

LEG. FINANCE - BILLS 1977 - 1978 830

HB 870 cont. , () () 89

STATE AGENCIES WHICH WILL BE INVOLVED IN DETERMINING
DATA ACQUISITION TO SATISFY PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

| Agency | Action |
|---|---|
| Department of Public Safety | Several plan check permits |
| Department of Commerce and Economic Development | Certificates of Public Necessity and Convenience |
| Department of Transportation and Public Facilities | Permits for utilities, encroachment and driveways |
| Department of Health and Social Services | Licenses and permits for institutional and private sector |
| Department of Environmental Conservation | Permits and licenses for actions that introduce potential pollutants to the environment |
| Department of Fish and Game | Permits for activities that affect fish and game. |
| Department of Natural Resources | Permits and plan reviews |

ESTIMATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT COSTS

| | Data Collection Period | | Data Analysis and Report Preparation | Total |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------|
| | Supplemental FY 1978 3/78-6/78 | Partial FY 1979 7/78-11/78 | | |
| HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY | \$ 60,400 | \$ 102,800 | \$ 170,400 | \$ 333,600 |
| GEOTECHNICAL | 202,600 | 127,600 | 43,600 | 373,800 |
| U.S.G.S (Water Studies) | | 42,000 | 40,000 | 82,000 |
| ARCHAEOLOGY | | 21,600 | 31,600 | 53,200 |
| BIOLOGY | | | | |
| FISH | 56,000 | 112,000 | 224,000 | 392,000 |
| WILDLIFE | 137,200 | 168,800 | 353,300 | 659,300 |
| VEGETATION | 16,000 | 204,200 | | 220,200 |
| METEOROLOGY AND AIR QUALITY | 300,000 | 60,000 | 130,000 | 490,000 |
| AIR QUALITY MODELING (Powerplant, Airport, City) | | | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| NOISE MODELING (Airport) | | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| PROJECT MGMT, STAFF AND OPERATIONAL EXPENSES | 156,000 | 210,000 | 1,394,000 | 1,760,000 |
| TOTAL | \$928,200 | \$1,049,000 | \$2,546,900 | \$4,524,100 |

COST ANALYSIS - HYDROLOGICAL AND GEOTECHNICAL

Project Description

Project - Hydrological

1. Identify source location, types and quantities of water pollutants addressing both construction and operational phases.
2. Summarize existing water quantity and quality information, identify historical patterns, annual trends, low flow conditions, temperature patterns, icing problems for all rivers, creeks and lakes in the area.
3. Examine the natural quality and quantity of surface waters, locating seeps, springs and interflow areas.
4. Assess the impact of ground water withdrawal through the use of data acquired in the drilling and testing program, electrical resistivity traverses and computer modeling.
5. Summarize available meteorological data to determine water availability and its part in the total hydrologic regime.
6. Lake profiling and contouring, water sampling, analysis of stream flow data, observations of surface water bodies such as ice thickness measurements, breakup and freeze-up data, installation of rain gauges for analysis in the hydrologic cycle. These efforts require extensive field observations.
7. Identify travel time and routes of surface and subsurface water through the lake drainage system by the use of tracer dyes.
8. Identify water use permits and attend permits and standards meetings with State and Federal agencies.
9. Analyze quantity, quality and impacts of sanitary, storm and casual operational water discharges, of sewage systems, septic systems, erosion, subhumus flow, storm drainage, landfill leachate and waste oil disposal.
10. Conduct a study of the impact of construction and operation of the city on the physical, biological and chemical aspects of Nancy Lake.
11. Examine developmental impacts of phased development and construction schedules, assessing both short and long term impacts on water quality and surface drainage.

12. Assess the impact of planned operation activity of the city including accidents such as oil spills, the long term effects of storm water management, regional water management, icing and ice fog.

Geotechnical

13. This phase includes test drilling, resistivity surveys, field data collection necessary to prepare maps of surficial geological materials and bedrock locations. This is the field data collection effort necessary to determine land use suitability for such uses as landfills and major structures.
14. Samples collected in Project 13 will be tested to derive physical properties used in determining the suitability of geographic areas for specific land uses.
15. The products of Projects 13 and 14 will be used to prepare detailed terrain unit maps indicated suitability for various land uses.
16. A hazards analysis study will be performed to evaluate geologic hazards such as earthquakes, slope failures and permafrost, seismic analysis and determination of earthquake responses such as ground motion intensity, liquefaction, slope stability, etc.
17. Prepare a preliminary text for initial review, describing the products of the previous projects and identifying impacts in appropriate formats.
18. After review, revisions of text will be made to conform to reviewers comments.

COST ANALYSIS - U.S.C. . WATER PROGRAM

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|--------|----------|------------|----------|
| 1 | | \$42,000 | \$40,000 | \$82,000 |

Project Description

1. Install two continuous gaging stations in FY79 (after 10/78), perform miscellaneous measurements quarterly on Willow and Deception Creeks, perform selected analysis of quarterly samples and perform continuous recording of water levels in three observation wells in proposed water supply test wells.

COST ANALYSIS - ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROGRAM

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|--------|----------|------------|----------|
| 1 | | \$21,600 | \$31,600 | \$53,200 |

Project Description

1. The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Parks proposes to conduct a archaeological and historical survey of the development area of the capital city site in the summer of 1978 and the capital reserve area during the summer of 1979.

COST ANALYSIS - BIOLOGICAL

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| 1 | | \$88,000 | | \$88,000 |
| 2 | | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| 3 | | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| 4 | \$8,000 | 60,200 | | 68,200 |
| 5 | 8,000 | 48,000 | | 56,000 |
| 6 | 10,800 | 2,400 | \$40,800 | 54,000 |
| 7 | 36,000 | 24,000 | 115,900 | 175,900 |
| 8 | 2,200 | 800 | 3,200 | 6,200 |
| 9 | 17,600 | 38,400 | 56,000 | 112,000 |
| 10 | 40,400 | 77,200 | 64,000 | 181,600 |
| 11 | 21,000 | 18,000 | 53,800 | 92,800 |
| 12 | 2,000 | 2,000 | | 4,000 |
| 13 | 2,400 | | 4,800 | 7,200 |
| 14 | 4,800 | 6,000 | 14,800 | 25,600 |
| 15 | 56,000 | 112,000 | 224,000 | 392,000 |
| 16 | | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| Total | \$209,200 | \$485,000 | \$577,300 | \$1,271,500 |

COST ANALYSIS - BIOLOGICAL

Project Description

Project

1. Preparation of a color mosaic at a scale of 1:15,840 for detailed vegetative analysis of habitat type.
2. Determination of detailed vegetative type.
3. Correlation of animal use areas and habitat types to improve knowledge of vegetative types and use.
4. Identify amount of acreage of key moose browse species, conditional and successional stages of all habitat types within a fifteen mile radius of the city.
5. Determine amount of moose habitat lost to construction and investigate methods and areas to create replacement habitat.
6. Conduct aerial surveys to determine areas used by moose at various times of the year, identify moose wintering and calving areas and correlate results with vegetation data from other projects.
7. Radio transmitter collars will be placed on 25 moose within a ten mile radius of the city center and a monitoring program will record their movements throughout the year to assist in establishing seasonal habitat preferences for specific sex and age classes.
8. Conduct aerial wolf census to determine abundance, location, movement and denning locations in and adjacent to the capital site.
9. Conduct aerial and ground reconnaissance of black and brown bear to determine habitat use, abundance, feasibility of ground snaring and tranquilizing from helicopter.
10. Capture twenty to twenty-five brown and black bears with snares and install radio transmitter collars and acquire biological data. Monitoring flights will be conducted to locate dens and critical habitat.
11. Conduct a comprehensive study of furbearers, their movements, habitat use and abundance.
12. Federal regulations require a survey to determine the presence, abundance or absence of endangered species.

13. Conduct aerial nest surveys of hawks, owls and raptors, with special emphasis placed on the areas to be modified by construction.
14. Spring, summer and fall aerial surveys will be conducted to determine presence, abundance and location of water fowl.
15. A total inventory of the fisheries resources in Willow Creek, Lilly Creek and Deception Creek drainages will be made to determine the presence and abundance of both anadromous and resident species.
16. The recreational use of fisheries resources will be assessed in Willow Creek, with major emphasis on a creek census of sport angling during July and August.
17. Preliminary measurements and evaluations of seasonal flows and instream flow needs on Willow Deception and Lilly Creeks.

COST ANALYSIS - METEOROLOGY, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE ANALYSIS

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1 | \$164,000 | \$40,000 | \$87,000 | \$291,000 |
| 2 | 23,000 | 10,000 | 23,000 | 56,000 |
| 3 | 113,000 | 10,000 | 20,000 | 143,000 |
| 4 | | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| 5 | | | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| 6 | | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 7 | | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Totals | \$300,000 | \$60,000 | \$290,000 | \$650,000 |

COST ANALYSIS - METEOROLOGY, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE ANALYSIS

Project Description

1. Tower (60 meter) at city site, instrumentation, maintenance and operation.
2. Tower (10 meter) installation at Houston, instrumentation, maintenance and operation, for airport analysis.
3. Tower (100 meter) on Willow Creek road, instrumentation, maintenance and operation for power plant analysis.
4. Air quality modeling - airport.
5. Air quality modeling - city.
6. Air quality modeling - power plant.
7. Noise forecast modeling - airport.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT, STAFF AND
OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

| | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| PROJ MGMT | \$120,000 | \$150,000 | \$390,000 | \$660,000 |
| SECRETARIAL | 24,000 | 45,000 | 117,000 | 186,000 |
| TECHNICAL EDITOR | | | 120,000 | 120,000 |
| TECHNICAL ILLUSTRATOR | | | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| PROFESSIONAL STAFF | | | 600,000 | 600,000 |
| OPERATIONAL EXPENSES | 12,000 | 15,000 | 42,000 | 69,000 |
| PRINTING | | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| TOTAL | \$156,000 | \$210,000 | \$1,394,000 | \$1,760,000 |

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Professional staff will participate in design of the program, monitor progress and prepare final document. Their time will be allocated as follows:

| | |
|-----|--------------|
| 25% | 3/78 - 6/78 |
| 25% | 7/78 - 11/78 |
| 50% | 12/78 - 1/80 |

PROFESSIONALS

| | Total - Man Mos. |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Meteorology and Air Quality | 4 |
| Water-surface, subsurface, quality | 4 |
| Archaeology | 2 |
| History | 2 |
| Soils | 2 |
| Vegetation | 4 |
| Forestry | 2 |
| Fish | 4 |
| Wildlife | 4 |
| Modelling-air, noise | 5 |
| Transportation- air, roads, rail | 4 |
| Aesthetics | 2 |
| Energy | 4 |
| Mineral resources | 3 |
| Recreation | 2 |
| Sociology | 4 |
| Economics | 4 |
| Power plant engineering | 4 |

| | Total - Man Mos. |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Seismology | 1 |
| Geology - surface, subsurface | 4 |
| Soils engineer | 4 |
| Health and Social Services | 4 |
| Housing | 3 |
| Total Man Months | <u>76</u> |

MEMORANDUM

TO: Janet Green

TO: Jay S. Hammond
Governor

DATE: February 13, 1978

FILE NO:

FEB 14 1978

Thru: Michael C. Harper
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM:

SUBJECT:

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

Charles E. Behlke
Chairman
New Capital Site Planning Commission
and

Charles E. Behlke

Ron Evans
Administrative Director
New Capital Site Planning Commission

SUBJECT: FY78 Special Appropriation Request

The New Capital Site Planning Commission, in the course of completing its financial and development plans per A.S. 33.06.230 (f) and (j), has identified the need for conducting a further study to understand the full implications of a capital move.

