

ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE/SUBJECT FILES 8672

3043 SCOMM 137: HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 2005-2006 723

**NASULGC**

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges



Upcoming Events

[Search](#) [Site Map](#) [Contact Us](#)[Main](#) [Back](#)[Washington Watch](#)[What's New](#)[About NASULGC](#)[Publications/
Public Affairs](#)[Issues](#)[Minority & Human
Resource Programs](#)[Campus & Other
Useful Links](#)[State Watch](#)[Initiatives](#)[Kelling Commission](#)[Councils](#)[Commissions](#)**About NASULGC****NASULGC MEMBER LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS****ALABAMA**

Alabama A&M University
Auburn University
Tuskegee University

ALASKA

University of Alaska System

AMERICAN SAMOA

American Samoa Community
College

ARIZONA

University of Arizona

ARKANSAS

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

CALIFORNIA

University of California

COLORADO

Colorado State University

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut Agricultural
Experiment Station
University of Connecticut

DELAWARE

Delaware State University
University of Delaware

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

University of the District of
Columbia

FLORIDA

Florida A&M University
University of Florida

GEORGIA

Fort Valley State University
University of Georgia

GUAM

University of Guam

HAWAII

University of Hawaii

MONTANA

Montana State University

NEBRASKA

University of Nebraska

NEVADA

University of Nevada, Reno

NEW HAMPSHIRE

University of New Hampshire

NEW JERSEY

Rutgers, The State University of
New Jersey

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico State University

NEW YORK

Cornell University

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina A&T State University
North Carolina State University

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota State University

OHIO

The Ohio State University

OKLAHOMA

Langston University
Oklahoma State University

OREGON

Oregon State University

PENNSYLVANIA

The Pennsylvania State University

PUERTO RICO

University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez

RHODE ISLAND

University of Rhode Island

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson University
South Carolina State University

IDAHO

University of Idaho

ILLINOIS

University of Illinois

INDIANA

Purdue University

IOWA

Iowa State University

KANSAS

Kansas State University

KENTUCKY

Kentucky State University

University of Kentucky

LOUISIANALouisiana State University System
Southern University and A&M
College**MAINE**

University of Maine

MARYLANDUniversity of Maryland Eastern
Shore
University of Maryland, College
Park**MASSACHUSETTS**Massachusetts Institute of
Technology
University of Massachusetts,
Amherst**MICHIGAN**

Michigan State University

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota

MISSISSIPPIAlcorn State University
Mississippi State University**MISSOURI**Lincoln University
University of Missouri System**SOUTH DAKOTA**

South Dakota State University

TENNESSEETennessee State University
University of Tennessee**TEXAS**Prairie View A&M University
Texas A&M University**UTAH**

Utah State University

VERMONT

University of Vermont

VIRGIN ISLANDS

University of the Virgin Islands

VIRGINIAAmerican Indian Higher Education
Consortium
Virginia Polytechnic Institute &
State University
Virginia State University**WASHINGTON**

Washington State University

WEST VIRGINIAWest Virginia University
West Virginia State University**WISCONSIN**

University of Wisconsin-Madison

WYOMING

University of Wyoming

Please Note: of the 106 Land-Grant institutions, all but two (the Community College of Micronesia, and Northern Marianas College) are members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). The 31 tribal colleges of 1994 are represented as a system by the single membership of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium.

Updated April 7, 2003


NASULGC

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges



Upcoming Events

[Search](#) [Site Map](#) [Contact Us](#)
[Main](#) [Back](#)
[Washington Watch](#)
[What's New](#)
[About NASULGC](#)
[Publications/
Public Affairs](#)
[Issues](#)
[Minority & Human
Resource Programs](#)
[Campus & Other
Useful Links](#)
[State Watch](#)
[Initiatives](#)
[Kellogg Commission](#)
[Councils](#)
[Commissions](#)

About NASULGC

LAND-GRANT TRIBAL COLLEGES

ARIZONA

[Dine College](#)

CALIFORNIA

[D-Q University](#)

KANSAS

[Haskell Indian Nations University](#)

MICHIGAN

[Bay Mills Community College](#)

MINNESOTA

[Fond Du Lac Tribal and Community College](#)
[Leech Lake Tribal College](#)
[White Earth Tribal and Community College](#)

MONTANA

[Blackfeet Community College](#)
[Chief Dull Knife College](#)
[Fort Belknap Community College](#)
[Fort Peck Community College](#)
[Little Big Horn College](#)
[Salish Kootenai College](#)
[Stone Child College](#)

NEBRASKA

[Little Priest Tribal College](#)
[Nebraska Indian Community College](#)

NEW MEXICO

[Crownpoint Institute of Technology](#)
[Institute of American Indian Arts](#)
[Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute](#)

NORTH DAKOTA

[Cankdeska Cikana \(Little Hoop\) Community College](#)
[Fort Berthold Community College](#)
[Sitting Bull College](#)
[Turtle Mountain Community College](#)
[United Tribes Technical College](#)

SOUTH DAKOTA

[Oglala Lakota College](#)
[Si Tanka College](#)
[Sinte Gleska University](#)
[Sisseton Wahpeton Community College](#)

WASHINGTON

[Northwest Indian College](#)

WISCONSIN

[College of the Menominee Nation](#)
[Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College](#)
[Page up](#)

©1999 NASULGC, 1307 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400 / Washington, D.C. 20005-4722
Telephone: 202-478-6040 Fax: 202-478-6046

Attachment B

*School Lands: Land Grants to States and Territories
For Educational and Other Purposes,*
United States Department of the Interior,
General Land Office,
Information Bulletin, 1939 Series, No. 1

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
HAROLD L. ICKES, Secretary
GENERAL LAND OFFICE
FRED W. JOHNSON, Commissioner
+

SCHOOL LANDS
LAND GRANTS TO STATES AND TERRITORIES
FOR EDUCATIONAL AND OTHER
PURPOSES



Information Bulletin, 1939 Series

No. 1

ALASKA HISTORICAL
LIBRARY AND MUSEUM

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1939

333.1 #1
Un31
v. 8

SCHOOL LANDS

Acres for Education

Dedication of portions of the Nation's public lands for the advancement of education was among the first principles adopted by the founders of our Federal Government.

Recognizing the importance of permanent endowment and development of a public-school system in the new Republic, this fundamental policy was written by the Continental Congress into its ordinance of July 13, 1787, in the following words:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Actually, this principle had been formulated 2 years before in the ordinance of May 20, 1785. In that ordinance, which provided for the establishment of the rectangular system of surveys on the public domain, it was stipulated that "There shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township."

Incidentally, under the rectangular survey system, there are 36 sections, each 1 mile square, in every regular township.

Ohio was the first State to receive a grant of the 640 acres contained in a 1 square mile school section, under the provisions of the 1785 act, and the dedication of one section for the support of public schools was specially provided for in the organization of each new State and Territory until the establishment of the Territory of Oregon in 1848. In that year demand for increased facilities for educational advancement resulted in the dedication of two sections in each township for school purposes, such an allotment being made upon the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union in 1859. Later, when Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico were admitted into the Union, the policy was expanded to the extent that these States received a grant of four sections of school land in each township.

In the course of time it was found that some of the tracts of public domain, intended for dedication as school grants, were embraced in old private land grants originating under governments preceding the United States in sovereignty, such as that of Great Britain, France, and Spain, and that some irregular and fractional townships contained no section numbered 16 or 36. It was also found that some of these sections had been appropriated by settlement before the survey of the land could be made.

As a result of this situation, Congress, in 1826 and again in 1859, provided that tracts of territory within the States, known as indemnity lands, should be provided in lieu of the original school section designations. In 1891 this indemnity policy was extended to provide for the selection of other lands in lieu of school sections embraced within Indian, military, or other reservations.

Although the school land grants in general were limited to non-mineral lands, they were, however, extended by Congress to include mineral school sections by the act of January 25, 1927.

To the grants for common-school purposes originally planned by the Continental Congress were added grants for seminaries of learning, universities, agricultural colleges, and normal schools, as the need for advancement in education progressed with the development of the United States. In most cases such grants were made in specific amounts to be satisfied by selections from the unappropriated, nonmineral public lands of the United States within the State, and in a few cases the granted lands were described in special acts of Congress.

On July 2, 1862, Congress provided for the granting of lands to the States for the support of colleges teaching agriculture and the mechanic arts. In connection with the establishment of the "land grant college" system, States in which there were no public lands of the United States or which did not contain a sufficient amount of public land to satisfy the grant, were issued land scrip to be sold by the State and located by the purchasers on public lands in other States.

Other Grants to States

Besides the grants for public-school purposes, portions of the public domain were assigned to the States for the benefit of internal improvements and for various State institutions, such as miners' hospitals, deaf, dumb, blind, and insane asylums, charitable and penal institutions, public buildings, etc. In more recent years grants have been made to several of the States for public parks.

The grant for internal improvements, 500,000 acres to each State, was made by act of September 4, 1841, the swampland grant to the States was made by the act of September 28, 1850, and the grant for the benefit of agricultural colleges, a quantity equal to 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative in Congress to which the States were respectively entitled, was made by the act of July 2, 1862.

Certain States, admitted at later dates, have received in lieu thereof other grants of definite amounts of lands for specified purposes, such as penitentiaries, miners' hospitals, insane asylums, schools of mines, military institutions, agricultural and mechanical colleges, and for the payment of bonds issued by certain counties, as in the case of Arizona and New Mexico.

Grants to States in aid of railroad construction are not included in this compilation.

The amounts of school sections and other Federal grant lands allocated to the States under the various statutes enacted since the formulation of the policy by the Continental Congress in 1785 are shown in the following tabulations.

Alabama.....
Alaska Territory.....
Arizona.....
Arkansas.....
California.....
Colorado.....
Connecticut.....
Delaware.....
Florida.....
Georgia.....
Idaho.....
Illinois.....
Indiana.....
Iowa.....
Kansas.....
Kentucky.....
Louisiana.....
Maine.....
Maryland.....
Massachusetts.....
Michigan.....
Minnesota.....
Mississippi.....
Missouri.....
Montana.....
Nebraska.....

State or Territory a

ALAB

Seminary of learning...

Common schools, sec

lands).

Salt Springs and contig

Seal of Government...

Internal improvements

schools.

Swampland.....

Swamp indemnity.....

Agricultural college scr

University.....

Tuskegee Normal and

Industrial School for G

Searcy Hospital for Co

Vocational and other

Total.....

ALASKA TI

Common schools, secs

(estimated).

Agricultural College a

certain secs. 33, reserv

Agricultural College an

Agricultural College an

Total.....

ARIZ

University.....

University.....

Public buildings.....

Penitentiaries.....

Insane asylums.....

Deaf, dumb, and blind

Miners' hospital.....

Total Grants by States

	Acres		Acres
Alabama.....	2, 260, 209. 35	Nevada.....	2, 723, 647. 00
Alaska Territory.....	21, 447, 453. 95	New Hampshire.....	150, 000. 00
Arizona.....	10, 543, 672. 71	New Jersey.....	210, 000. 00
Arkansas.....	9, 372, 993. 37	New Mexico.....	12, 789, 916. 20
California.....	8, 516, 484. 91	New York.....	990, 000. 00
Colorado.....	4, 433, 898. 00	North Carolina.....	270, 000. 00
Connecticut.....	180, 000. 00	North Dakota.....	3, 163, 551. 50
Delaware.....	90, 000. 00	Ohio.....	2, 493, 005. 93
Florida.....	21, 981, 392. 77	Oklahoma.....	3, 095, 760. 25
Georgia.....	270, 000. 00	Oregon.....	4, 375, 514. 88
Idaho.....	3, 639, 555. 21	Pennsylvania.....	780, 000. 00
Illinois.....	3, 639, 321. 11	Rhode Island.....	120, 000. 00
Indiana.....	4, 306, 253. 49	South Carolina.....	180, 000. 00
Iowa.....	3, 032, 937. 52	South Dakota.....	3, 435, 372. 95
Kansas.....	3, 614, 413. 29	Tennessee.....	300, 000. 00
Kentucky.....	352, 508. 65	Texas.....	180, 000. 00
Louisiana.....	11, 035, 438. 83	Utah.....	7, 464, 496. 54
Maine.....	210, 000. 00	Vermont.....	150, 000. 00
Maryland.....	210, 000. 00	Virginia.....	300, 000. 00
Massachusetts.....	360, 000. 00	Washington.....	3, 044, 471. 00
Michigan.....	8, 787, 693. 27	West Virginia.....	150, 000. 00
Minnesota.....	8, 374, 088. 23	Wisconsin.....	6, 222, 643. 99
Mississippi.....	5, 021, 078. 71	Wyoming.....	4, 139, 209. 00
Missouri.....	5, 578, 973. 99		
Montana.....	5, 871, 057. 70	Total.....	203, 315, 730. 30
Nebraska.....	3, 458, 711. 00		

State or Territory and purpose of grant	Granting acts	Amount granted (acres)
ALABAMA		
Seminary of learning.....	Acts Apr. 20, 1818 (3 Stat. 486), and Mar. 2, 1819 (3 Stat. 489).	46, 080. 00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).	Act Mar. 2, 1819 (3 Stat. 489).....	911, 627. 00
Salt Springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Mar. 2, 1819 (3 Stat. 489).....	23, 040. 00
Seat of Government.....	Act Mar. 2, 1819 (3 Stat. 489).....	1, 620. 00
Internal improvements including river and shoals.....	Acts May 23, 1828 (4 Stat. 290), and Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).	500, 000. 00
Swampland.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	419, 035. 67
Swamp indemnity.....	Act Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634), as extended by act of Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251).	20, 920. 08
<u>Agricultural college scrip.....</u>	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	240, 000. 00
University.....	Act Apr. 23, 1884 (23 Stat. 12).....	46, 080. 00
Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute.....	Act Feb. 18, 1899 (30 Stat. 837).....	25, 000. 00
Industrial School for Girls.....	Act Feb. 18, 1899 (30 Stat. 837).....	25, 000. 00
Searcy Hospital for Colored Insane.....	Act Dec. 15, 1921 (42 Stat. 348).....	181. 41
Vocational and other educational purposes.....	Act Feb. 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1201).....	1, 625. 19
Total.....		2, 260, 209. 35
ALASKA TERRITORY		
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36, reserved (estimated).....	Act Mar. 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214).....	21, 009, 209. 00
Agricultural College and School of Mines, certain secs. 33, reserved (estimated).....	Act Mar. 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214).....	336, 000. 00
Agricultural College and School of Mines.....	Act Mar. 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214).....	2, 249. 95
Agricultural College and School of Mines.....	Act Jan. 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1091).....	100, 000. 00
Total.....		21, 447, 458. 95
ARIZONA		
University.....	Act Feb. 18, 1881 (21 Stat. 326).....	46, 080. 00
University.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	200, 000. 00
Public buildings.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	100, 000. 00
Penitentiaries.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	100, 000. 00
Insane asylums.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	100, 000. 00
Deaf, dumb, and blind asylum.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	100, 000. 00
Miners' hospital.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	50, 000. 00

State or Territory and purpose of grant	Granting acts	Amount granted (acres)
ARIZONA—continued		
Normal schools.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	200,000.00
Charitable, penal, etc., institutions.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	100,000.00
Agricultural and mechanical colleges.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	150,000.00
School of mines.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	150,000.00
Military institutes.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	100,000.00
Payment of bonds issued to Maricopa, Pima, Yavapai, and Coconino Counties.	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	1,000,000.00
Common schools, secs. 2, 32, 16, and 36 (or indemnity lands).	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 572).....	8,093,156.00
University.....	Act Jan. 9, 1925 (43 Stat. 1544).....	180.00
Miners' hospital.....	Act Feb. 20, 1929 (45 Stat. 1252).....	50,000.00
Park and other purposes.....	Act Apr. 7, 1930 (46 Stat. 142).....	1,400.00
University.....	Act May 21, 1934 (48 Stat. 786).....	2,876.71
Total.....		10,543,672.71
ARKANSAS		
Seminary or university.....	Act Mar. 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 235), and act June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 58).....	46,080.00
Public buildings.....	Acts Mar. 2, 1831 (4 Stat. 473), June 15, 1832 (4 Stat. 531), and June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 58).....	10,600.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	Act June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 58).....	933,778.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 58).....	46,080.00
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519), as amended, and compromise act Apr. 29, 1898 (30 Stat. 387).....	7,686,455.37
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	150,000.00
Total.....		9,372,993.37
CALIFORNIA		
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	2,190,508.81
University.....	Act Mar. 3, 1853 (10 Stat. 244).....	46,080.00
Public buildings.....	Act Mar. 3, 1853 (10 Stat. 244).....	6,400.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).	Act Mar. 3, 1853 (10 Stat. 244).....	5,534,293.00
Agricultural and mechanical colleges.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	150,000.00
State Park System ¹	Act Mar. 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1487).....	89,203.10
Total.....		8,516,484.91
COLORADO		
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Agricultural college.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	90,000.00
University.....	Act Mar. 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 474).....	46,080.00
Public buildings.....	Act Mar. 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 474).....	32,000.00
Penitentiaries.....	Act Mar. 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 474).....	3 ⁰⁰ 000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).	Act Mar. 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 474).....	3,685,618.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Mar. 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 474).....	46,080.00
State agricultural college.....	Act Mar. 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1246).....	160.00
State agricultural college.....	Act June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847).....	1,600.00
Biological station.....	Act June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 477).....	160.00
School of mines.....	Act May 2, 1932 (47 Stat. 141).....	200.00
Total.....		4,433,898.00
CONNECTICUT		
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	180,000.00
DELAWARE		
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	90,000.00

¹ Grants to California for park purposes were made also by acts of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2026 and 2027); no selections approved—area undetermined.

