.) In a two-year meeting cycle, is there adequate time to see the impacts on a region's game resources resulting from Board of Game decisions from the previous meeting for that region?</b>
Annual would be better to address urgent need for changes.
Not in 13A. Get rid of the community moose hunt in this area.
Probably not - even after three years.
Depends on how radical the decision are.
Some solution have more immediate effect; others may take many years to get results. I think this is a poor reason to scrub the two year cycle.
We hear from the F&G staff each year on wildlife and fish. We would attempt to petition for an ACR if we were concerned enough.
Often it takes more than two years to assess the effect of regulation changes. On the other hand, game populations can change suddenly due to winter conditions.
Some comments don't have adequate time to resolve and could not be acted on during the time provided.
A three year cycle would be great if the Board allows more out of region proposals or ACRs for AC and ADF&G areas of concern.
Nature does not respond to random adjustments by man, some predator controls can have an immediate impact however.
Depends on regulations and resources.
Three year cycle is more reasonable.
Browse studies and twinning rates etc. Data analysis takes over three years to do.
Should be yearly.
Depends on the proposal. Off hand, I would say no
I do think that 50K is not a very high cost savings
On rapidly trending populations, NW arctic caribou, bear, sheep
Depends on regulation.

<b>10.) How would changing the Board of Game meeting cycle from two- to three-years reduce your AC's workload?</b>
I don't know if this would have that big of an effect on the workloads of AC in Alaska.
Depends on the number of proposals.
We feel it is better to stay engaged in the issue year round to keep participation and interest up on key fish and wildlife issues.
Maybe gives more time to make proposals...
It may in fact increase the load. More issues will occur increasing the number of proposals to be addressed that year.
Less frequent work sessions.
The meetings would be more intense but travel time would be reduced. I feel there will need to be able to petition the boards more easily on issues that arise out of cycle. Special meetings of the AC may need to be called.
We might not have to meet each & every year.
Less meeting to discuss & generate proposals, but going to 3 years may just result in more proposals...taking more time?
This is our job as AC members!
More time between meetings means less meetings so we would have more time to prepare and weigh in...
I don't think that would be a wise choice.
No, three years is too long between cycles and things are changing more rapidly in Alaska, so the two year



# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>10.) How would changing the Board of Game meeting cycle from two- to three-years reduce your AC's workload?</b>
cycle needs to stay in place.
Simply not having to deal with issues as often.
Nothing gets worked on until almost the meeting time.
We serve voluntarily and are not paid for participating, so the time lag may cause AC members to lose interest in spite of emerging or existing problems.
It is not a huge workload.
Proposals would not need to be reviewed as often.
By not having to go over so many proposal in a year.
There are many local issues that still need to be addressed.
This is just another attempt by the Parnell administration to remove the public from public processes and leave things up to lobbyists and those with inside political connections.
Since fewer meetings probably would be required, I assume that would mean reduced workload. On the other hand, a two to three year cycle would probably mean more proposals to review since they would pile up and that could mean more work.
I support 3 year cycle. It may not reduce the work load. It is more likely that the AC would have better data and perspective to work with and could be more effective. The problem would come if BOG and BOF work all land on the same year - that is very burdensome
Workload is no problem with two year cycle.
Add another year to the cycle to do the same work. (Not a good idea.)
Less discussion of proposals.
It's not about workload, it's about relevance. We would rather have a significant workload and some valid consideration when our positions are put forth than a light load and no say.
My comment here is that the impact of some rather poor board decisions dramatically affect hunter participation and game populations in our Southcentral region. I feel a 3-year cycle would be disastrous in view of rapidly changing conditions. (i.e. Nelchina caribou)
More time to review proposals and evaluate the effect of past changes.
Or at least it wouldn't reduce them significantly.
It would reduce workload but is not acceptable by most of the AC.
Depends on whether there would be a corresponding increase in the number of proposals submitted needing to be reviewed by the AC's.
Seems as though we are busy enough at every meeting with proposals, either game of fish and there are some we just don't have time to vote on.
Don't like the question. Think about the same work would exist so each meeting would be longer or have to go to multi day to take care of the pile-up.
Less time spent discussing and commenting on proposals.
Longer time between proposal review.
Less frequent development and review of proposals.
Reduce cycle overlap.
It could be that just as many total proposals will be submitted in the long run and result in even more work at the local AC level when dealing with a three year cycle.
We would still meet regularly and discuss and address issues that cannot wait three years.
We would still meet and discuss issues, including out of cycle proposals, emergency closures, cow moose reauthorization, etc.
Some but we would still ask to have a staff presentation on controversial topics.
Fewer meetings - more stability - may require crafting regulations structured to allow department to respond to game population changes between BOG cycles.
Meeting once a year.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>10.) How would changing the Board of Game meeting cycle from two- to three-years reduce your AC's workload?</b>
BOF meetings take a majority of time! ACs in ANC and MATSU deal with more proposals. We tend to stick to a more regional approach to community.
Time spent reviewing and commenting on hundreds of proposals.
Perhaps the affects from management changes would be more evident after 3 years. There is something called in season management.
Don't have to review/comment as often.
Give other regions to prepare their proposal and issue.
Would still meet annually.
Potential of increasing AC workload in that 3rd year ie more proposals being brought forward perhaps?
Would there be more proposal on the third year, thus equaling the amount of time spent versus a two year cycle.
We value our conversations with game managers. If issues seem important expect acrs.
By giving the AC's a little more time to review what may impact the subsistence in our region.