Data collection and analyses needed to complete this study dictates that the Commission submit a request for a Special Budget Appropriation of \$62,000 to cover work to be accomplished during the remaining months of FY78 (March-June), since no funding was included in the general appropriation bill to handle this undertaking:

(A) Project Description: analysis of the impact on Juneau and on state financial resources of retaining the capital in Juneau.

Should the capital move not take place, Commission consultants estimate that substantial additions of state office space would be required in Juneau by 1994. Population in the City and Borough would continue to grow rapidly.

As an initial assessment of cost considerations, Commission consultants have estimated construction cost only for state offices and community facilities and services utilizing indices derived for the Willow site. More definitive estimates are necessary for the legislature and the public to evaluate relative costs of state growth at Willow and Juneau. Such information will also be valuable if the Environmental Impact Statement for Willow requires full exploration of a "no-action" alternative--retention of capital functions in Juneau.

RECEIVED
FEB 15 1978

FISCAL OFFICE

Several factors concerning Juneau's physical setting mandate more extensive evaluation to establish costs. Relatively little open area exists within the city itself. Contiguous expansion of present state facilities would thus require: considerably higher densities than the basis for cost estimation at Willow; redevelopment of property largely in private use; concentration of parking in parking structures; acquisition of land. All of these conditions could alter substantially costs based on Willow indices.

Portions of state facilities expansion could conceivably be decentralized to other locations in the Juneau region. This could affect both capital costs and the operations of state government.

Accommodation of increased population affords additional issues which have public cost, efficiency, and environmental implications. The topographic and geologic features of Juneau, and their limitations, differ considerably from Willow. These may affect both the location and density of development, and therefore, construction and land acquisition cost requirements.

This study would take place between March 15 and June 1, 1978 and would involve the following activities:

1. Discussions with the Commissioner of Administration on factors affecting centralization/decentralization of additional state facilities in Juneau.
2. Establishment of a phased program for state facility expansion over the period 1980-1994. This would also include identification of specific sites or areas for expansion, establishment of floor space densities and structure parking requirements.
3. Estimation of land acquisition and construction cost requirements for state facilities based on the program, topographic and geologic information.
4. Similar analyses for other public office and support facilities (federal and local) and for private economic development (offices, hotels, commercial, etc.) likely to locate over the period.
5. Allocation of population growth to areas within the Borough at densities related to natural features, zoning requirements and service capacities.
6. Estimation of housing investment requirements.
7. Estimation of public service and facilities requirements to support state government, other public and private economic development, and the residential population over the period.

These would include investments for roads, schools, public health and welfare, public safety, water and sewer, parks and recreation, airports, port, etc..

8. Identification of methods of financing for the infrastructure, and the levels of government (state, federal, local) responsible for each facility type.

9. A detailed study to establish a basis of facts sufficient to make costs of growth in Juneau comparable in every way to the cost of the new capital in Willow.

10. Presentations of conclusions to the Commission and/or legislature and preparation of a report.

Cooperation of City and Borough of Juneau officials has been enlisted and current city-sponsored investigations on public facilities requirements for a population of 30,000 will be utilized in the investigation. Results should be of particular value both to Juneau officials and to the state administration regardless of the outcome of capital move decisions.

(B) Budget

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|------------------|
| Principal | 150 hrs. @ \$30 | = | \$ 4,500 |
| Senior | 230 hrs. @ \$20 | = | 4,600 |
| Professional 1 | 75 hrs. @ \$15 | = | 1,125 |
| Professional 2 | <u>50 hrs. @ \$ 8</u> | = | <u>400</u> |
| | 405 hrs. | | \$ 10,625 |
| Overhead at 126% | | | <u>\$ 13,387</u> |
| | | | \$ 24,012 |
| Fee at 10% | | | <u>\$ 2,401</u> |
| | | | <u>26,413</u> |
| <u>Expenses</u> | | | |
| Travel and Subsistence - 5 trips at \$1,000 | | | 5,000 |
| L.D. Telephone, Reproduction, Misc. | | | <u>\$ 1,587</u> |
| | | | \$ 33,000 |
| <u>Applied Economics Inc.</u> | 25 hrs. @ \$40 | = | 1,000 |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <u>Sub-Contractor (Consultant)</u> | \$ 24,000 |
| Principal, Civil Engineer 18 to 30 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Civil Engineer, Sr. Staff, Registered 18 to 30 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Civil Engineer, Staff 9 to 15 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Draftsmen 2 Draftsmen for 15 man days each @ 8 hours/day | |
| Clerical Assistance 6 to 10 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Incurred Expenses (Prints, Long Distance Telephone, Xerox Copying, Etc.) \$500 to \$750 | |
| Contingencies for additional travel and expenses | \$ <u>4,000</u> |
| TOTAL REQUEST | \$ <u><u>62,000</u></u> |

CEB:RE:Sgm

STATE
of ALASKA


MEMORANDUM

TO: Avrum M. Cross
Attorney General
Department of Law

DATE: February 21, 1978

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM:  Ronald B. Lind, Director
Division of Budget & Management
Office of the GovernorSUBJECT: Special Appropriation for
Capital Site Planning
Commission

The Capital Site Planning Commission requests introduction of a special general fund appropriation of \$1,221,200 to be in three parts:

1. \$231,000 to drill test wells to determine if sufficient ground water exists to provide the new capital city with water;
2. \$928,200 to initiate the first steps of the data collection process necessary for preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment and Statement; and
3. \$62,000 for analysis of the impact on Juneau and on State financial resources of retaining the capital in Juneau.

Please draft the transmittal memo for the Governor specifying the introduction of the bill is at the request of the Capital Site Planning Commission and being forwarded by the Governor to the Legislature.

The bill should include no lapse date.

STATE
of ALASKA

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ron Lind, Director
Division of Budget and Management

DATE: February 6, 1978

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO.

FROM: Alison Kugee, Budget Analyst
Division of Budget and ManagementSUBJECT: Capital Site Planning Commission
Request for Special Appropriation

I spoke with Ron Evans, Administrative Director of the New Capital Site Selection Committee, to discuss the request submitted for a special appropriation of \$1,159,200, February 2, 1978.

The appropriation request is broken into two main parts. The first part is \$231,000 for verification of well water at the Capital Site. As soon as the Commission is given the go-ahead, the contract will be let to drill 5 test wells in predetermined locations to ascertain there will be sufficient water and water pressure to provide the new city with water. The engineers estimate being able to start drilling by March with a 12 week monitoring period after the wells have been dug. If the drilling can begin on time we should be able to have preliminary test results prior to the legislature adjourning. The financial report being submitted to the legislature includes the cost of water being provided by these wells (the cheapest alternative for providing water.)

The second part of the appropriation request is \$928,200 for data collection in preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. The Commission's present schedule calls for completion of the total EIS data collection by 1/1/80. I have asked Ron Evans if it was possible to prioritize the projects proposed to begin with the \$928,200 funding, and what the effect would be of postponing any of this data collection. His general feeling about postponement was that there were certain required studies that will take a given amount of time to complete and any postponement will just push the completion date further down the line. However, he also said there may be some specific pieces of the data collection that could be postponed without serious delay, and he was going to check on it.

The data collection costs are at best just an estimate in terms of the time frame layout provided. The costs were broken between 7/78 - 11/78 and 12/78 - 1/80 in case the entire project was defeated by the voters in the November election. None of the data collection costs have ever been considered by the Commission as being bondable.

The financial report prepared by the Commission is at the printer's and will be mailed directly to the legislature in approximately two days. I have asked that a copy also be sent directly to our office as well as the Office of the Governor. I have also asked for a copy of the expenditure report that Mr. Evans prepares for the Commission detailing current year expenditures (including a list of contractors and what the contracts are for).

I told Mr. Evans we would be getting back to him the first part of next week with a response to their special appropriation request.

MEMORANDUM

10 [

Jay S. Hammond
Governor

DATE: January 27, 1978

FILE NO:

Thru: Michael C. Harper TELEPHONE NO:
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor SUBJECT:

FROM:

Charles E. Behlke *C.E.B.*
Chairman
New Capital Site Planning Commission

and
Ron Evans *R.E.*
Administrative Director
New Capital Site Planning Commission

SUBJECT: FY78 Special Appropriation Request

The Capital Site Planning Commission, in the course of completing its "recommended financial plan" and "specific development plan" as mandated under A.S. 44.06.230(f) and (j), has identified two critical next steps in the planning process which impinge on the State's ability to carry the proposed plans through to the construction phase within the required time frame.

Data collection and analyses needed to complete these "next steps" dictate that the Commission submit a request for a Special Budget Appropriation of \$1.2 million to cover work to be accomplished during the remaining months of FY78 (March-June), since no funding was included in the general appropriation bill to handle this undertaking.

The two steps (projects) are as follows:

(A) Source Verification of Well Water

The Commission's engineering investigations reveal that there are four alternate potable water sources for the New City:

1. Deep wells (14) capable of producing 350 gallons per minute together with two 1-million gallon capacity storage tanks.
2. Diversion of water from Willow Creek to Twelve-Mile Lake or storage tanks on site, including treatment facilities, pumps, etc.

3. Pumping of water from confluence of Willow Creek and Susitna River, including gallery system and sediment removal facilities.
4. Impoundment of Deception Creek augmented by water pumped from Willow Creek.

The estimated cost of these development alternatives ranges from \$2.8 million for deep wells to \$32 million for impoundment.

While existing data would seem to indicate the probability of sufficient existing ground water to proceed with alternative #1 above, this source is not verifiable without actual field testing. Therefore, in order to insure that the proper amount of funding for this component has been included in the financing plan, test wells must be drilled.

A special appropriation of \$231,000 is required to (1) prepare surface analyses and (2) drill five 300-foot wells at specific locations near the townsite. (See attachment A for detailed breakdown.)

