

ALASKA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

362 SCOM10: LOCAL GOVERNMENT STUDY 1979

e. Public Acceptability: Akin to political feasibility is the need for public acceptability of a planning or management option. A planning program is not viable unless it is acceptable to the involved and affected citizens, particularly if the structure or program depends upon formal (electoral) approval of the people.

Assessing the public acceptability of planning and management alternatives could be accomplished through an opinion survey of residents and public leaders in the unorganized borough and of various State leaders. A case study of public reactions in the past to proposed planning structures and programs might be another means of determining public acceptability.

f. Quality of Service Delivery: This is a multi-faceted criterion by which alternative planning structures and programs are to be evaluated. The quality of service delivery depends on a number of things, many of which are included in the other criteria. The objective, however, is not to repeat previous analyses, but to consider whether or not the planning alternatives are based upon "logical" planning units and how they will affect other public services and service areas.

For an unorganized borough, public services such as schools, utilities, and fire protection are usually provided on a service area basis, and individual service areas are established to provide specific services. As the rationale and purpose of the service areas vary, generally, so do their boundaries and jurisdiction.

In identifying and evaluating possible planning structures for an unorganized borough, it is important to consider the logic and efficiency of the unit or area of service. The rationale for and the boundaries of existing service areas may not be appropriate for the delivery of planning services. Geographic features (e.g., mountain ranges, rivers, watersheds), for instance, may be more important than regional corporation boundaries or cultural features for defining a planning area.

On the other hand, before proposing a new service system and area, it is important to consider its effect on existing service areas. Is the planning unit going to compete with, overlap, confuse, or fragment the functioning of and services provided by other resource service areas in a region?

g. Implementation Authority (planning options only): In almost all cases, a plan is only as good as its implementation. Therefore, an effective planning structure or organization must have appropriate implementation authorities and powers.

VICTOR FISCHER ASSOCIATES CONSULTING
221 EAST 7TH AVENUE #204 • ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501 • (907) 272-2381

December 20, 1979

Memo to Jan Erickson, Office of Coastal Management

Hi, Jan. The following are my comments on the unorganized borough study proposed by CRA. As I indicated in our conversation, my response to the proposal is premised on the fact that the subject is extremely important and that it is critical that the necessary foundation for coastal and other regional planning and plan implementation be established as expeditiously as possible. Therefore, if some of my comments are negative, they are offered in a constructive vein.

First of all, the project is too simplistic and too "academic". Too much effort appears directed toward background review and not enough to decision and action oriented research. (Attached is copy of a draft proposal Tom Morehouse and I prepared last July to revise and expand Borough Government in Alaska. As you will note, that project would cover much of the same ground, would probably have greater utility, including for coastal management, and would cost less.)

Second, and following from this observation, the CRA proposal seems oblivious of existing realities: work and legislative proposals of the Joint CRA Committee of the legislature, including the local government symposium, public hearings, studies sponsored by the committee, etc; previous studies of rural organization needs and options; and provisions of the state constitution. They propose to start at ground zero, rather than beginning with today.

Thus, the proposal throughout accepts the single unorganized borough as the framework within which the study will function. However, studies by CRA itself and by others have consistently concluded that the first step toward effective regional planning, program coordination, and resources management is dividing the unorganized borough into regional components. That should be the point of departure for the study.

Similarly, questioning the desirability of REAA and Native regional corporation boundaries as a basis for defining planning areas may be theoretically and academically appropriate. But from a realistic standpoint, one should begin boundary and area definitions that the state and the people in the various regions accept and identify with. One needs appropriate building blocks and uniform regional units to effect any kind of progress toward planning and its implementation.

Furthermore, neither coastal planning nor coastal management are ends in themselves or exist by themselves. They need to be viewed as elements of regional planning and governance mechanisms. The most effective implementation of plans can be achieved by organized governmental units. Short of having these throughout Alaska in the near term, an appropriate interim mechanism needs to be utilized, one that helps the people achieve maximum self-governance.

Progress in these directions is extremely important. And the coastal management program could help so greatly attain the objectives of more effective regional planning and plan implementation simply because most regions in the state fall within coastal areas; only the Doyon and Ahna regions do not.

Here are my suggestions for an OCM and CRA approach to a study project that would examine and recommend how to effectively plan for and manage coastal resources in Alaska:

1. Accept as point of departure the legislative proposals developed by the Joint CRA Committee to divide the single unorganized borough into regional unorganized boroughs, establish a regional strategy planning program, facilitate transition to home rule status, and provide for delivery and funding of basic services, including regional planning.
2. Obtain Coastal Management Council endorsement of Joint Committee proposals, particularly those pertaining to regional organization and home rule. This would help reinforce and legitimize the first suggestion.
3. Similarly, obtain the Governor's endorsement. CRA has tried that before, and now that the legislature has moved out front, the administration should be willing to support the effort.
4. Focus the study program directly on how an effective planning and management structure and process can be established in forthcoming regional unorganized boroughs. This should not be done in the abstract, but in the context of each coastal region. (My experience has been that the situation varies so much from area to area that generalizations either don't stand up or reach for the lowest common denominator.)
5. Take a good look at the implementation provisions of existing law and regulations, and examine how a regional structure might effectively support or take over coastal management functions. (The requirement that state agencies implement approved coastal management plans will, at least in some cases, prove unfeasible. Zoning is a good example of that; see my 2-2-79 memo to Steve Reeve on the subject.)
6. Eliminate two-phase process, with an initial "white paper" and followup studies by experts. Critical issues will usually emerge early in the study process. Ideally, experts will be brought in as necessary to fashion a single, coherent package.
7. The entire effort should, as suggested by others already, be geared to completion no later than November 1980, so as to allow implementation of legislative recommendation during the 1981 session. This timing would be ideal, assuming Joint Committee recommendations are enacted by the 1980 session and regional unorganized boroughs established by November 1980. Followup proposals could then relate directly to making the regionalized system work!

Jan, I hope these comments are of help, don't come too late, and will not step on too many sensitive toes. As before, I'll be glad to assist in any way I can.



cc. Arliss Sturgulewski
Bill Parker

A PROPOSAL TO PREPARE A CURRENT AND EXPANDED
EDITION OF BOROUGH GOVERNMENT IN ALASKA, A STUDY OF
REGIONAL GOVERNMENT AND STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS

by

Thomas A. Morehouse

and

Victor Fischer

In 1971, the Institute of Social and Economic Research published Borough Government in Alaska by these same authors. That study traced the evolution of boroughs during the first ten years after statehood: the constitutional base, the slow beginnings characterized by great uncertainties, mandatory borough creation in urban regions, reactions to the emergence of boroughs, their early struggles with cities and school district organizations, and the beginnings of a movement to unify boroughs and cities.

The publication was widely used by state and local groups and individuals. Its information and analysis was found useful in legislative deliberations, policy development, public education, and in technical assistance and training programs. Some 2,500 copies were distributed in response to requests primarily from within the state, but from outside as well.

The 1971 report is now out of print. It is also out of date. Major developments have occurred since the earlier study was completed in 1970. Boroughs have become an accepted part of Alaska's governmental structure.

Borough-city unification has taken place in three of Alaska's major urban areas. The first rural regional government was established on the North Slope. Provision for service areas in rural Alaska has been enacted: REAA's, coastal management, and fisheries enhancement areas. And the basis is being laid for attacking some of the serious governance issues in the existing unorganized borough.

At the same time, continuing new issues relating to borough government need to be resolved: relationships between federal, state, and local tax and regulatory powers; prospective establishment of boroughs as taxing jurisdictions in the pipeline corridor; the extent and limits of borough home rule powers under the state constitution; the relative governmental roles of boroughs, cities, service areas, and the state; and, service need, delivery, and cost problems, especially in rural Alaska.

We propose preparation and publication of a new volume on borough government in Alaska that would address such issues while accounting for new organizational developments. The new book would be about twice the ~~size~~^{length} of the previous report. Building upon the background and base established in the latter, the book would cover developments in organized boroughs over the last ten years, including unification; establishment of the North Slope Borough; developments in the rest of rural Alaska (based in part upon our 1974 study of regional government issues); role of the state; and analysis of trends and future prospects.

The publication project would require about 1 year. Total cost is projected at approximately \$80,000: 6-man months professional and 3-man months of research assistant time, plus necessary support services.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Steve Reeve, P & C, ADL

FROM: Vic Fischer

SUBJECT: Zoning in Unorganized Borough

DATE: February 2, 1979

Under AS 38.05.037, ADL has a general grant of authority to exercise zoning powers within the unorganized borough. Until recently, this has not been a problem because the zoning power was never used. Enactment of the homesite program, however, has forced ADL into the zoning game. And the Coastal Management Act is potentially going to expand this involvement into horrendous proportions. Unless the Division of Lands is ready to get bogged down in a massive morass, it will be wise to initiate and support legislative action that would eliminate need for ADL exercise of this zoning power.

Homesite Program

Under the act establishing the homesite program in 1977, the legislature required that zoning cover lands under the homesite disposal program both in the unorganized boroughs and in organized boroughs that do not exercise zoning covering such lands.

ADL promulgated zoning regulations in July, 1978: AAC 53. Chapter 53 provides for administration, zoning changes, variances, conditional use permits, nonconforming uses, appeals, etc. A board of adjustment is established, composed of the commissioners of Natural Resources, Community & Regional Affairs, and Environmental Conservation, or their designated representatives.

Zoning districts are classified (Article 2) as general zoning, homesite entry, and open-to-entry. All state land not specifically included in geographically defined districts (Article 3) is in the general zoning district. Use provisions and limitations are set for homesite entry and open-to-entry districts. The general zoning district permits all use not otherwise prohibited by law or regulation.

As ADL is becoming engaged in widespread disposal of state lands, administration and enforcement of zoning for lands located all over the state could become an increasingly time consuming and frustrating entanglement for the state. (I'm sure it's not necessary to elucidate the horrendous problems and conflicts that could arise, whether or not ADL chooses to seriously follow up on its own regulations.)

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Steve Reeve, P & C, ADL

Page Two

February 2, 1979

Coastal Management

The Coastal Management Act presents a potential burden of far vaster proportions than the land disposal program, for the latter requires zoning only for state owned lands.

Under the act, implementation of an approved district coastal management program is required on the part of the appropriate state agencies. Such implementation must be in accord with comprehensive use plans or statements of needs, policies, objectives, and standards adopted by the coastal districts. Where land-use controls are involved in the unorganized borough (and most of the coast falls outside of organized local government jurisdiction), zoning will have to be established and administered by the Division of Lands.

The scope of such coastal area zoning would obviously go far beyond the regulations so far established by ADL. Likewise, the administrative machinery would have to be extremely complex, and the entire program would become extremely expensive and burdensome, especially since each coastal area would likely have different objectives, different regulations, and different local enforcement needs.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Neither the Division of Lands nor the whole Department of Natural Resources derives any particular value from the exercise of zoning authority. ADL already has authority to establish use requirements and restrictions with respect to lands disposed of by the state, even though it would probably not want to carry permanent or long term responsibility for assuring that every lot or tract conforms to specified uses. Aside from the existing zoning authority, which was never examined from a policy-application standpoint by the legislature, ADL has no reason to concern itself with non-state lands.

If the state is deemed to have an overriding interest that requires it to exercise zoning authority in the unorganized borough, or at least within its coastal areas, neither ADL nor DNR appear to be the appropriate agency to manage the zoning program, with its strictly localized zoning, adjustment, appeals, and other aspects of continuing zoning administration. If the state is to engage in zoning, by far the most appropriate agency for the exercise of the functions is the Department of Community and Regional Affairs. (DCRA did not exist at the time ADL was granted zoning authority many years ago.)

In general, states have played only a minor role in the exercise of zoning authority beyond authorizing its use by local governments. The only exception is Hawaii, where general zoning classification is handled by the state, supplemented by local, i.e., county, regulations in urban and other development areas. Elsewhere, zoning has been applied as a local government police power.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Steve Reeve, P & C, ADL

Page Three

February 2, 1979

Except for the special authority given ADL, zoning in Alaska has traditionally been a power of cities and, more recently, of boroughs. Zoning would not have to be exercised by the state at all if provision were made for (1) reorganization of the unorganized borough into a series of organized boroughs with planning and zoning authority (and this could be done without forcing them to tax or even manage schools) or (2) delegating the planning and zoning power to service areas within the unorganized borough, much as was done by the legislature in the case of coastal management planning.

In view of all this, I would strongly urge the Division of Lands to do everything possible to divest itself of the existing zoning authority. I recommend that ADL and DNR take all of these three actions:

1. Obtain DCRA cooperation in resolving the zoning issue, including transfer of zoning authority to that department if it were continued to be vested in the state.
2. Obtain funds from the office of Coastal Management to examine the inter-land use control and zoning administration issue. This should be done well before the district program implementation phase is reached, so that appropriate policies and mechanisms can be established in sufficient time, especially if ameliorative legislation is found to be required. Such a study should probably be undertaken in cooperation with or through DCRA.
3. Obtain Governor's Office support for a legislative or a legislative/executive study directed toward establishment of organized boroughs or some other form of local area planning and management within the unorganized borough. A study along these lines is likely to be considered by the legislature this year.

If none of these approaches bear fruit and nothing else materializes, ADL will need to proceed on its own to figure out how otherwise to get out of this mess or, if all else fails, how to effectively manage the zoning of state lands and coastal areas.

VF:1a

cc: Mike Smith
Ted Smith
Tom Morehouse



Official Business

Alaska State Legislature

JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE
COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT STUDY

Co-Chairmen
Senator Arliss Sturgulewski
Representative Bill Parker

Address all
correspondence to:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ST

Pouch V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99801

FROM: TO:
TO: FROM:
DATE:

Vic Fischer, Consultant 272-2381

Marjorie Gorsuch

~~12/17/79~~ 12/19/79

465-3759

~~I will forward along the materials you requested as they are completed. Let me know if you need anything else.~~

Following are materials for left column of report. Copies given to Arliss and Bill; they will send any comments directly to Juno.

Materials on legislative proposals and hearings should be on way to Juno Thurs or Fri, I hope.

I should be back on Jan 7 or 8 at latest. Will contact Fay Alexiev to review final copy and layout. You (Gene) might advise her of that.

All best,

Vic

Alaska's constitution establishes the policy of maximum self-government for the people. This policy has been implemented ~~in urban areas and some rural communities~~ through creation of boroughs and cities in urban areas and some rural communities. However, the vast bulk of Alaska lacks ^{not only any/} ~~any~~ basis for ~~regional~~ self-government ~~but doesn't even have the~~ means for planning and participating in the affairs of their own region. It is this problem that provided the principal focus of the interim work of the Joint Committee.

Legislative proposals of the Joint Committee were derived from (1) a series of studies and analyses sponsored by the committee, (2) a two day symposium designed to define issues and problems and ~~to suggest~~ suggest policies and directions, and (3) a series of public hearings throughout ~~the~~ rural parts of the state. In addition, constructive support was provided by the Department of Community and Regional Affairs and staff of the Legislative Affairs Agency.

The Joint Committee found wide consensus in favor of ~~establishing~~ ^{and} a maximum measure of ~~self-determination and self-rule~~ self-determination and self-rule, ^{and} establishment of regional units throughout the state to provide a basis for planning and program coordination. At the same time, the people do not want to rush into formal governmental organization; nor do they want to be pushed into it.

Accordingly, the Joint Committee has developed an evolutionary approach that will provide people in rural areas with the means for self-government without forcing anything upon them prematurely. Choices and initiatives are left with each region. Concurrently, we are proposing ^{actions} ~~steps~~ that will provide greater equity in ^{the} funding and provision of basic public services and will improve the management of the state's own operations throughout Alaska.

In all, we believe that our program lays the foundation for further development of Alaska's system of local self-reliance and decentralization of state decision making, planning, and coordination of services and other activities.