<b>21.) Additional comments.</b>
The ADF&G is represented during the AC meeting through their staff across the state of Alaska...great job guys and gals!
Stop having commercial fisherman dominate the BOF. Have BOG stop pushing proposals that are designed for a particular group of people and therefore discriminate against the majority of users in the state.
I don't think switching the BOG cycle should be very weighted on the cost savings. It should be about the resource first. Fortunately, switching from 2-3 years would help see if implementations are working and also save the state some money.
Leave it as it is, it works just fine.
It is obvious that the majority of votes are generated in the city by user groups whose particular interest is for entertainment of a larger group than for the traditions or income of families in rural areas and permit holders whose investment is used directly to provide income for households.
Thank You!
I often feel that the opinions expressed by our AC are ignored by both boards. They seem to take positions that are the most politically expedient as opposed to what are the best from biological and environmental positions.
Answers regarding degrees of effort and time were rather wild guesses, as I've never made an effort to keep close accounting.
I initially joined the AC to try and make a difference but what I find is everyone is concerned with keeping user groups happy more than keeping the resources healthy which should be the priority. I point that finger at ADF&G, the Boards, and many of the users. A prime example are the Kenai River Kings. It may be too late for them and I am sorry that it has happened on my/our watch. Although I might add that predator control in the interior has been a success.
I am very thankful for our process with ACs and open BOG & BOF meetings. Most states have nothing like this...no public involvement. The question to ask is "How do we get the position of most sportsmen in an area"? I do not believe the BOG or BOF is currently getting that. They get what the position of special interests who have over powered the AC. Some AC Training would help and maybe a swear in oath that "you will express what the public wants...even when that position is opposed to personal views".
I would like to see local ACs have more influence on the statewide Board, especially on issues affecting the local areas.
I do not support a three year cycle. The current system functions very well now.
The AC meetings are very useful and a good way to get community involvement. Extending the cycles

