

Anchorage Fish and Game Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda  
William Hernandez Hatchery located at 941 Reeve Blvd  
March 3rd at 6:30 pm

- Call meeting to order at 1834 3/3/15.

- Roll Call to establish a quorum;

Committee Chair, Joel Doner, Committee Vice Chair George Jacoby, Committee Secretary Sam Albanese, Frank Neumann, Phil Calhoun, Jim Bogliano, Robert Caywood, Neil DeWitt, Brian Nelson, Ehren Strahn, Mark Campbell, Steve Flory

Michael Klehr and Kevin Taylor are excused

- Pledge and prayer
- Advise Guests of Public Testimony signup sheet – No guest in attendance.
- Approve Agenda –

Steve objected and spoke to us starting our meetings with a prayer and the pledge of allegiance. Joel does not object and questioned who would lead this.

Neil said he has no problem with the pledge, but has reservations about a prayer.

Joel asked what we think about amending policy and procedures. Sherry stated we should put it on the agenda, Steve wishes to amend this agenda. Sherry pointed out this all needs to follow the public notice act rules. Steve wants to do this to follow the same procedure as the legislature. We should mimic the legislature as close as possible. Sherry noted some committees do start with a prayer. Steve motioned we include the pledge and prayer on the agenda for this meeting between agenda items one and two. Motion seconded. Neil brought in a flag.

- Approve minutes from last meeting  
Minutes updated to correct the way the vote was recorded to not support Roland Maw.  
Motion to approve the amended minutes. Seconded. Minutes as amended approved.
- Introduce Department Staff: Sherry Wright
- Public testimony, if any: None.
- Committee Reports  
Game Chair- Frank Neuman-Southcentral BOG Comments

Frank Robert and Neil attended BOG meetings;

Reauthorizations for moose hunts passed through out the state except Kalgin Island.

Postponed Unit 13. Proposal 60, Paxson against, Denali For, Copper River did not vote on it, so it was tabled.

Copper Basin reauthorized the 13 hunt. Adopted some language from proposal 198. 198 triggers a cow hunt in 13A (or all of unit 13) when the moose population reaches the midpoint of the population objective. This will authorize a take of 1% of the cow population.

This is kind of the language the BOG adopted.

Steve said there was a reauthorization that was not done and was made into a bull hunt, proposal 40 in 22C and 22D. This was a cow hunt that was changed from 15 antlerless to 15 antlered bull.

Proposal 66, community subsistence harvest for unit 13. Wanted to change it to a 2 year commitment to enter the hunt.

Proposal 65 addressed the start date of the season. BOG approved from 8/10 to 9/1. Two days later it was brought back up for reconsideration and changed it to 8/20.

Proposal 84 dealing with the 100 any bull tag allocation for the community harvest. Proposal was amended and 5 tags will now be available for sport hunt.

Tier one for caribou still holds for moose.

Small game hunt for Hatcher pass approved.

106 and 107 full curl proposals shot down to any rams

All the other sheep proposals either failed or took no action.

207 and 208 were tabled.

127 and 128 for salvage of brown bear over bait failed. Still have to salvage edible meat. It is now defined as edible meat the same as black bear. Joel wants to look at how it is codified. The question is the June 1 exception, though the brown bear season closes June 1.

Proposal 129, bait station and clean up of contaminated soil. Still have to clean up the soil. Neil said part of BOG said afterward is you could clean it up, they could go in and pour oil and harass you.

We are now discussing bear crapping in the woods.

The town hall meeting had 175 people, 50-50 guide to sport hunter. Fairbanks was opposed to the working group. Robert C said everyone felt if there are working groups, AC should be involved. Chairman Spraker said this is DOA according to Joel.

Neil said of 167 people that showed up to testify Friday night, a 50-50 split. What got him was all the reconsideration votes. Chairman Spraker said of 207 and 208, it is not that they are dictating, rather they need input from the ACs as to what we want and how we want to do it.

In Joels conversation with Spraker, he asked for more comments for the next meeting. This will get kicked down the road to statewide next year.

Steve said one comment that Spraker made that he does not believe the ACs should be holding up the BOG on antlerless hunts.

Sheep management plan since the early 70s was discussed. The Department will bring it up to speed and update it.

Robert has a copy of it and will email it to the rest of the AC.