Finally,
— as the Joint Committee concludes its interim legislative work, we give our deepest thanks to the many citizens and public officials who so greatly contributed to the 1979 Local Government Study and the formulation of our ~~present~~ action proposals.

1/11/79

(this should be followed by list of committee members and staff) (Twillia's name /sp?/ should follow admin. assts and precede interns, as she is regular staff)

the introductory description which I taped onto layout sheet. since each statement is a separate item, ~~thasx~~ we can depart from regular column width and move the type closer to the margins; thus, smaller margins left. precede each item by "bullet" like so: ●)

②

PRINCIPAL PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY SYMPOSIUM

- the single existing unorganized borough is inadequate
- borough system is not adapted to rural regions
- constitution provides for regional unorganized boroughs
- lack of self-government and participation in rural areas
- coordination absent in delivery of public services
- lack of regional vehicles to serve general public
- difficulties of regional planning in rural Alaska
- absence of regional coordination by state
- regional differences require use of home rule concept
- issues of fiscal equity must be addressed
- equity lacking in state support of functions in organized and unorganized boroughs
- miscellaneous: overcoming racial divisiveness, survival of villages, lack of tax base in most rural Alaska, etc.

③

POLICIES, IDEAS, AND DIRECTIONS SUPPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS

- a series of regional boroughs should be established
- processes should involve people in regions
- unorganized boroughs should be able to elect assemblies
- principal unorganized borough functions would be regional planning and advice on state programs in region
- unorganized boroughs should be able to adopt home rule
- state should provide technical and financial assistance
- provision is needed for both regional and local planning
- disincentives to organized borough status should be eliminated
- a thorough study of revenue sharing is needed
- a basic level of service delivery for all Alaskans should be established by the state (as in education) for health and sanitation, public safety, public assistance, and regional planning
- a foundation approach should be established for these services

(these items should stand out as much as possible. if space allows, use larger type than regular text. might use bolder type.)

ATTACHED

~~(don't have these... will comment further when receive...)~~ since this is probably of secondary interest, we might use smaller type for this portion)

process chart might be squooshed down vertically to allow maximum space for other items

A box somewhere:

COMMITTEE REPORTS AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC. An interim report was issued by the Joint Committee ^{on} September 20, 1979. ~~It~~ ^{that} ~~report~~ explained the findings and suggestions of the Local Government Symposium, and describes the action program then being considered by the committee.

Copies of this Final Report and the 9/20/79 interim report can be obtained from:

??????????

4

Borough Incorporation Standards As Interpreted By
Local Boundary Commission - Marjorie Gorsuch, Administrative Assistant, House
Community and Regional Affairs Committee
Bureau of Indian Affairs and Comprehensive
Employment and Training Assistance
Contracting Procedures - Jim Sanders, Graduate Student Intern

Development of Traditional, Non-Traditional and
Quasi-Governmental Native Methods of Organization -
Lamar Cotten, Graduate Student Intern

Distribution of Flow of Funds in Alaska -
Elke Kallah, Policy Analyst, Division of Legislative Research

Financial Disincentives to Borough Formation -
Milt Barker, Fiscal Analyst, Legislative Finance Division

Identification of Requests Regarding Borough
Formation - Pat Poland, Local Government Specialist, Dept. of Community
and Regional Affairs

Identification of Services and Programs Provided
by the Non-Governmental and Quasi-Governmental
Organizations in the Unorganized Borough -
Jim Sanders, Graduate Student Intern

Local Government Study - Report of Local
Government Symposium, 9/20/79

Pipeline Boroughs - Vic Fischer, Consultant

Property Tax Revenues - Milt Barker, Fiscal Analyst, Legislative Finance Division

Property Tax Revenues of Pipeline Boroughs -
Milt Barker, Fiscal Analyst, Legislative Finance Division

Service Delivery to the Unorganized Borough -
Marjorie Gorsuch, Administrative Assistant, House C&RA

State/Federal A95 Review Process - Lamar
Cotten, Graduate Student Intern

State Municipal Land Trustee Program -
Lamar Cotten, Graduate Student Intern

Statutory Inducements and Disincentives
re Municipal Government Incorporation -
Eric Simpson, Director, Div. of Community Services, Dept. of C&RA

Taxing Capacity of the Unorganized Borough -
Alexander Hoke, Jack Kreinheder, Research Analysts, Division of Research Services

--- copies of above study reports may be obtained

PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

During FY 79, the division will continue its involvement, begun this year, in state telecommunications issues. There are a variety of important activities presently underway in the telecommunications arena, including expansion of telephone and television service in rural Alaska, FCC proceedings which are addressing the issue of adequate revenue recovery by the state's telephone companies in order to insure fair and reasonable rates for Alaskans, and Congressional efforts to rewrite the Communications Act of 1934.

The division expects to be involved in analyzing the state's position vis a vis these initiatives and recommending actions designed to achieve the goal of universal service in the state.

100.2 Telecommunications Planning

Source of Funds (\$000)	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981
Non-Federal	3.0	4.0	4.0
701 Federal	6.2	8.2	8.2
Other Federal			
Total	9.2	12.2	12.2

First Year Personnel/Cost Requirements	Months	Cost(\$000)
In-House Staff	2.0	5.9
Other Public Agency		
Consultant/Contractual		
Other Expenses		3.3
Total	2.0	9.2

Program Subcategory

100.3

Regional Planning in the
Unorganized Borough



Objective:

- 1) Establish a uniform regional planning structure in the unorganized borough.

Recently, the state has received a proposal sponsored by the Tanana Chief's Conference to establish six sub-regional planning commissions within what are the boundaries of the Doyon Regional Corporation. While it is the intention of TCC to proceed with this effort, they have requested the Governor designate these commissions as planning advisory councils, pursuant to AS 44.19.880(c).

While the state in conjunction with HUD has undertaken a similar planning effort in the NANA region, that initiative is somewhat different in that the NANA area is within the coastal zone and as such, an existing statutory structure for regional planning exists.

In conjunction with its request to the Administration, the Tanana Chiefs has also sought to have legislation submitted to establish the proposed regional planning commissions, vested with substantial local government powers.

*how does this
differ from what
DCR/ACM is doing?*

While this local initiative is laudable, it poses questions with significant ramifications, including the relationship of these planning commissions to the activities of federal and state agencies in the region and the relationship of these new entities to existing local governments organized under state law.

The division proposes to work jointly with legislative committees on this issue, and to develop an official policy in regard to regional planning in the unorganized borough and the structure through which sustained local involvement can be obtained.

work w/ DCA on their regional planning study

100.3 Regional Planning in the Unorganized Borough

<u>Source of Funds (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 1979</u>	<u>FY 1980</u>	<u>FY 1981</u>
Non-Federal	3.9	4.9	4.9
701 Federal	8.0	10.0	10.0
Other Federal			
Total	<u>11.9</u>	<u>14.9</u>	<u>14.9</u>

<u>First Year Personnel/Cost Requirements</u>	<u>Months</u>	<u>Cost(\$000)</u>
In-House Staff	3.0	6.8
Other Public Agency	<i>DCA?</i>	
Consultant/Contractual	1.0	2.0
Other Expenses		<u>3.1</u>
Total	<u>4.0</u>	<u>11.9</u>

PROGRAM CATEGORY 200.0 Budget Process Development

- Objectives:
- 1) to provide goals, objectives, and policies for the coordination of state financial resources and state administered federal resources;
 - 2) to produce information about the state's budget that will be of use to Alaska's citizens in evaluating the services provided by state agencies;
 - 3) to modify the current budget process, making it more directly responsive to the needs of Alaska's citizens.

Problem Statement

The current state budget process is viewed as cumbersome with several steps being superfluous as a result of arbitrary decisions made by the executive and legislative branches. While modifications have been implemented over the past several years, the process has not yet successfully dealt with the problem of establishing agencies'

How INCLUSIVE?

PROGRAM CATEGORY

400.0

Service Delivery
Patterns in Alaska

*

FED
UP
STATE
LOCALObjectives:

- 1) develop an information base on service delivery patterns in Alaska.

but what is goal? to assess quality of service delivery? to regionalize
 Information on where services are delivered, where they are lacking, and how they can be delivered more effectively and efficiently is needed. *identifying*
 There is a wide variation in the services offered in rural and urban Alaska, and often some of the most basic services or facilities which most Americans take for granted are non-existent in rural villages. Most of the villages are not connected to urban, or even rural centers by road or even water. This makes air transportation the only link to necessary goods and services. It also often makes them prohibitively expensive. Information on individual types of services, such as health care or education, is often available, but there has been no comprehensive evaluation of the entire range of services and relative levels of distress created because of inequitable service delivery.

DOT-
PF (ARS)

There are many uses for such a comprehensive data base, including state budgeting, capital improvements programming, economic development planning, regional planning (health, transportation, education, economic development, resource management, communications, energy development), impact analyses and decisions on allocation of state and federal assistance resources. The conclusions drawn from this study should assist the state in directing services to communities where they are most needed and in identifying regional centers where services may be grouped to provide more cost-efficient and effective service.

CAN YOU
RELATE
SERVICES/
FACILITIES
TO BUDGET?

The proposed program for FY 79 will consist of the following elements, to be accomplished generally in the following order:

1) Literature Survey

This element will entail a search of current literature on regional planning and analysis, specifically including central place theory in order to assure use of state-of-the-art methods.

HAS ANYTHING BEEN
FOUND THAT APPLIES?

2) Inventory of Services and Facilities

This information will be gathered where possible from existing inventories of various categories of services and facilities. Where it does not exist, it will be necessary to collect it directly. The following services and facilities will be inventoried:

- a) transportation services and facilities, accessibility; DOT
 - b) communication services and facilities; DOT
 - c) health, education services and facilities; HHS, DOE
 - d) commercial services and facilities; CED?
 - e) general government services and facilities; DPOP, DOT, Admin.
 - f) energy and power services and facilities; E&P
 - g) water, sewer, and other public services and facilities; and DFL, CLA
 - h) population distribution and projections. DOL
- LEGAL COURT 244 + PUBLIC SAFETY
RESOURCES PARKS REC

3) Evaluation and Analysis

Once the inventory information is collected, it must be evaluated and analyzed to be useful to decisionmakers. For instance, a hierarchy of regional and subregional centers may become apparent which will enable consolidation of state facilities and services. If a multitude of inconsistent service areas is identified, the information will enable the state to make a rational decision on whether to maintain them or to redesign them if it will provide more effective services at more efficient costs.

4) Mapping

Inventory information will be mapped so that it can be easily used by state and federal agencies, local communities and others to whom it will be of use.

5) Periodic Update

A system of periodically updating the inventory will be devised so that it will be of continuing use rather than a one-time effort.

6) Decisionmaking

Existing decisionmaking processes will be analyzed to determine how they may best incorporate service delivery pattern information.

400.0 Study of Service Delivery Patterns

PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Source of Funds (\$000)	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981
Non-Federal	9.3	10.3	10.3
Federal	18.5	20.5	20.5
Other Federal			
Total	27.8	30.8	30.8

First Year Personnel/Cost Requirements	Months	Cost(4000)
In-House Staff	6.0	17.7
Other Public Agency		
Consultant/Contractual	1.0	3.1
Other Expenses		7.0
Total	7.0	27.8

PROGRAM CATEGORY

500.0

Index on the Status of AlaskaObjective:

- 1) analyze and make recommendations on the feasibility of establishing a periodic index on the status of Alaska.

SCOMM

10:47

Alaska Coastal Management Program
First Year 306 Grant Application

Two Year Work Program - July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1981*

One Year Funding - July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980*

Office of Coastal Management
Division of Policy Development and Planning
Office of the Governor
Pouch AP, Juneau, Alaska 99811

May 4, 1979

* Starting date contingent on
receipt of federal approval of
the ACMP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM.....	1
HISTORICAL SUMMARY.....	1
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACMP.....	2
ACMP PARTICIPANTS FUNDED UNDER 305 AND 306 FUNDING.....	3
THE OBJECTIVES OF 1ST YEAR 306 WORK PROGRAM.....	5
DEFINITIONS.....	6
OBJECTIVE A - ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT.....	7
TASK A-1 GRANT ADMINISTRATION.....	7
TASK A-2 COORDINATION AND CONSISTENCY.....	8
SUBTASK A COUNCIL SUPPORT.....	9
SUBTASK B WORKING GROUP.....	9
SUBTASK C FEDERAL CONSISTENCY REVIEW.....	10
TASK A-3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.....	11
SUBTASK A NOTIFICATION OF DISTRICT PROGRAM START-UP.....	11
SUBTASK B PUBLIC INFORMATION.....	12
TASK A-4 REGIONAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS IN ACMP.....	13
TASK A-5 AMSA DESIGNATION AND COORDINATION.....	16
TASK A-6 REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DISTRICT PROGRAMS.....	20
TASK A-7 1ST YEAR 306 REVIEW.....	22

OBJECTIVE B	STATE AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION.....	23
TASK B-1	COORDINATION WITH ACMP BY STATE AGENCIES.....	23
TASK B-2	STATE AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION.....	25
TASK B-3	FEDERAL AND MAJOR STATE ACTIVITY REVIEW THROUGH CLEARINGHOUSE.....	33
OBJECTIVE C	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE STATE.....	35
TASK C-1	ASSISTANCE FROM CRA.....	36
TASK C-2	ASSISTANCE FROM STATE AGENCIES.....	37
TASK C-3	INFORMATION DISTRIBUTING (AEIDC).....	41
OBJECTIVE D	FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO DISTRICTS.....	43
TASK D-1	GRANTS TO DISTRICT PLANNING PROGRAMS.....	46
SUBTASK D-1A	NEW DISTRICT PROGRAMS.....	46
SUBTASK D-1B	CONTINUING DISTRICT PROGRAMS.....	47
SUBTASK D-1C	DISTRICT PROGRAMS NEEDING REVISIONS.....	47
TASK D-2	IMPLEMENTATION OF DISTRICT PROGRAMS.....	48
TASK D-3	SPECIAL ASSISTANCE.....	49
SUBTASK D-3A	DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO THE UNORGANIZED BOROUGH.....	49
SUBTASK D-3B	RURAL COORDINATION & ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.....	50
OBJECTIVE E	SPECIAL STUDIES.....	53
TASK E-1	WETLANDS STUDY.....	54
TASK E-2	UNORGANIZED BOROUGH MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES.....	55
TASK E-3	PERMIT INFORMATION AND SIMPLIFICATION.....	57

TASK E-4 FISHERIES PLANNING.....	60
TASK E-5 COMPLETION OF MATRIX.....	63
TASK E-6 ENERGY FACILITY SITING.....	64
TASK E-7 SHORELINE ACCESS.....	66
TASK E-8 EROSION.....	67
TASK E-9 COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION.....	69
SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES FOR 2ND. YEAR	
306 WORK PROGRAM FOR ACMP.....	70
GRANT APPLICATION SUMMARY.....	75
BUDGET INFORMATION.....	79
STATE MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.....	83
2ND DRAFT REVIEW COMMENTS AND OCM RESPONSES.....	84
APPLICATION FORMS	

Introduction

This document is a work program for the first two years of implementation of the Alaska Coastal Management Program. (Hereafter referred to as ACMP). Additionally, this document is a grant application for federal funds to support the first year. This program has been supported since 1974 by the grant program established under Sec. 305 for the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA). The ACMP is anticipated to receive approval under Sec. 306 of that Act in June of 1979. This is an application for implementation funding authorized by Sec. 318(2) of that Act for Sec. 306.

Purpose of the Program

The purpose of this program is to recognize the values of the Alaskan coast and to provide means for coordinated and comprehensive management of coastal resources at all levels of government.

Historical Summary

The first year of the program emphasized the gathering of data in order that the values and resources of the Alaskan coast would be better understood, and this trend continued through the second and third years.