In the event that this work is postponed until after the November 1978 bond election, the cost figures used in the financing plan could prove to be inadequate. Further, the exploration costs could climb to as much as 30% higher than the amount requested here due to the difficulties presented by drilling during the winter months.

(B) Environmental Analyses Data Collection

The Commission has determined that construction on the New City cannot begin until the spring of 1980, with initial occupancy currently slated for the summer of 1982. These dates are indeed optimistic, but possible.

The critical element in the network of events which must precede occupancy is the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment and Statement, which must be reviewed and approved by appropriate State and Federal agencies. We believe that a minimum period of eighteen months for data collection, evaluation, statement preparation, review and approval will be needed. This means that work must commence immediately (no later than May 1978) in order that it be completed in early 1980.

During this period, detailed planning would have to proceed on the assumption of approval or minor adaptations in order that construction might begin in the spring of

1980. This is an admittedly ambitious schedule dependent upon cooperative agencies, skilled technicians and the availability of a minimum of one year's field data in key areas of concern, such as air and water quality and biological effects.

In order to meet this requirement, a "crash" program of data collection must begin immediately. Data must be collected in sufficient quantities and in a manner acceptable to reviewing agencies. In order to accomplish this, field stations must be in place by May of 1978.

Work completed to date has been sufficient only to identify issues and to direct plans in an environmentally sound manner for subsequent detailed study and re-evaluation as necessary in the actual development planning which must precede construction.

A special appropriation of \$928,200 is required to initiate and continue the above data collection during the period March 1 through June 30, 1978. (See attachment B for detailed breakdown.) The total cost of EIS data collection, report preparation and approval is estimated to be \$4.52 million (i.e., \$928,200 for FY78; \$1,049,000 to cover FY79 period July 1, 1978 through November 30, 1978; \$2,546,900 commencing after the November election to complete EIS process by January of 1980).

Failure to begin this data collection and analysis now will inevitably delay approvals and construction. The ability to open facilities in the New Capital City by 1982 rests on this critical process.

SOURCE VERIFICATION OF WELL WATER

Surface Investigation

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Personnel and Expenses | |
| Two man-weeks | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Pre-test well analytic model | 10,000.00 |

Drilling Program

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| Drill, crew and Expenses | |
| 2 holes 6 inches in diameter | |
| Depth 300 ft. | |
| Cost \$120 per ft. | 72,000.00 |

| | |
|------------------------------|------------|
| Drill, crew and Expenses | |
| 3 holes 4 inches in diameter | |
| Depth 300 ft. | |
| Cost \$111 per ft. | 100,000.00 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Monitoring Drilling Analysis | |
| and preparation of final report | |
| Personnel and Expenses | |
| 12 man-weeks | 24,000.00 |

| | | |
|---------------|------------|------------------|
| Contingencies | 10 percent | <u>21,000.00</u> |
|---------------|------------|------------------|

| | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|
| | ESTIMATED TOTAL | \$231,000.00 |
|--|-----------------|--------------|

PROCEDURE FOR PREPARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Environmental impact statements (EIS) are a requirement of the Federal government and are mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act, PL91-190, January 1, 1970. These documents are required for all major Federal actions "...significantly affecting the quality of the human environment..." Issuance of permits and grants are considered to be Federal actions. The term "major actions" are implications of thresholds of importance and impact which must be met before a statement is required. Another consideration used to determine the necessity for an EIS is the potential for controversy of the proposed Federal action.

A second type of response to NEPA is the Negative Declaration, a statement that in the opinion of the agency no significant effects on the human environment will occur and an EIS is not required.

When several Federal agencies are involved in an action or several actions occur in a localized geographical area, the Council on Environmental Quality encourages the designation of a lead agency to prepare the statement. An important responsibility of the lead agency is to insure that all aspects of Federal actions are addressed adequately in the draft document.

In most cases, the Federal agency will not collect original data; instead it relies on

available data sources or data supplied by an applicant. In cases where the applicant must supply the data, the Federal agency will participate in the data identification and collection process in an advisory role to insure that the data collection process adequately responds to the needs of the environmental analysis. The agency also monitors the progress of the data collection process and will use the final product prepared by an applicant as the source document for the preparation of the agencies EIS. In other cases the Federal agency will contract with an organization for the preparation of an environmental assessment which the agency will use to prepare an EIS.

The first EIS is the draft environmental impact statement. This document is submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality, all interested agency reviewers, both Federal and State, and the public for review and comment.

Agencies seeking review and comment must allow forty-five days for review, and should allow for extensions for up to fifteen days for extensions requested by agencies or parties. Consideration must be given to the magnitude and complexity of the statement and the extent of citizen interest in the proposed action in granting requests for additional review time.

No administrative action can be taken sooner than ninety days after the draft EIS has been submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality and circulated for comment, nor sooner than thirty days after final copies of the document incorporating all changes resulting from reviewers comments have been submitted to the Council. If the final EIS is submitted prior to the end of the ninety day period, the minimum thirty day and ninety day periods can overlap.

FEDERAL AGENCIES WHICH MAY BE PARTICIPANTS IN THE
PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

| AGENCY | ACTION |
|---|--|
| Environmental Protection Agency | Construction grant for sewage treatment facility |
| Economic Development Administration Department of Housing and Urban Development | Grants to Community projects Grants for water and sewer projects Housing loans insured by FHA |
| General Services Administration | Construction of new Federal building |
| Federal Aviation Administration | Airport planning and construction grants |
| Corps of Engineers | Permits for placement of dredged material Construction of sewage outfall in navigable waters |
| Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Small Business Administration U. S. Coast Guard | Grants for recreation facilities Loans to small businesses Construction of bridges over navigable waters |
| Alaska Railroad | Construction of railroad spur Construction of rail-highway crossings |
| U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service | Review of actions affecting "waters of the U.S." |

STATE AGENCIES WHICH WILL BE INVOLVED IN DETERMINING
DATA ACQUISITION TO SATISFY PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

| Agency | Action |
|--|---|
| Department of Public Safety | Several plan check permits |
| Department of Commerce and Economic Development | Certificates of Public Necessity and Convenience |
| Department of Transportation and Public Facilities | Permits for utilities, encroachment and driveways |
| Department of Health and Social Services | Licenses and permits for institutional and private sector |
| Department of Environmental Conservation | Permits and licenses for actions that introduce potential pollutants to the environment |
| Department of Fish and Game | Permits for activities that affect fish and game. |
| Department of Natural Resources | Permits and plan reviews |

ESTIMATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT COSTS

| | Data Collection Period | | Data Analysis and Report Preparation | Total |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--------------|
| | Supplemental FY 1978 3/78-6/78 | Partial FY 1979 7/78-11/78 | | |
| HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY | \$ 60,400 | \$ 102,800 | \$ 170,400 | \$ 333,600 |
| GEOTECHNICAL | 202,600 | 127,600 | 43,600 | 373,800 |
| U.S.G.S (Water Studies) | | 42,000 | 40,000 | 82,000 |
| ARCHAEOLOGY | | 21,600 | 31,600 | 53,200 |
| BIOLOGY | | | | |
| FISH | 56,000 | 112,000 | 224,000 | 392,000 |
| WILDLIFE | 137,200 | 168,800 | 353,300 | 659,300 |
| VEGETATION | 16,000 | 204,200 | | 220,200 |
| METEOROLOGY AND AIR QUALITY | 300,000 | 60,000 | 130,000 | 490,000 |
| AIR QUALITY MODELING (Powerplant, Airport, City) | | | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| NOISE MODELING (Ai-port) | | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| PROJECT MGMT, STAFF AND OPERATIONAL EXPENSES | 156,000 | 210,000 | 1,394,000 | 1,760,000 |
| TOTAL | \$ 928,200 | \$ 1,049,000 | \$ 2,546,900 | \$ 4,524,100 |

COST ANALYSIS - HYDROLOGICAL AND GEOTECHNICAL

Project Description

Project - Hydrological

1. Identify source location, types and quantities of water pollutants addressing both construction and operational phases.
2. Summarize existing water quantity and quality information, identify historical patterns, annual trends, low flow conditions, temperature patterns, icing problems for all rivers, creeks and lakes in the area.
3. Examine the natural quality and quantity of surface waters, locating seeps, springs and interflow areas.
4. Assess the impact of ground water withdrawal through the use of data acquired in the drilling and testing program, electrical resistivity traverses and computer modeling.
5. Summarize available meteorological data to determine water availability and its part in the total hydrologic regime.
6. Lake profiling and contouring, water sampling, analysis of stream flow data, observations of surface water bodies such as ice thickness measurements, breakup and freeze-up data, installation of rain gauges for analysis in the hydrologic cycle. These efforts require extensive field observations.
7. Identify travel time and routes of surface and subsurface water through the lake drainage system by the use of tracer dyes.
8. Identify water use permits and attend permits and standards meetings with State and Federal agencies.
9. Analyze quantity, quality and impacts of sanitary, storm and casual operational water discharges, of sewage systems, septic systems, erosion, subhumus flow, storm drainage, landfill leachate and waste oil disposal.
10. Conduct a study of the impact of construction and operation of the city on the physical, biological and chemical aspects of Nancy Lake.
11. Examine developmental impacts of phased development and construction schedules, assessing both short and long term impacts on water quality and surface drainage.

12. Assess the impact of planned operation activity of the city including accidents such as oil spills, the long term effects of storm water management, regional water management, icing and ice fog.

Geotechnical

13. This phase includes test drilling, resistivity surveys, field data collection necessary to prepare maps of surficial geological materials and bedrock locations. This is the field data collection effort necessary to determine land use suitability for such uses as landfills and major structures.
14. Samples collected in Project 13 will be tested to derive physical properties used in determining the suitability of geographic areas for specific land uses.
15. The products of Projects 13 and 14 will be used to prepare detailed terrain unit maps indicated suitability for various land uses.
16. A hazards analysis study will be performed to evaluate geologic hazards such as earthquakes, slope failures and permafrost, seismic analysis and determination of earthquake responses such as ground motion intensity, liquefaction, slope stability, etc.
17. Prepare a preliminary text for initial review, describing the products of the previous projects and identifying impacts in appropriate formats.
18. After review, revisions of text will be made to conform to reviewers comments.

COST ANALYSIS - U.S.G.S. WATER PROGRAM

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|--------|----------|------------|----------|
| 1 | | \$42,000 | \$40,000 | \$82,000 |

Project Description

1. Install two continuous gaging stations in FY79 (after 10/78), perform miscellaneous measurements quarterly on Willow and Deception Creeks, perform selected analysis of quarterly samples and perform continuous recording of water levels in three observation wells in proposed water supply test wells.