#### Fish Chair- Joel Doner-Statewide Shellfish BOF Comments

Joel has nothing for the fish subcommittee. Neil went to the Mat Valley meeting. They had a public person sport /personal use and was the opposite of what the two commercial guys that were at our meeting last month. They were going to vote the shrimp proposals. Neil provided the information we had. They then voted 0-10 to support 258-259-260, oppose 251 and 253 TNA, 244 west side clamming was opposed by them.

#### Legislative Chair- Steve Flory

Steve said HB 103 would do away with the BOF and BOG to write and pass their own proposals. Our bill, Steve expects a call back from Senator Meyers tomorrow.

New language, not yet assigned a bill number yet, for antlerless moose hunts, will have to be approved every three years but leaves it for the AC to cancel the hunts on off years. The Department and BOG will not be able to unless they have a biological reason. The required vote will be in cycle, the ACs can take it up at anytime. Joel said in effect it is not changing anything. Steve said the ACs do have the ability to close a hunt. Sherry said it is convoluted. Steve said this AC is the only one that used it successfully.

Eddie Grasser initiated and distributed an email proposing an increase in hunting license and tag fees. A document was distributed by Steve of the email.

Steve brought up whether we should support Theresa Sager Albaugh and Kip Fanning. Should we support the commissioner appointee, Commissioner Cotton?

Steve motioned we write a letter of support for HB 103, seconded.

This stops the board from writing and passing their own new proposals.

Joel asked, isn't HB 103 redundant to our motion to Kevin Meyers. Steve said it isn't actually redundant. But the more bills before the legislature, the better chance we have.

If 103 is passed it will take the pressure off the AC to pass their proposals.

It use to work from AC to Regional AC, only after it was passed from the Regional AC could it be considered by the board. That was removed years ago. This resulted in no approving authority up the chain of command. What 103 does is prevent the BOG from generating and passing their own proposals.

Neil said they voted 6-1 to give the commissioner full authority to rule on a petition.

Steve mentioned an agenda change and was corrected by Joel and Sherry that these are for emergency petitions. So the criteria has changed. Still would go through board support.

Brian asked what Steve thinks about the likelihood of 103 passing. Steve said we are in the first half of the session, and very few bills pass in this half of the session. He believes based on who sponsored this that it will pass.

Second part of question, if Steve believes it will pass, will writing the letter further the support of the AC.

Steve said the agenda of the AC is to look out for our constituent's.

Will this encourage them to act how we want them to or is this just poking them.

Joel advocated for the board to be able to still generate proposals, Steve added that 103 would allow for this, but it would have to go through the full public notice process.

Frank pointed out frustration with 207 and how it did not follow the proper public notice and vetting process. HB 103 was generated because of how 207 and 208 came about.

Joel stated he is a bit uncomfortable with HB 103 as it is not clear what the differences are between our proposal and HB103 and asked if we should wait until our April meeting.

Frank spoke to Brians concern about us poking the Board. He said we don't have great success anyway.

Jim talked about how he spent a couple of years lobbying the legislatures. The more an issue is brought up by more people, the more likely it is it will be considered.

Neil understands the need for 103 and the cycle. He thinks we should take action tonight.

Sherry looked up HB 103, Joel read the text of HB 103 to the AC. He has trouble with this since the boards can not generate proposals. Joel thinks it is appropriate for the board to be able to generate proposals, just not how they did 207 and 208.

Steve differs with Joel and is strongly in favor of 103. He sees the problem as if the board generates a proposal it is almost certain it will pass. If an individual from the board generates one, it is not a guarantee.

Robert Peck does not think the board should make proposals, rather they should consider proposals and make recommendations. It is like a conflict of interest.

Joel asked if it is appropriate for the AC to write proposals, YES.

10 support, 1 oppose, 2 abstain. Motion passed to write the letter supporting HB 103

Steve motioned the AC write a letter of support for Theresa Sager Albaugh and Kip Fanning for appointment to the BOG. Motion second.

Last month was a letter to the governor to appoint them.

Now we need to write a letter to the legislature in support of them.

Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Steve needs more committee members for this. He met with commissioner Cotton 2/14/15 centered around the idea that the ACs are a branch of the legislature. He did not think it was based on his reading of the statutes. Said it was a novel legal argument for the lawyers. The monumental problem over the course of the next hour of the conversation that he had never heard of this argument before. We came into knowledge that he was indeed aware of this as recently as the previous day. Either he did not understand the statute as to who the ACs worked for, or he understood it and did not like it, or he just simply lied to us. If a commissioner will lie to us, it will just compound the problem.

