

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

AC NAME: Central Peninsula

LOCATION (town): Ninilehik

DATE (of meeting): 2/5/19 cont. from Jan. 22 meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rion Vanek, John McCombs
Steve Vanek, Dave Martin, Madeline Thomas,
Mike Schuster, Jesse Lucas, Dave Blossom,
Joe Simpson, Greg Enealowski, Dan Prestley
Gary Deiman, Jeff Berger

MEMBERS ABSENT EXCUSED:

~~Steve Vanek~~ Aaron Berger

MEMBERS ABSENT UNEXCUSED:

QUORUM PRESENT: YES ☒ NO ☐

AGENCY STAFF PRESENT: None

Time Meeting Called to Order: 7:05 PM

Old Business and New Business (See following pages)

Time Meeting Adjourned: 9:10 PM

Steve Vanek
Signature, Committee Secretary

Alaska Joint Board of Fisheries & Game Proposals

March 21-25, 2019 | Anchorage, AK

Proposal Number	Proposal Description		
Support, Support as Amended, Oppose, No Action	Number Support	Number Oppose	Comments, Discussion (list Pros and Cons), Amendments to Proposal, Voting Notes
12	Require members to reside within the committee's geographic area		
No Action			See comments in Prop #17
13	Change the advisory committees having jurisdiction for the Cook Inlet-Resurrection Bay area by removing Mt. Yenlo and Denali Advisory Committees		
Support	12 yes	0 no	This is practical and logical. AC not in an area should not have jurisdiction over that area. It is contrary to the charge of AC members to have local knowledge & expertise and represent the views of the locals.
14	Update the area of jurisdiction for westward area king crab to include the Kotzebue Fish and Game Advisory Committee		
15	Amend the emergency closure process to exclude advisory committees that have not meet within the last three years		
Support	13 yes	0 no	we agree with the Department as explained in the issue statement.

16	Expand the functions of the advisory committees to encourage the involvement of youth and elders		
Oppose	1 yes	12 no	You shouldn't need a regulation to encourage youth and elder involvement in committee activities. That should be happening anyway. Doing the regulation won't necessarily improve participation. Supporter agreed with proposer
17	Reorder and clarify the election procedures under the uniform rules of operation for advisory committees		
Support	12 yes	0 no	This is a good overhaul of the AC election procedures. It clearly spells out the procedure.
18	Clarify the provision that advisory committees may not refuse membership to a nominee		
19	Simplify the process for removing advisory committee members for having unjustifiable absences from meetings		
NO Action			See # 20
20	Amend the removal for cause provisions		
Support	13 yes	0 no	We agree with the Department's justification. Will make it clearer
21	Amend the advisory committee vacancy rules		

22	Allow advisory committee members to discuss and vote by email, excluding actions for antlerless moose reauthorizations or emergency order closures		
oppose	0	13	we don't oppose the idea of this proposal. But as written it would apply to all AC's. We didn't think that is a good idea.
23	Provide guidance for advisory committee actions having abstentions		
Support	13	0	abstention abstention should not even be counted, only yes and no votes
24	Add language to clarify advisory committee meetings are subject to the Open Meetings Act and modify noncompliant provisions		
oppose	0	13	The Department should <u>not</u> be able to call for an AC meeting.
25	Remove redundant provisions for advisory committee officer regulations and clarify duties of the secretary		
Support	13	0	we agree with the issues presented.
26	Schedule certain requests for advisory committees to be acted upon by each board during regularly scheduled meetings		
oppose	0	13	we didn't see any need to change it now

27	Remove the concept of "active" and "inactive" committees		
28	Allow advisory committee representatives to be at the board table during deliberations for those proposals the advisory committee authored		
Support	13 yes	0 no	This is very important to do. It will actually save time because the AC rep. can explain the purpose and the affect of their proposal when the Board stays from what the proposal is addressing. Historically AC's sat at the table!
29	Allow advisory committee representatives a seat at the board table during deliberations on proposals affecting their region		
Support	13 yes	0 no	we strongly agree and have asked for the AC's to be at the table during deliberation many time in the past. It was also a recommendation from the last Regional AC meeting in the 1990's. AC's ability to answer questions and add explanation will keep the Board focused on the intent of the proposal, save time and most importantly result in regulation addressing the intent of the AC.
30	Provide a definition for board work sessions and allow submitters of Agenda Changes Requests (ACRs) to provide testimony at work sessions		
Support	13 yes	0 no	THE sponsor of an ACR should have the opportunity to give testimony at work sessions and answer questions. That is what the public process is all about.
31	Provide a definition for a board hearing of at least three board members with a public comment requirement		
Support	13 yes	0 no	we agree with clarifying the definition for a board hearing.

32	Repeal the provision for Board of Fisheries members attending advisory committee meetings to be in compliance with the statutory requirement for holding board meetings in specific areas of the state		
33	Amend the Joint Board's procedure for establishing fish and game regulations		
Support	13	0	We agree with the issue statement, especially the last statement, most AC members cannot attend the Board meetings and are thus denied participation.
34	Amend the Joint Board Petition Policy to correct a contradiction with the subsistence proposal policy		
Support	13	0	This gets rid of contrary regulation.
35	Repeal and rewrite the Joint Board Petition Policy		
oppose	0	13	We feel that this proposal does not solve the problem. 30 days is too long for a real emergency.
36	Allow a petitioner the opportunity to present information about the petition to the		

	boards and establish definitions for unforeseen and unexpected events and situations		
37	Repeal the boards' Subsistence Proposal Policy		
38	Require the Board of Fisheries to schedule shellfish regulations for any that have been closed by emergency order for 24 consecutive months		
Support with one opposed	12	1	It was felt that if removed from the book of regulations, it would be hard to get it back on the book. So leave it in the book. The opposer felt the language was ambiguous.
39	Update the regulations to correct errors and omissions		
40	Amend regulations to align and clarify current practices for advisory committees and the process for adopting fish and game regulations		
oppose	0	13	There are too many parts to this proposal. Some are good and some are not. It is not our job to take apart this proposal. Should have been several proposals.