

Minutes and voting record of Aug 27, 2013 meeting;

Approved on Oct 1, 2013

Proposal	Action Requested
<i>Anchorage Advisory Committees Membership,</i> <i>Bruce Morgan, Chair; Jim Stubbs, Vice Chair; Kevin Sparrowgrove, Secretary; Vince Baldauf; Mark Campbell; Robert Caywood; Joel Doner; George Jacoby; Grant Klotz; Frank Neumann; Robert Peck; Matthew Rogero; Sasha Ruesch; Zach Stubbs; Kevin Taylor; Joel Wagner, Alternate; Mike Priebe, Alternate</i> <i>Members present for the April 23 2013 meeting:</i> <i>Bruce Morgan, Kevin Sparrowgrove, Joel Doner, Frank Neumann, Robert Caywood, George Jacoby, Kevin Taylor Grant Klotz Robert Peck, Mike Priebe, Mark Campbell</i> <i>Disussed, and voted on all proposal's except those list on the August 27, 2013 meeting.</i> <i>Menber present for the August 27, 2013 meeting:</i> <i>Bruce Morgan, Jim Stubbs, Vince Baldauf, George Jacoby, Grant Klotz, Frank Neumann, Robert Peck, Mike Priebe, Robert Caywood</i> <i>We took final action on Proposal #'s 4, 5, 6, 7, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41.</i>	
PROPOSAL NO. 1	ACTION: <u>10</u> SUPPORT <u>0</u> OPPOSED
DESCRIPTION: Re-designate the seats for the Seward Advisory Committee to all Undesignated seats instead of solely Seward representatives. AMENDMENT: DISCUSSION: Support for reason stated in proposal.	
PROPOSAL NO. 2	ACTION: <u>10</u> SUPPORT <u>0</u> OPPOSED
DESCRIPTION: Re-designate the seats for the Susitna Valley Advisory Committee. AMENDMENT: DISCUSSION: Supported for reason stated in proposal	
PROPOSAL NO. 3	ACTION: <u>TNA</u>
DESCRIPTION: Re-designate the Susitna Valley Advisory Committee. AMENDMENT: DISCUSSION:	
PROPOSAL NO. 4	ACTION: <u>TNA</u>
DESCRIPTION: Redistribute and increase representation from the community of Selawik from the Northern Seward Peninsula Advisory Committee to the Lower Kobuk Advisory Committee. AMENDMENT: DISCUSSION:	

PROPOSAL NO. 5**ACTION:** TNA**DESCRIPTION:** Establish an Advisory Committee for Mountain Village.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL NO. 6****ACTION:** TNA**DESCRIPTION:** Establish an Advisory Committee for the Community of Bethel.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL NO. 7****ACTION:** TNA**DESCRIPTION:** Restructure the Icy Straits Advisory Committee.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:****PROPOSAL NO. 8****ACTION:** 10 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED**DESCRIPTION:** Update the Regulation for Areas of Jurisdiction with the current Advisory Committees.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** Supported for reason stated in proposal.*Advisory Committees Uniform Rules of Operation***PROPOSAL NO. 9****ACTION:** 9 SUPPORT 1 OPPOSED**DESCRIPTION:** Change the Advisory Committee Membership Term Dates.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** The committee supports this idea, with most of the discussion centered around when the election should take place. The 1 Opposed thought that the current system is working fine.**PROPOSAL NO. 10****ACTION:** 0 SUPPORT 10 OPPOSED**DESCRIPTION:** Clarify the Advisory Committee Voting Process.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** We discussed the current system and all members found the system working per designed, Those that want to participate in the system get their voices heard.**PROPOSAL NO. 11****ACTION:** 0 SUPPORT 10 OPPOSED**DESCRIPTION:** Modify the Nomination Process Advisory Committees.**AMENDMENT:****DISCUSSION:** We thought this proposal placed to many qualification those who wish to join the AC process. And place extra burden on current AC member to interviews applicants.**PROPOSAL NO. 12****ACTION:** 0 SUPPORT 10 OPPOSED**DESCRIPTION:** Modify the Advisory Committee Membership Nomination and Election

Process.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: AC's are grassroots organizations, and we felt this proposal would take away from that. The idea that if you are a professional photographer with a hunting license, you wouldn't qualify for a seat.

PROPOSAL NO.13 ACTION: 9 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAIN

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Procedures for Declaring Vacancies and Noticing the Public.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Vote was taken and was supported for reason in the proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 14 ACTION: 0 SUPPORT 10 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Uniform Rules of Operation to Incorporate use of Bylaws and Provide Other Clarifications.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Our Committee felt that this would only complicate thing more for the elections, and would not really solve anything.

PROPOSAL NO. 15 ACTION: 10 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Uniform Rules of Operation to Accurately Reflect the Current Procedures Followed by the Advisory Committees and Boards Support Section.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Supported the proposal for reasons stated by the Department.

PROPOSAL NO. 16 ACTION: 4 SUPPORT 6 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Establish a Standard for Advisory Committee Minutes.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: After discussion on this most felt that this is what we currently are doing and didn't see the need for it.

PROPOSAL NO. 17 ACTION: 10 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Procedures for Removal for Cause of Advisory Committee Members, Implementing Disciplinary Measures under Roberts Rules of Order, and Submission of Minutes.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: We felt that this proposal would help clarify the steps that need to be taken when it becomes necessary to discipline or remove an A.C. Member.

