

H B

1 3 2

Rep. Brian Porter, Chairman

House Judiciary Committee

Date: April 19, 1993
Place: Capitol Room 120

HB 187 Interception of Private Communications
HB 132 Extend Resource Extraction Permit/Lease
SB 149 Revision of Banking Code
SB 112 Uniform Commercial Code Revisions

Subject of Meeting: SB 84 Revoke Driver's License if False ID Used; SB 86 Fund Transfers Under the UCC

Please Print Name	Representing	Business/Personal Mailing Address	Zip	(H) Phone	(W) Phone	Do you Want to Testify?	Which Subject/ Which Bill?
LT. CHRIS STOCKMERS	PUBLIC SAFETY	450 Whittier St Juneau.				(Y) N	HB 187 - FOR QUESTIONS ONLY ✓
Juanita Hensley	DPS/DMV	Box 111200	99811		4335	(Y) N	SB 84
Bill Kelder	Sen. Kerttala	Room 427, Capitol Bldg Juneau 99801-1152			4834	(Y) N	SB 86 + SB 112 ✓
JOSH FINR	SEN. KELLY				3819	(Y) N	SB 84 ✓
JOSH FINR	SEN. KELLY				3819	(Y) N	SB 149 ✓
BUD JAEGER	ALASKA INSURANCE AGENTS	301 STEWARD ST. JUNEAU	99801		586-2414	(Y) N	SB 149 ✓
BEN WILLIAMS	REP. TOM BRICE	STATE CAPITOL	99801		73466	(Y) N	CS (HB 132 (ND))
Margot Knuth	law - Crim	Box 110300	99811		X4049	(Y) N	HB 187
JEFF BUSH	Commerce - Banking + Securities	175 S. Franklin, Ste. 318, Juneau	99801		463-4150	(Y) N	SB 149 ✓
						Y N	
						Y N	
						Y N	

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(7)

Date Referred: March 30, 1993

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Finance

Date of Committee Action: 4-19-93

The JUDICIARY Committee considered:

HB 132

HOUSE BILL NO. 132

EXTEND RESOURCE EXTRACTION PERMIT/LEASE

"An Act extending the time period of all permits issued by the state relating to the extraction or removal of resources if the holder of the permits is involved in litigation concerning the issuance or validity of any permit related to the extraction or removal."

RECOMMENDATIONS:

be replaced with _____

CS HB 132 (JUD)

the same title
 a new title

have attached amendments(s)

do pass

do not pass

no recommendations

individual recommendations

additional referral to the _____ Committee

ADOPTS: _____ letter of Intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(s): _____ (Dept)

APPROVES PREVIOUS: _____ (Dept/Date)

fiscal impact _____

fiscal note(s) _____

zero fiscal note _____

zero fiscal note(s) DNR (3030-93)

SIGNING DO PASS	DP	OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	DNP	NR	AM
Joseph D.			
...	✓	...		✓	
Brian D. Porter	✓				
Mark Phillips	✓				

Brian D. Porter
 CHAIRMAN'S SIGNATURE

8-LS0527R
Luckhaupt
4/18/93

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 132(JUD)

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

EIGHTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Offered:
Referred:

Sponsor(s): REPRESENTATIVES BRICE, Kott, James

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act extending the time period of all permits issued by the state relating to
2 the extraction or removal of resources if the holder of the permits, or any of
3 the agencies issuing a permit to the holder, is involved in litigation concerning
4 the issuance or validity of any permit related to the extraction or removal."

5 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

6 * Section 1. AS 46.35 is amended by adding a new section to read:

7 **ARTICLE 2. EXTENSION OF RESOURCE EXTRACTION**
8 **OR REMOVAL RELATED PERMITS.**

9 **Sec. 46.35.300. EXTENSION OF RESOURCE EXTRACTION OR**
10 **REMOVAL RELATED PERMITS. (a) The time period of all permits relating to**
11 **resource extraction or removal in the state that are issued by any agency of the state**
12 **shall be extended by the agencies issuing the permits if the holder of the permits**

13 **(1) or any of the agencies issuing a permit to the holder, is sued by a**
14 **person other than the state concerning the issuance or validity of any state or federal**

1 permit that is related to the resource extraction or removal;

2 (2) is prevented from engaging in the resource extraction or removal
3 related activity authorized by the permits due to an order of the court in which the
4 litigation is pending;

5 (3) is the prevailing party in the litigation or, if an agency that issued
6 a permit to the holder is being sued, that the agency is the prevailing party in the
7 litigation; and

8 (4) notifies the department of the litigation, the order preventing the
9 resource extraction or removal related activity authorized by the permits, and the
10 successful decision of the suit in favor of the holder of the permits.