COST ANALYSIS - ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROGRAM

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|--------|----------|------------|----------|
| 1 | | \$21,600 | \$31,600 | \$53,200 |

Project Description

1. The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Parks proposes to conduct a archaeological and historical survey of the development area of the capital city site in the summer of 1978 and the capital reserve area during the summer of 1979.

COST ANALYSIS - BIOLOGICAL

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 2/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 | | \$88,000 | | \$88,000 |
| 2 | | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| 3 | | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| 4 | \$8,000 | 60,200 | | 68,200 |
| 5 | 8,000 | 48,000 | | 56,000 |
| 6 | 10,800 | 2,400 | \$40,800 | 54,000 |
| 7 | 36,000 | 24,000 | 115,900 | 175,900 |
| 8 | 2,200 | 800 | 3,200 | 6,200 |
| 9 | 17,600 | 38,400 | 56,000 | 112,000 |
| 10 | 40,400 | 77,200 | 64,000 | 181,600 |
| 11 | 21,000 | 18,000 | 53,800 | 92,800 |
| 12 | 2,000 | 2,000 | | 4,000 |
| 13 | 2,400 | | 4,800 | 7,200 |
| 14 | 4,800 | 6,000 | 14,800 | 25,600 |
| 15 | 56,000 | 112,000 | 224,000 | 392,000 |
| 16 | | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| Total | \$209,200 | \$485,000 | \$577,300 | \$1,271,500 |

COST ANALYSIS - BIOLOGICAL

Project Description

Project

1. Preparation of a color mosaic at a scale of 1:15,840 for detailed vegetative analysis of habitat type.
2. Determination of detailed vegetative type.
3. Correlation of animal use areas and habitat types to improve knowledge of vegetative types and use.
4. Identify amount of acreage of key moose browse species, conditional and successional stages of all habitat types within a fifteen mile radius of the city.
5. Determine amount of moose habitat lost to construction and investigate methods and areas to create replacement habitat.
6. Conduct aerial surveys to determine areas used by moose at various times of the year, identify moose wintering and calving areas and correlate results with vegetation data from other projects.
7. Radio transmitter collars will be placed on 25 moose within a ten mile radius of the city center and a monitoring program will record their movements throughout the year to assist in establishing seasonal habitat preferences for specific sex and age classes.
8. Conduct aerial wolf census to determine abundance, location, movement and denning locations in and adjacent to the capital site.
9. Conduct aerial and ground reconnaissance of black and brown bear to determine habitat use, abundance, feasibility of ground snaring and tranquilizing from helicopter.
10. Capture twenty to twenty-five brown and black bears with snares and install radio transmitter collars and acquire biological data. Monitoring flights will be conducted to locate dens and critical habitat.
11. Conduct a comprehensive study of furbearers, their movements, habitat use and abundance.
12. Federal regulations require a survey to determine the presence, abundance or absence of endangered species.

13. Conduct aerial nest surveys of hawks, owls and raptors, with special emphasis placed on the areas to be modified by construction.
14. Spring, summer and fall aerial surveys will be conducted to determine presence, abundance and location of water fowl.
15. A total inventory of the fisheries resources in Willow Creek, Lilly Creek and Deception Creek drainages will be made to determine the presence and abundance of both anadromous and resident species.
16. The recreational use of fisheries resources will be assessed in Willow Creek, with major emphasis on a creek census of sport angling during July and August.
17. Preliminary measurements and evaluations of seasonal flows and instream flow needs on Willow Deception and Lilly Creeks.

COST ANALYSIS - METEOROLOGY, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE ANALYSIS

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|
| 1 | \$164,000 | \$40,000 | \$87,000 | \$291,000 |
| 2 | 23,000 | 10,000 | 23,000 | 56,000 |
| 3 | 113,000 | 10,000 | 20,000 | 143,000 |
| 4 | | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| 5 | | | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| 6 | | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 7 | | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Totals | \$300,000 | \$60,000 | \$290,000 | \$650,000 |

COST ANALYSIS - METEOROLOGY, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE ANALYSIS

Project Description

1. Tower (60 meter) at city site, instrumentation, maintenance and operation.
2. Tower (10 meter) installation at Houston, instrumentation, maintenance and operation, for airport analysis.
3. Tower (100 meter) on Willow Creek road, instrumentation, maintenance and operation for power plant analysis.
4. Air quality modeling - airport.
5. Air quality modeling - city.
6. Air quality modeling - power plant.
7. Noise forecast modeling - airport.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT, STAFF AND

OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

| | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| PROJ MGMT | \$120,000 | \$150,000 | \$390,000 | \$660,000 |
| SECRETARIAL | 24,000 | 45,000 | 117,000 | 186,000 |
| TECHNICAL EDITOR | | | 120,000 | 120,000 |
| TECHNICAL ILLUSTRATOR | | | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| PROFESSIONAL STAFF | | | 600,000 | 600,000 |
| OPERATIONAL EXPENSES | 12,000 | 15,000 | 42,000 | 69,000 |
| PRINTING | | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| TOTAL | \$156,000 | \$210,000 | \$1,394,000 | \$1,760,000 |

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Professional staff will participate in design of the program, monitor progress and prepare final document. Their time will be allocated as follows:

| | |
|-----|--------------|
| 25% | 3/78 - 6/78 |
| 25% | 7/78 - 11/78 |
| 50% | 12/78 - 1/80 |

PROFESSIONALS

| | Total - Man Mos. |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Meteorology and Air Quality | 4 |
| Water-surface, subsurface, quality | 4 |
| Archaeology | 2 |
| History | 2 |
| Soils | 2 |
| Vegetation | 4 |
| Forestry | 2 |
| Fish | 4 |
| Wildlife | 4 |
| Modelling-air, noise | 5 |
| Transportation- air, roads, rail | 4 |
| Aesthetics | 2 |
| Energy | 4 |
| Mineral resources | 3 |
| Recreation | 2 |
| Sociology | 4 |
| Economics | 4 |
| Power plant engineering | 4 |

| | Total - Man Mos. |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Seismology | 1 |
| Geology - surface, subsurface | 4 |
| Soils engineer | 4 |
| Health and Social Services | 4 |
| Housing | 3 |
| Total Man Months | <u>76</u> |

MEMORANDUM

TO: Janet ^{action} Green

TO:

Jay S. Hammond
Governor

DATE: February 13, 1978

FILE NO:

Thru: Michael C. Harper
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM:

SUBJECT:

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

Charles E. Behlke
Chairman
New Capital Site Planning Commission
and

Charles E. Behlke

Ron Evans
Administrative Director
New Capital Site Planning Commission

SUBJECT: FY78 Special Appropriation Request

The New Capital Site Planning Commission, in the course of completing its financial and development plans per A.S. 33.06.230 (f) and (j), has identified the need for conducting a further study to understand the full implications of a capital move.

Data collection and analyses needed to complete this study dictates that the Commission submit a request for a Special Budget Appropriation of \$62,000 to cover work to be accomplished during the remaining months of FY78 (March-June), since no funding was included in the general appropriation bill to handle this undertaking:

(A) Project Description: Analysis of the impact on Juneau and on state financial resources of retaining the capital in Juneau.

Should the capital move not take place, Commission consultants estimate that substantial additions of state office space would be required in Juneau by 1994. Population in the City and Borough would continue to grow rapidly.

As an initial assessment of cost considerations, Commission consultants have estimated construction cost only for state offices and community facilities and services utilizing indices derived for the Willow site. More definitive estimates are necessary for the legislature and the public to evaluate relative costs of state growth at Willow and Juneau. Such information will also be valuable if the Environmental Impact Statement for Willow requires full exploration of a "no-action" alternative--retention of capital functions in Juneau.

RECEIVED
FEB 15 1978

FISCAL OFFICE

Several factors concerning Juneau's physical setting mandate more extensive evaluation to establish costs. Relatively little open area exists within the city itself. Contiguous expansion of present state facilities would thus require: considerably higher densities than the basis for cost estimation at Willow; redevelopment of property largely in private use; concentration of parking in parking structures; acquisition of land. All of these conditions could alter substantially costs based on Willow indices.

Portions of state facilities expansion could conceivably be decentralized to other locations in the Juneau region. This could affect both capital costs and the operations of state government.

Accommodation of increased population affords additional issues which have public cost, efficiency, and environmental implications. The topographic and geologic features of Juneau, and their limitations, differ considerably from Willow. These may affect both the location and density of development, and therefore, construction and land acquisition cost requirements.

This study would take place between March 15 and June 1, 1978 and would involve the following activities:

1. Discussions with the Commissioner of Administration on factors affecting centralization/decentralization of additional state facilities in Juneau.
2. Establishment of a phased program for state facility expansion over the period 1980-1994. This would also include identification of specific sites or areas for expansion, establishment of floor space densities and structure parking requirements.
3. Estimation of land acquisition and construction cost requirements for state facilities based on the program, topographic and geologic information.
4. Similar analyses for other public office and support facilities (federal and local) and for private economic development (offices, hotels, commercial, etc.) likely to locate over the period.
5. Allocation of population growth to areas within the Borough at densities related to natural features, zoning requirements and service capacities.
6. Estimation of housing investment requirements.
7. Estimation of public service and facilities requirements to support state government, other public and private economic development, and the residential population over the period.

These would include investments for roads, schools, public health and welfare, public safety, water and sewer, parks and recreation, airports, port, etc..

8. Identification of methods of financing for the infrastructure, and the levels of government (state, federal, local) responsible for each facility type.

9. A detailed study to establish a basis of facts sufficient to make costs of growth in Juneau comparable in every way to the cost of the new capital in Willow.

10. Presentations of conclusions to the Commission and/or legislature and preparation of a report.

Cooperation of City and Borough of Juneau officials has been enlisted and current city-sponsored investigations on public facilities requirements for a population of 30,000 will be utilized in the investigation. Results should be of particular value both to Juneau officials and to the state administration regardless of the outcome of capital move decisions.

