

Fairbanks Fish and Game Advisory Committee

Proposal 66 is asking to amend the BOG's regulation on the acceptance of Agenda Change Requests (ACR).

The FAC is submitting new amendments/language for proposal 66.

(a) The Board of Game (board) may change the board's schedule for considering proposed regulatory changes in response to an agenda change request, submitted on a form provided by the board, in accordance with the following guidelines:

(1) an agenda change request must be to consider a proposed regulatory change outside the board's published schedule and must specify the change proposed and the reason the proposed change should be considered out of sequence. An agenda change request is not intended to address proposals that could have been submitted by the deadline scheduled for submitting proposals;

(2) the board will accept an agenda change request only

[(A) for a conservation purpose or reason;] Repeal

(B) to correct an error in a regulation; or

(C) to correct an effect of a regulation that was unforeseen when a regulation was adopted;

(3) the board will not accept an agenda change request that is predominantly allocative in nature in the absence of new information that is found by the board to be compelling;

(4) a request must be received by the executive director of the boards support section at least 60 days before the first regularly scheduled meeting of that year;

(5) if one or more agenda change requests have been timely submitted, the board shall meet to review the requests **with the sponsors of the requests** within 30 days following the submittal deadline in subsection (4), and may meet telephonically for this purpose.

(b) The board may change the board's schedule for consideration of proposed regulatory changes as reasonably necessary for coordination of state regulatory actions with federal agencies, programs, or laws.

Reason for the amendments:

Section (2) A. Is the portion of this regulation that could construed as a vague requirement?

Section (5). This amendment is to allow the sponsor of an ACR to be present in person or telephonically at the meeting and allows them to answer any questions board members may have or to explain the justification for the request. The ACR requests receive comments from the BOG members, other divisions such as law, protection, subsistence and wildlife conservation, why not the sponsor, who is the most knowledgeable on why they submitted the request? We have noticed many times the BOG cannot understand the intent of the request, and this results in assumptions on what the request is about. Not everyone can elegantly explain in writing the reasons for their request, but may be able to clarify verbally if given the opportunity.