

From: [Sen. Click Bishop](#)
To: [Senate Finance Committee](#)
Subject: FW: I strongly oppose SB 62
Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022 3:10:48 PM

From: Marilyn Sigman <marilyn.sigman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2022 2:53 PM
To: Sen. Bert Stedman <Sen.Bert.Stedman@akleg.gov>; Sen. Lyman Hoffman <Sen.Lyman.Hoffman@akleg.gov>; Sen. Natasha Von Imhof <Sen.Natasha.VonImhof@akleg.gov>; Sen. David Wilson <Sen.David.Wilson@akleg.gov>; Sen. Donny Olson <Sen.Donny.Olson@akleg.gov>; Sen. Bill Wielechowski <Sen.Bill.Wielechowski@akleg.gov>; Sen. Click Bishop <Sen.Click.Bishop@akleg.gov>; Rep. Geran Tarr <Rep.Geran.Tarr@akleg.gov>; Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>; Senate Finance <Finance.Calendar@akleg.gov>
Subject: I strongly oppose SB 62

Dear Legislators,

I strongly oppose SB 62. I worked as a Habitat Biologist for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game for many years, including when the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat was created by the legislature. I'm appalled that you are even considering this action which would be in direct conflict with Alaska Statute 16.20.500 which states that the purpose of the Kachemak Bay CHA is to: "protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose". Oil and gas exploration and development, especially to include fracking, is not compatible with this primary purpose.

Seismic exploration would **threaten** marine mammals and **kill large numbers of zooplankton, disrupting the food web**. Exploring, drilling, and fracking for oil and gas in the area that has been protected and preserved through legislation for this purpose would place crucial Alaskan fish and wildlife resources at risk, including the destructive impacts of toxic spills like those of the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. All of these activities would also threaten the scenic and quiet attraction of Kachemak Bay for visitors, which would have an economic impact on the tourist industry that provides a substantial amount of income and jobs for Alaskans.

Fracking requires large-scale water withdrawals and releases ground water that contains high levels of toxins and heavy metals that are harmful to marine and aquatic life. Where will the water come from that won't impact other Critical Habitat Areas like the Anchor River, an important salmon stream and recreational fishery?

Hilcorp, in particular, has a terrible track record of spills and disregard for regulatory standards. To expect that they would conduct any of these activities in an environmentally-responsible way thus borders on the ridiculous.

In all likelihood, SB62 is also in direct conflict with the statutory purpose of every other State Park, Game Refuge or Sanctuary, Critical Habitat Area where it would be applied.

I respectfully ask you to uphold the protection and preservation of habitat envisioned in the original Kachemak Bay CHA legislation. Sustaining the productivity of the habitat and the uses that its fish and wildlife resources provide is even more crucial now than it was when the CHA was created.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Sigman

Retired ADF&G Biologist and Alaska Sea Grant Marine Education Specialist

Author: *Entangled: People and Ecological Change in Alaska's Kachemak Bay*

--

"When we contemplate the whole globe as one great dewdrop, striped and dotted with continents and islands, flying through space with other stars all singing and shining together as one, the whole universe appears as an infinite storm of beauty." - John Muir