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------|---|------------------|
| (B) | <u>Budget</u> | | | |
| | Principal | 150 hrs. @ \$30 | = | \$ 4,500 |
| | Senior | 230 hrs. @ \$20 | = | 4,600 |
| | Professional 1 | 75 hrs. @ \$15 | = | 1,125 |
| | Professional 2 | <u>50 hrs. @ \$ 8</u> | = | <u>400</u> |
| | | 405 hrs. | | \$ 10,625 |
| | Overhead at 126% | | | <u>\$ 13,387</u> |
| | | | | \$ 24,012 |
| | Fee at 10% | | | <u>\$ 2,401</u> |
| | | | | <u>26,413</u> |
| | <u>Expenses</u> | | | |
| | Travel and Subsistence - 5 trips at \$1,000 | | | 5,000 |
| | L.D. Telephone, Reproduction, Misc. | | | <u>\$ 1,587</u> |
| | | | | \$ 33,000 |
| | <u>Applied Economics Inc.</u> | 25 hrs. @ \$40 | = | 1,000 |

February 13, 1978

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <u>Sub-Contractor (Consultant)</u> | \$ 24,000 |
| Principal, Civil Engineer 18 to 30 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Civil Engineer, Sr. Staff, Registered 18 to 30 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Civil Engineer, Staff 9 to 15 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Draftsmen 2 Draftsmen for 15 man days each @ 8 hours/day | |
| Clerical Assistance 6 to 10 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Incurred Expenses (Prints, Long Distance Telephone, Xerox Copying, Etc.) \$500 to \$750 | |
| Contingencies for additional travel and expenses | \$ <u>4,000</u> |
| TOTAL REQUEST | \$ <u><u>62,000</u></u> |

CEB:RE:Sgm

COMMITTEE REPORT
SENATE

FURTHER: _____

4/25/78

Date: _____

Mr. President:

The Committee on FINANCE has had CSHB 870 am special appropriation to New Capital Site Planning Commission & the legislative finance division

under consideration and (a majority of the committee) (the committee reports it back as follows)

- recommends it do pass recommends it do not pass
- recommends it do pass with attached amendment(s)
- recommends it be replaced with CS for _____

and _____ new title same title

- AND attaches a Letter of Intent New Fiscal Note
- reports it back without recommendation
- and recommends it be referred to the _____ Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING DO PASS:

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

Chairman

COMMITTEE REPORT

SENATE

3/30/78

FURTHER: FINANCE

Date: April 25, 1978

Mr. President:

The Committee on STATE AFFAIRS has had CSHB 870 am special appropriations to New Capital Site Planning Commission & the legislative finance division

under consideration and (a majority of the committee) (the committee reports it back as follows)

() recommends it do pass () recommends it do not pass

() recommends it do pass with attached amendment(s)

recommends it be replaced with SCS for CSHB 870

and _____ new title () same title

() AND attaches a Letter of Intent () New Fiscal Note

reports it back without ^{individual} recommendation

() and recommends it be referred to the _____ Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING DO PASS:

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

J. Kattelus ~~Do not pass unless~~ amended

delete 62,000.

John Weber

DO NOT PASS UNLESS AMENDED TO DELETE THE \$62,000.00 APPROPRIATION

Brad Bralley Do Pass

Bill Ray DO NOT PASS UNLESS DELETE 62,000

Ed Willis, Co Chairman
Chairman
Do Pass

Original sponsor: Rules Committee
by request of the Governor (by request
of the New Capital Site Planning Commission)

Offered: 4/25/78
Referred: Finance

1 IN THE HOUSE

BY THE STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

2 SENATE CS FOR CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 870

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 TENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act making special appropriations to the New Capital Site Planning Commission; and providing for an effective date."
7
8

9 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

10 * Section 1. The sum of \$840,200 is appropriated from the general fund to
11 the New Capital Site Planning Commission, to be allocated as follows:

12 (1) Fund an analysis of the impact on Juneau and
13 on state financial resources of retaining the capital in
14 Juneau. The assumptions used for the analysis shall be those
15 used in projecting growth at the new capital site with
16 relevant regard to existing facilities and capabilities in
17 the present capital \$ 62,000

18 (2) Initiate the first steps of the data collection
19 process necessary for preparation of the Environmental Impact
20 Assessment and Statement 778,200

21 * Sec. 2. The appropriation made under sec. 1 of this Act does not lapse
22 at the end of this fiscal year under AS 37.25.010.

23 * Sec. 3. This Act takes effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.10.-
24 070(c).

Original sponsor: Rules Committee
by request of the Governor (by request
of the New Capital Site Planning Commission)

Offered: 3/24/78
Referred: Rules

1 IN THE HOUSE

BY THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

2 CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 870 am

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 TENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5 A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act making special appropriations to the New Capital
7 Site Planning Commission (and the legislative fi-
8 nance division; and providing for an effective date."

9 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

10 * Section 1. The sum of \$1,009,200 is appropriated from the general fund
11 to the New Capital Site Planning Commission, to be allocated as follows:

12 (1) Drill test wells to determine if sufficient
13 ground water exists to provide the new capital city with
14 water

\$231,000

15 (2) Initiate the first steps of the data
16 collection process necessary for preparation of the
17 Environmental Impact Assessment and Statement

778,200

18 * Sec. 2. The sum of \$62,000 is appropriated from the general fund to
19 the legislative finance division to fund an analysis of the impact on Juneau
20 and on state financial resources of retaining the capital in Juneau. The
21 assumptions used for the analysis shall be those used in projecting growth
22 at the new capital site with relevant regard to existing facilities and
23 capabilities in the present capital.

24 * Sec. 3. The appropriations made under secs. 1 and 2 of this Act do not
25 lapse at the end of this fiscal year, under AS 37.25.010.

26 * Sec. 4. This Act takes effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.10.-
27 070(c).

7 LB 870

March 3, 1978

The Honorable Hugh Malone
Speaker of the House
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Under the authority of art. III, sec. 18 of the Alaska Constitution, and in accordance with AS 24.30.060(b) and the Uniform Rules of the Alaska State Legislature, I am transmitting a bill making a special appropriation to the New Capital Site Planning Commission. This appropriation provides for:

1) \$231,000 to drill test wells to determine if sufficient ground water exists to provide the new capital city with water;

2) \$928,200 to initiate the first steps of the data collection process necessary for preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment and Statement; and

3) \$62,000 for analysis of the impact on Juneau and on state financial resources of retaining the capital in Juneau.

This measure is being requested by the New Capital Site Planning Commission. I believe that it is necessary to place this measure before you for your consideration. Fiscal information is attached.

Sincerely,

S/SSH

Jay S. Hammond
Governor

STATE
of ALASKA

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ron Lind, Director
Division of Budget and Management

DATE: February 6, 1978

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: Alison Edge, Budget Analyst
Division of Budget and ManagementSUBJECT: Capital Site Planning Commission
Request for Special Appropriation

I spoke with Ron Evans, Administrative Director of the New Capital Site Selection Committee, to discuss the request submitted for a special appropriation of \$1,159,200, February 2, 1978.

The appropriation request is broken into two main parts. The first part is \$231,000 for verification of well water at the Capital Site. As soon as the Commission is given the go-ahead, the contract will be let to drill 5 test wells in predetermined locations to ascertain there will be sufficient water and water pressure to provide the new city with water. The engineers estimate being able to start drilling by March with a 12 week monitoring period after the wells have been dug. If the drilling can begin on time we should be able to have preliminary test results prior to the legislature adjourning. The financial report being submitted to the legislature includes the cost of water being provided by these wells (the cheapest alternative for providing water.)

The second part of the appropriation request is \$928,200 for data collection in preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. The Commission's present schedule calls for completion of the total EIS data collection by 1/1/80. I have asked Ron Evans if it was possible to prioritize the projects proposed to begin with the \$928,200 funding, and what the effect would be of postponing any of this data collection. His general feeling about postponement was that there were certain required studies that will take a given amount of time to complete and any postponement will just push the completion date further down the line. However, he also said there may be some specific pieces of the data collection that could be postponed without serious delay, and he was going to check on it.

The data collection costs are at best just an estimate in terms of the time frame layout provided. The costs were broken between 7/78 - 11/78 and 12/78 - 1/80 in case the entire project was defeated by the voters in the November election. None of the data collection costs have ever been considered by the Commission as being bondable.

The financial report prepared by the Commission is at the printer's and will be mailed directly to the legislature in approximately two days. I have asked that a copy also be sent directly to our office as well as the Office of the Governor. I have also asked for a copy of the expenditure report that Mr. Evans prepares for the Commission detailing current year expenditures (including a list of contractors and what the contracts are for).

I told Mr. Evans we would be getting back to him the first part of next week with a response to their special appropriation request.

MEMORANDUM

10 F

Jay S. Hammond
Governor

DATE: January 27, 1978

FILE NO:

Thru: Michael C. Harper TELEPHONE NO:
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor SUBJECT:

FROM:

Charles E. Behlke *C.E.B.*
Chairman
New Capital Site Planning Commission

and
Ron Evans *R.E.*
Administrative Director
New Capital Site Planning Commission

SUBJECT: FY78 Special Appropriation Request

The Capital Site Planning Commission, in the course of completing its "recommended financial plan" and "specific development plan" as mandated under A.S. 44.06.230(f) and (j), has identified two critical next steps in the planning process which impinge on the State's ability to carry the proposed plans through to the construction phase within the required time frame.

Data collection and analyses needed to complete these "next steps" dictate that the Commission submit a request for a Special Budget Appropriation of \$1.2 million to cover work to be accomplished during the remaining months of FY78 (March-June), since no funding was included in the general appropriation bill to handle this undertaking.

The two steps (projects) are as follows:

(A) Source Verification of Well Water

The Commission's engineering investigations reveal that there are four alternate potable water sources for the New City:

1. Deep wells (14) capable of producing 350 gallons per minute together with two 1-million gallon capacity storage tanks.
2. Diversion of water from Willow Creek to Twelve-Mile Lake or storage tanks on site, including treatment facilities, pumps, etc.

3. Pumping of water from confluence of Willow Creek and Susitna River, including gallery system and sediment removal facilities.
4. Impoundment of Deception Creek augmented by water pumped from Willow Creek.

The estimated cost of these development alternatives ranges from \$2.8 million for deep wells to \$32 million for impoundment.

While existing data would seem to indicate the probability of sufficient existing ground water to proceed with alternative #1 above, this source is not verifiable without actual field testing. Therefore, in order to insure that the proper amount of funding for this component has been included in the financing plan, test wells must be drilled.

A special appropriation of \$231,000 is required to (1) prepare surface analyses and (2) drill five 300-foot wells at specific locations near the townsite. (See attachment A for detailed breakdown.)

In the event that this work is postponed until after the November 1978 bond election, the cost figures used in the financing plan could prove to be inadequate. Further, the exploration costs could climb to as much as 30% higher than the amount requested here due to the difficulties presented by drilling during the winter months.

(B) Environmental Analyses Data Collection

The Commission has determined that construction on the New City cannot begin until the spring of 1980, with initial occupancy currently slated for the summer of 1982. These dates are indeed optimistic, but possible.

The critical element in the network of events which must precede occupancy is the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment and Statement, which must be reviewed and approved by appropriate State and Federal agencies. We believe that a minimum period of eighteen months for data collection, evaluation, statement preparation, review and approval will be needed. This means that work must commence immediately (no later than May 1978) in order that it be completed in early 1980.

