SCOMM

#30:17

FILE COPY

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, STATE OF ALASKA

Conference on Alaska's Future Frontiers

Friday, December 7, 1979

Sheraton Anchorage Hotel

Anchorage, Alaska

Legislative Reference Library
Legislative Affairs Agency
Pouch Y State Capital
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Reported by: Charlene Beovich, RPR

GAMMA GROUP MEETING PROCEEDINGS

(December 7, 1979, 9:40 a.m.)

THE MODERATOR: Could we get seated? We're already 45 minutes behind the schedule on the agenda. It says "Continuation of Work Groups," and, as you see, we're supposed to be organizing comments by this afternoon and this evening. We've got quite a bit ahead of us.

When we recessed yesterday, we were talking about goals, and some of us met, I think there were a couple of groups who met and worked on a few statements, but right now I think, let's go around and each one of you make, if you wish, and have a goal, would you state it, just one, in this first time going around. And if you want to pass, that's fine. I think we may get something then that we can come to agreement on. Would you accept that?

Okay, let's start with Ellen. I'm sorry, start with -- Are you ready?

MS. HUNTER: No, I'm not ready.

THE MODERATOR: How about Ellen?

MS. HAYES: No, I need to check with Georgianna first.

THE MODERATOR: All right, Gary.

MR. HOLTHUS: Maybe this doesn't need to be said, but I stick with the theme of justice I guess. I like to see

the law fall with equal weight and force on all segments of society. It's an old constitutional guarantee, but it doesn't happen in Alaska. We don't have enough policemen to provide police protection in most of the state, and when people do have difficulty with the law, there is discrimination between whites, natives, blacks and others. And the sentencing statistics that have come out in recent years make the point. So I want some kind of equal justice.

THE MODERATOR: Carl.

MR. JACK: Pass for now. I'll come back later.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, are we going to write these down in any kind of wording?

THE MODERATOR: This --

MS. HEDLAND: That isn't really what he said, is where the law falls in equal weight --

MR. TOMA: Anytime you want to correct me, please do so.

THE MODERATOR: I don't think that covers it enough either. Gary, why don't you be sure that it says what you mean?

MR. HOLTHUS: You know, what the constitution says is the law should fall with equal weight on all segments of the society. And in our case it doesn't, in your terms of protection or in terms of enforcement.

Just keep to -- excuse me a moment

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MR. HOLTHUS: Just to keep that from seeming abstract, that I guess means that I want to spend some money on the State Troopers and the police department, the court system and so on. Sooner or later, we get to talking in more practical terms.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) My very rock, rock goal is to preserve the life-style desired by its Alaskan people.

MS. LUDWIG: I'd just like to add to what Gary said and say that in our area, we have no legal aid. We have a Trooper that covers the whole Aleutian chain that is very seldom in our town. And in our particular area we need a lot of things. The legal aid would really be a great help. You have to go clear to Anchorage or call on the telephone and our phone service is very poor, so we have very poor legal representation out there.

THE MODERATOR: Then is one of your goals also communication?

MS. LUDWIG: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Better communication?

MS. LUDWIG: Yes. Transportation is one of the major things. Our air fare is $350 to Anchorage roundtrip.

THE MODERATOR: Could you make a goal statement out of that, Chip?

MR. TOMA: I'm sorry? Excuse me.

THE MODERATOR: Could you make a goal statement out of what she said regarding better communication for --

MR. TOMA: Communications, transportation and --

THE MODERATOR: Communication and transportation for --

MR. TOMA: And protection services? Equitability --

THE MODERATOR: For all areas.

MR. TOMA: Equitability of service.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Gene.

MS. KINCKA: I have two things. One is short and sweet and may seem facetious, but to me it's not. Tourism dollars, the tax dollars. I'd like to see them spent to give a dignified impression of our state.

And also I would like a system of perhaps tax incentives or investment incentives to private industry to figure the terms of human profit and perhaps head off the horrendous effects of the aftermath of some businesses coming into our area. I'd rather see it headed off in the beginning than to do an impact study afterwards and see what's left behind in regard to women, education. I've seen five or six studies done on the impact of the oil pipeline in Fairbanks. If it had been done ahead of time, some of those terrible effects might have been headed off, and if we can figure some of the profits in human profit instead of dollar profit, it might be done in advance. I

don't know how else to say it.

THE MODERATOR: Well, we need to do some editing of that kind of statement. We're just getting, talking out ideas right now. Maybe someone who is get --

MS. KINGRA: Tax incentives and incentives to encourage businesses to provide services and offset adverse impacts developing after the fact.

THE MODERATOR: Why don't you give that to him and he can write that down after we're going around here?

MS. KINGRA: Can you read my writing?

MR. TOMA: Sure.

THE MODERATOR: I don't want to get too far ahead of you.

MR. TOMA: That's all right.

THE MODERATOR: Next.

MS. LONGPRE: I'd like to echo the preservation of Alaskan life-styles --

THE MODERATOR: Speak up. She can't hear you.

MS. LONGPRE: That the preservation of Alaskan life-styles should be a priority.

THE MODERATOR: We have that on there.

MS. LONGPRE: I'd just like to echo that. Also we talked about a clause where good health is assumed as a right yesterday and I would like to see the consideration --

THE MODERATOR: I didn't hear you.

MS. LONGPRE: We talked about a clause yesterday where good health is assumed as a right. I would like that to be included, and I'm particularly concerned about alcoholism as fitting in under there.

THE MODERATOR: I think the statement was --

MS. LONGPRE: One where good health is assumed as a statement.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, good health is assumed as a right, instead of rights of good health.

MR. TOMA: All right.

THE MODERATOR: It's from this goal statement of ten years ago.

MR. TOMA: All right.

THE MODERATOR: Next?

MR. LADNER: I'd like to see a continued development of the transportation intrastructure within the state.

THE MODERATOR: Wouldn't that be the one that she's got down there? Isn't that within the state that she was speaking to?

MR. LADNER: Well, equitability I'm speaking about. She's speaking about equitability of services and I'm talking about expansion of services, development of services.

THE MODERATOR: You mean you wish to have expansion of better -- of transportation system.

MR. LADNER: Improvement of.

THE MODERATOR: Improvement?

MS. HEDLAND: To include mass transit.

THE MODERATOR: Would that include mass transit?

MR. LADNER: I don't have an opinion on that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. HEDLAND: But would it?

MR. LADNER: Yes.

MS. KINGRA: I didn't say encourage tourism. I said that our tax dollars be spent on tourism to encourage a dignified impression of the state, not a woman in a bikini on the glacier.

THE MODERATOR: Could we edit these later? I want to go around. We'll take a break and you can straighten them out.

THE MODERATOR: Andy.

MR. MATHIESEN: Well, it sounds to me like everybody is saying essentially the same thing, that we have a quality of life in Alaska that's rather unique and we're desperately trying to preserve it and that essentially is my goal.

THE MODERATOR: John?

MR. KELSEY: I have no problem with what I'm hearing. I think -- I would like to say though, to underscore, I called it fiscal responsibility yesterday, I call it

responsible action. I think we have responsibility to our children and our grandchildren to act in a responsible way so that they have some of the things that we are enjoying today. Whether you include it in the matter of preserving our culture or whatever, but I'm thinking in terms of wasteful action.

And I have a problem when I see programs that were suggested to us this morning. I think it's great, and I think that we need to address the matter of our delinquent children, but I think that we shouldn't always look to our government to solve those problems. I think we should look to our family units. I think they have the responsibility of keeping our kids within line.

And I don't think we should just increase our bureaucracies with the idea of they're going to solve our problems. I think we have that responsibility, and if I were to say any one thing, I think responsible action should be a goal. I called it fiscal responsibility and I don't think it was too well received yesterday, but that's about --

THE MODERATOR: You mean to save some of the money then?

MR. KELSEY: Absolutely. I don't think we'd have the right to dissipate all our assets in our generation. I think we have a responsibility to our children.

THE MODERATOR: Haden?

MR. KADEN: I have three things. Is that all right? Or do you want just one?

THE MODERATOR: Well, we're going to say one. How about, if none of these have been covered, say one now and we'll come back to extra ones.

MR. KADEN: Okay, I'll take the most important. One where, this is a future where, one where large areas of Alaska still exist in their natural state for their own sake and for the sake of still future generations, because of our continuing recognition of our stewardship for the land.

THE MODERATOR: Marion?

MS. HYLEN: One where continuing education is provided for all age groups.

THE MODERATOR: That's good.

Andy?

MS. HYLEN: I think we're ahead of him.

MR. TOMA: Excuse me Marion, that was education --

MS. HYLEN: One where continuing education is provided for all age groups.

MR. TOMA: Okay, thank you.

THE MODERATOR: Andy?

MR.HOPE: Well, the first thing I'd like to see is a government that stays out of the way. Now, after that I'd

like to see increased educational opportunities from childhood through adult, through the whole span of adult life. That's including vocational and higher education. And then a short note on that impact: How do we place a price tag on the cultural traditions of the native people? Suppose they're severely impacted or destroyed. How do you compensate for the loss of those cultural traditions? If you want to try --

THE MODERATOR: I've given you one goal this first time around, then can we come back, Andy?

MR.HOPE: All right, I want to stress again the theme of localization. I think that's important that we provide the means to develop local governments, recognizing the cultural diversity of the people of Alaska, too.

THE MODERATOR: First you said keep government out of the way, --

MR.HOPE: I mean a centralized bureaucratic government. Do you think that's a contribution?

THE MODERATOR: No, I just wondered, I was giving you one goal and you've given me about three.

MR.HOPE: Well, I think they're all --

THE MODERATOR: I want to keep --

MR.HOPE: They're all the same.

THE MODERATOR: -- them in mind but right now we'll go around and come back to those, okay?

Carolyn.

MS. JONES: I have several so would you come back to me when you do the second run?

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. JONES: One where political representation reflects not only the population but geographic diversity.

MR. KELSEY: Is that legally possible, Madam Chairman? Can I ask the lady? She's an attorney.

Is that legally possible in a one man, one vote --

MS. JONES: I think there are ways to get around it. For example, in the U. S. Government the senate provides for two senators from every state regardless of population. If we turned our senate into something similar -- I think there are probably lots of ways to get around that particular situation.

MR. HUSS: That would have to be in charge of the Supreme Court though.

THE MODERATOR: Could we hold the discussion until we get all these down?

Mr. Marshall?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I'd like to speak on education. I think we should be putting more emphasis on the basic education, because without the basics, the higher education would be null.

THE MODERATOR: Then you would like an expansion of

education goal?

MR. MARSHALL: Education, yes, because you have children who are coming out of high school today that can't read.

THE MODERATOR: Should broaden the education goal then.

Kevin.

MR. HARUN: I've just hastily scribbled it down. Some of it may have come up with another person brought it up. I would just like to read it. Won't take that long.

Whereas, the vast majority of Alaskans are urban dwellers;

And whereas the way in which urbanization is taking place has great effects on Alaska as a whole, specifically settlement and resource demands on rural Alaska;

Whereas, Alaska's major cities should begin major efforts to enhance the aesthetic qualities in urban areas, to encourage the ability to walk, to reduce strip commercial sprawl, strip commercial development, and to reduce the homogenization of Alaska;

And whereas, the leading detriment of Alaska's urban development and land-use patterns are transportation patterns, specifically the total dependence on the automobile;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the State of

Alaska make a massive commitment to reshift transportation funding from automobile dependence to mass transit.

THE MODERATOR: That's good.

MR. HUSS: I just have one more. I'd like to provide employment that's necessary to support all Alaskans, and an economic base. I don't know if that -- it could even enlarge it to say some sort of acceptable employment on employment.

MR. TOMA: I'm sorry, Bernie, can I have that again?

MR. HUSS: An economy which could support every Alaskan, or something like --

MR. TOMA: An economy to support all Alaska?

THE MODERATOR: Christy?

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. I'd like to see us develop energy sources which utilize renewable resources and which are localized whenever it's feasible.

THE MODERATOR: David?

MR. KEENER: Only thing I would do is renewable resource, but that's just discussion.

THE MODERATOR: Karen?

MS. HEDLAND: The same. They're all up there, although I'm not satisfied with them.

THE MODERATOR: Well, I think the wording --

MS. HEDLAND: Wording, right

THE MODERATOR: Needs work. They're not exactly

saying what everybody has said.

Getting back over here --

MS. HEDLAND: Kay.

THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry, ahead. Yes, it is.

MS. LINCOLN: One of the goals that I'd like to see us work on is the educational system, the education under one system instead of two, the state and federal.

MR. TOMA: Want a state educational system, strong State?

MS. LINCOLN: Just one. Whichever way is the best.

THE MODERATOR: You mean --

MS. HUNTER: Equal educational opportunities for all?

THE MODERATOR: You mean state --

MR. TOMA: You're talking about the administration, aren't you?

MS. LINCOLN: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: You mean with the university and the --

MS. LINCOLN: No, I'm talking about the State and Federal Government in education. What I'd like to see, one of the goals worked on, is all the education being under one system instead of two separate ones.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, you mean like BIA and --

MS. LINCOLN: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, okay. One educational system. That's clear now.

MS. HUNTER: I would like to see, "Protection of the environment and maintenance of viable ecological systems shall be major factors in assessing impacts and making decisions on both public and private projects."

THE MODERATOR: I think that sort of goes along with with your statement, doesn't it, in the pink sweater?

MS. KINGRA: Me? Yes, but I think she stated it very well.

THE MODERATOR: But they're similar.

MS. HUNTER: I'll keep this wording and you can put it on either way you want.

THE MODERATOR: Alan?

MR. MACK: Stan.

THE MODERATOR: Are you ready to proceed?

MR. MACK: Not really. As I got into it quite late, my major concern would be in the education department, providing a little more stronger educational department. That's just one of them.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. Ellen.

MS. HAYES: I'd like to reinforce this. There's language that can be developed. In the broad category, educational needs or emphasis to work toward preventive health rather than to try to set facilities after, you know, everyone is needing care. And then, you know, address ourselves to care. I would like to address ourselves to an

educational program where prevention is an emphasis as well as including alcoholism, understanding and good nutrition, so I'd say education, with the idea of preventive prevention, good nutrition and alcoholism.

MS. HEDLAND: Under the preventive sections, not only for health and education, but I would like to see somewhere in there the day care availabilities for single parents. It's nice to say everything should be the family structure, but, unfortunately, that is not the fact. We have a horrendous need for after-school care, particularly for kids up to the ages of ten, and I understand that is not just an Anchorage problem, that is a state-wide problem, so I don't know where it fits. But I think it's part of preventive and you're preventing these juvenile delinquency things.

I do not think the programs were shown -- I think the programs that were shown today were wonderful, but I think there's a lot more to it, and that a two-week session is not really the answer. I like the word "preventive" and under preventive I'm talking in terms of not only health, not only alcohol, not only drugs, I'm talking about child abuse. That hasn't been brought up at all. Education in these areas, also. I don't know how to say it.

THE MODERATOR: I want to be sure that everyone has had a chance to have one goal before. I think Jack did not

have. He passed. Do you have one now?

MS. HAYES: Carl.

THE MODERATOR: Do you have one now?

MR. JACK: I have five.

MR. TOMA: Can you work on a little bit of wording now?

MS. HEDLAND: I can't decide if it works in with something else.

MR. TOMA: Go ahead, Carl.

MR. JACK: Let me preface the points that I'm going to say, reiterating what I've said yesterday, that we are going to be discussing the direct services, the finances and the resources, and all of these type of services will revolve around the type of government that will be there to provide these services. So I would request the chairman of the group here to extend to me the privilege of presenting these with no objections.

No. 1 would be to reaffirm that which were established ten years ago as by the Gamma group in '79.

Second would be to reaffirm such as Gary stated, and that is just state that is fair and can provide equitable treatment for all the citizens of the State of Alaska. The second one is to maximize local control, with the type of government to meet these local needs through the foundation formula similar to the REA system.

And the last one would be that the rural areas be

guaranteed legislative representation on geographical basis.

THE MODERATOR: That is what Carolyn was stating in her goal.

MR. JACK: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: I think now that we've gone around the table, Haden Kaden had some more and so did Andy and so did Carolyn.