PROPOSAL NO. 18 ACTION: TNA

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Definition for Removal for Cause.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

Advisory Committee Membership Qualification

PROPOSAL NO. 19 ACTION: 0 SUPPORT 10 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Expand the Qualifications for Advisory Committee Officers.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Committee felt that this was an unnecessary proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 20 ACTION: 0 SUPPORT 10 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Change the Qualifications of Chairman and Modify the Removal for Cause of Advisory Committee Members.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION:

PROPOSAL NO. 21 ACTION: 1 SUPPORT 9 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Expand the List of Qualifications for Advisory Committee Members.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: A working knowledge of the State Constitution, and Statutes would be great, we don't want it to become a requirement for a seat on the AC.

Advisory Committee Active Status, Function, & Staff Assistance

PROPOSAL NO. 22 ACTION: 5 SUPPORT 5 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Reduce the Number of Meetings Required for Advisory Committees to Remain in Active Status, and Clarify the Process for Merging Advisory Committees.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Split Vote

PROPOSAL NO. 23 ACTION: 5 SUPPORT 5 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the functions of Advisory Committees and add the applicable Regional Council Functions.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Split Vote

PROPOSAL NO. 24 ACTION: 5 SUPPORT 5 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Replace "Council" with "Committee" in the Regulation Assigning Staff Assistance.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Split Vote

Adoption of Fish & Game Regulations

PROPOSAL NO. 25 ACTION: 9 SUPPORT 1 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Clarify the Procedure for Accepting Proposals for each Board.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: We support the proposal for reasons stated in the proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 26 ACTION: 0 SUPPORT 10 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Require the Joint Board to Meet Every Year; Establish a Standing

Committee of the Joint Board; and Remove the Reference to Council.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: System works as it is, see no need to add another duty to the BOF, and BOG.

PROPOSAL NO. 27 ACTION: 10 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Regulations to Reflect the Need to Schedule Meetings for the Joint Board.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Supported for reason stated in the proposal.

Advisory Committee Participation at Board Meetings

PROPOSAL NO. 28 ACTION: 2 SUPPORT 8 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Incorporate Advisory Committee Participation into Board Deliberations.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: This proposal could give the Boards some valuable insight into local concerns, or needs, but on the other hand it could complicate the issue with too many opinions.

PROPOSAL NO. 29 ACTION: 4 SUPPORT 5 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAIN

DESCRIPTION: Incorporate Advisory Committee Participation in Board Deliberations.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Same discussion as proposal #28.

Regional Councils

PROPOSAL NO. 30 ACTION: 8 SUPPORT 2 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Remove the Definition for “Council” from Regulation.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: No objections to eliminating the language. The 2 opposed votes thought that the current language wasn’t hurting anything as is.

PROPOSAL NO. 31 ACTION: 8 SUPPORT 2 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Repeal the Regional Council Regulations.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Same comments as proposal #30.

PROPOSAL NO. 32 ACTION: 8 SUPPORT 2 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Repeal the Regional Council Regulations and Incorporate the Functions into the Advisory Committee Regulations.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Same comments as proposal #30

Subsistence Uses & Procedures

PROPOSAL NO. 33 ACTION: 9 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Process for Determining Amount Necessary for Subsistence Finding.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Our Committees concluded that good data is Valuable. Technology to communicate is available to all user groups Therefor reporting harvest data under the same criteria should be a requirement. With all the modern modes of communication available to everyone in the state, via the phone, internet, and mail, WHY wouldn't the reporting be the same for ALL?

PROPOSAL NO. 34 ACTION: 2 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Modify the Subsistence Procedures for Determining Amounts Reasonably Necessary for Subsistence Uses.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Refer to comments on Proposal #33

PROPOSAL NO. 35 ACTION: 2 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Create a Definition for Nonsubsistence Harvest.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Support for reason stated in the proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 36 ACTION: 2 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Delete the Reference to Proximity of the User's Domicile to the Stock or Population.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Support for reason stated in the proposal. The State Supreme Court has ruled that this as Unconstitutional back in 1989, Needs to repealed.

PROPOSAL NO. 37 ACTION: 2 SUPPORT 1 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Add a Statewide Definition of "Noncommercial" as it Applies to Barter.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Supported for reasons stated in the proposal.

Nonsubsistence Areas

PROPOSAL NO. 38 ACTION: 2 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Repeal the State Nonsubsistence Areas.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Supported for reason stated in the proposal. Our Committee would like to see the Boards of Fish, and Game , comply with the State Constitutional in all areas it has the authority to do so. This practice of Rural area over Urban area priority has been Ruled as unconstitutional already. Our AC is representing as 2012, 68,116 licensed Alaskan Residents hunters and fishermen who would like to be treated equal, and counted, and not discriminated against because of where they live..

PROPOSAL NO. 39 ACTION: 2 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Reduce the size of the Fairbanks Nonsubsistence area.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: supported for reason stated in the proposal.

PROPOSAL NO. 40 ACTION: 9 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Create the Kodiak Nonsubsistence area

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Supported for reasons stated in the proposal. The Board needs to vists this issue, as the population has grown and developed, the area now has access to goods and services that any other community has.

PROPOSAL NO. 41 ACTION: 9 SUPPORT 0 OPPOSED

DESCRIPTION: Create the Bethel Nonsubsistence area.

AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION: Supported for reasons stated in the proposal. The Board needs to vists this issue, as the population has grown and developed, the area now has access to goods and services that any other community has