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>21.) Additional comments.</b>
would not be a good way to address concerns for the boards of game & fish.
AC's are a very important part of the public input part of the process. I support refinement of the process but think things are pretty good right now.
As in mathematics, smaller intervals equates to greater accuracy. Two year cycles will give us more data, more accuracy, and more control. Our game and fish management should not be dictated by budget concerns or convenience, it is much more important than that.
Would like to see more trooper enforcement input at meetings.
This three year thing will not work for game populations to respond when needed. Unless there is a mechanism to handle situations that need immediate attention, this should stay a two year cycle or even one year when needs arise.
We are okay with two-year cycles for the BOG, however, if changes are imminent, we will adjust accordingly. Our main objection is that the system does not accommodate the difference in the hunting "workload" for individual GMU's, as we know that there is little activity in some, and a lot in others, such as GMU23, where user conflicts are growing between users who hunt for food, and those who, in their two-three weeks off, hunt for trophies. This is and has become a major problem that, despite high level groups like the Unit 23 User Conflict Working Group, has accomplished very little.
Educating the public on the purpose of the AC's and trying to get more participation is the biggest issue and overcoming apathy is not easy.
I believe that the current AC structure is adequate.....and allows for representative feedback from all....
I think it is quite important that the State keep the AC's active and that people from communities have the opportunity to voice their opinion through their very own local AC. With the right people filling the seats of the AC's the State has very valuable information pertaining to what is happening on the ground in the different areas. ADF&G is doing a damn good job out there, but they are limited in different ways, the information that the AC passes on to them is from people that are out there on the ground and experienced. Just need to weed out the ones that are misleading for their own special interests! Thanks
I would be interested in the statewide results, if possible. Thanks.
I believe teleconference abilities could be very cost effective if done right.
I think our AC should have a say in a lot of different areas of the state. While we are the Anchorage AC, we have hunters traveling through-out the state to go hunting. While I attend BOG meeting to represent our AC, I see the Department comment on what the area AC votes are on proposal's for the area being discussed. In some of these areas, our AC hunters have a bigger percent of hunters than the local AC does. I think the Anchorage AC comments should be given more consideration during department and board discussion throughout the state. 25,000 hunters cover this state in all regions and their voices need to be heard.
The Mat-Su Valley AC is very pro-active. Members take an in-depth interest in issues that affect both hunting and fishing.
Board meetings are too long and expensive for most people to attend. This leaves most of the discussion and input up to those who have personal financial gain in the decisions made. This essentially privatizes the process. More meetings that are regional and shorter would improve the credibility of the process. This may cost more but lowering cost is a misguided effort if it sacrifices credibility.
Comment in general about shift from two to three year cycle: Going to a three year cycle leaves some AC issues waiting a long time to be addressed. I know there are out of cycle options but the requirements to make them happen seem onerous and narrowly defined. So it might not address my concerns and I don't support the shift from two to three years. In response to my choice on question #13, I'd love to see ADF&G get the \$ from the savings of a shift of two to three year cycle. I think the legislature should fund the ADF&G with the savings they would realize, not take if from cost saving measures that distance the public input from the process.
I am an absolute believer that our regulatory system with citizen ACs and board members is the best in the

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>21.) Additional comments.</b>
world. However, I am concerned how to keep it working in the large urban areas where there can be large constituencies for very fractionated opinions (Cook Inlet fisheries) that seems to motivate significant numbers of people to seek end-runs around the system or to break it down. I also have concerns in the small rural areas whether ALL Alaskan citizens have fair opportunity to participate in the AC system. I am concerned that some communities may allow the tribal or one other segment of local government to dominate or even totally control it in a village to the exclusion of a few for whatever reason. Some communities don't fully embrace fair representation for all - I've seen a few crazy things done in the process of electing a community representative to the AC. I think some of the newer Support staff and processes I'm seeing are a very good move to getting more fair elections, better processes in place but it is a huge effort on their part and will take constant vigilance to maintain. Again a reason to have a couple more on staff. I still think it's insane for the Board Staff in Dillingham to be burdened with covering ACs in Kodiak and the far flung Aleutians - from a cost and personal burden stand point. Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment.
The AC numbers, structure, and locations in the Southcentral region are adequate. The BOG and BOF cycle are appropriate. Bad regulations would not do justice to the resource and users is not addressed and restructured under the current time frame.
Sometimes the meetings appear too casual in structure, and not enough info presented ahead of time on what to be looking over or studying, to be individually more prepared for each meeting.
The BOG has taken far too much power in the last ten years. The BOG essentially tells the department what the department will do while completely disregarding science and cost effectiveness. The idea that the a proposal would be submitted "by the department at the request of the BOG" would have been unheard of 10 years ago, and flies in the face of how our "system" is supposed to function. The tail is wagging the dog these days, and it's resulted in the disintegration of the process.
Would like the Boards respond more affirmatively to the recommendations of the ACs.
Our advisory committee is very strongly opposed to a three year meeting cycle.
BOG is small potatoes for us, but it would help if you could you put SE finfish and SE shellfish in different years.
Would like to see some type of yearly event for training and bringing AC from across the state together. Also more funds for AC to attend federal meetings and AC involvement in ADFG work groups. From the public eye the board process is too complicated. Also it is very hard for an AC rep to attend full board meetings, can't afford to take time off work for 2 weeks.
Top down overhaul and independent evaluation of the department of fish and game should happen before we lose the resources in the state. Both fish and game don't seem to be important to the managers. Vanishing moose, vanishing king salmon and most of us know why department of fish and game is responsible along with federal intrusion.
I'm a great supporter of our Board Support folks, as you know, and especially Sherry. She's done such an excellent job at supporting us, lighting fires under us, and keeping us in the loop. Keep these positions vital.
Great board.
Question 12: Workload depends on the number of proposals and timing of Board Meetings. Question 13: It is imperative that savings to the Department be allocated to "field work". General Comment: Perhaps a CD/DVD could be developed as an informational reference for AC members to assist them in learning the process of serving in that capacity. It would replace the printed manual and be much easier to revise and less costly to provide.
Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
I am concerned that the projected \$50K savings by moving to a three year cycle would be forfeited and not used to enhance management of our fish and game resources.
The local chair runs the AC with minimal communication with the public and has not been tolerant of certain points of view. This has resulted in several user groups steering clear of the local AC process. There is a good ole boy feel to some of the actions and attitudes of some of the men on the committee.