MS. KINGRA: I had one.

THE MODERATOR: Excuse me.

MS. KINGRA: Yes, I do, too.

MR. HOLTHUS: So do I.

THE MODERATOR: And Gary, okay.

So, Haden, do you want to give your other two?

MR. KADEN: Okay, one in which there is a maximum of flexibility in the types of government available on the local level, and where experimentation and the means by which we govern ourselves is encouraged. This is at a local level, because right now we're locked into just certain forms of government which came to us from outside the state, essentially, and they work well for urban areas, but not necessarily for rural.

Okay, and the other one is one which provides for maximum possible self-sufficiency by and for the people through the encouragement of small-scale, self-sustaining businesses, agriculture, manufacturing, resource and energy

utilization.

THE MODERATOR: That's the one that we were discussing yesterday. That's good wording.

MS. HAYES: Very good.

THE MODERATOR: Very good.

Okay, Andy, those of you have written out your statements, could you just give them to Chip? And it would be -- then we'd be sure to have them to have the exact wording. We're sort of behind here.

MR. HOPE: Do we have an agenda that we're following?

THE MODERATOR: Pardon?

MR. HOPE: Do we have an agenda that we're following? If we don't, I wanted to make a motion that we break into five different groups.

THE MODERATOR: Could we finish these goals and then --

MR. HOPE: Well, how long is this going to carry on to? because I --

THE MODERATOR: The goals is just going to take until the two of you finish, then we're going to have --

MR. HOPE: Okay. Then you're going to have a what?

THE MODERATOR: -- you give your goals. We'll take about ten more minutes and then we're going to break. Then we'll come back to the agenda that was suggested yesterday and see how you feel about the agenda.

MR. HOPE: Okay. Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Andy, didn't you have a couple more?

MR. HOPE: No. I was going to make a motion.

THE MODERATOR: Carolyn.

MS. JONES: I have two more. I see in Alaska as one where we have high expectations for all our students and where the opportunity for an enriched education is available to all Alaskans without discrimination. I have that.

THE MODERATOR: Do you have that language to give him?

MS. JONES: I have that, yes. I have it written down. I'll give it to you.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Just make a note it's an educational goal.

MS. JONES: Is the gentleman from Hooper Bay here?

THE MODERATOR: No.

MS. JONES: Okay, I wanted to hear if this reflected what he was saying yesterday.

One where the arts and cultural pursuits are seen as valuable life-styles in themselves essentially, too, and enhancing the quality of life.

THE MODERATOR: She's got that written out.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

MR. HOLTHUS: I think this maybe ties in with what John was talking about, maybe what Karen was talking about,

one of my concerns though, it's a just state that provides for the health and safety of families. The reason that's a concern is that Alaska has a terribly high suicide rate. It has the highest rate in the nation. It has very high incest rate. The alcoholism and the drugs we've talked about earlier. Anchorage has a homocide rate that's second only to Detroit. We get 60 to 70 child abuse reports every month in Anchorage, with about a 60 percent verification rate.

Cordova has a high child abuse rate. Ketchikan has a high child abuse rate. Fairbanks has a high child abuse rate, so evidently it's wide spread throughout the state. Spouse battering, VD, which is a kind of violence we perpetrate on each other, although it's not normally classified as violence. And for awhile, at least in '75 and '76, Anchorage was cranking out divorces faster than it was marriages.

So if we are able to raise kids to the time they're 20, and they are not involved in drugs or alcohol, if they haven't been the victims of violence or the perpetrators of violence, or if they don't have some really warped idea of what families are all about, I think we've been just lucky. So, when we think about Alaska being a good place to raise kids, the reality is maybe a lot different.

So, somehow or other, you know, those are all symptoms of a society that's got some real problems. And somehow or other, we've got to make a state that's safe and healthy for families.

THE MODERATOR: You had some more goals.

MS. HEDLAND: I just wanted to add to the --

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. HEDLAND: It's not a set thing, but I would just like to add, the words I wrote down is a strong support system for troubled families, if you would, also. Then we get to the means that would include the child abuse centers and the counseling and so forth. But the strong support system is what's important to me under the health and safety of family.

MS. KINGRA: We've all been talking about education around the table, and if it's presumed that we all start out equal by these new Headstart programs and everything else, and there have been studies that show minority children start out the same as white kids, but by the time they graduate from high school, they're behind, and I would like to see a two-step certification for our teachers, one certifying in education abilities and second, a certification in cultural understanding, that it might help as a starting place.

THE MODERATOR: That's a very good goal.

MS. LINCOLN: Madam Chairperson, I'd like to emphasize that. We in the rural areas have been concerned with that for a number of years now.

MR. HOLTHUS: Could I speak to that, too?

THE MODERATOR: Yes. She wanted to speak.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Well, it's a different subject.

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, Gary.

MR. HOLTHUS: I agree wholeheartedly, especially with that latter. We need some kind of training program for teachers that are new to the State so they're not going out as strangers to lay more strange stuff on village kids, but one of the problems with the certification process is that sometimes, for instance, where a bilingual instructor -- what that means is that a woman who is 55 and been in the village all her life and is working in a bilingual program is now required to go to the university and pursue an academic career and maybe leave her kids and her husband for weeks at a time because she has to do something in Fairbanks and get the kind of education that leads to certification.

MS. KINGRA: Not necessarily.

MR. HOLTHUS: So I think the kind we want is some informal sort of methods to provide that certification, so that she's not required to go --

MS. KINGRA: Within the state here are --

MR. HOLTHUS: -- to the university to get it.

MS. KINGRA: -- experience levels that correspond to educational levels and certainly they could be applied unto this.

MS. HUNTER: I would like to say, Gary, that one of the things I think might be used as a model is the training they give the medical aides in the villages, where they come into Anchorage for maybe a week --

MR. HOLTHUS: Yes.

MS. HUNTER: -- a year and get the technical things they need, but their practicing and any other training is right on the job.

MR. HOLTHUS: That would be great.

THE MODERATOR: Well, there's a lot of possibilities. If we had a communication system, a network of telecommunications, and television, you could do a lot of that through in-service right in the community, too.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I'm stealing the thunder of the Council of Energy Resources, part of it, and Alaska was included in it, and it was an article that was in the paper yesterday, but I would like to see as one of our goals here for the future Alaska, that the goal of national energy independence not be reached at the expense of the Alaskan citizens.

MS. HUNTER: And environment.

THE MODERATOR: And the environment, would you add that?

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Sure.

THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

MR. HAKUN: I just wanted to touch back on the last one, the previous one, before Georgianna's.

I was down in the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta last week and I'd been there last spring, too, in different villages, and one thing I noticed is that almost all the teachers were from Texas and Oklahoma. And I asked about that and I said, "Well, what about our local teachers that we put out in, say, Fairbanks and Anchorage from the university?"

And I understand they have a hard time placing Alaskans in the bush. I don't know whether that's because Alaskans don't want to go there or whether it's just an inbred system where the principal comes from Texas and brings his friends up. That's what appeared to be happening down there.

I was wondering, is that a problem, that Alaskans aren't in teaching positions?

MS. LINCOLN: I have been finding that the native or the people born and raised in Alaska, whether they be white or native or whatever, I've been finding out that they go to school and they go and get their teaching certificate,

then they move out of the village or out of rural into urban.

MR. HARUN: So they don't want to go down there?

MS. LINCOLN: Some of them do. There's a very high percentage though that do stay in rural Alaska.

THE MODERATOR: Now that I've heard all these goals, it seems to me that there are certain -- there's a grouping that comes through, that what we could do now is break up into groups and refine these statements rather than doing it in a large group--

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, before you --

THE MODERATOR: -- under certain areas.

MS. HEDLAND: Before you do, I made a commitment to my friend out there, that the needs of senior citizens would be addressed. That has not come up at all. And I guess I'm a little disturbed when I look back at all these things and I see we've got 90 percent dealing with the land and ten percent dealing with the people on the land. And I think we're a little bit amiss, remiss, off base in that fact, and I would just like you to put up there with a word later that we address the needs of senior citizens and that somewhere the right of adequate housing is assured, also. To all people.

MR. HOPE: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Andy.

MR. HOPE: I'd like to present a motion that we create seven committees.

THE MODERATOR: I can't hear you. Could you speak up?

MR. HOPE: I move we create seven committees. I'll name them off here, the ones that I have in mind. No. 1 is financing Alaskan government. No. 2 is marine resources. No. 3 is energy policy. No. 4 is transportation systems. No. 5 is education. No. 6 is governmental structures. And No. 7 is social concerns.

MS. LUDWIG: How about health?

MR. HOPE: Well, that would come under social concerns.

THE MODERATOR: What was the first one? Finance and what?

MR. HOPE: Financing government, Alaskan government.

THE MODERATOR: Finance and government?

MR. HOPE: Financing Alaskan government.

THE MODERATOR: There's a motion that we break up into seven committees.

MS. HEDLAND: Has it been seconded?

THE MODERATOR: No, it wasn't seconded. Was there a second?

MS. JONES: I second it.

THE MODERATOR: You second it.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Madam Chairman, discussion.

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I don't know if that's such a wise idea. Seven. I don't know. Yesterday we were saying there's 30. I don't know if there's still 30 here. But that's --

MR. TOMA: 23, I think.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Okay, three people per committee, and I feel a little uncomfortable that I'd have my input into the committee system, in that I think we need to just get ourselves a little bit better organized. I don't think we necessarily have to go into committees to complete our function here. We only have two things we're going over today, finances and, this morning resources. And I feel like certainly we could do it as a group.

THE MODERATOR: I'd like to say that I think it will destroy the -- what the -- the way this was set up, because there's no way that we can have a record of what's going on, because she's here to take it all together, and I just throw that out.

MR. LADNER: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MR. LADNER: If I might, I think Andy has come up with seven good categories and I didn't write them down, but maybe Chip could put them on the board for us.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

MR. LADNER: Perhaps those seven categories might

simplify and amplify seven goals that we want to talk about.

MR. HOPE: Well, as far as having her record everything, everyone of us can write. Everyone of us knows how to write. And each group could write their recommendations out and hand them to her.

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MS. HEDLAND: I'd like to take her suggestion, his, one step further in terms of the categories. That's an excellent idea. And what we were to do, as I understood it, was to get our goal to the end and then we go to the means to the end, and that's all of the things that are on the agenda. I think it would lose a lot with only three of us in a group, because I really enjoy the input of all 20-plus individuals. And if we would go with the categories and then consider them a so-called end and then get to the means, we are discussing financing of all of them. We are discussing resources of all of them, and we're discussing direct services. So we would, in fact, be doing what we're supposed to be doing.

THE MODERATOR: Well, that was what I was -- I don't have that letter that was sent to all the delegates, where the mission was that you were to come up with --

MS. HUNTER: You should get a copy of that for us. I don't have it either.

THE MODERATOR: -- the suggestions for the meeting which is to be presented, I believe, tomorrow morning. Saturday. Yes, Saturday morning. And there's five --

MS. HUNTER: Ask Chip if he can get it Xeroxed.

THE MODERATOR: There are five categories, and the one category that this group has addressed the most is not anything that was asked for, and I think you have the prerogative to add that, and that is the social needs, because there's just educational needs, financing Alaska's future, development of marine resources, Alaska's oil and gas policy, transportation system and educational needs are the five categories. Those do not touch very many of the kinds of concerns that this group has. And it seems to me i. this group wants to present those kind of concerns, that's exactly -- we're free to do that.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) There's another part to that though. It says "Additionally the conferees will be asked to generate long-range goals for the investment of " -- "intelligent" investment, I can't forget that word -- "of revenues derived from the slope." So I think that falls into that category.

THE MODERATOR: Investment, intelligent investment? Okay. Well, those seven categories that Andy had, you only added -- I think you added two more to what this list that was in the delegates -- isn't that correct?

MR. HOPE: Feel free to add.

THE MODERATOR: Those five, the social concerns and the government structures are the two additional.

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, is No. 1 not a part of all of the other six?

THE MODERATOR: Financing Alaska's future?

MS. HEDLAND: The government, I mean the category of financing government, is it not a part of --

MR. HOPE: Everything's a part of everything.

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MS. HEDLAND: So that one I would suggest might be --

MR. TOMA: There are structures. I mean there are choices to be made on the structure you want to devise for doing that, too. You can invest it, you can spend it, you can leverage it.

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MR. JACK: I'm going to speak against this motion, if it comes to a vote, and that is, I think this motion is premature, because we are going to discuss these, and I would rather discuss these as a group. I think the appropriate procedure would be, No. 1, for the Chair to direct Mr. Toma to take a look at these and get them into some semblance of order and entertain a motion for the adoption of these by the Gamma group, and then move on to

the next one.

THE MODERATOR: Any more discussion on the motion? Kevin?

MR. BARON: Well, I guess I'm not in favor breaking up into groups, and I think maybe the best thing we could do would be to take these and try to think of specific solutions that would fit these goals, specific strategies as to how we could, say, encourage tourism or how we could preserve Alaskan life-styles, specific ideas that people can latch onto, and then of the time on them.

THE MODERATOR: Any other comments?

MR. HUSS: I just think, well, yesterday we went -- we started going through the Alpha list, right? We decided on several of those. I think we should take those. And then it seems to me you could group almost all these groups into several categories, like education or health or whatever the four or five main categories are and we could derive four or five more goals. Then we'd have these and for those four or five additional goals, then we'd have a set list of our goals.

THE MODERATOR: Well, the mechanics right now, we're discussing whether we want this motion.

MR. HUSS: That's what I'm --

THE MODERATOR: You're opposed to the motion.

MS. HEDLAND: Let's vote.

MS. JONES: I second the motion for the purpose of the discussion. What I want to discuss is the basic implementation of the goals that we've been passing around the table, because I have a feeling of hopelessness right now. I know we're going to disagree lots when we start talking about actual implementation and I want it to happen now.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. HOPE: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Any more discussion on the motion?

MS. HULEN: Motion.

MR. HOPE: Little defense in here.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. HOPE: We're not locked into anything the committee recommends. It would just hasten the process up a little, I think, and provide a little bit more meat to the discussion. The committees can meet for a short amount of time. The way I was thinking, and then come back and present the recommendations. Those could be added in at any time.

MS. LONGPRE: I'm not in favor breaking up into these groups, as I feel that it would be limiting. I'm going to have a hard time choosing just one group, you know. I'd like to be in several of those groups, which would be impossible.

THE MODERATOR: Are you ready to vote on the motion?

MR. JACK: Question.

MR. KEENER: I'd like to say one thing. I've been sitting here day and a half, or whatever, I feel the reason why we're doing this is so that when we get those goals, we can take those, these different suggestions talked about, and plug them into our goals, and it will expediate the whole process. These other groups are having a hard time getting to their ends because they're going through the means. We are putting down the ends so we can run through these and just plug them right in, and the means should not take the length of time as the ends.

THE MODERATOR: Very good point. Are you ready now to --

MS. HAYES: My remarks was that I think these categories do help us get to the means and, therefore, the means will come out this afternoon. I like the idea of the categories. I also feel like I'm interested in several of those categories. And breaking into -- I couldn't break myself into that many groups.

THE MODERATOR: Okay. The motion is to break up into seven committees. All those in favor say aye.

MR. HOPE: Aye.

THE MODERATOR: Those opposed? Motion failed.

Okay, it seems to me that the wording of some of these goals was much stronger than what we have in the

short statements on the board. I think before you can adopt these goals and know whether you accept them, we must have the actual wording.

MS. HEDLAND: But I would like to suggest that we use these as these -- these categories as a guideline and just zip through them and go, you know, No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, where it does go? Where does it belong?

THE MODERATOR: Is that on a sheet?

MS. HEDLAND: See how many we have under each category, then we'll be able to combine, condense and rework the wording.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, but the point is that these were all suggested and we have to actually adopt them as a group, and you wait till they're categorized and then adopt them.

MS. HEDLAND: Right. I don't feel --

MR. LADNER: Madam Chairman, I would like to move that we adopt the categories as established on the green board over there, moving right along, with the exception that we strike government structures and add tourism.

MS. HEDLAND: Second.

