

SCOMM

#30:18

FILE COPY

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, STATE OF ALASKA

Conference on Alaska's future frontiers

Friday, December 7, 1979

Sheraton Anchorage Hotel

Anchorage, Alaska

VOLUME 11

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

Reported by: Charlene Leovich, FR

1 provides for is that Local Resource Planning Councils can
2 be established to develop a plan about how the coastal
3 areas in their region will be developed.

4 In the areas where you have a local unit of
5 government, such as a borough, the borough represents and
6 is that agency that develops the coastal policy. Such as
7 the North Slope Borough, the municipality of Anchorage, the
8 Kenai Borough or the Mat-Su Borough. However in the areas
9 of the unorganized borough an election must be held whereby
10 the people in the region must duly agree through an
11 election to form such a council; then, secondly, they must
12 elect members to that council who are regional
13 representatives.

14 They then go through the process of developing a
15 plan. That plan must be approved by the local council. It
16 must be approved by the State Coastal Policy Council, which
17 Carl mentioned, and must then be approved by the Federal
18 Government. What that then does is says that no federal
19 action may go against the policies as established by that
20 plan. And it's called consistency. It also says that no
21 State action can go against the policies that are laid out
22 in that plan.

23 So that it really provides local regions a
24 tremendous clout in determining what both the State and the
25 Federal Government will do in relationship to development

1 along the coast.

2 THE MODERATOR: So actually the suggestion of Andy's
3 really isn't necessary, that wording, or is it?

4 MR. HOPE: Well, it helps to know these things.

5 MS. ANVIK: Okay, the decisions about whether or not a
6 lease will occur, also, as Carl mentioned, the coastal
7 management, the coastal zone planning legislation, operates
8 totally independently from the legislation and the agencies
9 that govern leasing. And they are in fact at this time not
10 coordinated. So that the Bureau of Land Management governs
11 leasing and NOA governs other agencies, which are different
12 agencies within the Federal Government, which is one
13 problem why the timing is a little out of sync right now.

14 The decision to hold a lease sale or not will in
15 the future be based in compliance with those coastal plans
16 as well as other kinds of considerations, such as whether
17 or not they anticipate there's any oil there, a very
18 extensive both socio-economic and environmental assessment
19 of the area. The issue of justifiable, the federal and the
20 state government would probably argue that no lease would
21 ever occur unless it was justifiable through going through
22 several checks anyway. The coastal policy, the coastal
23 zone plans will represent yet another measure in
24 determining whether or not it's justifiable to lease in the
25 area.

1 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jane. Marion?

2 MS. BYLEN: Then why do we need this?

3 MS. ANVIK: Currently the federal leasing schedule is
4 not in sync with the same federal and state law that says
5 that coastal management plans will be developed. The
6 leasing schedule is ahead of -- we're probably four or five
7 years off. The leasing schedule says that there will be a
8 lease sale, for example, in the Norton Basin in 1982. The
9 Norton Basin Coastal Zone Plan will not be ready probably
10 before 1982. The reason, for example, the Beaufort lease
11 sale today is going back and forth is that the North Slope
12 Borough raced to try to get their Coastal Zone Management
13 Plan done prior to the lease sale which is to be held next
14 week, and it's now before the Court trying to decide
15 whether or not that will happen. So the issues, they're
16 not in sync.

17 THE MODERATOR: Okay one more comment.

18 MR. HOPE: Rosita Whirl has worked pretty hard on this.
19 Before we take any action, I'd like to hear from her or at
20 least somebody from up there that's been working on it.
21 Again, it's presumptuous for us to take action.

22 THE MODERATOR: Let's put this one over then. We have
23 a request to hold this one over, so we'll hold it and go on.

24 Unfortunately we have to move again at 4:30, but
25 we do have a room to go to, but it's going to be very --

1 I'd like us to get as far as we can now.

2 MR. KADEN: Who are we waiting for on this room?

3 THE MODERATOR: He wants to have some input from
4 somebody who is not on our committee, but a --

5 MS. KINGKA: She's a delegate.

6 THE MODERATOR: Kosita Whirl from Barrow?

7 MR. HOPE: Anchorage.

8 MS. MEDLAND: Point of information on this Coastal
9 Zone Management, which since I quit League, I've sort of
10 gotten out of it again, but it's my understanding, Jane,
11 correct me if I'm wrong, that every local community has to
12 have input into the local management plan. I know I sat in
13 on numerous meetings right here in Anchorage for what are
14 they going to do, Tidewater Freeway and so forth. The
15 concern which I think is a valid thing to address in our
16 goal statement is that the mandates of the federal law,
17 which were "Thou shalt have a local and a State plan in
18 order to be eligible for federal funding and so forth for
19 Coastal Zone Management" are not being dealt with, because
20 they said we had to have a State Coastal Zone Management
21 plan, you know, that took five years, or whatever, of
22 hearings.

23 We came up with a plan. Then they said we had to
24 have local plans. We did that. We came up with local
25 plans. And now the Federal Government is on their own

1 timetable and they're ignoring exactly those things they
2 said we had to have. So there is some validity to
3 reemphasizing the fact that we should at least conform with --
4 or they should conform with what they told us to do.

5 THE MODERATOR: Haden, were you objecting to the fact
6 that there was no need to hold this over?

7 MR. KADEN: I don't see any reason. I don't know
8 Kosita Whirl, but --

9 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That was my statement. I
10 don't see any need to hold it over. I'm ready to vote.

11 MS. HEDLAND: Read it again.

12 THE MODERATOR: Read the statement.

13 MR. TOMA: "Oil and gas leases should occur only where
14 justifiable and after the Coastal Resource Service Area
15 plans have been completed and approved by the cognizant
16 agencies."

17 THE MODERATOR: Now, Andy had a suggestion for some
18 word change there.

19 Do you still want that change or are you
20 satisfied with the explanation, that --

21 MR. MATHIESEN: They're in there.

22 THE MODERATOR: -- the concern would be there. It's
23 in there okay. All those in in favor of this as a goal
24 please stand.

25 (complying)

1 It's okay. I wasn't sure. Passed.

2 MR. TOMA: "The State shall develop bottom fisheries
3 and the continued rehabilitation of existing renewable
4 fisheries." I'll just put "continuing" in here.

5 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to this goal?

6 MS. REDLAND: Hooray.

7 MR. TOMA: That's a big commitment, you know.

8 MR. MATHIESEN: I could tell you I'm opposed to the
9 State developing bottom fishery.

10 THE MODERATOR: You are?

11 MR. MATHILSEN: Darn rights I am.

12 THE MODERATOR: You think it should be done --

13 MR. KADEN: Why?

14 MR. MATHIESEN: The State is not obligated to develop
15 anything. Their obligation is to perpetuate that resource.

16 MR. KILCHER: Right.

17 MR. MATHIESEN: The State doesn't owe fishermen a
18 living, contrary to the limited-entry thing. They owe the
19 rest of us the fact that the fish are going to be there a
20 hundred years from now. And that's the sole obligation.

21 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

22 MR. HARUN: I was assuming within that that the State
23 would encourage the renewability of the resource at the
24 same time. I think that unless we do encourage renewable
25 resources, we end up risking pulling communities which now

1 depend on it forcing them into nonrenewable areas, putting
2 roads in there, doing a lot of different things that would
3 be harmful, and so I personally feel that bottom fishing is
4 a good economic development, but that it does imply, maybe
5 we want to clarify, that the State has an obligation to
6 maintain the long-term viability of that resource at the
7 same time.

8 MR. TOMA: This right here means building docks and
9 support facilities on the Aleutian chain. That's what the
10 meaning of this phrase is right here.

11 THE MODERATOR: John?

12 MR. KELSEY: I would suggest that you insert the word,
13 first word to be "encourage."

14 MR. KILCHER: Or "favor," or "favor."

15 THE MODERATOR: The State should encourage, what? the
16 development?

17 MR. KILCHER: That's right.

18 THE MODERATOR: How does that read now?

19 MR. TOMA: "State should encourage the development of
20 bottom fisheries."

21 THE MODERATOR: Ellen?

22 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, just a question raised
23 here by these two men, for me then I need clarification.
24 Does the language here then indicate that the State is in
25 business --

1 MR. TOMA: No.

2 THE MODERATOR: --

3 MS. HAYES: -- of developing? Or the facilities. You
4 know, the way it looks now is that without discussion by a
5 group whose ideas come around verbally, that without that
6 verbal exchange, the State is in business to develop bottom
7 fisheries, the State of Alaska. So it looks like they
8 would be the business entity from the way I'd read it.

9 THE MODERATOR: David?

10 MR. KEENER: I get the feeling that we're here to
11 determine how to spend a certain amount of money for the
12 future. What we have are expenditures in government for
13 telecommunications, for expenditures from which you will
14 never get an economic base, unless you keep subsidizing.
15 The development of bottom fisheries may not prove to be
16 viable, because it may not be competitive on the world
17 market. But if it is, you're creating an industry, a
18 community, an economic base, that will get on its feet and
19 be able to perpetuate itself in private industry without
20 further governmental assistance. So it's one program where
21 it helps itself.

22 THE MODERATOR: Any other comments?

23 MR. MATHIESEN: I disagree with that completely. The
24 country's full of places where we have developed something
25 to an entity, a production entity, is what I think he's

1 talking about, to utilize a natural resource. And without
2 proper management of that natural resource, then we have a
3 community that needs further support. I'll give you a
4 prime example on bottom fish, seeing as how that's what
5 we're talking about.

6 We encouraged a few years ago a drag fleet to
7 come around from the east to harvest scallops. Most of
8 them couldn't afford to go home, in spite of record catches,
9 world record catches of scallops here for a short period of
10 time. And I think if you asked me to stop and think, I
11 could think of a few more. We shouldn't be in a
12 development business.

13 MS. BEDLAND: Madam Chairman, what it sounds like
14 we're looking for is support for expanded expertise in
15 technology for our renewable industries, and bottom fish
16 and fisheries in general and so forth all come under that.
17 I think I'm a little disturbed by limiting it to bottom
18 fish and not just the whole technological concept, and
19 that's probably someplace else, but maybe that's the draw-
20 back. It looks like we're subsidizing one industry over
21 another.

22 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

23 MS. JOHNSON: I have exactly the same concern. I
24 think we're becoming overly specific. We are addressing
25 ourselves to bottom fish, but we're not addressing

1 ourselves to the crab industry or the salmon industry. I
2 think if we want to talk at this point, I see that, Chip, I
3 see that --

4 MR. TOMA: Okay.

5 MS. JOHNSON: -- but at this point. These are our
6 goals. They're supposed to be broad. We're going to talk
7 about narrow things later. We can't just discuss the
8 bottom fish industry here in three minutes. I mean I think
9 we need to look big right now and then narrow later. I
10 think this is much too narrow.

11 THE MODERATOR: Anyone else before I call on David
12 again? Kaden?

13 MR. KADEN: In several of the papers there was a plea
14 for setting up an institute or a number of them and pumping
15 a lot of this money into just basically research and research,
16 you know, that relates specifically to specific rural
17 countries, to Alaska's peculiar environment, their natural
18 resources. Maybe that's the way we should be looking at
19 some of this resource development, you know, and maybe make
20 that a goal that part of that money should go into having
21 local, you know, research in Alaska, top quality, you know,
22 with the -- and that would deal with alternative energy
23 sources and, you know, fishing, you know, the whole gamut
24 of, you know, technological skills as applied to life in
25 the northern countries.

1 THE MODERATOR: Well, that would be more in line with
2 what Andy thinks should be done, as far as renewal of the
3 fishing industry, to have research, which would preserve --

4 MR. MATHIESEN: Madam Chairman, that is really true,
5 because part of research, as it relates to the fishery, may
6 even include having the Japanese harvest the fish. We get
7 the money. We go to Mexico and South America and have a
8 glorious winter. We don't have to go out there and pound
9 our butts on the ground floor. That may prove to be a
10 better alternative.

11 THE MODERATOR: Would you like to scrap this statement
12 and coming up with a broader statement? Is that the
13 feeling, the consensus of the group?

14 (Answering affirmatively)

15 THE MODERATOR: We'll scrap that, and someone comes up
16 with a good strong research statement for resources.

17 Excuse me, Stan, you're going to have to scream
18 at me.

19 MR. MACK: There's a program. I think the program is
20 already incorporated where the State has subsidized some
21 industries in respect to the bottom fishing. That program
22 I believe is already in effect.

23 THE MODERATOR: We're down to human resources section,
24 right?

25 MS. HAYES: Up to.

1 THE MODERATOR: Up to human resources.

2 MR. TOMA: The State should guarantee the dignity and
3 well-being of Alaskans of all ages and economic status.

4 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

5 (No response) Okay.

6 MR. TOMA: The State should support systems for all
7 family structures, including adequate housing, preventive
8 and crisis, medical treatment, day care and aid for elderly
9 as essential.

10 THE MODERATOR: Gary, I'm sorry, you had your hand up,
11 I didn't see you behind him.

12 MR. HOLTHUS: That was fine. I just think once again
13 we've got our ends and means mixed up.

14 MR. TOMA: Okay.

15 THE MODERATOR: Oh.

16 MR. HOLTHUS: I'd rather see it say something like a
17 place where adequate mechanisms are provided for the health
18 and safety of families. And then we'll have time during
19 the meetings to get into the support systems that provide
20 for that. I'm not just interested in support systems and
21 not just interested in support systems, but some more --

22 THE MODERATOR: Well, that was your goal and I guess
23 somebody else wrote it up for you, because --

24 MR. HOLTHUS: It's got everything in it. It's just
25 that I think it's got the means as well as the end.

1 MS. HEDLAND: I did write it up and I did try to put
2 it all in there, but I think the word mechanisms was also a
3 means --

4 MR. HOLTHUS: Yes.

5 MS. HEDLAND: -- therefore, and I do believe after
6 thinking about it, that just a goal of support systems is
7 an achievable and valid goal, and in the means you have to
8 get into the administering of these and the mechanisms for
9 them.

10 MR. HOLTHUS: Madam Chairman, I don't agree at all. I
11 think it's possible to have an infinite number of support
12 systems and still have, as we have some now, and still have
13 unhealthy families and unsafe families. So I think the
14 goal is to have healthy, safe families, and that's --
15 that's the goal.

16 THE MODERATOR: Can you change it right now by looking
17 at it?

18 MR. HOLTHUS: Sure, what we want is healthy safe
19 families.

20 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

21 MS. HEDLAND: However, I'm very concerned that the
22 implication of family will include a single person, a
23 divorced person --

24 MR. HOLTHUS: I hope so.

25 MS. HEDLAND: -- with two children and the elderly,

1 and somehow it never does. That's why I wanted to somehow
2 get in there all types of family units or something like
3 that.

4 MR. HOLTHUS: Yes, okay. Well, let's just say healthy
5 and safe conditions for everyone then or something like
6 that. I hate to water it down all that much, but maybe in
7 the means we can get to the rest of it. But health and
8 safety I guess is the thing that really concerns me.
9 Dignity is fine, but you can be sick and dignified, too,
10 and you can be in poverty and dignified. So I think we
11 need something more than that, and health and safety is
12 fine, and just say that and we'll include the definition of
13 families in the means.

14 MR. TOMA: Support health and safety systems?

15 MR. HOLTHUS: For everyone.

16 MR. TOMA: Okay for everyone.

17 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

18 MR. MATHIESEN: Couldn't we say like for instance the
19 welfare of our human resources should hold the highest
20 priority?