The second year of the program initiated study into the means of management by looking into the application of state and local authority. This trend continued into the third year when the Alaska Coastal Management Act (hereafter called ACMA) was passed by the Legislature in the Spring of 1977. The third year of the ACMP saw many changes occur within the program. The ACMA established the Coastal Policy Council as the guiding body for the program. The Act called for coastal regulations to be adopted by the Council which would be used by state agencies in their coastal activities and by local governments in their local programs. The Council spent the last part of the third year working on the regulations.

The fourth year of the ACMP saw the completion of the planning phase of coastal management at the state level in Alaska. The regulations were passed by the Council and approved by the Legislature; local governments began writing coastal programs; and an administrative order was recently signed by the Governor assuring the coordination of the state agency activities in the coastal area; federal consistency procedures are established and will be implemented; state agencies have formed an inter-agency working group to work on issues of state concern. The program is now ready for federal approval and implementation.

Implementation of the ACMP

The passage of the ACMA and subsequent adoption of regulations established the ACMP as mandatory at local and state levels. Alaska has applied for federal approval of its management program. As Alaska moves into the implementation or management stages of its program, it becomes eligible for Sec. 306 funding (implementation grants) rather than Sec. 305 (planning grants) funding.

There are two important benefits that occur with federal approval of Alaska's coastal management program. First, the federal act provides that federal agencies must take actions and make decisions in the state which are consistent with the state program..."to the maximum extent practicable..." Secondly, Section 306 provides rather ample funding for the implementation and continued refinement of state program. The major objective of this grant is to proceed with implementation of the state's coastal management program as approved by the federal Office of Coastal Zone Management, NOAA (hereafter referred to as OCZM).

Implementation will be carried out by federal, state and local governments and coordinated by the Office of Coastal Management (hereafter referred to as OCM). The state clearinghouse will review federal and major state activities for consistency with the ACMP. Federal agencies will certify the consistency of their activities with the ACMP and submit them to the Clearinghouse for review and consistency determination by OCM. State agencies will enforce the ACMP regulations through their already ongoing programs including permits, leases, and policy making decisions; will offer technical assistance to districts writing coastal programs; will assist OCM in Clearinghouse reviews. Local governments will write district programs for their areas and submit them to the Coastal Policy Council and the Legislature for their adoption and approval. Once district programs are adopted and approved, state and federal agencies will be consistent with these plans.

This is the final version of the OCM's first 306 grant application which has been prepared and circulated for review and comment. A two-year work program is our suggested format. (It should be noted that the federal Office of Coastal Zone Management can authorize a two-year grant period.) OCM feels the longer time period will give much greater continuity and financial stability to the ACMP especially on the local level. District coastal programs designed on a two-year basis will give local governments more flexibility and time in which to complete desired projects. Although OCZM can authorize a two-year grant period, they can not obligate actual funding except on a year-by-year basis. This grant application is a work program for two years, thus allowing OCM and contractors two years in which to spend their first year funding. The funding shown herein is only for one year with the understanding that it can be extended into the second year and that additional funding will be available for the second year. When the first year comes to an end, a new grant application will be submitted to obtain funds for the second year. The process will repeat every year as long as federal funds are available for implementation of ACMP.

The funding in this grant includes federal, state, and local monies. The match ratio is 1:4, local or state to federal dollars. All subgrantees will be expected to provide their own match except possibly the unorganized borough and private contractors. The Office of Coastal Management, which is a section in the Division of Policy Development and Planning, (DPDP) Office of the Governor, is responsible for preparing the grant application. The Director of DPDP has the formal power to approve the application for submittal to the federal grantor agency and signs it on behalf of the state.

Attached are copies of all A-95 comments received on the second draft and OCM's responses. The format of the application has been changed at the advice and request of OCZM for administrative purposes to reflect the structure of the program in its entirety. The coordination and management of the ACMP which is the chief responsibility of the OCM is the first component. The second and third components describe the responsibilities of state agencies participating in the ACMP both implementation of the ACMP within the agency and the agency assistance to districts. The fourth component describes the task of local governments in the writing of district coastal programs. The fifth component contains special studies which will in all probability span the next several years and will ensure the comprehensiveness of the ACMP. We would like to assure all reviewers and participants in the ACMP that this restructuring has not affected the work program envisioned for federal, state and local participants in the ACMP and by OCM but was done at the request of OCZM for a more understandable administrative structure for the program.

ACMP Participants funded under 305 and 306 Grants

In order to operate the ACMP successfully in Alaska, it has been and will be necessary to fund the major participants in the program. This includes the OCM/DPDP who has been designated as the lead agency for coordinating the ACMP; state agencies with land and water use authorities or programs affected by such authorities and who have been mandated by the Alaska Coastal Management Act to comply with the ACMP regulations; and coastal resource districts who are mandated to write district coastal programs. (Districts can be formed in the unorganized borough). The OCM is responsible for the administration and coordination of the ACMP. Much of the expertise required to develop and manage coastal resources already existed in the state agencies when the ACMP was first established.

Rather than create an entire new agency with a mandate to develop and manage the ACMP, a small coordinating staff was placed in DPDP with responsibility for overseeing a program which was eventually to draw on the expertise and resources of the state agencies and local governments. In addition, the Governor in his administrative order implementing the ACMP for the state agencies, designates DPDP as the lead agency for the

ACMP. The actions of both the Legislature and the Governor in the last few years recognize the importance of local governments in the coastal management program, the particular expertise of each line agency participating in the ACMP, and the role of the OCM as the coordinator of the ACMP.

The state agencies being funded to participate in the ACMP are described below in alphabetical order. The legislative mandate of each agency and its importance in the ACMP, particularly in regard to agency compliance with the program and agency assistance to districts, is described below.

The Department of Commerce and Economic Development (DCED) is responsible for regulating most of the state's industry and business and for promoting the balanced economic development and growth of the state. Because the ACMP represents a balanced approach to management of its coastal resources, the involvement of DCED is necessary to assure the consideration of economics and growth in the ACMP decisions and review of federal and state activities.

The Department of Community and Regional Affairs (DCRA) has the responsibility to meet the state's commitment to render maximum assistance to government at the community and regional level. As the ACMA is strongly oriented towards involvement of local governments in the overall state coastal management program, the involvement of DCRA is essential to assure proper assistance to districts.

The Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) provides policy to the management of the state's environmental programs which protect and enhance Alaska's natural and manmade environments, while permitting the wise utilization of the state's natural resources. As the agency designated with responsibility for Alaska's environmental management, DEC's participation in the coastal management program is essential in terms of expertise and assistance to districts drafting coastal programs, assurance of compliance of agency activities with the ACMP, and review of other agencies activities (including federal) for consistency.

The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is responsible for the administration of the state program for management, conservation and development of fish and game resources. As the agency designated management of wildlife resources, DFG's participation in the program is essential in terms of expertise and assistance to districts drafting coastal programs, assurance of compliance of agency activities with the ACMP, and review of other agencies (including federal) activities for consistency.

Department of Natural Resources (DNR) administers the state programs for the conservation and development of natural resources, including forests, parks and recreational areas, lands, waters, agriculture, soil conservation and minerals, but excluding fish and game. It also develops and administers the state program for historic and archeological sites, objects and related matters. As the agency responsible for most of the state's

natural resources, their development and conservation, DNR's participation in the program is essential in terms of expertise and assistance to districts drafting coastal programs, assurance of compliance of agency activities with the ACMP and review of other agencies (including federal) activities for consistency.

The Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT/PF) has authority over design of all modes of transportation and transportation facilities, communication facilities, docks, floats, breakwaters, buildings and similar facilities. The Department is required to formulate comprehensive transportation plans and consider the economic social and environmental impacts of transportation alternatives. As the agency with mandated responsibility for all transportation in Alaska, DOT/PF's participation in the ACMP is essential in terms of expertise and assistance to districts developing coastal programs, assurance of compliance of agency activities with the ACMP, and review of other agencies (including federal) activities for consistency.

The Division of Policy Development and Planning (DPDP) is within the Office of the Governor. DPDP assists the Governor and state agencies in planning and achieving coordinated policies and programs and advises the Governor concerning comprehensive state planning. The Office of Coastal Management is an office within the Division of Policy Development and Planning. In addition to funding which supports OCM administrative activities for the ACMP, DPDP with its responsibility for comprehensive planning is the best location for projects involving an extensive coordination effort such as the federal consistency review procedures and permit simplification project.

The definition of a coastal resource district which is eligible for funding to write a local program includes unified municipalities, organized boroughs which exercise planning and zoning authority; first class and home rule cities of the unorganized borough or within boroughs which do not exercise planning and zoning authority; second class cities of the unorganized borough or within boroughs which do not exercise planning and zoning authorities and which themselves do exercise planning and zoning authority and coastal resource service areas which have organized as districts. In addition to the above categories which are eligible for district planning funding, a specific sum of funding has been set aside for educational purposes concerning coastal management and organization elections in the unorganized borough and for assistance purposes for small communities which request assistance in participating in the district planning effort which concerns them.

All funding changes came about due to comments received during the review periods.

The Objectives

There are five objectives in this grant application to carry out the first year of implementation of the ACMP. Objective A is overall coordination and

administration of the ACMP by OCM. Objectives B and C describe the role of state agencies in the ACMP -- implementation in agency activities and technical assistance to districts. Objective D describes the drafting of district programs by local governments. Objective E includes all special studies which OCM feels are necessary to make the ACMP more complete and effective.

Five general objectives are outlined in the 306 work program, their titles are:

- A Administration and Management of ACMP by OCM
- B Implementation and Coordination Efforts by State Agencies
- C Technical Assistance to Districts by State Agencies
- D District Coastal Program Development by Districts
- E Special Studies - directed by OCM

Definitions:

ACMP: Alaska Coastal Management Program. This term includes all the participants in ACMP; state, local and federal.

OCM: Office of Coastal Management. This office provides the administrative leadership for ACMP and provides staff support to the Alaska Coastal Policy Council which provides the policy leadership for ACMP.

Coastal Resource District: Unified municipalities and organized boroughs which exercise planning and zoning authority, home-rule and first class cities of the unorganized borough or within boroughs which do not exercise planning and zoning authority, second class cities which exercise planning and zoning authorities and which are in the unorganized borough or within boroughs which do not exercise planning and zoning authority, coastal resource service areas established and organized as districts per the ACMA.

ACMA: Alaska Coastal Management Act.

CZMA: Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 as amended in 1976

Coastal Policy Council: The Council established by the ACMA as policy leadership for the ACMP.

State agencies participating in the ACMP include:

- DCRA - Department of Community and Regional Affairs
- DCED - Department of Commerce and Economic Development
- DEC - Department of Environmental Conservation
- DFG - Department of Fish and Game
- DNR - Department of Natural Resources
- DOT/PF - Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
- DPDP - Division of Policy Development and Planning

Scope of Service - Work program written by districts and DCRA describing work to be completed by local governments for development of district programs.

RSA - Reimbursable Services Agreement which is a contract signed between two state agencies.

District Record File - Official record file held at OCM to retain all evidence of district program development, compliance and review.

Objective A: Administration and Management of ACMP by OCM

To administer ACMP over the coming years, OCM/DPDP will be required to accept and handle new responsibilities. In addition, state agencies participating in the ACMP will be funded to establish a coordinator in each agency who will be responsible for ensuring compliance with and participation in the ACMP. Objective A explains the role of OCM in the ACMP.

The primary leadership and coordination function for ACMP will remain at the OCM. OCM will double its staff to include nine professional and five clerical positions to accomodate the expanded workload anticipated to begin when the ACMP enters the implementation phase.

OCM through DPDP has been designated as lead agency for the ACMP. OCM/DPDP will have responsibility for oversight of the ACMP as described in Objective A. This will include grant administration, its preparation and monitoring; coordination of state, federal and Coastal Policy Council activities in conjunction with ACMP; public involvement efforts; monitoring and review of district programs; organization of materials for OCZM's 312 review of the ACMP first year 306 work program.

Task A1: Grant Administration - Preparation, Administration, and Monitoring of 306 Funding

Administration of the 306 grant includes a number of responsibilities for the OCM which begin and end with each successive grant year. The task with this first year 306 grant begins with the administration of contracts (RSA's) with each of the line agencies, and contracts with each contractor who will be working with the ACMP for the period from July 1, 1979 through June 30, 1980. Most of these RSA's should have been negotiated before July 1, however, several may still require some final negotiating. The contracts will identify the participant, schedule, products and funding necessary for the work to be completed.

During the grant year, the responsibility of the administration staff will include the monitoring of activities of participants in the ACMP. OCM will receive financial and summary reports of work completed by each agency for the four quarters of the year. OCM

will use these reports to monitor and make payments for activities carried out and completed by each agency and to make quarterly reports to OCZM of ACMP progress. By the beginning of the first year 306 program, OCM will have drafted additional report forms and procedures to be used by OCM and ACMP participants to monitor activities of participants. Examples of the new reporting forms to be used by OCM are agency summaries of all assistance given to districts and agency logs of all permits issued which required a consistency determination, in order to receive payment for services. In addition, through the procedure established for the notification of district program start-up, OCM will be able to identify and monitor state agency assistance to districts.

At the beginning of the second half of the grant year, OCM will begin to solicit information, requests and suggestions from all interested participants in the second year of the 306 work program. On the basis of this input, OCM will draft a preliminary work program for the second year of the two year work program described in this grant application. It will be submitted for A-95 review during the third quarter, revised on the basis of comments, and submitted for a second review at the beginning of the fourth quarter. At that time it will be revised by OCM and submitted to the Coastal Policy Council for their review and comments. It will then be put in final form and submitted to OCZM for approval and funding. At the time that the grant application is submitted to OCZM during the fourth quarter, OCM will begin to negotiate RSA's and contracts with participants in the second year work program. Funding for second year activities will be granted on the basis of the successful completion of first year work program objectives. Components laid out in the original two year 306 program will be expanded or diminished on the basis of first year efforts.

Products and Schedule:

1. A mid-year report and an annual report will be submitted to OCZM by OCM summarizing the work progress of the ACMP during the first year of 306 funding.
2. 306 grant application - May 1980

Costs and Contracts of Task A1 Grant Administration

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
OCM	41mm	120,540	30,135	150,675

Task A2: Coordination and Consistency

This component of administration covers four tasks - Council support, interagency working group, OCM role in consistency certification, and consultation.

Subtask A-2a: Council Support

The first task under coordination is that of Council support. This includes travel, per diem, and administrative costs of maintaining the Council. A good deal of staff time at OCM is needed to make meeting arrangements for the Council, to record meetings and write Council summaries, to keep Council members informed on ACMP matters and to respond to their collective and individual requests. OCM is anticipating scheduling ten (10) Council meetings during the first year of the 306 program.

Products and Schedule

Council information packets (which include summary of previous meetings), information materials to be discussed, agenda is prepared and distributed prior to each Council meeting by OCM and will also be sent to OCZM.

Subtask A-2b: Interagency Working Group

The second task of this component is that of coordination of state agency activities. The primary mechanism for this coordination will be through an interagency working group made up of representatives of each of the line agencies participating in the ACMP. As well, these representatives are staff to the departments' Council member or alternate and will also be responsible for briefing them before each Council meeting as to ACMP activities.

The purpose of the interagency working group is to enable OCM to discuss matters related to ACMP with the agencies as a whole, to involve line agency participants in making decisions for the ACMP, and to resolve differences of opinion between agencies regarding the implementation of the ACMP. The group will meet about once a month during the year usually just prior to the Coastal Policy Council meetings. Working group agenda will include items to be discussed at the next Council meeting, thus enabling OCM to ensure that agencies have an opportunity to review the Council agenda and that each state agency and thus eventually their respective Council members are briefed before the Council meetings.

The working group will, in general, discuss activities of importance to each agency including such items as the grant applications, contracts (RSA's), administrative orders, permit simplification, regional planning decisions, program review, federal and state agency consistency, and progress of district programs.

Products and Schedule

Meetings will be held bi-monthly throughout the year. A series of working memos will contain the work of the inter-agency working group.