MR. LADNER: Maybe I should finish that, I'm sorry, before the second is made, and that we adopt these as our goals and/or ends and proceed.

MS. HEDLAND: Then I won't second that, because you can't adopt two words as a goal.

THE MODERATOR: No, you've got two --

MS. HUNTER: Tourism would be too long.

THE MODERATOR: You want to amend this list and put tourism?

MR. LADNER: Okay, I wanted to make sure it was covered. Then I'll amend the motion to say that.

MS. JONES: There's no second.

THE MODERATOR: She withdrew her second.

MR. LADNER: You withdrew your second.

THE MODERATOR: So start over again.

MR. LADNER: I move we adopt the seven goal as listed on the green board as our ends, and proceed to the means, discussion of the means.

THE MODERATOR: You don't mean goal. You mean you just want to adopt these seven categories --

MR. LADNER: All right.

THE MODERATOR: -- and proceed to put the goal under the categories? Is that what you're saying?

MS. HUNTER: That's the only way we can work it. Is that okay?

THE MODERATOR: Did somebody second it?

MR. LADNER: I feel like these superimposed over these. I think we should adopt these as our --

MR. TOMA: Structure?

MR. LADNER: -- structure, categories, goal, ends,

whatever, and proceed to the discussion of the means.

THE MODERATOR: Is there a second?

MS. HEDLAND: Get Gary.

MS. JONES: No.

MR. HOLTHUS: There isn't a second.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the motion dies for lack of a second.

MR. HOPE: I'll second it.

THE MODERATOR: It already died. Go ahead.

MR. HOLTHUS: I'm not ready to make a motion, but before we adopt that list I'd like us to look a little harder at that list, because it seems to me one of the categories, for instance, under resources ought to be resource development. If we're talking about goal for resources, we don't want to limit ourselves to marine resources, for instance. I mean there's timber and oil and a lot of other resources that we need to talk about.

MS. HEDLAND: Fish.

MR. TOMA: Oil here, right?

MR. HOLTHUS: Well, energy policy ought not to include just oil, but all kinds of alternative energy.

MR. TOMA: Well, I admit that.

MR. HOLTHUS: So I think, you know, we need to talk about that list a little bit before we adopt it, but we ought to adopt some sort of categorization like that.

THE MODERATOR: Mr. Jack?

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, I think I would agree with Gary on this. I think everybody has a copy of this, in which all of these are listed. I think the appropriate way to handle this would be to, No. 1, take care of the direct services, financing, resources, that every one of these on the board either falls into resources or direct services.

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, I'd like to reverse that and have the direct services or financing fall into every one of our categories, but I believe it does need to be amended. And bear in mind that you have a resource of fish, which is in there somewhere, I suppose, but, if you would change that, if you only had marine resources, then it's only fish, right? What about timber and so forth? So perhaps the word "marine" ought to be deleted.

MS. HYLEN: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Marion?

MR. TOMA: If I might elaborate, the reason why we don't have timber, for instance, in this book this time around is because 90 percent of the timber, 95 percent of the timber in this state, that is marketable is federal. All right? And we have very little State timber that is either going to be put on the block or has been put on the block, just because of the way it is. I can expand on that, if you want to, but that's the reason why it wasn't

included under State policy.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) But it was included in the questionnaire, you know, as to what our --

MR. TOMA: I know it was.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Yes, so I think it should be considered.

THE MODERATOR: Marion?

MS. HYLEN: I think we should get back to the goal and finish them and then get onto this other work or we're never going to get through.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) A suggestion that was made earlier, Madam Chairman, was that you direct the Facilitator to group these things while we move on, so we're not spending our time doing that. I think that's a good suggestion.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: But what would we move on to?

MR. MATHIESEN: I would suggest where we move on to.

We can't lose track of why we're here. This is a conference on the future of Alaska. And we've decided, essentially, what kind of a future we want. We know the administration in the legislature is going to be the ones implementing this, and generally, while they implement these types of actions or whatever they're doing, they seek the best minds that they can find on various and sundry

contractual activities to come in with proposals on how to achieve it, and I would imagine that they will do it again if we see fit to do that. And if we suggest merely that this is the direction we want to go, now you find the experts to see that we get there, that we will be through with this conference.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Madam Chairman, since the question was asked --

THE MODERATOR: Just a minute, she--

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) -- about how to do that, I'm saying that I agree on that recommendation. I think we can go ahead, since those are very broad things and these will probably fall into a majority of those, then what are our objectives to reach those things? And I think we can be addressing those while he's doing this. He is now saying what the objectives are in reaching these various--

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, I'd like to pursue that one matter further.

THE MODERATOR: Carolyn.

MS. JONES: My point of personal privilege is, in the future how may I get recognized?

THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry, Carolyn.

MS. JONES: I know it's not your fault. But I raised my hand. That's my style. And other people -- I can't get your attention by calling you, and my arm's getting sore.

I wanted to be recognized to say that I have been looking at the goal over there and I've tried to put in some categories. I would like to suggest these categories as the outline under which the goal can be grouped, and then we could move on to deal with the goals under these categories.

Category No. 1, just --

MR. TOMA: Just one second, Carolyn.

MS. JONES: Okay.

MR. TOMA: Excuse me. Okay.

MS. JONES: Okay. Category 1: Justice, political. Category 2: --

MR. TOMA: Political?

MS. JONES: Yes. I see political representation as justice.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

MS. JONES: Life-style.

3: Communication-transportation.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

MS. JONES: 4: Development. 5: Social. 6: Education.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

MS. JONES: Government style.

THE MODERATOR: What?

MS. JONES: Government style, form, government form.

MS. HYLEN: Is that education?

MS. JONES: No, that's next.

And the last one is economy and finances.

THE MODERATOR: Structure?

MS. JONES: Structure is fine. I'll take any of those.

The last one is economy-finances.

THE MODERATOR: Ellen?

MS. HAYES: Does the Category 4 include resources?

MS. JONES: Yes.

MR. KELSEY: What? Would you say that again, please?

MR. TOMA: Category 4 include resources, the answer is yes.

THE MODERATOR: That's development of --

MS. JONES: Yes.

MR. KELSEY: Madam Chairman --

THE MODERATOR: Do you want to add that in there-as resources? If you want to add it as slash development, that was my intent, too.

MS. HOLLAND: Does it also include energy question of alternative sources?

MS. JONES: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Resources of energy come in that, too. John Kelsey.

MR. KELSEY: Yes, I'm concerned about the resources that you've been talking about. And nobody said anything about human resources. I think that's one of our more

important resources in the state. I think it should be included.

THE MODERATOR: Did you intend to include it under social concerns?

MS. JONES: Yes. Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Should you add the word concerns and social concerns? Would that include human --

MS. JONES: I would accept that, or I even would have accepted changing human to social resources.

THE MODERATOR: Would that be a better title for it, human resources?

MS. JONES: Fine.

THE MODERATOR: Would that cover it then? And the social concerns would come under that?

MS. JONES: M-hm (affirmative response).

THE MODERATOR: Okay, I guess, were you next, Marion?

MS. HYLEN: What happens to the ones that we accepted yesterday?

THE MODERATOR: Well, we accepted --

MS. HYLEN: A lot of them cover a good part of this.

THE MODERATOR: We accepted them yesterday for discussion purposes.

MS. HYLEN: I know, but are we going to use them or discard them and start all over?

MS. HEDLAND: They fit into this.

THE MODERATOR: They fit into all of these, I believe. They were just stated differently.

MS. HYLEN: They cover a lot of these we have already taken care of.

MS. HUNTER: This is merely a categorization.

MS. HEDLAND: Is Carolyn's in the form of a motion?

THE MODERATOR: Did you make a motion?

MS. JONES: I move that we adopt this list as an outline of the goals to be addressed, and address those goals.

MR. LADNER: Second.

THE MODERATOR: It's been moved and seconded that we adopt these eight goals as categories so we can -- no, that's not what we said. We adopt these titles for the categories.

MS. JONES: As an outline of our goals.

THE MODERATOR: As an outline. Is there any discussion?

MS. HEDLAND: Question.

THE MODERATOR: All those in favor--

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Under discussion, then alternative futures is going to be within all these categories?

MS. JONES: I think all those categories together would be put together to make our alternative future.

MR. HUSS: Right. Before I vote on this, I'd like to know if our next step is going to object to try and write a goal for each area like this. Are we going try to consolidate all of these into a single goal for each area? Then we have a page of eight goals. Then when we try and do our means, we can look and see if that means is going to conflict with any goal? Is that our next step? I have to know where this is going to go before I can know whether I want to vote yes or no on it.

THE MODERATOR: The question was that we categorize all of these statements that have been presented under these eight areas, and then we will adopt each goal, I gather, as a group, if that's your wish.

Andy?

MR. HOPE: Some of those categories are too wide open, you know, for me to tie anything. How can you tie anything to political or life-style? How can you tie anything onto that? I just can't see it.

THE MODERATOR: Celia?

MS. HUNTER: I think, well, what Andy was trying to do and what Carolyn was trying to do, is simply to give us a handle in which to place each of these goals, and it isn't a matter of reducing the goals to one goal for each of the areas. It's simply that these categories will then have a number of different goals listed, and those goals, which we

already have pretty much put down on paper, -- this is simply a device for making them easier to handle

MR. TOMA: Gives you a direction.

MS. KINGRA: We're getting bogged down in semantics again. We're all saying the same thing. We want to move ahead. We want to find a way to categorize these things under some form, either that one or the one suggested by Andy and I suggest we either vote on this motion or move ahead to something else, because all we're doing is filling the air with words.

THE MODERATOR: How about --

MR. HOPE: That's what we're here for.

MS. HEDLAND: Question.

THE MODERATOR: There is nothing that would lock you into not changing a title if you feel that the goal doesn't fit that particular name, as we move along, as Celia said, it's just a matter of let's -- a way to operate.

All those in favor of the motion, Carolyn's motion say aye.

(Responding)

THE MODERATOR: Those opposed? Motion carried.

MS. LUDWIG: Could I ask a question, please?

THE MODERATOR: Yes. Will you describe which category would sewer and water be under?

MS. KINGRA: Resources.

THE MODERATOR: Development. Human resources, government.

MS. HEDLAND: Life-style.

(Laughter)

MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I also have a question, and that is I notice hands go up, and which form do you want us to use? holler at you like I just did, or else, you know, like Stan has been doing for a long time, holding his hand up, and he doesn't get recognized. I do immediately.

THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry. I didn't see you.

MS. HAYES: Which form do you want us to use? is all I want to know.

THE MODERATOR: I think --

MS. HUNTER: Just ask people to help you point out people that need attention.

THE MODERATOR: Really I can't have my eyes all over.

MS. HUNTER: I try to help you.

THE MODERATOR: And I'm sorry, Stan.

MR. MACK: I was going to suggest maybe to satisfy this problem we might after we're recognized, stand and present our topic and then be seated, and then you could go on and recognize that person and that person will be through speaking,'s and then you can recognize another person.

THE MODERATOR: I think that would be better, because it would help the recorder, too.

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, Stan.

MR. MACK: I'll be the first to stand. I was just looking over all this, and it might help us if we just put this all under one group as health, education and welfare. And then divide it up into what's concerned with health, what's concerned with education, and what's concerned with welfare. Suggestions came up on the resources. We can categorize those in two, renewable and nonrenewable. And then we can take the renewables and list all those and then the nonrenewables, and then go from there, if that might help us speed things up here a bit.

THE MODERATOR: Well, we have a suggestion of these categories, and maybe when we're going through them, ou can -- that would be another set of categories, you can start working with this one right now. We voted to do that right now.

MR. JACK: For the benefit of the chairperson, I've noticed, with all due respect to the chairman, that I notice some editorializing in some cases. I'd like to try to avoid that as much as possible. So I think it would be better if the chairman does have some specific comments to say on these subject matters, that we establish a Vice Chairman, so when the chairman wants to, again, say

something, that she can turn the chair over to the Vice Chairman and state his opinion -- her opinion. For that I would move to nominate Kevin Harun as the Vice Chairman.

THE MODERATOR: Kevin, come on up here.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I'll second it.

THE MODERATOR: It's been moved and seconded --

MS. JONES: Point of order.

MS. HEDLAND: Yes, point of order.

MS. JONES: We haven't discussed --

THE MODERATOR: You're supposed to stand, Karen.

MS. JONES: -- whether or not we want a Vice Chairman. I would like to discuss that first, nothing personal, but that is the first point.

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, I want to second what Carolyn said. You know, we're not in here for parliamentary procedure. We have now wasted about 25 minutes on procedure. We did take a motion. We voted on categories. I would like to suggest that we don't really need a Vice Chairman. I would hate to think that Katy couldn't talk because we put her in the position of having to sit at the front of the room.

I would like to suggest that we have adopted the categories. Let's take them one by one. Let's just start going through. Let's make an indication of what category they lie in. Let's not get all bogged down in this picky

stuff.

THE MODERATOR: In answer to Carl Jack's suggestion, in the future when I feel that I want to discuss something, I will just turn it over to anyone around. Anyone of you could be as good a chairman as I am, so let's not get bogged down into that detail.

MS. REDLAND: Let's move.

THE MODERATOR: I'll try to be careful about my comments.

Was somebody else wishing to speak?

MS. HUNTER: I would. Madam Chairman, did we have a motion on the floor and can we get rid of it?

THE MODERATOR: It wasn't seconded.

MS. HUNTER: Okay, fine.

THE MODERATOR: Was it?

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, you seconded it.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Okay.

THE MODERATOR: There's been a motion to nominate Kevin as Vice Chairman.

MR. HARUN: I'll just decline, okay? We'll just get on with it. I think we could just go through and put in the categories.

THE MODERATOR: Do you wish to remove the motion?

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, I'll check the motion, with

the understanding that if you have something to say, you'll turn the chair over.

THE MODERATOR: I will. The motion has been withdrawn.

We now have the categories. Shall we start with the goals that we started yesterday and put them under these categories? I think they are up there, aren't they, the beginning statements?

MR. TOMA: Yes, they are. I'll use the numbers, if I may for right now, and we'll go with that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. TOMA: We have "preserve choice of life-style," we have an agreement on 2, life-style? Preserve choice of life-style, life-style.

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MR. TOMA: Means are the ends --

MR. MATHIESEN: Hold off a minute. The choice of life-style, that's got to include every last one of those, because every one of them is apt to upset the life-style.

MR. TOMA: How do you want to do it?

MR. MATHIESEN: Life-style is included in every one of those.

THE MODERATOR: What you're saying, Andy, life-style is not necessarily separate categories?

MR. MATHIESEN: That includes all these categories, and I've been trying to get that across ever since I got

here.

THE MODERATOR: Let's remember that. Does everybody agree with Andy's statement that life-style -- all of these other categories infringe on life-style?

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, I agree with them, but I think that can be a prefacing remark for all the rest of those. Once again, let's not get bogged down. Can we eliminate some of the formality? Quickly when he goes through, say, is this No. 1, 2, 3. Everybody just say 3, 6, 8, whatever.

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MS. HEDLAND: I think that deserves a separate statement in itself. We can preface them and separate the issues. In fact, it was strong enough that it deserved a separate statement, is the way I look at it.

MR. TOMA: These are more statements than goals. How do you feel about that? Do you want --

MS. HEDLAND: Just put them into categories and let's go.

MR. TOMA: Put these in a categories, means are ends, means are the ends, okay? An ideal is an Alaskan word. So these are life-style then? You want to put them in your category life-style?

MS. HUNTER: Would you read those off, Chip? Some of us can't read this far away.

MR. TOMA: Yes, means are ends, the means are the ends, an ideal Alaskan word.

MS. HEDLAND: That's a very poetic introduction.

MS. HUNTER: I don't think that's relevant.

MR. TOMA: That's what I saying. Any statement, we have to nail down this plan.

THE MODERATOR: Chip, I don't think those are -- those are the beginning of the goals.

MR. TOMA: Okay, those --

MS. HUNTER: Those were discussion points I think yesterday.

MR. LADNER: Just pick up on Friday's goal.

THE MODERATOR: I don't think those got written down yesterday. We were working from this sheet of paper.