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

<b>21.) Additional comments.</b>
Thank you for getting our advice on what information we have.
Board meetings have improved to allow greater participation from ACs. Statewide proposals waste time and money that could be better spent concentrating on regional proposals that affect AC members and communities greater. (Noted on question 12; stagger the BOF and BOG regular years for meetings.)
Our AC spends quite a bit of time considering proposals. I feel the Board of Fish does not pay attention to our opinion and local experience unless it happens to fit the Board's political opinion.
I am concerned a 3 year cycle won't allow addressing fast changing situations in a timely fashion. I appreciate proposal books etc are sent out by mail as I can't get on the internet.
Thanks for this opportunity
Thank you for your interest in AC needs.
Thank you.
I want a lot more information before answering. What # = limited? Does the current # of 82 reflect one AC per community? Are the questions driven by further potential budget cuts or long standing inaction by some designated AC communities? Are some areas of the state not been represented for years?
Since we are a large State with many regions that vary in size and population it would be better if we have both community and regional ACs. Looking at proposals for both fish and game; I see a varied amount of proposals from groups and individuals that cross boundaries on a frequent amount.
Within the region of the AC we have a per capita representation by community.
All of the north slope borough should be one game unit to be fair to all subsistence users.
How are you defining community in this context?

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### APPENDIX E: Detailed Results for Advisory Committees with Four or More Responses