11 (b) The length of an extension under (a) of this section shall be equal to the
12 period of time the holder of the permits was prevented from engaging in the activity
13 authorized by the permits due to the order of the court.

14 (c) An extension of time under (a) of this section shall be considered to be part
15 of the time period of the original permits and when extending the permits a department
16 may not impose a fee or a charge for the extension or for the right to engage in the
17 activity authorized by the permits during the term of the extension except as provided
18 in the original permits.

19 (d) In this section,

20 (1) "permit" means a permit, lease, authorization, license, or another
21 determination necessary for or related to resource extraction or removal;

22 (2) "prevailing party" means one who has successfully prosecuted or
23 defended against the action, who is successful on the main issue of the action and in
24 whose favor the decision or verdict is rendered and the judgment entered.

25 * **Sec. 2. APPLICABILITY.** (a) Section 1 of this Act applies to all permits relating to
26 resource extraction or removal that are affected by litigation relating to the issuance or validity
27 of a permit related to the extraction or removal if the suit is filed after the effective date of
28 this Act.

29 (b) In this section, "permit" has the meaning given in AS 46.35.300(d), added by
30 sec. 1 of this Act.

Rep. Brian Porter, Chairman

House Judiciary Committee

Date: April 16, 1993
Place: Capitol Room 120

SB 54 Juvenile Waiver
 HB 222 Use of Rented Property/Law Violations
 HB 188 Forfeiture of Property
 HB 195 Authorizing Youth Courts
 HB 187 Interception of Private Communications

Subject of Meeting: HB 132 Extend Resource
 Extraction Permit/Lease

Please Print Name	Representing	Business/Personal Mailing Address	Zip	(H) Phone	(W) Phone	Do you Want to Testify?	Which Subject/ Which Bill?
Mary A. A. ARBACE	ALASKA MINERS ASSN	240 MAIN ST, STE 500	99801		586-3340	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	HB 132
Margot Knuth	Law - CDCO	BOX 110300	99811		465-3428	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	SB 54
Randall Hines	DHSS	Box 110630	99811		465-3187	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	SB 54 & HB 195
						<input type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	
						<input type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	
						<input type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	
						<input type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	
						<input type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	
						<input type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	
						<input type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	
						<input type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N	

Rep. Brian Porter, Chairman

House Judiciary Committee

Date: April 16, 1993

Place: Capitol Room 120

SB 54 Juvenile Waiver
 HB 222 Use of Rented Property/Law Violations
 HB 188 Forfeiture of Property
 HB 195 Authorizing Youth Courts
 HB 187 Interception of Private Communications

Subject of Meeting: HB 132 Extend Resource
 Extraction Permit/Lease

Please Print Name	Representing	Business/Personal Mailing Address	Zip	(H) Phone	(W) Phone	Do you Want to Testify?	Which Subject/ Which Bill?
EVANS McMillion	AK Environ. Lobby	P.O. Box 22151 ^{JNU} AK	99802	586-2476	463-3366	(Y) N	HB 132
C S CHRISTENSEN	COURT SYSTEM	303 K. ST ANCH	99501		463-4770	(Y) N	HB 185
						Y N	
						Y N	
						Y N	
						Y N	
						Y N	
						Y N	
						Y N	
						Y N	
						Y N	

A M E N D M E N T

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE
TO: CSHB 132(RES)

BY REPRESENTATIVE BRICE

Page 2, line 2:

Delete "to a substantial extent"

A M E N D M E N T

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE
TO: CSHB 132(RES)

BY REPRESENTATIVE BRICE

Page 2, line 24:

Delete "as defined by AS 46.35.200(4)"

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA 1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSHB 132 (RES)

Revision Date Original Department Affected: Natural Resources
 Title: "An Act extending the time period of all BRU: various
permits issued by the state relating to the extraction or..." Components: Commissioner's Office
 Sponsor: Representative Brice
 Requestor: RES, JUD, FIN Component Serial No. 423

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND&STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAPITAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
REVENUE fund source:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

Estimate of current year (FY93) Impact: \$ No fiscal impact anticipated

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)
 The intent of the bill is to acknowledge the impact of delays due to litigation on time limited activity authorization (permits). To achieve this goal, perhaps it may only be necessary to fill the term of the original permit rather than to provide additional time to the permit term.