MS. HUNTER: Right up here, Chip, is where you should start.

MR. TOMA: This is Friday then. Equal justice. I think everyone can read these here, right?

MS. HUNTER: Category one. Why don't you make a big 1?

MR. TOMA: Okay, fine.

MS. JONES: Two.

MR. TOMA: (writing)

MS. JONES: Three

MR. TOMA: (writing)

MR. LADNER: Three.

MR. TOMA: (writing)

MS. JONES: Four.

THE MODERATOR: That's five.

MS. HUNTER: No.

THE MODERATOR: Human resources, isn't it?

MS. HUNTER: No, no, it said --

MR. TOMA: I guess they're government form in a lot of ways.

MS. HUNTER: Impact prior to development, impact prior to development. It would be development, it would be four.

THE MODERATOR: The author of that goal, where do you think it should go? The lady in pink.

MR. TOMA: Is this one yours here?

MS. KINGKA: Yes.

MR. TOMA: Consider the impact prior?

MS. KINGKA: That is considered under human --

MR. TOMA: Considered to be a human value?

MS. KINGKA: Yes. Social concerns.

MR. TOMA: Five. Under impact, okay.

MS. HAYES: No. 5.

MS. HUNTER: But I also think a form of it is four, but go ahead.

THE MODERATOR: Well, it could go under two. You could have it --

MS. HUNTER: No, not two.

THE MODERATOR: -- in two places maybe if it was --

MS. HUNTER: Well, you'll come to it again. That's fine.

MR. TOMA: I'm sorry. I think these might -- are supposed to be broken here?

MR. MACK: Right.

MR. TOMA: I think these are three different statements right here.

MS. HUNTER: Definitely.

MS. HEDLAND: But it is both four and five.

MS. KINGRA: Consider impact prior to development in relation to human profits, and in relation to human --

MR. TOMA: Okay, we'll introduce it five then?

MS. KINGRA: Right.

MS. HEDLAND: Five.

MR. TOMA: Excuse me?

MS. KINGRA: Five.

THE MODERATOR: Chris?

MS. JOHNSON: I just wanted to object to tourism going in, communications and transportation. I'd like to see it go in four in development.

MS. HEDLAND: How about both?

MR. JACK: It's resources. It's resources.

MS. HUNTER: I think it should be in both.

MR. TOMA: It really is a main function of

transportation, Chris, if you think about it.

MS. JOHNSON: I know, but how she introduced, the thing was, she wanted to have the tourism in Alaska as a dignified industry and I think she talked about it apart from transportation and communication.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

MS. HEDLAND: Just put it in both of them, three and four.

THE MODERATOR: Why don't you put it in both of them?

MR. TOMA: (complying)

MS. HUNTER: Let's come back and argue about it later.

MS. JONES: Okay, alcoholism is five.

THE MODERATOR: Five.

MR. TOMA: (writing)

MS. JONES: Three

MR. TOMA: (writing)

MS. JONES: Eight. Is that eight?

MR. TOMA: (writing)

MR. KADEN: Four.

MR. TOMA: (writing)

MS. JONES: Six.

MR. TOMA: (writing)

THE MODERATOR: That was yours. Is that right for you?

MR. KADEN: Well, it could be, you know, it's one of those.

THE MODERATOR: Because your statement was --

MR. KADEN: Well, it has to do whether you're going to develop resources or not, but it also has to do with life-style, which is --

THE MODERATOR: That's what Andy says also.

MS. JONES: Two also?

MR. KADEN: And two.

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, education is six.

MR. TOMA: Six here?

THE MODERATOR: Six.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Government form, which one is that?

MS. JONES: Seven.

MS. HEDLAND: Seven.

THE MODERATOR: I mean this one, culture values have priority.

MR. KADEN: Five.

THE MODERATOR: Human, five.

MR. TOMA: (writing)

MS. HAYES: I think life-style is also --

MS. JONES: Make it two also.

MS. HUNTER: Make it two also.

MR. TOMA: (complying)

MS. JONES: One.

THE MODERATOR: One.

MS. HEDLAND: It's also seven, isn't it?

MS. HAYES: Government form.

THE MODERATOR: Representation?

MS. HAYES: Seven.

MR. TOMA: Which one?

MS. HAYES: One also has another aspect, that's the government form.

MS. JONES: Six.

MS. HAYES: Six.

THE MODERATOR: Transportation, three.

MS. HAYES: Three.

MR. HARUN: That wasn't my intent though. It was more encompassing. I think there needs to be more addressing of urbanization in the state, how urbanization is taking place. I think that's one specific -- I think that's a major component, transportation in urban development.

THE MODERATOR: Is that human resources, too?

MR. HARUN: Aesthetics is something we haven't put up there.

MS. HUNTER: I think, when I started looking through them, that we might need a 9th category which would be community development, which could encompass things like reduction of your ban sprawl and amenities for rural communities and that sort of thing.

MS. HAYES: Development, would development for now

cover it?

MS. HUNTER: Actually development was resources pretty much.

THE MODERATOR: It's his goal.

Where do you think it should go?

MR. HARUN: That's one of the problems I had with categories. I think it's a good idea we're going through categories, because once we get them I think we can be more specific, but I think one major thing that we really have to look at as far as the future Alaska is concerned is what is happening in the urbanized areas and how that affects the rest of the state, because I think it has vast implications how Anchorage, Juneau, Fairbanks develop on the rest of the state. I don't know which it would fit in under.

THE MODERATOR: Government form? Would it come under that category?

MR. HARUN: That has more the connotation of government.

MS. JONES: Maybe life-style.

MR. HUSS: Could we ask that be an extra category?

THE MODERATOR: Is that agreeable with you, community development as a separate category?

MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I'd like to think that development category can cover community development or a

conglomerate development or whatever development, and add our aesthetic component to that development category. I think, to me, it fits in there.

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, philosophically I think we all agree with you, except we have this directive letter that kind of emphasizes that we have to have a separate emphasis, and I think if we're going to have any impact, we have to think of it strong enough as an addition to what was proposed.

MR. HARUN: Yes, that's true. I think I agree with that, too, because these categories are important, because if someone in the legislature looks at them, they'll say, as Ed Merdes, priority No. 1, education. The categories largely determine how they view the goals, because we're putting the goals in the categories. And I personally feel that urbanization itself is strong enough, you know, it's an important enough thing.

THE MODERATOR: Would you like that category rather than the community development?

MR. HARUN: What does everybody else think?

MR. KADEN: Community development is more encompassing, because you can fit other things in.

THE MODERATOR: Would you all accept we have another category of community development, No. 8 --

MR. TOMA: Nine.

THE MODERATOR: Nine, okay. Without objection, we'll have that as the 9th category.

MS. HAYES: Is this nine then?

MR. HARUN: Yes.

MR. TOMA: Okay. How about this one here (indicating)?

MS. JONES: Eight.

MR. TOMA: That's an eighter?

MR. JACK: Eight.

MR. TOMA: (writing) Okay, energy, renewable and localized.

THE MODERATOR: That's four.

MS. JONES: Four.

MR. TOMA: It is four?

THE MODERATOR: Well, Carolyn had suggested or I put down that energy would come under like development, resources and energy.

MS. JONES: No, it wasn't my topic, so I --

MR. TOMA: It's kind of life-style, too, but --

MS. JOHNSON: That was my topic.

MS. HEDLAND: The emphasis was renewable resources.

MS. HUNTER: It's a community development.

MR. TOMA: One educational system, six. Health education, --

MS. HUNTER: That would be social concerns, five.

THE MODERATOR: -- five (writing). Protection of --

MS. HUNTER: That would be four, is where I visualized it.

MR. TOMA: Okay. I'll try to read these for the people down here at the end.

Address needs of senior citizens?

THE MODERATOR: Five.

MR. TOMA: Maximize local control, that might make government.

MS. HUNTER: Style. Seven.

THE MODERATOR: Is that seven, government form?

MR. TOMA: (writing) Diversity of government systems, seven. Self-sufficient, sustaining local resource supply, that's your community, isn't it?

THE MODERATOR: Is that where you MR. TOMA: Adequate housing?

MS. HEDLAND: Five.

THE MODERATOR: Five.

MR. TOMA: Okay (marking). Education?

MS. JONES: Six.

MR. TOMA: That's six.

THE MODERATOR: That's more than education, isn't it?

MR. TOMA: Excuse me, without the --

MS. HUNTER: Without justice, that would be one.

MR. TOMA: Justice, yes. Cultural life-styles emphasis.

MS. JONES: Two.

MS. HAYES: I think that's education as well.

MS. JOHNSON: That's the same one, isn't it?

MR. TOMA: In education.

THE MODERATOR: Ellen said she thought it was education also.

MR. TOMA: Okay, Carolyn, this is yours.

MS. JONES: Life-styles. My intent was that we respect people who do things in the arts as a part of their culture as well as respect people who do it to earn a living and people who are engaged in it for leisure.

MR. TOMA: So --

THE MODERATOR: Life-style?

MS. JONES: I think it would really be life-style.

MR. TOMA: Excuse me, I forget the numbers here. No. 2, all right.

health and safety of families, strong support systems.

MS. JOHNSON: Five.

MS. JONES: Five.

MS. HUNTER: Five.

MR. KEENER: One.

MR. TOMA: Five and one?

MR. KEENER: Yes, justice and safety.

MR. TOMA: Okay, certifying teachers.

THE MODERATOR: That's education.

MR. TOMA: Six. And national energy goals, that's our development?

MS. JONES: Development.

MR. KADEN: Development.

MS. HUNTER: That would be four, because florist going to have to contain energy.

MR. TOMA: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Then we have these other ones. Are they included in --

MR. KEENER: If they can be.

THE MODERATOR: I believe this is a good time to have a coffee break and come back in about 15 minutes. Ten minutes?

Yes, David?

MR. KEENER: Madam Chairman, I would like to see -- now, I haven't personally -- I don't have anything written up there. I don't have a direct form of goal that I plug in. There are people here that have written down direct goals or could help other people write their direct goals so that you have one central feeling.

I'd like to see those people gather together possibly over a half-an-hour break and come back with them rewritten under each of the categories, all put in their proper respective places, and those people that had a

directive that they wanted to enter could get together with the other people and have them written out, and if they would meet together, --

THE MODERATOR: That was where I was about an hour ago. That's where I wanted us to be, but now we've gotten it to a very good point.

MR. KEENER: Those particular people, I don't know if you want to gather together under your specific number or what, --

MS. HEDLAND: You got to make sure all numbers are covered though.

THE MODERATOR: Yes. We'll take a break now and come back at 11:30. Those of you who wrote goals that are up there, and I know those are not the words that you -- those are shortened versions of the goals and the language really flowed on a lot of those and made them much more exciting than the way they are, and I think we can analyze and appreciate them more when we see them written out. So I would suggest that you write them --

MR. TOMA: We have a blank right here, Katy.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, a blank on those pages so that everyone can see them.

MS. HUNTER: I think we ought to have them on a sheet, because it's going to be much too long to go up. Couldn't we then --

MR. KEENER: Mimeograph them.

MS. HUNTER: -- turn them in to you and we'll have a small break and quickly put them under their headings.

THE MODERATOR: I think we all want to view them as we're voting on them and we do not have time to have them duplicated or anything, so each of you who had those goals write them on one of those sheets and they'll be right around the room. There are not that many.

MS. JONES: Do we have enough paper to put nine sheets up?

MR. TOMA: Sure.

MS. JONES: And put a number on each one, go write our goal under the heading number.

THE MODERATOR: Put the heading number and under the numbered things and then we'll have it before us, and if it takes longer than a half hour, okay.

MR. KADEN: Is somebody going to deal with the first three things that we picked out of the Alpha statement, four things, whatever it was? Did you write those down yesterday?

MS. HEDLAND: Those should be included.

THE MODERATOR: Some of these are included up there, and the language is a little bit different, but some of them are not, so we can add those in where needed.

MR. TOMA: Madam Chairman, just one suggestion on

yesterday's notes and trying to formulate ourselves, those people that want comments off of this, let's say, would you take those down into your note form before we break here, then I can take down these five sheets and we can start condensing things this way, as it were, okay?

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. TOMA: Let's get the stuff off.

THE MODERATOR: Anybody who wants anything off those notes, will you take them off? because he's going to take off the board

MR. TOMA: I'll take off Thursday. Thursday starts down here and goes this way. So let's try and remove these and we can formulate everything this way.

THE MODERATOR: So we'll recess for half an hour.

MS. HEDLAND: Until what time?

THE MODERATOR: Well, I have ten after 11, so if it takes us -- it will probably take us a half hour to do this, so 20 to 12 could we come back?

MS. HEDLAND: My only concern is that some of the people that were the most eloquent will only be writing something in one area, and so some of the --

MS. HUNTER: I don't think it's necessary to limit it.

THE MODERATOR: If they can help with the writing of it to improve them, --

MR. HUSS: I think it can be added once it's on the

board as we go through maybe, like we did yesterday. It seemed to work all right on those -- on the Alpha suggestions.

THE MODERATOR: We're recessed now.

(RECESS: 11:10)

1:30

THE MODERATOR: We'll come to order.

For the benefit of those of you who weren't here who are here visiting, and also for the benefit of the other delegates. We have another delegate here, Yule Kilcher from Homer.

Before we recessed, we had suggested goals and they were all put under the nine categories. What I would like to do now is have -- oh, where is our facilitator? -

MR. HUSS: He was just here. He must have stepped out.

THE MODERATOR: -- to have Chip read each one and then we'll vote the time on accepting or rejecting, and rather than spending time amending, changing commas, words and so forth, I would like to have volunteers for a committee which I would like to call Style and Drafting from my experience at the Constitutional Convention. And if we could have that committee, then any comments that would be picked up, they will meet then after we get through and come up with a nice, clean group of goals. And then we will come back tonight, or maybe we can get to that this afternoon, see how we carry out the goals, what kind of services are needed or what kind of projects would be needed to carry out those goals.

So do I first of all have volunteers for the Style and Drafting Committee?

John Hurlbert. Marion? And Haden Kaden, I see your hand. I don't think we need a big committee. I think it's easier if we have a small committee. But anyone could --

MR. KILCHER: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: You want to be on the committee, too. That's four.

MS. HEDLAND: That's enough.

THE MODERATOR: That's enough. So I don't like to go ahead without the facilitator but I certainly don't really want to -- John Kelsey.

MR. KELSEY: Would you give us a clarification? Do you want comments now about, you know, the feelings at this point or later?

THE MODERATOR: Oh, no, this is the way I think we should proceed. We'll read the resolution or the goal. Then I would like a show of hands. If there is an overwhelming support, the minority I guess would be entitled to make a minority report, rather than spending time arguing about whether it's a good goal or not.

Does that seem fair to everyone?

MS. LUDWIG: Couldn't we just try to see if we could go through it all together to see what happens?

THE MODERATOR: You mean go all the way? We have to accept one of them each as we go along. You mean without any discussion --

MS. LUDWIC: No.

THE MODERATOR: -- since we have discussed it?

MS. LUDWIC: Rather than go in committees, just see --

THE MODERATOR: We're not going to go into committees. We're going to do it here.

MS. LUDWIC: Oh, okay.

THE MODERATOR: No, we're not going to break into committees.

Let's see and what happens.

MS. HEDLAND: Chip is going to read each one?

MR. HARUN: Just one question.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Kevin.

MR. HARUN: Some of the goals are also the means, as we referred to.

THE MODERATOR: Is that what happened, we got means in there?

MR. HARUN: I think that's what happened. Some of them are interspersed. I think maybe the thing to do is, some of them we may want to keep or amend and some of them we may want to elaborate on them.

MS. HEDLAND: Except that we have got an Editing Committee, and I hope the person that edits is intelligent enough to separate the means from the goals. I think I'm leery of us getting bogged down in the first three things in the next couple of hours without being able to get an

overview, if this is even the way the group feels. So I would support her concept of going through, finding out if there's a lot of support for that, and if some of them come out real iffy, you know, obviously we'll go back to them and spend more time.

MR. HAKUN: What I'm saying is that some of them might stand as means without having to go through the whole process all over again.

MS. HEDLAND: I see.