Advisory Committee (Responses)	Percentage of time on:			How difficult is it for your committee to meet on the following regions (1 = Not difficult, 4 = Very difficult)											
	BOG	BOF	Other	Statewide	Do Not Discuss	Interior	Do Not Discuss	Arctic / Western	Do Not Discuss	Southcentral	Do Not Discuss	Central / Southwest	Do Not Discuss	Southeast	Do Not Discuss
Anchorage (8)	48%	49%	3%	1.6	0%	1.4	0%	1.8	29%	2.0	0%	2.0	29%	2.2	29%
Copper Basin (4)	89%	4%	7%	1.3	25%	1.0	50%	1.0	75%	1.3	25%	1.0	50%	--	100%
Copper River/Prince William Sound (5)	28%	63%	10%	1.2	0%	2.0	80%	2.0	80%	1.2	0%	2.0	80%	2.0	80%
Delta (5)	76%	17%	7%	1.4	0%	1.2	0%	1.7	40%	1.5	20%	1.7	40%	2.0	60%
Fairbanks (7)	66%	29%	5%	1.4	0%	1.3	13%	1.2	0%	1.0	0%	1.0	0%	1.0	0%
Homer (8)	52%	46%	3%	1.3	0%	1.3	13%	1.2	38%	1.4	0%	1.3	0%	1.2	38%
Juneau-Douglas (5)	38%	59%	3%	1.2	0%	1.0	75%	1.0	75%	1.0	75%	1.0	75%	1.8	0%
Kenai/Soldotna (8)	39%	56%	5%	1.3	0%	1.1	13%	1.1	13%	1.6	0%	1.1	13%	1.2	25%
Kodiak (5)	33%	60%	7%	1.0	0%	1.0	80%	1.0	80%	1.0	80%	1.4	0%	1.0	80%
Matanuska Valley (11)	51%	45%	5%	1.5	0%	1.1	9%	1.1	27%	1.6	0%	1.0	9%	1.1	36%
Petersburg (4)	27%	65%	8%	1.3	25%	--	100%	--	100%	--	100%	--	100%	1.8	0%
Seldovia (5)	29%	68%	4%	1.0	0%	1.5	60%	2.0	60%	1.6	0%	1.5	60%	1.0	80%
Seward (8)	44%	49%	8%	1.1	0%	1.0	38%	1.0	63%	1.3	0%	1.0	50%	1.0	50%
Sitka (4)	16%	73%	11%	1.0	0%	--	100%	--	100%	--	100%	--	100%	1.0	0%
Whittier (5)	16%	77%	6%	1.0	40%	--	100%	--	100%	1.4	0%	--	100%	--	100%

Advisory Committee (Responses)	Adequate Time to See Impacts on Game Resources in a Two Year Cycle?				Would a three year cycle reduce AC workload?			Does Your AC Review BOF and BOG Proposals in the Same Year		Significance of Saving Money in Shifting to Three Year Cycle Significance (1=Insignificant, 4=Very Significant)
	Yes	No	Maybe	No Answer	Yes	No	Maybe	Percent "Yes"	Difficulty Level (1=Easy, 4 = Very Difficult)	
Anchorage (8)	5	1	2		2	3	2	88%	3.0	1.4
Copper Basin (4)	2	1		1		2	1	75%	2.3	2.0
Copper River/Prince William Sound (5)		1	4		3	2		100%	2.4	2.2
Delta (5)		3	2		1	2	2	100%	2.2	2.6
Fairbanks (7)	3	1	3		3	1	3	100%	2.6	2.5
Homer (8)	3	2	3		3	3	1	100%	2.0	1.9
Juneau-Douglas (5)	2	1	2		1		4	100%	2.6	1.8
Kenai/Soldotna (8)	1	5	2		5		3	75%	3.3	2.7
Kodiak (5)		5			3		2	100%	2.2	1.8
Matanuska Valley (11)	3	4	4		5	2	4	82%	3.0	2.1
Petersburg (4)		2	1	1	1	1	1	50%	3.5	2.0
Seldovia (5)	3	1	1		1	4		100%	1.8	2.8
Seward (8)	4		3	1	1	3	3	88%	1.9	2.0
Sitka (4)		2	2		1	2	1	75%	1.7	2.7

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

---

Whittier (5)	5	2	2	1	100%	2.0	2.0
--------------	---	---	---	---	------	-----	-----

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### APPENDIX F: Advisory Committees Meeting Hours per Board Meetings

#### Arctic Region Advisory Committee Responses

##### BOG 2 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings

Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M/ Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16	7.9	0.4	5.3				13.5	2.0	2.429	1.0	1.6									7.0	20.6
FY17				1.4	0.2	0	1.6									0.0	0.2	0.0	1.2	1.4	3.0
FY18	7.9	0.4	5.3				13.5					0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6					1.2	14.7
FY19				1.4	0.2	0	1.6	2.0	2.429	1.0	1.6									7.0	8.6
FY20	7.9	0.4	5.3				13.5									0.0	0.2	0.0	1.2	1.4	14.9

##### BOG 3 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings

Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M/ Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16			5.3				5.3	2.0	2.4	1.0	1.6									7.0	12.3
FY17	7.9	0.4		1.4			9.7									0.0	0.2	0.0	1.2	1.4	11.1
FY18					0.2	0	0.2					0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6					1.2	1.4
FY19			5.3	1.4			6.7	2.0	2.4	1.0	1.6									7.0	13.7
FY20	7.9	0.4					8.3									0.0	0.2	0.0	1.2	1.4	9.7