Subtask A-2c: Monitoring and Reviewing of State and Federal Agency Activities for Consistency with the ACMP and Mediating Disagreements

The state clearinghouse, under contract, will have the overall responsibility to coordinate the review for the ACMP of proposals, grant applications, plans and other documents submitted by state and federal agencies which affect the coastal area, either requiring a uniform state response or for which wide review and comment is desirable. The Clearinghouse's role in the consistency determination process is important enough to warrant financial support.

The Clearinghouse will take on most of the administrative burdens of federal consistency and state consistency determinations when requested. However the final determination of consistency will be made by OCM.

Federal proposals, permits, grant applications, DEIS's and plans and major state agency activities when requested will be circulated via the Clearinghouse. The state's consistency opinions, declarations, or findings will be made in the Clearinghouse close-out letters, with consultations and final determinations made by the OCM/DPDP. If the Clearinghouse review, which includes all state agencies, reveals no inconsistencies of a project with the ACMP, then the Clearinghouse with the approval of OCM shall complete the review. If the review reveals disagreements about the consistency of a project, then the clearinghouse will request that OCM be responsible for resolving the disagreements, complete the review and make the final determination.

The process for a Clearinghouse consistency review is as follows:

1. A project is submitted to the state Clearinghouse.
2. The Clearinghouse will send the project to all concerned parties including OCM. (OCM will not comment at this time but will wait for all reviewing agency comments).
3. Agencies will have a certain number of days within which to comment to the Clearinghouse.
4. The Clearinghouse will send all comments to OCM to assist OCM in making the consistency determination.
5. OCM will take all comments into consideration in making the consistency determination.
6. OCM will make a consistency determination and notify the Clearinghouse and the applicant. (If there is a problem with determining the consistency of a project with the ACMP, then OCM will work with the parties in disagreement to reach a solution.

Products and Schedule

Quarterly report on activities, licenses, and permits, assistance programs submitted to the Clearinghouse and OCM for consistency review, and action taken upon the projects will be submitted to the Coastal Policy Council for their information and review. OCZM will also receive copies if desired.

Subtask A-2d: Consultation

The last task of this component enables the OCM to become involved in ongoing projects initiated by others which affect the ACMP, such as the federal consistency project being carried out by the Federal Regional Council. A small percentage of person months will be allocated to this task to enable an OCM staff member to track and assist in such projects in whatever ways possible.

Costs and Contracts of Task A2 Coordination and Consistency

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
OCM	42mm	123,480	30,870	154,350

Task A3: Public Involvement

Participation by the public and federal, state and local government agencies is an integral part of the entire Alaska Coastal Management Program. It is worth pointing out that state agencies are already required to involve the public in their decision making process. It is incumbent upon OCM to ensure that they are carrying out their respective mandates.

Subtask A-3a: Notification and Involvement of Federal, State and Private Agencies in the Development of District Programs

OCM has established and is implementing a procedure for early coordination between federal, state and private agencies, and the districts when contracts are awarded and the districts are ready to begin their plans.

The procedure in brief is as follows:

1. DCRA transmits signed and approved "Scope of Services" for a district to OCM. (see definition section)
2. OCM sets up a District Record File and transmits the "Scope of Services" with a comment sheet to all federal, state and private agencies interested in District Programs.

Note: OCM has compiled a mailing list for district programs of federal, state and private agencies. Anyone may be added to the mailing list by notifying OCM. OCM recognizes that all pertinent

private parties may not have been identified at the present time and so periodically prints notice of district program development in the Current-ly. By this means, OCM lets people know that they can contact OCM for further information on district program development.

3. After a 30 day review period, the agencies return comment sheets (with their written comments) to OCM.
4. OCM incorporates the responses into the District Record File and transmits copies to the District, DCRA, and to the consultant, if one is involved.
5. Follow-up is required for agencies that are late with comments and for agencies requesting additional information or arrange meetings to exchange additional information.

It is felt that early coordination efforts reduce points of conflict and aid in meeting consistency requirements. This procedure also involves the maintenance of district record files in the OCM. All evidence of coordination and/or participation by federal, state, private, public and local agencies becomes a part of the District Record Files to be used as evidence in the program approval process.

The notification, involvement and file maintenance procedure requires a full time professional for promoting a cooperative atmosphere for exchange of ideas and information and to help settle disputes when and if they happen.

Products and Schedule

Scopes of Service will be mailed to OCZM throughout the year as they are signed by DCRA and local governments.

Subtask A-3b: Public Information

The second task of public involvement will encompass general information distribution to those interested in the ACMP. This will include a bi-monthly newsletter, special bulletins concerning such items as Council meetings and legislative actions, and letters of correspondence to respond to requests for information. Agencies, groups, and individuals expressing interest and participation in district programs are placed on notification mailing lists for all future and final information for each district program.

Products and Schedule

OCZM will receive copies of the newsletter, and special bulletins as they are produced throughout the year.

Costs and Contracts of Task A3 - Public Involvement

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
OCM	19mm	55,860	13,965	69,825

Task A4: Regional Planning Considerations in ACMP

In the near future ACMP will focus heavily on local coastal programs since these programs are the building blocks of the full program as it is eventually to exist. However, there will continue to be statewide and regional problems that merit ACMP attention. Many of the districts are so large that they constitute regions in their own right, and will thus be responsible for regional considerations as well as more local matters. The main responsibility for regional considerations will, however, fall to the state agencies and, to some extent, federal agencies. The Coastal Policy Council is charged, in the Alaska Coastal Management Act, to "initiate an interagency program of comprehensive coastal resource planning for each" of the nine regions from which the public members of the Council are appointed.

There are a variety of approaches possible to carry out this charge. One would be to undertake a planning activity of the same type as intended by the districts. However, the Legislature provided no specific instructions in the law for regional planning. Furthermore, a duplication of the local efforts would be neither cost-effective nor workable, since the ACMA provides no basis for enforcement of a planning document prepared by state agencies. In any event, the time that would be needed for preparation of such plans would be just as long, if not longer, than that needed by the districts; regional plans could not be completed soon enough to represent the final state consensus of how the various coastal resources in each region should be reflected in district programs. The local program, however, or multiples of such programs, could represent the state view as well as the local and even federal view of how resources are to be used, since state and federal agencies, as well as others, will be intimately involved in the development and approval of the local programs. OCM, therefore, has dismissed the development of "regional plans" by state agencies as an approach to represent regional concerns in district programs.

As OCM analyzed various alternative regional planning concepts, one specialized need became clear, and was thought to be a proper objective for a regional planning effort. This was the need to provide the districts with five particular types of information:

1. An indication of, generally, what the state agencies considered to be uses of state concern. (This has now been clarified in Resolution 13 of the Council which expands the definition found in the Alaska Coastal Management Act for this term.)
2. Agency expertise and information that the districts will need to be able to respond to the ACMP standards.
3. A regional perspective on resource characteristics, uses, demands and impacts, including information on cumulative effects of resource uses or management practices.

4. Agency opinions as to uses of state concern that may exist within the districts now, or which are likely to need locations in the district in the foreseeable future. This is needed so that the districts will not unknowingly exclude or restrict a use of state concern in a manner that could later be deemed arbitrary or unreasonable.
5. Agency opinions and information on special areas within the district which would be candidates for designation in the district programs as Areas Which Merit Special Attention.

The first aspect of this task has been satisfied with the adoption of Resolution 13, although case-by-case determination of state or national concern will have to be made in the event of a conflict when a local coastal program reaches the Council for review. The other four aspects of the local program assistance task can be conveniently met by the state agencies and federal agencies assisting the local governments on an individual basis. OCM can assure that interagency coordination occurs because of the record files kept for each district program, by paying attention to regional considerations in reviewing and monitoring the communications between the districts and the agencies, and by taking full advantage of the opportunities for coordination through the ACMP interagency working group.

Current plans call for an increased amount of attention to regional matters directly in OCM. By using the relationships OCM has developed with state and federal agencies, OCM will maintain a master planning list showing all statewide and regional planning activities of state and federal agencies. The status of any of these projects will be available, as well as descriptions of the objectives and work done to date on any of them. Using this list, OCM will be able to assure that the local planning efforts are cognizant of these state and federal activities. This will act as a double check since the state and federal agencies themselves are to work directly with the local governments as much as possible. Along this line, the state agencies represented on the Coastal Policy Council will each be contracted by OCM to directly assist the districts (Objective C). Parts of each of these contracts will be obligations upon the state agencies to make districts aware of regional problems and considerations that affect or could be affected by the district coastal programs.

Where regional concerns appear that are not being dealt with by an existing state, local or federal planning activity, and where ACMP goals, objectives or standards are involved, OCM can initiate a regional concern. Examples of this are studies proposed for a bottomfish industry impact study in the Aleutian Islands and an energy facilities sites survey for western Alaska.

Another technique available to achieve regional planning needs is formal coordination among the districts themselves, especially where the districts share common coastal features. The three local

governments around Cook Inlet, or the two cities located in Prince William Sound are examples. To enable such activity at the local level, the local governments will be able to use portions of their coastal program development or implementation grants in concert with each other to address regional issues.

Products and Schedules

In summary, ACMP will respond to the legislative mandate for regional planning by supporting or initiating, on a regional basis:

1. A master file containing data covering all state, federal and local planning activities affecting each region will be established and operative by October 1979. The file will also contain all correspondence relevant to uses of state concern, special areas, and expressed state and federal interests as they appear in correspondence among ACMP participants. This file will be maintained in such a way that it can be readily duplicated and summarized on a short-notice basis and made available to anyone who needs it.
2. Special studies initiated by OCM to address regional concerns or problems not being addressed by others - i.e. see fisheries and energy facility siting studies in Objective E.
3. Special studies initiated by local governments as part of their local coastal program development or implementation.
4. Regional reports, prepared by OCM, as the need arises, or as requested by the Council or other ACMP participants.
5. The efforts of the state and federal agencies to assist the local governments in the development of their coastal programs, which will be monitored, facilitated, and recorded by OCM, as well as paid for in the case of state agencies.

Contracts and Costs of Task

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
OCM	11mm	32,340	8,085	40,425

Task A-5: Areas Meriting Special Attention Designation and Management in ACMP

The multiple values and uses of all coastal areas, and the inevitable conflicts between various uses and these values, gave rise to coastal management at the state and national levels. The legislation which created both levels of the program declared that within the general coastal areas there would be more specific areas, which had even more value than the coast in general, and that a coastal management program should provide special means to identify and manage these values.

Government at all levels has engaged in special area designation and management for various purposes. ACMP has created two new methods by which special areas may be designated and managed, and there are a number of state and federal programs that now exist for the purpose of identifying, designating, and managing special areas for special reasons. This section will show how these areas are designated and managed for special coastal values in Alaska.

Rationale for Special Area Management

In Alaska, as in other states, much of the coastal area can be managed with only generalized land and water use controls. This in itself is expensive, but the fact that the effort must be spread over the entire coastal area results in an inability to properly recognize and manage (with overall program authorities) certain areas that have unique values or fragile characteristics that make them, on balance, more in need of special attention. By adding a special area identification and management element to a state coastal program, the financial and managerial resources of the program may be focused on such areas and detailed management programs may be developed.

The State of Alaska has a number of special area management programs now underway. Until ACMP, however, there has been no single program for identifying and managing special areas for all values. The existing programs in aggregate, however, do address nearly any special value. In addition, local governments also are involved in providing management attention in certain areas, or for certain values.

The identification of special areas is not the exclusive province of the state or local governments. Federal agencies, private organization, individuals, and other entities may know of special areas, or might seek them out, knowing that a process for accommodating such areas is available.

Finally, special area identification and management should take place in a process which recognizes the other interests which might be affected by such management, assuring that the value of the area is protected without causing other unnecessary impacts.

In light of these considerations, ACMP has been designed to have its own special area identification, designation, and management element, and to be able to participate in similar program under other authorities.

Special Area Designation in Alaska

There are three methods by which special areas can be designated and managed in Alaska's coastal area. These are:

- Method (a): Council approval of special area designations appearing in district coastal management programs as Areas Which Merit Special Attention.
- Method (b): Direct designation of special areas as Areas Which Merit Special Attention in the Unorganized Borough by the Council.
- Method (c): Special area designations proposed by state and federal agencies which offer such proposals under authorities other than those provided by the Alaska Coastal Management Act.

Process for Identification

Identification may come from any source, whether governmental or private. The information required in an AMSA recommendation (or designation) is:

- (1) the basis or bases for designation under AS 46.40.210(1) or (b) of this section;
- (2) a map showing the geographical location, surface areas and, where appropriate, bathymetry of the area;
- (3) a description of the area which includes dominant physical and biological features;
- (4) the existing ownership, jurisdiction, and management status of the area, including existing uses and activities;
- (5) the existing ownership, jurisdiction and management status of the area, including existing uses and activities;
- (6) present and anticipated conflicts among uses and activities within or adjacent to the area, if any; and
- (7) a proposed management scheme, consisting of the following:
 - (a) a description of the uses and activities which will be considered proper and the uses and activities which will be considered improper with respect to land and water within the area;

(b) a summary or statement of the policies which will be applied in managing the area; and

(c) identification of the authority which will be used to implement the proposed management scheme. This must "preserve" protect, enhance, or restore the value or values for which the area was designated.

As required by the ACMA and regulations, districts will designate AMSA's in their programs (method a). Delivery of an identification for method (a) is handled in two ways. If a federal or state agency or private party makes the identification, it is transmitted to the Office of Coastal Management which will assure that the guidelines and standards requirements have been met, and then forward the identification to the local government involved. The second way is where the local government itself identifies the AMSA, and then the recommendation, along with all the information called for in the ACMP regulations, is included in the program document for the district's coastal management program approval.

In addition, the Council has provided a means by which AMSA's can be designated in the unorganized borough by anybody (method b). Any such designation to the Council must contain the information required in 6 AAC 80.160(a) as described above. Such recommendations must be submitted to the Office of Coastal Management which must first determine that the information is adequate before presenting the recommendation to the Council. If the Council approves and designates the recommended place, actual management of the AMSA for the specified uses or purposes cannot begin until the Office of Coastal Management has arranged for an appropriate managing authority, in most cases a state or federal agency, and until that authority has taken whatever steps may be required by law to gain the powers needed to effectuate the management scheme for the AMSA. The Office of Coastal Management has no powers to directly manage any area.

Method (c) is simply the continued application of these existing government programs, primarily those of the state. The Council can participate in special area designation in a review and endorsement capacity, and has resolved to do so in the future if Council approval for a special area designation is sought by the agency which operates an existing governmental program for whatever type of coastal value is involved.

Special area proposals offered to the Council by method (c) are not AMSA proposals, and acquire no authority from the Alaska Coastal Management Act. Endorsement by the Council of such a special area proposal does not supplant any other steps required by law to cause the designation and management of the special area.

Designation of an AMSA

For designation of an AMSA under method (a), it will occur with the approval of the district program or an amendment at a later date. In either case, they will follow the same review and approval process as the district program itself.

Under method (b) for designation, the Council may designate the area, but arrangements must be made with the appropriate state agencies to undertake direct management. Under this method recognizing the potential for lack of public involvement because it is not a part of an ongoing district program, designation will not occur until there has been one or more well-advertised public hearings on the matter, and not until all parties likely to be interested or affected by the designation have been contacted on the matter. The actual amount of time needed, from the point of recommendation to final action by the Council, will vary depending on the type and complexity of the proposed AMSA.

Under method (c), since it is part of other ongoing state programs and Council involvement is not mandatory, any of the above procedures are optional; however, it is presumed that under existing programs some form of public involvement is a part of the process.

Management of an AMSA

After the AMSA has been approved, management of the area on behalf of the particular value which led to its designation begins. The plan for this management is part of the AMSA recommendation, and is thus approved along with the designation itself. The management plan may be carried out by either state or local authority, depending on what the value of the area is and how it will be used after designation.

The type and degree of management for an area is decided when the decision is made to establish special management for the area. The state and local decision-makers who are considering an AMSA recommendation will know not only what value is under consideration for protection or utilization, but also exactly how this is to take place.