During this period, detailed planning would have to proceed on the assumption of approval or minor adaptations in order that construction might begin in the spring of

1980. This is an admittedly ambitious schedule dependent upon cooperative agencies, skilled technicians and the availability of a minimum of one year's field data in key areas of concern, such as air and water quality and biological effects.

In order to meet this requirement, a "crash" program of data collection must begin immediately. Data must be collected in sufficient quantities and in a manner acceptable to reviewing agencies. In order to accomplish this, field stations must be in place by May of 1978.

Work completed to date has been sufficient only to identify issues and to direct plans in an environmentally sound manner for subsequent detailed study and re-evaluation as necessary in the actual development planning which must precede construction.

A special appropriation of \$928,200 is required to initiate and continue the above data collection during the period March 1 through June 30, 1978. (See attachment B for detailed breakdown.) The total cost of EIS data collection, report preparation and approval is estimated to be \$4.52 million (i.e., \$928,200 for FY78; \$1,049,000 to cover FY79 period July 1, 1978 through November 30, 1978; \$2,546,900 commencing after the November election to complete EIS process by January of 1980).

Failure to begin this data collection and analysis now will inevitably delay approvals and construction. The ability to open facilities in the New Capital City by 1982 rests on this critical process.

SOURCE VERIFICATION OF WELL WATER

Surface Investigation

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Personnel and Expenses | |
| Two man-weeks | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Pre-test well analytic model | 10,000.00 |

Drilling Program

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| Drill, crew and Expenses | |
| 2 holes 6 inches in diameter | |
| Depth 300 ft. | |
| Cost \$120 per ft. | 72,000.00 |

| | |
|------------------------------|------------|
| Drill, crew and Expenses | |
| 3 holes 4 inches in diameter | |
| Depth 300 ft. | |
| Cost \$111 per ft. | 100,000.00 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Monitoring Drilling Analysis | |
| and preparation of final report | |
| Personnel and Expenses | |
| 12 man-weeks | 24,000.00 |

| | | |
|---------------|------------|------------------|
| Contingencies | 10 percent | <u>21,000.00</u> |
|---------------|------------|------------------|

| | |
|-----------------|--------------|
| ESTIMATED TOTAL | \$231,000.00 |
|-----------------|--------------|

PROCEDURE FOR PREPARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Environmental impact statements (EIS) are a requirement of the Federal government and are mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act, PL91-190, January 1, 1970. These documents are required for all major Federal actions "...significantly affecting the quality of the human environment..." Issuance of permits and grants are considered to be Federal actions. The term "major actions" are implications of thresholds of importance and impact which must be met before a statement is required. Another consideration used to determine the necessity for an EIS is the potential for controversy of the proposed Federal action.

A second type of response to NEPA is the Negative Declaration, a statement that in the opinion of the agency no significant effects on the human environment will occur and an EIS is not required.

When several Federal agencies are involved in an action or several actions occur in a localized geographical area, the Council on Environmental Quality encourages the designation of a lead agency to prepare the statement. An important responsibility of the lead agency is to insure that all aspects of Federal actions are addressed adequately in the draft document.

In most cases, the Federal agency will not collect original data; instead it relies on

available data sources or data supplied by an applicant. In cases where the applicant must supply the data, the Federal agency will participate in the data identification, and collection process in an advisory role to insure that the data collection process adequately responds to the needs of the environmental analysis. The agency also monitors the progress of the data collection process and will use the final product prepared by an applicant as the source document for the preparation of the agencies EIS. In other cases the Federal agency will contract with an organization for the preparation of an environmental assessment which the agency will use to prepare an EIS.

The first EIS is the draft environmental impact statement. This document is submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality, all interested agency reviewers, both Federal and State, and the public for review and comment.

Agencies seeking review and comment must allow forty-five days for review, and should allow for extensions for up to fifteen days for extensions requested by agencies or parties. Consideration must be given to the magnitude and complexity of the statement and the extent of citizen interest in the proposed action in granting requests for additional review time.

No administrative action can be taken sooner than ninety days after the draft EIS has been submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality and circulated for comment, nor sooner than thirty days after final copies of the document incorporating all changes resulting from reviewers comments have been submitted to the Council. If the final EIS is submitted prior to the end of the ninety day period, the minimum thirty day and ninety day periods can overlap.

FEDERAL AGENCIES WHICH MAY BE PARTICIPANTS IN THE
PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

| AGENCY | ACTION |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Environmental Protection Agency | Construction grant for sewage treatment facility |
| Economic Development Administration | Grants to Community projects |
| Department of Housing and Urban | Grants for water and sewer projects |
| Development | Housing loans insured by FHA |
| General Services Administration | Construction of new Federal building |
| Federal Aviation Administration | Airport planning and construction grants |
| Corps of Engineers | Permits for placement of dredged material |
| Bureau of Outdoor Recreation | Construction of sewage outfall in navigable waters |
| Small Business Administration | Grants for recreation facilities |
| U. S. Coast Guard | Loans to small businesses |
| Alaska Railroad | Construction of bridges over navigable waters |
| U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service | Construction of railroad spur |
| | Construction of rail-highway crossings |
| | Review of actions affecting "waters of the U.S." |

STATE AGENCIES WHICH WILL BE INVOLVED IN DETERMINING
DATA ACQUISITION TO SATISFY PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

| Agency | Action |
|--|---|
| Department of Public Safety | Several plan check permits |
| Department of Commerce and Economic Development | Certificates of Public Necessity and Convenience |
| Department of Transportation and Public Facilities | Permits for utilities, encroachment and driveways |
| Department of Health and Social Services | Licenses and permits for institutional and private sector |
| Department of Environmental Conservation | Permits and licenses for actions that introduce potential pollutants to the environment |
| Department of Fish and Game | Permits for activities that affect fish and game. |
| Department of Natural Resources | Permits and plan reviews |

ESTIMATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT COSTS

| | Data Collection Period | | Data Analysis and Report Preparation | Total |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | Supplemental FY 1978 3/78-6/78 | Partial FY 1979 7/78-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | |
| HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY | \$ 60,400 | \$ 102,800 | \$ 170,400 | \$ 333,600 |
| GEOTECHNICAL | 202,600 | 127,600 | 43,600 | 373,800 |
| U.S.G.S (Water Studies) | | 42,000 | 40,000 | 82,000 |
| ARCHAEOLOGY | | 21,600 | 31,600 | 53,200 |
| BIOLOGY | | | | |
| FISH | 56,000 | 112,000 | 224,000 | 392,000 |
| WILDLIFE | 137,200 | 168,800 | 353,300 | 659,300 |
| VEGETATION | 16,000 | 204,200 | | 220,200 |
| METEOROLOGY AND AIR QUALITY | 300,000 | 60,000 | 130,000 | 490,000 |
| AIR QUALITY MODELING (Powerplant, Airport, City) | | | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| NOISE MODELING (Airport) | | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| PROJECT MGMT, STAFF AND OPERATIONAL EXPENSES | 156,000 | 210,000 | 1,394,000 | 1,760,000 |
| TOTAL | \$ 928,200 | \$ 1,049,000 | \$ 2,546,900 | \$ 4,524,100 |

COST ANALYSIS - HYDROLOGICAL AND GEOTECHNICAL

Project Description

Project - Hydrological

1. Identify source location, types and quantities of water pollutants addressing both construction and operational phases.
2. Summarize existing water quantity and quality information, identify historical patterns, annual trends, low flow conditions, temperature patterns, icing problems for all rivers, creeks and lakes in the area.
3. Examine the natural quality and quantity of surface waters, locating seeps, springs and interflow areas.
4. Assess the impact of ground water withdrawal through the use of data acquired in the drilling and testing program, electrical resistivity traverses and computer modeling.
5. Summarize available meteorological data to determine water availability and its part in the total hydrologic regime.
6. Lake profiling and contouring, water sampling, analysis of stream flow data, observations of surface water bodies such as ice thickness measurements, breakup and freeze-up data, installation of rain gauges for analysis in the hydrologic cycle. These efforts require extensive field observations.
7. Identify travel time and routes of surface and subsurface water through the lake drainage system by the use of tracer dyes.
8. Identify water use permits and attend permits and standards meetings with State and Federal agencies.
9. Analyze quantity, quality and impacts of sanitary, storm and casual operational water discharges, of sewage systems, septic systems, erosion, subhumus flow, storm drainage, landfill leachate and waste oil disposal.
10. Conduct a study of the impact of construction and operation of the city on the physical, biological and chemical aspects of Nancy Lake.
11. Examine developmental impacts of phased development and construction schedules, assessing both short and long term impacts on water quality and surface drainage.

12. Assess the impact of planned operation activity of the city including accidents such as oil spills, the long term effects of storm water management, regional water management, icing and ice fog.

Geotechnical

13. This phase includes test drilling, resistivity surveys, field data collection necessary to prepare maps of surficial geological materials and bedrock locations. This is the field data collection effort necessary to determine land use suitability for such uses as landfills and major structures.
14. Samples collected in Project 13 will be tested to derive physical properties used in determining the suitability of geographic areas for specific land uses.
15. The products of Projects 13 and 14 will be used to prepare detailed terrain unit maps indicated suitability for various land uses.
16. A hazards analysis study will be performed to evaluate geologic hazards such as earthquakes, slope failures and permafrost, seismic analysis and determination of earthquake responses such as ground motion intensity, liquefaction, slope stability, etc.
17. Prepare a preliminary text for initial review, describing the products of the previous projects and identifying impacts in appropriate formats.
18. After review, revisions of text will be made to conform to reviewers comments.

COST ANALYSIS - U.S.G.S. WATER PROGRAM

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|--------|----------|------------|----------|
| 1 | | \$42,000 | \$40,000 | \$82,000 |

Project Description

1. Install two continuous gaging stations in FY79 (after 10/78), perform miscellaneous measurements quarterly on Willow and Deception Creeks, perform selected analysis of quarterly samples and perform continuous recording of water levels in three observation wells in proposed water supply test wells.

COST ANALYSIS - ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROGRAM

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|--------|----------|------------|----------|
| 1 | | \$21,600 | \$31,600 | \$53,200 |

Project Description

1. The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Parks proposes to conduct a archaeological and historical survey of the development area of the capital city site in the summer of 1978 and the capital reserve area during the summer of 1979.