Not included in Merrill Act Totals

State or Territory a	
FLOA	Seminaries of learning. Internal improvements Seat of government. Common schools, sec. 16 Swamp. Swampland indemnity
	Agricultural college scrip
	Total.....
GEOR	Agricultural college scrip
IDAI	University. University, Moscow. Agricultural college. Penitentiary. Public buildings. Insane asylum. Educational, charitable Normal schools. Scientific schools. Common schools, secs. nity lands). Lava Hot Springs. Public park. University. Perpetual easement for Fish culture.
	Total.....
ILLIN	Seminary of learning. Common schools, sec. 16 Salt springs and contigu Seat of government. Internal improvements, Swamp. Swampland indemnity.
	Agricultural college scrip
	Total.....
INDIA	Seminary of learning. Seat of government. Common schools, sec. lands). Salt springs and contigu Internal improvements
	Swamp. Swampland indemnity.
	Total.....
IOW	Internal improvements. University. Public buildings. Common schools, sec. lands). Salt springs and contigu Swamp. Swampland indemnity.

FLORIDA

Seminaries of learning.....	Act Mar. 3, 1823 (3 Stat. 754).....	92,180.00
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Seat of government.....	Act Mar. 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 788).....	5,120.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Mar. 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 788).....	975,307.00
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	20,224,022.97
Swampland indemnity.....	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634), and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251).....	94,782.80
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	90,000.00

Total..... 21,981,392.77

GEORGIA

Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	270,000.00
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------

IDAHO

University.....	Act Feb. 18, 1881 (21 Stat. 326).....	46,080.00
University, Moscow.....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	50,000.00
Agricultural college.....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	90,000.00
Penitentiary.....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	50,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	32,000.00
Insane asylum.....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	50,000.00
Educational, charitable, etc.....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	150,000.00
Normal schools.....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	100,000.00
Scientific schools.....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	100,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215).....	2,963,698.00
Lava Hot Springs.....	Act June 13, 1902 (32 Stat. 330).....	187.30
Public park.....	Act Apr. 30, 1908 (35 Stat. 70).....	6,751.34
University.....	Act Feb. 17, 1909 (35 Stat. 626).....	606.40
Perpetual easement for fish and game.....	Act Dec. 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 10).....	40.22
Fish culture.....	Act Jan. 29, 1929 (45 Stat. 11).....	191.95

Total..... 3,639,555.21

ILLINOIS

Seminary of learning.....	Act Apr. 18, 1818 (3 Stat. 428).....	46,080.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Apr. 18, 1818 (3 Stat. 428).....	996,320.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Apr. 18, 1818 (3 Stat. 428).....	121,029.00
Seat of government.....	Act Mar. 3, 1819 (3 Stat. 525).....	2,560.00
Internal improvements, including canals.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453), with the act of Mar. 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 234).....	533,368.24
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	1,457,654.80
Swampland indemnity.....	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634), and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251).....	2,309.07
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	480,000.00

Total..... 3,639,321.11

INDIANA

Seminary of learning.....	Acts Mar. 26, 1804 (2 Stat. 277), and Apr. 19, 1816 (3 Stat. 289).....	46,080.00
Seat of government.....	Act Apr. 19, 1816 (3 Stat. 289).....	2,560.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Apr. 19, 1816 (3 Stat. 289).....	668,578.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Apr. 19, 1816 (3 Stat. 289).....	23,040.00
Internal improvements (canals and roads).....	Act Mar. 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 234, 236), as supplemented by other acts.....	1,916,804.56
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	1,254,310.73
Swampland indemnity.....	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634), and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251).....	4,880.20

Total..... 4,306,253.49

IOWA

Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
University.....	Act Mar. 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 789).....	46,080.00
Public buildings.....	Act Mar. 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 789).....	3,200.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Mar. 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 789).....	1,000,678.62
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Mar. 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 789).....	46,080.00
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	874,377.65
Swampland indemnity.....	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634), and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251).....	321,976.98

3,000.00
3,000.00
3,000.00
3,000.00
3,000.00
0,000.00

3,156.00

160.00
0,000.00
1,400.00
2,876.71

3,672.71

16,080.00

10,000.00

32,778.00
46,080.00
00,000.00
86,455.37

50,000.00

72,993.37

300,000.00
190,508.81
46,080.00
6,400.00
534,293.00

150,000.00
89,203.10

516,484.91

500,000.00
90,000.00
46,080.00
32,000.00
32,000.00
685,618.00

46,080.00
160.00
1,600.00
160.00
200.00

433,898.00

180,000.00

90,000.00

6 and 2027);

State or Territory and purpose of grant	Granting acts	Amount granted (acres)	State or Territory
IOWA—continued			
Agricultural college	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503)	240,000.00	Internal improvements
State park	Act June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1464)	544.27	Swamp
Total		3,052,937.52	University
KANSAS			
Internal improvements	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453)	500,000.00	Public buildings
University	Act Jan. 29, 1861 (12 Stat. 126)	46,080.00	Common schools (or indemnity lands)
Public buildings	Act Jan. 29, 1861 (12 Stat. 126)	6,400.00	Salt springs and
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands)	Act Jan. 29, 1861 (12 Stat. 126)	2,907,520.00	Agricultural college
Salt springs and contiguous lands	Act Jan. 29, 1861 (12 Stat. 126)	46,080.00	Public park
Agricultural college	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503)	90,000.00	Experimental for
Soldiers' home	Act Mar. 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 1012)	128.56	Military purpose
Experiment station, agricultural college, normal school, and public park	Act Mar. 28, 1900 (31 Stat. 52)	7,507.53	Total
Agricultural college	Act May 29, 1908 (35 Stat. 465)	7,682.00	
Game preserve	Act June 22, 1916 (39 Stat. 233)	3,021.20	
Total		3,614,413.29	Jefferson College
KENTUCKY			Common schools
Agricultural college scrip	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503)	330,000.00	
Deaf and dumb asylum	Acts Apr. 5, 1826 (6 Stat. 334), and Jan. 29, 1827 (4 Stat. 201)	27,508.65	Seminary of learning
Total		352,508.65	Seat of government
LOUISIANA			Internal improvements
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	Acts Apr. 21, 1806 (2 Stat. 391), and Mar. 3, 1811 (2 Stat. 662)	807,271.00	Swamp
Seminary of learning	Act Mar. 3, 1827 (4 Stat. 244)	46,080.00	Swampland indemnity
Internal improvements	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453)	500,000.00	
Swamp	Acts Mar. 2, 1849 (9 Stat. 352), and Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519)	9,439,245.30	
Swampland indemnity	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634), and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251)	32,630.97	
Agricultural college scrip	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503)	210,000.00	
University and agricultural college	Act Apr. 28, 1902 (32 Stat. 172)	211.66	
Total		11,035,438.83	Seminary of learning
MAINE			Seat of government
Agricultural college scrip	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503)	210,000.00	Common schools
MARYLAND			Salt springs and c
Agricultural college scrip	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503)	210,000.00	Internal improvements
MASSACHUSETTS			Swamp
Agricultural college scrip	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503)	360,000.00	Swampland inden
MICHIGAN			
University	Act June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 59)	46,080.00	Agricultural college
Public buildings	Act June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 59)	3,200.00	Total
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands)	Act June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 59)	1,021,867.00	
Salt springs and contiguous lands	Act June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 59)	46,080.00	University
Internal improvements	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453)	500,000.00	Agricultural college
Swamp	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519)	5,656,191.73	Public buildings
Canals	Acts Aug. 26, 1852 (10 Stat. 35), Mar. 3, 1865 (13 Stat. 519), and July 3, 1866 (14 Stat. 80)	1,250,235.85	Deaf and dumb as
Swampland indemnity	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634) and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251)	24,038.69	Reform school
Agricultural college	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503)	240,000.00	School of mines
Total		8,787,693.27	Normal schools
			Common schools
			(or indemnity lands)
			Militia camp
			Observatory for u
			Biological station
			Fort Assiniboine
			tions
			Public park and r
			Total
			N
			Internal improve
			Agricultural colle
			Common schools
			(or indemnity lands)

State or Territory and purpose of grant	Granting acts	Amount granted (acres)
MINNESOTA		
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Swamp.....	Acts Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519), and Mar. 12, 1860 (12 Stat. 3).....	4,706,097.22
University.....	Acts Feb. 19, 1851 (9 Stat. 568), Feb. 26, 1857 (11 Stat. 166), Mar. 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 208), and July 8, 1870 (16 Stat. 196).....	92,160.00
Public buildings.....	Act Feb. 26, 1857 (11 Stat. 166).....	6,400.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Feb. 26, 1857 (11 Stat. 166).....	2,874,951.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Acts Feb. 26, 1857 (11 Stat. 166), and Mar. 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 352).....	46,080.00
(Agricultural college.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	120,000.00
Public park.....	Act Aug. 3, 1892 (27 Stat. 347).....	8,392.51
Experimental forestry.....	Act Apr. 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 536).....	20,000.00
Military purposes.....	Act May 2, 1932 (47 Stat. 141).....	7.50
Total.....		8,374,088.23
MISSISSIPPI		
Jefferson College.....	Acts Mar. 3, 1803 (2 Stat. 229) and Apr. 20, 1832 (6 Stat. 484).....	23,040.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	Acts Mar. 3, 1803 (2 Stat. 229), Mar. 31, 1808 (2 Stat. 479), Mar. 3, 1815 (3 Stat. 228), Mar. 3, 1817 (3 Stat. 375), and May 6, 1822 (3 Stat. 680).....	824,213.00
Seminary of learning.....	Act Feb. 20, 1819 (3 Stat. 485).....	23,040.00
Seat of government.....	Act Feb. 20, 1819 (3 Stat. 485).....	1,253.18
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	3,290,590.79
Swampland indemnity.....	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634) and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251).....	56,781.76
(Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	210,000.00
University.....	Act June 20, 1894 (28 Stat. 94).....	23,040.00
Agricultural and mechanical college.....	Act Feb. 20, 1895 (28 Stat. 673).....	46,080.00
Industrial institute and college for girls.....	Act Mar. 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 815).....	23,040.00
Total.....		5,021,078.71
MISSOURI		
Seminary of learning.....	Acts Mar. 3, 1811 (2 Stat. 662), and Feb. 17, 1818 (3 Stat. 406).....	46,080.00
Seat of government.....	Act Mar. 6, 1820 (3 Stat. 545).....	2,560.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Mar. 6, 1820 (3 Stat. 545).....	1,221,813.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Mar. 6, 1820 (3 Stat. 545).....	46,080.00
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	3,351,424.30
Swampland indemnity.....	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634), and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251).....	81,016.69
(Agricultural college.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	330,000.00
Total.....		5,578,973.99
MONTANA		
University.....	Act Feb. 18, 1881 (21 Stat. 326).....	46,080.00
Agricultural college.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	140,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	182,000.00
Deaf and dumb asylum.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	50,000.00
Reform school.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	50,000.00
School of mines.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	100,000.00
Normal schools.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	100,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	5,198,258.00
Militia camp.....	Act Feb. 13, 1891 (26 Stat. 747).....	640.00
Observatory for university.....	Act Mar. 9, 1904 (33 Stat. 64).....	480.00
Biological station for university.....	Acts Apr. 23, 1904, and Mar. 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 302, 1081).....	160.84
Fort Assiniboine, for educational institutions.....	Act Feb. 11, 1915 (38 Stat. 807).....	2,000.00
Public park and recreational site.....	Act Aug. 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 746).....	1,438.36
Total.....		5,871,057.70
NEBRASKA		
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
(Agricultural college.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), as amended by act of July 23, 1866 (14 Stat. 208).....	90,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Apr. 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 47).....	2,730,951.00

State or Territory and purpose of grant	Granting acts	Amount granted (acres)
NEBRASKA—continued		
University.....	Act Apr. 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 47).....	46,080.00
Public buildings.....	Act Apr. 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 47).....	12,800.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Apr. 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 47).....	46,080.00
Penitentiary.....	Act Apr. 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 47).....	32,000.00
Dry-land agricultural experiments.....	Act Mar. 3, 1917 (39 Stat. 1130).....	800.00
Total.....		3,458,711.00
NEVADA		
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Penitentiary.....	Act Mar. 21, 1864 (13 Stat. 30).....	12,800.00
Public buildings.....	Act Mar. 21, 1864 (13 Stat. 30).....	12,800.00
Mining and mechanic arts.....	Act July 4, 1866 (14 Stat. 85), extending provisions of act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).	90,000.00
University.....	Act July 4, 1865 (14 Stat. 85).....	46,080.00
Common schools, certain secs. 16 and 36, and lieu lands.....	Act June 16, 1880 (21 Stat. 287).....	2,061,967.00
Total.....		2,723,647.00
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	150,000.00
NEW JERSEY		
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	210,000.00
NEW MEXICO		
University.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	111,080.00
Saline land (university).....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	1,622.86
Agricultural college.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	100,000.00
Improvement of Rio Grande.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	100,000.00
Penitentiary.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	50,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	32,000.00
Insane asylum.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	50,000.00
Deaf and dumb asylum.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	50,000.00
Reform school.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	50,000.00
Normal schools.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	100,000.00
School of mines.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	50,000.00
Blind asylum.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	50,000.00
Reservoirs.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	500,000.00
Miners' hospital.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	50,000.00
Military institute.....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	50,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act June 21, 1898 (30 Stat. 484).....	4,355,662.00
University.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	200,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	100,000.00
Insane asylums.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	100,000.00
Penitentiaries.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	100,000.00
Deaf, dumb, and blind asylum.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	100,000.00
Miners' hospitals.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	50,000.00
Normal schools.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	200,000.00
Charitable, penal, and reformatory.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	100,000.00
Agricultural and mechanical colleges.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	150,000.00
School of Mines.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	150,000.00
Military institutes.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	100,000.00
Payment of bonds issued by Grant and Santa Fe Counties.....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	1,000,000.00
Common schools, secs. 2 and 32 (or indemnity lands).....	Act June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 561).....	4,355,662.00
Agricultural college.....	Act Mar. 2, 1927 (44 Stat. 1296), as amended by Pub. Res. 58 (44 Stat. 1345).	54,868.41
Reimbursement of certain counties and town of Silver City.....	Act May 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 775).....	250,000.00
Eastern New Mexico Normal School.....	Act Mar. 31, 1932 (47 Stat. 75).....	76,667.00
Regents of University of New Mexico for archaeological purposes.....	Act Aug. 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 659).....	218.13
Purpose not specified.....	Act Aug. 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 747).....	46.10
Regents of Agricultural College of New Mexico.....	Act Feb. 14, 1938 (Pub. 429).....	2,089.70
Total.....		12,789,916.20

State or Terr

Agricultural coll

NO

Agricultural coll

N

University.....

Agricultural coll

Public buildings

Educational and

Deaf and dumb

Reform school...

School of mines...

Normal school...

Common schools

nity lands).

State historical s

Total.....

Seminaries of lear

Common school

lands).

Salt springs and c

Internal improve

Swamp.....

Agricultural colle

Total.....

Normal schools...

Oklahoma univer

University prepar

Agricultural and

Colored agricultu

Common schools,

nity lands).

Institutional purp

Insane asylum...

Total.....

Internal improve

mp.....

University.....

Public buildings

Common schools,

nity lands).

Salt springs and c

Agricultural colle

Public park.....

University.....

Total.....