As previously discussed, under method (a), AMSAs may be designated along with the general approval of a district program, or as a later amendment to a district program. In either case, the management system developed for the AMSA will be devised and approved in the context of the larger program. Thus the effects and impacts of the special area management will be considered at the same time that the uses of the areas around and adjacent to the AMSA are being planned.

Under method (b), after the Council has designated the AMSA the Office of Coastal Management will arrange for the management of the area with the state or federal agency most appropriate to the purpose. The Office of Coastal Management has no powers to directly manage any area.

Under method (c), management will be according to state statutes and regulations.

Product and Schedule

Funding for this task has been allocated to OCM for review and coordination procedures. It is expected that local governments will be making AMSA

designations in conjunction with the development of their district programs and that state agencies will be assisting local governments technical assistance in this area and implementing their agency's role in the ACMP. OCM staff is being funded to:

- 1) establish the review procedures for all 3 methods of AMSA designation.
- 2) conducting review procedures when necessary
- 3) act as mediator in selling disagreements concerning AMSA designations
- 4) make recommendations to the Coastal Policy Council

It is assumed that much of the activity concerning AMSA designation will take place when the district programs come in for review in the fall and again in the spring.

Contracts and Costs of Task A5 - AMSA Review & Coordination Procedures

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
OCM	3mm	8,820	2,205	11,025

Task A6: Review and approval of District Programs

The review and approval process for District Programs is complex, due to the number of agencies involved and the legally prescribed public hearings. For a local District Program to become an element of the Alaska Coastal Management Program, the process starts when the district has completed their basic tasks and has submitted the stipulated number of "review draft" documents to the Department of Community and Regional Affairs.

The approval process is as follows:

1. DCRA transmits copies of "review draft" to OCM and to the eligible notification list already established during work program process. (This list includes federal, state, local and private agencies and public groups and individuals who are on the distribution list due to participation and interest from the beginning of the district's efforts on a coastal management document as explained in Task A3).
2. The district (in conjunction with DCRA) schedules and holds one or more public hearings in the district.
 - a) Comments derived from the public hearing(s) are collected by the district and transmitted to OCM and DCRA. All who comment are added to the "eligible notification list".
3. The district responds to the comments and incorporates them into an addendum or prepares a new draft document. The revised draft is advertised for public review for 30 days.

4. A second public hearing in the district allows the governing body (or Service Area Board) to adopt the "concept approved draft" in concept only. DCRA officially transmits copies of the "concept approved draft" to OCM along with all records and comments (with their responses) derived from the public hearing.

5. A 90-day processing period begins when OCM receives the "concept approved draft" from DCRA. The first 30 days are required for OCM review and recommendations.

a) OCM Staff transmits copies of "concept approved draft", comments and responses to Coastal Policy Council for their review.

b) OCM Staff reviews concept material and writes recommendation for OCM Coordinator's signature.

c) Recommendations are transmitted to the District, DCRA and the eligible list.

d) OCM Staff completes the District Record File.

e) The second 30-day interval allows for the return of comments on the Staff recommendation.

f) By the 70th day, OCM Staff will submit the recommendation with written comments to the Coastal Policy Council.

g) The Coastal Policy Council holds a public meeting by the 90th day to take action on the "concept approved draft". The Council may grant full approval, partial approval or total disapproval.

6. If the Council grants full approval, the program becomes the "Council Approved Draft" and is returned to the District for final District approval. If the District approves of all changes and/or amendments, it adopts an ordinance of total approval and the Ordinance of approval along with the final approved document is returned to OCM.

7. OCM prepares and presents the Council approved document and ordinance for Legislative approval. (Must be submitted by 10th day of a regular session).

8. After legislative approval, the program is returned to OCM and the District and the final program document is printed.

9. In cases of partial or total disapproval by the Coastal Policy Council, the document and recommendations are returned to OCM and a special procedure begins to allow the Council and the District to resolve the conflicts that prevented full approval.

Products and Schedules

OCZM will receive copies of appropriate drafts. It is estimated that approximately eight programs will go through these steps this year beginning in the fall. They will probably include North Slope Borough, Cordova, Haines, Juneau, Craig/Klawock, Anchorage, Ketchikan, and Metlakatla.

Contracts and Costs of Task A6 - Review and Approval of District Programs

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
OCM	34mm	99,960	24,990	124,950

Task A7: First Year 306 Program Review

One of the responsibilities of the OCM will be to prepare for the first year 306 program review of the ACMP. The review is the OCZM's evaluation of the first 306 year of Alaska's implementation of the coastal management program. OCM's responsibilities in preparing for the review will include the following: collecting information requested by OCZM, preparing materials in the format specified by OCAM, making arrangements for OCZM site visit (this should occur in April 1980), attending the site visit and acting as host, responding to the report written by OCZM on their site visit to Alaska.

Products and Schedule

Products will include information requested by OCZM and the actual site meeting in April and OCM's response to OCZM's review.

Contracts and Costs of Task A7 - First Year 306 Program Review

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
OCM	4mm	11,820	2,955	14,775

Objective B: State Agency Implementation

The purpose of this objective is to implement consistency and to explain coordination procedures to be used by state and federal agencies.

The Alaska Coastal Management Act and the federal regulations for approval of a state coastal program under Section 306 of the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, require that state agency actions and decisions which affect coastal resources be consistent with the state coastal program. In this case, the "state coastal program" means, initially, the ACMP regulations and Alaska Coastal Management Act itself, but eventually the term will include the district coastal programs as they are approved by the Council.

Over the past three years, much effort has been devoted to the study of state agency actions and authorities which, when aggregated, amount to management of significant coastal land and water uses. The management system for Alaska must assure that state agencies conduct their developments consistently with ACMP regulations, and further, that agencies issue, condition, or deny their permits or other authorizations consistently with ACMP regulations. In addition, time and effort has been devoted to studying the issue of federal consistency and how the ACMP will effect this clause of the federal CZMA.

Implementation of the ACMP by state agencies falls into three general tasks described below. The first is administration and coordination of the line agencies' participation in the ACMP. The second is assurance that each state agency's development plans and activities are carried out and permits are granted consistent with the ACMP regulations. The third is assurance that federal and major state activities which come through the clearinghouse for review are consistent with the ACMP.

There are no products slated for completion on any particular date during the year, except for procedural reports specifically mentioned under each state agency's work program and quarterly reports to be submitted to OCM documenting all work completed under all tasks. As detailed in task A-1, OCM will be drawing up an outline for agency quarterly reports which will include specific work tasks which must be documented by each agency in regards to agency implementation. OCM's outline will include such items as formats for permit logs to be kept on all permits issued which require an agency consistency certification, and for consistency review logs to be kept on all projects reviewed by a state agency for consistency review.

Task B1: Coordination with ACMP by State Agencies

Each agency participating in the ACMP will be funded under this task to ensure coordination and participation with the ACMP.

It includes:

1. Support to the Coastal Policy Council by ensuring that their commissioners and alternatives are briefed and updated for meetings.
2. Participation on the interagency ACMP working group to represent and contribute to matters pertaining to the department's scope of responsibilities.
3. Monitoring of status and progress of district programs and assistance provided to the districts by the department.
4. Maintenance of assurance of consistency of all department activities with ACMP.
5. Coordination of the procedures for and conduct of A-95 clearinghouse review of proposals, grants, applications, plans, projects and other documentation presented to the department.
6. Maintenance of working liaison with other state and federal agencies on ACMP related activities.
7. Funding and program development for agency's participation in ACMP including writing (rewriting) grant proposals, RSA's, quarterly and annual progress reports as detailed by OCM.
8. Oversight of agency activities to ensure that contract agreements are met and that resources of department are efficiently utilized with duplication of effort.
9. Writing of reports detailing participation in the ACMP.

Products and Schedule

The working group will meet on a monthly basis most likely in conjunction with a Coastal Policy meeting. It is an ongoing task throughout duration of 306 funding period. Products will include memos, monthly meetings and actions of group which will be described in half and annual reports. (see Objective A for further information).

Contracts and Costs of Task B1: Coordination with ACMP by State Agencies

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
DCED	25mm	9,220	915	10,135
DCRA	12mm	32,000	8,000	40,000
DEC	6mm	28,942	-0-	28,942
DFG	16mm	39,616	10,977	50,593
DNR	25mm	53,000	83,100	136,100
DOT/PF	9.25mm	36,160	9,040	45,200
		<u>198,938</u>	<u>112,032</u>	<u>310,970</u>

Task B2: State Agency Implementation

This task describes the responsibilities that each line agency will undertake in implement the ACMP. This includes a review function of federal and major state projects coming through the clearinghouse for a consistency determination as described in task B3, and an assurance by each line agency that their individual development plans, activities, and permits granted by the agency are consistent with the ACMP regulations.

OCM feels that in general, it is unnecessary to increase the staff or budget for permit systems and clearinghouse personnel in each agency. However, it is recognized that it is necessary for OCM to support each agency in its efforts to comply with the above obligations. Due to the difference in structure of each line agency, each has proposed a different method by which to meet its obligations to the ACMP for agency activity consistency and for review of federal and other state projects for consistency. All state agencies will be obligated to describe in detail in their contracts with OCM the methods which they will use to implement the ACMP regulations.

As stated above, all agencies are responsible for assuring that all of the ACMP standards are met, both in review of activities of federal and other state agencies received through the clearinghouse and in implementation in their individual agency activities. However, this is a somewhat unrealistic expectation in practice since not all of the agencies have expertise in all the disciplines needed to carry out the standards. In view of this, for the purpose of review of state and federal projects which come through the clearinghouse for review, OCM has identified key agencies and their respective divisions which will be responsible for assuring consistency of a project and that standard and providing the agency reviewer with that information.

Public Participation	OCM
Coastal Development	DOT/PF
	DCED
	DNR/Division of Forest, Land and Water Management (DFLWM)
	DEC
Geophysical Hazards	DNR/Division of Geological and Geophysical Survey (DGGS)
Recreation	DNR/Division of Parks (DOP)
Energy Facilities	DCED
	DNR/Division of Mineral and Energy Management (DMEM)
Transportation and Utilities	DOT/PF
	DCED
Fish and Seafood Processing	DCED
	DFG/Habitat Protection Section

Timber Harvest and Processing

DCED
DNR/Division of Forest, Land
and Water Management (DFLWM)
DFG/Habitat Protection Section

Mining and Mineral Processing

DOT/PF
DCED
DNR/Division of Mineral and
Energy Management (DMEM)
DFG/Habitat Protection Section
DEC

Subsistence
Air, Land and Water Quality
Historic, Prehistoric, and
Archaeological Resources

DNR/Division of Parks (DOP)

For the purposes of assuring consistency of individual agency activities and permits which do not come through the clearinghouse for review, line agencies should also contact the above agencies for expertise not available in-house to assure consistency. However, it is recognized that in the name of expediency and efficiency for in-house and smaller matters, one line agency should be identified as the technical expert on each of the standards. OCM has agreed to work out such a contact list of one agency per standard for small matters. It should also be noted that although DCED will not be listed as a technical expert on any of the standards, it will be expected that wherever the issue of feasible and prudent arises, DCED will be contacted for their assistance.

Below is a description of the method of implementation to be used by each agencies.

DCED

Keeping in mind the legislative mandate of DCED, the department has requested partial funding for a core group of people within the Division of Economic Enterprise who will allocate a certain part of their time during this grant year to carrying out DCED's responsibilities to the ACMP.

Although DCED is not a permitting agency in the context of ACMP, they still have a mandated interest in assuring that permits are granted by state agencies consistent with the development and economic sections of the ACMP regulations. The department's interests are twofold: 1) to assure that economic development projects and/or related permits are properly handled; and 2) the economic factors associated with and resulting from a given project and/or permit are adequately evaluated and understood.

DCED through its Division of Economic Enterprise will provide analytical and other assistance for the program areas identified in the above list. It is to be understood that the DCED review will concentrate on the economic aspects of each project or permit, and not on the functional requirements for each.

Additionally DCED will undertake to develop and implement a process for handling the analyses that will be required in interpreting the "feasible and prudent" rule as applied to the ACMP. These analyses will be required for both the evaluation of project plan and program alternatives and in application of the regulations. DCED will summarize their findings in a report to OCM recommending methods and procedures for carrying out "feasible and prudent" analyses. This report will include various alternatives for addressing the issue of "feasible and prudent" analyses in the issuance of permits including staffing requirements and agency responsibilities in making such determinations. It has been recognized by OCM and DCED that studying "feasible and prudent" alternatives in regards to permits affecting the use of natural resources has not been attempted by the state before and deserves to be studied thoroughly before any process is set into affect. This report should be completed towards the end of the first year 306 funding. This will enable OCM to give adequate consideration to the need for possible funding of this task as a separate work item in the second year.

DEC

With its mandated responsibilities in mind, DEC is requesting funding to support the Division of Policy and Program Coordination (DPPC). DPPC is responsible for coordination of the various divisions' activities and has been designated within the department as having lead responsibility in the implementation of the ACMP. With that in mind, DEC has elected to spread their funding over positions in several divisions with the coordination of response laying in DPPC. This includes five positions in the Division of Planning and Program coordination which is responsible for the major portion of implementing the ACMP, one position in the Division of Water Programs (DWP) which is responsible for preliminary decisions on certifications under 401 and will also be responsible for providing information to the districts, and two half-time field positions in the regional offices where the primary responsibility lies for administering the DEC's subdivision review authorities.

DPPC has responsibilities to coordinate the processing of DEC's air quality control permit to operate, certification of activities under Secion 401 of the Clean Water Act, pesticide permit, solid waste disposal permit, and wastewater disposal permit. DPPC operates the state's permit information centers and is central to the department's view of major projects and interagency program. In addition, DPPC serves as DEC's contact for the state's A-95 clearinghouse system. The department's coastal management coordinator will be located in DPPC and be responsible for assuring DEC's actions are consistent with the ACMP. The coordinator will serve as DEC's contact with the clearinghouse on all major activities requiring DEC action and will be the state's contact for expertise on standards listed above.

Division of Water Programs (DWP) is responsible for reviewing and making preliminary decisions on certifications under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, wastewater disposal permit, public water supply and sewerage system construction grants, sewerage system or treatment works plan review, and public water system plan review. In addition, DWP is the principal sponsor of the state's water quality management planning process of which the 208 water quality management program is a part. Increased participation by DWP in ACMP's management of coastal wetland is anticipated. DWP will reflect the department's expertise on water quality and dredge and fill activities through the coastal management coordinator. It will also insure plans and programs relating to water quality are conducted consistently with the ACMP.

Division of Terrestrial Programs (DTP) is responsible for reviewing and making preliminary decisions regarding DEC's air quality control permit to operate, pesticide permit, and solid waste disposal permit. The division is currently developing a state solid waste management plan and revising the state air quality control plan. DTP will reflect DEC's expertise for air quality and solid waste disposal. It will insure that the department's plans and programs for air quality control and solid waste disposal are carried out consistent with the ACMP.

DEC's regional offices have the principal responsibility to administer the department's subdivision review authorities. Increased consultation with DNR and DFG regional staff, in addition to increased site investigation, will be required to assure subdivision review authorities and major project review are carried out consistent with ACMP. The regional offices are heavily relied upon to provide the central office with advice on most permit, certification, and plan review actions undertaken in a particular region. The regional offices are most sensitive to local concerns and desires and will be most useful in assuring DEC's actions are consistent with approved district programs.

DFG

With its mandated responsibilities in mind, the Department of Fish and Game ((DFG) has elected to fund one full time staff member in the Marine and Coastal Habitat Management Project of the Habitat Protection Section (Habitat) for ensuring the consistency of the DFG's activities and review procedures with the ACMP.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game will guarantee consistency on all department permits and on the review of other state and federal permits by drafting a coastal management consistency manual for use by the department and by establishing a permit consistency review procedure.