#### Southcentral Region Advisory Committee Responses

##### BOG 2 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings

Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M/ Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16	1.9	2.9	7.0				11.8	1.3	0.8	2.1	5.0									9.2	20.9
FY17				3.4	4.2	9.6	17.2									6.6	9.6	1.3	1.8	19.3	36.4
FY18	1.9	2.9	7.0				11.8					5.7	0.8	0.8	2.6					10.0	21.7
FY19				3.4	4.2	9.6	17.2	1.3	0.8	2.1	5.0									9.2	26.4
FY20	1.9	2.9	7.0				11.8									6.6	9.6	1.3	1.8	19.3	31.0

##### BOG 3 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings

Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M/ Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16			7.0				7.0	1.3	0.8	2.1	5.0									9.2	16.2
FY17	1.9	2.9		3.4			8.1									6.6	9.6	1.3	1.8	19.3	27.4
FY18					4.2	9.6	13.8					5.7	0.8	0.8	2.6					10.0	23.7
FY19			7.0	3.4			10.4	1.3	0.8	2.1	5.0									9.2	19.6
FY20	1.9	2.9					4.7									6.6	9.6	1.3	1.8	19.3	24.0

#### Interior Region Advisory Committee Responses

##### BOG 2 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings

Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M/ Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16	3.3	10.7	6.9				20.8	0.6	3.0	1.5	2.7									7.8	28.6
FY17				3.6	2.7	2.5	8.9									1.6	1.8	1.3	0.7	5.3	14.2
FY18	3.3	10.7	6.9				20.8					3.4	0.8	0.3	0.3					4.8	25.6
FY19				3.6	2.7	2.5	8.9	0.6	0.0	1.5	0.0									2.1	11.0
FY20	3.3	10.7	6.9				20.8									1.6	1.8	1.3	0.7	5.3	26.1

##### BOG 3 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings

Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M/ Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16			6.9				6.9	0.6	3.0	1.5	2.7									7.8	14.6
FY17	3.3	10.7		3.6			17.6									0.0	1.8	1.3	0.7	3.8	21.3
FY18					2.7	2.5	5.2					3.4	0.8	0.3	0.3					4.8	10.1
FY19			6.9	3.6			10.5	0.6	3.0	1.5	2.7									7.8	18.3
FY20	3.3	10.7					13.9									0.0	1.8	1.3	0.7	3.8	17.7



# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### Southeast Region Advisory Committee Responses

BOG 2 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings																					
Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M / Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16	0.1	0.1	3.9				4.1	0.6	0.3	0.4	4.4									5.7	9.9
FY17				10.5	0.1	0.3	10.9									0.1	0.1	0.1	0.9	1.3	12.2
FY18	0.1	0.1	3.9				4.1					0.1	6.0	9.6	3.7					19.4	23.5
FY19				10.5	0.1	0.3	10.9	0.6	0.3	0.4	4.4									5.7	16.6
FY20	0.1	0.1	3.9				4.1									0.1	0.1	0.1	0.9	1.3	5.5

BOG 3 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings																					
Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M / Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16			3.9				3.9	0.6	0.3	0.4	4.4									5.7	9.6
FY17	0.1	0.1		10.5			10.7									0.1	0.1	0.1	0.9	1.3	12.0
FY18					0.1	0.3	0.4					0.1	6.0	9.6	3.7					19.4	19.8
FY19			3.9	10.5			14.3	0.6	0.3	0.4	4.4									5.7	20.0
FY20	0.1	0.1					0.3									0.1	0.1	0.1	0.9	1.3	1.6

### Southwest Region Advisory Committee Responses

BOG 2 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings																					
Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M / Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16	0.4	0.4	3.7				4.5	7.5	0.4	8.1	3.9									19.9	24.4
FY17				0.4	8.3	2.7	11.4									0.4	0.6	3.5	1.2	5.7	17.1
FY18	0.4	0.4	3.7				4.5					0.4	0.0	0.2	1.4					2.0	6.5
FY19				0.4	8.3	2.7	11.4	7.5	0.4	8.1	3.9									19.9	31.3
FY20	0.4	0.4	3.7				4.5									0.4	0.6	3.5	1.2	5.7	10.3