21 THE MODERATOR: The what?

22 MR. HOLTHUS: Well, welfare can be such a bad word.

23 MS. HEDLAND: I was afraid of that word myself.

24 MR. MATHIESEN: Well, you might choose something
25 different, but I think the meaning is not complicated.

1 THE MODERATOR: How does it read now?

2 MR. TOMA: "The State should support health and safety
3 systems for all Alaskans."

4 THE MODERATOR: Well, maybe just state it health and
5 safety should have a high priority, should be a high
6 priority.

7 MR. HOLTHUS: I think the State's minimum obligation
8 is to provide for the health and safety of its residents,
9 period. If we get the systems in there, then we're still,
10 you know, the State's goal is to provide systems. It's not
11 to provide health. That's not where we're at.

12 MR. KILCHER: That's where we're at.

13 MR. HOLTHUS: That's where we are at, that's right.

14 MR. TOMA: "The State should support the health and
15 safety of all Alaskans."

16 THE MODERATOR: Does that really say though what you
17 mean?

18 MR. HOLTHUS: Well, provide for -- I'd say provide for
19 instead of support.

20 MR. TOMA: Okay.

21 THE MODERATOR: Ellen, did you have a comment on that?

22 MS. HAYES: While he's writing on that one, Madam
23 Chairman, I'm trying to figure out the top one that went by.
24 We are saying that we will guarantee the dignity of
25 economic status, the well-being of economic status, that

1 economic status, in my head, I don't know how it hangs in
2 there very well. In the future we want to guarantee the
3 dignity and well-being of Alaskans. Then how does the
4 economic status, what does that mean? To me it isn't in
5 good form.

6 THE MODERATOR: Well, right now, Ellen, I think this
7 is confusing. If we can finish what we're on right now.

8 MS. HAYES: While he was writing, I had to make a
9 point. I'm not satisfied with it.

10 THE MODERATOR: All right, I'll make a note of that.

11 MR. TOMA: The State should provide for the health and
12 safety of all Alaskans." Okay.

13 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

14 MR. MATHIESEN: What if you see somebody, just, you
15 know, laying out in the street and doesn't want to
16 contribute anything? Then what we're saying is that we
17 should have some entity come along and pick him up? Buy
18 him a nice set of clothes like John's got here and furnish
19 him a nice house and make sure he's back in the mainstream?
20 Is that what we're saying?

21 MR. TOMA: I don't think so.

22 THE MODERATOR: I don't believe so.

23 MR. MATHIESEN: They're guaranteed these things.

24 MS. KINCKA: But you're not specifying how you're
25 guaranteeing.

1 THE MODERATOR: We're on the second one now. We're
2 discussing the second one now.

3 Will you read it again?

4 MR. TOMA: "The State should provide" or "shall
5 provide for the health and safety of all Alaskans." "The
6 State should provide for the health and safety of all
7 Alaskans."

8 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Question.

9 MR. HOLTHUS: I don't guess it's worth going back for
10 one of us I guess. We can talk about it a little bit.

11 THE MODERATOR: Are we in agreement on this?

12 MR. KILCHER: Yes.

13 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Let's vote on it.

14 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to the wording
15 of this second goal under human resources? I see no
16 objection.

17 MR. TOMA: Is there any distinction between "shall"
18 and "should"? Should we make it "shall" consistent the
19 whole way through here? Do you have some feeling on that?
20 I guess we shall. The State shall provide for the health
21 and safety of all Alaskans."

22 This is a means I would imagine, educate doctors
23 about nutrition.

24 THE MODERATOR: What was the next one there?

25 MR. TOMA: "The State shall have programs which

1 effectively address alcohol abuse as an independent -- oh,
2 as an impediment, excuse me. "The State shall have
3 programs which effectively address alcohol abuse as an
4 impediment to full utilization of Alaska's human resource
5 and nutritional --

6 THE MODERATOR: Means? That's a means, isn't it? If
7 you're talking about the State having programs, that's a
8 means.

9 MR. HUSS: Means.

10 MR. TOMA: Nutritional, means, okay. "The State shall
11 provide programs which effectively address alcohol --

12 THE MODERATOR: Isn't that a means? The State shall
13 provide a program? You're going to have to change that to
14 make it a goal.

15 Kevin?

16 MR. BARON: It is covered, but it isn't, because what
17 we're looking for under the means are specific solutions,
18 and this, if you leave it as it is, is not a specific
19 solution, it's a goal. It's a general goal. And so it's
20 going to have to be refined more. But I think as a goal,
21 it's a laudible goal.

22 MS. HYLEN: A goal is the elimination of alcoholism in
23 Alaska, would be the goal.

24 MR. BARON: How do you do that?

25 THE MODERATOR: Could we have some order? I must tell

1 you that when you are talking like this, nothing goes on
2 the record, because there's no way that she can get
3 anything. So if you want it to be on the record, you will
4 have to address the chair.

5 Okay, we're now back to this one. Would you read
6 it again, please?

7 MR. TOMA: "The State shall effectively alcohol abuse
8 as an impediment to full utilization of Alaska's human
9 resource."

10 THE MODERATOR: Any objection? Marion?

11 MS. HYLEN: Why don't you just say that we -- the goal
12 is really to eliminate alcoholism in Alaska?

13 THE MODERATOR: Is that an achievable goal?

14 MS. HYLEN: I mean you have a goal. These others are
15 means. Your goal is still there.

16 MS. LONGPRE: I differentiate alcoholism from alcohol
17 abuse. There is -- I believe there is some alcohol abuse,
18 at least in the idea that I'm from, that is not -- wouldn't
19 necessarily be called alcoholism or not alcoholics.

20 MS. HYLEN: You mean when he gets drunk and beats
21 somebody else? That's alcohol abuse?

22 MS. LONGPRE: I'm talking about alcohol abuse in our
23 area by children. I couldn't class them as alcoholics.
24 But children, you know, there's a large percentage of
25 alcohol abuse by children in our area. I wouldn't call

1 then alcoholics.

2 THE MODERATOR: Yes, Marion?

3 MS. HYLEN: Madam Chairman, that comes under the same
4 thing that there's a lot of abuse on kids eating candy, too.
5 But it isn't something that you can eliminate.

6 But the thing you have to work for is your
7 alcoholic. He is the only one that's a detriment to
8 society.

9 MS. LONGPRE: I think that --

10 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

11 MS. JOHNSON: Could I suggest that we pass the general
12 idea of this and leave the wording up to the Editing
13 Committee?

14 MR. TOMA: To the author? How about to the author?

15 THE MODERATOR: Do you agree with the concept that
16 this is a goal that we need in the -- in our goals
17 statements?

18 MR. KELSEY: We already have.

19 THE MODERATOR: You agreed, okay. I stand corrected,
20 all right.

21 Style & Drafting will be sure that the point is --

22 MR. TOMA: Under Human Profit, "The State shall grant
23 tax credits and/or investment incentives to industry, to
24 encourage the provisions of services and to offset adverse
25 impact from developing after the fact."

1 MR. KINGHA: After the fact of industry.

2 MR. TOMA: Impact developing after the fact.

3 MR. KINGHA: In fairbanks we still have the adverse
4 impact of the pipeline and we're still trying to handle it,
5 and if they had done -- if they had thought about what
6 might have happened before they were allowed to go through
7 and made some provision for services that would have offset
8 that adverse impact, then we wouldn't have it now, and the
9 company who developed the business would have paid for it
10 instead of the citizens who are left there now. That's
11 probably worded improperly, but that's what it is.

12 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn?

13 MS. JONES: I think some of what's up there is a means.
14 And I would suggest that the general goal is probably
15 something like this: The State will encourage Alaskan-owned
16 and operated industries to assume their social
17 responsibilities to provide needed services and to offset
18 adverse developmental impact in the community.

19 MS. KINCRA: I'll accept that wording.

20 MR. TOMA: Okay, do you have that wording?

21 THE MODERATOR: Did you all hear it?

22 MS. JONES: Want me to read it?

23 MR. TOMA: You have the wording. Just hold onto it.
24 We'll vote on that then.

25 THE MODERATOR: Would you read it? They didn't hear

1 it. Would you speak up?

2 MS. JONES: All right, okay. "The State will
3 encourage Alaskan-owned and operated industries to assume
4 their social responsibilities, to provide needed services,
5 and to offset adverse development impact in the community."

6 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to that? John?

7 MR. KELSEY: Question: Do we want to limit it to
8 Alaska-owned and operated?

9 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That was my question, too.

10 MS. KINGRA: To private industry.

11 MS. JONES: Fine, fine.

12 THE MODERATOR: Any other objections? Changes? It's
13 accepted.

14 MR. TOMA: Okay, "Funds should be made available for
15 building suitable medical facilities in rural areas."

16 MS. HYLEN: That is a means.

17 THE MODERATOR: That is a means to a --

18 MR. TOMA: No, that's a goal.

19 MR. KILCHER: Yep.

20 MR. TOMA: I mean health is already a goal, right?

21 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

22 MR. TOMA: But this is a goal, too, because I mean
23 it's been a long-time goal.

24 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that as a goal?

25 (No response)

1 Accepted.

2 MR. TOMA: Under Education, "One which provides
3 continuing education for all age groups," or an age group?
4 All -- yes, excuse me, an education -- "The State shall
5 have an education policy which provides continuing
6 education for all age groups."

7 THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

8 MR. KILCHER: I think we had that.

9 THE MODERATOR: Beg your pardon? Do you have a
10 comment, Yule?

11 MR. KILCHER: I think that exists.

12 MS. KINGRA: No.

13 THE MODERATOR: Continuing education, that means life-long.

14 MS. BUSS: The State has policies for bits and pieces
15 of it, but not much of a whole policy for the State.

16 THE MODERATOR: Kaden?

17 MR. KADEN: One thing, Chip, where that says one in
18 which, what that is is just continuing, "We envision a
19 future for Alaska as "One which," that's why it states like,
20 instead of saying "The state should do these things." That
21 was the format these were being set up in.

22 THE MODERATOR: Well, the Style & Drafting is going to
23 have to decide which form it's going to be.

24 MR. KADEN: But opposed to him scratching, you know --

25 THE MODERATOR: Don't edit. What they were using was

1 this form that was left from ten years ago.

2 MR. TOMA: All right. "One which provides continuing
3 education for all age groups."

4 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection?

5 (No response)

6 MR. TOMA: Okay.

7 THE MODERATOR: It's accepted.

8 MR. TOMA: "better standards for village high schools."

9 THE MODERATOR: Whose is that?

10 MS. LAYES: Doesn't matter whose it is unless there's
11 comment about it.

12 THE MODERATOR: Is there any comment?

13 MR. KELSEY: Doesn't the State have certain standards
14 that they have to -- all high schools have to follow?

15 THE MODERATOR: Yes, there are standards, but someone
16 is questioning and wants them improved, I guess.

17 MR. KADEN: Just seems like that's pretty narrow. You
18 know it's creating sort of a division, thereby
19 distinguishing --

20 THE MODERATOR: David?

21 MR. KEENER: I think possibly it might just be the
22 word better. I mean better for us or better for them, for
23 their own life-style. Somewhere it's got to be correlated
24 where it meets their own needs.

25 THE MODERATOR: John?

1 MS. HUSE: I'm not sure what's meant by standards.

2 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

3 MS. JOHNSON: I'd go back to Haden's original point,
4 that I think this is overly narrow and maybe should be
5 addressed at another time in the means category.

6 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn?

7 MS. JONES: Over on Justice, R, which people said was
8 in the wrong place, would that satisfy what we're talking
9 about under better standards? Would that be the goal and
10 that be the means?

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

15 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

16 THE MODERATOR: Yes, that sounds like that should be
17 moved over there.

18 Georgianna?

19 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Well, Carolyn on that, it
20 says, we have high expectations for our students, but --
21 and an opportunities for an enriched education for all.
22 heck, the State could have high expectations. I'm sure
23 they do for all of our students. I'm more concerned about
24 our high expectations for the standards for quality of
25 education that they're receiving. And we all have high

1 expectations of the students.

2 MS. JONES: I don't have any quarrel with you on that.

3 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I think instead of students that
4 needs to be changed somehow where we have high expectations
5 for the quality of education.

6 MR. TOMA: For the quality of education? I don't know
7 if we want to change what we've done.

8 MS. JONES: May I be recognized, Madam Chairman?

9 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn.

10 MS. JONES: We never discussed b or any of them, we
11 just voted on them.

12 MR. TOMA: Yes.

13 MS. JONES: Could I have 30 seconds to explain my
14 intent?

15 My intent in saying high expectations is because
16 it's my observations in the school with my black child and
17 other black children, and in conversations I've had with
18 some native parents, that there are teachers in the school
19 that do not expect a high performance from minority
20 students. They do not encourage them. They do not demand
21 excellence. They do not get upset when those children
22 don't do their homework. And as a result they are rewarded
23 with mediocre performances, and so my point in including
24 high expectations is that I want the school systems to
25 expect the highest from all the students. And my point in

1 putting enriched education indication is that I've been
2 informed that while there are a lot of rural schools where
3 you now can stay home, they do not provide all the courses
4 that some of the students need to have an enriched
5 education. They're getting a basic education. Maybe you
6 want to say something else, Georgianna, but that's what I
7 meant.

8 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I guess again it's
9 just this high expectation from the students. That's the
10 thing that's a hang-up for me, because that's true about,
11 you know, the teachers not having a high expectations, but
12 I think it's the teacher that we need to beat on the head,
13 not the student. The quality of the teachers.

14 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman?

15 THE MODERATOR: Caroline, are you wishing to answer
16 that?

17 MS. JONES: Could I suggest an amendment then, that
18 "One where the school systems have high expectations for
19 all the students"?

20 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman, --

21 MS. JONES: Do something with that. I don't want to
22 fight. I just want to get it done.

23 THE MODERATOR: Perhaps that would be under the means
24 that you would bring that in, that teach -- about the
25 teachers, rather than changing that -- that wording now.

1 Yule?

2 MR. FILCHER: Madam Chairman, I think we could word it
3 possibly, listen to this: Education to match our high
4 expectations for." It's our high expectations, and the
5 children's, too, but the State can -- there's no use for
6 the State to have high expectations, you know. We have it
7 all in the beginning, presumably. Every politician that
8 runs for office has high expectations. But we want to
9 furnish education that matches our high expectations or the
10 children's expectations. Would you agree with that?

11 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

12 MR. HARUN: Well, Dave mentioned a point back here.
13 He said something about he interpreted that, I don't know
14 who wrote it, did you write it Dave?

15 MR. KEENER: No.

16 MS. JONES: I wrote it.

17 MR. HARUN: I interpreted it better standards for
18 village high schools, that they be culturally relevant.
19 That's how we got back to though

20 THE MODERATOR: Whose goal was that better standards?
21 Was that yours, Georgianna?

22 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) No.

23 THE MODERATOR: Better standards.

24 MR. HARUN: The better --

25 MR. TOMA: Better standards, No. 6, the second one

1 there?

2 MS. LONGPHE: Yes.

3 THE MODERATOR: Whose was that?

4 MR. HARUN: That's how we got over to this.

5 THE MODERATOR: No one will admit authorship.

6 MR. HARUN: If I might just mention. He had a really
7 good point -- excuse me, Madam Chairman, I wasn't finished
8 with that.

9 THE MODERATOR: Sorry.

10 MR. HARUN: He made a really good point in that a lot
11 of times that I have friends who are school teachers in the
12 bush, his point was that they were not culturally relevant
13 for a lot of standards. For instance they take SKA tests
14 and Dick and Jane and the dog, but it doesn't fit with a
15 villager.