A coastal management consistency manual will be developed describing all of the provisions of the ACMP which would require deviation from standard ADFG permit stipulations for any particular area or activity. This manual will be continually updated as new district plans are completed and other changes are made in the coastal management program. Initially briefing books will also be prepared for the permitting arm of Habitat. The briefing books will outline the Alaska Coastal Management Program as it applies to ADFG's review and permit authorities. In addition, Habitat will review district programs for consistency with existing fish and game statutes and uses of state concern prior to program approval. After district program approval, Habitat will conduct a thorough review of fish and game regulations and procedures to insure consistency with each district program, rewriting and extending existing regulations where needed.

Habitat is responsible for the review and issuance of Title 16 permits (this includes the protection of anadromous fish waters permits, critical habitat permits, game refuge permits, game sanctuary permits). Habitat has also been given the key responsibility for incorporating the ACMP into the DFG's permit review process and ensuring DFG consistency. To avoid significantly increasing the time necessary to obtain a Title 16 permits after issuance, and will notify the responsible projects review coordinator of any conflicts with the ACMP and the corrective action to be taken. Habitat biologists will be available for consistency consultation on any permit as the need arise.

Habitat also reviews state permits issued by DNR and DEC; federal permits issued by the Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and Section 10 of the River and Harbor Act of 1899, U. S. Coast Guard permits for bridges over navigable water, EPA NPDES permits, and USGS OCS geophysical exploration permits. For the review of these other state and federal permits and federally funded projects which have a considerably longer response time, Habitat will review the proposed action and will provide comments on ACMP consistency directly to the department's project review coordinator for inclusion in the department response.

After issuing Title 16 permit or responding to other agency actions, a copy of the findings will be sent to OCM and another copy sent to the affected coastal district. Through this mechanism, coastal management districts will be kept informed of all Title 16 permits which are issued in their area of interest. ADFG permits in the coastal zone will be issued with the understanding that final consistency review authority lies with the Office of the Governor, Division of Policy Development and Planning.

The coastal management consistency manual which will be completed in October 1979 will be an in-house guide for DFG to use in implementing the ACMP. It will be written in conformance with the report being submitted to OCM in June 1979 which outlines how DFG will be consistent with the ACMP and the Administrative Order.

DNR

With its mandated responsibilities in mind, DNR is requesting funding to support its Division of Planning and Research for the interagency coordination mechanism to implement the Alaska Coastal Management Program.

This group will include CZM coordinator, several staff to work within the division, and liaison staff with each major division involved in the ACMP (DGGs, DMEM, DFLWM, DOP). This group will be responsible for implementation of the ACMP in DNR. The division liaison will serve as ACMP experts for review and comment on the standards for which it is determined that their assigned division is responsible for in the ACMP regulations.

This task will include preparation of a CZM implementation guide based on departmental re-organization for use by departmental personnel; establishment and conduct of training workshops for DNR personnel to assist in integrating CZM considerations into day-to-day agency activities, review of proposed federal, state, local and private actions for consistency; review of district programs; assurance of consistency of all department plans, management programs, actions, procedures, and resource allocations with ACMP; assurance that all permits and leases granted by DNR are consistent with ACMP.

The implementation report which will be completed by October 1979 will be an in-house guide for implementation of the ACMP by DNR staff. It will be drafted in conformance with the report DNR is submitting to OCM in June 1979 which outlines DNR's overall role in the ACMP and compliance with the newly signed Administrative Order.

DOT/PF

There are two major divisions within DOT/PF which the department feels that it is important to fund through ACMP. The Transportation Planning Division and its Regional Offices are responsible for transportation planning throughout the state. The Design and Construction Division is responsible for the actual construction of the capital improvement projects.

In order to comply with the mandates of the ACMP - both departmental planning and construction phases have to be consistent with the ACMP; therefore, DOT/PF feels that funding can be better used to support the program if it is used throughout the department. They have chosen to request partial funding for the following positions for this task: the ACMP coordinator in the Transportation Planning Division who will be responsible for coordination of the program throughout the department, Environmental Coordinator in the Design and Construction Division who is responsible for drafting the DEIS's, consistency of applications for permits, and coordinators in the three regional offices who will work with local governments on district programs. These people will be responsible for carrying out the following activities within the department.

1. Provisions of special technical support in evaluating alternatives and determining impacts in the state's transportation infrastructure.
2. Assurance of consistency with the ACMP in the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements required for those transportation facility projects in designated coastal areas which are authorized to proceed by a federal or state authority.
3. Preparation of permit applications required for construction of transportation and public facilities in coastal areas.
4. Coordination with local, state and federal agencies to assure ACMP consistency for capital improvement projects, and/or required environmental impact statements and permits.
5. Monitoring of transportation facilities and projects in designated coastal zones for compliance with ACMP Guidelines and Standards.
6. Review and evaluation of projects presented to the department by the A-95 clearinghouse.

DOT/PF will be preparing an in-house procedure manual which will be completed by October 1979. . It will be an in-house guide for implementation of the ACMP by DOT/PF staff.

Schedule of Agency Products

DCED - Report on "Feasible and Prudent" Alternatives 5/80

DFG - Coastal Management Consistency Manual 10/79

Briefing Books

DNR - Revised Implementation Report 10/79
Training Workshops - Fall 1979

DOT/PF - Procedure Document 10/79

All Agencies - Quarterly and Annual Reports

October 1979

January 1980

April 1980

June 1980

Contracts and Costs of Task B2: State Agency Implementation

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
DCED	4.5mm	18,630	5,115	23,745
DEC	46.5mm	104,418	20,740	125,158
DFG	20mm	72,221	19,567	91,784
JNR	43.25mm	134,800	-0-	134,800
DOT/PF	13.75mm	52,000	13,000	65,000
		<u>382,069</u>	<u>58,418</u>	<u>440,487</u>

Task B3: Federal and Major State Activity Review through the Clearinghouse

As OCM established and implemented a process for making federal consistency determinations for the ACMP, it became apparent that a formal review procedure would be necessary. The clearinghouse with its A-95 review procedure has been selected as that procedure and vehicle to receive, distribute, organize, review and respond to federal consistency matters. The clearinghouse will function as the agency responsible for coordinating the state review of federal coastal management consistency matters concerning federal development and activities, federally issued permits and licenses, license and permit activities described in detail in OCS plans for exploration and development/production, and applications for federal assistance. It is anticipated that about half of the present clearinghouse workload (500 out of 1000) will have coastal management consistency finding ramifications and that 500 new licenses and permits will be added to the present review responsibility.

Work on implementing a procedure for federal consistency review was begun under the fourth year of 305 funding with the establishment of contacts with all the federal agencies active in Alaska coastal area by staff of OCM and the clearinghouse. The purpose of these contacts was to establish working relationships with all the federal agencies. It was determined that the most effective vehicle available to OCM to implement federal consistency would be Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with each of the federal agencies most active in the coastal area. The MOUs are to be working agreements between each federal agency and OCM/DPDP on roles of the respective agencies in applying for and making federal consistency determination. In many cases, the MOU defines the consistency review as a part of the already occurring A-95 review.

At the present time, several MOUs are signed, and most are in draft stages. The final signature on most of the MOUs is expected with the approval of the ACMP by the federal OCZM.

In addition to action on federal activities, OCM will be making consistency determinations on behalf of state agencies who request them.

The outline for the A-95 Federal Consistency Review is as follows:

The normal review period of a project coming through the Clearinghouse is 30 days with 15 day extensions as necessary.

Day 1 - Clearinghouse sends out projects sent in for review to appropriate agencies.

Clearinghouse notifies OCM of project review beginning.

State agencies begin review of project for consistency to the guidelines and standards designated as part of their agencies' responsibilities.

- Day 22 - Agencies submit their comments back to the Clearinghouse by this date.

Clearinghouse checks over comments to see if project is agreed to be consistent or if a more extensive review is needed.

- Day 22 - If no need for additional work by OCM for consistency determination, the project is signed by DPDP Director.

If there is a need for some additional work before consistency determination can be made through the Clearinghouse, OCM is notified and OCM has 8 working days until close of comment period in which to work out differences between agencies. It is hoped that if only minor changes are needed to make project consistent that OCM can work out the differences on unofficial level.

If it appears there needs to be quite a bit of work for resolution of differences about a project's consistency the Clearinghouse will notify the applicant and the agencies that a 15 day extension has been granted which will give the OCM the needed time to meet with the dissenting parties.

As can be seen by the procedure, the Clearinghouse review involves Clearinghouse staff, OCM, and state agencies. The Clearinghouse is the vehicle for circulating the document, the state agencies are the expertise on the standards, and OCM is the decision-maker who must certify as to the consistency of the project. OCM does not conduct the actual review of the project but rather counts on Clearinghouse to circulate and the agencies to review, then OCM will make a consistency determination on the basis of comments submitted by state agencies and others.

Work on this task by OCM is described under Task A-2 and by the agencies under task B2.

Products and Schedule

A reporting system will be designed by OCM and DPDP for recording all consistency actions taken. A report will be submitted to the Coastal Policy Council quarterly for monitoring purposes. OCZM may receive these reports if they so desire.

Costs and Contracts of Task B3: Federal and Major State Activity Review through the Clearinghouse

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Clearinghouse (DPDP) 36mm	80,000	20,000	100,000

Objective C: Provide Technical Assistance to Districts and Unorganized Borough Participating or Interested in Participating in the ACMP

Whereas Objective D provides financial assistance to coastal resource districts, this objective is directed towards providing technical and informational assistance by state agencies to coastal resource districts. This will also include information on uses of state concern and areas meriting special attention.

With the passage of the Alaska Coastal Management Act, state agencies and local governments were presented with a unique opportunity to cooperate in land planning and management activities conducted in coastal areas. This cooperation has been and will continue to be, largely manifested on the state level in technical assistance rendered to local governments.

The Department of Community and Regional Affairs (hereafter called DCRA) is the state agency responsible for rendering assistance to local governments and has been mandated with special responsibilities in ACMA to provide financial and technical assistance to coastal resource districts. DCRA has performed this function on behalf of ACMP for the last four years of the program. DCRA is responsible for working out the financial aspects and programmatic requirements between the state and the coastal resource districts interested in participating in the ACMP. A contract between DCRA and a coastal resource district officially signifies that a district program is underway. The work program attached to the contract is called a Scope of Service.

The procedure for providing technical assistance to districts by state agencies is initiated with the signing of the Scope of Services. At this point, OCM will notify the state, federal, and private agencies of a beginning district program. State agencies will contact OCM if they can be of technical assistance in that district. OCM will then contact the district planner and inform the planner of the agencies which should be contacted for information. At this point, it is the district's responsibility to contact the state agencies. Upon the district's request, state agency staff will begin collecting and preparing the resource information needed by the district. Every attempt will be made to provide the information as rapidly as possible because of the relatively short period of time which districts have been given to develop their draft plans. Draft plans will be reviewed by each department and comments will be provided to the district of agency concerns.

Assistance will continue throughout the review stage, including participation at workshops, public hearings, assembly review, Coastal Policy Council review and legislative review. As each new district plan is initiated this process, will be started.

State agencies will keep records of their assistance efforts to districts. This record will include which departmental division assisted, what the

division provided, what the district requested, what the turnaround time in responding to request was. This will enable OCM to monitor the effectiveness and efficiency of the allocation of these funds. Funding under this objective, primarily to state agencies, will allow state agencies to place the needed time and manpower into providing technical assistance and information.

Task C1: Assistance to Local Coastal Programs by DCRA

To administer the grants discussed above, and to provide other services to local governments, an ACMP staff cadre amounting to six full positions has been established in DCRA. The DCRA will provide the following types of general assistance:

- a) administer the pass-through grants;
- b) provide direct planning services to small local governments and to coastal resources service areas on request;
- c) conduct such special studies and investigation as may later be determined to be useful and within the time and budget constraints of the ACMP cadre;
- d) provide public participation technical services (in association with the OCM public participation effort);
- e) assist in the organization of coastal resource service areas;
- f) review the progress of district coastal programs as an augmentation of OCM's responsibility to do so on behalf of the Council;
- g) review submitted district programs as an augmentation to OCM's review on behalf of the Council; and
- h) prepare and conduct technical workshops and other similar activities for local planners and others involved in local program.

Products and Schedules

Work under this task is ongoing throughout the year. Scopes of Services will be sent to OCZM as completed. See Objective D for more detail.

Contracts and Costs of Task C1: Assistance to Local Governments by DCRA

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
DCRA	73mm	\$205,200	\$51,300	\$256,500

Task C2: Technical Assistance and Information to Districts by State Agencies

Not all of the requests for assistance to coastal district citizens and agencies can be handled by DCRA. In many cases, technical assistance from a line agency expert in a particular matter may be the most effective method of dealing with the requests for assistance.

As local governments begin their district programs, state and federal agencies and the general public are being informed of them. The OCM is responsible through the process outlined in Objective A for informing all state, federal, and private agencies of the commencement of district programs, and for them informing the district of state, federal and private agencies who are interested in being involved in that particular district program. Once the district is notified of interested parties, it is the district's responsibility to contact the state and federal and private agencies and listen to their comments. It is then the agencies responsibility to respond to the requests of the district and to provide technical assistance.

There are a variety of information needs and obligations as a result of the ACMP regulations. This is information that the districts need, that they may be obligated to acquire and use, and that state agencies are either obligated to provide or are in a good position to provide. The list below is based in part on the "management products" described in the Uses of State Concern paper produced by the Regional Planning Team (during the period of the fourth year grant), the requirements in the ACMP regulations and the experience of OCM.

State agencies will also be required to provide information on Uses of State Concern and AMSA's which fall within their area of expertise. It recognized that much of this information and data is in raw form, and incomplete; however, it is felt that such materials will be useful to the local governments in their planning efforts.

In the Reimbursable Service Agreements (RSA) with the agencies, there are certain specification which the agencies must meet in the provisions of finished products to OCM. To the greatest extent possible, agencies will make sure that their information to districts also complies with the RSA specifications. The requirements in the RSA include:

- 1) Written products shall be in clear, nontechnical English for easy public understanding. A short glossary of necessary technical terms shall be provided. Where applicable, an index to localities, species & processes shall be included.
- 2) Graphics (maps, illustrations, graphs and tables) shall be submitted at 11" x 17" or smaller (letter size when possible), or reducible to 11" x 17" with easy legibility. Graphics shall be labeled and designed for quick, easy understanding. Letter size, line width and color, and symbols shall be chosen for legibility at this size and for reproduction by blue-line or xerox process. Graphics shall be provided in reproducible form.

The respective agencies shall be responsible for providing the following materials.

- DFG:
1. An interpretation of coastal management boundaries and assistance in defining coastal zone boundaries.
 2. Information on biophysical processes at work within the coastal district.
 3. Fish and Wildlife resource information including distribution, abundance and relative values of fish, wildlife and habitat resources.
 4. Maps of fish and wildlife special habitats. Special habitats support critical life stages or functions of important harvestable or protected species including nesting, breeding, spawning, rearing, over-wintering, and migration areas. Identification of these areas will include a description of the sensitivity of each type of special habitat area.
 5. Maps of endangered and protected species' habitats.
 6. Maps of known anadromous rivers, lakes and streams, along with existing management policies and existing processes used to identify new ones, when available.
 7. Maps showing significant sport, commercial and subsistence harvest areas.
 8. Maps of existing and proposed hatcheries, aquaculture sites and enhancement projects. Identification will include a description of the purpose of each existing or proposed enhancement project.
 9. Maps showing all existing refuges, sanctuaries, and critical habitats along with existing management policies and plans for them, when available.
 10. State's existing management policies for harvesting of fish and wildlife (by region) when available.
- DNR:
1. land status and ownership;
 2. mineral and mining sites, leases, prospects, and existing policies for;
 3. existing and proposed parks, waysides, historical and archaeological sites and resources, and existing policies for;

4. hazardous geological or geophysical areas, potential geological or geophysical hazards, and existing policies for geological or geophysical hazards;
5. energy resources, development sites and existing policies for;
6. forested areas, and existing policies for;
7. water resources;
8. agricultural potential.