PE

Agricultural colle

RE

Agricultural colle

State or Territory and purpose of grant	Granting acts	Amount granted (acres)
NEW YORK		
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	990,000.00
NORTH CAROLINA		
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	270,000.00
NORTH DAKOTA		
University.....	Acts Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), and Feb. 18, 1881 (21 Stat. 326).....	86,080.00
Agricultural college.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	130,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	82,000.00
Educational and charitable purposes.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	170,000.00
Deaf and dumb asylum.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	40,000.00
Reform school.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	40,000.00
School of mines.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	40,000.00
Normal school.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	80,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	2,495,396.00
State historical society.....	Act Mar. 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1241).....	75.50
Total.....		3,163,551.50
OHIO		
Seminaries of learning.....	Acts Apr. 21, 1792 (1 Stat. 257), and Mar. 3, 1803 (2 Stat. 225).....	69,120.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	Acts Apr. 30, 1802 (2 Stat. 173), and Mar. 3, 1803 (2 Stat. 225).....	724,266.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Apr. 30, 1802 (2 Stat. 173).....	24,216.00
Internal improvements (canals and roads).....	Acts Feb. 28, 1823 (3 Stat. 727), Mar. 3, 1827 (4 Stat. 243), and May 24, 1828 (4 Stat. 305).....	1,019,071.98
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	26,331.95
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	630,000.00
Total.....		2,493,005.93
OKLAHOMA		
Normal schools.....	Act June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267).....	300,000.00
Oklahoma university.....	Act June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267).....	250,000.00
University preparatory school.....	Act June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267).....	150,000.00
Agricultural and mechanical college.....	Act June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267).....	250,000.00
Colored agricultural and normal university.....	Act June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267).....	100,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267).....	1,375,000.00
Institutional purposes, certain secs. 13 and 33.....	Act June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267).....	669,000.00
Insane asylum.....	Act May 29, 1908 (35 Stat. 465).....	1,760.25
Total.....		3,095,760.25
OREGON		
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	286,107.50
University.....	Act Feb. 14, 1859 (11 Stat. 383).....	46,080.00
Public buildings.....	Act Feb. 14, 1859 (11 Stat. 383).....	6,400.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Feb. 14, 1859 (11 Stat. 383).....	3,399,360.00
Salt springs and contiguous lands.....	Act Feb. 14, 1859 (11 Stat. 383).....	46,080.00
Agricultural college.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	90,000.00
Public park.....	Act Aug. 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 505).....	1,401.96
University.....	Act Mar. 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1506).....	85.42
Total.....		4,375,514.88
PENNSYLVANIA		
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	780,000.00
RHODE ISLAND		
Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	120,000.00

State or Territory and purpose of grant	Granting acts	Amount granted (acres)
SOUTH CAROLINA		
(Agricultural college scrip.....)	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	180,000.00
SOUTH DAKOTA		
Insane asylum.....	Acts June 16, 1880 (21 Stat. 290), and Apr. 1, 1892 (27 Stat. 13).....	640.00
University.....	Act Feb. 18, 1881 (21 Stat. 326).....	46,080.00
University.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	40,000.00
Agricultural college.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	160,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	82,000.00
Educational and charitable.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	170,000.00
Deaf and dumb asylum.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	40,000.00
Reform school.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	40,000.00
School of mines.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	40,000.00
Normal schools.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	80,000.00
Missionary work.....	Act Mar. 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 895).....	160.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	2,733,084.00
Military campground.....	Act Oct. 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 646).....	640.00
Public park.....	Act May 12, 1928 (45 Stat. 501).....	1,599.39
Custer State Park.....	Act Mar. 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1185).....	1,169.56
Total.....		3,435,372.95
TENNESSEE		
(Agricultural college scrip.....)	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	300,000.00
Total.....		300,000.00
TEXAS		
(Agricultural college scrip.....)	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	180,000.00
Total.....		180,000.00
UTAH		
University.....	Act Feb. 21, 1855 (10 Stat. 611).....	46,080.00
University.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	110,000.00
Agricultural college.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	200,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	64,000.00
Insane asylum.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	100,000.00
Deaf and dumb asylum.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	100,000.00
Reform school.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	100,000.00
School of mines.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	100,000.00
Normal schools.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	100,000.00
Blind asylum.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	100,000.00
Permanent reservoirs.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	500,000.00
Miners' hospital.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	50,000.00
Common schools, secs. 2, 16, 32, 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	5,844,196.00
Penitentiary near Salt Lake City.....	Act July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107).....	160.00
Miners' hospitals.....	Act Feb. 20, 1929 (45 Stat. 1252).....	50,000.00
University purposes.....	Act June 22, 1934 (48 Stat. 1203).....	60.54
Total.....		7,464,496.54
VERMONT		
(Agricultural college scrip.....)	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	150,000.00
VIRGINIA		
(Agricultural college scrip.....)	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	300,000.00
WASHINGTON		
University.....	Acts July 17, 1854 (10 Stat. 305), Mar. 14, 1864 (13 Stat. 28), and Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	46,080.00
Agricultural college.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	90,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	132,000.00
Educational and charitable.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	200,000.00
Normal schools.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	100,000.00

State or Ter

WASH

Scientific school
Common school
nity lands).

Total....

Agricultural col

Canal.....

Internal improv
University...Public building
Common school
River improver
Swamp.....
Swampland incAgricultural col
Forestry.....

Total....

University....
Fish hatcheriesCommon school
nity lands).
Agricultural co
Public building
Penitentiary..
Insane asylum
Charitable, edu
tions.
Miners' hospit
Deaf and dum
Poor farm.....
Hot Salt Sprin

Total....

Grand to

A grant to
act of Aug. 22,

State or Territory and purpose of grant	Granting acts	Amount granted (acres)
WASHINGTON—continued		
Scientific schools.....	Act Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	100,000.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Feb. 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676).....	2,376,391.00
Total.....		3,044,471.00
WEST VIRGINIA		
(Agricultural college scrip.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	150,000.00
WISCONSIN ¹		
Canal.....	Acts June 18, 1838 (5 Stat. 245), and Apr. 10, 1866 (14 Stat. 30).....	338,626.97
Internal improvements.....	Act Sept. 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453).....	500,000.00
University.....	Acts Aug. 6, 1846 (9 Stat. 56), and Dec. 15, 1854 (10 Stat. 597).....	92,160.00
Public buildings.....	Act Aug. 6, 1846 (9 Stat. 56).....	6,400.00
Common schools, sec. 16 (or indemnity lands).....	Act Aug. 6, 1846 (9 Stat. 56).....	982,329.00
River improvements.....	Act Aug. 8, 1846 (9 Stat. 83).....	683,722.43
Swamp.....	Act Sept. 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519).....	3,254,357.60
Swampland indemnity.....	Acts Mar. 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634), and Mar. 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 251).....	105,047.99
(Agricultural college.....	Act July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).....	240,000.00
Forestry.....	Act June 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 517).....	20,000.00
Total.....		6,222,643.99
WTOMING		
University.....	Act Feb. 18, 1881 (21 Stat. 326).....	46,080.00
Fish hatcheries.....	Acts May 28, 1888 (25 Stat. 158), and July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	5,480.00
Common schools, secs. 16 and 36 (or indemnity lands).....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	3,470,009.00
Agricultural college.....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	90,000.00
Public buildings.....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	107,000.00
Penitentiary.....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	30,000.00
Insane asylum.....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	30,000.00
Charitable, educational, penal, etc., institutions.....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	290,000.00
Miners' hospital.....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	30,000.00
Deaf and dumb asylum.....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	30,000.00
Poor farm.....	Act July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222).....	10,000.00
Hot Salt Springs.....	Act June 7, 1897 (30 Stat. 96).....	640.00
Total.....		4,139,209.00
Grand total.....		203,315,730.30

¹ A grant to Wisconsin of unsurveyed islands in inland lakes, for forestry purposes, was made by the act of Aug. 22, 1912 (37 Stat. 324)—no estimate made as to area involved.

Attachment C

**"University Land Grants,"
Prepared by the University of Alaska**

UNIVERSITY LAND GRANTS
(IN ACRES)

State	University Land Grant	State Land Grant	% of Total Grant to State
New York	990,000	990,000	100.00%
Pennsylvania	780,000	780,000	100.00%
Massachusetts	360,000	360,000	100.00%
Tennessee	300,000	300,000	100.00%
Virginia	300,000	300,000	100.00%
Georgia	270,000	270,000	100.00%
North Carolina	270,000	270,000	100.00%
Maine	210,000	210,000	100.00%
Maryland	210,000	210,000	100.00%
New Jersey	210,000	210,000	100.00%
Connecticut	180,000	180,000	100.00%
South Carolina	180,000	180,000	100.00%
Texas	180,000	180,000	100.00%
New Hampshire	150,000	150,000	100.00%
Vermont	150,000	150,000	100.00%
West Virginia	150,000	150,000	100.00%
Rhode Island	120,000	120,000	100.00%
Delaware	90,000	90,000	100.00%
Kentucky	330,000	354,607	93.06%
Oklahoma	1,050,000	3,095,760	33.92%
Ohio	699,120	2,758,862	25.34%
Washington	336,080	3,044,471	11.04%
Indiana	436,080	4,040,518	10.79%
South Dakota	366,080	3,435,373	10.66%
North Dakota	336,080	3,163,552	10.62%
New Mexico	1,346,546	12,794,718	10.52%
Idaho	386,686	4,254,448	9.09%
Illinois	526,080	6,234,655	8.44%
Arizona	849,197	10,543,753	8.05%
Alabama	383,785	5,006,883	7.67%
Utah	556,141	7,501,737	7.41%
Montana	388,721	5,963,338	6.52%
Mississippi	348,240	6,097,997	5.71%
Missouri	376,080	7,417,022	5.07%
Nevada	136,080	2,725,226	4.99%
Nebraska	136,080	3,458,711	3.93%
Iowa	286,080	8,061,262	3.55%
Wisconsin	332,160	10,179,804	3.26%
Wyoming	136,080	4,342,520	3.13%
Colorado	138,040	4,471,604	3.09%
Michigan	286,080	12,142,846	2.36%
Louisiana	256,292	11,441,343	2.24%
California	196,080	8,825,508	2.22%
Kansas	151,270	7,794,669	1.94%
Oregon	136,165	7,032,847	1.94%
Arkansas	196,080	11,936,834	1.64%
Minnesota	212,160	16,422,051	1.29%
Florida	182,160	24,214,366	0.75%
Alaska	112,064	104,569,251	0.11%
Totals	16,707,787	328,426,536	

Source: Mari Montgomery, Director, Office of Land Management, University of Alaska,
907-786-7766.

Attachment D

Terrence M. Cole, Ph.D.,
The University of Alaska: A Land Grant College Without the Land,
November 1993

A Land Grant College Without the Land:

**A History of the University of Alaska's
Federal Land Grant**



**A Report to the University of Alaska
Statewide Office of Land Management**

by Terrence M. Cole, Ph.D.

**Chair, Department of History
University of Alaska Fairbanks**

November 1993

Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary	3
11.	Acres for Education.	4
	Morrill Act of 1862	
	Inequities of the Land Grants	
111.	Alaska's Educational Land Grants.....	6
	Tanana Valley Agricultural College Reserve	
	Absence of Surveys Negate 1915 Reserve	
	Lack of Land Income	
	1929 Land Grant	
	10 Million Acres More	
IV.	The Statehood Movement	9
	1916 Statehood Bill—	
	11.3 Million Acres for Higher Education	
	1940s Revival of the Statehood Campaign	
	From In-Place To quantity Grants	
	103 Million Acres	
	Internal Improvement Land for Higher Education	
	Proposed Elimination of 1915 Reserve	
	Direct Grants of School and Univ. Land	
	UA Campaign for Additional Grant Land	
	Elimination of Dedicated Land Grants	
V.	The Land Grant College Without the Land	17
	Loss of a Quarter-million Acres Due to Statehood	
	Legislative Approval of One Million Acres for UA	
	Egan's Veto of One Million Acre UA Reserve	
	Reaction to Egan's Veto	
	The UA's "Starvation Grant"	
	Continuation of Efforts in 1960s to Acquire Land	
	President Wood Lobbies for North Slope Land	
	After the Land Freeze	
VI.	Sources	25

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Alaska is a land-grant college without the land. In 1915, Congress reserved for Alaska's land-grant institution potentially more than a quarter-of-a-million acres in the Tanana Valley, proceeds from the sale and development of which would help finance the operation of the school. Under the terms of the measure, written by Delegate James Wickersham, the college was to receive every surveyed and unclaimed Section 33 in an area of about 14,000 square miles between Fairbanks in the north and the foothills of the Alaska Range in the south, in addition to the main campus of about 2,250 acres four miles from Fairbanks.

However, this large Tanana Valley land-grant never materialized. For decades, almost all of the land in the Tanana Valley (like the rest of Alaska) remained unsurveyed and therefore unavailable. As late as the 1950s, only 0.6 percent of Alaska had been properly surveyed under the standard rectangular system, and a territorial report concluded that at the speed Alaska was being surveyed, it could take as long as 43,510 years to complete the job. (Chipperfield 1954: 4) Due primarily to this incredibly slow pace of federal land surveys, Alaska's landgrant institution received only a fraction of the land Congress reserved for it in 1915; in addition to its 2,250 acre campus, the University of Alaska received less than 9,000 acres out of a reservation created for it totalling approximately 268,800 acres.

To partially remedy the situation, Congress granted an additional 100,000 acres to Alaska's land-grant college in 1929, but even with this additional grant, the total was less than half of the original acreage authorized in 1915.

Further efforts to increase the size of Alaska's higher education federal land-grant were made from the 1930s through the 1950s. Several bills were submitted to Congress that would have reserved up to 10 million acres for Alaska's land-grant college, but strong opposition, primarily from the Department of Interior, doomed the effort.

With the passage of the Alaska statehood bill in 1958, the university's legal rights to further land under the 1915 reservation were extinguished. The statehood act repealed the 1915 reservation because Congress apparently believed the enormous statehood entitlement of more than 103 million acres—far larger than that of any other state in American history—would provide sufficient resources so that the 49th state could adequately support its university. Alaska Delegate E.L. "Bob" Bartlett agreed with the majority of Congress that by not targeting specific amounts of land for specific purposes, such as had traditionally been done for the support of higher education elsewhere, the new state would have greater flexibility and more control of its own affairs.

Bartlett claimed in 1958 that in exchange for giving up the "in-place" grants—such as the Tanana Valley Section 33 reservation—the state of Alaska had received not only a far greater percentage of the public domain than other western states, but also greater freedom to choose land wherever it wished "without any reference at all to the traditional section-by-section formula." This freedom, as Bartlett predicted, helped the state immeasurably, for instance, when the state selected land at Prudhoe Bay, which turned out to be the richest oil field in North American history. But the cost of this greater freedom in land choice was a vastly smaller educational land grant for Alaska.

Traditionally, the size of land grants were most often determined by a state's population not by its area. Nevertheless, some of the last western states were given generous grants despite their sparse populations. For instance, Oklahoma and New Mexico each received about one million acres to support higher education. But, Alaskan higher education never shared in this federal bounty. Alaska received less land specifically dedicated for the support of higher education than any other western public land state, and less educational land or script than all but one of the contiguous states. Among the 48 states which had received federal land or land scrip to establish land-grant colleges, mining schools, teachers' colleges, and state

CORRECTION

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT(S)
HAVE BEEN REFILMED TO
ASSURE LEGIBILITY OR PAGINATION



Central Microfilm Services
Department of Education & Early Development
State of Alaska

A Land Grant College Without the Land:

**A History of the University of Alaska's
Federal Land Grant**



**A Report to the University of Alaska
Statewide Office of Land Management**

by Terrence M. Cole, Ph.D.

**Chair, Department of History
University of Alaska Fairbanks**

November 1993



Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary.	3
11.	Acres for Education. Morrill Act of 1862 Inequities of the Land Grants	4
111.	Alaska's Educational Land Grants. Tanana Valley Agricultural College Reserve Absence of Surveys Negate 1915 Reserve Lack of Land Income 1929 Land Grant 10 Million Acres More	6
IV.	The Statehood Movement 1916 Statehood Bill— 11.3 Million Acres for Higher Education 1940s Revival of the Statehood Campaign From In-Place To quantity Grants 103 Million Acres Internal Improvement Land for Higher Education Proposed Elimination of 1915 Reserve Direct Grants of School and Univ. Land UA Campaign for Additional Grant Land Elimination of Dedicated Land Grants	9
V.	The Land Grant College Without the Land Loss of a Quarter-million Acres Due to Statehood Legislative Approval of One Million Acres for UA Egan's Veto of One Million Acre UA Reserve Reaction to Egan's Veto The UA's "Starvation Grant" Continuation of Efforts in 1960s to Acquire Land President Wood Lobbies for North Slope Land After the Land Freeze	17
VI.	Sources	25



I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Alaska is a land-grant college without the land. In 1915, Congress reserved for Alaska's land-grant institution potentially more than a quarter-of-a-million acres in the Tanana Valley, proceeds from the sale and development of which would help finance the operation of the school. Under the terms of the measure, written by Delegate James Wickersham, the college was to receive every surveyed and unclaimed Section 33 in an area of about 14,000 square miles between Fairbanks in the north and the foothills of the Alaska Range in the south, in addition to the main campus of about 2,250 acres four miles from Fairbanks.

