

**PUBLIC NOTICE ON THE ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES'
BOARD-GENERATED PROPOSAL CRITERIA**

Notice is given that the Alaska Board of Fisheries (board) established *DRAFT* criteria for development of board-generated proposals during the board meeting conducted in January 2013.

Criteria has been established to guide board members when deliberating the proposed development and scheduling of a board-generated proposal.

The *DRAFT* board-generated proposal criteria is attached and can also be found on the board website at: <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=fisheriesboard.findings> (*under the 2013 Board of Fisheries Findings/Policies*). The board encourages the public to submit written comments on this criteria by the **deadline of 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 20, 2013**, via fax at (907) 465-6094 or mailed to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Boards Support Section, P.O. Box 115526, Juneau, AK 99811-5526.

Written public comments limited to 10 single-sided or 5 double-sided pages in length from any one individual or group will be accepted as a record copy (RC), and will be provided to the board for their discussion during the miscellaneous business portion of the Statewide Finfish and Supplemental Issues board meeting schedule for March 19-24, 2013.

Monica Wellard, Executive Director
Alaska Board of Fisheries

3/13/13
Date

~DRAFT~

ALASKA BOARD OF FISHERIES

CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BOARD-GENERATED PROPOSAL

It has been suggested that criteria need to be established to guide Alaska Board of Fisheries (board) members when deliberating on whether or not to develop a board-generated proposal. The board will consider the following criteria when deliberating the proposed development and scheduling of a board-generated proposal:

1. Is it in the public's best interest (e.g., access to resource, allocation concerns, consistent intent, public process)?
2. Is there urgency in considering the issue (e.g., potential for escapement objectives not being met or sustainability in question)?
3. Are current processes insufficient to bring the subject to the board's attention (e.g., reconsideration policy, normal cycle proposal submittal, ACRs, petitions)?
4. Will there be reasonable and adequate opportunity for public comment (e.g., how far do affected users have to travel to participate, amount of time for affected users to respond)?

Approved: January 20, 2013
Vote: 6-0
Anchorage, Alaska

Karl Johnstone, Chairman
Alaska Board of Fisheries