16 MS. LINCOLN: In that connection, I disagree.

17 MR. HARUN: You do?

18 MS. LINCOLN: I think the cultural aspect and the
19 expectational level are two completely different things,
20 because the quality of education does not always mean that
21 culture is involved. I don't know just how to say it, but
22 I do disagree, in that they are two different things.

23 THE MODERATOR: Well, is this goal of better standards,
24 is that a goal that we need, or do you want to put
25 something regarding standards under a means to improve

1 education? So right now we'll pass over, that this is not
2 a goal? Is that the feeling that I'm getting from you?

3 Okay, that's not a goal.

4 MR. TOMA: Okay, a means.

5 "One in which basic education is stressed."

6 THE MODERATOR: How does that start?

7 MR. TOMA: "One in which basic education is stressed."

8 MR. HARUN: Must be a means again.

9 THE MODERATOR: Any objection? Chris?

10 MS. JOHNSON: I don't understand what that means.

11 MR. TOMA: Can I get the full phrase, Haden? What's
12 the term here?

13 MR. KADEN: We envision of future for Alaska as --

14 MR. TOMA: We envision a future for Alaska as one in
15 which basic education is stressed."

16 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I remember this morning or
17 yesterday, the remark that I remember was that we are
18 graduating from the secondary level, young people who are
19 not able to read was one of the examples, and to go into
20 the -- the enriched without the basic, we're not even
21 already doing basics very well.

22 THE MODERATOR: Well, if I might say something, in all
23 the years that I was on the State Board of Education, no
24 one has ever been able to come up with a definition of what
25 basic education is, and they have been working on it -- for

1 I think hon Hohman will go along with that, they're still
2 working on that, a definition; isn't that correct?

3 MR. HOHMAN: Uh-huh (affirmative response).

4 THE MODERATOR: So if you want to say that you believe
5 that -- your goal is that every child should be able to
6 read and write and cipher, maybe that is something that is
7 more understandable, if that's what you mean by your
8 interpretation of basic, because to me I would like to say
9 I believe that basic is art and music and libraries and lot
10 of things. And so that's why nobody has ever been able to
11 get back to --

12 MS. KINGRA: If you read the next two on the sheet,
13 under six, education, down here, these two, yes, they take
14 in almost everything on the top except for all educational
15 funds to be administered. They're broad. They're not
16 goals -- I mean, they're not means, they're goals. And
17 they incorporate just about everything that's up there.

18 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

19 MS. JOHNSON: I would make one exception, it says "Provide
20 opportunity for all adults."

21 MS. KINGRA: But the next one is "Applied to the
22 fullest extent possible, and all educational levels
23 principles and practices."

24 MS. JOHNSON: Don't you want to include, like in the
25 first one, all Alaskans?

1 MS. HUSS: May I respond to this?

2 THE MODERATOR: John.

3 MS. JOHNSON: I know.

4 MS. HUSS: I understand it should be all Alaskans, you
5 and I talked about it before.

6 MS. JOHNSON: Right.

7 MS. HUSS: I have a particular reason for that, in
8 saying adults. That is because if it's not said
9 specifically, it will get passed over in the legislature
10 and within the State Department of Education, that the
11 funds for adult education is so slight it's necessary to
12 keep stressing that all the time.

13 MS. KINGRA: But the next one says all levels.

14 THE MODERATOR: Yule.

15 MR. KILCHER: I think it will be clear if we say all
16 Alaskans. You might think we address it as Alaska on the
17 local, regional and racial level, and if you say it for
18 Alaskans of all ages, then we have all Alaskans and of all
19 ages. Will you go for that?

20 MS. HUSS: Oh, yes. I'd put children in there, too.

21 MR. KILCHER: Okay, for Alaskans of all ages.

22 MR. TOMA: All Alaskans of all ages.

23 MR. KILCHER: For Alaskans of all ages.

24 THE MODERATOR: For Alaskans of all ages.

25 MS. HUSS: How about youth and adults? Again, it's

1 just a practical point.

2 MR. KILCHER: Well, all ages, all ages, that includes
3 adults.

4 MS. LUSE: Yes.

5 THE MODERATOR: John and Yule, we cannot amend like
6 this. It just gets too confusing. If you want to, could
7 you take a, you know, just --

8 MR. KILCHER: I thought I still had the -- I was
9 recognized and have it --

10 MR. HOLMAN: Madam Chairperson.

11 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

12 MR. HOPE: I thought we were talking about the third
13 one down. If you're amending the -- whatever it is down,
14 I'd like to ask when issued submit a possible amendment to
15 the one that Chip is pointing at?

16 THE MODERATOR: Well, I think what's -- what happened
17 is that someone -- I think --

18 MS. KINGRA: I did.

19 THE MODERATOR: Rosemary.

20 MS. KINGRA: I just pointed out that these two appear
21 to take in everything that we're talking about up there,
22 except for educational funds, and stresses good health and
23 nutrition, because it talks about adults in the first
24 paragraph and to the fullest extent possible, all
25 educational levels in the second paragraph.

1 THE MODERATOR: Well, first of all, maybe we should
2 read through those first ones, because I can't see them
3 from here.

4 MR. TOMA: "We envision future for Alaska is one in
5 which basic education is stressed." Do you want to keep
6 going through them?

7 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

8 MR. TOMA: All right. "To establish student exchange
9 programs between all high schools, and alternative methods
10 of certification for teacher aids in rural areas; and
11 special programs for gifted and handicapped students."

12 THE MODERATOR: Those are all means.

13 MR. TOMA: And all educational funds be administered
14 under the department to eliminate duplication of programs;
15 and to stress good health and nutrition as a responsible
16 part of the program.

17 THE MODERATOR: Gene?

18 MS. KINGRA: I eliminated those last two, educational
19 funds and stresses good health, because --

20 MR. TOMA: Has been part of this.

21 MS. KINGRA: Has not been part of this.

22 MR. TOMA: So there's a consideration here that these
23 take in as goals and then these are means of these goals.

24 MS. HEDLAND: Let's hear the suggestion.

25 THE MODERATOR: Ron, I'd like to hear from you.

1 MR. HOHMAN: Yes, if we're going back up to the third
2 one down, "One in which basic education is stressed," not
3 getting into the issue of defining what basic education is
4 or what is basic need, I would submit, because you'd be
5 able to satisfy the concern I have and a bias, by
6 substituting the word "Stressed," leaving the rest of the
7 sentence the same, except putting in at that point "Supported
8 with 100 percent funding," so the sentence would then read:
9 "One in which basic education is supported with hundred
10 percent funding."

11 MS. HEDLAND: State funding?

12 MR. HOHMAN: Yes.

13 MS. HEDLAND: Would you like to say that?

14 MR. HOHMAN: Good point.

15 THE MODERATOR: Yes, John.

16 MS. HUSS: I'm not at all sure what basic education
17 means up there. To my orientation, what I mean by basic
18 education would be self-directed learning abilities on the
19 part of a student, not any particular skill other than that.
20 The ability to process the information and learn on their
21 own and using a teacher as a learning Facilitator. I think
22 that's extremely vague the way it is right there, and sort
23 of an unusable term.

24 MS. HYLEN: I'm not an educator. I have been a mother
25 in the last -- not the last few years, but my boys have

1 gone through high school within the last ten years, and
2 from what I hear from people, basic education, and also
3 what I read in books, the basic education is the ability to
4 read, that they be taught to read, and that they be taught
5 the multiplication tables, where they can be taught the
6 simple multiplication, and where they can spell,
7 particularly where they can read, because if they can't
8 read, they can't do anything else.

9 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

10 MR. HUSS: I just want to reiterate what she said. I
11 think we can take the two bottom ones and that covers
12 everything we have up there.

13 THE MODERATOR: And then use the other. You don't
14 think that some of those are means?

15 MR. HUSS: I think almost everything on the top is a
16 means. We can take the A and B below here on the bottom
17 sheet and add the part about the "All funds administered
18 under one department," because even the good health and
19 nutrition can be covered under life-coping competencies. I
20 think those two cover everything we've got in the whole
21 list up there. I think we're wasting a lot of time arguing
22 about what basic education is right now. I mean that
23 should be something we want to cover when we get to actual
24 means. But as far as goals --

25 THE MODERATOR: First Karen, then Stan, then John.

1 Okay.

2 MS. MEDLAND: I fully agree. My definition of basic
3 education may be much different from yours. My question is:
4 The subject of 100 percent financing for all schools has
5 been one that has been around for a long time. It could be
6 considered a means, but it could also be considered a goal
7 in terms of just plain coming right out and stating hundred
8 percent State support for all school systems. I'm not sure
9 of that. I'm violently opposed to discussing the
10 definition of basic needs.

11 THE MODERATOR: Stan?

12 MR. BACK: I was just going to add to the discussion
13 here. It seems to be a problem of defining "basic." So to
14 eliminate any hangups, we might just eliminate the word
15 "basic," from the discussion and all education be included.
16 Thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Stan.

18 John?

19 MR. KELSEY: Well, I would agree with what they're
20 suggesting, that those, the ones on the above sheet, are
21 probably means. I do think we've lost sight of something
22 that I think needs to be addressed. That is, we seem to be
23 hepped on the idea of educating the normal child, but I
24 think we have to address the blind, and the handicapped. I
25 think it's not covered there. I think we should address

1 that.

2 THE MODERATOR: You don't think that providing
3 opportunity for all Alaskans to acquire basic academic and
4 life-coping competencies --

5 MR. KELSEY: I'm not too sure that's covered.

6 MS. HUSS: Excuse me. That was my concern about
7 having the word "adults" in, too. It sort of assumed. But
8 you wanted it stated just so nobody misses it?

9 MR. KELSEY: That's right.

10 MS. HUSS: My intent was it would be included within
11 that.

12 THE MODERATOR: Gene?

13 MS. KINGRA: I don't currently deal with handicapped
14 children, but I have dealt with them in the past. Deaf and
15 multiple-handicapped. And I feel very strongly that
16 providing an opportunity for basic academic and life-long
17 competencies would cover those people.

18 THE MODERATOR: Couldn't you state those in the needs
19 that that would be a --

20 MS. KINGRA: Yes.

21 THE MODERATOR: -- one of the ways you would
22 accomplish that for everybody, that you would specifically
23 do things for the handicapped, so forth?

24 MR. KELSEY: I'll buy that, if you're addressing me.

25 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

1 MR. KELSEY: but, you know, I think we should
2 underscore it, because I think we tend to think of only
3 educating our normal youngsters. I think there's a very
4 crying need for the handicapped education and the blind. I
5 think it's important.

6 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

7 MS. HEDLAND: It's the old phrase of exceptional
8 children, and I must admit that I'm as concerned about both
9 ends of the spectrum, those with learning disabilities that
10 are not physically handicapped, and those that are supertalented.
11 So I really hoped that we would deal with that in the
12 specifics of the needs rather than now in a goal statement.

13 THE MODERATOR: Ellen?

14 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, my reasons would be based
15 on the subject that our statements use the two paragraphs
16 on the second sheet and that we arrange the means in a
17 later session.

18 THE MODERATOR: Can we then -- Ron?

19 MR. HOHMAN: I would agree with that, if you would
20 take the first goal on the second sheet, right under the
21 six education, where it said "Provide opportunity for --"
22 is that all?

23 MS. KINGRA: Alaskans of all --

24 MR. HOHMAN: "Alaskans of all ages to acquire basic
25 academic and life-long --"

1 MS. HUSS: "Life-coping competencies --"

2 MR. HOHMAN: " -- life-coping competencies, with
3 hundred percent funding with all school districts."

4 MS. HUSS: That's an entirely new objective.

5 MR. HUSS: That's a means, too.

6 MR. TOMA: That's a means of bringing that about,
7 right?

8 MR. HOHMAN: Then I'd like to go back and I'd like to
9 object and put back in the top the fact that we have basic
10 education for all school districts supported with 100
11 percent State funding.

12 MR. TOMA: As a means? As a means, Ron?

13 MR. HOHMAN: I don't think it's a means. I think it's
14 a goal to acquire hundred percent funding for all school
15 districts in the State of Alaska, for all of the
16 educational needs within those districts as defined by the
17 local authority. I didn't want to when I initiated it. I
18 didn't want to bring open the discussion of what is basic
19 education and what is basic need. I thought, since I was
20 absent this morning, there had maybe been some consensus
21 regarding that, and so rather than disrupt it, I thought
22 that you would accept that amendment better than rewording
23 it. But I do think it is a goal to receive hundred percent
24 State funding in all of the school districts for the
25 educational needs defined by each of the districts.

1 THE MODERATOR: Is that all in there, hon?

2 Which one is it you're talking about?

3 MR. TOMA: This one right here. "One in which basic
4 education is supported with a hundred percent funding."

5 MR. KILCHER: That's a goal.

6 MR. TOMA: As a goal.

7 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to that as a
8 goal?

9 MS. HUSS: Yes.

10 THE MODERATOR: One objection.

11 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I'm still not clear on it.
12 I'm ready to move on those two paragraphs and the
13 accompanying means, with the exception of what that means,
14 "a hundred percent," you know, that hundred percent item
15 we're talking about, I need a little more discussion on
16 that. Otherwise, you know, I think we can move, except for
17 that one.

18 MR. KILCHER: You can move anyway.

19 THE MODERATOR: Marion?

20 MS. HYLEN: May I ask a question? On hundred percent
21 funding, are they going to use the federal funding in that
22 hundred percent statement? Or is it to be funded just by
23 the State?

24 THE MODERATOR: This is not -- this group cannot make
25 that decision. That's a legislative --

1 MS. HULEN: When you state "State funding," what are
2 you meaning?

3 MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, that's a technicality,
4 and we are talking about federal funds and the difference.
5 Right now the difference between what the federal
6 Government and the State government provide is made up by
7 local tax assessments, and I believe, correct me if I'm
8 wrong, that's what he's proposing is the elimination of
9 that local tax assessment against one of our -- one of our
10 goals is hundred percent State financing, which has been an
11 issue in political campaigns for the last ten years.

12 THE MODERATOR: Does that answer your question, Ellen?

13 MS. HAYES: No. I mean it's part of it. But it
14 doesn't answer -- I'm not ready to say I'm still not ready
15 to say that that should be a part of the goal. I don't
16 understand it well.

17 THE MODERATOR: Could we, then, to make us move along,
18 how about taking up those two down below, one at a time,
19 the first one there --

20 MR. TOMA: "To provide opportunity for Alaskans of all
21 ages to acquire basic academic and life-coping competencies."

22 THE MODERATOR: Anybody object to that as a goal?
23 Georgianna?

24 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) It seems it's a little bit
25 redundant to the goal we passed up there, that the State

1 shall have education policy which provides continuing
2 education for all age groups. It seems like it's a bit
3 redundant.

4 THE MODERATOR: Isn't that going to be the job of the
5 style & drafting, if they have duplications, so that we
6 don't have to decide that right now?

7 MR. TOMA: Right.

8 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I see.

9 THE MODERATOR: I think that's a good point.

10 MS. BUSS: Georgianna, also, continuing ed is usually
11 thought of as post-high school on and not pre-graduation.
12 That's the way that term is usually used, so it doesn't
13 usually apply in K through --

14 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to that goal
15 being provide opportunity for," I can't read it --

16 MR. TOMA: Excuse me, to provide opportunity for
17 Alaskans of all ages to acquire basic academic and life-coping
18 competent ceases.