Prepared by: Raga S. Ellim Phone: 465-2400
 Division: Commissioner's Office Date: 26-Mar-93
 Approved by Commissioner: Glenn A. Olds Date: 26-Mar-93
 Agency: Department of Natural Resources

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office



Representative Tom Brice

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

119 N. Cushman, Ste. 205
Fairbanks, AK 99701
907-456-7423
While in Juneau
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182
907-465-3166

MEMORANDUM

TO: Representative Brian Porter, Chairman
House Judiciary Committee

FROM: Representative Tom Brice *TB*

DATE: March 31, 1993

SUBJECT: **CSHB 132(Res)**

I would appreciate your scheduling a hearing for CSHB 132(Res), which would support natural resource development in certain cases, at your earliest convenience.

When a lawsuit challenging the validity of any state permit prevents the permit holder from operating, CSHB 132(Res) will extend the life of all state issued permits if three conditions are met: 1) the lawsuit is filed by someone other than the state; 2) a court order substantially prevents the permit holder from operating; 3) the lawsuit is decided in favor of the permit holder or the agency issuing the permit. The permit holder must notify the state to receive this extension. The length of the extension will be equal to the amount of time lost due to the lawsuit.

Please include the attached materials in the bill file. Thank you.

Attachments



119 N. Cushman, Ste. 205
Fairbanks, AK 99701
907-456-7423
While in Juneau
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182
907-465-3466



Representative Tom Brice

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

Sponsor Statement for CSHB 132(Res)

Many resource development projects in Alaska are delayed by time consuming litigation. These delays can not only drive up the costs of a project, they can kill it.

Most of the lawsuits filed on resource development projects are over federal permits. While the developer is tied up in court, the clock is still running on the state permits for the project. Even if the permit holder wins in court, the useful time span of state permits will be shortened or may even run out, requiring another round of permit applications and fees. The Alaska Minerals Commission and the Governor's Task Force on Regulatory Reform both recommend extensions of permits foreshortened by court proceedings.

CSHB 132(Res) will help to fix this problem. All state issued permits relating to a resource extraction or removal project will be extended when the permit holder or issuing agency (state or federal) is sued over the issuance of a permit and the permit holder or agency wins in court. The state permits will then be extended by the amount of time lost to the lawsuit, not to exceed the original length of the permit. The state would not be able to impose a fee or charge for the extension.

These amendments were proposed by DC&ED and AMA and adopted by the House Resources Committee.

The language in CSHB 132(Res) now includes lawsuits brought against the permitting agency for a particular project, but which do not name the permit holder. This will ensure that all cases are addressed by the bill.

The bill will now address cases where the permit holder is prevented from operating to a substantial extent due to a court order.

A broad definition of "permit" is in CSHB 132(Res), in order to prevent questions regarding what is covered by the bill.

An attempt to list all required permits is also included by referencing AS 46.35.200(4). The Revisor's notes on this section state, "Many of the references in list (4) are obsolete."





Alaska State Legislature

Official Business

State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

provided by Representative Tom Brice

Sectional Summary of CSHB 132(Res)

Section 1:

Adds a new section AS 46.35.300

(a) The state will extend the time period of all state issued resource extraction or removal permits under certain conditions:

(a)(1) The permit holder or issuing agency must be sued by a third party over a state or federal permit.

(a)(2) The permit holder must be substantially prevented from operating by a court order from that lawsuit.

(a)(3) The permit holder must win in court.

(a)(4) The permit holder must notify the state about the outcome of the proceedings.

(b) Any state permits related to that resource extraction or removal will be extended by the amount of time lost to the lawsuit.

(c) The permit holder would not have to pay additional fees for the extension.

(d) A permit is broadly defined to include a permit, lease, authorization, license or other necessary determination.

Section 2:

(a) Applies to all permits as defined by 46.35.200(4) affected by qualifying lawsuits after the effective date.

(b) Permit has the meaning of AS 46.35.300(d) in Sec. 1 above.

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(9)

Date Referred: February 5, 1993

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Judiciary
Finance

Date of Committee Action: 3/29/93

The RESOURCES Committee considered:

HB 132

HOUSE BILL NO. 132

EXTEND RESOURCE EXTRACTION PERMIT/LEASE

"An Act extending the time period of all permits issued by the state relating to the extraction or removal of resources if the holder of the permits is involved in litigation concerning the issuance or validity of any permit related to the extraction or removal."