MR. HAKUN: And duplicate them. Might suffice on some of them.

THE MODERATOR: I take it when we read it, if someone thinks it's a means, say so, we'll pass that one over then.

MS. HEDLAND: Would you also include short one-sentence suggestions for means at this stage for them to take notes on to include in their writing or not?

MS. HYLEN: Oh.

THE MODERATOR: I'm afraid if we get into that, we've got to stick with the goals right now. I think if we get into the means, it will take us too long.

Let's try it and see what happens. I always feel you can change your mind on procedure if it isn't going to work.

MR. TOMA: I was going to suggest just one thing, that's that form I showed you yesterday, on the

recommendations. What we were trying to do is use that in all the five groups. I will get a copy of that, Madam Chairman, --

THE MODERATOR: I don't know where it is.

MR. TOMA: -- and run 30 or 40 copies off. It's just a form that said category, recommendation, specific regions, and funding suggested.

THE MODERATOR: Wouldn't that be what we would be after we go through the goals and we come back to see how to implement the goal?

MR. TOMA: Right, exactly.

THE MODERATOR: Before we proceed, I did neglect to tell you about this that was handed out before lunch, the summary of recommendations of a paper on health and social services. I wanted you to know that this had been presented and we didn't get copies of it, and if anyone has any questions that they would like to direct during a break to Dr. McGinnis, he is here, but it might be in some of this paper here.

MS. HEDLAND: I just said I would bring to your attention the fact there was another paper submitted also.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, someone else submitted a paper on Biological Significance of the Exploitation of Space and Geographical Barriers by Transportation Technology, and that paper is here for anyone who would like to get copies

of it. We'll have Chip make some copies.

So, Chip, can we have the first goal down there under, what is it? Justice?

MR. TOMA: Justice, political.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. TOMA: "One where the political representation reflects not only the population but the geographic diversity as well."

THE MODERATOR: Would all of you who accept that raise your hand?

(complying)

MS. HEDLAND: Point of information. Will we be able to, Charlene, get a printout of these nine things as they are said? Is that a possibility, or should we all be writing them down?

MR. TOMA: This will be easy to transcribe. That's no problem

THE MODERATOR: She means if we could have it, so that tonight we could be seeing what those goals are.

MR. TOMA: That's what these recommendations sheets could be for, too. I mean we could pass out 30 of these forms. Each of us could be responsible, just assign numbers, everyone write one down and then we're done, right?

THE MODERATOR: How is that?

MR. TOMA: We can make up any kind of a form to work

from, and then if you want one of us to do one thing, then it's all done.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, tonight, okay.

MR. TOMA: "One where we have high expectations for all our students and where an opportunity for an enriched education is available to all Alaskans without discrimination."

MS. HEDLAND: All in favor raise your hand.

MR. KILCHER: I don't think it's pertinent to the title of justice, political justice. It's on education.

THE MODERATOR: Well, the author of the goal felt that it was equalization and that we talked about that this morning when you weren't here.

MR. KILCHER: Oh.

THE MODERATOR: And we decided it was justice.

Okay, would you vote the time on that one please?

(complying)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed?

MS. HYLEN: It's in the wrong place.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, just because it's in the wrong place. Make that note, you people who are drafting, styling and drafting, you may decide that you want to rearrange it, okay?

MR. TOMA: "One where justice and enforcement of the laws are applied with an even hand without regard to race,

ethnic group, geographic location or sex."

THE MODERATOR: Race, ethnic group, is that two different things?

MS. HEDLAND: Uh-huh (affirmative response).

THE MODERATOR: All in favor raise your hand.

(complying)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed?

MR. KILCHER: Question: Could something be amended later after it's accepted?

MS. HEDLAND: No.

MR. HUSS: No.

THE MODERATOR: If it doesn't change, my feeling, if it doesn't change the meaning and it makes it clear so that you can read --

MR. KILCHER: Well the group mentioned, I think should include a status, social class.

THE MODERATOR: That would be something that everyone would have to agree on.

MR. KILCHER: It's the discrimination.

THE MODERATOR: Do you think that's important, social class?

MR. KADEN: Somebody put up there, they just added "to all Alaskans," then you just leave out all the rest of the words. How is that? Instead of race, ethnic group.

THE MODERATOR: Well, who is the author of that goal?

I don't want to --

MS. JONES: (Raising hand)

THE MODERATOR: Carolyn, would that --

MS. JONES: I thought about stopping her and just putting justice.... an even hand for all Alaskans," period, and the reason I added the rest, I thought it was important to add the rest. Just because the way things are.

THE MODERATOR: Because it underscores it, I think your point is right.

MS. HEDLAND: I would agree that social status may be a word that should be added. We've got that in different of our different ones, in terms of economic status, so forth, and that our economic status --

THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to adding social status in that listing? If not, we'll accept that amendment.

Did you put that in there then, Chip?

MR. TOMA: Excuse me. Again on social status? I was reading ahead there.

THE MODERATOR: Race, ethnic group. I don't know where it would fit in there, social status.

MS. JONES: Down below. After sex.

MR. KILCHER: After sex, third line.

THE MODERATOR: After the life one.

MR. HARUN: Or sex.

(Laughter)

THE MODERATOR: Moving right along then,

MR. TOMA: "One where ethnic, racial and cultural diversity is a proud and cherished accomplishment and all Alaskans are truly brothers and sisters."

THE MODERATOR: Is that a duplication? Could that be worked in, some of those words be worked in with some of the other ones?

MS. HEDLAND: But, Katy, that's the point of the editorial thing.

THE MODERATOR: That's right, okay. All in favor of that?

(Voting)

THE MODERATOR: Opposed? I think that that's something that Style and Drafting would have to take into consideration.

Are we still on justice?

MR. TOMA: Yes, we are. "Legal aid be available to rural communities."

MS. HEDLAND: Where did that come from?

THE MODERATOR: Someone put that on

MR. HARUN: That's a means.

THE MODERATOR: That's a means, isn't it, of carrying out equality?

MR. HUSS: Yes.

MR. TOMA: Are the means in this writing here?

THE MODERATOR: No. Not necessarily. Make a note on there that the group considers that a means.

MR. TOMA: (complying) Do you want to go to a means now or go on to goals?

THE MODERATOR: Just goals.

MR. TOMA: Under life-style.

THE MODERATOR: Read that. We don't know -- was that the last one there?

MS. HYLEN: There's another one.

MR. TOMA: Expansion of public safety in rural areas.

THE MODERATOR: That's another means.

MR. TOMA: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. TOMA: "One where the arts and cultural pursuits are seen as integral to our life-styles as well as essential to and enhancing the quality of life."

THE MODERATOR: All accept?

(Voting)

Opposed?

MR. TOMA: "Protect and respect the diverse life-styles desired by its Alaskan people."

THE MODERATOR: In favor?

(voting)

Opposed?

MS. HEDLAND: Might be easier if you asked for those opposed.

MR. JACK: Just say "Are there any objections?"

MS. HUNTLEY: Sure, that would be easiest.

THE MODERATOR: Sure, are there any objections? Okay.

MR. TOMA: "One which maintains a harmony between man and the natural environment with controls on pollution and environmental degradation that respects local needs."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that goal?

(No response)

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we'll accept that.

MR. KELSEY: I have some concerns.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. KELSEY: I don't know whether or not you want to discuss them now, but maybe under means, I don't know.

THE MODERATOR: Well, if you have an objection to it, I think it should be noted at the time that we're voting on it, and then we can -- let me see. I don't like to cut off anybody's debate on an issue, so unless it gets completely out of hand, you know, we get bogged down, I think that a person should feel free to express their objection to a goal.

And if you have at this time, John --

MR. KELSEY: Yes. I only have this -- I have no objection to that, in fact I'm for it. I would like for

the editorial group though to keep it in mind that if they have that, they should couch it in such a way that it doesn't encroach upon, because there's contradictions throughout here, and if you adopt this, you may eliminate it all. I'm concerned about that. I'm not for development. I'm for what this stands for. I'm concerned about what happened ten years ago, because the legislature took what we gave them and they ran right the end of the chain with it, and they passed some legislation that I'm not very proud of.

And they have done some things I think that have prevented us from going ahead. They've made legislative action that has allowed delays that I think were uncalled for. I just in some way would like to have that couched so that it doesn't show that we want to stop everything from happening, because I always think in terms of not too long ago for every dollar we created in this state for our own welfare, the rest of the states had to produce $11. We were a welfare state. I don't think that's something to be proud of. End of speech.

THE MODERATOR: Well, there might be a point where you might want to make a minority statement on that to go with the report, if it gets to that point, John. You can keep that in mind.

MR. KELSEY: All right.

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, I would share his views.

MR. KELSEY: For minority report.

MS. HEDLAND: Point of information. That is going to be hit, that was -- and I think we're a little bit premature to talk about minority reports at this stage. I think the editorial people should be taking these comments into line, but I'm not prepared to say it's a minority report, because --

THE MODERATOR: Just a minute.

MR. MATHIESEN: I want to add one thought there on that respects local needs. I think "meets local needs" would be better than "respects," because you can respect a local need without meeting it.

THE MODERATOR: Editorial Committee, take that into consideration. Or if without objection we could change that, is there any -- without objection we'll change "Respect" to "meets local needs."

The Editorial Committee for those of you who were late, they were volunteer jobs, and John Hurlbert and Marion Hylen and Haden Kaden and Yule Kilcher, and we figured three or four, but if you wished to be on the committee, I'm sure that they would welcome you. We have adopted the first. All of those first statements were goal statements and have been accepted on under Justice. Okay.

Go ahead.

MR. TOMA: Transportation and Communications. "The state should incorporate aesthetics, green belts, open ways, art, in appropriate scale in State transportation and public facilities planning."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

(No response)

THE MODERATOR: That's accepted.

MR. TOMA: "The State Department of Transportation, PF, should avoid homogeneity in highway design standards through incorporation of aesthetics through a more holistic approach to planning through employing people of various disciplines, not just engineers."

THE MODERATOR: That's a new one. Would you read that again?

MR. TOMA: What does PF stand for? Oh, Public Facility.

"The state Department of Transportation, Public Facilities, should avoid homogeneity in highway design standards through incorporation of aesthetics through a more holistic approach to planning, through employing people of various disciplines, not just engineers."

THE MODERATOR: Oh. Any objection?

MR. KELSLY: Comment.

THE MODERATOR: Comment.

MR. KELSEY: When you get 97 percent of your money

from the Federal Government for such projects, you're going to have strings attached and regulations to conform to, and that sounds like a tremendous goal, but it's really not --

THE MODERATOR: It still could be a goal.

MR. KELSEY: Yes, it can still be a goal. I don't know whether you can accomplish it.

THE MODERATOR: We'll get to that when we get to meeting the needs.

Chris?

MS. JOHNSON: I agree with what that one is trying to say, but I have a concern that that's moving into means again. I don't know if you would want to separate it or not, but I just wanted to bring that out.

THE MODERATOR: Gary?

MR. HOLTHUS: I agree with Chris. I think maybe the first part of that phrase is the goal. The rest of it is means. What you want to avoid is homogeneity in highway design and standards. That's the goal. You can do that through the following means, by incorporation of aesthetics, et cetera, so I suggest we drop the last part of it and keep the first, and when we get to the means, incorporate that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, the Editorial Committee will take note of that, please.

THE MODERATOR: Celia.

MS. HUNTER: Wouldn't standardization be better than homogenous.

THE MODERATOR: Excuse me, I have one person talking here and I haven't -- I'm not hearing back there.

MR. TOMA: Sure.

MS. HUNTER: I just wondered if standardization isn't what's meant by homogeneity there.

THE MODERATOR: Whose goal is that? What do you think?

MR. HARUN: I think either one is fine. My concern is how everything is the same wherever you go, and it should somehow reflect the indigenous concerns of an area.

THE MODERATOR: Carolyn?

MS. JONES: To the Editorial Committee, I think that second clause starting with "The state DOT-PF" is all means to the person.

MR. HUSS: I didn't understand.

THE MODERATOR: Is that what we're saying?

MS. JONES: No.

THE MODERATOR: Part of it is means?

MS. JONES: I think the whole second one starting with "The state DOT-PF," that whole phrase is all the means of accomplishing the previous goal. That one.

MR. TOMA: Right.

MS. JOHNSON: We can't see that. What does that do?

MR. TOMA: What she's saying is the entire statement I

just read, the State DOT -- excuse me, I forget what it says, is the means of this goal here, [illegible] the State should incorporate aesthetics, green belts, open ways, art, in appropriate scale in State transportation and public facilities planning."

THE MODERATOR: Would you accept that, the author of that?

MR. HAKUN: Sure.

THE MODERATOR: That's Kevin. Wasn't it his goal? Next one please.

MR. TOMA: And of course he has a means here that says "To accomplish this, the State should at times seek waivers of federal standards and/or build the projects with State monies."

THE MODERATOR: Well, that's a means.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Did we accept that? I can't remember whether that --

MR. TOMA: Excuse me, yes.

THE MODERATOR: I don't think we voted on that first one, did we?

MS. HEDLAND: We did on the first part, but we're not accepting any means right now.

THE MODERATOR: No, no, that's why we're saying it's a means and we're setting that aside. I'm not sure we voted

on that one.

MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I believe that was in a resolution, a long resolution, that was presented to us. And the language was changed to fit this form.

THE MODERATOR: I see.

MR. HARUN: Yes that was a give one.

THE MODERATOR: I mean right now did we accept it? Is what I meant.

MS. HYLEN: It's a means; we don't have to.

THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that now as it's written. Okay.

MS. HEDLAND: Would you read again?

MR. TOMA: "The State should incorporate aesthetics, green belts, open space, art, in appropriate scale in State transportation and public facilities planning."

THE MODERATOR: Good, fine, okay. Go on then.

MR. TOMA: "There should be great public involvement in transportation decisions."

MR. HARUN: "Greater" is what that should be.

MR. TOMA: "Greater"? Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

MS. HEDLAND: Except maybe it's a means again.

THE MODERATOR: I was wondering about that a little while ago.

MR. KILCHER: No, no, goal, some people don't have.

MR. TOMA: No objection?

THE MODERATOR: No objection.

MR. TOMA: Okay. "Spending tax dollars in a dignified manner to encourage tourism," dignified meaning not an exaggeration of Alaska.

(Laughter)

MS. HEDLAND: What?

MS. KINGRA: That still is not what --

THE MODERATOR: No, I think that needs -- that will need some editing. To spend dollars in a dignified manner --

MS. KINGRA: What we were objecting to --

THE MODERATOR: I know what you're talking about. You mean advertising should be dignified instead of --

MS. HUNTER: No topless beauty.

MS. KINGRA:

THE MODERATOR: No topless women sitting on glaciers is what you're talking about. So maybe the Editing Committee will try to strengthen that. Is there any objection to that goal?

(No response)

MS. HUNTER: I think you have to be careful how much you promote tourism, and frankly, well, it's all right.

MR. MATHIESEN: I've been in the tourist business, and I totally agree. We shouldn't have to pay to get them here.

THE MODERATOR: All right, next. This is very

difficult for the reporter, so please be careful about your comments, because you should address the chair.

MS. JOHNSON: I have another concern with that one. What that means again, I know developing the tourist industry in itself is not means, but the way you have specified this one, I just have this concern.

MS. KINGRA: Let the Editorial Committee, because I haven't been able to say what it is, it comes out different.

MS. JOHNSON: Right, but you're addressing a manner of approaching the tourism industry, and I would say that belongs in the means category.

MS. KINGRA: We are already spending tax dollars to promote touring.

MR. KILCHER: No, it's closer to goal, because the goal being a different approach, about how to do it, not what to do.

MS. JOHNSON: That's right. It is a how. And I would like to hear Celia's and Andy's comments on what other ways we should be advertising ourselves to --

MS. KINGRA: Yes, it's a means.

MS. JOHNSON: To other areas.

MS. HUNTER: I think that should be under a discussion of means.

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead and say it.

MR. MATHIESEN: Well, you're being hornswaggled into

spending millions of dollars to encourage tourists here at the request of airlines, tour ships and what have you that are almost totally based out of the state and you're just being milked, that's why.