However, this large Tanana Valley land-grant never materialized. For decades, almost all of the land in the Tanana Valley (like the rest of Alaska) remained unsurveyed and therefore unavailable. As late as the 1950s, only 0.6 percent of Alaska had been properly surveyed under the standard rectangular system, and a territorial report concluded that at the speed Alaska was being surveyed, it could take as long as 43,510 years to complete the job. (Chipperfield 1954: 4) Due primarily to this incredibly slow pace of federal land surveys, Alaska's landgrant institution received only a fraction of the land Congress reserved for it in 1915; in addition to its 2,250 acre campus, the University of Alaska received less than 9,000 acres out of a reservation created for it totalling approximately 268,800 acres.

To partially remedy the situation, Congress granted an additional 100,000 acres to Alaska's land-grant college in 1929, but even with this additional grant, the total was less than half of the original acreage authorized in 1915.

Further efforts to increase the size of Alaska's higher education federal land-grant were made from the 1930s through the 1950s. Several bills were submitted to Congress that would have reserved up to 10 million acres for Alaska's land-grant college, but strong opposition, primarily from the Department of Interior, doomed the effort.

With the passage of the Alaska statehood bill in 1958, the university's legal rights to further land under the 1915 reservation were extinguished. The statehood act repealed the 1915 reservation because Congress apparently believed the enormous statehood entitlement of more than 103 million acres—far larger than that of any other state in American history—would provide sufficient resources so that the 49th state could adequately support its university. Alaska Delegate E.L. "Bob" Bartlett agreed with the majority of Congress that by not targeting specific amounts of land for specific purposes, such as had traditionally been done for the support of higher education elsewhere, the new state would have greater flexibility and more control of its own affairs.

Bartlett claimed in 1958 that in exchange for giving up the "in-place" grants—such as the Tanana Valley Section 33 reservation—the state of Alaska had received not only a far greater percentage of the public domain than other western states, but also greater freedom to choose land wherever it wished "without any reference at all to the traditional section-by-section formula." This freedom, as Bartlett predicted, helped the state immeasurably, for instance, when the state selected land at Prudhoe Bay, which turned out to be the richest oil field in North American history. But the cost of this greater freedom in land choice was a vastly smaller educational land grant for Alaska.

Traditionally, the size of land grants were most often determined by a state's population not by its area. Nevertheless, some of the last western states were given generous grants despite their sparse populations. For instance, Oklahoma and New Mexico each received about one million acres to support higher education. But, Alaskan higher education never shared in this federal bounty. Alaska received less land specifically dedicated for the support of higher education than any other western public land state, and less educational land or script than all but one of the contiguous states. Among the 48 states which had received federal land or land scrip to establish land-grant colleges, mining schools, teachers' colleges, and state

universities, only Delaware received fewer acres than Alaska. Thus, after statehood, Alaska in 1959 was in an anomalous position. While the state had received more land and a greater percentage of land from the federal government than any other western state, it ranked next to the bottom of the list in the amount of federal land it had received for higher education.

Since the statehood act had invalidated the university's 1915 Tanana Valley reservation, many Alaskans supported efforts to specifically designate a portion of the 103 million acre statehood entitlement for the support of the University of Alaska. In the spring of 1959, the first state legislature passed a measure authorizing the state to reserve to the UA one million acres "for the purpose of replacing grants of certain Sections 33 in the Tanana Valley previously allowed under federal law and now superseded" by the statehood act.

To the dismay of the University of Alaska and its supporters, Governor William A. Egan vetoed the one million acre university on the grounds that it would complicate the enormous task of the Division of Lands in selecting the statehood entitlement, and would furthermore violate the Alaska constitution's prohibition against dedicated funds. University of Alaska President Ernest Patty, shocked at Egan's veto, believed that the governor did not understand the century-long tradition of American land-grant colleges. President Patty did not share Egan's view that increasing the size of the university's land grant would violate the state constitution.

William R. Wood, Patty's successor as UA President, remembers that both state and federal officials agreed that the university had been short-changed in the statehood act, but that state officials believed additional lands should come from authorities in Washington, D.C., while federal officials told the university to look to Juneau for redress. Governor Egan's steadfast opposition to granting or reserving state land to the university essentially killed any chance of addressing the issue on the state level until Walter J. Hickel became governor in 1966. But shortly after Hickel's election, he was greeted by Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall's land freeze halting all transfers of federal lands until the issue of Alaska Native land claims could be settled.

Over the next 15 years, controversies regarding Alaska land matters continued to boil, as the public domain in Alaska was carved up for the first time. In 1971, Congress passed the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, reserving 44 million acres for Alaska Natives and opening the way for the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. The pipeline marked the start of a national conservation battle in the 1970s over the future of Alaska's lands, which culminated in 1980 with the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, a measure which added 104 million acres to the state's conservation systems.

Now, with many of the major Alaska land issues of the 1970s and 1980s settled, supporters of the University of Alaska have encouraged the state to re-examine the question of the university's land grant and consider granting the school additional lands in order for it to "achieve parity" with higher educational systems in other states.

This report is a brief historical review of the land-grant issue as it pertains to the University of Alaska, a land-grant college without the land.

II. ACRES FOR EDUCATION: THE TRADITION OF FEDERAL LAND GRANTS

The U.S. government helped finance America's educational system, from kindergarten to college, not with money, but with land. The practice of trading acres for education is one of the oldest traditions in American history, even pre-dating the United States Constitution. Dedicating land from the public domain to finance schools in the various states and territories was born of necessity, since the national government had a shortage of dollars and a surplus of acres. According to a 1939 Department of Interior tabulation, the total educational land grants to Alaska and the 48 states amounted to more than 200 million acres, an area bigger than the state of Texas.

The Ordinance of 1785 established the rectangular survey of New England as the basis on which all land west of the Ohio would be subdivided; land was surveyed into townships composed of 36 sections of 640 acres or one square mile each. The 1785 law also established the principle of federal land endowments for education by reserving Section 16 of every township "for the maintenance of public schools, within the said township." (Taylor 1969: 131) After the admission of Ohio in 1803, Section 16 of every township in every new territory or state was typically reserved for schools; any Section 16 which had somehow been preempted was replaced by another section "in lieu thereof." (Hibbard 1939: 310) Over the 19th century, as the need for the expansion of education grew, so did the size of the federal land endowment for schools. With the admission of Oregon in 1848, the usual common school section grant doubled from one section to two (Sections 16 and 36). Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona, three of the last four states admitted before Alaska, each received four sections for school lands (Sections 2, 16, 32 and 36).

Common school grants were by far the largest in terms of acreage; however, higher education also received varying amounts of land. Different states received federal land grants for seminaries, teachers' colleges, mining schools, military schools and universities totaling millions of acres. Most notable among the land grants for higher education were the land-grant agricultural colleges created by the Morrill Act of 1862.

MORRILL ACT OF 1862

The Morrill Act, which has been called "perhaps the most important single act for education ever passed by Congress," revolutionized higher education in America. (Taylor 1969 111) Previously attending a college or university had been the privilege of an elite upper class, but supplied with government land grants totalling more than 11 million acres, the nation created new kinds of colleges in every state and territory that would stress the teaching of "agriculture and the mechanic arts" to the "industrial classes." Thanks to the creation of the system of land-grant colleges and universities, which eventually spread to all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, the doors of higher education swung open for the first time to millions of working class men and women. "Democracy's College" is the apt title of the classic history of the land-grant college movement.

INEQUITIES OF THE LAND GRANTS

Despite the laudable goals of the Morrill Act, serious problems with the legislation emerged. The acreage of each state's land grant was based on population as measured by the size of its congressional delegation; for each senator and representative a state sent to Congress, it received 30,000 acres. Therefore, the law favored the heavily populated, industrialized eastern states over the more sparsely settled and primarily agricultural western states. For instance, Rhode Island, the smallest state in the union, received 120,000 acres in scrip, a larger land grant than that of either Oregon, Nebraska, Kansas, Nevada, or Colorado, all of which received the minimum of 90,000 acres. Similarly, Connecticut (180,000 acres) received more than California (150,000 acres), and New Jersey (210,000 acres) more than Montana (140,000 acres).

Besides the glaring inequities between eastern and western states, except in a few instances, the land grants never created the financial endowments for the agricultural colleges which Congress had intended. As one historian has noted, the disposal record of the various states' agricultural college land grants "is clouded by scandal, fraud, and poor management. Many states realized less than one dollar an acre for their land, and some were even swindled out of the proceeds of the sales altogether." (Madsen 1976: 34) The poorest performance was that of Brown University in Rhode Island, which received only 42 cents an acre for its land.

One of the few states to earn a significant income from its land grant was New York, which received the largest grant of nearly one million acres (in scrip). Ezra Cornell, founder of New York's land-grant college, Cornell University, invested the scrip in 500,000 acres of the pinelands of northern Wisconsin to amass a nest egg of

III. ALASKA'S EDUCATIONAL LAND GRANTS

TANANA VALLEY AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE RESERVE

ABSENCE OF SURVEYS NEGATE 1915 GRANT

\$5 million for the school. Historian Paul Wallace Gates noted in his 1943 study of Cornell's land grant that the university's investment in Wisconsin was "one of the largest and ultimately most successful land speculations in American history." (Gates 1943: 49) But Cornell University was the exception. "None of the states received, through the Agricultural-College Act, sufficient funds to place their agricultural colleges on a sound financial basis at the outset," Gates wrote, "and with the exception of New York, no state east of the Mississippi River ever obtained from land or scrip what might be regarded as an adequate endowment." (Gates 1943: 245)

The man who ensured that the federal government would provide land for the support of schools and colleges in Alaska, as it did elsewhere, was Alaska Delegate James Wickersham. In 1915, Wickersham pushed a measure through Congress which reserved lands for both a common school system throughout the Territory and an agricultural land-grant college in the Tanana Valley near his hometown of Fairbanks.

Wickersham's 1915 school lands' bill appeared to be the first giant step in the disposition of the public domain in Alaska, reserving potentially about 20 million acres for education in the Territory. Despite earmarking this large reservation of federal land specifically for education, however, federal officials did little to ensure that schools and colleges in Alaska would actually receive any of the land which had been reserved for them. The high cost and slow speed of Alaskan development, due in part to bureaucratic inertia and the lack of federal land surveys, invalidated the generous terms of the 1915 act, so that Alaska ultimately received only a tiny fraction of the approximately 20 million acres of land Congress reserved for education in the Territory in 1915.

Delegate Wickersham's 1915 school lands' bill followed the precedents in other states and territories by reserving specific sections of federal land for the purposes of education. His legislation reserved every surveyed Section 16 and 36 throughout the territory for the support of the "common schools" of Alaska. This total reservation—of potentially more than 20 million acres—was the largest public school grant (on paper at least) in American history.

Besides the enormous common school grant, Wickersham's bill also set aside potentially more than a quarter-of-a-million acres in the Tanana Valley for the support of an agricultural college and school of mines. Four sections around the Fairbanks Agricultural Experiment Station outside of Fairbanks were designated as the campus, while every Section 33 in the Tanana Valley between 64 and 65 degrees north (approximately from the foothills of the Alaska Range to Fairbanks) and 145 and 152 degrees west (from near modern-day Delta Junction in the east to the mouth of the Tanana River in the west) were reserved to provide an endowment for the support of the college. Wickersham's bill also followed the established procedure set in other states and territories by promising the territory "in lieu of" lands, if any of the reserved sections would be preempted before survey by homesteaders or otherwise disposed of by Congress.

In 1917, the Alaska Territorial Legislature formally incorporated the Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mines (renamed the University of Alaska in 1935) as Alaska's land-grant institution. However, the land which Congress had reserved in 1915 to provide an endowment for the school was never transferred from federal ownership due to the same problem that effectively negated nearly every Congressional land measure in Alaska: the absence of surveys.

At the time Wickersham introduced his measure in 1915 to reserve lands for a land-grant college, no one in Congress was even certain about how much Tanana Valley revenue land they were actually reserving for the agricultural college. For instance, before the bill's passage, the report from the Committee on Public Lands stated that the agricultural college reserve in the Tanana Valley was "a very small one" of 134,400

acres, "which is a smaller number of acres than is usually given an agricultural college or school of mines." (U.S. House 1915: 5) Wickersham himself said on the floor of the House that the Alaska Agricultural College would receive only a total of 80 sections (51,200 acres). Another congressman claimed the reserve would be about 180,000 acres, while another claimed "it would be even more than that." (Congressional Record, 24 February 1915: 4544-4545) Still later the Dept. of Interior estimated that the Section 33 grant totaled 336,000 acres. (U.S. Dept. of Interior, 1939: 3)

Confusion stemmed mostly from the fact that virtually none of the land under consideration had yet been surveyed, so no one could have known exactly how many sections were potentially included in the reserve. (According to calculations made years later by University of Alaska administrators, the total Section 33 land reserved for Alaska's land-grant college under the 1915 measure comprised 420 sections or 268,800 acres. (Patty to Egan, 8 February 1960, Pres. Papers, 60/61, Box 14, File 204)

The lack of surveys not only caused confusion about the size of the Alaska Agricultural College's reservation, it also effectively cancelled the value of the reservation itself. The land set aside in 1915 was clearly predicated on surveys; obviously, the specific sections reserved for education could not be reserved until after they had been delineated. The first line in the 1915 law stated in part that the educational lands could be reserved only "when the public lands of the Territory of Alaska are surveyed, under direction of the Government of the United States..." Considering the pace at which the federal government was completing the rectangular survey of Alaska, the college could have literally waited until the next ice age, or longer, to receive all of its land. In 1915, the General Land Office had hardly even begun the task of surveying the Territory. Even four decades later, in 1952, only about 0.6 percent of Alaska's estimated area of 375 million acres had been surveyed. One politician predicted in the early 1950s that at the going rate of land surveys, it would take between 12,000 and 17,000 years to finish the job, while a less optimistic report from the Territorial Division of Lands estimated it might take as long 43,510 years! (U.S. House, Statehood For Alaska, 1957: 321; Chipperfield 1954: 4) Not until after statehood in the 1960s did the U.S. government finally begin to survey sizeable portions of the public domain in Alaska. (Ducker 1992)

Without surveys, the 1915 congressional school land reservations in Alaska for both public schools and the land-grant college remained empty promises. Out of the estimated 20 million acres that the 1915 grant reserved for the public schools of Alaska, the Territory of Alaska ultimately received only about 106,000 acres, or 0.5 percent of the original reservation. (Chipperfield 1954: 2; Stein 1987: 7)

The land-grant college's expected Tanana Valley land grant never materialized either. In 1958, the university reported that only 19 Section 33s—out of a possible total of 420 Section 33s in the Tanana Valley—had been surveyed. "At present rate of survey," the university's land manager reported in 1958, "one might expect completion of survey in from 200 to 1,000 years." (Land Manager Report, 20 May 1958, Pres. Papers, 1958/59, Box 6, File 88) According to figures from the State Division of Lands, out of the 1915 reservation, Alaska's land-grant institution ultimately received only 11,211 acres, of which about 2,250 acres were the campus site reserved for educational purposes, leaving only 8,961 acres for revenue purposes. Thus, the University of Alaska was granted less than 3.3 percent of the 268,800 acre Tanana Valley reservation Congress created for its financial support in 1915. (Stein 1987: 167)

LACK OF LAND INCOME

The lack of land was clearly seen in the university's balance sheet. During the University of Alaska's first three decades, from 1917 to 1946, the total revenue to its permanent fund from land sales, rentals, and leases was only \$227.50. During that time, the university's land income never amounted to more than \$30 a year. Other years were even worse. From 1926-1928, Alaska's alleged land-grant college earned only 75 cents from its land grant. Nearly every third year, until the late 1940s, the UA

earned absolutely no income from its land whatsoever. (UA Permanent Fund Statement, 1917-1971, Pres Papers, 1971/72, Box "Higher Ed...", File, Land—July-Dec)

1929 LAND GRANT

Congress recognized the inadequacies of the 1915 Tanana Valley agricultural college reservation when it passed a measure 14 years later to grant an additional 100,000 acres for the "exclusive use and benefit" of the Alaska Agricultural College and School of Mines. Under the 1915 act, the educational lands were merely reserved, with title vested in the Federal government, but the 1929 act was an outright grant of 100,000 acres to the Territory for the support of the college.

The 1929 law required the granted land to be surveyed before selection. However, unlike the 1915 in-place reservation which specified particular sections, the 1929 legislation was an actual quantity grant; under its provisions, the Territory of Alaska could select 100,000 acres of "vacant, nonmineral, surveyed, unreserved public lands" anywhere in Alaska for the financial support of the college. (U.S. Senate 1929)

The 1929 quantity grant became the major land grant of the University of Alaska. By the 1960s, virtually all 100,000 acres had been selected and patented, forming the bulk of UA's total land-grant trust of approximately 111,000 acres.