- DEC:
1. existing air pollution sources;
 2. existing water pollution sources;
 3. existing water pollution sources related to solid waste;
 4. existing and proposed sewage treatment facilities;
 5. existing and proposed public water supply systems;
 6. existing and proposed solid waste disposal facilities.

- DCRA:
1. sites under consideration for the Development Cities Act;
 2. energy facility sites in specific localities where siting analyses have occurred.

- DCED:
1. existing and commercial and industrial sites and facilities and new ones proposed by others;
 2. a process for identifying potential sites for industrial or commercial development facilities and activities;
 3. a list of site requirements for various types of industry;
 4. forecasts and demand indicators for various economic sectors.

- DOT/PF:
1. existing and proposed transportation routes and facilities;
 2. existing and proposed public buildings and facilities;
 3. policies, standards and specifications for siting, construction, operation, and maintenance of transportation and public facilities.

- OCM:
1. OCM will assure communication between districts and the parties they affect, maintaining record files for all district programs and facilitate local program development, approval and implementation in any other way necessary.

In the process of providing information to districts, each agency will also identify on a site specific basis Uses of State Concern applicable to particular coastal areas of the state.

Each agency will also propose areas meriting special attention to districts and will accompany such proposals with the information for AMSA recommendations as detailed in objective A.

Provision of this information should be at the request of the coastal resource districts, although it is important OCM make districts aware that such information is available.

Products and Schedule

Agencies shall provide assistance for the entire year. A log will be kept for monitoring purposes of assistance given.

Contracts and Costs of Task C-2 Technical Assistance and Information to Districts by State Agencies

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Costs</u>
DCED	9.5mm	\$ 47,150	\$13,220	\$ 60,370
DEC	12 mm	42,868	--	42,868
DFG	59.5mm	113,549	29,545	143,094
DNR	45.75mm	144,700	--	144,700
DOT/PF	7 mm	<u>27,840</u>	<u>6,960</u>	<u>34,800</u>
Total		\$ 376,107	\$49,725	\$425,832

Task C3: Distribution of Publications and Informational Referral for ACMP

Subtask C-3a: Publications produced by ACMP

In addition to information and raw data provided to districts and described above, there are many reports, summaries, and maps produced for the ACMP over the past 4 years which are now available to state and federal agencies and the general public through the pilot project at the Arctic Environmental Information and Data Center (AEIDC) sponsored by RALI-USGS. If AEIDC is not able to furnish a copy of an ACMP document, their staff will inform the requestor of where the document may be viewed. Alaska has a difficult problem when it comes to distribution and receipt of materials due to Alaska's size, weather, and transportation difficulties. OCM's information distribution system at AEIDC is an attempt to cope with the situation. USGS-RALI will continue to fund this effort through the first year of implementation.

Subtask C-3b: Information referral relevant to ACMP

To prepare for developing coastal zone plans and ordinances, districts need to know the availability of all relevant data and published material. AEIDC's Information Services staff will fill these needs as follows:

- 1) identify individual researchers and experts,
- 2) monitor current research,
- 3) locate publications and unpublished material in federal and state agency files,
- 4) develop site-specific bibliographies for the districts, including current research, data files, and publications. The bibliographies will be indexed by author, geographic location, and subject. The source of publications will be noted, and
- 5) provide copies of materials to districts.

Products and Schedules

This task will be for one year and if successful will be extended. The product will be a master bibliography of coastal management information which will be completed by fall 1979. The master bibliography will be developed containing a site-specific geographic location index, as well as author and subject index. It will include materials available at other locations in addition to AEIDC and the document source will also be indexed. When any district requests information, computer search time will be minimal and a site-specific print-out will be generated.

AEIDC will record all inquiries on log sheets, which will be submitted quarterly to OCM with an analysis of information needs versus available information.

Contracts and Costs of Task C3 - Distribution of Publications and Information
Referral for ACMP

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
AEIDC	20mm	\$ 80,000	\$20,000	\$100,000

Objective D: Provide financial support to districts for the development of district coastal management programs and to the unorganized borough for their participation in the ACMP.

As the primary managers of the coastal area, local governments will need financial (covered in this Objective) and technical (covered in Objective C) assistance to carry out the duties mandated by the Alaska Coastal Management Act. Funding under this objective will include financial assistance for the unorganized borough as well as for the organized districts. The structure of Alaska Coastal Management Program has been defined in the Alaska Coastal Management Act. Local governments are assigned the key responsibility to do detailed planning and management under the general direction provided by the ACMP regulations. Funding will be passed through to local governments to enable them to carry out these responsibilities.

The Act also mandates coastal planning in the unorganized borough if citizens of the area desire it or if economic development is pending. The Act sets up a process to allow sections of the unorganized borough to organize and form a coastal resource district so that the area may draft its own district coastal management plan.

Although the unorganized borough currently lacks the local political structures needed to actual assist in electing, funding in task D3 is provided to allow for education and assistance in the area before the election is held if it is desired or found necessary.

To date, the Municipality of Anchorage, Annette Islands Indian Reserve, City of Cordova, City of Craig, City of Haines, City and Borough of Juneau, Kenai Peninsula Borough, Ketchikan Gateway Borough, City of Klawock (joint program with Craig), Matanuska-Susitna Borough, North Slope Borough, City and Borough of Sitka, City of Valdez, and City of Unalaska have participated financially in district coastal management program development. A small grant was also awarded to Protectors of the Land, Inc. (Nunam Kitlusi, Inc.) to inform residents of the Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta Region about coastal management and coastal resource service area organization processes.

To date, these funds have been allocated as shown in the following table. (Figures are in thousands).

	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Anchorage	\$ 82.0	\$ 20.5	\$102.5
Annette	39.0	9.0	48.0
Cordova	18.7	4.7	23.4
Craig/Klawock	30.4	7.6	38.0
Haines	20.8	5.2	26.0
Juneau	78.9	19.7	98.6
Kenai	94.9	95.5	189.6
Ketchikan	60.0	15.0	75.0
Matanuska-Susitna	44.5	15.0	59.5

	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
North Slope	55.4	60.6	116.0
Nunam Kitlusi (Protectors of the Land)	10.0	2.5	12.5
Sitka	22.7	5.7	28.4
Unalaska	10.0	2.5	12.5
Valdez	20.0	5.0	25.0
TOTAL	\$586.5	\$268.5	\$855.0

Of these efforts, eight are scheduled to progress to a point that a program will be submitted to the Coastal Policy Council during late summer and fall of 1979. These include the Municipality of Anchorage, Annette Islands Indian Reserve, City of Cordova, Cities of Craig and Klawock, City of Haines, City and Borough of Juneau, Ketchikan Gateway Borough and North Slope Borough (Prudhoe Bay Area segment).

Areas which are coastal resource districts as defined by AS 46.40.210(2) and which have not embarked on district program development (in terms of receiving district program development grant funds) include: the Bristol Bay Borough, Kodiak Island Borough, City of Petersburg, City of Wrangell, City of Dillingham, City of Hoonah, City of Hydaburg, City of Kake, City of King Cove, City of Nome, City of Pelican, City of Sand Point, City of Skagway and City of Yakutat.

The City of Saint Mary's has elected to include itself within the adjacent resource service area. In addition, a few second class cities such as Bethel which requested to plan by itself may be found by the Commissioner of Community and Regional Affairs, under AS 46.40.210(2)(D), to be districts. Also, coastal resource service areas covering the Northwest Alaska, Bering Straits, Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta, Bristol Bay, Aleutian/Pribilof Islands, Prince William Sound, and Southeast Alaska Regions could be formed. (Under existing statutes, up to three areas could be formed in both the Aleutian/Pribilof Islands Region and Southwest Alaska Region.)

The Northwest Alaska area recently had a successful organization election and will have its board election in early July 1979. The Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta area will have an organization election in late May 1979.

Finally, the Haines Borough could undertake a program if it upgraded its municipal status and assumed planning and zoning authority.

Allocation of funding to coastal resource districts is dependent initially upon their eligibility as defined in the ACMA. At the present time, the types of communities eligible for funding are unified municipalities, organized boroughs, home rules and first class cities, second class cities which practice planning and zoning, and coastal resource service areas which have elected boards.

In certain cases, small start-up grants are being made available to existing non-profit organizations in regions of the unorganized borough for the purposes of education. This is described in Task D-3a.

Procedure for distribution of funding to districts is as follows:

- 1) DCRA notifies all eligible coastal resource districts of new grant funding available. Communities should respond in writing (normally within 30 days) as to interest.
- 2) DCRA acknowledges receipt of responses and transmits an application for funding and supporting materials. Informational meetings will be scheduled on request by DCRA.
- 3) Applicants must submit completed applications with appropriate supporting materials.
- 4) Scope of Service including work program is finalized by DCRA and local government.

Criteria used to assist in establishing priority in funding local governments are as follows:

1. Those jurisdictions with existing planning and enforcement powers, and demonstrated capability in using them will receive a high priority. In organized boroughs with planning authority, the borough will be the focal point for local coastal management activities within its boundaries.

In areas where such capability is absent or deficient, emphasis will be placed on coastal management capabilities as a requisite of program development.

2. Areas experiencing or faced with imminent and substantial growth and development pressures will receive a high priority. The presence of coastal resource use conflicts and/or threatened critical area values will also be heavily weighted.
3. Programs which benefit the largest numbers of people will receive a high priority.
4. Grants for projects that are to be completed in a single year will tend to be larger than individual annual increments for multi-year projects.
5. Applicants with longstanding assistance requests will be afforded a relatively high priority.
6. Programs in which efficiencies can be realized through cooperative efforts involving other programs or jurisdictions will be assigned a relatively high priority. Programs of a regional context will be encouraged.

Products and Schedule

It's estimated that 10-12 new contracts will be signed this year, approximately 18 communities will be continued and approximately 8 will come for coastal approval.

Task D1: Grants to District Planning Programs

Subtask D-1a New District Programs

At this time, grants are being made primarily to communities with planning and zoning authority. Grants to some local governments will be for continuation of coastal program development efforts begun in the fourth year or earlier. In other cases, the grants will be to initiate program development. Local grants under this section will be matched with local cash or in-kind services.

About 20 units remain where district programs could be undertaken. In addition to the programs already ongoing as previously noted, several districts which consist of home rule or first class cities may be merged with larger, adjacent coastal resource service areas. OCM anticipates ten to twelve new programs during the first "306" grant period. As earlier indicated the average cost to date of existing programs has been approximately \$61,000. However, funding was conservative due to compressed time frames and limited funds.

Programs were directed at constructing a solid base from which to expand sound coastal management programs. Given our past experience and the recognized needs of the various districts we anticipate a reasonable program to cost approximately \$100,000 (per district). Thus \$1,000,000 to \$1,200,000 would be required for new district program (which equates to \$800,000 - \$900,000 of grant funds, assuming an 80:20 matching ratio).

Contracts and Costs of Subtask D-1a: New District Programs

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Grants to Local Governments	\$960,000	\$240,000	\$1,200,000

Subtask D-1b Ongoing Programs

Ongoing programs in addition to those expected for submittal to the Coastal Policy Council during 1979 are expected to be continued during the initial "306" grant period. These programs include those listed under task D-1c and Kenai Peninsula Borough, Matanuska-Susitna Borough, North Slope Borough (beyond the Prudhoe Bay Area segment), City and Borough of Sitka and City of Valdez. \$800,000 is estimated to be necessary for continuing district program development. (\$640,000 in grant funds, assuming an 80:20 matching ratio).

Contracts and Costs of Subtask D-1b: Ongoing Program

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Grants to Local Governments	\$640,000	\$160,000	\$800,000

Subtask D-1c Programs Submitted for Approval Needing Revisions

The eight programs expected for submittal to the Coastal Policy Council during 1979 are the Municipality of Anchorage, Annette Islands Indian Reserve, City of Cordova, Cities of Craig and Klawock, City of Haines, City and Borough of Juneau, Ketchikan Gateway Borough and North Slope Borough (Prudhoe Bay Area segment).

They will likely require augmentation to make adjustments requested through the review and approval process. Significant costs are also likely to be incurred in producing the final district program document once all necessary approvals are obtained. Once a few programs have been subjected to review and approval, we will have a relatively solid basis upon which to derive estimates for this category of funds. At present, we will budget approximately \$100,000 for this purpose (\$80,000 grant - \$20,000 local match).

Contracts and Costs of Subtask D-1c: Programs Needing Revisions

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Grants to Local Governments	\$80,000	\$20,000	\$100,000

*Please note that listed below is the cost of Subtasks D-1a,b, and c together.

Contracts and Costs of Task D1: Grants to District Planning Programs

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Grants to Local	\$1,680,000	\$420,000	\$2,100,000

Task D2: Grants for Implementation of District Programs

It is anticipated that at least three district programs will be approved by the Council early in 1980, and possibly more during the first year of program administration. Certainly a good many district programs will be completed and approved early in the second year of administration. After a district program is approved, the local government becomes eligible for implementation funds. These funds can be used to improve local administration in the sense of planning and zoning management, and they can be used to augment, amend and improve local programs. The local government could use implementation funds to further study areas which merit special attention and resolve other issues that remain after the main parts of their program have been approved.

Programs which are successful in achieving approval will require financial support for administration and implementation. Needs are likely to range from a few thousand dollars to perhaps hundreds of thousands. OCM would like to budget \$400,000 for this type of funding (\$320,000 grant funds and \$80,000 in match). This funding would also be designed to accommodate amendments to approved district programs.

Contracts and Costs of Task D2: Grants for Implementation of District Programs

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Grants to Local	\$320,000	\$80,000	\$400,000

Task D3: Special Assistance

Subtask D-3a Direct Assistance to the Unorganized Borough

The entire \$150,000 requested for this subtask would be passed through the Department of Community and Regional Affairs to non-profit organizations for public information and education projects prior to elections forming on the question of forming districts in the unorganized borough. A pilot project has been conducted in the Association of Village Council Presidents (AVCP) region around Bethel by Protectors of the Land, Inc. The Department of Community and Regional Affairs will evaluate this pilot project before embarking upon similar projects. It is agreed by the Council, DCRA, and OCM, that given the lack of knowledge by coastal management in the unorganized borough that funding of this task is important if people in rural Alaska are going to get involved in the ACMP.

Contracts and Cost of Subtask D-3a: Direct Assistance to the Unorganized Borough

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractor	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$150,000

Subtask D-3b Rural Coordination and Assistance Program

A special need has been demonstrated in rural areas in Alaska. This need is not a large area or a regional need, but rather reflects the difficulty that small villages and settlements have in responding to ACMP initiatives. The general grant structure provides well for local governments and the large service areas that might be created, but, apart from this subtask, no special assistance has been available to villages, either in service areas or located within existing local governments.

The clientele for this program is the traditionally organized village or the very small city. These groups often have less than a hundred residents and have very little in the way of normal municipal services. None have planning and zoning powers and so their coastal areas will be planned and managed by the larger boroughs which surrounds them, or by the service areas for the villages located in the Unorganized Borough. This subtask will provide for a contractor to work on behalf of the villages.

A small group of people, either newly created groups or part of existing organizations, will be contracted to identify those villages and settlements most in need of assistance, review state and local coastal plans and initiatives that would affect the villages, inform the village leadership of anticipated impacts, and respond with comments or counter proposals on behalf of the village. The contractor will be directly responsible to OCM, but would work on behalf of the villages. By this means, rural villages and settlements will have direct planning services without having to create local government infrastructures to support such services. Villages can then become directly, and effectively involved in both state and local coastal planning activities.

Contracts and Costs of Subtask D-3b: Special Assistance

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractor	\$128,854	\$32,213	\$161,067

Contracts and Costs of Task D-3: Special Assistance

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Local Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
Contractor	\$248,854	\$62,213	\$311,067

*Please note that above figure is a composite of costs for subtasks D-3a and b.