COST ANALYSIS - BIOLOGICAL

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| 1 | | \$88,000 | | \$88,000 |
| 2 | | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| 3 | | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| 4 | \$8,000 | 60,200 | | 68,200 |
| 5 | 8,000 | 48,000 | | 56,000 |
| 6 | 10,800 | 2,400 | \$40,800 | 54,000 |
| 7 | 36,000 | 24,000 | 115,900 | 175,900 |
| 8 | 2,200 | 800 | 3,200 | 6,200 |
| 9 | 17,600 | 38,400 | 56,000 | 112,000 |
| 10 | 40,400 | 77,200 | 64,000 | 181,600 |
| 11 | 21,000 | 18,000 | 53,800 | 92,800 |
| 12 | 2,000 | 2,000 | | 4,000 |
| 13 | 2,400 | | 4,800 | 7,200 |
| 14 | 4,800 | 6,000 | 14,800 | 25,600 |
| 15 | 56,000 | 112,000 | 224,000 | 392,000 |
| 16 | | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| Total | \$209,200 | \$485,000 | \$577,300 | \$1,271,500 |

COST ANALYSIS - BIOLOGICAL

Project Description

Project

1. Preparation of a color mosaic at a scale of 1:15,840 for detailed vegetative analysis of habitat type.
2. Determination of detailed vegetative type.
3. Correlation of animal use areas and habitat types to improve knowledge of vegetative types and use.
4. Identify amount of acreage of key moose browse species, conditional and successional stages of all habitat types within a fifteen mile radius of the city.
5. Determine amount of moose habitat lost to construction and investigate methods and areas to create replacement habitat.
6. Conduct aerial surveys to determine areas used by moose at various times of the year, identify moose wintering and calving areas and correlate results with vegetation data from other projects.
7. Radio transmitter collars will be placed on 25 moose within a ten mile radius of the city center and a monitoring program will record their movements throughout the year to assist in establishing seasonal habitat preferences for specific sex and age classes.
8. Conduct aerial wolf census to determine abundance, location, movement and denning locations in and adjacent to the capital site.
9. Conduct aerial and ground reconnaissance of black and brown bear to determine habitat use, abundance, feasibility of ground snaring and tranquilizing from helicopter.
10. Capture twenty to twenty-five brown and black bears with snares and install radio transmitter collars and acquire biological data. Monitoring flights will be conducted to locate dens and critical habitat.
11. Conduct a comprehensive study of furbearers, their movements, habitat use and abundance.
12. Federal regulations require a survey to determine the presence, abundance or absence of endangered species.

13. Conduct aerial nest surveys of hawks, owls and raptors, with special emphasis placed on the areas to be modified by construction.
14. Spring, summer and fall aerial surveys will be conducted to determine presence, abundance and location of water fowl.
15. A total inventory of the fisheries resources in Willow Creek, Lilly Creek and Deception Creek drainages will be made to determine the presence and abundance of both anadromous and resident species.
16. The recreational use of fisheries resources will be assessed in Willow Creek, with major emphasis on a creek census of sport angling during July and August.
17. Preliminary measurements and evaluations of seasonal flows and instream flow needs on Willow Deception and Lilly Creeks.

COST ANALYSIS - METEOROLOGY, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE ANALYSIS

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1 | \$164,000 | \$40,000 | \$87,000 | \$291,000 |
| 2 | 23,000 | 10,000 | 23,000 | 56,000 |
| 3 | 113,000 | 10,000 | 20,000 | 143,000 |
| 4 | | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| 5 | | | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| 6 | | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 7 | | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Totals | \$300,000 | \$60,000 | \$290,000 | \$650,000 |

COST ANALYSIS - METEOROLOGY, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE ANALYSIS

| Project | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1 | \$164,000 | \$40,000 | \$87,000 | \$291,000 |
| 2 | 23,000 | 10,000 | 23,000 | 56,000 |
| 3 | 113,000 | 10,000 | 20,000 | 143,000 |
| 4 | | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| 5 | | | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| 6 | | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 7 | | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Totals | \$300,000 | \$60,000 | \$290,000 | \$650,000 |

COST ANALYSIS - METEOROLOGY, AIR QUALITY AND NOISE ANALYSIS

Project Description

1. Tower (60 meter) at city site, instrumentation, maintenance and operation.
2. Tower (10 meter) installation at Houston, instrumentation, maintenance and operation, for airport analysis.
3. Tower (100 meter) on Willow Creek road, instrumentation, maintenance and operation for power plant analysis.
4. Air quality modeling - airport.
5. Air quality modeling - city.
6. Air quality modeling - power plant.
7. Noise forecast modeling - airport.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT, STAFF AND
OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

| | 3-6/78 | 7-11/78 | 12/78-1/80 | Total |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| PROJ MGMT | \$120,000 | \$150,000 | \$390,000 | \$660,000 |
| SECRETARIAL | 24,000 | 45,000 | 117,000 | 186,000 |
| TECHNICAL EDITOR | | | 120,000 | 120,000 |
| TECHNICAL ILLUSTRATOR | | | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| PROFESSIONAL STAFF | | | 600,000 | 600,000 |
| OPERATIONAL EXPENSES | 12,000 | 15,000 | 42,000 | 69,000 |
| PRINTING | | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| TOTAL | \$156,000 | \$210,000 | \$1,394,000 | \$1,760,000 |

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Professional staff will participate in design of the program, monitor progress and prepare final document. Their time will be allocated as follows:

| | |
|-----|--------------|
| 25% | 3/78 - 6/78 |
| 25% | 7/78 - 11/78 |
| 50% | 12/78 - 1/80 |

PROFESSIONALS

| | Total - Man Mos. |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| Meteorology and Air Quality | 4 |
| Water- surface, subsurface, quality | 4 |
| Archaeology | 2 |
| History | 2 |
| Soils | 2 |
| Vegetation | 4 |
| Forestry | 2 |
| Fish | 4 |
| Wildlife | 4 |
| Modelling-air, noise | 5 |
| Transportation- air, roads, rail | 4 |
| Aesthetics | 2 |
| Energy | 4 |
| Mineral resources | 3 |
| Recreation | 2 |
| Sociology | 4 |
| Economics | 4 |
| Power plant engineering | 4 |

| | Total - Man Mos. |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Seismology | 1 |
| Geology - surface, subsurface | 4 |
| Soils engineer | 4 |
| Health and Social Services | 4 |
| Housing | 3 |
| Total Man Months | <u>76</u> |

MEMORANDUM

TO: Janet ^{action} Green

TO: Jay S. Hammond
Governor

DATE: February 13, 1978

FILE NO:

Thru: Michael C. Harper
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM:

SUBJECT:

FEB 14 1978

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

Charles E. Behlke
Chairman
New Capital Site Planning Commission
and

Charles E. Behlke

Ron Evans
Administrative Director
New Capital Site Planning Commission

SUBJECT: FY78 Special Appropriation Request

The New Capital Site Planning Commission, in the course of completing its financial and development plans per A.S. 33.06.230 (f) and (j), has identified the need for conducting a further study to understand the full implications of a capital move.

Data collection and analyses needed to complete this study dictates that the Commission submit a request for a Special Budget Appropriation of \$62,000 to cover work to be accomplished during the remaining months of FY78 (March-June), since no funding was included in the general appropriation bill to handle this undertaking:

(A) Project Description: Analysis of the impact on Juneau and on state financial resources of retaining the capital in Juneau.

Should the capital move not take place, Commission consultants estimate that substantial additions of state office space would be required in Juneau by 1994. Population in the City and Borough would continue to grow rapidly.

As an initial assessment of cost considerations, Commission consultants have estimated construction cost only for state offices and community facilities and services utilizing indices derived for the Willow site. More definitive estimates are necessary for the legislature and the public to evaluate relative costs of state growth at Willow and Juneau. Such information will also be valuable if the Environmental Impact Statement for Willow requires full exploration of a "no-action" alternative--retention of capital functions in Juneau.

RECEIVED
FEB 15 1978

FISCAL OFFICE

Several factors concerning Juneau's physical setting mandate more extensive evaluation to establish costs. Relatively little open area exists within the city itself. Contiguous expansion of present state facilities would thus require: considerably higher densities than the basis for cost estimation at Willow; redevelopment of property largely in private use; concentration of parking in parking structures; acquisition of land. All of these conditions could alter substantially costs based on Willow indices.

Portions of state facilities expansion could conceivably be decentralized to other locations in the Juneau region. This could affect both capital costs and the operations of state government.

Accommodation of increased population affords additional issues which have public cost, efficiency, and environmental implications. The topographic and geologic features of Juneau, and their limitations, differ considerably from Willow. These may affect both the location and density of development, and therefore, construction and land acquisition cost requirements.

This study would take place between March 15 and June 1, 1978 and would involve the following activities:

1. Discussions with the Commissioner of Administration on factors affecting centralization/decentralization of additional state facilities in Juneau.
2. Establishment of a phased program for state facility expansion over the period 1980-1994. This would also include identification of specific sites or areas for expansion, establishment of floor space densities and structure parking requirements.
3. Estimation of land acquisition and construction cost requirements for state facilities based on the program, topographic and geologic information.
4. Similar analyses for other public office and support facilities (federal and local) and for private economic development (offices, hotels, commercial, etc.) likely to locate over the period.
5. Allocation of population growth to areas within the Borough at densities related to natural features, zoning requirements and service capacities.
6. Estimation of housing investment requirements.
7. Estimation of public service and facilities requirements to support state government, other public and private economic development, and the residential population over the period.

These would include investments for roads, schools, public health and welfare, public safety, water and sewer, parks and recreation, airports, port, etc..

8. Identification of methods of financing for the infrastructure, and the levels of government (state, federal, local) responsible for each facility type.
9. A detailed study to establish a basis of facts sufficient to make costs of growth in Juneau comparable in every way to the cost of the new capital in Willow.
10. Presentations of conclusions to the Commission and/or legislature and preparation of a report.

Cooperation of City and Borough of Juneau officials has been enlisted and current city-sponsored investigations on public facilities requirements for a population of 30,000 will be utilized in the investigation. Results should be of particular value both to Juneau officials and to the state administration regardless of the outcome of capital move decisions.

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------|------------------|
| (B) | <u>Budget</u> | | |
| | Principal | 150 hrs. @ \$30 | = \$,500 |
| | Senior | 230 hrs. @ \$20 | = 4,600 |
| | Professional 1 | 75 hrs. @ \$15 | = 1,125 |
| | Professional 2 | <u>50 hrs. @ \$ 8</u> | = <u>400</u> |
| | | 405 hrs. | \$ 10,625 |
| | Overhead at 126% | | <u>\$ 13,387</u> |
| | | | \$ 24,012 |
| | Fee at 10% | | <u>\$ 2,401</u> |
| | | | <u>26,413</u> |
| | <u>Expenses</u> | | |
| | Travel and Subsistence - 5 trips at \$1,000 | | 5,000 |
| | L.D. Telephone, Reproduction, Misc. | | <u>\$ 1,587</u> |
| | | | \$ 33,000 |
| | <u>Applied Economics Inc.</u> | 25 hrs. @ \$40 | = 1,000 |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <u>Sub-Contractor (Consultant)</u> | \$ 24,000 |
| Principal, Civil Engineer 18 to 30 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Civil Engineer, Sr. Staff, Registered 18 to 30 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Civil Engineer, Staff 9 to 15 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Draftsmen 2 Draftsmen for 15 man days each @ 8 hours/day | |
| Clerical Assistance 6 to 10 man days @ 8 hours/day | |
| Incurred Expenses (Prints, Long Distance Telephone, Xerox Copying, Etc.) \$500 to \$750 | |
| Contingencies for additional travel and expenses | \$ <u>4,000</u> |
| TOTAL REQUEST | \$ <u><u>62,000</u></u> |

CEB:RE:Sgm

STATE
of ALASKA


MEMORANDUM

TO: Avrum M. Gross
Attorney General
Department of Law

DATE: February 21, 1978

FILE NO.