10 MILLION ACRES MORE

Charles E. Bunnell, the first president of the University of Alaska, and Delegate Anthony J. Dimond never ceased their efforts to increase the size of the UA's land grant and reserve. During the seven years from 1936 to 1943, Dimond introduced at least five nearly identical bills in the 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th and 78th Congresses, to extend the 1915 Section 33 reservation in the Tanana Valley to the entire territory. Dimond's legislation proposed amending the 1915 act, stating:

... Section 33 in each township in said Territory shall be, and the same is hereby, reserved from sale or settlement for the support of the University of Alaska...

Reserving each Section 33 throughout the entire Territory of Alaska, not simply those in the Tanana Valley, would have increased the university land reserve to approximately 10 million acres. This would have been, by far, the largest higher education land grant in history, nearly equal by itself to all of the land and script given to all of the land-grant colleges and universities in the United States.

Dimond saw this 10 million acre land bank as the university's endowment for the future. He explained in a 1937 telegram that the land he proposed reserving was at present "of little if any value but eventually by increased value may be of substantial aid in maintaining university." (Dimond to Shattuck, 14 July 1937)

Opposition to the 10 million acre university reserve came principally from the Department of Interior. Year-after-year, the Secretary of Interior recommended against expansion of the Section 33 reserve on the grounds that the university already had more land than it needed. As evidence, Interior officials pointed out that the UA had taken no steps to select any of the 100,000 acres made available to it by Congress in 1929. "It appears," Acting Secretary of the Interior Charles West wrote in 1937, "that no selections have yet been made by the Territory of Alaska under said grant." (West to DeRouen, 3 April 1937)

No matter how it looked in Washington, D.C., the failure to file any selections was more a factor of Bunnell's short-handed administration than a lack of interest in acquiring additional land. Struggling to survive from one fiscal year to the next, the UA lacked the staff in the 1930s and 1940s to tackle the massive job of land selection that the 1929 act required. Officially, Bunnell was both president and comptroller, and any issue of substance that concerned the university crossed his desk, from buying library books to selecting land.

Dimond asked Bunnell to explain in writing why the University genuinely needed the reservation of additional lands. However, Dimond realized Bunnell's

difficult position. The university had numerous dealings with Interior Department officials and Bunnell could not afford to alienate them. "If you are disinclined to write a letter that I can use before the Committee," Dimond wrote Bunnell, "will you not at least with your superior knowledge of the entire subject, write me a memorandum which I may adopt in whole or part as my own without bringing your name into the controversy." (Dimond to Bunnell, 6 April 1937) If Bunnell ever wrote the memo which Dimond requested, it has not yet come to light.

In 1938, the university selected 1,927 acres near Fairbanks for its first quantity grant under the 1929 law. (Stein 1987: 7) Nevertheless, the Interior Department continued to thwart Dimond's and Bunnell's efforts to reserve additional land for the university. "The Department of the Interior is still vigorously opposed to having set aside for the University of Alaska any more of the public lands in the Territory...." Dimond wrote to Bunnell in February 1941. (Dimond to Bunnell, 11 February 1941)

A month later Dimond further explained: "The Department's argument against the bill seems to be based upon the theory that plenty of land has already been reserved for the University of Alaska and no more is needed. Specific reference was made to the fact that the grant of 100,000 acres made to the Territory of Alaska for the benefit of the University...has not yet been selected except for approximately 2000 acres..." (Dimond to Bunnell, 12 March 1941)

By the time Dimond introduced his 10 million acre bill for the fifth and last time in 1943, he had apparently resigned himself to the Interior Department's unwavering opposition. As Dimond expected, the Interior Department responded once again with a negative recommendation. Acting Secretary Abe Fortas wrote in July 1943 that Delegate Dimond's proposed 10 million acre reserve, added to the more than 20 million acres previously reserved in 1915 for common schools and higher education in Alaska, would create a gigantic educational reserve of more than 30 million acres which Alaska did not need.

"Such an amount would be greatly in excess of the grants of public land made to any of the States," Fortas wrote, "and, considering the comparatively small population of the Territory of Alaska, approximately 60,000, an additional reservation of the amount proposed for educational purposes, would seem unwarranted and greatly out of proportion to the present or contemplated need of the Territory." (Fortas to Peterson, 19 July 1943)

In 1944, E. L. "Bob" Bartlett replaced Dimond as Alaska's Delegate to Congress. Bartlett told Bunnell he would resubmit Dimond's 10 million acre reservation proposal, but claimed it would be futile as the Interior Department would continue to thwart the measure. "I have no doubt that if I introduce a bill seeking the same objective a similar report will be made," Bartlett wrote, "but I am perfectly willing to do so in any event if such is your desire." (Bartlett to Bunnell, 30 December 1944)

Apparently Bartlett did not reintroduce Dimond's university land measure, as by that time a new force had arisen which would drastically alter Alaska's political landscape and the land question: the Alaska statehood movement.

IV. THE STATEHOOD MOVEMENT

In 1916, one year after Congress reserved more than a quarter of a million acres in the Tanana Valley to finance a land-grant college in Fairbanks, James Wickersham submitted the first bill requesting statehood for Alaska. Wickersham introduced his statehood bill, a symbolic gesture with no real hope of passage, on the 49th anniversary of the signing of the Alaska Purchase Treaty. He patterned his measure after the statehood act of Oklahoma, supposing the generous grants of money and land for education would find favor with Democrats, traditional supporters of state's rights, who at the time controlled both Congress and the White House. (Atwood 1979: 306)

**FIRST STATEHOOD ACT PROPOSES
11.3 MILLION ACRES FOR HIGHER
EDUCATION IN ALASKA**

Wickersham's 1916 bill called for Congress to grant Alaska approximately 11.3 million acres specifically for the support of higher education and approximately 20 million acres for public schools. If enacted, the proposals would have been the most generous public education and higher education grants in the history of the United States. Among its other provisions, Wickersham's measure-anticipating Delegate Anthony Dimond's campaign in the 1930s and 1940s to increase the University of Alaska's land grant—proposed granting one section in each township throughout the territory for higher education. Delegate Wickersham recommended granting every Section 13 (about 10 million acres) for the equal benefit of Alaska's future universities, teachers' colleges, agricultural colleges, and schools of mines. Furthermore, instead of certain traditional land grants for internal improvements, and other swamp land grants which were not applicable to Alaska, the bill would have granted an additional 1.3 million acres for higher education dedicated as follows:

400,000 acres for universities

400,000 acres for agricultural colleges and schools of mines

300,000 acres for teachers' colleges

200,000 acres for schools of forestry

(Daily Alaska Dispatch, 31 March 1916; Naske 1972: 3)

**THE 1940s REVIVAL OF THE
STATEHOOD CAMPAIGN**

Delegate Wickersham's 1916 statehood bill died without receiving a hearing, and it was not until more than a quarter of a century later that the question of Alaska statehood again surfaced in Congress. In 1943, bills were introduced in both houses calling for the admission of Alaska as a state, requesting extraordinarily generous land provisions. The bills would have given Alaska all of the unappropriated public land in the Territory, except for those lands actively used by the federal government. Furthermore, Delegate Anthony Dimond's bill in the House also included his long standing proposal to grant the University of Alaska an additional 10 million acres by reserving for it every Section 33 in the Territory. (Naske 1972: 3)

When Congress seriously began to address the Alaska statehood issue following World War II, debate centered on the amount of land the proposed 49th state would receive. Initially, most Alaskans assumed that the new state of Alaska would be given all the public land in the territory. Delegate Bob Bartlett's 1947 statehood bill, like his predecessor Anthony Dimond's bill four years earlier, recommended that the United States government convey to the state of Alaska all of the vacant public domain; and, in addition, reserve 20 million acres or two sections in each township (Sections 16 and 36) for public schools, and 10 million acres or one section in each township (Section 33) for the support of the University of Alaska. (U.S. House 1947: 2)

The Interior Department supported the concept of Alaska statehood, but fiercely opposed granting the future state government all of Alaska's public domain. Acting Secretary Warner Gardner wrote the department's official report on April 14, 1947 claiming most of Alaska should be held in trust for all of the people of the United States.

The custom has been for the federal government to grant to the new states lands for schools and for internal improvements, but to retain the bulk of the public lands under federal ownership. I strongly recommend that there be no change in this practice in the case of Alaska.

Gardner suggested several changes in Bartlett's bill, which the secretary claimed would permit

Alaska to enter into the Union on a basis similar to that on which the western continental States were admitted. While retaining the greater part of the public lands for national management, the federal government has made grants to the new states for school purposes and internal improvements. Similar grants should be made in the case of Alaska. (U.S. House 1947: 12)

In particular, Gardner's suggested amendments would reduce the state's land entitlement to about 20 million acres for public schools (every Section 16 and 36),

FROM IN-PLACE TO QUANTITY GRANTS

500,000 acres for miscellaneous internal improvements, and approximately 438,000 acres for the support of the University of Alaska. (Under Gardner's proposal, the university's total acreage would consist of the 2,250 acre campus, the 1915 Tanana Valley Section 33 reservation—erroneously calculated by Interior to be about 336,000 acres—and the 1929 land grant of 100,000 acres.) (U.S. House 1947: 14)

In the spring of 1948, Delegate Bartlett and the Interior Department compromised on the size of the statehood land-grant proposal; both agreed to support a grant of four sections in each township (Sections 2, 16, 32 and 36) totaling about 40 million acres, and to reassert the University of Alaska's rights to the entire 1915 Tanana Valley Section 33 grant, i.e. about 268,000 acres, and the 1929 grant of 100,000 acres. (U.S. House 1949: 2) Bartlett and other strong statehood supporters admitted that they would have preferred to ask for more land, but that political reality at the time dictated that four sections per township, plus Section 33 in the Tanana Valley, was the best deal Alaska could hope to receive. As retired Delegate Dimond told a Senate committee in 1950, "...we have to take this or we do not get anything." (U.S. Senate 1950: 75)

Nevertheless, others still maintained that unless Alaska received more land, it could never become economically viable as a state. Two statehood bills introduced in 1949 again repeated the original Dimond-Bartlett position: all public land not needed by the federal government, in addition to about 20 million acres for public schools (every Section 16 and 36) and about 10 million acres for the support of the University of Alaska (every Section 33). (H.R. 25 and H.R. 2300, 81st Congress, 1st Session)

Congress moved towards a revolutionary solution to the Alaska state land question in 1950, when it rejected traditional in-place grants of specific sections, and endorsed the concept of quantity grants of larger blocks of open acreage. Ironically, the most eloquent case for changing the manner in which Alaska's land would be granted, and for also granting Alaska additional land, probably originated with statehood's most vocal opponent, Winton C. Arnold, chief lobbyist and publicist for the Alaskan canned salmon industry. (Naske 1972)

At numerous congressional statehood hearings, Arnold showed charts and graphs illustrating that at the rate the rectangular survey was being extended to Alaska, it would literally take thousands of years to complete the task. (As noted previously, estimates in the 1950s were that it might take anywhere from 12,000 to 43,510 years to survey all of Alaska.) For instance, Arnold tabulated the history of land surveys in the last ten states admitted into the union, from North Dakota (1889) to Arizona (1912). On the date of admission, the percentage of surveyed land in the new states ranged from a minimum of 20 percent in Idaho, to a maximum of 100 percent in Oklahoma. By contrast, Arnold noted that only 0.672 percent of Alaska had been surveyed by 1950. (U.S. Senate 1950: 414) Since Alaska could not receive title to a specific section of land until it had been surveyed, the state would virtually have to wait forever to receive all of its land, and Arnold maintained that therefore statehood was not a practical option for Alaska.

Instead of ruling out statehood, however, the slow pace of surveys merely convinced the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as Bob Bartlett wrote, to adopt a "bold and precedent shattering way in determining how land should be transferred to the new state." (Naske 1972: 8) In 1957, the year before Congress finally voted to admit Alaska into the Union, Bob Bartlett recalled that during its deliberations in 1950, the Senate committee

evolved an entirely new principle in respect to land grants. Its decision was that the historic manner of passing on to the new state numbered sections after the survey should be discarded. Substituted, therefore, was the provision which has remained in every statehood bill since, namely the extraordinarily liberal and, I believe for Alaska, advantageous principle that the state should be allowed to select what land it desired from the

public domain not already appropriated or reserved. Recognizing the fact that surveys were so far behind, the Senate Committee inserted language which would permit the state to select this land 25 years after admission. Transfer was to have been made after the exterior boundaries were surveyed by the Secretary of the Interior. This is intended to speed up the whole process of land selection so that title may pass swiftly to the state instead of the state having to wait for years and years—perhaps as many as 15,000!—before receiving its land patrimony. (Bartlett to Franklin, 19 January 1957, RG 223, Box 132, HR 50)

The committee abandoned the practice of in-place grants and substituted quantity grants of blocks of land ranging in size from slightly more than 5,000 to as much as 50,000 acres, surveyed on exterior lines only. Giving the state selection rights would enable it to choose the most valuable tracts of land and avoid the traditional checkerboard pattern of land ownership which would only further increase the cost and retard the pace of Alaskan economic development. Carefully selecting land, the new state could theoretically create a consistent strategy of land planning and resource development.

103 MILLION ACRES

Besides replacing in-place grants with quantity grants, in the early 1950s Congress also broke with historical precedent by recommending Alaska receive far more acreage than any state in the history of the United States. This was necessary, a Senate report stated in 1954, because the laws for the disposal of the public domain in Alaska "have been and are vitiated to a large degree by the Federal policies of the last half century..." To alter Alaska's "distorted landownership pattern"—99 percent of the land was still under federal control—the Senate recommended in 1953 that the new state be given 103 million acres or nearly 30 percent of the area of Alaska, almost three times the percentage of land given to any other western state. (Later proposals would run as high as 182 million acres or about 50 percent of Alaska, though the final figure approved by Congress in 1958 was a total of 103,350,000 acres.) Even with such an enormous statehood entitlement, however, more than two-thirds of Alaska would continue to be federal land. "From one point of view, therefore," the Senate reported in 1954, "a grant of 103,350,000 acres may be unprecedented. From the other point of view, a grant of any smaller amount would still leave the federal government in a position of overwhelming dominance over the land and resources of the new state and its people." (U.S. Senate 1954: 2)

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT LAND SPECIFIED FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Most of the statehood bills submitted in the 1950s continued to recognize that higher education in general, and the University of Alaska in particular, should be given a specific amount of acreage. The basic formula for the 103,350,000 acre proposal, repeated in numerous bills submitted between 1953 and 1957, divided the state's total acreage into three categories: an unrestricted general-use grant, community development grants, and internal improvement grants. (See Table No. 1 on page 13)

The bulk of the land consisted of an unrestricted "general open grant" of 100 million acres; revenues from the disposition of this land could be "used for the running expenses and the development of the new State, as its people, through their elected representatives, may direct." (U.S. Senate 1954: 30) A second category of land was the community development grant of 800,000 acres, half of which would be selected from the public domain and half from the national forests. These lands were designated for "the development and expansion of communities." (Stein 1987: 13)

The third and final category of land, comprising the remaining 2,550,000 acres, was for specific internal improvements, including penitentiaries, reform schools, public buildings, pioneers' homes, teachers' colleges, and the University of Alaska. Virtually every piece of statehood legislation Congress considered until 1957 specified that higher education would directly receive at least one million acres of the

103,350,000 acre proposed statehood entitlement, consisting of 500,000 acres for the University of Alaska and 500,000 acres for the support of teachers' colleges or normal schools. (See Table No. 1)

TABLE NO. 1

Typical Calculation of Acreage in proposed Alaska Statehood Bills, 1953-1957

1. 100 million acres—General open grant, no restrictions.
2. 800,000 acres—Community Development Grants—to be used for expansion of communities. Half of acreage would come from the public domain, half from national forest land.
3. 2,550,000 acres—for various specified state functions and internal improvements enumerated as follows:
 - 500,000 acres—University of Alaska
 - 500,000 acres—teachers' colleges
 - 500,000 acres—public buildings
 - 200,000—schools and asylums
for the deaf, dumb and blind
 - 200,000 acres—penitentiaries
 - 200,000 acres—mental institutions
 - 200,000 acres—charitable, penal and
reformatory institutions
 - 250,000 acres—pioneer homes

(U.S. House 1953: 17)

PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF 1915 RESERVE

By the early 1950s, it seemed likely that if and when Alaska achieved statehood, the University of Alaska would receive its long-delayed increase in the size of its land grant. Invariably, all of the statehood bills before Congress addressed the need to give the university additional land. But impending statehood also raised fears in the Territory of cancellation of the 1915 public school and university land reservation. Given that Congress had rejected the concept of in-place grants in favor of quantity grants, it seemed reasonable to many lawmakers, including Delegate Bob Bartlett, that Congress should revoke the 1915 reservations and substitute a larger quantity grant.