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman --

THE MODERATOR: I don't know who was first. Jack?

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, I have a qualifier on that that can be read, that basically no tourism to be promoted without the involvement of the local community or people that are going to be affected.

THE MODERATOR: That's better, that's --

MS. KINGRA: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: That's a better goal than what the other one is. Could we do this right now? Could we withdraw that one and you write up something --

MR. JACK: It's already up there.

THE MODERATOR: Would you write up another one and then we'll put it up there?

MR. JACK: It's up there already.

MR. TOMA: Yes. "No tourism should be developed without the involvement of the affected communities."

THE MODERATOR: I think you can combine the wording that's in that other one and make a stronger goal without means in it. Kevin?

MR. KILCHER: I've seen some of the goriest stuff

start in the community.

THE MODERATOR: Yule, please, we're trying to keep this orderly and it's difficult for the reporter. So, Gary.

MR. HOLTHUS: It just seems to me it's in the appropriate column under development rather than under transportation. They're sort of intertwined, but I think as a goal one of the things we may want to develop or may not want to develop is tourism.

THE MODERATOR: What you're suggesting is that that should be moved to --

MR. HOLTHUS: Well, the one he has in his hands on now is in the category of development.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, all right.

MR. HOLTHUS: Seems to me that's where it belongs.

THE MODERATOR: Let's remember that, Editorial Committee.

MR. TOMA: This is the means. We'll work on the wording here.

THE MODERATOR: Those two should be combined with the one in development.

MR. TOMA: All right.

THE MODERATOR: Was anyone else's hand up? I'm sorry, I can't see you, Enid. You're going to have to yell.

MR. KEENER: Our recorder is having a very bad time.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, that's what I'm admonishing the

group. Please wait until I recognize you.

Kevin?

MR. HARUN: Well, on the one on no tourism to be developed, I would think a more positive way of saying it would be "tourism should be developed the" -- what is that? "with the involvement" --

MR. TOMA: With the involvement of the affected communities.

MR. HARUN: I personally am in support of tourism, provided it's done in a certain way. I wouldn't want to impose something that people wouldn't want, but I think --

MS. KINGKA: It is a good resource that we have. It can be. It isn't necessarily a bad thing. I think the words "no tourism," kinda gives the impression that we as a group aren't for tourism.

MR. TOMA: We'll come down here to this.

THE MODERATOR: May I see that statements should be made not in a negative way. They should be positive statements, so you would have to turn it around.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) We're talking about something that's in the development column and I think we should stick with transportation communication and address that when we get to in the development column.

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, what's the chance that we move the tourism subject itself over to development and

discuss it there, and continue on with the other transportation?

THE MODERATOR: Very good.

MR. TOMA: Okay. Under transportation "Improve airport systems, rural. Larger and longer airports. Monies for maintenance and operation. Lighting systems. Safety to be the major emphasis, to have major emphasis."

THE MODERATOR: I believe the last part of that are means, but the first is a goal, correct?

MR. TOMA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: So, read the first part.

MR. TOMA: "Improve rural airport systems."

MS. HEDLAND: It was my understanding that we were interested in improving rural transportation, not necessarily just by air, but also by boat. And I would --

MR. TOMA: We're coming to that.

MS. HEDLAND: -- suggest that they be combined, that they come from somebody that was in the area that suggested what they wanted.

MR. TOMA: Why combine? It's a positive statement toward one goal, right? I mean airports are different from boats.

THE MODERATOR: We have a comment from Jack, please.

MR. JACK: That's the one I put. That's one of the marching orders that I got from the 57 villages. So I

would stick to the airport, just improve airport systems as part of the transportation system.

THE MODERATOR: Well, is there going to be another --

MS. HEDLAND: That's okay, but then let's go on and put all the rest as means.

MR. JACK: Yes, no objection.

MR. LADNER: I would go with Carl on that. Airport and water are separate modes under the transportation generic term.

First of all, I think that the A, B, C, D there that are listed there are good ones. There should be one more, and that is airport warehouse facilities, because I think in the bush you got some problems with --

THE MODERATOR: Well, that's a mean that we're going to come to. We're not actually --

MR. LADNER: All right.

THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection then to the first, that statement "Improve bush airfields, rural airfields, rural airfields."

MS. HEDLAND: "System" is a better word.

MS. KINGKA: Tht's what he said, "system."

MR. TOMA: Improve "rural airport systems".

THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that as a goal?

MR. HUSS: I just wonder if it wouldn't be easier to incorporate all the transportation facilities into a single

goal.

THE MODERATOR: But they don't want it that way, because it's important to the rural that it be set out separately.

MR. HUSS: Yes, but I think then you're possibly overlooking --

THE MODERATOR: Well, maybe they're coming up to those. Could we wait and see?

MR. HUSS: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: As I understand it, you have some other goals in that area, have you not?

MS. LUDWIG: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. TOMA: "Improve the dock facilities in regional transportation centers."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

MR. KELSEY: I'd like to know what they mean by that.

MR. HUSS: Yeah.

MR. KELSEY: What do they mean? Build new ones or improve the ones they have?

THE MODERATOR: Whose goal is that?

MS. LUDWIG: The ones that are there are privately owned and they have withdrawn their permission for the City's use. We need new docks, public.

MS. HYLEN: Such as where?

MS. JONES: Isn't that a means of a broader goal to improve the water transport system?

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Jack.

MR. JACK: I would be amenable to revise that to improve the marine transportation system. Whereas the dock facilities would be the means to achieve that.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, to improve the marine transportation system is a goal. Do you have any objection to that? And then the other thing would be the suggestion there would be a means.

David?

MR. KEENER: Maybe I'm just repeating things. "Marine transportation system and support facilities."

MR. MACK: That's it.

MR. JACK: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. TOMA: I would suggest, Madam Chairman, you say marine transportation systems "throughout Alaska," because my contacts is that's a southeast turn, the marine transportation system. But that's up to the group, too.

MS. JOHNSON: I would agree to that.

THE MODERATOR: Well, we have another suggestion over here that it say "Including facilities."

MR. KEENER: "Support facilities."

THE MODERATOR: "Support facilities." Improve marine transportation, including support facilities."

MR. TOMA: All right.

THE MODERATOR: Do you accept that?

MS. HEDLAND: Yes.

MR. HUSS: This might be something for the Editing Committee, but I'd like to make it known before they get there. I have trouble with the word "improve." I think it should be something like "provide for adequate," or whatever, because the case could be in an isolated case. I realize you need facilities, but there might be a certain area that has adequate facilities, and if we say across the board "improve all docks and harbors," you know, there might be an isolated area that doesn't need any improvement. Maybe that's just semantics, but I just have trouble with that.

THE MODERATOR: Well, "provide" of course is broader.

MS. HEDLAND: And if he says state "throughout the State," that would also indicate.

MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman

THE MODERATOR: Yule?

MR. KILCHER: I think the word "expand" would cover some of your objections. "Expand" is a verb.

THE MODERATOR: Expand. There may be places that do not have facilities at all.

MS. LUDWIG: Right, right.

THE MODERATOR: Just a minute please.

MR. LADNER: How about "improve as required" or "as needed"?

MR. KILCHER: And expand.

THE MODERATOR: Carolyn.

MR. LADNER: "Marine transportation facilities, including support facilities throughout Alaska."

THE MODERATOR: I have a suggestion; it just hit me. If we get to a goal where we have objections to it, can we put them aside and come back to them? By that time we will maybe have worked out -- the person who objected can work out what would improve it, rather than doing this right now. I think it will facilitate our going along.

So can we put that one aside until we finish?

MR. TOMA: I'll read what we have on this last point, our last touch with it here. "Improve marine transportation, including support facilities, throughout Alaska."

MR. HARUN: That's great.

MS. HEDLAND: Sounds good.

THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to that? Or do you want to wait? Do you want to come back to it?

MR. HUSS: I'd like to come back to it.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we'd like to come back to that

one. So can you make some kind of a mark so we know we are going to come back to that?

Okay

THE MODERATOR: Carolyn.

MS. JONES: Could we please take a vote or something on that? because I think the majority of us are happy with the way it is.

THE MODERATOR: Do you want to go along then?

MS. HEDLAND: Take a vote.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, take a vote on it. Is there any objection to this --

MS. KINGRA: Let him read it, again, Madam --

THE MODERATOR: Read it again, please.

MR. TOMA: "Improve marine transportation, including support facilities, throughout Alaska."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection? There's three, four objections, five.

It will be adopted. Let's go on.

MR. TOMA: I guess we need a minority report or minority phrase at that point.

THE MODERATOR: You might get a change with the Editorial Committee.

MR. TOMA: "Roads should be developed according to regional plans based on existing transportation modes."

THE MODERATOR: Read that again.

MR. TOMA: "Roads should be developed according to regional plans based on existing transportation modes."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

MS. HUNTER: No.

MS. KINCKA: Haven't we covered that?

THE MODERATOR: Beg your pardon?

MS. KINCKA: Haven't we covered that up further?

MS. JOHNSON: I disagree. Excuse me.

THE MODERATOR: Wait a minute. I have a hand down there. Andy.

MR. HOPE: What about the local government agency? What if they don't sign off on the regional plan?

THE MODERATOR: Are you asking me?

MR. HOPE: Well, that's an important issue I think.

THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

MR. HARUN: I have a question. Did you make that, Carl?

MR. JACK: Yes, I did.

MR. HARUN: Is what you're getting at the existing types of transportation in areas be what are supported by the -- where there are no roads, don't support roads, but support air and water, and in areas where there's roads, support those types, or what is the goal?

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, in response to the inquiry, I have marching orders that no roads be developed to the

urban centers, such as Anchorage, Fairbanks, to the Bethel area. That is a mean in itself, but I thought it would be more acceptable to the group to state in such a way that the road systems, as part of the transportation system, should be developed according to the regional plans.

THE MODERATOR: Well, what I gather Andy is saying is that he this is it should go further and the local government should have --

MR. HOPE: No, I don't like like the regional plan.

THE MODERATOR: Oh, I see. David?

MR. KEENER: I'm interested. You say you don't want a road to Bethel, but you want State funding for water and air into the area, whereas, if you're looking for a goal for 20 years from now, limiting the modes of transportation, you're also limiting the number of people that are using those funds. You're eliminating your tourist industry, the travel-by-car, whatever means. Now, it could be that the local input from Bethel is their need of air and water transportation, but they don't want the accessibility by road to an urban area like Anchorage.

Myself being from Kenai, we're Anchorage's backyard every weekend in the summer, and I can understand the feeling, but I don't know if that should be something that we come up with in a future planning organization like this.

THE MODERATOR: We have some other comments here.

Karen?

MS. HEDLAND: I would like to suggest that we reread our first goal that we have already adopted, because I consider the road part of the standardization or whatever the other homogenous, whatever we had, to be incorporated there, and I think we're down to the specific means again in terms of roads.

But would you reread that first one? What does it say? I can't see it.

THE MODERATOR: Haden.

MR. HADEN: Well, I think that is a goal that should be looked at, because we're talking about preserving life-styles. You can't preserve a life-style if you've got a road from an urban center going into a bush area. You know, there's just no way.

MS. HEDLAND: How about no more to the urban centers, either, you know?

THE MODERATOR: Just a minute.

THE MODERATOR: We have a comment in the back.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Yes. I think this is a crucial area for all of the State of Alaska in the rural areas. In the interior we want to see some type of a plan developed before someone gets hot on the idea of there should be a road to Rampart without the input of the village people and those that live in the area. A plan has

to be developed, and I don't think that that's saying that in that first goal. So if that goal can be broadened, fine, but I for one want to protect the rights of the rural people in having their say whether there's a road in there or not.

THE MODERATOR: Celia had her hand up, and then Mike and, oh, Andy was next.

MS. HUNTER: Okay. I think that even Woody Johansen, who is one of the most terrific highway builders we have, recognizes the need for local option to be preserved in road construction. He says in here, "We must upgrade the Seward and Glenn Highways. In Western and Northern Interior Alaska, we must build access roads to airfields, boat landings, material sources and garbage dumps. We must improve the village streets and develop material sources. We must not connect these villages with a highway system."

So I think even a highway builder recognizes the local option has some validity and the big people of Minto would verify this.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, thank you, Celia. Mike.

MR. LADNER: I could only second Celia's remarks, and I might say this. I'm not an expert in DOT policy, but I believe that built into their structure, and it could be probably addressed further under government form, but I believe that part of their procedure for building and

developing roads is input, and an important part is input from the people that are being affected by that road, so there's protection there.

THE MODERATOR: Before I ask you again, is there anyone else who hasn't spoken on this motion, I mean this goal, who would like to speak? Chris, did I see your hand?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. I have a concern with the second part of the goal, although I agree with what Georgianna said about the first part, and that is, limiting ourselves to existing modes of transportation. I don't think we want to do that either. It really presents all kinds of future -- who knows what we may be driving or flying in or moving in in ten years? I don't think we want to do that.

MS. LONGPRE: I agree that maybe that last part could be stricken about limiting ourselves, but I think the people from the bush want to have input, and the Department of Transportation, they provide for hearings on proposed roads, but that we don't feel that we have actual input. Maybe people are listening, but not acting on.

THE MODERATOR: Andy, you had something you wanted to say?

MR. MATHIESEN: Yes, I really get nervous here. We spent all day yesterday talking about preserving a quality of life in Alaska, and yet, here we're now jumping into every damn thing you can dream up that's going to change

the quality of life, and I'm afraid it's going to change it down rather than up. We must be very cautious of this. It's out the window as soon as we start doing all these things. It's a good example. You know, we're going to get local input. Okay, you get the local input, you get the highway, too.

THE MODERATOR: Georgia.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I feel I must respond to what see Celia read in there. What Woody said, I think that's the point, Woody said, "We must not develop roads." That's not for Woody to say. You know, that's for the village to say, and I'm not so sure that Minto wouldn't have said, "Yeah, we want a road " --

MS. HUNTER: They did.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) And we would want a road again. So it's a two-way street there.

THE MODERATOR: One more comment and I think we ought to take a vote on this or else pass it and come on.

MS. HEDLAND: I think we ought to pass it and come back to it again.

MR. TOMA: We have a request to hear it.

MR. HARUN: Without saying no road at all without consent.

MS. JONES: That's negative.

THE MODERATOR: That's negative.

MR. HAKUN: How about road development without local consent? It's true though.

MS. LONGPRE: Carl wrote that.

THE MODERATOR: Yes.

MS. LONGPRE: Would he consider rephrasing that, what the input has been?

MR. HOPL: I got one.

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, let me try to rephrase that in such a way that it would be palatable to everyone here. And that is, recognizing that the State Highway Department has a method or the process for the design and construction of the roads. Along those lines, those plans, regional plans, on the road system should accommodate or have -- before they're approved, have the local preference in terms of planning.

THE MODERATOR: Since there is this much discussion on this, how about passing this over and you reword the goal and we'll come back to it, so that we can go along? Okay? Reword it. You've heard the input.

MR. JACK: Yes, will do.

THE MODERATOR: Now, you know, maybe what you should -- you want more comment?

MS. LONGPRE: Just one more comment. It seems that I'm hearing that people are agreeing that regions should have input in roads in their area. Maybe we could have

something simply stating that.

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, but what I also heard is we should come back to it and we should not limit ourselves to existing forms. We might have a monorail from Anchorage to the Kenai or we might have a train system that's a lot more elaborate, and I am leery of the word "road," and that's where I come from. I don't want the highways either, but I don't want us to just be limited to any future mode of transportation, and that would be -- I would like to see us come back to it, but I would like to think about rewording it in such a way that we give some flexibility and room for 25 years down the road when we might have monorails or something.

THE MODERATOR: We'll pass this over then. Chip, would you go on?

MR. TOMA: Okay. "Improve village communications." Then the means were cited as UHF-VHF microwave system."

THE MODERATOR: Let's not read those then now. Let's just have the goal statement.

MR. TOMA: Okay. "Improve village communications."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

(No response)

THE MODERATOR: Accepted.

MR. TOMA: Okay. "The extension of the Marine Highway systems to Western Alaska."

MS. HEDLAND: We already have that.