19 Is there any objection?

20 MS. BUSS: Just one, I'd like to add youth and adults.

21 MS. HEDLAND: It says all ages.

22 MS. BUSS: But it's most important to stress the word
23 adult in there.

24 MS. HAYES: I object.

25 THE MODERATOR: There's an objection.

1 MR. TOMA: To the amendment?

2 THE MODERATOR: All those in favor of the way it is
3 written, please raise your hand.

4 (complying)

5 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

6 MR. TOMA: "to apply to the fullest extent possible,
7 and at all educational levels, principles and practices of
8 self-directed life-long learning."

9 THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

10 MR. BACK: May I have that clarified, what it means by
11 self-directing, life-long learning?

12 THE MODERATOR: What's the difference between that and
13 continuing education?

14 MS. BUSS: Continuing education is usually thought of
15 in a post-high school vein primarily for adults. Life-long
16 education would be whereby education is viewed as a
17 continuous process from birth to death.

18 MS. HEDLAND: If we accept a concept, I don't really
19 think we have to get into, "Can I have this clarified with
20 these two words?" It seems to me we're getting ourselves
21 bogged down again and we have lost what we were first doing,
22 of accepting a concept or not, and we have an editorial
23 staff that you can talk to.

24 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to this as a goal?

25 Okay, it's accepted.

1 Now, --

2 MR. TOMA: Now we have means everywhere.

3 THE MODERATOR: Everything else is a means?

4 MR. HOHMAN: No. Object. Object.

5 THE MODERATOR: Except Ron.

6 MR. TOMA: Except for the State funding break. "One

7 in which basic education is supported with hundred percent

8 funding."

9 MS. HEDLAND: Let's just vote on it.

10 MR. KILCHER: Questions.

11 MS. HUSS: Two questions.

12 THE MODERATOR: The suggestion has been we vote on

13 this goal. Any discussion? You don't want discussion?

14 MS. HUSS: Yes, please.

15 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

16 MS. HUSS: I'm not clear. Maybe it's just my own

17 ignorance, on what's meant by "100 percent State funding,"

18 and "basic education." I think both terms are vague. It

19 makes it hard to vote.

20 MR. HOPE: Is this K through 20, K through 12, or --

21 or pre-school through 25 or pre-school through --

22 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman.

23 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

24 MR. KILCHER: Compulsory education is where --

25 compulsory education is hundred percent supported by the

1 State. That's the only place the State has a say. The
2 rest is voluntary. We have that further down. Make it
3 possible for everybody to be educated, life long, programs,
4 et cetera, but we have a compulsory education program.
5 That should be supported a hundred percent.

6 THE MODERATOR: Good, good suggestion.

7 MR. TOMA: One in which --

8 MR. HOPE: Madam Chairman.

9 THE MODERATOR: Andy.

10 MR. HOPE: My response to that is that the proposal
11 that Mr. Merdes presented to us on the first day, like the
12 University of -- well, in California, it's K through 14,
13 the first two years of college are also funded, too, by the
14 State, and that's not compulsory, but it's offered to the
15 people. And that's hundred percent funding.

16 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

17 MS. HEDLAND: I agree with him, but I think that's a
18 means underneath the expanded education thing, and I think
19 what we are talking about is compulsory education. It is
20 against the law to not go to school.

21 MR. HOPE: Well, the hundred percent figure is a means,
22 too, then.

23 MS. HEDLAND: No, because --

24 MR. RUSS: It is though.

25 THE MODERATOR: This is what we're going to vote on,

1 as I understand it, whether this is a goal or whether it's
2 going to become a means. So now you are to vote on whether
3 you accept this as a goal, and I do believe that Yule's
4 suggestion of putting in there "compulsory education" makes
5 it stronger.

6 MS. KINGRA: I have a question. "hundred percent
7 State funding," do you mean to State educational systems?
8 Do you mean to nonprofit engaged in education, do you mean
9 to private schools engaged in education? What do you mean?
10 I'm really unclear about that?

11 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

12 MR. LOHMAN: In attending all public school systems, I
13 would submit that maybe for clarification and possible
14 consensus by the group, if you substituted the word, "all
15 school systems" for basic education that would address what
16 my goal is, which I should think should be a goal of this
17 group. So then it would say one in which compulsory
18 education in all school systems is supported with 100
19 percent State funding.

20 MS. LUDWIG: Does that include --

21 MS. BEDLAND: Let's vote on whether or not it's a goal
22 or a mean.

23 THE MODERATOR: Are you ready to vote on this? Ellen.

24 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, would you help me to know
25 then, the existing support for himself comes from

1 municipalities and from the Federal Government and private,
2 right?

3 THE MODERATOR: No.

4 MS. LAYES: The existing condition now is what we're
5 going to be departing from another goal, and what we're
6 departing from is the reason why we're going towards this
7 goal. Could you elaborate?

8 MR. HONMAN: Yes. You have basically 52 school
9 districts in the State of Alaska. I think it's one, is
10 that right, Marshall? 21 of them supported hundred percent
11 by the State of Alaska. Now, when I say they're supported
12 a hundred percent by the State of Alaska, we do receive PL
13 874 impact monies that comes to the State, and that does
14 support the school district. We think of it as State
15 funded. I think the State ultimately views it in the
16 financing of the support of the school, that is State money,
17 although technically it is federal money.

18 We also in the 21 R&A districts receive special
19 and transitional funding through federal programs. But
20 they are entitled supplemental programs, but they are
21 special and transitional in the sense it's federal dollars
22 coming in generally on a grant for one year or three years,
23 as the worth of the program is evaluated that's either
24 implemented into the basic program or not renewed.

25 For the remaining districts, first-class cities

1 and about your boroughs, you receive the minimum of 97
2 percent of the full basic need. Then depending on what the
3 local tax evaluation and some of the other kinds of
4 considerations, they make up three percent or somewhat less
5 than three percent.

6 MR. HOPE: Stumpage fees.

7 MR. HOLMAN: Pardon?

8 MR. HOLMAN: Stumpage fees.

9 MR. HOLMAN: Yes, stumpage fees, that's a good point.

10 MS. LUDWIG: Am I correct that you're asking -- you
11 want to leave out the word "public" in school system.
12 You're in favor of hundred percent support on private
13 school systems also?

14 MR. HOLMAN: No, that's not the intent. One in which
15 compulsory education for all public school systems is
16 supported with 100 percent State funding.

17 Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: For the benefit of all, the
19 commissioner of education is here. I don't know whether we
20 want to drag this out anymore or not, but you're ready to
21 vote?

22 MS. LUDWIG: M-hm.

23 MR. TOMA: Okay, "One in which --

24 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

25 MR. FARUN: Well, the only reservation I would have

1 about that, and I don't know whether this is accurate or
2 not, but I strongly believe there should be some local
3 autonomy in the administration of the funds, and I don't
4 know what that would due to the local determination, and if
5 it's -- because a lot of times you have the federal monies
6 come down. They tell you how you spend it and they tell
7 you what you do with it. I think that's important. It's a
8 very important thing that we have that federal money. I
9 agree with it. But the fact that we do provide a little
10 bit, say, in our own community in Fairbanks, I think we're
11 able to determine a little bit where it goes. So I don't
12 know whether I'd go with a hundred percent, but I don't
13 know.

14 THE MODERATOR: We're going to have a choice of
15 whether you feel it's a goal or a means. So we will now --

16 MR. HAKUN: That's the question.

17 THE MODERATOR: That's the question. Are you ready to
18 vote? All those in favor of this statement, read it.

19 MR. TOMA: "One in which compulsory education in all
20 public school systems is supported with hundred percent
21 State funding."

22 THE MODERATOR: Now, you're voting on whether this is
23 a goal. If you vote it down, you put it into something
24 else, I guess. So all those in favor of it is a goal,
25 raise your hand.

1 MR. PILCHER: It's a goal, right.

2 THE MODERATOR: You're not in this group, are you?

3 MR. TOMA: Yes, she -- this lady in the red. Rev.

4 THE MODERATOR: Where have you been? I'm sorry, I got

5 thrown. All of you back there.

6 MR. PILCHER: It's a goal, okay.

7 THE MODERATOR: One, two, three, four, five, six,

8 seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven? Did I count you before?

9 Stand up.

10 (complying)

11 12. Now those opposed.

12 (Standing)

13 Seven. 13, 7.

14 MR. TOMA: There's a good basis for your minority

15 report there, too.

16 THE MODERATOR: It is now 4:30, almost 4:30.

17 MR. TOMA: I think we can stay till quarter of five if

18 we are fast about this.

19 THE MODERATOR: Are there any more goals in that

20 education?

21 MS. HEDLAND: We did adopt it as a goal?

22 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

23 MR. TOMA: Madam Chairman, if I may, if someone can

24 start getting this off --

25 THE MODERATOR: Weren't there a couple there that we

1 missed?

2 MR. TOMA: Just one that we passed by, and that was on
3 the bottom fisheries.

4 THE MODERATOR: I just don't want you to lose those
5 sheets when we move.

6 MR. TOMA: I won't lose them. I was hoping they could
7 be transcribed so we don't have to put them up.

8 MS. KINCKA: Before we get involved in talking about
9 these. Are we going to meet in the same room tonight that
10 we're in now?

11 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

12 MR. TOMA: For those who are leaving early, we're
13 going to 14 16, and we'll be up there in 15 to 20 minutes.
14 That's a large suite.

15 MR. KADEN: Who is taking down all this stuff? Are we
16 supposed to -- the editorial --

17 THE MODERATOR: Yes. Those sheets you will have.

18 MR. KADEN: Just take the sheets?

19 THE MODERATOR: Yes. The sheets you will have.

20 All right, where are we now? Are there any more
21 education?

22 MS. LINCOLN: Katy, there are two educational issues
23 that were --

24 THE MODERATOR: That's what I'm asking for.

25 MR. TOMA: As I understand it, these are means then.

1 THE MODERATOR: Not all of them.

2 MR. TOMA: Not all, okay.

3 THE MODERATOR: There's one up there about the one
4 system. That's not a means.

5 MR. TOMA: All educational funds be administered under
6 one department to eliminate duplication of programs.

7 THE MODERATOR: Isn't that yours, ahead?

8 MS. LINCOLN: Yes, it is.

9 THE MODERATOR:

10 MS. HUSE: Question. I'm not clear by what's meant by
11 all educational funds. Federal funds? State funds?
12 Private foundation funds?

13 MR. TOMA: We're only dealing with State, aren't we?

14 THE MODERATOR: I think what she's addressing is that
15 there are now in the State of Alaska two school systems,
16 there's the public -- the State schools and then there is
17 the B I A schools, and this is what she's addressing.
18 They're federal schools. Beg your pardon?

19 MR. HOPE: Community colleges. University.

20 THE MODERATOR: K through 12. That's true that may be
21 misleading there, you better say K through 12, otherwise
22 you're going to be saying there should be one system in the
23 whole university and over the --

24 MS. LINCOLN: Why don't we be consistent and put in
25 there "compulsory education"?

1 MR. HUSS: Because in the Department of Education
2 there is a section on adult continuing ed, too; is that
3 being included in there or (pause) --

4 MR. TOMA: All educational funds for compulsory
5 education be administered under one department to eliminate
6 duplication of programs.

7 THE MODERATOR: May I make a suggestion? Wouldn't it
8 be better to just come out and say what you really want to
9 say instead of beating around the bush and say there shall
10 be one school system and there will not be BIA schools or
11 something like that?

12 MR. HUSS: One school system isn't the right word
13 though. That means Kenai is with Fairbanks. I mean one
14 state-wide administration.

15 THE MODERATOR: Andy.

16 MR. HOPE: How would this affect Mt. Edgecumbe High
17 School? Would it allow nonnatives to attend Mount
18 Edgecumbe if the State took over the school? Right now
19 it's a segregated school.

20 THE MODERATOR: Certainly. I don't know how that
21 would be administered.

22 MR. HOPE: Would the BIA be willing to do this? They
23 have a trust responsibility to the natives, where the State
24 doesn't really have a trust responsibility. How would you
25 reconcile that? The Federal Government has a trust

1 responsibility, to provide certain things to the native
2 people.

3 THE MODERATOR: The constitution of the State of
4 Alaska says the State has a responsibility for educating
5 all the children of the State.

6 MR. ROPE: But what I'm saying is that you don't know
7 that the BIA would give up that trust responsibility.

8 THE MODERATOR: It's a goal. It's not a command.
9 It's a goal, if I may argue with you. I'm sorry, I should
10 be getting off of this chair. Georgianna.

11 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Madam Chairman, that's
12 exactly what I'm trying for bring out, your comment there,
13 why don't we say what we mean, in that it should be all one
14 State school system, that there are villages in my area
15 that have a BIA school that want the BIA school. That's
16 their choice. And because of that trust responsibility/
17 between Federal Government and the Indian people, they can
18 make that choice. And we shouldn't say that it shall be
19 all one system. You know, that there is a choice there if
20 we want.

21 MS. LINCOLN: If I may say something to that --

22 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

23 MS. LINCOLN: I don't mean to take the choice away
24 from the people in the villages. What I would like to see
25 is that both the BIA and the State get together and all the

1 knowledge that both of them have, get together instead of
2 duplicating services and programs, that there just be one
3 system. I in no way meant to take that choice away from
4 the people. What I was looking for is a betterment with
5 both educational systems.

6 MR. LUSK: Would it be possible to state it as
7 advisable to the fullest extent, possible coordination
8 between the existing systems rather than trying to get one
9 system?

10 THE MODERATOR: Stan?

11 MR. MACK: Madam Chairman, we discussed the other goal
12 there, we voted on, concerning the one up there, to all
13 which compulsory education is stressed, whatever.

14 MR. TOMA: Yes, right in here, compulsory education in
15 all --

16 MR. MACK: Can we relate this in with that goal that
17 we just passed?

18 THE MODERATOR: Hundred percent funding?

19 MR. MACK: We're talking strictly of, what is it?
20 public school being 100 percent funded, the BIA school
21 would be a private school, strictly financed. Are we
22 talking about two separate -- the State has no controls
23 over the BIA school. Therefore, we -- the way you have it
24 there, in your proposal, it's fine. But I couldn't quite
25 figure out where the -- to eliminate duplications of

1 programs come into effect. And then we got into the
2 discussion of the LJA versus the State. I believe we
3 should concern ourselves strictly with the state programs.

4 THE MODERATOR: Perhaps under one of these goals, it
5 would work that you could address that problem, ahead, as a
6 means of improving the delivery of education to communities,
7 that that is a way that that need could be met, to be sure
8 that there is more responsibility on both sides, so that
9 there isn't the duplication.

10 MS. LINCOLN: But what would that be a means to?

11 THE MODERATOR: I don't know which one of those goals
12 that you could use it for.

13 MS. LELLAND: To the first one, to basic academic and
14 life-coping competencies.

15 MR. KADEN: How important is this to the overall
16 picture of education in Alaska? I mean, is this a great
17 issue of import? There seems to be some --

18 THE MODERATOR: It's an important issue in the rural
19 part of the State. Edin comes from a place out of Nome,
20 and has served on the school board, and Georgianna --

21 MR. KADEN: But she's worrying about duplication of
22 services; is that correct?

23 THE MODERATOR: Kon.

24 MR. BOHMAN: I think it's an important issue, because
25 as it stands today, and Monday of next week, the Federal

1 Government is violating the State constitution, and I
2 understand the business of higher authorities, but the
3 point is, you come down and in several districts and in
4 several schools you have this problem. And it's creating a
5 great deal of disruption in the delivery system.