The Territorial Department of Land warned in a December 1954 report that Alaska was in danger of potentially losing the millions of acres which the United States had reserved for Alaska education almost three decades earlier. The statehood bill then under consideration (See Table No. 1) would repeal the 1915 school land reservation, and though it would provide up to one million acres specifically for the support of higher education (500,000 acres for the University of Alaska and 500,000 acres for teachers' colleges), it would not provide specific acreage to support the school system, traditionally the prime justification for granting land to states. The report recommended that some means be found to guarantee that land be granted to support Alaska schools, just as was being done for higher education with internal improvement land under the proposed statehood bill.

There may be no objection to the repeal of the school reservation act providing some other provision is made to grant the school system 20,101,488 acres, an amount equal to the amount it would have received under that act. The original and chief purpose of making grants of land to states was for benefiting the public schools. The proposed legislation... provides grants for many other state institutions and purposes for which grants are generally made but the most important grant for the public schools is not provided for. In fact, the school system would lose the reservations that have been previously granted. (Chipperfield 1954: 13-14)

In March 1955, Territorial Land Commissioner W.A. Chipperfield drafted a bill which he believed would protect the land rights of Alaska's schools and the University of Alaska, by immediately granting to the Territory all surveyed reserved school and university sections, with funds from the sale or other use of such lands earmarked for the schools and the University of Alaska. (Chipperfield to Heintzleman, 7 March 1955, E.L. Bartlett Collection, Legislative Bill File, Box 2, Folder 19)

In response to the concerns of Commissioner Chipperfield and others, Delegate Bartlett argued that dedicated school lands were not in Alaska's best interest. Bartlett claimed Chipperfield's proposal seemed to run "directly counter to the existing concept which has been expressed in the various statehood bills for the last few years, namely, that Alaska shall have the privilege of choosing its lands rather than having to accept them by reason of established sections..." (Bartlett to Heintzleman, 26 March 1955, Bartlett Collection, Legislative Bill File, Box 2, Folder 19)

Alaska's Commissioner of Education Don Dafoe voiced similar concerns about the lack of "specific land grants for schools." Dafoe wrote Bartlett that receipts from school lands should be added to the "permanent school fund with a view toward building it up to where it would be a good endowment in 50 to 100 years from now..." (Dafoe to Bartlett, 16 April 1957) Dafoe argued that the long-term interests of Alaskan education required careful management of the school lands.

Whether or not Alaska has a good solid permanent school fund 50 years from now will depend upon how carefully school land matters are handled at this time. There is a school of thought which believes in giving away these lands for little or nothing and which believes that the monies received should be subject to immediate use in total, rather than going into the permanent school fund. (Dafoe to Bartlett, 5 April 1957, Bartlett Collection, Legislative Bill File, Box 2, Folder 20)

Bartlett responded that he was philosophically opposed to dedicating lands or funds for specific purposes.

...personally I have a very strong feeling that some of the fiscal woes of our government in all of its subdivision today are brought about by income segregations for stated purposes. Such income may be too much or too little for the objectives sought. All money for government use must come from the taxpayers, and I, for one, feel that the legislative bodies should not be shackled in appropriating according to the needs of the times. (Bartlett to Dafoe, 19 April 1957, Bartlett Collection, Legislative Bill File, Box 3, Folder 28)

DIRECT GRANTS OF SCHOOL AND UNIV. LAND

Despite Bartlett's opposition to dedicated lands and funds, he did introduce a measure in May 1955 calling for the U.S. government to grant all reserved (i.e. surveyed) public school and University of Alaska lands to the Territory of Alaska. Under Bartlett's bill, the Territorial Legislature would have the authority to dispose of the lands as they wished, however, all "proceeds or income are to be expended solely for the exclusive use and benefit of the public schools of Alaska and of the University of Alaska..." (H.R. 6242, 84th Congress, 1st Session)

The Interior Department supported Bartlett's proposal. Since the only reserved school lands were those which had been surveyed, the total acreage to be granted would have been relatively small (one estimate was about 160,000 acres). The bill provided, however, that as more sections were surveyed and therefore reserved each year, more acreage would be granted. "In all respects, the school sections should be treated as if statehood had already been conferred on Alaska," Assistant Secretary Fred Aandahl wrote. However, the Secretary wished Congress to consider both the public school land and the university land as one whole, rather than two separate pots of money. As Aandahl wrote,

At the present time, Sections 16 and 36 throughout the Territory are set aside for the support of the common schools, while the sections numbered 33 in part of the Tanana Valley are set aside for the support of the University. We

would prefer that no distinction be made by the terms of the statute, but that, instead, the proceeds from all the granted sections be set aside for the common support of the schools and the University and that the Territorial government be given discretion in the distribution of proceeds between these two educational purposes. (Aandahl to Rep. Engle, U.S. House, National Archives, RG 233, Box 113, H.R. 6242)

The bill to grant school and university sections directly to the Territory failed, as did another measure introduced by Bartlett in 1955 which would have granted millions of acres directly to the Territory of Alaska without waiting for statehood. This bill would have repealed the 1915 school and university reservation, and simultaneously granted the Territory the right to select up to 20 million acres from the public domain, approximately the amount of land that could have been reserved under the 1915 act.

The Interior Department agreed with the spirit of Bartlett's bill, which called for in-place grants to be replaced with a quantity grant.

A grant of school sections in place is a grant of lands widely dispersed on a geographical basis. Such a grant gives the recipient, within limits, a fair proportion of the various classes of lands within its boundaries, the good as well as the bad. Since the grantee's holdings are distributed over a wide area, large-scale exchange programs are required, as we have learned by experience, to bring the holdings together into manageable and economical units...

A very large proportion of the land in Alaska does not appear to promise, for the reasonably near future, any substantial economic return. A grant of school sections in place would, therefore, leave the Territory with a large body of widely dispersed holdings, needing management and protection and yielding little in the way of revenues. (Assistant Secy to Rep. Engle, RG 233, U.S. House, National Archives, Box 97A, H.R. 246)

Though the Interior Department favored quantity grants in principle, the department opposed revoking the 1915 school and university section reservation on the grounds that the Territory was not yet ready to manage 20 million acres. Rather, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior suggested granting three million acres immediately to the Territory as the first installment of a large quantity grant that would eventually replace the 1915 reservations. Furthermore, Interior Department officials suggested that the revenue from the three million acres be divided as follows:

- 20%—public schools
- 20%—University of Alaska
- 20%—University of Alaska Teacher Training
- 40%—discretion of the legislature

(Assistant Secy to Rep. Engle, 23 May 1956, RG 233, U.S. House, Box 97A, H.R. 246)

UA CAMPAIGN FOR ADDITIONAL GRANT LAND

Charles Bunnell's successors as University of Alaska president, Terris Moore (1949-1953) and Ernest Patty (1953-1960), both recognized the necessity for the university to gain additional land if it was to be placed on a secure financial footing. President Patty noted in 1955 that the university had virtually no income at all from its small amount of surveyed Section 33 land in the Tanana Valley, which he claimed was predominantly "moose pasture" anyway. He estimated the UA's total income from the Tanana Valley land reservation was only about \$20 a year. (Patty to Sen. Anderson, 21 July 1955, UA Pres Papers, 1955/56, Box 5, File 93)

President Patty made the acquisition of additional grant land and the repeal of the restrictions on existing university land—especially the prohibition against selecting mineral lands, and the ten-year leasing limit, which eliminated the possibility of any private investments on educational land—primary goals of his admin-

istration. Under Patty for the first time in its history, the University actually designated a land manager to look after its holdings.

Starting in 1954, Patty made numerous proposals to the Secretary of Interior for more land, including a request that the U.S. government grant the university part of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 on Alaska's Arctic coast, so that the school could participate in any bounties from future oil leases. In order to stimulate Alaskan economic development, Patty suggested in July 1954 that the Territory be immediately granted one million acres, instead of waiting to receive several million acres that could come with eventual statehood. (Land Manager Report, 20 May 1958, Pres. Papers, 1958/59, Box 6, File 88)

Since all recognized that the lack of surveys had effectively negated any effective land grants in the past, the University of Alaska Board of Regents unanimously passed an official resolution in October 1955, requesting the right to select half-a-million acres—including mineral rights—of unsurveyed lands, to support the institution. The resolution stated:

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents, recognizing their responsibilities in the furnishing of higher education in Alaska, and whereas (sic) must continually maintain an adequate source of funds for the conduct of a good university, and

WHEREAS, it is an accepted and desirable procedure for a state university to look to the income from land under its jurisdiction as a source of funds for the university, and

WHEREAS, valuable lands in Alaska are not being developed because they have not been surveyed, and

WHEREAS, the University is being denied an important source of income because mineral rights are withheld for land under its jurisdiction;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Congress of the United States is urged to enact appropriate legislation to grant the University of Alaska the authority to select land up to 500,000 acres with full mineral rights and permission to select non-surveyed land...

(Minutes of UA Board of Regents, 24 October 1955) Congress failed to act on the Board of Regents' request.

ELIMINATION OF DEDICATED LAND GRANTS

Initially, university officials were not particularly alarmed at the prospect of losing the 1915 reservation with the coming of statehood. Most statehood bills would have given the university an additional one million acres—almost four times the amount of land that the institution would have lost with the abolition of the Tanana Valley educational reserve. In the final push towards statehood in 1957-1958, however, the internal improvement grants of 2,550,000 acres—including the 500,000 acres for the University and 500,000 acres for the University's teacher training programs—were consolidated into the 100 million acre general grant, leaving the disposition of all 102,550,500 acres at the discretion of the legislature.

Beyond eliminating the specific grant of one million acres for higher education, the final statehood bill also cancelled the 1915 education reserve (though it did confirm the university's rights to the few thousand acres of Section 33 land that were already reserved and surveyed). The congressional intent clearly was that the massive unrestricted quantity grant substituted for the 1915 reserve. As Assistant Secretary of the Interior Hatfield Chilson wrote in March 1957, "In view of the quantify grants contained in the bill, we agree that section 1 of the 1915 act should be repealed. As of the present time, only a small percentage of the Territory has been surveyed, and we suggest that, as to such lands, the sections which have been reserved for educational purposes should be granted to the State of Alaska to be used by it for the purposes for which they were reserved." (U.S. House 1957: 25)

Apparently, the elimination of the designated internal improvement grants from the statehood bill for the University of Alaska and other essential state services was done with the full support and backing of Alaska Delegate Bob Bartlett, who had long

V. THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGE WITHOUT THE LAND

LOSS OF A QUARTER-MILLION ACRES DUE TO STATEHOOD

opposed attempts to dedicate state land for specific purposes. Looking back on the issue in 1964, then Senator Bartlett explained his reasoning to Gov. William A. Egan. He had always opposed dedicated land grants, he said, because he did not want to see the chaotic inter-agency bickering which had plagued Alaska during Territorial days, the same fear which led Alaska's constitutional framers to create a powerful executive branch. Bartlett continued:

I have a particularly strong feeling on this because at many times during consideration of the statehood bill, efforts were made to set aside this amount of land or that amount of land for the common schools and for other educational uses. I always resisted these and, as it turned out, successfully. My conviction was—and is—that notwithstanding the possible need for such reservations in the early statehood bills, the reasons for such have long since evaporated. I suspect that in those days there was not the dedication or devotion to education which has since come into being and it was felt that an assured source of income must be provided for the schools. That is not so in these days... (If dedication is made for one institution or one purpose, what argument could be made against expanding? None, of course. The philosophy here is closely akin, as I believe, to board control of a state agency with the Governor serving only as a figurehead. If it is done for one department of government, then almost necessarily it must be done for all. Once we are there, we have the chaos of territorial days all over again. (Bartlett to Egan, 8 June 1964, UA Pres Papers, 1963/64, Box 14, Folder 212)

The passage of the Statehood Act in 1958, without any provision for land specifically dedicated for the support of the University of Alaska, ended for the time being at least the possibility of getting additional land from the federal government. But even more critical from the point of view of the university was its loss of the balance of the Tanana Valley Section 33 reservation—more than a quarter million acres. The statehood act cancelled the 1915 reservation of educational lands, stopping any further lands under the act from being reserved once they were surveyed, though reaffirming the university's rights to any acreage already surveyed, selected, and reserved.

University attorney Ed Merdes wrote Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton in early 1960 to clarify the status of the Section 33 lands. Merdes wrote that one interpretation of the statehood act, could be that all Section 33s were still in fact reserved, pending a survey. Merdes argued:

From a reasonable interpretation of the language of the Act, it appears that Section 33 continues to be reserved, subject only to being surveyed; and that upon the survey of these lands, title to the same immediately passes to the state for the University of Alaska. It is not clear whether such lands are included in or in addition to the grant of 102 (sic) million acres specified in Section 6(b) of the Statehood Act and although we would like to think it is "in addition to", we suspicion (sic) it is "included in" the 102 million acres. (Merdes to Seaton, 7 March 1960, Pres Papers, 1959/60, Box 6, File 90)

The Secretary's answer has not been found in the files, however, it is clear from the historical record that the government maintained the Section 33 land could not be reserved until surveyed and selected. Therefore, any lands not surveyed prior to the statehood act, could in no way be still considered reserved.

The UA did make an effort to keep its rights to some of the disputed Section 33 land. During the week before President Eisenhower signed the statehood act on January 3, 1959, UA land manager Donald Eyinck filed 64,000 acres of indemnity selections chosen in lieu of surveyed Section 33 land in the Tanana Valley which had been denied to the university. Eyinck filed the applications, as attorney Merdes wrote, "to keep alive any possible rights the University might have to these lands," despite

the repeal of the 1915 reservation by the statehood act. Merdes said the filing was also done because he thought it might possibly "be the basis for either grandfather rights or legislation that would grant the University additional lands, seemingly lost by said repeal." (Merdes to Wood, 15 November 1960, Pres Papers, 1959/60, Box 6, File 85; Board of Regents Minutes, 20-22 October 1960)

The Bureau of Land Management rejected the university's 64,000 acre indemnity selections on the grounds that the selections were not timely. BLM argued that as of January 3, 1959, the official day Alaska became a state, the reservation was no longer in existence. Since, by that date, the lands had not yet been reserved, title could not be transferred. It is unclear from the record, however, precisely why applications filed prior to January 3 would have been automatically disallowed and not given some grandfather rights.

Merdes contacted now Senator Bartlett's legislative assistant, Joe Josephson, about the impact of the statehood act on university land selections in the Tanana Valley. Based on his research in unpublished Congressional hearings, and discussions with Senator Bartlett, Josephson replied unequivocally that Congressional intent in the statehood act had been for the new state government to address the issue of the size of the university's land grant. In a memo to Merdes, Josephson wrote:

The theory of the land-grant provisions in the statehood act was that they would replace inter alia [among other things] the reservations authorized in 48 U.S.C. 353 and that the state university would petition the state government to satisfy the needs of the University which previously to statehood were met in part by 48 U.S.C. 353. (Josephson to Merdes, 10 November 1959, Pres Papers, 1959/60, Box 6, File 85)

Besides the legal issue, Josephson argued that it would be politically disastrous to ask Congress to reopen such a major clause of the statehood compact as the land grant.

Such a decision would encompass broad issues of tactics affecting all the legislation which relates to the welfare of Alaska. Unfortunately, there may still be members of Congress who look at the admission of Alaska with a disapproving eye and who would seize upon proposed legislation to make the terms of the Act of Admission more generous from the state's point of view to prove that their position against statehood was correct and, possibly, to justify rejection of other programs. (Josephson to Merdes, 10 November 1959, Pres Papers, 1959/60, Box 6, File 85)

Merdes accepted Josephson's reasoning, and recommended the university drop the 64,000 acre claim against the federal government and concentrate on getting additional land from the state government. "For even if the lands were reserved," Merdes wrote in a memo to the university president, "let alone merely filed upon, there still would be no chance of success, since the intent of Congress was to repeal 48USCA 353, and thereby permit the University to obtain future lands from the State under the generous grant given to Alaska in the Statehood Act, rather than as an individual entity." (Merdes to Wood, 10 November 1960, Pres Papers, 1959/60, Box 6, File 85)

LEGISLATIVE APPROVAL OF ONE MILLION ACRES FOR UA

The university sought redress for its land deficiencies from the state of Alaska. Probably the clearest evidence that many Alaskans assumed that the new state would designate additional lands for the support of the university was the passage by the first state legislature in the spring of 1959 of a measure authorizing the state to reserve one-million acres for the UA.

The original version of the university land bill (House Bill No. 176) declared the legislature's ultimate intent was eventually to grant the university five million acres "for the purpose of replacing those grants previously allowed under federal law... which has been superseded... and for the further purpose of establishing a means by which the University may be properly maintained and operated and direct state support thereby reduced." The measure specifically called for the UA to "select, accept or

secure by July 7, 1983" one million acres "from those lands granted the state by the federal government." Sixteen legislators from across Alaska—or 40 percent of the entire body—joined in sponsoring H.B. 176. Among others, the list of sponsors of the UA's land restitution bill included future Alaska governor Jay S. Hammond of Naknek, House Speaker Warren Taylor, the entire Fairbanks delegation, and other members from Anchorage, Nome, McKinley Park, Cordova, McGrath, Seward, and Point Barrow.