THE MODERATOR: Don't we have something that covers that up above there?

MR. TOMA: We have "Improved marine transportation, including support facilities throughout Alaska."

THE MODERATOR: Well, that's it.

MR. MACK: Improve. Improve and expanded.

MR. TOMA: We mean ferries here now, people ferries?

MR. HOPE: Well, there's a transport goal, too.

THE MODERATOR: Mike.

MR. LADNER: I think there is a difference there. The Marine Highway system to Western Alaska was treated in those white papers and they're talking about the extension of the Alaska marine ferry highway system, not necessarily with passengers, but with a high-density freight-handling capacity as opposed to the interior, the improvement of the interior riverway transportation system.

THE MODERATOR: Carolyn?

MS. JONES: Would we say it by amending the earlier one to develop and expand marine highway --

THE MODERATOR: To improve and expand? Would that do it?

MS. JONES: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: To improve and expand the Marine highway system, would that cover that last one?

MS. HEDLAND: Yes.

MS. JOHNSON: M-hm (affirmative response).

THE MODERATOR: The Editing Committee should take note.

MR. HUSS: Do we want Marine Highway system or marine transportation?

MS. HEDLAND: Transportation.

THE MODERATOR: Marine transportation.

MR. HUSS: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Are we ready to go on?

MR. TOMA: I'll read this one again. "Improve and expand marine transportation, including support facilities, throughout Alaska." That would then incorporate the extension of the Marine Highway system to Western Alaska.

THE MODERATOR: The Editing Committee may want to be sure that's clear, so you may want to add a phrase in that goal.

Okay? We're on --

MR. TOMA: Development. "Protection of the environment and maintenance of viable ecological systems shall be a major factor in reaching decisions on both public and private development projects."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

MR. HOPE: Well, isn't it kind of presumptuous to say it will be for the private? It will be a major factor.

MS. HUNTER: No. No. The Alaska pipeline was a

private project. It was --

MS. HEDLAND: Let's take a vote. All in favor, all opposed.

THE MODERATOR: You have an objection. I'll note that objection, Andy. Any other objections to that goal? John Kelsey?

MR. KELSEY: Well, I object to this point. I'm for this concept, but we did this ten years ago, which had a lot to do with delaying the oil pipeline.

MS. HUNTER: Which was a great help to the construction of the pipeline.

THE MODERATOR: Please, for the sake of not only the secretary, but for order let's not make comments without addressing the chair.

MR. TOMA: Do you want it read again? Does anyone? Or do you understand?

THE MODERATOR: No, I think we had two objections and otherwise it's acceptable; is that correct?

MS. HEDLAND: Right.

MR. TOMA: "The energy needs for a future Alaska shall be based on renewable resources to the greatest extent possible, and on smaller localized units allowing maximum self-sufficiency and affordable costs."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

MS. HEDLAND: How can you object to that?

MR. KEENER: Was that "and/or at affordable cost"?

MR. TOMA: It says and here --

MS. JOHNSON: Oh, it should be "at," I'm sorry.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: No objection? Carolyn?

MS. JONES: Question: Should it be allowing for maximum self-sufficiency?

MR. TOMA: Allowing for? (writing) Looks good. Put a comma here.

THE MODERATOR: No objection? Chris?

MS. JOHNSON: Could I strike one word from it, I'd like to strike "smaller," please.

THE MODERATOR: That's your goal?

MS. JOHNSON: It's mine, right.

THE MODERATOR: Would you read it now?

MR. TOMA: Yes. "The energy needs for a future Alaska shall be based on renewable resources to the greatest extent possible, and on localized units allowing for maximum self-sufficiency at affordable costs."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

(No response)

Accepted.

MR. TOMA: "The State must recognize its stewardship role for present and future generations of Alaskans, in protecting the natural environment, including wildlife

habitat and wild and scenic areas and in preserving air, land and water quality."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

MR. JACK: Objection.

THE MODERATOR: Two objections, three objections.

MR. KELSEY: Udall is doing a great job for us.

MR. HOPE: You're talking about a government that's in the way.

THE MODERATOR: Excuse me, Georgianna?

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Could the author of that goal explain what -- I don't understand the whole intent.

THE MODERATOR: That's Haden Kaden's, isn't it?

MR. KADEN: Yes, and Celia.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. KADEN: It's just that the push is to turn over State land to people regardless of what cost, without planning, without anything. There is no recognition that the State has an obligation to future generations to preserve large areas of wild land for all Alaskans. And that's recognizing that, you know, that obligation on the part of the State.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I'd like to note my objection, too, please.

THE MODERATOR: The objections -- if you want your

names, it's Jack Carl, John Kelsey, Georgianna, Andy Hope, --

MR. HYLEN: I'm objecting.

THE MODERATOR: -- Marion.

MS. HYLEN: Rosemary?

MS. LUDWIG: M-hm.

THE MODERATOR: David?

MACK: Stanley.

THE MODERATOR: Stan. So how many -- I don't know.

MS. HEDLAND: Let's vote again.

THE MODERATOR: We better vote again on this one.

MR. MATHIESEN: I would like to make one comment, if I can, Madam Chairman, before you take a vote on that. I don't understand how anybody can sit here and not think that the State has the responsibility in taking care of our lands for us, to make sure they're there tomorrow and the next week, our fish, our game, our resources. I don't see how we can -- who is going to be responsible for doing it if our own selves aren't?

MS. HEDLAND: I would like to --

THE MODERATOR: Karen.

MS. HEDLAND: -- reiterate that my understanding of this was a dream for our future, and granted I was not born and raised here, but my three children were born and raised here, and I would like to see there is something left for them to pass on when they come along and that's one of the

reasons why I really believe in that. We've got to be thinking of what it's going to be like 25 years from now.

THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

MR. HARUN: I think people might have in their minds in objecting to it some specific means. For instance, you look at the Udall bill. That's a means lot of people don't agree with to get to that, but the goal itself is a very, very laudible goal, I think. It's something like what we were supporting yesterday.

THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, Marion.

MS. HYLEN: I think the first one does it. "Protection of the environment and maintenance of viable ecological systems."

THE MODERATOR: It's not enough.

Georgianna?

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) In stating my objection, I felt that that was maybe one of the means for the overall goal, but also I think that Alaska sometimes tends to look at the environment more than it does its people, and I think that to me the people are more important than the animal.

THE MODERATOR: I think on this one for voting purposes, I'm going to have to ask you to stand, because some of you are sitting back there in the area of where the public is, so I'm not going to be able to count it very

well. For voting on this one, I think we better stand. Those in favor of this as a goal, please stand.

(complying)

MR. HOPE: We've got to vote on this and pass a lot of others.

MR. TOMA: Is there an objection?

THE MODERATOR: 15. Am I correct in counting 15? Did anybody else count and check me? Mike, would you stand? Keep standing.

MR. LADNER: (complying)

THE MODERATOR: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and I'm 15.

MS. HUNTER: Did you count me?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, 15. I started with you. Is that correct? It passed.

I think there are how many of us in here?

MS. HEDLAND: 23.

THE MODERATOR: 23.

Would you go on, please?

MR. TOMA: Excuse me, Madam Chairman. Next one. It passed. "Tourism should be developed -- " I changed this, Madam Chairman, to make it, take out the "not" in there, without -- "Tourism should be developed only with the involvement of affected communities." Then the means is this one over here, which we're going to work with.

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

MR. KELSEY: I have a question. What do they mean by involvement, what extent?

THE MODERATOR: I'm not the author of that. Are you?

MR. JACK: I'm the author of that. There is fairly strong feeling in the Bethel area that most of the tourist industry development have been done by the people from outside, by package tours and all that, and they're fairly adamant about that, even though, frankly, the tourist industry is a clean industry itself.

THE MODERATOR: Chris?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, I'd like to see us strike the word "only," because I know that there are some maybe state-wide tourists plans that it would simply -- that really in a very broad sense affect every community. Who knows where tourists who are brought in on these state-wide plans would end up? That to me is a little unrealistic. So I would like to see "only" stricken.

THE MODERATOR: Georgianna?

MR. TOMA: That's a motion? I put it in, so we'll just take it out.

THE MODERATOR: Without any objection, we'll take "only" out.

MS. HUNTER: How does it read first?

THE MODERATOR: Read it first.

MR. TOMA: It's Carl's. "New tourism to be developed only without the involvement of community. I changed it to "Tourism should be developed only with the involvement of affected communities." And the change then "Tourism should be developed with the involvement of affected communities."

THE MODERATOR: That makes sense, doesn't it?

MR. HUSS: How is something like that regulated though? I mean we live in a free state --

MS. HEDLAND: This is a goal.

THE MODERATOR: That's a goal. You have to figure that out when you get to the means.

MR. HUSS: But if I want to land my plane in Bethel airport, and want to show people around, --

THE MODERATOR: Georgianna.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I'd like to add a word in there that tourism should be involved and implemented, adding the word "implemented" to involvement, because I think tourism, I'd like to see more of the development, the implementation and the actual tourism in the affected community and not someone from the Lower 48 coming up and doing the implementation after it's developed.

THE MODERATOR: Ellen?

MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, there is a comment made back here that if we would insert the word "when" ahead of tourism, "that when tourism is developed," --

MR. TOMA: How about "promoted and developed"? Is that what we mean?

MS. HAYES: I don't know whether we want to say promoted, or, you know, that's one of the things we're doing, I'm not sure, but when it is --

THE MODERATOR: I think the chairman will say that we will pass this one over. It sounds like it needs a little bit more working-up. A couple of people get together during our first break and see if you can straighten that out, because I'm afraid we're going to be taking up too much time on a statement that we could do in a few minutes on the side.

Go ahead.

MR. TOMA: "The goal of national energy independence should not be reached at the expense of Alaskan citizens and its environment."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that goal? I think it needs some --

MR. KELSEY: I think it needs some editing. Aren't you flying in the face of a national goal? Do we have the right to totally keep them from reaching that goal?

THE MODERATOR: We're a sovereign state.

Andy?

MR. HOPE: I would think expense cuts both ways. I think it cuts both ways, both ways. You got to define what

you mean by expense.

THE MODERATOR: Whose goal is that?

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That's mine.

THE MODERATOR: Georgianna?

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I don't think it was looked at as expense in the word dollar expense, but that the extraction --

MR. KILCHER: Impact.

THE MODERATOR: Maybe you mean -- use the word "Impact" instead of expense?

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Like the oil and gas maybe being, you know, pulled out and --

MR. KILCHER: Sucked out.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) -- and there's no doubt given to what alternative energies should be developed in these areas where that's done, and not just come in and do it because there's a national crisis.

It sounds good to me still. I don't know how --

THE MODERATOR: Karen?

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, I would suggest that's something we come back to, because alternative energy is not actually addressed in that, and I also do not believe that we are willing to have people freezing to death in nursing homes in Kansas or someplace, because, you know, they can't get the oil from Iran. I don't just think

that's really what was intended originally and I would suggest we come back to that one.

THE MODERATOR: We'll pass this over. Are you making a mark so --

MR. TOMA: I made a check. Are we going to --

THE MODERATOR: No, we're not. We're going to pass this one over.

MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Why don't we take a vote? I get the feeling we're starting to say, "Let's come back and come and back."

THE MODERATOR: Karen had an objection, thinking that the wording should be changed.

MS. REDLAND: My suggestion came from her statement in terms of alternative energy sources. There is no way that addresses alternative energy sources being explored, the extraction of our nonrenewable resources.

MR. KILCHER: But you talk about mean. I think she talks about means when she talks about this. I think the goal is very close. I personally think we can vote.

THE MODERATOR: All right, we'll vote then. Any objection to this goal?

(Responding)

Two objections -- three objections. Four. Did I get them all? Four objections, okay.

MR. TOMA: "There should be a commitment to

agriculture for local and state. It should be commitment to -- " oh, I see, "There should be a commitment to small-scale agriculture for local and state food self-sufficiency as opposed to large agriculture just for export."

MS. HUNTER: Madam Chairman, I think if you look up under Economy, that's almost duplicated, and I'm not sure where it should be, but those two are very similar.

MR. KILCHER: Yes, right.

MR. TOMA: Under development then we have an agriculture here.

THE MODERATOR: "One which -- " okay. Well then, which one do you want to discuss now?

MR. JACK: I move to table that, take that under Economy.

THE MODERATOR: Take it up under Economy? We'll hold that one to discuss economy.

MR. LARUN: Madam Chairman, I agree with that goal up there under Economy, but I think that one is getting something else, too, and I think what we should always be getting at, is production for food self-sufficiency. In other words segregating that as a separate item. There it's lost as business, agriculture. I think we need to send a message to the legislature that we need to produce more food in our own state rather than importing it.

I was just reading today in the Anchorage Daily

News if the lines were cut off to the Lower 48, we'd have hardly enough moose in the State to feed Anchorage for a year if we killed every one of them.

I think with transportation costs going up as they are, and with possible things happening in the future with energy and transportation problems, we should try to develop, as best we can, some agriculture self-sufficiency.

MR. TOMA: I might add, Madam Chairman, that the State has a committed development goal, you know, on this agriculture. I think it fits here also.

THE MODERATOR: Well, I don't think -- that's fine. Perhaps we should vote on this now and --

MR. JACK: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, you've made a motion to table it.

MR. JACK: Tabling motion does not require a second unless there's an objection.

MS. HAYES: We can adopt any rules of order though.

(Laughter)

THE MODERATOR: Motion to table is undebatable if we're going to go by Roberts Rules of Order, and I should not have recognized anyone after Jack spoke, but I didn't think we were running such a tight ship, but I will defer to his motion and the motion to table is before us.

MR. KILCHER: Point of order, Madam Chairman. As the lady said, since we have not adopted any rules of order,

the point of order is that we have no order. Consequently, you're free not to accept his motion, which I strongly suggest, --

THE MODERATOR: Well, I will --

MR. KILCHER: -- on the point of order.

(Laughter)

MR. HOPE: I'd like to ask for a short recess.

(Laughter)

MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, it does seem we should have a show of hands, how many want agriculture under Development, and let's just ask that question.

MR. KILCHER: No, Madam Chairman.

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Yule.

MR. KILCHER: I agree with the young gentleman over there. The two things are different, one is socioeconomy. The other one is subsidization, everything else is subsidized. And we're talking about surplus money for the next ten or 20 years, and it's a strong case for subsidization funds and they need help outside the normal economic pattern. The state has agriculture and development, but precisely for large export. I think that there's a good --

THE MODERATOR: Jack, would you be very upset if I ignored your motion to table and that we took a vote on this right now?

MR. JACK: I withdraw that with one exception, --

THE MODERATOR: Everybody is being so cooperative.

MR. JACK: -- and that is as far as exporting, that does not exclude exporting of the goods.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MS. LONGPRE: I'd prefer the words as "opposed to" to be changed to "in addition to" instead of separating the two forms of agricultural development to be more positive and --

THE MODERATOR: Any objection, the author of that?

MR. HARUN: No.

THE MODERATOR: Kevin? Okay. Change that "in addition."

Chris.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, my objection to that would be you have the words "in addition to" prioritize the two, making the exportation of more importance than the commitment to our own use of the products, and I'd like to see it reversed in some way, so that that has first priority.

MS. HEDLAND: Would you read it again?

THE MODERATOR: Read it now, please.

MR. TOMA: All right. "A commitment to small-scale agriculture for local and state food self-sufficiency, in addition to large agriculture just for export."

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman.

THE MODERATOR: It does change.

MR. TOMA: I'll change it, "There should be a commitment to small-scale agriculture to local and state food self-sufficiency."

THE MODERATOR: Period.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, any objection to that goal as stated?

MR. KILCHER: Now we got it.

THE MODERATOR: Would you read it, please?

MR. TOMA: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Mike.

MR. LADNER: I've got a little problem with that, because if we take off that last part, it does eliminate the Delta agricultural projects.

MR. JACK: Yes.

MR. TOMA: No.

THE MODERATOR: No, it doesn't. It doesn't talk to that, does it?

MR. JACK: It doesn't talk to importing. That's what I was --

MR. LADNER: Then does it include an agricultural project of that magnitude?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Because this is just a commitment to small farms, isn't it?