Districts Eligible for Funding Under Task D1

UNIFIED HOME RULE MUNICIPALITIES AND ORGANIZED BOROUGHS

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE
BRISTOL BAY BOROUGH
HAINES BOROUGH (if upgrades its planning capabilities)
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
KENAI PENINSULA BOROUGH
KETCHIKAN GATEWAY BOROUGH
KODIAK ISLAND BOROUGH
MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH
CITY AND BOROUGH OF SITKA

HOME RULE CITIES

CORDOVA
PETERSBURG
VALDEZ
WRANGELL

FIRST CLASS CITIES

CRAIG
DILLINGHAM
HAINES
HOONAH
HYDABURG
KAKE
KING COVE
KLAWOCK
NOME
PELICAN
SAINT MARY'S
SKAGWAY
UNALASKA
YAKUTAT

SECOND CLASS CITIES WITH PLANNING CAPABILITIES

ANGOON
BETHEL
KUPREANOF
PORT ALEXANDER
TENAKEE SPRINGS
WHITTIER

INDIAN RESERVE

ANNETTE ISLANDS INDIAN RESERVE

COASTAL RESOURCE SERVICE AREAS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING IF ORGANIZED

NORTHWEST ALASKA
BERING STRAITS
YUKON-KUSKOKWIM
BRISTOL BAY
ALEUTIAN-PRIBILOF ISLANDS (could be up to 3 different boards)
PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND
SOUTHEAST ALASKA (could be up to 3 separate boards)

Districts Eligible for Funding Under Task D2

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE
ANNETTE ISLANDS INDIAN RESERVE
CITY OF CORDOVA
CITIES OF CRAIG AND KALAMUCK
CITY OF HAINES
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
KETCHIKAN GATEWAY BOROUGH
NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH (Prudhoe Bay Area segment)

Coastal Areas Eligible for Funding Under Task D3

NORTHWEST ALASKA
BERING STRAITS
YUKON-KUSKOKWIM DELTA
BRISTOL BAY
ALEUTIAN-PRIBILOF ISLANDS
PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND
SOUTHEAST ALASKA REGIONS

Objective E: Special Studies

Special studies have been subject to OCM's attention since the establishment of the ACMP. Over the past several years, items have been subject to special attention for different reasons. These reasons have included changes in the federal Coastal Zone Management Act, requests for specific additional research and services project by local and state agencies and OCZM; and availability of additional funding to cover these new elements. It should be noted that the funding for this objective is designated to contractors, state agencies or OCM. Selection of the recipient for funding has been or will be determined by OCM on the basis of the goal to be accomplished and the expertise to be available.

The special studies considered for funding during the first year of 306 include: wetlands, unorganized borough management alternatives, permit information and simplification, fisheries planning, matrix, energy facility siting, shoreline access, erosion, and computerized information. In order to meet the needs of state agencies and local governments, and prioritization of work for the ACMP, OCM has decided that the ACMP will not be able to support all of the above mentioned special studies during the first year of 306 funding. However, the work objectives have been left in the grant application as possibilities for funding during the second year of the work program contingent on such things as legislative action on certain state programs, availability and amount of funding for the second year, priority of the special study at that time.

Wetlands have been determined as an issue to be of major concern to the ACMP by OCZM if we are to continue to make the ACMP more comprehensive. The subject of unorganized borough management alternatives with the support of DCRA, permit simplification and information with the support of DEC and DPDP, fisheries planning with the support of DFG, matrix completion with the support of DFG, DNR and DEC, and energy facility siting with the support of DCRA have been determined by OCM to be special studies which should be funded during the first year of 306. Although shoreline access and erosion could use further additional work, OCM has decided that they are not priorities for funding during the 1st year of 306. A preliminary background paper is available on both subject areas. The papers outline the issues for Alaska, define the terms of the subjects, identify the problems for Alaska, and suggest potential solutions. OCM feels that for the time being, that will have to be enough. If the work program for the second year allows, OCM will consider additional work in those components at that time. Computerized information has also been determined to wait until the second year of funding. OCM feels that the ACMP should be supporting this effort as the local governments, state agencies and federal agencies participating in the ACMP would greatly benefit from a coordinated data bank of information for the state of Alaska. However, the ACMP does not feel it should be the lead agency in this activity. At the present time both DNR and the Legislature are considering action on this subject. OCM will consider helping to fund this effort next year, after DNR and the Legislature have each decided what approach that they should take.

Task E1: Wetlands Management Planning

Recognizing the vast amount and diversity of Alaska's wetlands and that ACMP's current policy is fairly general, OCM will mount a wetlands management planning program during the first two years of program implementation to do the following:

1. Refine definition of the term, and categories of wetlands. OCM using contacts and contributors from government, academia, and the public will attempt to achieve consensus on the general definition of the term, and definitions of the various categories of wetlands. This will involve an examination of the productivity and nature of each category and will be a prelude to identifying the types of wetlands that are the most critical.
2. Expand and detail the management policies and regulations for use of wetlands. Again working with other parties, OCM will develop a wetland policy base which addresses each type or category of wetland. Drafts of the wetland policies will be circulated independently for review. When it appears that general agreement with the policies can be reached, they will be offered for adoption as regulations by either the Coastal Policy Council, or a combination of the authorities administered by the Departments of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation.
3. Possibly, but not necessarily, in conjunction with the Permit Simplification Planning Element, a new management regime will be developed. While the goal of this regime will be better management of wetlands, an important side objective will be to equip the state to take over the Corps of Engineers section 404 permit system. A work program for this effort will be offered to the 1980 session of the state legislature with a request that the legislature establish an interim committee to work with OCM and other ACMP participants during the summer and fall of 1980 to prepare a legislative package to manage wetlands and to take over the 404 permit system. The agreement of the Corps of Engineers will have to be obtained during this same period, and other preparations made for a more active state role in wetland management.

Products and Schedule

A detailed work program for this planning element will be circulated to ACMP participants in the summer of 1979, and adjusted as a result of comments. Wetland policies should be completed by Spring 1980.

Contracts and Costs of Task E1: Wetlands Management Planning

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
OCM	15mm	\$ 44,100	\$11,025	\$55,125

Task E2: Unorganized Borough Management Alternatives

Structures or mechanisms for local planning in the unorganized borough raise questions and have implications for the ACMP as well as every other state program in the unorganized borough. The state needs to carefully identify and analyze alternative approaches and structures for planning in the unorganized borough. The Legislature is sufficiently concerned about the problems of local government and the discrepancies between the organized and unorganized areas, that a special legislative committee has been organized to study alternatives for the provision of all services to all local areas (both organized and unorganized) during the next interim. The appropriate state agencies including DPDP, DCRA and DNR, Dept. of Education, and Dept. of Health & Social Services will be involved in making recommendations to this committee and assisting them in their study. In addition, the Coastal Policy Council has directed the OCM and DCRA to study the alternatives for coastal planning and in the unorganized borough. The DCRA has submitted a request to do the following study which will be used to assist both the legislative interim committee and the Coastal Policy Council in making recommendations to the Legislature next fall.

The issues which cause this item to be a priority for special study by the coastal management program are several. The new lease sale schedule, proposed bottomfish expansion, and suggested new port development all affect the unorganized borough which at the present time has no satisfactory regulatory management mechanisms by state or local governments.

If funded at the requested level, DCRA will fund one person for this project to study alternatives for planning in the unorganized borough. They will begin their effort by researching the issue thoroughly. Their research will include studying other states which have portions with sparse population and little local government, determining the legal parameters of local government versus state control; and completing necessary background work. After this work is completed, DCRA will work up summation of the alternatives which will be presented to various rural communities throughout the state for community input.

Workshops will be held in the regional centers (i.e. Kotzebue, Nome, Bethel, Dillingham, Unalaska,, Sand Point, Valdez, Cordova, Sitka, Ketchikan) or other locations which would afford good representation of residents in the unorganized borough. The workshops would be held in conjunction with other meetings as much as possible to reduce expenses. They would be designed to explore with residents of the unorganized borough alternative ways of managing coastal areas in the unorganized borough.

Each regional workshop would culminate in endorsement of a "position paper" by workshop participants and designation of one participant to attend a statewide meeting. Each position paper would summarize key coastal management issues, and recommendations to be considered by the

Administration, the Coastal Policy Council, and the Legislature. After all regional workshops have been conducted, a statewide meeting will be held, probably in Anchorage, and attended by delegates designated at the regional workshops. At the Statewide meeting, delegates would discuss position papers prepared at each regional workshop and prepare a consolidated set of recommendations to the Administration, the Coastal Policy Council, and the Legislature.

Products and Schedule

A transcript of workshop proceedings would be printed as part of this task. Recommendations would be available in January, if legislative action is required. A final report would be prepared in June, after the Legislature adjourns and would reflect legislative deliberations.

Contracts and Costs of Task E2: Unorganized Borough Management Alternatives

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
DCRA	16 person months	\$ 77,200	\$ 19,300	\$96,500

Task E3: Permit Information and Simplification

ACMP will continue to work on simplyfying the current array of permits and other governmental sanctions along three directions:

1. Continued support of the existing one-stop permit system and permit information centers operated by the Department of Environmental Conservation.
2. Investigations into more automated permit information systems that could make operation of the existing systems more coordinated and effective.
3. New investigations into structural changes in the existing array. This will involve examinations of the existing array of permit systems and proposals to consolidate, streamline or eliminate systems. A proposal for this task will be presented to the 1980 session of the legislature with a request for an interim committee to work with over the summer and fall of 1980 to prepare a full package of changes to simplify the existing array.

Subtask E-3a: Permit Information

Several years ago the Legislature became concerned about difficulties in obtaining state (and federal) development permits of various types. The state of Alaska has a wide variety of these permits and when combined with federal permitting requirements the developer, especially the developer who has little experience, often has trouble obtaining all the permits that he needs within a reasonable period of time. Other problems that have been noted by the Legislature and others are the need for coordination among the agencies giving permits so that the developer is not asked to do something by one agency that another agency would not allow. Permit information has been difficult to uncover. The developer is often unsure exactly what is required.

In view of this, the Legislature passed the Environmental Procedures Coordination Act of 1977, a sort of companion bill to the Alaska Coastal Management Act. The objective of this act was to provide permit information and eventually to develop a one-stop permit system whereby a developer can go to a single state agency and obtain all the permits that he needs with that agency acting on behalf of the developer in terms of obtaining the permit information requirements and planning requirements from other agencies assuring that the needs of the other agencies are met by the developer and generally trying to make the delivery of permits more expeditious.

The responsibility to implement the Environmental Procedures Coordination Act fell to the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation which in conjunction with the Department of Commerce and Economic Development, published the Directory of Permits which is an inventory of 133 state and 72 federally administered permits required for the development and operation of a facility of project in Alaska. It also includes plan review, licenses, certifications and other authorizations. This project was supported in part by ACMP funds.

Annual update to the directory will be the sole responsibility of DEC and will expand the directory to include permit requirements administered by local governments. Inclusion of local permits will be of particular benefit to the ACMP as district programs adopt local coastal use permits or other local regulatory systems. In addition to the permit directory, DEC has established an information and referral service for individuals or companies who may need permits for industrial, commercial or private projects. Permit information staff help project proponents identify the state, federal or local agencies which should be contacted and the permits that may be needed for the construction and/or maintenance of a facility in Alaska.

In addition, DEC has developed a master application form for permits issued by DEC. At the present time use of the master application form is limited to only DEC permits and must be requested by the applicant before it is used. When the master application form is used, however DEC uses it to notify all other agencies of the nature of a proposed activity thus bringing some standardization to the issuance of DEC permits. Eventually, it is hoped that the application form maybe used by all state agencies, thus bringing some standardization to the permit application form used for all state permits.

Although this program does not involve only coastally-related permits, it does involve a good number of them. If the ACMP is to be truly successful in Alaska, permit simplification and coordination must happen. In order to assist in permit coordination, the OCM feels that the ACMP should help support the activities of DEC.

Products and Schedules

In first year 306, funding support to DEC for permit information would include update of the Directory of Permits, and the administration of the permit information centers throughout the year.

Logs will be kept by the permit information center regarding the number of cases involving coastal management where assistance was rendered by DEC.

Subtask E-3b: Permit Simplification

The DEC has not been able through its mandate in the Environmental Procedures Act to coordinate actually develop a one-stop permit system. There are a number of built-in difficulties including statutory time limits by which state or federal agencies must respond to a permit request, difference in specific requirements inspection schedules' opportunity or lack thereof to attach special conditions depending on which permit systems are under consideration; and the general fact that each of the various permit systems involved in this coordination system sprang from different legislative intents and administrative need. The type and the amount of consideration for each permit is different. The expertise required to administer the various permits also varies. Finally, the several dozen permits specifically listed in the Environmental Procedures Coordination Act contain a mix of both police and proprietary permits giving the state different degrees of control depending upon where the proposed action is to be taken and different types of responsibilities depending on the type of the action. It will be necessary for the Legislature to take further action, if a full-blown one-stop permit system is to be established for the state of Alaska.

Recognizing the limitations of the mandate given to DEC, OCM has decided to fund the DPDP in the Governor's Office to study further the issue of permit simplification. The efforts taken on by DPDP would not be overlapping to the efforts of DEC, but would be complementary.

Products and Schedule

The work outlined in items 2 and 3 would be carried out by DPDP is thought by OCM to be a two year work task. Item 2 would be a 5 to 6 month study of possible methods to coordinate the existing permit systems and possibly to automate them as well. This report would be made to the OCM on the results of the investigation and the recommendations of the investigator by December 1979.

The proposal described in Item 3 will use information gathered in item 2 to make recommendations in January 1980 to the Legislature regarding work to be done on actual structural changes to the existing array of permits. As a part of a general deregulation effort, the proposal to the Legislature will suggest an interim committee to work with the OCM over late summer of 1980 to pursue legislation to directly alter the existing permit regulation system and laws.

Contracts & Costs of Task E3: Permit Information and Simplification

		<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Match</u>	<u>Total</u>
DEC	36 mm	\$67,060	\$40,632	\$107,692
DPDP	18.75mm	60,000	15,000	75,000
		\$127,060	\$55,632	\$182,692

Task E4: Fisheries Planning Element

The federal coastal zone management program has begun to recognize the need for assistance to states where the fisheries resource is important to the well-being of the state. Alaska has an extremely important fishing resource, which has been of tremendous economic significance to the state for decades and promises to be even more significant in the future.

The passage of the extended jurisdiction act creating the 200 mile fisheries management zone around the U.S. has greatly increased the fishery resource available to all fishermen in the U.S.; and particularly in Alaska. This new act impacts Alaska significantly. It will probably lead to new onshore support facilities for the expected increases in the American use of the bottom fisheries, greater coordination between state and federal fishery management agencies, and international coordination between the U.S. and Canada, and between the U.S. and other countries which have in the past made use of the Alaska fishery resources.

These events in combination with existing Alaskan concerns regarding the habitat of anadromous fish and the sharing of fishery resources among sport, commercial and subsistence users, give rise to the need for comprehensive planning for Alaska's fishery resource. The OCM in recognition of the increasing need for such comprehensive fisheries planning proposes three tasks to be completed under this objective for first year 306 funding. These include: a fisheries study to be conducted by OCM; a special fisheries assistance project by DFG for the City and Borough of Sitka; and a proposed bottomfish study for the Aleutian Chain to be further defined on the basis of Task E-4a.

Subtask E-4a: Fisheries Management Study

The Federal Office of Coastal Management has developed expectations for fishery planning assistance and desires some background information to be developed prior to full-scale state fishery planning elements. OCM will prepare this background material in-house during the early part of the first grant.

In cooperation with the Department of Fish and Game and other relevant agencies, OCM will develop a procedure for identifying fishery management problems, issue and opportunities, planning goals and strategies, and work which needs to be completed to accomplish the goals. This procedure outlined in a report with recommendations about the role of ACMP in fisheries management will be the basis for funding.