6 The Malahooch consent decree mandates that some
7 parents that want children educated at home, the State is
8 required to do so. We're in one of those situations where
9 we have to deliver several programs. In ten villages we
10 have the responsibility of the high school program and the
11 Bureau, because of the trust relationship and the self-
12 determination now have the authority for the elementary
13 program. We've been talking about it for better than 20
14 years. I don't know beyond that how long it had been
15 discussed. But it has been a goal. It has been a platform
16 on several state-wide offices to see that that end be
17 reached.

18 And I think maybe the suggestion that was made
19 would be that the State assume its constitutional
20 responsibility for educating all publicly-aged children.
21 Then you can discuss the other. But there is a specific
22 point. And I challenge anybody to show me in the State
23 right now where the BIA is delivering a better educational
24 system than what the State is. The monies are not there.
25 There are less advantages when you talk about handicapped

1 children, and the State having some requirements. In fact,
2 the State does require that handicapped children be
3 addressed from the year of one through 16 years old. So
4 other than attending them at high school for five hours a
5 day, those are about the very basic requirements. So I
6 think it would help a great deal, better than 50
7 communities in the State, if the constitution were
8 respected and honored and enforced.

9 THE MODERATOR: Are you saying then that you suggest
10 another goal there, that goal instead, or just use it as a
11 means? Keyword it?

12 MR. HOLMAN: Yes.

13 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

14 MR. MCPH: I think we really have to work with the
15 Federal Government on this issue. We can't ignore them,
16 because there's so much funding from the Federal Government
17 for education that comes down. And the one example that I
18 could think of where the BIA might be doing a better job is,
19 why is it enrollment in Mount Edgecumbe High School is
20 increasing if the State is doing such a fantastic job in
21 those new rural high schools?

22 THE MODERATOR: Gene.

23 MS. KINGRA: I have to ask a question as to who's
24 being served by the State taking over. I feel very
25 strongly about cultural communication and education, and

1 who is being served? Are the children to be educated being
2 served, or is the state being served? That's what I want
3 answered before I can vote on that.

4 THE MODERATOR: If I could add something that I'm --
5 maybe you are not aware of, that there are local boards
6 elected in all of these areas where the people serving on
7 almost -- Ron's more familiar with that than I am, but most
8 of the people serving on those boards are native Alaskans
9 from those villages who determine the policy in the schools.

10 MS. KINCA: But Georgianna brought up there were
11 villages in her area that felt very strongly about
12 continuing their own school.

13 THE MODERATOR: That's right.

14 MS. KINCA: That's what I'm addressing.

15 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I think we're talking about
16 coordination.

17 THE MODERATOR: Through the years since statehood
18 there have been many, many schools that have been taken
19 over by the -- the people in the villages have voted to
20 become a part of the State system, and that's the way they
21 do it.

22 MR. BOHMAN: To answer your first question: The
23 children would be the ones that would directly benefit from
24 all of this, in terms of special education programs that
25 the bureau does not provide. They just do not have them.

1 There's one down in the Bethel area. But I know there's
2 support in the State as well as the basic needs. The State
3 is supporting their schools much better than the borough is
4 now. I talked to Dr. Barlow right here in Anchorage, who
5 is the new director in Washington, D C, he assumed the
6 responsibility and he came to Anchorage and we discussed
7 some of these problems. He sees a gloomy future for Mount
8 Edgecumbe because of the lack of funding they're
9 anticipating.

10 I think your issue, your question about the
11 community vote -- I've gone through that for 13 years now.
12 Generally speaking, if the custodian and the cook are
13 making more money than what the state is, then the BIA
14 system is better. I know the delivery system for
15 instructional purpose cannot be denied. The State is doing
16 a much better fact, that's part of the factual information.
17 I think it's a credit to the educational in the state,
18 which Katy was Chairman of the Board for several years and
19 fought diligently for it. You can't deny the programic
20 needs. The State is providing much more.

21 THE MODERATOR: Are we ready? Where are we now? That
22 goal. What was the wording of that?

23 MS. HEDLAND: I liked his wording better than what's
24 up there.

25 THE MODERATOR: Read it.

1 MR. TOMA: "All educational funds for compulsory
2 education shall be participated under one department to
3 eliminate duplication of programs."

4 THE MODERATOR: Edin, would you accept the regions
5 that Ron has there? You read something a little bit ago,
6 Ron.

7 MR. HOLMAN: "The State assumes its constitutional
8 responsibility for educating all publicly aged children."

9 MS. HUNTER: All what?

10 MR. HOLMAN: Publicly aged children. I didn't know
11 whether that was right.

12 THE MODERATOR: Publicly aged.

13 MS. LAYES: Numerically.

14 MR. HOLMAN: Public school-aged children is a better
15 way of saying it.

16 THE MODERATOR: Do you all understand that? Are you
17 agreed --

18 MR. KELSEY: Question.

19 THE MODERATOR: -- that that should be a goal?

20 MR. KELSEY: Question.

21 THE MODERATOR: That is accepted. Will you get that
22 wording to the --

23 MR. TOMA: Is that replacing this?

24 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

25 MR. TOMA: I'll put Ron's initials down here.

1 THE MODERATOR: Scratch it out.

2 Is there any other -- is there another education
3 goal there, or are they all means?

4 MR. TOMA: This one here, I think, "alternative
5 methods of certification for teacher, teacher aides, in
6 rural areas."

7 THE MODERATOR: That's a means.

8 MR. TOMA: And how about establishing the student
9 exchange program? Is that a means?

10 THE MODERATOR: That's a means.

11 MR. TOMA: Okay.

12 THE MODERATOR: Is everything else accounted for?

13 MR. TOMA: And here we have "funds shall be made for
14 suitable buildings in which to teach."

15 MS. HEDLAND: That's a means.

16 THE MODERATOR: With what?

17 MR. TOMA: And "commitment to bilingual education."

18 MS. HEDLAND: That's a means.

19 MS. HUSS: Means.

20 THE MODERATOR: That's a means. What was the one
21 before that?

22 MR. TOMA: Funds for suitable buildings in which to
23 teach.

24 MR. KILCIER: That's a means.

25 THE MODERATOR: That's a means.

1 MR. TOMA: Okay. On the government.

2 THE MODERATOR: It's now quarter of five. Are we

3 going to have to move?

4 MR. TOMA: Let's stay here till they move it.

5 MR. KILCHER: I somehow disagree bilingual is means or

6 goal. I think it's a goal, but I won't argue about it.

7 MS. HEDLAND: It's a means.

8 MR. TOMA: Well, it's incorporated anyway.

9 THE MODERATOR: We got it, so we're going to use it.

10 Anybody else objecting? Georgianna.

11 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I'm not objecting, but

12 before you move on to education, Carolyn and I came up with

13 some new language on this one that we had some problems

14 with. I don't know if you just want us to submit it to the

15 group.

16 THE MODERATOR: Are you going to switch that one over

17 and put it in education?

18 MS. JONES: Yes.

19 THE MODERATOR: Unless it changes the meaning for the

20 group, the editorial changes can be made in the editing.

21 MR. TOMA: "The State should increase greatly the

22 amount of dollars going to the permanent fund. Oil

23 revenues should not be hastily exhausted, but conserved for

24 the future."

25 THE MODERATOR: Any objection? Carolyn?

1 MR. JONES: I suggest it be shifted to No. 8, economy.

2 MR. TOMA: Okay. Okay. Do you want to vote on it now
3 since we discussed it? Do you want to just vote on an
4 economy one right now?

5 THE MODERATOR: We better move on over, because --

6 MR. TOMA: "One in which there is a maximum of
7 flexibility in the types of government available on the
8 local level and where experimentation and the means by
9 which we govern ourselves is encouraged."

10 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

11 MR. KELSEY: I want a clarification. Do you envision
12 that there has to be enabling legislation on a new form,
13 new type of, because I don't think it's addressed at this
14 point.

15 MR. KADEN: That's the problem, is that the State
16 structure, the legislative structure or the legal structure
17 is such that it doesn't allow for any flexibility at all.
18 It has to fit into a certain type of governmental unit,
19 first, second-class city, or different types of boroughs.
20 There needs to be in other forms.

21 MS. HEDLAND: But those are real specific means of
22 achieving it, right?

23 MR. KADEN: Right, yes. I'm just saying that's the
24 reason.

25 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn, did you have a question?

1 MS. JONES: I just didn't understand it.

2 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection then to that as
3 a goal? Okay.

4 MR. TOMA: And decentralized State decision-making by
5 maximum local public involvement.

6 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that as a goal? John?

7 MS. HUSS: Would it be useful to say involvement and
8 control?

9 MR. TOMA: Involvement and control? Decentralized --

10 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

11 MS. HEDLAND: Is that not incorporated in what we just
12 passed?

13 MR. KADEN: No.

14 THE MODERATOR: No, according to Haden, it isn't.
15 It's his motion. His other goal.

16 MS. HEDLAND: Why isn't it? I don't care, the concept --

17 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to this now? Okay.
18 Let's go.

19 MR. TOMA: Okay. Under Economics, "The State should
20 increase greatly the amount of dollars going to the
21 permanent funds."

22 THE MODERATOR: Isn't there something more to that?

23 MR. TOMA: No?

24 MS. EYLEN: All revenues shall not be --

25 MR. TOMA: That seemed like a clause to me, all oil.

1 "The State should increase greatly the amount of dollars
2 going in the permanent funds. Oil revenues should not be
3 hastily exhausted but conserved for the future."

4 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that as a goal
5 statement?

6 Bev?

7 MS. ISENSEN: I object, you know, since we got the 900
8 million. Everyone talks about how we wasted it. We didn't.
9 We have a permanent fund now. We haven't been able to
10 figure out what to do with the permanent fund. In the
11 meantime, whenever we want to undertake the program we
12 really need, the excuse is, "Well, we haven't the money to
13 spend," or "We should be putting it in the permanent fund."
14 That is the argument I would hear when the Malahooch case
15 came up, and I thought it was really atrocious. The people
16 would want to put away money for the future, in addition to
17 what we're already putting away, when we're not meeting our
18 future needs. I think we're shorting ourselves and we're
19 shorting our children. If we think that putting money away
20 for the future is a good thing, while we don't even have
21 the kind of education we ought to have now or the kind of
22 health system.

23 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman, by restricting too great
24 a flow of money and by putting some away for the future,
25 hopefully intelligently that we don't lose any of it, we

1 create certain pressure for the people and the government
2 to be willing to look into ways of saving money. Money is
3 wasted within the operations and all the tightening of the
4 belts, a little depression is good once in awhile. The
5 people start to save money where it belongs in the
6 operation. 30 percent of the money that is wasted. I
7 don't want to use judicious words, what happened to the 900
8 million dollars? It would have happened if they didn't put
9 it in the permanent fund. Leave it there. Put more in.

10 THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

11 MR. BARON: Even if we put more money into the
12 permanent fund, I don't think we're going to be suffering
13 in depression. The point is, we've got so much money, I
14 don't think we know what we can do with all of it. We have
15 3.5 billion this year, and each year, successive years,
16 we're going to have more and more, and it's actually our
17 future to put away and save it.

18 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn, and then Ellen.

19 MS. JONES: The goal as stated doesn't say it's all
20 going into the permanent fund.

21 THE MODERATOR: No.

22 THE MODERATOR: Ellen.

23 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I think the -- our problem
24 is it's a negative statement. We will be committing some
25 of those funds to some of the means that we'll be

1 discussing later on. It's not that this is our only focus
2 is the future. We will be, and I think responsibly,
3 addressing, you know, our present needs and, therefore,
4 commitments of those funds. And it doesn't sound like
5 we're doing that here. But I think that that's why it's --
6 it's offensive in a sense, because it isn't positive in the
7 sense of responsible actions now. It just says "Should not
8 hastily -- "

9 THE MODERATOR: "The State should increase greatly
10 --"

11 MR. TOMA: This is the negative.

12 MS. HAYLES: It says "revenues should not be hastily."

13 THE MODERATOR: Oh, yes.

14 MS. HAYLES: That's where I think --

15 THE MODERATOR: What does it say?

16 MR. TOMA: Just say, "should be conserved for the
17 future," and instead of "hastily exhausted," just cross
18 that out. "Should be conserved for the future." "Oil
19 revenues should be conserved for the future."

20 THE MODERATOR: Is that agreeable with everyone, that
21 amendment?

22 MR. KILCHER: No.

23 THE MODERATOR: Maybe you changed it before people had
24 voiced themselves. Karen.

25 MS. HEDLAND: I would be in favor of scratching

1 everything, as Celia said, after in the permanent -- I
2 can't see it.

3 THE MODERATOR: Right. Fund. head -- in the
4 permanent fund.

5 MR. TOMA: "The State should increase greatly the
6 amount of dollars going into the permanent fund."

7 MS. HEDLAND: Period.

8 MR. KILCHER: Without moral icing.

9 MR. TOMA: There is a period there.

10 MS. HEDLAND: But I mean delete the rest of it.

11 THE MODERATOR: Andy before we do -- excuse me, finish
12 it.

13 MS. HEDLAND: To me that does not say you cannot spend
14 any of it for roads, if that's what you need, or a hospital,
15 or whatever, but it does say that you don't need to give it
16 away.

17 MR. KILCHER: Right.

18 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

19 MR. HOPE: Just a comment. We had a number of
20 resource people here, and some of these -- we're talking
21 about broad generalities, but they have some real
22 implications, and I wish we could have, you know, like
23 Milton Lipton was here, I wish he could have come in and
24 made a few comments on some of the implications that he
25 would think, and then Marshall listened on the education

1 issues. I'm sure maybe if we do this again, we could take
2 advantage of some of these resource people. I don't know
3 if they just come here to watch us or what, I think that's --
4 that's just a comment.

5 MR. TOMA: They were here to do that, but the way this
6 happened, they weren't here at the time these were being
7 discussed. They were all discussed at once.

8 THE MODERATOR: Now, we have before us this goal
9 statement. The suggestion has been made that we delete the
10 rest of it. Is there any objection to deleting that and
11 putting a period at fund and deleting the rest of that?

12 MR. KILCHER: Yes.

13 MR. JACK: I'm somewhat leery about the word greatly
14 increase.

15 THE MODERATOR: Greatly.

16 MR. JACK: Greatly increase, because, as everyone
17 recalled in the questionnaire that we filled out initially,
18 there were some substantial amounts of questions with
19 respect to the problem --

20 MR. KILCHER: Increase is sufficient.

21 MR. JACK: -- ranging from one-eighth to one-fourth to
22 one-half of the revenue.

23 THE MODERATOR: But what I was asking now whether
24 there was any -- you were not objecting to taking out of
25 the rest of that sentence?

1 MR. JACK: No.

2 THE MODERATOR: Now you have a suggestion that the
3 word "greatly" is maybe editorial icing.

4 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman, I support his idea there.
5 Increasing already is sufficient. Increasing, it means
6 growing. Cut greatly out, and everything after fund, after
7 the period. Second sentence, strike it all out.

8 THE MODERATOR: Do you agree all agree to take out the
9 word greatly? Should increase -- Carolyn?

10 MS. JONES: I don't know what to put in instead, but
11 once you take out the word greatly, it really weakens it.
12 Two dollars would be enough, I guess.

13 THE MODERATOR: "Substantially." How about "substantially"?

14 MR. KELSEY: That's better.

15 THE MODERATOR: "Substantially," I think, is a better
16 word than greatly.

17 MS. HEDLAND: That's still three dollars.

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

19 MR. KEENER: I just came back, I'm sorry, but there's
20 some of the things that they asked us to direct our
21 attention to in the original letter. Might not be able to
22 do both of these after we get through considering those
23 points for which we were brought here to consider.