TELEPHONE NO.

FROM:  Ronald B. Lind, Director
Division of Budget & Management
Office of the GovernorSUBJECT: Special Appropriation for
Capital Site Planning
Commission

The Capital Site Planning Commission requests introduction of a special general fund appropriation of \$1,221,200 to be in three parts:

1. \$231,000 to drill test wells to determine if sufficient ground water exists to provide the new capital city with water;
2. \$928,200 to initiate the first steps of the data collection process necessary for preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment and Statement; and
3. \$62,000 for analysis of the impact on Juneau and on State financial resources of retaining the capital in Juneau.

Please draft the transmittal memo for the Governor specifying the introduction of the bill is at the request of the Capital Site Planning Commission and being forwarded by the Governor to the Legislature.

The bill should include no lapse date.

STATE
of ALASKA

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ron Lind, Director
Division of Budget and Management

DATE: February 6, 1978

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: Alison Elgee, Budget Analyst
Division of Budget and ManagementSUBJECT: Capital Site Planning Commission
Request for Special Appropriation

I spoke with Ron Evans, Administrative Director of the New Capital Site Selection Committee, to discuss the request submitted for a special appropriation of \$1,159,200, February 2, 1978.

The appropriation request is broken into two main parts. The first part is \$231,000 for verification of well water at the Capital Site. As soon as the Commission is given the go-ahead, the contract will be let to drill 5 test wells in predetermined locations to ascertain there will be sufficient water and water pressure to provide the new city with water. The engineers estimate being able to start drilling by March with a 12 week monitoring period after the wells have been dug. If the drilling can begin on time we should be able to have preliminary test results prior to the legislature adjourning. The financial report being submitted to the legislature includes the cost of water being provided by these wells (the cheapest alternative for providing water.)

The second part of the appropriation request is \$928,200 for data collection in preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. The Commission's present schedule calls for completion of the total EIS data collection by 1/1/80. I have asked Ron Evans if it was possible to prioritize the projects proposed to begin with the \$928,200 funding, and what the effect would be of postponing any of this data collection. His general feeling about postponement was that there were certain required studies that will take a given amount of time to complete and any postponement will just push the completion date further down the line. However, he also said there may be some specific pieces of the data collection that could be postponed without serious delay, and he was going to check on it.

The data collection costs are at best just an estimate in terms of the time frame layout provided. The costs were broken between 7/78 - 11/78 and 12/78 - 1/80 in case the entire project was defeated by the voters in the November election. None of the data collection costs have ever been considered by the Commission as being bondable.

The financial report prepared by the Commission is at the printer's and will be mailed directly to the legislature in approximately two days. I have asked that a copy also be sent directly to our office as well as the Office of the Governor. I have also asked for a copy of the expenditure report that Mr. Evans prepares for the Commission detailing current year expenditures (including a list of contractors and what the contracts are for).

I told Mr. Evans we would be getting back to him the first part of next week with a response to their special appropriation request.

MEMORANDUM

10 F

Jay S. Hammond
Governor

DATE: January 27, 1978

FILE NO:

Thru: Michael C. Harper TELEPHONE NO:
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Governor SUBJECT:

FROM:

Charles E. Behlke *C.E.B.*
Chairman
New Capital Site Planning Commission

and
Ron Evans *[Signature]*
Administrative Director
New Capital Site Planning Commission

SUBJECT: FY78 Special Appropriation Request

The Capital Site Planning Commission, in the course of completing its "recommended financial plan" and "specific development plan" as mandated under A.S. 44.06.230(f) and (j), has identified two critical next steps in the planning process which impinge on the State's ability to carry the proposed plans through to the construction phase within the required time frame.

Data collection and analyses needed to complete these "next steps" dictate that the Commission submit a request for a Special Budget Appropriation of \$1.2 million to cover work to be accomplished during the remaining months of FY78 (March-June), since no funding was included in the general appropriation bill to handle this undertaking.

The two steps (projects) are as follows:

(A) Source Verification of Well Water

The Commission's engineering investigations reveal that there are four alternate potable water sources for the New City:

1. Deep wells (14) capable of producing 350 gallons per minute together with two 1-million gallon capacity storage tanks.
2. Diversion of water from Willow Creek to Twelve-Mile Lake or storage tanks on site, including treatment facilities, pumps, etc.

3. Pumping of water from confluence of Willow Creek and Susitna River, including gallery system and sediment removal facilities.
4. Impoundment of Deception Creek augmented by water pumped from Willow Creek.

The estimated cost of these development alternatives ranges from \$2.8 million for deep wells to \$32 million for impoundment.

While existing data would seem to indicate the probability of sufficient existing ground water to proceed with alternative #1 above, this source is not verifiable without actual field testing. Therefore, in order to insure that the proper amount of funding for this component has been included in the financing plan, test wells must be drilled.

A special appropriation of \$231,000 is required to (1) prepare surface analyses and (2) drill five 300-foot wells at specific locations near the townsite. (See attachment A for detailed breakdown.)

In the event that this work is postponed until after the November 1978 bond election, the cost figures used in the financing plan could prove to be inadequate. Further, the exploration costs could climb to as much as 30% higher than the amount requested here due to the difficulties presented by drilling during the winter months.

(B) Environmental Analyses Data Collection

The Commission has determined that construction on the New City cannot begin until the spring of 1980, with initial occupancy currently slated for the summer of 1982. These dates are indeed optimistic, but possible.

The critical element in the network of events which must precede occupancy is the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment and Statement, which must be reviewed and approved by appropriate State and Federal agencies. We believe that a minimum period of eighteen months for data collection, evaluation, statement preparation, review and approval will be needed. This means that work must commence immediately (no later than May 1978) in order that it be completed in early 1980.

During this period, detailed planning would have to proceed on the assumption of approval or minor adaptations in order that construction might begin in the spring of

1980. This is an admittedly ambitious schedule dependent upon cooperative agencies, skilled technicians and the availability of a minimum of one year's field data in key areas of concern, such as air and water quality and biological effects.

In order to meet this requirement, a "crash" program of data collection must begin immediately. Data must be collected in sufficient quantities and in a manner acceptable to reviewing agencies. In order to accomplish this, field stations must be in place by May of 1978.

Work completed to date has been sufficient only to identify issues and to direct plans in an environmentally sound manner for subsequent detailed study and re-evaluation as necessary in the actual development planning which must precede construction.

A special appropriation of \$928,200 is required to initiate and continue the above data collection during the period March 1 through June 30, 1978. (See attachment B for detailed breakdown.) The total cost of EIS data collection, report preparation and approval is estimated to be \$4.52 million (i.e., \$928,200 for FY78; \$1,049,000 to cover FY79 period July 1, 1978 through November 30, 1978; \$2,546,900 commencing after the November election to complete EIS process by January of 1980).

Failure to begin this data collection and analysis now will inevitably delay approvals and construction. The ability to open facilities in the New Capital City by 1982 rests on this critical process.

SOURCE VERIFICATION OF WELL WATER

Surface Investigation

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Personnel and Expenses | |
| Two man-weeks | \$ 4,000.00 |
| Pre-test well analytic model | 10,000.00 |

Drilling Program

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| Drill, crew and Expenses | |
| 2 holes 6 inches in diameter | |
| Depth 300 ft. | |
| Cost \$120 per ft. | 72,000.00 |

| | |
|------------------------------|------------|
| Drill, crew and Expenses | |
| 3 holes 4 inches in diameter | |
| Depth 300 ft. | |
| Cost \$111 per ft. | 100,000.00 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Monitoring Drilling Analysis | |
| and preparation of final report | |
| Personnel and Expenses | |
| 12 man-weeks | 24,000.00 |

| | | |
|---------------|------------|------------------|
| Contingencies | 10 percent | <u>21,000.00</u> |
|---------------|------------|------------------|

| | |
|-----------------|--------------|
| ESTIMATED TOTAL | \$231,000.00 |
|-----------------|--------------|

PROCEDURE FOR PREPARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Environmental impact statements (EIS) are a requirement of the Federal government and are mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act, PL91-190, January 1, 1970. These documents are required for all major Federal actions "...significantly affecting the quality of the human environment..." Issuance of permits and grants are considered to be Federal actions. The term "major actions" are implications of thresholds of importance and impact which must be met before a statement is required. Another consideration used to determine the necessity for an EIS is the potential for controversy of the proposed Federal action.

A second type of response to NEPA is the Negative Declaration, a statement that in the opinion of the agency no significant effects on the human environment will occur and an EIS is not required.

When several Federal agencies are involved in an action or several actions occur in a localized geographical area, the Council on Environmental Quality encourages the designation of a lead agency to prepare the statement. An important responsibility of the lead agency is to insure that all aspects of Federal actions are addressed adequately in the draft document.

In most cases, the Federal agency will not collect original data; instead it relies on

available data sources or data supplied by an applicant. In cases where the applicant must supply the data, the Federal agency will participate in the data identification and collection process in an advisory role to insure that the data collection process adequately responds to the needs of the environmental analysis. The agency also monitors the progress of the data collection process and will use the final product prepared by an applicant as the source document for the preparation of the agencies EIS. In other cases the Federal agency will contract with an organization for the preparation of an environmental assessment which the agency will use to prepare an EIS.

The first EIS is the draft environmental impact statement. This document is submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality, all interested agency reviewers, both Federal and State, and the public for review and comment.

Agencies seeking review and comment must allow forty-five days for review, and should allow for extensions for up to fifteen days for extensions requested by agencies or parties. Consideration must be given to the magnitude and complexity of the statement and the extent of citizen interest in the proposed action in granting requests for additional review time.

No administrative action can be taken sooner than ninety days after the draft EIS has been submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality and circulated for comment, nor sooner than thirty days after final copies of the document incorporating all changes resulting from reviewers comments have been submitted to the Council. If the final EIS is submitted prior to the end of the ninety day period, the minimum thirty day and ninety day periods can overlap.