A committee substitute scaled down the legislative intent language to one million acres. "This reservation of land," the substitute bill stated, "shall be for the purpose of replacing grants of certain Sections 33 in the Tanana Valley previously allowed under federal law and now superseded" by the statehood act. (Committee Substitute for H.B. 176)

After a heated debate, the committee substitute passed the House on March 24, 1959 by a vote of 26-10, with four absences. One legislative observer noted that opponents of the bill were either "anti-university" (no one from Southeastern Alaska supported the measure) or were "anti-dedicated fund votes as they considered the granting of land another form of earmarking funds..." (Butler to Patty, 24 March 1959, Pres Papers, 1958/59, Box 6, File 93) In the state senate, the one million acre appropriation passed unanimously 20-0, after Senators changed the terminology in the bill from "granting lands" to "reserving lands for the support of." (Alaska Senate Journal, 1st Legislature, 1st Session, 1959: 859-860)

EGAN'S VETO OF ONE MILLION ACRE UA RESERVE

It came as a shock to President Patty and the Board of Regents when Governor William A. Egan vetoed the one million acre bill on May 4, 1959. Egan gave numerous justifications for his rejection of the legislature's bill, and his veto message detailed his strong philosophical objections to it. His veto read in part:

I am vetoing COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 176, a bill intended to reserve lands for the support of the University of Alaska, because I believe it wrong in principle, inconsistent with constitutional concepts and not in the public interest. In so saying, I may add that I would act similarly on any bill which sought, as this does, to make special disposition of the proceeds of public lands in aid of one public function to the exclusion of others. For more than a century and a half, the United States has granted to new states, on admission, lands for particular purposes. These so-called 'internal improvement grants' have been made for a variety of purposes, i.e., public schools, universities, normal schools, capital building, penal institutions, etc., and have comprised in all, a hodge-podge of grants for varied purposes, without assurance that in selection, income potential, or quality, lands so earmarked would be equitably apportioned among state functions.

Governor Egan correctly stated that traditionally federal lands were specifically earmarked for internal improvements such as penitentiaries, mental institutions, etc.. But as this report has demonstrated, the vast majority of federal land grants to states were for the support of education. Egan then gave the legislature his version of why the land provisions in the Alaska statehood were unique.

Some years ago, a Senate Committee headed by Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming, while considering Alaska's proposed admission to the union, developed an entirely new concept of federal land grants to newly admitted states. That new concept sought, instead of the earmarked 'internal improvement' grants, to grant to the new state a specified total acreage for the support of state functions, yet earmarked for none. In short, the proceeds of such lands would go to the state treasury for suitable allotment of income by the legislature to the various state functions as circumstances might from time-to-time require.

That proposal, in terms of lands, is consistent with Alaska's constitutional and budget concepts regarding public monies and their earmarking, and allows desired flexibility in meeting changed conditions from year-to-year.

The governor then explained the heart of the matter as far as he was concerned. If the university received its internal improvement grant, how could the state refuse similar land grants for other state functions? According to Egan, the university was no different from any other agency of state government.

If we are to return to the 'internal improvement' concept of earmarking state lands, can we in good conscience limit the practice to the University? Why not similar provision for common schools, public buildings, hospitals, penal institutions, highways, airports, aid to dependent children, and so on throughout the entire list of important state functions? Certainly, this bill invites similar treatment for other state responsibilities. By this bill, the door would be opened to an unplanned disposition, or dissipation, of the resource without regard to relative need and without regard to the clear constitutional and congressional intent.

Besides Egan's philosophical opposition to the state granting additional land to the university, he claimed UA leaders were mistaken in believing that unsurveyed Section 33 lands were ever truly University of Alaska lands. The confusion arose from the difference between surveyed reserved lands (such as the 1915 in-place Section 33 reservation) and granted lands (such as the 1929 quantity grant of 100,000 acres).

Prior to the passage of the statehood bill, certain Sections 33 in the Tanana Valley were reserved, not granted, to the territory on the condition that their rental proceeds go to the University... To suggest that those other areas, which, on survey some time in the distant future, would have become numbered Sections 33 in the Tanana Valley, but which have never been surveyed and, therefore, have never been reserved nor productive of income for the University, have now been lost, is to say that the University has lost something it never had.

In conclusion, Egan rejected what had long been the basic financial concept behind the land grant institution. "I wish to make it perfectly clear that I have great interest in the University of Alaska," he wrote, "and that this veto is motivated by good administrative practices alone. The University's financing will be sounder and more certain by reliance on the appropriation and bonding processes." (Alaska Senate Journal, 1st Legislature, 1st Session, 1098-1100)

REACTION TO EGAN'S VETO

President Patty and the regents assumed that Egan's veto was based on the fact that the governor had been hospitalized with a severe illness when the measure was under discussion, and that he misunderstood the unique role and history of land-grant colleges in America. Following the passage of the bill by the legislature, Patty had never even bothered to contact Egan, thinking the governor was sure to sign it into law. As Patty wrote one legislator on June 15, 1959:

We were completely caught off base by the Governor's veto of the land bill. I think he made a very serious mistake which was based largely on the fact that he did not understand that there is historical precedent in every state of land grants to their land-grant university. Also, I feel he was not advised of the fact that the University lost potentially (sic) millions of acres of land under the Statehood act. (Patty to Erwin, 15 June 1959, Pres Papers, 1959/60, Box 6, Folder 96)

C.W. Snedden's Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, a key player in the battle for statehood, explained that Egan's veto left the "University in the slightly unique position of being a land-grant university without any land to speak of." *The News-Miner* continued:

Governor Egan may have lost sight of the fact that with the coming of statehood to Alaska, the University of Alaska lost its right to acquire almost a million acres of Alaska land.

The University's rights to this land, as has been stated by Dr. Ernest Patty, president of the University, have been 'washed out' in the bill which granted more than a hundred million acres of land to the new state. We agree with Dr. Patty in the belief that the theory behind depriving the University of this land was that Congress felt the state would provide adequately for the University through special land grants.

The assumption was proved correct when the legislature acted to ensure that a land area equivalent to that lost to the University by passage of statehood was restored... We do not believe that Governor Egan's veto of this bill has or will ever have the support of the Alaskan public. We feel the veto reflects a lack of appreciation for the importance of providing an independent source of revenue for our University—an ever growing asset not subject to the whims of future legislatures. (News-Miner, 7 May 1959)

THE UA'S "STARVATION GRANT"

Patty wrote Egan in February 1960 to renew the campaign for the university's land bill. "The Regents and I felt that this was the most forward looking Bill for the University that had ever reached the Legislature," Patty wrote, "and we were all surprised when you vetoed it. This veto came shortly after you returned from the hospital and I blamed myself for not making a special trip to Juneau to explain the background of the bill." (Patty to Egan, 8 Feb 1960)

In his six-page letter, President Patty highlighted for the governor ten reasons why the legislation was essential:

1. The history and theory behind the Morrill Act setting up a Land-Grant University in each state is based on the theory that each Land-Grant University would be given a land grant for the partial support of the University...
2. The Statehood Act for Alaska took away from the University the major portion of its original Land Grant.
3. The University now has only a minimal grant of land; much of this is of no immediate value and compared, area wise, to the other states, it is one of the smallest and (sic) unpromising grants of any state university.
4. Most universities now have a subsidiary income from lands or other property. This is generally used for research and for projects that cannot be readily financed from legislative appropriations. The income from lands should be invested in an endowment fund and only the income from this fund should be disbursed. The idea the University might possibly secure an income beyond its reasonable need is a misconception beyond the realm of possibility.
5. There may come a time in the history of the state when some great financial crisis will develop. If the university had, by that time, developed an important endowment, then the income from this might be very helpful in tiding the university through the difficult period.
6. To avoid duplication, the land granted to the university would be handled by the state Division of lands and there would be limitations on the amount of land which the university could acquire in any one year.
7. The land-grant idea is workable and has 100 years of history behind it.
8. A broad financial base is important.
9. (A) Strong state university is vital to growth of state...
10. A subsidiary endowment income will help to make the difference between a moderately good university and an outstanding university.

Patty detailed the history of the university's land grant. He recounted how the statehood act had cost the university some 259,296 acres of the total 268,800 acre reservation created in the Tanana Valley in 1915 and called it a "pathetic situation." The university's total income from its 1915 Tanana Valley land was only \$243 a year.

Even with the 100,000 acre grant of 1929, which the statehood act had not affected, Patty calculated that the university's total land grant amounted to only 109,504 acres. "This is a starvation grant for a land-grant university located in a state containing 365 million acres," Patty wrote. "Actually the requested addition of one million acres is very modest and is less than one percent of the land which the state will acquire."

The university president then blasted what he called the "trickle down theory" as completely counter to the theory behind land-grant institutions.

Obviously, some of the state income from land will trickle down to the university, but this violates the original concept of the Land-Grant Act which sought to provide a partial and separate form of income to supplement the work of the university, which cannot always be financed by annual appropriations.

The Board of Regents plan to use its land income as an endowment fund and to draw off only the income from this endowment. It would probably be 10 years hence before this endowment would yield an important income. Who knows, if we could build up an endowment of several million dollars the income would be vital in keeping the university alive, if lean years should come. At the present time, the endowment fund of the university, in the hands of the state treasurer, totals only \$15,300.

Patty scoffed at the idea that the university might end up with too much money if it received additional land. "This is beyond even the most remote possibility," he wrote. "The chances are many times better that you or I might win the Nenana Ice Classic." At that time, even the oil-rich University of Texas received only 39 percent of their budget from their endowment. "What a wonderful thing it would be for all Alaska if a great oil bonanza should be developed on university land and we could accumulate an endowment of 50 million dollars and use the income from this in perpetuity."

In conclusion, Patty suggested to Egan that the legislation allow the University of Alaska to select up to one million acres over the next 20 years. He predicted it could be a decade or longer before the endowment grew to any significant size. "However, I would expect that our grandchildren would conclude that we had great foresight."

Initially, Patty believed in early 1960 he was making progress convincing Egan of the rightness of the university's cause. In a memorandum to the Board of Regents in late February, Patty noted: "When I talked to the Governor several weeks ago he told me that he had been reluctant to veto the Bill and even suggested that if we would wait two or three years he might be willing to change his mind."

But on his next visit with Egan, Patty found the governor's position against the million acre grant had hardened. "Governor has become most adamant against this," he informed the regents, "and indicated that if the Legislature again passed this Bill he would veto it. Several members of the Legislature are anxious and willing to promote the Bill, but I did not encourage them for there seems to be no chance to pass the measure over the Governor's veto." (Patty to Regents, 29 February 1960, Pres Papers 1963/64, Box 14, File 206)

CONTINUATION OF EFFORTS IN 1960s TO ACQUIRE LAND

Governor Egan's steadfast opposition to granting the university additional land doomed the effort on the state level. Nevertheless, bills to provide the UA additional land continued to find support in the legislature and were regularly introduced throughout the 1960s.

Patty's successor as UA President, Dr. William R. Wood, kept up the fight for a new land grant from either the state or the federal government, or both. According to Wood, state and federal authorities always agreed that the university should receive additional land and agreed that the other party should provide it.

**PRESIDENT WOOD LOBBIES FOR
NORTH SLOPE LAND**

Wood found the possibility of acquiring new land particularly appealing, because, for the first time in its history, the university finally started to earn a sizeable income from its land holdings in 1961 when it began selling oil leases on its Kenai Peninsula land. In its first 43 years, the university's cumulative income from land was only \$16,256.03. But with the start of oil leasing in FY 60/61, the UA earned \$604,470 in one year alone, or about 38 times what it had earned since 1917. No oil was ever struck on university land, however, and thereafter the amount netted from oil leasing steadily declined. (UA Permanent Fund Statement, 1917-1971, Pres Papers, 1971/72, Box "Higher Ed...", File, Land—July-Dec)

In April 1964, when Congress was grappling with relief efforts for the Good Friday Earthquake, President Wood wired Sen. Bartlett if it would be "presumptuous" to request amending the statehood act and give the university three million acres. "This could provide base for much-needed sustained support of the university now central to development of state's resources and nationally valuable as regional environmental research center." (Wood to Bartlett, 25 April 1964) Bartlett's administrative assistant Mary Lee Council dashed Wood's hopes. "Since any omnibus or other legislation will relate strictly to the disaster," she wrote, "I would doubt very much whether legislation of the kind you mention would be entertained." (Council to Wood, 28 April 1964, Pres Papers, 1963/64, Box 14, File 212)

Continuing discussions with both state and federal officials, President Wood tried a new approach to acquire the three million acres he believed the university required for financial security. Wood proposed to Senator Bartlett that the university be given land from either "within the Arctic Wildlife Range, from Naval (Petroleum Reserve) No. 4, when and if the Reserve is eliminated or diminished in size, from the existing public domain, or from lands already acquired or to be acquired by the state." Before taking up Wood's suggestion with Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, Bartlett conferred with Roscoe Bell, director of the state Division of Lands. "I am reminded that Governor Egan once vetoed a bill involving the university lands," Bartlett wrote, "but my memory on the subject is somewhat hazy..." (Bartlett to Bell, 14 May 1964)

Lands Director Bell informed Bartlett that the state would continue to oppose giving the university new lands from the public domain, simply because it would merely take away land from the State of Alaska. Already the Division of Lands faced a difficult challenge finding land that would in fact produce any revenue. "Any new authorizations for university land selection from open public domain would appear unacceptable," Bell wrote Bartlett, "because such would in effect, reduce other state land suitable for selection. (The acreage of land having apparent value seems far below the state's entitlement of 103,000,000 acres." Bell then reiterated Egan's long-standing objections. He wrote Senator Bartlett,

I am sure that you understand perfectly the state's past position in opposing a university land selection of several million acres of valuable land, which could result in a situation where the university has valuable lands producing more revenue than would be needed while other state functions were neglected because of lack of funds. (Bell to Bartlett, 27 May 1964)

However, there was one idea for giving the University of Alaska land to which Bell and Governor Egan responded enthusiastically: taking it from a pre-existing federal reserve, such as the nine million acre Arctic Wildlife Range (now known as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or ANWR) created in 1960.

Bell complained that though the Arctic Wildlife Range was supposed to be "subject to multiple use management," such a hope was unrealistic. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, he charged, "is of necessity more or less beholden to conservationists, some of whom are radical and articulate single-use wilderness proponents (sic)." However, he speculated, "Perhaps revocation of the withdrawal could be accomplished if it were to permit a university selection for conservation and

management as a 'great Arctic Wildland Management Laboratory.'" Bell explained his proposal in some detail, by which the Arctic Wildlife Range would be supplanted by a university laboratory.

The University and its motives in management could not be questioned. The University likewise has the potential for tapping foundation monies as well as entering into cooperative agreements with federal agencies under which it might be possible to develop a program of Arctic Wildlife Research and Resource Management without unbearable cost to the state of Alaska. As 'university land,' the land would be under the full management control of the university. At the same time, multiple-use management and revenue production would be a possibility without violation of the primary purpose of the 'laboratory.' Because it appears that the state would have little probability getting the land restored to the public domain to permit normal selection and management procedures, and since the land does offer some possibility of producing revenue ultimately to help support the university, such a program might possibly be supportable by the state. Enabling state legislation would be required to authorize such a university selection of several million acres. To be acceptable, such a selection would probably be limited to lands made available by revocation of the Arctic wildlife refuge. (Bell to Barden, 27 May 1964)

Governor Egan supported Bell's proposal that the Arctic Wildlife Range be replaced in whole or in part by a University of Alaska Management Laboratory. Thus, the state of Alaska had no objection to the University of Alaska receiving millions of acres of additional land, if it came from a federal reserve closed to exploration and development, that would otherwise be unavailable for general state selection. There is no evidence in the record, however, that federal authorities ever showed any support for the plan.

AFTER THE LAND FREEZE

With the defeat of Governor Bill Egan by Walter Hickel in the 1966 election, Hickel promised a new era of Alaskan economic development. Yet the land freeze instituted by Secretary of Interior Udall in December 1966 virtually brought state land selections to a dead stop and extinguished the fading hope that the University of Alaska might be able to receive an additional land grant in the foreseeable future. Legally and politically the Alaska land picture grew more complex year-by-year. Within the next 15 years the open public domain in Alaska would essentially vanish, as the entire state was parceled off among development interests, environmental interests, and Native groups, with settlement of the Native Land Claims issue in 1971, construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline from 1974-1977, and passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act in 1980.

Now that Alaska's land issues have been somewhat resolved, university supporters have again proposed that additional lands be granted to the University of Alaska from either the state or the federal government, or both, to resolve the financial issue which continues to haunt the land-grant college without the land.