RECOMMENDATIONS:

be replaced with CS HB 132 (res) the same title a new title

have attached amendments(s)

do pass

do not pass

no recommendations

individual recommendations

additional referral to the _____ Committee

ADOPTS: _____ letter of Intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S): (Dept) _____

APPROVES PREVIOUS: (Dept/Date) _____

fiscal impact _____

fiscal note(s) _____

zero fiscal note DNR

zero fiscal note(s) _____

SIGNING DO PASS	DP	OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	DNP	NR	AM
<i>Bill Hudson</i> Hudson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>[Signature]</i> Finkelstein		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>[Signature]</i> Carney	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>[Signature]</i> Davies			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>[Signature]</i> James	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
<i>[Signature]</i> Bunde	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
<i>[Signature]</i> Williams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

[Signature]
CHAIRMAN'S SIGNATURE

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY STATE OF ALASKA

(907) 465-3867 or 465-2450
FAX (907) 465-2029
Mail Stop 3101


130 Seward Street, Suite 409
Juneau, Alaska 99801-2105

MEMORANDUM

March 29, 1993

SUBJECT: Extension of Permits - CSHB 132(RES) (Work Order No. 18-LS0527(O))

TO: Representative Bill Williams
Attn: Mary McDowell

FROM: Jerry Luckhaupt 
Legislative Counsel

Enclosed is the final CS(RES) you requested. I have a comment about the committee substitute. The amendment the committee adopted (p. 2, line 24, of the committee substitute) that provides that sec. 1 of the Act "applies to all permits relating to resource extraction or removal as defined in AS 46.35.200(4)" (the underlined language in bold type was added by the committee) is, at the least, very confusing. The committee substitute already defines "permit" to be "a permit, lease, authorization, license, or another determination necessary for or related to resource extraction or removal" (p.2, lines 21-22). This definition of permit is very broad and applies to both the substantive provisions of sec. 1 and the applicability provision of sec. 2. But the language added by the committee defines a "permit" in a contradictory manner for purposes of the applicability section, sec. 2, by providing that sec. 1 of the committee substitute only applies to the permits that are related to resource extraction and removal that are listed in AS 46.35.200(4) or are designated by the commissioner under that section. The definitions are not consistent. Further, the list of permits provided in AS 46.35.200(4) has not been kept up to date and cannot be considered accurate. It has not been kept up to date by the legislature because the one-stop permit procedure provided in AS 46.35 has never, to the best of my knowledge, been: (1) funded by the legislature; or (2) otherwise implemented by the executive branch. The use of the definition of "permit" provided by AS 46.35.200(4) can only lead to confusion and the possibility of litigation to resolve the ambiguities engendered by the adoption of this out-dated listing.

Finally, applying this definition to the applicability section of the bill and not to the substantive portion of the bill seems at the best ill-conceived. If the definition of "permit" the committee desires is that found in AS 46.35.200(4) then that definition

Representative Bill Williams

March 29, 1993

Page 2

should be substituted for the definition of "permit" found in both the substantive portion of the bill, sec. 1, p. 2, lines 21 - 22, and in the applicability section, sec. 2, p. 2, lines 27 - 28.

GPL:pl
93-245.plm

AMENDMENT

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE
TO: CSHB 132(RES)

BY REPRESENTATIVE BRICE

Page 2, line 24:

Delete "as defined by AS 46.35.200(4)"

A M E N D M E N T

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE
TO: CSHB 132(RES)

BY REPRESENTATIVE BRICE

Page 2, line 2:

Delete "to a substantial extent"



Representative Tom Brice

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

119 N. Cushman, Ste. 205
Fairbanks, AK 99701
907-456-7423
While in Juneau
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182
907-465-3466

Sponsor Statement for HB 132

Many resource development projects in Alaska are delayed by time consuming litigation. These delays can not only drive up the costs of a project, they can kill it.

Most of the lawsuits filed on resource development projects are over federal permits. While the developer is tied up in court, the clock is still running on the state permits for the project. Even if the permit holder wins in court, the useful time span of state permits will be shortened or may even run out, requiring another round of permit applications and fees.

HB 132 will help to fix this problem. All state issued permits relating to a resource extraction or removal project will be extended if:

- 1) a lawsuit is brought over a state or federal permit for the project;
- 2) a court order from that suit prevents them from operating;
- 3) the permit holder wins in court;
- 4) the permit holder notifies the state of the proceedings.