Frank pointed out that in the discussion the commissioner asked about this statute, he was interested in it. It was in the book according to Steve. Steve said it has always been known that the ACs were a branch of the legislature.

The position of the commissioner is irrelevant since our position is codified. Joel thinks this will be a grave mistake to oppose him. This will only result in us continuing to not getting our way.

Steve pointed out if we are just going to go along to get along, then we may as well just go home now.

Steve moved we write a letter in opposition of the legislatures confirmation of Commissioner Cotton.

Frank pointed out he was impressed with Cotton attending the 4 days of meetings. Steve reiterated, he lied to us and knew he lied to us. Robert Peck joked it might just be he is old and forgot, That is worse.

Neil backed Steve to a point. He knew he was not telling the whole truth. Might have been too much information and not completely up to speed.

Robert Caywood, he agrees with Steve, he does not like this guy at all. If we oppose him, who will step up. He is not approved yet, if not approved what happens.

Jim stated he thinks it is trivial that we caught a politician in a lie. It should be something more meaningful. He thinks we should pass on this.

Phillip asked when will we put our foot down when someone lies. If they can't be honest why have them in any position like this.

Neil, can we write the letter to the specifics of the lie, Steve said that is his intention. With boundaries on it he might support it.

Steve plans to write what happened as justification as to our opposition.

Joel stated he is more opposed to the letter including specifics about lying. He does not think we should have the committee write and back this letter. He thinks this will be a great mistake, the AAC would not likely sway the vote to confirm.

Motion failed 2 yes-9 no -2 abstain.

Steve said he intends to write a letter on his own behalf.

- Old Business  
BOG generated Sheep Proposals

Joel asked if anyone has any comments for 207 and 208, the sheep proposals.

Frank said we took no action until we heard what was said at the town hall meeting.

George asked why would we support any hunts for less than full curl. Frank said to increase the opportunity of taking sheep.

Joel said the taking of the old rams affects the population. The sub full curl have added stress to fight and breed therefore take from the population the smaller rams to reduce the competition. Not sure he agrees with this.

Neil said a presentation was made and in it that 14C is more than half way back for the population lows. He agrees with George that there aren't any up there. 14D had substantial number of sheep.

Steve pointed out that there is research supporting the taking of full curl does not adversely impact the population.

Joel said that 207 and 208 were an attempt by the board to start or address the perceived problem.

Caywood said the department finally did a survey. 97% of residents support limiting non-residents. 66% of guides support limiting non-residents. We should vote these down.

Steve stated the group with input were NGO and BOG in a private meeting.

Robert Peck said 207 infuriates him. This does not reflect anything from what the public has stated.

Frank agrees with Robert about 207. Proposal 208 option one is for non-resident hunters will enter into a limited draw. So he could support option one of 208.

Steve motioned we support 207, it was seconded

Neil said option 1 and 3 are unenforceable. Option 2 gives the advantage to someone.

Joel finds the unenforceable comments suspicious.

Robert Peck, the comment that a guide could live with it because he has plenty of resources.

Steve, as much as he would like to see stuff done for sheep hunting, this will not help the resource. He only supports limiting non-residents because that is what our constituent's want.

He does not see 207 changing anything now.

Joel said there are a percentage of problem people with aircraft. The small percentage of the people actually doing that would not change.

Proposal 207 opposed unanimously. The motion failed.

Motion to support 208. Seconded.

Neil can now comment on 208. Not ready at this point.

Robert Caywood supports option 1 for non residents and opposes the rest of the options. Steve will oppose because it states current hunts unchanged, and existing draw hunts will remain unchanged. These are where most of the contentious issues. All the other just divide the portion of the pie that has not yet been divided.

Joel stated that Spraker asked for comments on 207 and 208.

Robert P agrees with Steve that he will not support 208 but would support changes to the hunt types and drawing and registrations similar to non resident #1.

Frank asked should option 1 be amended to no more than 10%, Robert said it will be changed to non-residents no more than 10%.

Neil said the 10% came out for all sheep proposals and the BOG opposes it. They made comment that that is where the money is coming from while still providing opportunities for residents.