BOG 3 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings																					
Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M / Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16			3.7				3.7	7.5	0.4	8.1	3.9									19.9	23.6
FY17	0.4	0.4		0.4			1.2									0.4	0.6	3.5	1.2	5.7	6.9
FY18					8.3	2.7	11.0					0.4	0.0	0.2	1.4					2.0	13.0
FY19			3.7	0.4			4.1	7.5	0.4	8.1	3.9									19.9	24.0
FY20	0.4	0.4					0.8									0.4	0.6	3.5	1.2	5.7	6.5

### Western Region Advisory Committee Responses

BOG 2 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings																					
Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M / Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16	1.8	0.0	1.8				3.6	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.8									6.0	9.6
FY17				1.6	6.2	0.0	7.8									0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.8
FY18	1.8	0.0	1.8				3.6					0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					0.0	3.6
FY19				1.6	6.2	0.0	7.8	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.8									6.0	13.8
FY20	1.8	0.0	1.8				3.6									0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6

BOG 3 Year Cycle: AC Meeting Hours in Preparation for Board Meetings																					
Year	Arctic/ Western	Interior	Statewide Reg	Southeast	Central/ Southwest	Southcentral	Game Total	Bristol Bay	AYK	Area M / Chignik	Statewide Finfish	PWS	SE Shellfish	SE Finfish	Statewide Shellfish	LCI	UCI	Kodiak	Statewide K&T	Fish Total	Total Hours
FY16			1.8				1.8	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.8									6.0	7.8
FY17	1.8	0.0		1.6			3.4									0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
FY18					6.2	0.0	6.2					0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					0.0	6.2
FY19			1.8	1.6			3.4	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.8									6.0	9.4
FY20	1.8	0.0					1.8									0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

### APPENDIX G: Advisory Committees Input on a 3-Year BOG Cycle

Advisory Committee and Index Number	Action	Comments
Bethel Advisory Committee AC001	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>
Craig Advisory Committee AC002	Support	All Members were in agreement for a 3 year cycle
Eagle Advisory Committee AC003	Support	<p>At this time the Eagle AC unanimously supports that change, 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	Oppose	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 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

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

Advisory Committee and Index Number	Action	Comments
		<p>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 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.</p>
<p>Grayling Anvik Shageluk Holy Cross Advisory Committee AC005</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Lower Kuskokwim Advisory Committee AC006</p>	<p>Support</p>	<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. [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>
<p>Mid-Lower Yukon AC AC007</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>MOTION TO SUPPORT PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.</p>

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

Advisory Committee and Index Number	Action	Comments
Stony Holitna Advisory Committee AC008	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	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	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 developing or that something developed that had not been considered previously.
Anchorage Advisory Committee AC011	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.</p> <p>Our reasons are, but not limited to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <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</p>

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

Advisory Committee and Index Number	Action	Comments
		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.
Paxson Advisory Committee AC012	Oppose	All Members Opposed this Change. Greg: Be as responsive as possible. Keep it 2 years Mark: 3 year BOF cycles are okay. Fisheries are 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	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	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	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	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 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	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	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	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 completed with harvest

# 2014 Advisory Committee Survey Results

## Input on a Three-Year Board of Game Meeting Cycle

Advisory Committee and Index Number	Action	Comments
		<p>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&amp;G, Susie provides AC a little more information about the cost savings estimated.</p>
Juneau Douglas AC (RC12)		<p>Jesse – afraid to see Alaskan’s voice in game management get pushed aside for monetary reasons and have greenie biologists making decisions not in Alaskans best interests. Supporting a 2 year cycle aligns with ADF&amp;Gs mission. 3 year does not.            Mike P – money cuts and EO’s are in place already , ok with 3 year cycle.            Henry W-everyone in state needs to feel budget hits            Atlin – big issues at hand like sheep permits, should be decided in 2 year cycle.</p>