The state issued permits will then be extended by the amount of time lost to the lawsuit, not to exceed the original length of the permit. The state would not be able to impose a fee or charge for the extension.





Official Business

Alaska State Legislature

State Capitol

Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

provided by Representative Tom Brice

Sectional Summary of HB 132

Section 1:

Adds a new section AS 46.35.300

(a) The state will extend the time period of all state issued resource extraction or removal permits under certain conditions:

(a)(1) The permit holder must be sued by a third party over a state or federal permit.

(a)(2) The permit holder must be prevented from operating by a court order from that lawsuit.

(a)(3) The permit holder must win in court.

(a)(4) The permit holder must notify the state about the outcome of the proceedings.

(b) Any state permits related to that resource extraction or removal will be extended by the amount of time lost to the lawsuit.

(c) The permit holder would not have to pay additional fees for the extension.

Section 2:

Applies to all permits affected by qualifying lawsuits after the effective date.

House Bill 132

The Department of Commerce and Economic Development supports passage of House Bill 132.

Resource developers are frequently faced with third-party legal challenges after they have received agency approvals for their projects. Permits are typically issued for a defined period of time. The usable term of a permit may be reduced or eliminated if a permittee is prohibited from operating under the permit by a court as the litigation proceeds. Even if the court rules in favor of the permittee, the permittee is damaged not only by the project delay, but also by the loss of operational time originally allowed under the permit.

This legislation eliminates the loss of operational time allowed a permittee under a permit which is issued by the state and is caused by legal actions initiated by persons other than the state.

House Bill 132 provides those who have successfully met the regulatory requirements of the state an assurance that the state will be aggressive in its support of the operational term of the permit. House Bill 132 also helps limit the utility of third-party use of the courts to impair the development of approved projects.

The effectiveness of this legislation could be improved by:

1. Defining "permit" to mean a permit, lease, authorization, license, or any other determination necessary for completion of a project.
2. Expanding the application beyond resource extraction or removal projects to include any type of development project, including infrastructure developments (ports, schools, etc.).



Paul Fuhs, Commissioner

3-28-93

Date

dgl/172pp.ed

ALASKA MINERALS COMMISSION

1993 Report to the Governor and Alaska State Legislature

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY Page iv

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PART A: ISSUES REQUIRING STATE ACTION

INCENTIVES	Page 1
GEOPHYSICAL & GEOLOGIC MAPPING	Page 1
MENTAL HEALTH LANDS	Page 2
WATER QUALITY	Page 2
AIR QUALITY	Page 3
ACCESS	Page 3
STATE LAND SELECTIONS	Page 4
STATE MINERAL POLICIES	Page 4
STATE LAND WITHDRAWALS AND MANAGEMENT	Page 4
STATE REGULATORY REFORM	Page 5
CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON FEDERAL AREAS	Page 6
COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT	Page 6
COAL ISSUES	Page 7
EDUCATION AND RESEARCH	Page 7
USER FEES	Page 8

PART B: FEDERAL ISSUES OF STATE CONCERN

MINING LAW OF 1872	Page 8
WETLANDS	Page 8
ANILCA PROVISIONS	Page 9
FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT PLANNING	Page 9
BERINGIAN HERITAGE INTERNATIONAL PARK	Page 9
U.S. - CANADA ACCESS AGREEMENTS	Page 10

APPENDICES

A. ALASKA MINERALS COMMISSION STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND STATUTE AUTHORIZING COMMISSION	Page 12
B. LEGISLATION REFERENCED IN THIS REPORT	Page 14

THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDS THAT:

14. *The Governor should direct the Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources to take the necessary steps to allow Miscellaneous Land Use Permits to be issued for periods of up to 5 years.*

FINDING: There is currently a requirement that a best interest finding be made before an offshore prospecting permit (OPP) can be issued by the DNR. The process of generating a best interest finding is being used to restrict DNR from normal issuance of OPPs.

THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDS THAT:

15. *The Governor should direct the Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources to review regulations governing offshore prospecting permits such that they not be required to be subject to best interest findings, being exempted in a manner similar to leases of land for onshore fishery sites, mineral claims or upland mining leases. A.S.38.05.035(e) should be changed by adding "(5) an offshore prospecting permit or lease issued under A.S.38.05.250."*

FINDING: The usable term of a permit may be reduced or eliminated when a permittee is prohibited from operating under their permit due to third party litigation challenging the issuance, validity, completeness or other aspects of the permit. Though the litigation may not be successful, the permittee has still been damaged. Statutory action should be taken to remedy this situation.

THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDS THAT:

16. *The Legislature should enact legislation creating an automatic extension of permits foreshortened by court proceedings.*

CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON FEDERAL AREAS

FINDING: The Citizens Advisory Commission on Federal Areas was established by the Alaska Legislature in 1981 shortly after the enactment of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. The Commission is composed of 16 members, half of whom are appointed by the Governor and half by the Legislature, including four sitting legislators. The Commission analyzes federal legislation, regulations and management decisions, determines the impact of these actions on Alaska's citizens, and makes recommendations to both State and Federal agencies for corrective actions to problems identified.

Development of Federal lands and regulations for access across them is important to the State's economy. The Commission provides a valuable and cost-effective mechanism through which State concerns regarding management of all Federal lands can be expressed.

THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDS THAT:

17. *The Governor and Legislature should provide expanded budgetary and programmatic support to the Citizen's Advisory Commission on Federal Areas.*

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

FINDING: Alaska Statute, Sec. 46.40.100 (b) does not allow applicants to petition the Coastal Policy Council when relief is sought on decisions made by the coastal resource district or state agency. The State administration is evaluating the role and functions of the Coastal Policy Council in relation to the power it has over decisions

FINAL REPORT
OF THE
GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE
ON
REGULATORY REFORM

MARCH 19, 1993

SI 12. Eliminate all reference standards and requirement for turbidity for water. 18 AAC 70.020

The federal EPA maintains and requires no standards or references to water turbidity. This is a State of Alaska requirement. This particular requirement has caused massive costs to mining operations, and in many cases, has resulted in operation closures, for economic inability to meet the standards.

In a "common sense" test, it is illogical to require that miners return water to glacial silt streams of a turbidity quality not achieved by City of Fairbanks tap water.

The Task Force believes that a proposed ADEC regulation that requires users to return water to its source in a condition similar to that which exists upstream from the point of extraction will more than adequately address the real need and intent of the turbidity standard.

SI 13. The natural resource regulations should be amended to require an automatic extension of durable time for permits and other administrative decisions that are foreshortened by administrative appeals and or court actions. 11 AAC 02.new section

The net usable term of a permit or other delivered authorization may be reduced significantly or eliminated entirely when a person receiving authorization is prohibited from using it due to a third party intervention. Any third party may challenge administrative permits or decisions for a variety of reasons, and although litigation or other administrative remedies may not change the prior decision regarding a permit or authorization, a person may become damaged by the foreshortening of time guaranteed by the original approval. The process of intervention in these decisions currently is structured in favor of the challenger, with no equal footing supplied to the permittee even when they prevail in the dispute. Delays presented by these challenges can effectively deny an individual or business the right to provide a living for themselves and others, or even more devastating, cause the possible loss of a business investment.

SI 14. The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) should amend the water quality regulations to allow the natural levels of contaminants and the physical properties of a receiving water to dictate which water quality criteria should be applied for a designated use category. 18 AAC 70.010 (c)

ADEC regulation 18 AAC 70.010(c) requires that "water with natural characteristics of higher quality than the water quality criteria for the use classes set out in 18 AAC 70.020 must be kept at existing quality...." This approach to water quality is called the ANTI DEGRADATION POLICY which is intended to limit the degree of human influence as a result of their actions. This policy does not, however, address the case of many Alaskan water bodies where the naturally occurring water quality is no where near its protected use class.



Resource Development Council

for Alaska, Inc.

121 West Fireweed Lane, Suite 250, Anchorage, Alaska 99503-2035
Phone 907/276-0700 Fax 276-3887

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Becky L. Gay

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Paul S. Glavinovich, President, (1992-93)

Dolly M. Campbell, Sr. Vice Pres.

James L. Cloud, Vice Pres.