Sherry pointed out the board said the residents have the most impact and are the most successful. We pointed out the guides are the biggest impact.

Robert pointed out other all other states limit non-resident.

George said the Safari club shot down the 10% because of money.

Phillip is opposed because money should not be the issue, the resource is.

Steve pointed out resource first to benefit to the state. He has always supported the 10-15% rule. So don't completely downplay what the non-resident contributes. Don't forget we still have to pay for the department and work associated with managing game.

Joel said his career sheep guiding that he could count on one hand the number of resident hunters, Almost everyone guided was non-resident. He rarely saw non guided resident hunters.

Robert P hugely supports limiting non-resident and increasing fee for resident.

Neil, Robert hit on one the board might agree to. Fee for resident tags.

Steve opposes resident tag fees, we are an owner state.

Robert P, lets limit non-residents to 10% and we make up the difference.

Robert Caywood, al lot of resident got up stating they would pay for a tag to limit non-resident.

Steve read to the AC the fee scale from 10 years ago that this committee took the time to come up with. Provides for a gradual increase up to \$50 for hunting license. Hunt fish and trap went up to \$95. Non-resident license was opposed by APhi and SCI. These would rise to \$750. Non-resident brown bear up to \$2500. State imposed trophy fees were on this, Bison to \$1000, moose 50-65 \$250.

Phil asked, we are talking about raising fees to pay for government. There is so much waste in government, increasing fees will not result in improving government. He opposes this.

This was worked up and inserted into a bill that said for the department to get more money they would have to perform. The department opposed it.

Frank still does not have a clear direction for 208.

Robert said the idea for 208 was for the government to get more money through matching funds.

Question called, motion failed by unanimous vote.

Brian has a letter we wish to present to DNR in opposition of the Chuitna Mine

- New Business

Call for Proposals; by our next meeting proposals must be refined and it would be nice to provide to the committee prior to the meeting for review.

Frank had a couple of thoughts, as does Steve, they want to do it through the sub committee to refine them. These need to be done before April 7<sup>th</sup>. It would be nice for us in case we need to amend any of the proposals.

Frank asked what the BOF meeting is on next year. Sherry provided the list.

Brian motioned he would like to write a letter opposed to the Chuitna Coal Strip Mine. Neil second. PacRim coal draft permit application from June 2013, it gets worse with every turn of the page. The scope of this mine takes 11 miles of creek to be replaced 29 years later. It is a salmon stream. 300 foot deep pit will be dug. Statewide the bigger deal is this lease butts up to another mine and would create a mining district. This permits a company to remove 11 miles of salmon stream and is a bad precedent.

Joel asked Sherry if she could find the resolution of this committee from 9 years ago.

Steve, which backyard do you want to put your mine in. He sees this as a property right issue. Steve had issues with this stretching the truth. Stream restoration and reconstruction is dicey. Only 1000 to 2000 fish, is it a lot no, and would like to keep them, but some things are give and take. Steve went through the document point by point refuting some of the claims.

We should state what we like and don't like and recommend corrective actions.

Joel pointed out this is not a property rights thing, it is about the permitting of this project.

Phil said he would like to see what the developers plan is. We need more information before we write a letter.

Robert Caywood agrees with Phil, we can't write a letter not knowing what is really planned. Mining can be done in a way that works with other things. We don't have that knowledge to decide if it can be done or not. Robert Peck believes we should table this until our next meeting. However the comment deadline is March 10<sup>th</sup>.

Joel said it completely reroutes the Chuitna River.

Steve reiterated this is a 29 year project.

Neil said using our situation in the US, they are trying to do away with coal industries. What happens if they run out of money and get shut down.

Robert said a 200 man camp equates to more than 200 people.

Sam, we can what if this to death.

Phil is opposed to this because of not enough information.

Question called. Motion failed 3-9-1.

Steve motioned we ask DNR to provide information we are seeking, Jim seconded and amended to request an extension for the time to comment.

Question called, motion passed unanimously and Brian will right the letter.

#### April Elections

3 regular seats and 2 alternates are open beginning in June.

Steve motioned we postponed this election until the fall. We can not postpone as it was already announced through public notice.

Next meeting place and time; April, 7 BP Energy Center Located at 900 E. Benson Blvd. at 6:30 PM

Meeting adjourned 2116.