24 THE MODERATOR: I don't think that --

25 MR. KEENER: I said it's a possibility. It might not

1 happen.

2 THE MODERATOR: Well, I think that this group can make
3 that decision whether they want to have this as a goal or
4 whether they don't want to have this as a goal, and that's
5 what's before us right now.

6 I believe that they're pushing us to get out of
7 here.

8 MS. HEDLARD: I remain convinced that one of the
9 things we are charged in that letter was Alaska's future,
10 and they're billing us on everything we carry around as
11 future frontiers, and I do not feel we should be limited by
12 what was dealt with in that letter.

13 MR. TOMA: Right.

14 MR. KELSEY: Let's have the question.

15 THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question is right now, read
16 it.

17 MR. TOMA: "The State should substantially increase
18 the amount of dollars going into the permanent fund."

19 THE MODERATOR: All in favor raise your hand.

20 (complying)

21 THE MODERATOR: Those opposed.

22 We have two in opposition.

23 MR. TOMA: I told them five minutes. Let's just stay.

24 THE MODERATOR: My only problem is, I don't want us to
25 be rushing and not giving thought to these just to get out

1 of here. If we could break now and come back or go
2 upstairs and finish.

3 MR. TOMA: We have 1416.

4 THE MODERATOR: Where is it, 1416?

5 Please, everyone go up there so we can finish
6 these goals today.

7 And our schedule is that we are to come back at
8 eight o'clock, and we should work until six. I think if we
9 go up there now, we should be able to finish this by six
10 o'clock and give us a two-hour break for dinner and then
11 come back. But we need your cooperation of really moving.

12 (RECESS: Five o'clock)

13 (Whereupon the Gamma group reconvened in Room 1416)

14 THE MODERATOR: I'll stand out here so we can talk. I
15 know all of you can't see this goal list, but I think we'll
16 just go ahead without the facilitator.

17 MR. KADEN: He said he wasn't going to be here.

18 THE MODERATOR: So that under economy, which is where
19 we are, "One which provides maximum possible self-sufficiency
20 by and for the people through the encouragement of small-scale,
21 self-sustaining business, agriculture, manufacturing, and
22 resource and energy utilization."

23 Is there any objection to that as a goal?

24 MS. JOHNSON: Katy, I'm sorry, can you read the first
25 part of that again?

1 THE MODERATOR: "One which provides the maximum
2 possible self-sufficiency by and for the people through the
3 encouragement of small-scale self-sustaining business."

4 I believe this is Haden Kaden's. Isn't this
5 yours? We had it, but we didn't have it all written out on
6 the board this morning.

7 Anybody want to ask any questions or do you have
8 any objections?

9 It's a goal.

10 "Responsible fiscal actions be applied to all
11 goals suggested herein." And I know who this is, John
12 Kelsey's. Any objection?

13 Okay. I didn't see any hands.

14 You want some more, David?

15 MR. KEENLE: Just a comment. There's another
16 government form, or direction we might also want to -- well,
17 there was.

18 MS. KINGRA: They have gone with the Editorial
19 Committee to bring it back to us tonight.

20 THE MODERATOR: But there were some other ones that we
21 hadn't acted on on that list we passed over.

22 MR. KADEN: There were? On seven.

23 MR. HUSS: We did that, and we moved permanent fund
24 over.

25 THE MODERATOR: I thought there was one earlier one.

1 There was one, I know.

2 Okay, David, what is your problem?

3 MR. KEENER: No, I'm just I -- I -- forget it.

4 THE MODERATOR: Well, actually, what this is is not
5 necessarily a goal, John, if I may comment, seems to me
6 what you want, because those other statements are long-range
7 goals. What you're saying is that you want to be sure that
8 all of the actions that are taken by this group, that are
9 the wrong -- am I wrong in interpreting you?

10 MR. KELSEY: It's certainly a goal. If we're not
11 going to act in a responsible manner, then we -- we're not
12 going to leave anything for the future generations, and I
13 think it's certainly a goal.

14 THE MODERATOR: Well, I guess what bothers me is the
15 "suggested herein" is what makes me sort of look at it; it
16 narrows it.

17 MR. KELSEY: I guess I'm trying to apply it to all the
18 goals that we have.

19 THE MODERATOR: "Responsible fiscal action be applied
20 to all goals," period. Wouldn't that be better than to say
21 "suggested herein"? Or does that bother anybody else?

22 MR. MATHIESEN: Well, it should be incorporated in the
23 first one. If we're going to stimulate the economy with
24 some type of thing, well, we should have it fiscally
25 responsible of some sort, I think probably is what is

1 trying to be accomplished here. We don't want to encourage
2 a business scale that is not a responsible thing, just for
3 the -- just for encouraging a business.

4 THE MODERATOR: Okay. When if we leave it up to the
5 editors editing to be be sure it makes sense with all of
6 our other goals, is that okay then?

7 MR. KADEN: Is that to apply as well to government
8 action?

9 MR. KELSEY: Absolutely.

10 MR. KADEN: That's what I was thinking you meant. It
11 was not just to stimulation of the economy, but --

12 THE MODERATOR: Well, that's why I was worried about
13 those two words, "suggested herein," that's why I brought
14 that up.

15 MR. KELSEY: You know, I didn't have it under economy.
16 I was talking about the suggestions in toto.

17 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Georgianna.

18 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I would not want that to be
19 a cop-out for the State to say on any of the goals that,
20 "Well, this would not be a responsible fiscal action on our
21 part if we went ahead with it." Some of the goals were so
22 strong, and I think that the objectives to reach those
23 goals are going to be equally strong, and I don't want them
24 to use that as a cop-out of why they can't do that, because
25 we want responsible fiscal action with each one, and

1 they're going to measure that. I would be very worried
2 about that being incorporated.

3 MR. KELSEY: May I respond to that?

4 THE MODERATOR: Yes, John.

5 MR. KELSEY: Well, I think that we -- I had the
6 feeling that we have been somewhat irresponsible in the
7 past and I submit that the increase in the budget has over
8 the last ten or fifteen years demonstrates that, and I
9 think that we should consciously be responsible, more
10 responsible, than we have in the past in the spending of
11 the money. I just would have to feel that if we're not
12 going to be responsible, then we're going to be
13 irresponsible. I think we should say so.

14 THE MODERATOR: Does anyone have any problem with this
15 as a goal?

16 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I do.

17 THE MODERATOR: Yes, I meant anyone else. I'm sorry,
18 Georgianna. Anyone else?

19 MS. HAYES: Could I have it read again? I can't see
20 it very well.

21 THE MODERATOR: "Responsible fiscal actions be applied
22 to all goals suggested herein."

23 MS. LINCOLN: I have a little problem with that in
24 that all of what we're doing is going to the legislature,
25 right, for their review?

1 THE MODERATOR: I don't know. I gather that's what
2 the message was, that this is being done to help the
3 legislature make decisions.

4 MS. LINCOLN: Right. Well, I don't know if it's
5 really that important, but it would seem like having
6 something like that to show to them would maybe suggest
7 that we're saying they're not fiscally responsible.

8 MR. KELSEY: That's what I'm saying

9 THE MODERATOR: I think that's what John's been saying,
10 they haven't been in some cases.

11 MR. KELSEY: Absolutely.

12 THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry, did you speak already,
13 David? No, go ahead David.

14 MR. KEENER: I was just going to say that in the same
15 light it shows we're concerned about our own judgment as
16 far as fiscal responsibility in our suggestions, in that
17 that adds validity to the thought that not only do we want
18 certain ideas about the native life being sustained, but we
19 also have in the back of our mind the fiscal responsibility
20 of this type of thing.

21 THE MODERATOR: Whether we're making the decisions as
22 to the means of carrying out all the goals?

23 MR. KEENER: Yes, right.

24 THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

25 MR. HARUN: It really all comes down to what you mean

1 by responsible. You know, the goal in general is a good
2 one, and it just depends on what the means are as to
3 whether I would agree with it all the time. So I would go
4 along with it, and I have no problem with it being applied
5 to all the different goals, but it just depends on what the
6 means are that we come up with to institute that fiscal
7 responsibility.

8 MR. KELSEY: That's right.

9 MS. HAYES: I'll support it because it is responsible
10 and we have -- there are things that need to be taken care
11 of by the State with funds that we have, and it requires
12 spending as well as not spending.

13 MR. KELSEY: Sure, absolutely.

14 MR. MATHIESEN: I could give a good example of that,
15 if you want to hear it.

16 THE MODERATOR: Okay, Andy.

17 MR. MATHIESEN: A few years ago we had a bond issue
18 that provided funds for port facilities, and our town of
19 Petersburg was eligible for something over a million
20 dollars to put in a port facility. We put in the port
21 facility because we didn't want to let the million get by.
22 We didn't need the port facility. What we needed was
23 facilities to tie up fishing boats, but the restrictions on
24 the port facility didn't allow it to be used for that. So
25 we have what could be called another boondoggle, simply

1 because a chamber-type didn't want to let that million in
2 construction get by. It ended up two million, and I don't
3 think that's fiscal responsibility.

4 MR. HOPE: Same thing happened in Sitka.

5 THE MODERATOR: Beg your pardon?

6 MR. HOPE: Same thing happened in Sitka, too.

7 MR. HUSS: The Editing Committee is not here, right?

8 THE MODERATOR: One of the members of the Editing
9 Committee is.

10 MR. HUSS: I think rather than "goal" would be "recommendation"
11 because our goals aren't spending money. It's our
12 recommendations that we are going to spend money.

13 THE MODERATOR: I was going to make the suggestion
14 this be part of the preamble of our report.

15 MR. KELSEY: That's what I was going to do, Madam
16 Chairman.

17 THE MODERATOR: Because it just somehow doesn't sound
18 like -- we're supposed to be looking to the future in a
19 long-term goal. It is a goal, but it seems to me to make
20 more sense if it were part of the preamble, but that's up
21 to the body.

22 MR. JACK: So moved.

23 MS. JONES: Second it.

24 THE MODERATOR: What? I didn't hear the move. Did
25 somebody move?

1 MS. JONES: Carl moved.

2 THE MODERATOR: Andy? Who moved?

3 MR. LARON: Carl moved.

4 THE MODERATOR: Oh, Carl, to make this a part of the
5 opening statement regarding our report?

6 MR. JACK: Yes.

7 THE MODERATOR: Are you all agreed with that?

8 MR. KELSEY: I want a clarification. Is it going to
9 say it is a goal? Or are we going --

10 THE MODERATOR: We're going to vote on it right now so
11 it can be --

12 MR. KELSEY: I mean in the preamble. How is it going
13 to be couched?

14 MR. KEENER: It's a goal of both our movement and what
15 we recommend for the government.

16 MR. BLISS: That's a great point.

17 THE MODERATOR: Part of our recommendations as to what
18 the future should be, and it could -- yes, it could be a
19 goal, but it doesn't seem to be under economy, I guess is
20 what's bothering me.

21 MR. BLISS: It will carry the same weight as a goal
22 though.

23 MR. KELSEY: Okay, that's my point.

24 THE MODERATOR: That's the main thing, the Editing
25 Committee.

1 MR. KELSEY: I don't want the meaning to get lost in
2 the couching of it.

3 THE MODERATOR: We don't need a motion, I don't think,
4 to say where it should go. I want to know whether you
5 support this as being something that the body, this group,
6 wants to go on record as saying. Is there anyone who
7 objects to this?

8 MR. KELSEY: Question.

9 THE MODERATOR: Georgianna? One objection.

10 Okay, we go on to "fishery resources should be
11 made available for local consumption. Why can it and ship
12 it out?"

13 MS. HUNTER: I don't think that's a goal, Madam
14 Chairman, frankly. Seems to me that's an economic fact of
15 life and, you know, --

16 THE MODERATOR: What fishery resources should be made
17 available for local consumption?

18 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman?

19 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

20 MS. HAYES: I think it -- this falls in with my other,
21 hm, goal and that is, you know, the small agriculture
22 places for self-sufficiency. Those things that are natural
23 to the area and can be grown in the area should be
24 available to us in the State. We shouldn't have to import
25 everything, like, you know, people who come to Alaska think

1 they're going to be able to get king crabs at the king crab
2 capital. They can't. They think that because they're in
3 southeast, they could go and -- to the market and buy fresh
4 local things. You really can't. None of the things, you
5 know, and maybe that's the rule and very acceptable, but I
6 think this says that the markets, you know, for the
7 fisheries, whatever it brings, could be available for local
8 consumption. It is available, but through Seattle.

9 THE MODERATOR: Well, are you saying then that you
10 don't believe it's a goal; it may be a means of achieving
11 the number -- the first goal?

12 MS. LAYES: Maybe it fits right in with the other
13 sentence.

14 THE MODERATOR: Yes. David.

15 MR. KEENER: Of course, this is what I do, so I know
16 that it's available. The reason why it's not available as
17 much as you would expect it to be is because either the
18 people here catch their fish on subsistence and use it
19 themselves, or else they aren't going to pay the price,
20 because they think it should be at such -- a much lower
21 price. They feel that because it's here, it should be
22 exempt from the overall economy of the world. And it
23 happens in apples, it happens in -- down in California you
24 can't get a head of lettuce down where you grow thousands
25 of them, because you get second-rate lettuce because people

1 think they should be getting it for much less.

2 It's just like Celia said. It's a fact of life.

3 MS. KINGRA: I have to disagree with you, because I
4 resent paying more for king crab or fish here in Fairbanks
5 or even on Kodiak than I have to pay back in Philadelphia
6 or Stone Harbor, New Jersey, where I came from, and that's
7 a fact of life. I pay a lot more for stuff caught right
8 off our shores here than I paid for it back there.

9 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

10 MR. HOPE: The way I interpret it would be to keep the
11 resources, channel them to American markets, instead of
12 channeling them to, say, the Korean market or the Japanese
13 market, and then be dependent on the fluctuations of their
14 economy. Right now that's where a lot of our fish is going
15 to, to the Japanese market, and not too much to the
16 American market. I know that the fishermen are working on
17 that problem, but I think that, you know, that could be a
18 goal.

19 THE MODERATOR: Celia?

20 MS. HUNTER: Well, I just think it's -- usually there
21 are places where you can find these products at less money.
22 I go to a fish wheel up in Fairbanks and get my fish. I
23 think, you know, I was just reading, I was going to New
24 Zealand, I was reading some of the facts of life down in
25 New Zealand, and down there they claim they can't get top-

1 quality lamb; it's all exported.

2 These are the things that you can't really
3 legislate, because it's simply an economic condition, and I
4 think you've got to somehow develop the market here and I'm
5 not going to buy Alaskan salmon at the prices they want for
6 it. Not when it goes through the processing. I'll just
7 not eat salmon. You know, it's a product of inflation and
8 a lot of other things.

9 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

10 MR. HARUN: I wrote the thing and it's exactly why --
11 we both live in Fairbanks. Not only, you know, can you not
12 afford it; they don't even have it in the store. They just
13 don't have it there. The resource is not available. Not
14 only do we import everything we eat and live on, we export
15 everything else we've got left, and it just disturbs me.

16 MS. HUNTER: How are you going to change it?

17 MR. HARUN: It disturbs me. Maybe it is a means, if
18 you're going to category it towards self-sufficiency, but
19 it seems to me we can encourage a State policy which would
20 somehow try to develop those market instate. Because I'm
21 sure they exist. Maybe we don't want to pay the prices.
22 Maybe also that's somewhere the State could step, too? I
23 don't know. It's something we'd have to analyze as far as
24 the fiscal responsibility of something like that --

25 MR. KEENER: Just one small statement is that

1 businesses in America in general take a larger percent at
2 the retail level than at the wholesale. We wholesale at a
3 price that is very low compared to what you're paying.
4 They increase the price at the retail store by 200 percent,
5 because I know what we sell it for and I know what they're
6 on the market for.