Scott L. Thorson, Secretary

Kyle Sandel, Treasurer

Rex I. Eirichopp

James M. Davis

John Forcoskie

Mano Frey

Uwe L. Gross

Roger C. Herrera

Dan H. Keck

John C. Miller

Dave Parish

Elizabeth Rensch

John A. L. Rense

William E. Schneider

Jerome Selby

R. D. Stock

William Thomas

Lyle Von Borgen

DIRECTORS

Will Abbott

Jacob Adams

Larry G. Anderson

Sharon E. Anderson

Ray Barnds

Richard F. Barnes

Mark Begich

William C. Bivin

Jerry Booth

George Burden

Lynn C. Chrystal

Thomas Cook

Larry Daniels

James C. Dore

James V. Drew

Paula P. Easley

Donald S. Follows

Richard Foster

Scott Goldsmith

Lisa Haas

John L. Hall

Alan E. Hastings

Robert S. Hatfield, Jr.

Joseph R. Henn

Karen J. Holstad

William L. Hopper

Lowell A. Humphrey

Norman Ingram

Dorothy A. Jones

John T. Kelsey

R. Marc Langland

Pete Leathard

Wayne Lewis

Robert Loescher

A. Roy Lyons

Carl H. Marrs

Howard McWilliams

Clarence "Rocky" Miller

E. H. "Pete" Nelson

William Noll

John K. Norman

Wilbur O'Brien

Jamie Persons

K. E. "Ken" Peavyhouse

Gail Phillips

Barbara Post

Stephen M. Rehnberg

Jeff Ripley

Dan Rowley

George R. Schmidt

William R. Snell

Heinrich "Henry" Springer

John Sturgeon

Barry Thomson

Mitch Usibelli

George P. Wuerch

HONORARY DIRECTORS

Phil R. Holdsworth

William R. Wood

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Senator Ted Stevens

Senator Frank Murkowski

Congressman Don Young

April 8, 1993

Representative Brian Porter, Chair
House Judiciary Committee
State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: CS for HB 132 - *Extending time period of state permits in case of litigation.*

Dear Chairman Porter and members of the Committee:

RDC appreciates the opportunity to submit comments for the record on CS for HB 132.


RDC believes the bill takes the right step to help holders of permits relating to the extraction or removal of resources to have some relief in case of litigation regarding the permit.

The bill will reduce frivolous lawsuits by persons or organizations which oppose development, while limiting the hardship of delay on the permittee in the case of more legitimate litigation.

Thank you for giving RDC the opportunity to comment on HB 132.

Sincerely,

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL
for Alaska, Inc.


Becky L. Gay
Executive Director



Charlie Boddy
Vice President Government Relations

- March 23, 1993

Representative Tom Brice
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

HOUSE BILL NO. 132 - An Act Extending the Time Periods of Permits

Dear Representative Brice,

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you and your staff for keeping me apprised of the continuing work on this most important piece of legislation. I offer these comments and observations prior to your hearing schedule starting. For your reference, similar comments were included in a report forwarded to Governor Hickel as part of a task force report on regulatory reform.

The net usable term of a permit or other delivered authorization sometimes is reduced significantly or even eliminated entirely when a person or company is prohibited from using it due to some action by an intervening third party. Any third party may challenge administrative decisions regarding permits and other authorizations for a variety of frivolous reasons. A person or company can then become damaged by the foreshortening of durable time guaranteed by a permit or other authorization.

This legislation will provide for more equal footing by restoring the time guaranteed in the original approval. You have provided in this legislation a remedy to those who suffer monetary or other damage, a mechanism for recovery that has been sorely missing for many years. I am sure that others from the mining community will provide the committees numerous comments and examples of past problems.

If I can be of any assistance during hearing process, please don't hesitate to call. With best regards, I remain,



ALASKA MINERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

601 West Northern Lights Boulevard, Suite 203, Anchorage, Alaska 99503 fax: (907) 278-7997 telephone: (907) 278-0347

March 26, 1993

Honorable William Williams
Chairman
House Resources Committee
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Re: HB-132, An Act Extending The Time Period of Permits

Dear Representative Williams,

I am writing on behalf of the Alaska Miners Association in support of House Bill 132.

The cost of developing a mine or any other resource project in Alaska is significant and the potential problems are many. In particular, when a company decides to develop minerals in Alaska there are many challenges that are expected. These challenges include the lack of infrastructure, the climate, the difficulty of locating an economic ore deposit, the difficulty of obtaining the financing and finally the difficulty of obtaining all the myriad of permits. These challenges are part of the business.

There are however other impediments to developing a mine that are not based on the merits of the project. One such case is where third party suits are filed. Such suits and litigation are often based on a philosophical viewpoint that there should be no development in Alaska the "big park" or at least "not in my backyard". HB-132 seeks to address one aspect of this issue.

