

From: [Susan A](#)
To: [Senate Finance Committee](#)
Subject: Public Testimony in Support of SSCR 1
Date: Monday, March 03, 2025 5:58:03 AM

Public Testimony in Support of SSCR 1

Presented to the Alaska State Legislature

Chairperson and members of the legislature, thank you for allowing me to testify in support of SSCR 1, which disapproves Executive Order No. 136.

1. Legislative Oversight and Constitutional Integrity

EO 136 oversteps executive authority by creating a new department without full legislative review.

The Alaska Constitution gives the governor authority to transfer functions but does not authorize creating new departments without legislative approval.

SSCR 1 ensures that any restructuring of agricultural policy undergoes proper legislative scrutiny.

2. Avoiding Bureaucratic Expansion and Funding Risks

EO 136 fails to clarify how the new department will be funded, raising concerns about budget shortfalls or unfunded mandates.

Without clear funding plans, agricultural programs could be disrupted, harming farmers and rural communities.

Keeping agriculture under DNR ensures stability and prevents unnecessary government expansion.

3. Protecting Indigenous and Rural Agricultural Communities

Many Indigenous land users and rural farmers depend on existing DNR programs—shifting responsibilities could disrupt vital services.

The legislature must ensure that any changes to agricultural policy do not disproportionately harm small farmers, subsistence agriculture, or Indigenous land rights.

4. Preventing Alignment with Project 2025

The creation of a standalone Department of Agriculture could lead to deregulation, favoring corporate agribusiness over small farmers.

Project 2025 promotes centralized government control over agriculture to benefit large corporations, threatening local food security and environmental protections.

By passing SSCR 1, Alaska prevents this harmful shift and protects local, sustainable

agricultural practices.

5. Legal and Constitutional Risks

If EO 136 proceeds without legislative approval, lawsuits could arise over the constitutionality of agency reorganization.

Indigenous groups and small farmers could sue if the new department negatively impacts land rights or funding allocations.

SSCR 1 prevents these legal risks by ensuring legislative oversight.

Conclusion

For these reasons, I urge the legislature to pass SSCR 1 and reject EO 136. This action will:

Preserve constitutional integrity and legislative oversight.

Prevent unnecessary bureaucracy and funding uncertainty.

Protect Indigenous land rights and small farmers.

Ensure agriculture policy remains in the hands of the people, not corporate interests.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Susan Allmeroth

Two Rivers

Myself

References

Alaska Constitution, Article III, Section 23.

Alaska Public Interest Research Group v. State, 799 P.2d 927 (Alaska 1991).

State ex rel. Legislative Council v. Governor, 631 P.2d 963 (Alaska 1982).

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2023). Small Farm Policy Trends and Corporate Agribusiness Influence.