7 If you could buy from Lavco down here, which you
8 can't, because it's a wholesaler, you would be surprised
9 how cheap you could get it for, but it's just -- in other
10 countries, like in Japan, they take our fish, they put them
11 on an open market, and it's a fish market, starts at five
12 in the morning, and you pay just about maybe five percent
13 over what it cost them to get it there, which is cheap.
14 And then it goes into the retail markets and their mark-up
15 is only about 20 percent. But here the mark-up is very
16 high.

17 THE MODERATOR: Does anyone else have anything to say
18 on this?

19 MR. MATHIESEN: I think it's a problem, but I'd like
20 to move we just strike that and move on.

21 MR. KEENEK: Second.

22 THE MODERATOR: Maybe we can work it in as a means.

23 MR. HUSS: It's a resource anyway, so it fits the
24 other one. I think it got too --

25 THE MODERATOR: Was that the only one we had?

1 MS. JONLS: Yes, there was only one sheet.

2 THE MODERATOR: There was another one left.

3 MS. JONLS: There's another one.

4 THE MODERATOR: I hope we have a majority here. I
5 guess we do, of our group. There were 23 before.

6 MS. JONES: We have 18.

7 THE MODERATOR: Okay, community development. "The
8 State should discourage urban sprawl and strip commercial
9 development through a massive commitment to reshift
10 transportation funding from projects which promote
11 automobile dependence to mass transportation."

12 Any objections?

13 THE MODERATOR: Carried.

14 MR. KEENER: I totally disagree with the whole thing.
15 The State stepping into the private sector of development
16 totally disagrees with the natural concept of the way -- of
17 the development of the natural process in the private
18 enterprise. Transportation is expensive, and if what is
19 being said is "Let's create transportation, so that people
20 can move out into the outer lying districts and develop
21 those," where in actuality the center of the mass of people
22 is in one area, it's going to cost more because of the
23 costs of the transportation. It's not a natural balance.

24 THE MODERATOR: Andy.

25 MR. HOPE: It's negatively worded, which is, I don't

1 know --

2 THE MODERATOR: What?

3 MR. HOPE: It's negatively worded, which I thought was
4 against the policy.

5 THE MODERATOR: Right.

6 MR. HOPE: However, if you're going to have a hundred
7 percent subsidessides on Marine Highway system in
8 Southeast, it's okay.

9 THE MODERATOR: Beverly?

10 MS. ISENSEN: I don't know if any other cities have
11 much in the way of mass -- internal mass transit systems,
12 but here in Anchorage, we have a bus system and it is
13 largely funded by the Federal Government, and because the
14 federal bureaucracy moves so slowly, we are about 20 buses
15 behind than we would like to. Our ridership on the bus
16 system has risen by about 35 percent over the last year,
17 and we are the second fastest growing mass transit city in
18 the nation.

19 And what this means is that instead of putting
20 more federal and State and local money into roads, making
21 two-lane roads to four-lane and four-lane to six-lane and
22 so on, and having more people want more parking lots, which
23 aren't particularly attractive and really not the best use,
24 what we've got is a lot of people who are climbing on the
25 bus at 7:30 in the morning. Mass transit has made an awful

1 lot of difference to this community in the last year and
2 probably will continue to. And while it is expensive, it
3 is less expensive than doing the other things you have when
4 every individual wants to drive around in a car all by
5 herself or himself.

6 THE MODERATOR: Edin?

7 MS. LINCOLN: I have a problem with the first part of
8 that statement "The state should discourage urban sprawl,"
9 because I envision if people are going to come into an a
10 city or a town, they're going to come in anyway, and if you
11 restrict where they're going to set their house on, you end
12 up with nothing but slums.

13 MR. BUSS: Nothing but what?

14 MR. KEENER: Slums.

15 MR. FARON: The point is, that statement isn't telling
16 people where you place your house and where you develop.
17 The fact is the government is encouraging by their present
18 highway policies strip development project. Who wants to
19 live on a four-lane? That's the case in Fairbanks. You
20 have a two-lane road with houses on it, you put a -- it's
21 going to go commercial, you naturally lose the downtown
22 core, because there's nowhere else to go.

23 The point was, why you don't let private
24 enterprise take its course? But the fact is in the
25 interior of Alaska we're spending about a hundred million a

1 year on highway construction. We spend about a million on
2 public transit. Of that, the local government puts in
3 about 200,000 of that. If we put one-tenth the effort we
4 put into highways into incorporating the highways for
5 transit purposes, bus turnouts, new buses, we'd have a
6 system that would be so fantastic that everyone would want
7 to ride it. And it just seems to be a never-ending thing.
8 There are alternative ways of developing, and the fact that
9 is that in Alaska, in fact, in Fairbanks, many of us refer
10 to Anchorage Los Anchorage, because it's gone that
11 direction, it's gone like Los Angeles. There's many ways
12 urbanize. You can consolidate your commercial. You have
13 green belts. You have mass transportation. There are ways
14 of organizing. You can fit 400,000 people here a lot
15 better than the 200,000 that live here now. That is the
16 basic point, that we as an American culture, as an Alaskan
17 culture, have got to get into it a little bit differently
18 than being a carbon copy of Los Angeles or the Lower 48.
19 That's why I support that.

20 THE MODERATOR: Chris.

21 MS. JOHNSON: I would like to see the first part of
22 that, which is -- stricken, which is in my opinion is
23 editorializing, and could we just say it should be the
24 State's policy to shift transportation funding from
25 projects? Do you see the cut I'm making?

1 MR. HARUN: Well, we should editorialize, I think.
2 It's a statement of values.

3 THE MODERATOR: I was going to suggest maybe you have
4 two subjects in there.

5 MR. HARUN: Yes.

6 THE MODERATOR: And maybe you should address the mass
7 transportation as one and then the other one could come
8 under a statement that had to do with the State handling
9 planning and zoning, which would certainly make the
10 difference. That was my suggestion.

11 MR. KELSEY: Madam Chairman, back to what Andy was
12 saying though. I don't think we should take a negative
13 point of view. Let's say we encourage something, rather
14 than discourage something.

15 THE MODERATOR: It's more encourage than he wants. He
16 wants the state to really --

17 MR. HARUN: I think there's a real problem in this
18 State. I think the problem of our urban area is that we're
19 allowing them to go to rack and ruin. We're not taking
20 care of them. I think it's a negative thing we're doing.
21 I think we should point it out to the legislature and say,
22 "Look, it needs some attention. Fairbanks, here's the
23 problem," everybody agrees. Chuck Konigsberg said the
24 other day, "Oh, yes, we want a livable city, a livable
25 environment, but when we come to the specifics, we back off."

1 we're not willing to support it." I think this is
2 something that's got to take both local and State action to
3 solve. It's one of the major problems in the State,
4 because if you don't check urbanization, if you don't care
5 to take quality urbanization, then you're going to have it
6 splintering all over to the hinterlands. People want to
7 move out to the Mat-Su Valley and you see the same thing,
8 Rabbit Creek, Eka or Cold Stream in Fairbanks, Gustavus,
9 because they want no State lands out there, they want to
10 get out of this mess. They come to Alaska because they
11 want a better life-style. What do we do? We create the
12 same thing. I think the legislature has to be made aware
13 of that and correct it.

14 THE MODERATOR: But, Andy, I think, made the point.
15 We have have been trying to make all our statements maybe
16 positive statements. If you could turn it around and make
17 it a positive statement and say what you're meaning is a
18 criticism that --

19 MR. HOPE: You know, traditionally, too, whenever
20 you're making a -- writing a resolution or --

21 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

22 MR. HOPE: -- it has to be stated positively.

23 MR. HARUN: What actually is technically stated
24 positively. It doesn't say "not" in it.

25 THE MODERATOR: Except it's in shift.

1 MR. HOPE: Why is it in transportation? Cumulative
2 development?

3 THE MODERATOR: David.

4 MR. KLENER: I don't know. My -- I studied some
5 history, and a lot of it was industrialization of the U S
6 society. What we found in New York, back in the early days,
7 was a small cottage environment inside the city. And it
8 shifted to mass transit trains, because people wanted to
9 live outside the city and commute into the city on mass
10 transportation and have a centralized urban development.

11 Then the businesses started moving out closer,
12 because they didn't want to make this long trip. The
13 businesses -- in the present day, you'll find the Sears
14 Mall; they moved clear out to Northern Lights. The
15 Boniface Parking Center; they're expanding to get closer to
16 the residential centers. And what happens is, that what's
17 left downtown is so far away and removed from the mass
18 people, that it creates a problem where it's not a
19 desirable place to live.

20 I think here in Anchorage they're having a
21 problem trying to keep the downtown area downtown. They're
22 having problems with parking lots.

23 Maybe, Bev, maybe you could expand on this, but
24 if you're going to say, "We want mass transit to alleviate
25 the problems of the sprawling city," it just compounds it.

1 No. 1, green belts and public systems back then, only the
2 most affluent people could afford them. And all the
3 housing projects, it is green belt housing projects, began
4 with a level of income to afford it. And if you're going
5 to do this, you're limiting it to the level of income also.

6 THE MODERATOR: I think that you want mass transit not
7 just because of the urban sprawl, but because it helps
8 people.

9 MR. KELNER: Right, right.

10 MR. HARUN: There's many reasons for wanting transit.

11 THE MODERATOR: Right. I think what all of you are
12 saying is that your statement should, you know, Chris's
13 suggestion, take out that first part so that you have the
14 emphasis on what you really mean.

15 MR. HARUN: As the maker of it I'm trying to say
16 something different than maybe what you're saying. There
17 are many reasons for supporting transit, but what I'm
18 saying is that the leading determinant of urbanization in
19 this state is our transportation systems. The leading
20 cause of everything that we've got is the way in which we
21 have -- develop our transportation systems. The same thing
22 we were talking about Wasilla the other day. They didn't
23 put a bypass through there the way they directed. The road
24 encouraged that strip commercialization.

25 THE MODERATOR: I know.

1 MR. BARON: That transportation should be addressed,
2 but somewhere I think we got to address the question of
3 urban roads.

4 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

5 MR. MATHIESEN: I have some wording you just might
6 think about that perhaps might accomplish that, "And that
7 the State should encourage alternatives to transportation
8 dependent upon automobiles."

9 Does that help your situation any?

10 MR. BARON: Yes.

11 MR. MATHIESEN: Because as an example, an alternative
12 to having these massive highways getting to the country
13 might even be more apartment complexes downtown that are
14 attractive that do not even require an automobile at all,
15 things of that sort. It's an alternative that does not
16 necessarily mean more of --

17 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That sounds good.

18 THE MODERATOR: We're getting bogged down again in an
19 issue that is important, but I would like us to try to
20 resolve it. Chris.

21 MS. JOHNSON: I have two things. One of them is a
22 message from Chip and I wanted to give it now before I go.
23 he says that Room 305 has a conference table and he thinks
24 it will handle all of us and that we can move down there to
25 start again at eight o'clock, if you would prefer, or we

1 could come back to this room or we could divide into groups.
2 That was his groups.

3 THE MODERATOR: I don't want us to divide into groups,
4 or ever really, but -- I mean that's my --

5 MS. JOHNSON: I just wanted to tell you it was
6 available.

7 THE MODERATOR: 305 is a lot better than this setup.

8 MS. JOHNSON: It does have a conference table.

9 MR. HOPE: It has a bar in it.

10 THE MODERATOR: We'll need that.

11 MS. JOHNSON: I wanted to make one point. It seems to
12 me that several of these points in this area could be
13 grouped. It seems like we're talking in a way about means,
14 that mass transportation is again a means. And it seems to
15 me that one statement that we're trying to make, and I like
16 the wording that you used is, we would like the State to
17 assist us in quality urbanization. And then I see mass
18 transportation as a means in this regard. I don't know.
19 Carl.

20 MR. JACK: Just a comment first to qualify my
21 statement. I'm not speaking against this goal here. A
22 question just came around. I'm just thinking out loud.
23 We're talking about government and its regulatory authority
24 and we seem to be talking about cares of government here,
25 where we have a State dictating, to a borough where the

1 borough may have that regulatory authority, too.

2 MR. ISENSEN: In the case of Anchorage, the State has
3 done very little to help reverse the decline of downtown,
4 and much to help create another Los Angeles. And so a
5 statement like that, maybe Andy's wording would be
6 sufficiently broad so it's applicable for any community,
7 whether it's a village or a state, but I feel very strongly
8 we need something as an example of what the State is doing.
9 They have a -- They're looking for office space now for 400
10 employees and their ad says "Any place outside of a two-mile
11 radius of downtown," which is crazy.

12 THE MODERATOR: I didn't get your wording, Andy. Can
13 you say it?

14 MR. MATLIESEN: Well, if it is in fact you wanted, you
15 know, to change the auto dependent type of highway, well,
16 then we should encourage alternatives to transportation,
17 that is, modes or access that are dependent upon auto type
18 transportation, because there's a jillion alternatives to
19 that, and if you just leave it up to the State, why, the
20 highway department is part of the State. The they think
21 the urban center is cloverleafs and underpasses and over-
22 passes and God knows what known to man.

23 MR. HUSS: I think Chris's definition was even broader
24 than and better than that, the "One where," said, "the State
25 should strive to help the cities achieve an equality

1 urbanization," or something like that.

2 MR. BARON: Yes, that's good.

3 MS. HAYES: Then you could have means under that; is
4 that right?

5 MR. HUSS: All these, like alternatives to the
6 automobile, green belts, all that could be the alternatives
7 to what we have now, and that would be --

8 MR. KELSEY: Means.

9 MR. HUSS: Means, that's what I mean to say.

10 THE MODERATOR: The State should strive to achieve a
11 quality urbanization.

12 MS. KINGRA: To assist.

13 THE MODERATOR: The State should assist --

14 MS. KINGRA: In quality urbanization.

15 MR. BARON: What you're trying say is quality with
16 urbanization is taken. You don't want quality.

17 THE MODERATOR: It's difficult to try to amend this
18 from the floor. Do you think you could take it back and
19 come up with a -- now that you've heard what everybody is --
20 everybody is happy with the idea, but they don't like the
21 language there.

22 "The State should assist --

23 MS. KINGRA: There was something else in there besides
24 the State should assist in achieving quality urbanization.

25 MR. HUSS: Just cities in achieving. That way it

1 would put in the cities.

2 THE MODERATOR: The State should assist cities or
3 communities.

4 MS. ISENSEN: Communities, communities.

5 MR. HARUN: Quality urbanization taking place.

6 THE MODERATOR: Everybody is telling me what it was
7 and I can't get it.

8 What is the language you prefer?

9 MR. HARUN: Well, the State should assist in achieving
10 quality in urbanization, or a quality where urbanization is
11 taking place. Quality development.

12 THE MODERATOR: This is what I'm saying. You know, to
13 try to get this. I mean without having it written down.
14 Could we -- could I ask you to come back with it at eight
15 o'clock?

16 MR. HARUN: Sure.

17 THE MODERATOR: Now, these other --

18 MR. KELSEY: Do you want to vote on that, on the
19 concept. I think we're agreed on that pretty well.

20 THE MODERATOR: The concept of mass transit?

21 MR. KEENER: Sure, sure.

22 MS. DAVES: No it's not true mass transit we've been
23 talking about.

24 THE MODERATOR: No. 1, I don't like to vote on the --

25 MR. HUSS: We got to vote on the one you got basically,

1 those are going to be our means. That's going to be our
2 goal, what you have down basically.