We see two important benefits associated with passage of this bill. The first and most obvious benefit is that although the project owner may be delayed, he will not lose the investment made in obtaining the necessary permits and will not run the risk of being forced to go through the permitting process before he has the opportunity to exercise the permits. If third party litigation against the project delays start-up until the term of the permits has lapsed, or nearly lapsed, the project owner would be forced to go through the permitting process again. This bill would require that the term of the permits be extended for whatever period the project owner was affected by the litigation.

The second benefit is less material but yet it may be even more important for the future of the State. This benefit is the in the message that such a bill will have for the international mining

**ALASKA MINERS ASSOCIATION, INC.**

industry. That message is that Alaska wants to see mineral development and that the State wants to change the negative image that continues to prevail in the industry.

There are two locations in the bill that should be modified. The first is on page one line 12. We would suggest the phrase be modified to read "...shall be extended by the agencies issuing the permits if the holder of the permits or an agency...". In most instances it is an agency involved in some aspect of issuing a permit that is the sued rather than the company receiving the permit. The suggested change would insure that the permits would be extended if an agency, in addition to the applicant, is sued.

The second modification is on page two line 19 where we would suggest referencing the existing definitions with the words "...all permits relating to resource extraction or removal as defined by 46.35.200(4) that are affected by litigation...". This minor modification will further clarify the applicability of this new Section 1.

Alaska is now in fierce competition for exploration and development funding with countries all around the world. Many countries are changing their laws for mining, investment, ownership of property, repatriation of profits and permitting to encourage minerals investment. We must also do everything practical and possible to improve the business climate or Alaska will not experience the mineral development and associated job creation that is otherwise possible.

Sincerely,

Steven C. Borell, P.E.
Executive Director

cc: Representative Tom Brice

March 26, 1993

To: Representative Tom Brice

From: *C. C. Hawley - signed*
Chuck Hawley, Mining Geologist, # 300-941 E Dowling,
Anchorage, Ak 99518

Subject: H B 132, a bill to extend the time period for permits

This brief note is to support H B 132. It would be an important tool to support warranted development in Alaska.

My view is derived from the circumstances surrounding a project that I was involved in at Nyac, Alaska during the early 1980's, and still am involved in trying to clean up.

Briefly, Nyac is an important placer mining camp in Southwest Alaska, about 100 miles east of Bethel. It has been mined nearly continuously by bucket-line dredges and washing plants since 1928. In 1980, I was general partner in Northland Gold Dredging.

Our company leased mining claims at Nyac, and in 1980 rebuilt a dredge at a cost in excess of \$1,000,000. We operated in 1981 and 1982. In 1983, we began to repermit the operation so that we could move the dredge to the lower part of the reserves and begin a systematic "upstream" operation in the broad flood plain of the Tuluksak River. Mining "upstream" in a broad valley with a bucket line dredge, means that you have a bank of tailings below the operation that assists in filtering any effluent of the operation and protects downstream water quality.

We were successful, in a difficult two-year period, of obtaining the necessary permits to mine. The main permits came from Corps of Engineers, BLM, EPA, on the federal side and DEC and DFG on the State side. We also passed Coastal Zone consistency review.

After Northland received its permits, the agencies granting the permits were sued. Critical suits were in Federal Court against the BLM, and in State Court against a favorable Coastal Zone management decision. (Nyac was not in the coastal zone, but it could be construed that the operation might affect the coastal zone).

Although the lawsuits were never fully resolved, and indeed coastal zone was never heard, the ultimate result was that the project finally failed.

It would be inappropriate to say that a bill like H B 132 would have saved the project, because the circumstances were more complex. But at all times, we had difficulty holding our investment base, partly because of the uncertain nature of our permits after the conclusion of the lawsuits.

It appears that H B 132 would not have a negative environmental effect, because if lawsuits against the project were successful, the resolution of litigation should be that a project could be modified so that it accepts necessary and valid corrections.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to the committee for considering this legislation. It means that they are aware of the tremendous impediments to development that exist in Alaska. I believe the results at Nyac were not even close to a win-lose situation, let alone a win-win deal. No one won anything. The investors finally lost nearly \$3,000,000; southwest Alaska lost about 25-well paying jobs that would have been in existence for many years. The environmental work done over many years at Nyac shows that mining resulted in gains as well as losses to the biologic productivity of the region, but on balance gains from mining appear to at least equal any losses that could have occurred because of mining--so there was not even an environmental gain from killing the project.