MR. LADNER: Well if it's a commitment to small farms, then I think we're talking about again two different things. Granted the State has funded as a development project, where it's correctly categorized, the Delta Ag project, for example. For two years they've been saying they're going to be exporting grain, not for food, but for protein supplement. Well that's a food, but it's also for soybean for oil, but they haven't exported a pound. Currently they're looking, they've changed some of their philosophy, and they're looking at developing the Delta Ag project to develop the red meat industry within the state.

So, you know, we are developing an industry that, as Kevin wants, or has suggested, that does provide some State self-sufficiency. But I think if we take off, you know, the way it's written now, it's written towards everybody having a garden out in their back yard.

MS. HEDLAND: Not me.

THE MODERATOR: No, it's just meaning that it -- I take it that the State should have a commitment and the means would be that they should appropriate some dollars to see that that is being done, and it doesn't take away from the fact that they're already doing the other business. Am I wrong?

MR. HOHMAN: You can grow night tomatoes, because I can't.

THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

MR. HARUN: To give you an example, we have 25,000 acres coming up for State disposal. A lot of the tracts had been scheduled in large acreages, in other words, to where local people couldn't afford to get into the business. And what people in Two Rivers have asked for by petition is that they be gotten down to under 300 acres, to 40-acre, 160-acre parcels. I agree what Mike is saying is true. We've changed our thoughts on this large-scale agriculture, and we're finding a lot of stuff we're planning on exporting is going to be used locally for the red meat production, and the State has that as a goal at present, but I really think -- I can see putting in a support of the Delta barley project as well, but that's already supported.

What I think isn't supported at the state-wide level are the smaller farms, I don't mean garden, but 40, hundred-acre tract farms, and perhaps if we did have a commitment to that, I think it would really help out.

THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to the way it's written now, or are we going to -- Jack?

MR. JACK: I would propose to add a wording such as "inhibiting exporting of the agricultural products where feasible."

THE MODERATOR: That's a suggestion. Did you all hear that?

MR. MATHIESEN: I'm wondering if we aren't trying to decide whether we want a higher, lower or equal priority to this commitment, if that isn't what we're trying to establish here, whether we want an equal commitment to small farms or higher commitment or a lower commitment.

THE MODERATOR: I think that is a problem of --

MR. HUSS: Could we just add possibly a commitment to both large and small agriculture for local and State food self-sufficiency? Would that --

THE MODERATOR: I think we need to give the secretary a break, and I think that maybe during the recess you can come up with something. I think we should have a ten-minute break, but please let's not make it longer than ten minutes, because we want to -- we're going along and we need to move. So we'll now have a ten-minute break, and get together on that one issue.

(RECESS: 2:45)

THE MODERATOR: These forms that Chip is passing around are the suggested form that the committee in charge of arranging this conference came up with. It isn't anything that we need to necessarily use, but I thought if we passed them around now, that if you had some ideas of means as we're discussing it, you could just make a note on there now rather than bringing it up, but we could -- you know, it might help when we get back to it tonight. That

was all the reason for giving it to you now.

So, Chip, --

MR. TOMA: Yes, ma'am.

THE MODERATOR: -- may we continue then?

MR. TOMA: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: We're on this agriculture one.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: I think during the recess the authors got together and will accept that change, I believe.

Is that correct, Kevin?

MR. HARUN: We're just going to end it with a period?

MR. TOMA: Yes, right here. "There should be a commitment to small-scale agriculture for local and State food

self-sufficiency."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

(No response)

We'll accept that then.

MR. TOMA: "The State should be a place where technology and material development works in the service of man, not vice versa."

THE MODERATOR: That was the goal from ten years ago from the Alpha group that we discussed yesterday.

Chris?

MS. JOHNSON: I just have to register an objection to

that. I think that's basically rhetoric. I really don't think it says anything.

MR. TOMA: Okay.

THE MODERATOR: Any other comments?

MS. JOHNSON: Could we vote on it?

THE MODERATOR: We did discuss it yesterday, but we didn't accept it, so now do you wish to accept this as a goal?

MS. JOHNSON: I object.

THE MODERATOR: Any other objections?

MR. BUSS: I object.

MR. MACK: I object.

THE MODERATOR: Object? Four, five? Is that an objection, Carolyn?

MS. JONES: M-hm (nodding head).

THE MODERATOR: Let's take a vote, there's so many objections. All those in favor of this as a goal please stand.

(complying)

THE MODERATOR: Those opposed stand.

(complying)

THE MODERATOR: That one will be stricken.

MR. JACK: One abstention.

THE MODERATOR: One abstention, okay.

THE MODERATOR: Excuse me, I'm sorry, Stan.

MR. MACK: Before the vote, I was just going to tell you, if it's already been established as a goal ten years ago, you know, it's there already, if we don't vote on it.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. MACK: Are we voting to strike it from the ten-year plan or are we --

MS. HUNTER: No. No.

THE MODERATOR: No.

MS. HUNTER: Just not reiterating it.

THE MODERATOR: Right.

MR. TOMA: Under human resources "The State should guarantee the dignity and well-being of Alaskans of all ages and economic status."

MS. JONES: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Carolyn.

MS. JONES: I handed Chip a third page.

MR. TOMA: Excuse me, I forgot. Under Development, "No oil and gas leases should occur until the Coastal Resource Service Area plans have been completed and approved by the cognizant agencies."

THE MODERATOR: That's under Development?

MR. TOMA: That's under Development, yes.

MS. HYLEN: Would you read it again?

MR. TOMA: "No oil and gas leases should occur until the Coastal Resource Service Area plans have been completed

and approved by the cognizant agencies."

THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

MR. KELSEY: What does she mean? I'd like to have it explained.

THE MODERATOR: Could you explain it? Is that yours, Carolyn?

MS. JONES: No.

MR. JACK: The author is here.

THE MODERATOR: Who? Yours?

MR. JACK: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: Okay.

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, according to the State schedule of leasing time tables, Norton Sound Basin is up for leasing in '82. Norton Sound Basin is involved, St. George Basin is involved. And the State has formed under the Coastal Zone Management enabling that legislation. We formed the Coastal Resource Service Area District encompassing all of the Yukon-Kuskokwim area. Our concern is that the governor under his authority should postpone those oil and gas leases until such time the Coastal Resource Service Area plans have been completed, otherwise it would be like putting the cart before the horse.

THE MODERATOR: Do you understand what the --

MR. KELSEY: But isn't he talking about a regional thing? I don't understand that to apply to the rest of the

state.

MR. MARUN: It does apply in the Beaufort Sea. Right now there's a suit against the oil sale on behalf of the North Slope Borough, and the way it works is that they have to develop a Coastal Zone Management plan and that plan has to be approved by the legislature. Now if that plan is approved, then the existing laws as they are take effect and there is no regulation on it. It seems to me the main point that is being brought up is local control over the resource extraction, and my personal feeling on that is that it's a good thing, in that it hasn't been abused today. In the North Slope Borough they didn't object to the oil and gas lease sale. They just objected beyond a certain depth in the water, up to the Barrier Islands. So it's a laudible objective, I think. Maybe it might be rewarded a little bit.

THE MODERATOR: Marion?

MS. HYLEN: I've sat here and said nothing. I am against our being blackmailed by the Arabs, and every place, you want more money, more money, money for this. You want the State and the Federal Government to provide roads, ports, assistance. Every place you want money. Now, where in the heck is the money going to come if we don't extract some oil, if we don't take care of the South 48? They have to have this, if we're going to become self-sufficient. If

the Arabs cut off the oil, you haven't even got the oil to supply the planes. And for us to sit here and say "We don't want any of this, we just want money," I think is really self-serving, nor is it thinking of anyone else but our own little selves. And there's more people in this country than just Alaskans.

THE MODERATOR: Celia?

MS. HUNTER: I don't think what is being discussed here is necessarily eliminating oil production on State lands or within State waters in Alaska. Of course, this is offshore leasing. But I think that we're looking at a collision of State interests and not necessarily purely local parochial interests either. The Coastal Zone plans which are being an adapted are designed to take into account all of the resources in an area, and I think it's much better for us and much better for the welfare of Alaska and of the whole country to take into account those resources, because it doesn't make sense to eliminate a fisheries resource in order to have a short-term oil resource, if you can have both by care. And I think this is one of the major things that the Coastal Zone plans are trying to promulgate, is a matter of how do we judge the impacts that this oil production is going to make? What are we going to lose? Can we afford that cost? And is there a way to mitigate it?

And I think further in terms of our own financial well-being that, if you go on into really major oil and gas policy, that if Alaska looks ahead to leasing all of its oil potential within the next few years, we're going to lose a lot of money. What we need to do is to space our leasing out to such an extent that we maintain an even flow of income from that leasing, because that's a one-time-only resource, and we'd be crazy to just commit it all at current prices when everything is going up like mad. And I think that the point is very definitely that we have to have some protection of coastal resources other than oil along with oil development.

THE MODERATOR: Are you speaking in favor of the goal?

MS. HUNT: Well, I think what they're trying to do is to not stop the oil development, but to put it in coordination with a planning process.

THE MODERATOR: John Kelsey?

MR. KELSEY: Madam Chairman, I just feel that the Coastal Zone Management Law takes care of that. It addresses that. And I really don't see the reason for this. I believe there are safeguards in that management law.

THE MODERATOR: Carl?

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, currently the leasing schedule does not affect the Norton Sound Basin, which is scheduled for '82, and Kound Basin in '85, it's all

state-wide, you have Cook Bay '84, Kodiak '83, Aleutian Shelf in '85, St. George Basin, '85, the Hooper Bay Basin in '85. I think that the people here should be cognizant of the fact that there are a lot of people out there in the villages that have that have great concerns about this, and this does not necessarily mean that we're all out for stopping such leases, but to put this in a perspective through which everyone will be involved in the planning process.

THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Carl.

Chris?

MS. JOHNSON: I agree with what Carl has said, and I would like to speak in favor of the idea which Carolyn is expressing, but I'm concerned about the areas that -- let's say, we are developing our resources in the interior of Alaska where there is no Coastal Zone Management plan, and I would like to broaden what she has said into something that says, "The development of our natural resources should respect the needs and desires of the regions affected." I'd like to see something broad like that and not so specific.

THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

MR. HAKUN: Well Georgianna had one up there that I -- did we table or approve, "goal of natural energy independence not be reached at the expense of Alaskan

citizens and its environment."

THE MODERATOR: That was passed over.

MS. KINGHA: No, we passed it.

MR. TOMA: No, we passed it.

MR. HARUN: I thought we had passed it. If we had passed that, then the Coastal Zone Management tools might be a means underneath that, that goal, as well as perhaps some other suggestions for on-land resources in the interior. Maybe you want to go stronger on that, but it could fit, if you want it to, because that's what we're talking about. We're talking about energy extraction and its effect upon people in the environment.

THE MODERATOR: Carl? Did you want to respond to that?

MR. JACK: I've just been advised that there is basically no coordination between the federal -- with the Coastal Zone Management enabling legislation which resulted in the time frame that has been established by the Federal Government for offshore leasing.

THE MODERATOR: Then what you're saying is that this is an important goal that should be separate from the other?

MR. JACK: It is. Should be.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, are you ready to accept or reject this?

MS. HEDLAND: Yes.

THE MODERATOR: All those in favor --

MR. HAKUN: Could we have it read one more time, please?

THE MODERATOR: Yes. Would you read the goal, please?

MR. TOMA: Yes. "No oil and gas leases should occur until the coastal research -- completed and approved by the cognizant agencies

THE MODERATOR: We did say we weren't going to make negative statements. So could we --

MR. TOMA: okay. "Oil and gas leases should occur until the Coastal Research Service Area plans have been approved by the cognizant agencies."

THE MODERATOR: Ellen.

MS. HAYES: Yes, are we, Madam Chairman, then looking at this as a means under development or is it an end in itself?

THE MODERATOR: No, I understand it's a goal.

THE MODERATOR: Stan?

MR. MACK: I have trouble with the wording of the goal. There is a difference between leasing of a plot and developing that plot. Are we assuming then that immediately upon leasing we are then taking for granted that activity will start in in regard to, in this respect, drilling of the well? Or are we addressing the issue of merely leasing an area? I have trouble distinguishing between the two.

THE MODERATOR: I hope someone around here can answer that. Not me.

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, there's basically three methods, as I understand it, I could stand corrected on this, that there's two major steps that it will take. One is the nominations for sale for the affected areas. Following that, exploration will start. And after the exploration starts, then the development would occur, and at the development stage, which is probably the time frame between exploration and development, is probably about five years in general, I believe. At the time of the development, that's when they go out and drill for oil.

THE MODERATOR: Are there any other objections or comments before we vote on this? Gary?

MR. LOLTHUS: I just wanted to sort of second what Carl said about the concern of the people around the coast, and point out that this one, while it's more specific, that Georgianna's is necessary, partly because I happen to be familiar with some developments in other states, like in Montana and Wyoming. Those places are being called national sacrifice areas, and the State governments are having terrific struggles to maintain any kind of constraints on the development of coal, especially, and oil. And I think this is another kind of constraint that gives the State a lever in dealing with the Federal Government.

Now, the issue in the simplest form is: Who is going to develop resources? Is it going to be the feds? Is it going to be the State? Is it going to be private industry? And on whose timetable? And so far we've been losing the battle with the feds in terms of the timetable. This gives us a little handle, or one more weapon to use in that kind of a struggle.

THE MODERATOR: Andy.

MR. HOPE: Did we start standing up again or --

THE MODERATOR: I don't know.

MR. HOPE: The one thing I have a question about is that agencies, how many agencies and what, from where? I think it would be best if it would be left up to the local agencies or local governments, as I have stressed.

THE MODERATOR: Carl?

MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, clarification on that, as I understand it, upon the completion of the coastal or CR, plans would be submitted to the Alaska Coastal Policy Council. So that's a State agency. So the cognizant agency is synonymous with the State agency in this case.

THE MODERATOR: Okay, we're ready to --

MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman?

THE MODERATOR: Yes, Yule.

MR. KILCHER: With the word "when" there, with the word "when," it almost looks like a dictate, that oil and

gas leases should occur when, immediately after, but I think if we take "after" instead of "when," it's more important than to Style and Drafting, just say "after," or "only after" possibly.

MR. TOMA: "Only" might satisfy the "until" part of it.

MR. KILCHER: Yes, only after the Coastal Resource Service plans have been agreed. Not "when."

MR. TOMA: So we read, "Oil and gas leases should occur only after the Coastal Resource Area plans have been completed and approved by the cognizant agencies"?

THE MODERATOR: Carl, do you accept that?

MR. JACK: No objections.

THE MODERATOR: Carl accepts that. Do you have a comment, Andy?

MR. MATHIESEN: Yes, I should like to say that those leases should occur only when justifiable and after their resource service area plans have been completed. Otherwise, you're saying that those leases should occur no matter where, as long as you got a plan for it.

THE MODERATOR: Do you wish to change that?

MR. MATHIESEN: Yes, I would like to see that issue occur only where justifiable.

MS. HEDLAND: By whose standards?

MR. HUSS: Won't that be included in the Coastal Zone Management plan?

THE MODERATOR: I don't know enough about that, I can't answer that. Marion?

MS. HYLEN: May I ask a question? Is this coastal zone, or the -- let's see, I can't see that.

MR. TOMA: Excuse me.

MS. HYLEN: Coastal Resource Service Area plans, is that -- that isn't the State coastal zone. This is the regional that he's talking about?

MR. JACK: No.

MS. HYLEN: Or is it the state?

MR. JACK: It's state.

MR. TOMA: State local and regional. I mean it's federal, state, local and regional. All four entities have been brought into these planning agencies.

MR. HOPE: Under whose legislation?

MR. TOMA: Under federal legislation. These are under federal -- these are federal monies that are pumped in to set these up.

THE MODERATOR: Is Jane knowledgeable -- Jane Anvik is here, and I think maybe she could straighten that out for us.

MS. ANVIK: This is a quick resource background. The Coastal Policy Act is passed by the Federal Covernment. The state of Alaska then has the opportunity to develop its own coastal policy act, which it did do. What that then