3 THE MODERATOR: I'm not sure I have it. "The State
4 should assist cities in achieving quality urbanization."

5 MR. HUSE: Something like that. I mean let Kevin edit
6 and we'll vote on that concept.

7 THE MODERATOR: Okay, any objection to that as a goal?
8 Okay. Do you have it? for your editing?

9 MR. KADEN: (nodding head)

10 THE MODERATOR: "The State should consolidate State
11 land disposals to discourage further strip
12 commercialization and sprawl and rural areas along the
13 State highway system."

14 Any comments?

15 MR. KADEN: I think that that is a much bigger issue
16 than just the sprawl along the highways. I think what has
17 happened the State is disposing of huge quantities of land
18 without any planning at all, and they haven't looked --
19 they haven't looked at the effects, the social, economic,
20 any other effect upon the areas in which they're disposing
21 of land. So I mean that's part of the same problem. But
22 it's a much greater problem than just that. I mean it's
23 one that bush people are experiencing, urban people,
24 everybody's getting nailed by this -- these land disposal.

25 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

1 MR. HOPE: I'd like to know if there really is a
2 problem. You know, this is why we need resource people
3 here. I'd be making a judgment in ignorance if I -- you
4 know, because I haven't been up to Vasilva lately or
5 wherever this was supposed to be happening, and I thought
6 that the thrust of the lands legislation was to turn over
7 lands to the local municipalities or whatever, boroughs,
8 then they could --

9 THE MODERATOR: That's only one portion of their land
10 disposal.

11 MR. HOPE: See, like I say, I'm ignorant on it.

12 THE MODERATOR: Georgie.

13 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) In the interior, I don't
14 like the wording that the State should consolidate state
15 land disposals, because the areas that we're having
16 problems with is, if you consolidate the State land
17 disposal and you put in a tract that would accommodate 20
18 people in an urban -- I mean, excuse me, a rural area or a
19 village, it says the whole concept of what that village is,
20 and in fact the voting population at times is even greater
21 than the village itself. And it -- so I'm strongly opposed
22 to consolidating the State land disposal. It has a
23 detrimental effect on our villages.

24 THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

25 MR. TALUN: That one was just meant in reference for

1 communities along the State highway system, such as
2 Cantwell and --

3 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) To the case.

4 MR. BARON: To the case.

5 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) To the case is one of our
6 villages.

7 MR. BARON: What they had planned, it varies I guess
8 from community to community. I guess the point is, as
9 Haden was saying, there could be a lot more local
10 involvement in these land disposals before they take place.

11 THE MODERATOR: Well, one of the things they're doing
12 is putting land at disposal out there where there are no
13 roads or anything to it, and the next thing you know you'll
14 have people there and they'll be asking for all of the
15 kinds of services that are available close in, schools,
16 roads and so forth, without -- I think that's one of the
17 things that you were talking about, in that it needs to be
18 a broader issue. John.

19 MR. KELSEY: That's precisely where we are. Where I
20 come from, Valdez, we're -- State disposing of the lands
21 and those people are demanding that we build roads to them,
22 and we're even thinking of going and litigating it. It's
23 that bad.

24 THE MODERATOR: Were you first?

25 MR. MATHIESEN: Well, I'd like to say that the

1 legislature demanded the administration to dispose of those
2 lands and we really can't put all the blame on the
3 administration. And as far as the planning part goes,
4 those that are in the planning now assure us, if you can be
5 assured with that, that in future land sales that the
6 planning will be much more comprehensive to accomplish
7 exactly what you're discussing. But in the initial land
8 disposal they had to get rid of so much.

9 MR. HOPE: Was it in a rush towards last year's
10 election or what?

11 THE MODERATOR: It was because of the Bierre
12 initiative that motivated the legislature to take this
13 action to tell, you know -- and the people spoke and said,
14 "we want land," and this is the way they reacted. This is
15 the reaction.

16 MS. HUNTER: Madam Chairman, I think there are
17 meetings all over Alaska with legislators right now before
18 they go back to Juneau, complaining about HB 66 and the
19 letter of intent. And I think it might be well to
20 acknowledge among the people here that we recognized the
21 problem of these very hasty and ill-planned State land
22 disposals which are doing, among other things, strip
23 commercialization, but worse than that are impacting
24 existing communities in ways that are costly and, you know,
25 downgrading the quality of life in those communities, and

1 that we feel that much more local involvement needs to be
2 present in the -- you know, rather than just disposing of
3 the land. I don't know how to say it exactly, but we're
4 all agreed on the same thing.

5 THE MODERATOR: I think all of these, they're too
6 narrow, I guess, is what you're saying.

7 MR. KADEN: Could we just restate it and say that a
8 directive from us to the legislature, which all these are
9 supposedly are, that the State should not dispose of any --
10 I mean make a negative out of it, because it's a negative
11 program, and the State should not dispose of any more State
12 land until proper planning has been done. You know, that's --
13 I mean if that's all it is, if they had planned at all, if
14 they had looked at the land they were disposing of, you
15 know, lot of the problems would have been alleviated. They
16 sold swamp land, you know, where we are.

17 THE MODERATOR: You can turn that into a positive
18 statement. Disposal of land shall follow only after proper
19 planning.

20 THE MODERATOR: I think you need to come up with a
21 statement rather than an offer. I'm afraid we're going to
22 come up with some sloppy goals and then we're going to look
23 terrible.

24 MR. ROPE: How about at eight o'clock. It's after six
25 now.

1 MS. HAYES: It's very taxing.

2 THE MODERATOR: It is.

3 MR. MATHIESEN: Let me try this one, "Existing
4 qualities of life must be maintained prior to a disposal of
5 State land."

6 MS. LUNTZ: Well, not prior to.

7 MR. MATHIESEN: See, when I say existing qualities of
8 life, you know, they have to be maintained before --

9 MS. ISENSEN: State land disposal should be in concert
10 with the existing quality of life.

11 THE MODERATOR: This is the kind of thing, it doesn't
12 do quite anything -- to try to put it together over the
13 dinner hour and come up. I know it's six o'clock and you
14 do need a couple hours. We're going to have to have ideas
15 about means tonight, because we have to finish.

16 MR. KEENER: This is our last goal sheet?

17 THE MODERATOR: Well, no, we've got -- yes, we got one
18 more.

19 MS. HAYES: Then we have the means.

20 THE MODERATOR: "Rural housing and water and sewage
21 disposal facilities and solid waste disposal shall be
22 designed for local needs."

23 MS. HAYES: Is that a means?

24 THE MODERATOR: Criteria should include energy
25 conservation, affordable, utilization of local resources

1 and know how and strong local input into planning and
2 implementation.

3 MR. KEENLEK: That's a means.

4 THE MODERATOR: I guess that's why -- that's a means.
5 What do you feel about this? Do you have any objections to
6 that?

7 MR. HUSS: Which one?

8 THE MODERATOR: Rural housing and water and sewage
9 disposal facilities and solid waste disposal --

10 MS. HUNTER: Solid waste disposal.

11 THE MODERATOR: -- solid waste disposal be designed to
12 suitability to local needs. Does everybody agree that's a
13 good goal?

14 MR. KELSEY: I think it's a great goal. I just think
15 it's in conflict with governmental requirements and I
16 wonder if we're going to look silly --

17 MS. HUNTER: I don't think so, John. I think it's
18 important to come out and say it, because the government is
19 going crazy in what they're doing.

20 MR. KELSEY: I agree.

21 MR. HUSS: Yes, I agree.

22 THE MODERATOR: I don't think we have to stand back
23 just because the feds say something.

24 MS. HUNTER: Or the State government does something,
25 you know.

1 THE MODERATOR: I agree.

2 MR. FALLOWS: Designed for a suitability to local needs
3 and somehow getting a concept of aesthetics in there,
4 because oftentimes rural housing, they come in and they
5 just -- I mean it may be suitable, but they're totally ugly
6 and it's --

7 MR. HOLL: It's not suitable either.

8 THE MODERATOR: Well, designed to take into
9 consideration the -- why don't you edit that? If there's
10 no objection, if everybody agrees with it.

11 MS. HUNTER: I think we all agree on it.

12 THE MODERATOR: -- that that's important, I think you
13 could edit that.

14 MS. HUNTER: You could add a couple words or something.

15 THE MODERATOR: So you agree this is a goal?

16 (responding affirmatively)

17 THE MODERATOR: This group. Now we just have one more
18 sheet and then we can pretty much --

19 MS. KINGRA: I am past thinking.

20 THE MODERATOR: I know, I'm afraid that's what's
21 happening.

22 THE MODERATOR: A commitment to downtown core
23 revitalization and enhancements in urban areas.

24 MR. RUSS: I think that fit our other one.

25 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Yes, that would go into

1 the first one -- not the first one, the second.

2 MR. HUSS: The quality urbanization.

3 THE MODERATOR: That should go with the one up there
4 as a goal.

5 MR. HUSS: The one you have on your pad. It's the
6 same thing.

7 MR. KELSEY: Yes, same thing.

8 THE MODERATOR: What you're saying then is we should
9 rewrite this whole thing and include that; is that it?

10 MR. HUSS: No, I think you can just drop that and keep
11 the one you got.

12 THE MODERATOR: We haven't adopted anything yet.

13 MR. KADEN: We adopted a concept.

14 THE MODERATOR: "State lands selections and disposals
15 should reflect local desires to maintain quality of life."

16 MR. KELSEY: Same thing.

17 MS. HUNTER: That's what we're talking about.

18 THE MODERATOR: -- and adopt a land-use tax" -- I saw
19 Yule you'll put this on there. "Adopt lands-use tax
20 concepts, variations of Henry George."

21 MR. KELSEY: He's not here to defend that, so we'll
22 leave that.

23 MR. KEENER: When you talk about quality urbanization,
24 you talk about the residential areas surrounding the
25 downtown area, if that's what you want. I mean if you

1 don't want the Los Angeles urban, you should also say with
2 that quality urbanization say it's a quality revival.

3 THE MODERATOR: Someone is supposed to come up with a
4 statement that will cover those -- we'll leave that with it
5 and the drafters of that notion.

6 MS. HAYES: I think, Katy, I think the real statement
7 there is a result. And we in another statement are trying
8 to prevent such a need to revitalize places. They
9 shouldn't need it this soon, like the downtown Anchorage
10 area shouldn't be really needing revitalization, it's a
11 brand-new city.

12 MS. HUNTER: Fairbanks desperately needs it.

13 MS. HAYES: Yes, because, you know, there is no
14 attention given to this, we're going to be revitalizing a
15 lotta places all the time and it's a waste of construction,
16 all the building, you know, all the building needs. It's a
17 poor excuse to me, and I don't think a place as young as
18 Anchorage is, it's the youngest city, you know, needs to be
19 abandoned and there are places for lease, and they're
20 building new ones everywhere. It's incredible to me. I
21 think we want to avoid such.

22 THE MODERATOR: Yes, I can see to avoid --

23 MS. HAYES: This is the very thing we want to avoid by
24 the other action.

25 THE MODERATOR: All right, Carl, you had your hand up.

1 MR. JACK: Are we done with that?

2 THE MODERATOR: Well, we're done with it because the
3 very subjects, as I understand it, we feel have already
4 been touched and we need to come back with some better --

5 MR. KELSEY: Why don't we just tear it up then?

6 THE MODERATOR: No, he needs it to do his writing for
7 the ones we need to adopt.

8 MR. KELSEY: Let's have it understood we're not going
9 back to it.

10 MR. JACK: I was going to bring out what was thrown
11 back to me in regards to the goal. I was told to rewrite
12 it.

13 THE MODERATOR: I know there are some other things.

14 MR. JACK: Let me just throw it out just once more,
15 and then, this is on the roads. The original wording was "Roads
16 to be developed according to regional plans based on
17 existing transportation loads. The revised language is "Any
18 anticipated road construction, in parentheses,
19 transportation development, parentheses closed, should only
20 be implemented based on the expressed preference of local
21 communities to be affected."

22 THE MODERATOR: How does that sound? Do you have any
23 objection to that as a goal? That would be the -- to take
24 care of that one on another sheet.

25 Okay, are you too tired?

1 MR. RADEN: Would you reread it, please?

2 THE MODERATOR: Would you read it again, Carl?

3 MR. JACK: "Any anticipated road construction, in
4 parentheses transportation development, parentheses closed,
5 should only be implemented based on the expressed
6 preference of local communities to be affected."

7 THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

8 MR. FEELEY: I'm just -- may I?

9 THE MODERATOR: Yes, John.

10 MR. KESLEY: I'm wondering now if we're precluding
11 something that, you know, might be desirable. I'm thinking
12 of, let's just say -- let's take another area, the North
13 Slope Road, for example. If you wanted to go from point A
14 being Fairbanks to Prudhoe Bay and they have to go through
15 Anaktuvuk Pass or something, and yet they have to get the
16 permission of the people in Anaktuvuk in order to
17 accomplish that. I think they did have a problem, I'm just
18 wondering by adopting you might be precluding something
19 that might be desirable by the rest of the state.

20 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) No way.

21 THE MODERATOR: No, I think that's exactly what the --
22 what they want to do is let it be a decision to the people
23 there whether they want a road or not.

24 MS. LUTER: Madam Chairman, seems to me the Hall Road
25 is really the first instance we've had where there has been

1 a debate in which a lot of the values of local people got
2 into the debate. Mostly we've never had a chance to debate
3 where a road goes, or whether a road should go. The
4 highway department generally comes to you after they have
5 decided on a road and they say, "Should it go here and here?"

6 You say, "I don't want it to go either place,"
7 and they say, "Tough." I think what is requested is that
8 this form of local input get into the planning at a stage
9 when it can influence what happens, and I think, you know, --
10 maybe it will preclude something, but I think -- this is a
11 democratic society, and if it is a will of the majority
12 people that a road go through ultimately to develop
13 something, it will be done. You aren't going to stop it,
14 but you're certainly going to give local people some input.

15 THE MODERATOR: John.

16 MR. KELSLY: Madam Chairman, but aren't you precluding
17 the possibility of what's going for the vast majority by a
18 minority, a very small group? I just have a little problem
19 with that.

20 MS. HUNTER: I can't see that happening.

21 MR. KELSEY: Oh, I can.

22 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) And I think that that is a
23 great opportunity for the minority, because rural people
24 are minority people, that it's a great opportunity for the
25 minority voice, I don't mean the minority, the minority

1 voice to be heard. It's always majority rule. I think
2 there has to be some kind of equal justice for the minority
3 voice, too.

4 MR. KELLEY: I would certainly agree, but, you know, I
5 wouldn't think -- I wouldn't want to give them the tool to
6 preclude something that was in the best interests of the
7 entire state. I certainly wouldn't want to be in a
8 position to take a vote and cancel out something that was
9 good for the state if I were against it. I don't believe
10 in that.

11 MS. LAYES: We are the state.

12 THE MODERATOR: Gene had something she wanted to say.

13 MS. KINCH: Our stenographer is going downhill as
14 fast as the rest of us, and I think we should consider her
15 in our zeal to finish, because she doesn't rest for two
16 hours.

17 And as I understand, you go and transcribe your
18 notes.

19 And I wish we would take her into consideration,
20 and ourselves, adjourn until eight and come back fresher
21 than we are now.

22 THE MODERATOR: We'll vote on yours at eight o'clock,
23 Carl.

24 (RECESS: 6:20)

25