VI. Sources

1. BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

Atwood, Evangeline. 1979.

Frontier Politics: Alaska's James Wickersham. Portland: Binford and Mort.
Carstensen, Vernon., 1963.

The Public Lands: Studies in the History of the Public Domain. Madison:
University of Wisconsin Press.

Daily Alaska Dispatch (Juneau).

Eddy, Edward D., 1957.

Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land-Grant Idea in American Education.
New York: Harper and Brothers.

Fairbanks Daily News-Miner.

Gates, Paul Wallace., 1943.

The Wisconsin Pine Lands of Cornell University. New York:
Cornell University Press.

Gruening, Ernest H., 1954.

The State of Alaska. New York: Random House.

Hibbard, Benjamin H., 1939.

A History of the Public Land Policies. New York: Peter Smith.

Land Grant Fact Book: Centennial Edition., 1962. Washington: National Association
of State University and LandGrant Colleges.

Madsen, David., 1976.

"The Land-Grant University: Myth and Reality," pp. 23-48, in G. Lester Ander-
son, ed., Land-Grant Universities and Their Continuing Challenge. Michigan State
University Press, 1976.

Naske, Claus-M., 1972.

"103,350,000 Acres," Alaska Journal, Autumn 1972.

Naske, Claus-M., 1979.

Edward Lewis "Bob" Bartlett of Alaska: A Life in Politics. Fairbanks: University
of Alaska Press.

Naske, Claus-M., 1985.

A History of Alaska Statehood. Maryland: University Press of America.

Peffer, E. Louise. The Closing of the Public Domain: Disposal and Reservation
Policies 1900-50. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ross, Earle D., 1969.

Democracy's College: The Land-Grant Movement in the Formative State. New
York: Arno Press and the New York Times.

Taylor, Howard Cromwell., 1969.

The Educational Significance of the Early Federal Land Ordinances. New York:
Arno Press and the New York Times.

2. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Alaska Senate Journal., 1953.

Chipperfield, W.A., 1954.

Report: Alaska Territorial Department of Lands.

Congressional Record.

Ducker, James H., 1992.

BLM Alaska Historical Chronology (Draft). Anchorage: State Office of Bureau
of Land Management.

Stein, Gary., 1987.

"Promised Land": A History of Alaska's Selection of its Congressional Land
Grants. Anchorage: Alaska Dept. of Natural Resources.

U.S. Dept. of Interior., 1939.

School Lands: Land Grants to States and Territories For Educational and Other Purposes. Information Bulletin, 1939 Series, No. 1.

U.S. House, 1915.

Reservation of School Lands in Alaska. Report No. 1280, 63rd Congress, 3rd Session.

U.S. House, 1947.

Statehood for Alaska: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions of the Committee on Public Lands, April 16-24, 1947, 80th Congress, 1st Session, Committee Hearing No. 9.

U.S. House, 1949.

Statehood for Alaska: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions of the Committee on Public Lands on H.R. 331, March 4, 8, 1949, 81st Congress, 1st Session, Committee Hearing Serial No. 3.

U.S. House, 1953.

Providing for the Admission of Alaska Into the Union. Report No. 675, 83rd Congress, 1st Session.

U.S. House, 1957.

Statehood for Alaska: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, March 11-29, 1957, 85th Congress, 1st Session, Serial No. 6.

U.S. Senate, 1929.

Additional Grant of Lands to Agricultural College and School of Mines, Territory of Alaska. Report No. 1419, 70th Congress, 2nd Session.

U.S. Senate, 1950.

Alaska Statehood: Hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, April 24-29, 1950, 81st Congress, 2nd Session.

U.S. Senate, 1954.

Providing for the Admission of Alaska Into the Union. Report No. 1028, 83rd Congress, 2nd Session.

U.S. Senate, 1954a.

Alaska Statehood: Hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 50, Jan 20-Feb 24, 1954, 83rd Congress, 2nd Session.

3. ARCHIVAL RECORDS

University of Alaska Archives (Fairbanks)

- Anthony J. Dimond Collection
- Charles E. Bunnell Collection
- Dan Sutherland Collection
- E. L. "Bob" Bartlett Collection
- William A. Egan Collection
- General Correspondence of the Alaska Territorial Governors
- Minutes of the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska
- Papers of the Presidents of the University of Alaska

National Archives, Washington D.C.

- RG 48, Office Files of the Secretary of Interior
- RG 233, Records of the House of Representatives
- RG 46, Records of the United States Senate

4. INTERVIEWS

- William R. Wood
- Al George
- John Butrovich
- Richard Greuel
- Joseph Josephson
- Harold Byrd

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2006 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: _____

Bill Version: HJR 14

() Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____

Title URGE CONGRESS TO GRANT LAND TO UNIV.

Dept. Affected: _____

RDU _____

Component _____

Sponsor Representative Elkins

Requester House Special Committee on Education

Component No. _____

Expenditures/Revenues

(Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2006) cost: 0.0

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2007 budget proposal: ☐

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Prepared by: Beth Schneider

Division Committee Aide, House Special Committee on Education

Phone 465-3820

Date/Time _____

Approved by: Representative Mark Neuman

Agency Chair, House Special Committee on Education

Date 1/31/2006

SCOMM

137:40

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2006 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 1 (CORRECTED)

Bill Version: SB 235

(S) Publish Date: 1/17/06

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction):

Dept. Affected: Education

Title An act relating to school performance
incentive payments

RDU K-12 Support

Component New -School Performance

Sponsor Rules Committee

Incentive Program

Requester Governor

Component No.

Expenditures/Revenues

(Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims	15,000.0					
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	15,000.0	**	**	**	**	**

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()

FUND SOURCE

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	15,000.0					
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type-Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	15,000.0	**	**	**	**	**

Estimate of any current year (FY2006) cost: 0.0

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2007 budget proposal: ☐

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This legislation will allow the Department of Education & Early Development to establish a school performance incentive program. This program will provide an incentive payment of up to \$5,500 for certified personnel and up to \$2,500 for noncertified personnel if the students in their school demonstrate substantial growth in achievement on state assessments from one year to the next. Incentive payments will be based on four achievement levels. The cost of the incentive program will vary from one year to the next based on the number of schools that qualify and at which level. Because it is not known how many schools will qualify for the incentive payments in FY2007, the department will seek an extended lapse date for this appropriation through June 30, 2008.

The following page outlines the amount of the bonus for each of the achievement levels. There is also an estimate of the range of costs for the program. If 5% of Alaska's school staff qualified for the incentive at the highest level, the cost would be approximately \$3 million and up to \$15 million if 25% qualify.

Prepared by: Barbara Thompson, Director

Phone

Division: Teaching & Learning Support

Date/Time: 1/11/06 3:00 PM

Approved by: Roger Sampson

Date: 1/12/2006

Agency: Commissioner

STATE OF ALASKA
2006 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. SB 235

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

Staffing: The department will utilize existing staff, to the extent possible, to calculate the schools that qualify for the bonus at which level, the staff to be awarded the bonus and to make the actual grant payments and provide the accounting support. Depending upon the volume of payments, it may be necessary to hire staff. If so, funds would be transferred from the grant line to cover personnel costs.

The School Performance Incentive Program will have four levels: Strong; High; Excellent; Outstanding. All school staff, certified and non-certified will be eligible for the incentive payment if the students in the school meet the achievement targets. The table below outlines the levels and the amount of the incentive payment for each level:

Achievement Level	Bonus Amount for Certified Staff	Bonus Amount for Non-Certified Staff
Strong	\$2,500	\$1,000
High	\$3,500	\$1,500
Excellent	\$4,500	\$2,000
Outstanding	\$5,500	\$2,500
Approximate # of Employees Statewide	9,000	3,700

The following chart illustrates a range of costs based on estimates of the percentage of school staff that would qualify for the incentive at the highest level or \$5,500 per certified staff and \$2,500 for non-certified staff:

Achievement Level = Outstanding

Range of Cost - Assumptions

Assumption % of staff that qualify for bonus	Estimate of Certified Staff that qualify (of approx. 9,000)	Estimate of Non-Certified Staff that qualify (of approx 3,700)	Range of Certified Cost Based on % of staff	Range of Non- Certified Cost Based on % of staff	Central Office Staff may receive up to 5% of the total paid to all employees at all schools	Total
5%	450	185	\$2,475,000	\$462,500	\$146,875	\$3,084,375
10%	900	370	\$4,950,000	\$925,000	\$293,750	\$6,168,750
15%	1,350	555	\$7,425,000	\$1,387,500	\$440,625	\$9,253,125
20%	1,800	740	\$9,900,000	\$1,850,000	\$587,500	\$12,337,500
25%	2,250	925	\$12,375,000	\$2,312,500	\$734,375	\$15,421,875
30%	2,700	1,110	\$14,850,000	\$2,775,000	\$881,250	\$18,506,250
40%	3,600	1,480	\$19,800,000	\$3,700,000	\$1,175,000	\$24,675,000
50%	4,500	1,850	\$24,750,000	\$4,625,000	\$1,468,750	\$30,843,750
75%	6,750	2,775	\$37,125,000	\$6,937,500	\$2,203,125	\$46,265,625
100%	9,000	3,700	\$49,500,000	\$9,250,000	\$2,937,500	\$61,687,500

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2006 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 2
Bill Version: CSSB 235(FIN)
(S) Publish Date: 4/12/06

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction):		Dept. Affected:	Education
Title	An act relating to school performance incentive payments	RDU	K-12 Support
Sponsor	Rules Committee	Component	New-School Performance Incentive Program
Requester	Governor	Component No.	

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims	5,800.0	5,800.0	5,800.0	**	**	**
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	5,800.0	5,800.0	5,800.0	**	**	**

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	5,800.0	5,800.0	5,800.0	**	**	**
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type--Do not abbreviate)						
TOTAL	5,800.0	5,800.0	5,800.0	**	**	**

Estimate of any current year (FY2006) cost: 0.0

Mark this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2007 budget proposal: ☐

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This legislation will allow the Department of Education & Early Development to establish a school performance incentive program. This program will provide an incentive payment of up to \$5,500 for certified personnel and up to \$2,500 for noncertified personnel if the students in their school demonstrate substantial growth in achievement on state assessments from one year to the next. Incentive payments will be based on four achievement levels. The cost of the incentive program will not exceed \$5.8 million annually because the program is limited to 850 certified staff and approximately 340 non-certified staff. The program will sunset June 30, 2009. This bill also requires LB&A to review the program by December 31, 2008 and recommend whether it should be continued or not.

It is not expected that all 850 certified staff will qualify for the maximum bonus. EED prepared this fiscal note to show the legislature the maximum entitlement under this pilot program. The following page outlines the amount of the bonus for each of the achievement levels.

Prepared by: Eddy Jeans, Director	Phone:
Division: School Finance	Date/Time: 2/23/06 12:00 AM
Approved by: Roger Sampson	Date: 2/23/06 12:00 AM
Agency: Commissioner	

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2006 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 2
Bill Version: CSSB 235(FIN)
(S) Publish Date: 4/12/06

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

Staffing: The department will utilize existing staff, to the extent possible, to calculate the schools that qualify for the bonus at which level, the staff to be awarded the bonus and to make the actual grant payments and provide the accounting support. Depending upon the volume of payments, it may be necessary to hire staff. If so, funds would be transferred from the grant line to cover personnel costs.

The School Performance Incentive Program will have four levels: Strong; High; Excellent; Outstanding. All school staff, certified and non-certified will be eligible for the incentive payment if the students in the school meet the achievement targets. The table below outlines the levels and the amount of the incentive payment for each level:

Achievement Level	Bonus Amount for Certified Staff	Bonus Amount for Non-Certified Staff
Strong	\$2,500	\$1,000
High	\$3,500	\$1,500
Excellent	\$4,500	\$2,000
Outstanding	\$5,500	\$2,500
Approximate # of Employees Statewide	9,000	3,700

The following chart illustrates the cost based on 850 certified staff and 340 non-certified staff that would qualify for the incentive at the highest level or \$5,500 per certified staff and \$2,500 for non-certified staff:

Achievement Level = Outstanding

Range of Cost - Assumptions

	Number of Certified Staff	Number of Non-Certified Staff	Certified Cost	Non-Certified Cost	Central Office Staff may receive up to 5% of the total paid to all employees at all schools	Total
	850	340	\$4,675,000	\$850,000	\$276,250	\$5,801,250

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY
STATE OF ALASKA

(907) 465-3808
FAX (907) 465-2029
Mail Stop 3101

130 Seward Street, Suite 400
Juneau, Alaska 99801-2105

Copies of minutes listed below were originally included in this file. The minutes are available on the legislative computer database. In order to save space copies of minutes have not been left in the files.

Mary Pagenkopf

SB 235

Senate Finance 3/17/06



School Performance Incentive Program

Goal: To accelerate growth in student achievement.

Overview of benefits to Alaska

1. Accountability: The money is directly linked to high levels of student learning.
2. Promotes effective instruction, staff collaboration, and shared responsibility.
3. Enhances Alaska's teacher recruitment efforts.
4. No-risk program: If there is no performance, there is no cost.

Why is this program different from other bonus programs?

- Focuses on how the same students performed this year compared to last year – student growth.
- Provides clear targets for meeting success.
- Provides an incentive for **ALL** school staff to work together, be creative, and design and implement systems to improve student performance.
- Provides a system for policy makers to recognize school performance.
- Focuses on improving each student's performance from where he or she currently is to proficiency and beyond.

Why have other models failed?

- Not based on individual student growth related to achievement standards.
- Unrealistic or unclear targets for success.
- Competition among staff – some must lose for others to win.
- Excluded building administrators and other school staff.
- The instrument/criteria used to measure success was not reliable and consistent.
- Compensation was not large enough to change behavior.

What will be the outcomes from this program?

- Instruction directly linked to outcomes.
- Incentive to work differently and create partnerships that will result in more than a year's growth in learning for students.
- Cause creative and effective use of instructional time in schools – scheduling the school day and year with a focus on higher levels of student learning.

- Accountability and incentive to cause students to reach proficiency and higher levels of advanced achievement.
- Responsibility for student learning and achievements is expanded to all staff.

The bottom line: The program will award bonuses to a school's administrators, teachers and support staff each year that its students show more than a year's academic growth. In some cases, school district central office staff will receive bonuses as well.

How growth is measured:

1. Each student's score on state standards-based assessments will be placed in one of six achievement categories: advanced, proficient, below proficient plus, below proficient minus, far below proficient plus, and far below proficient minus.
2. Each student's performance will be compared with his or her performance the previous year. Schools will earn various points based on whether a student moves up or down in the categories or remains in the same one.
3. The points will be totaled, and then divided by the number of students in the school to produce a school score. That score will be applied to an index that has several levels.
4. The higher the points, the larger the bonus, up to the maximum set in law. Schools that do not show progress will not earn a bonus.

Cost:

1. Bonuses will range from \$2,500 to \$5,500 for certificated staff (administrators and teachers) and \$1,000 to \$2,500 for noncertificated staff (support staff such as aides and custodians). School district central office staff, except for superintendents, who play a significant role in a school's growth will be eligible for bonuses of up to \$5,500.
2. The cost will depend on how many people earn bonuses, and on details of the point system and the index, which will be set in regulation by the State Board of Education & Early Development.
3. A fiscal note prepared by the department estimates the range of what the program could cost. For example, if 5 percent of the state's school staff members received the highest level of bonus, it would cost nearly \$3.1 million. If 25 percent of the state's school staff members received the highest level of bonus, it would cost about \$15.4 million.

Alaska School Performance Incentive Program

Measuring Individual Student Achievement

February 17, 2006

1



What is the Program?

School Performance Incentive Program

- Performance incentive pay for improved student achievement beyond a year's growth
- Entire staff in a school receive incentive (all or none) includes administrators, teachers, classified
- Target based on individual student growth
- Compares the same student from previous year to current year
- All schools qualify if they meet growth target
- Measurement tool is the Standards Based Assessments (SBA) given annually in April

February 17, 2006

2



Benefits

School Performance Incentive Program

- No risk program: no performance = no cost
- Create a strong workforce for Alaska
- Enhance teacher recruitment efforts
- Accountability: directly linked to high levels of achievement
- Promote collaboration, effective instruction and spread responsibility across grade levels and content areas
- Requires focused instruction aligned to Alaska standards

February 17, 2006

3



Expected Outcomes

School Performance Incentive Program

- All staff have ownership of instruction and share responsibility for results
- Incentive to work differently, embrace innovation and create partnerships to improve student achievement
- Accountability and incentive to cause all students to reach proficiency and higher levels of advanced achievement
- Expand responsibility for the three Rs to all staff
- Instruction designed and delivered to meet student needs

February 17, 2006

4



Why Other Models Fail

School Performance Incentive Program

- Not based on student growth
- Unrealistic targets
- Conflict among staff: Some must lose for others to win
- Exclude building administrators
- Instrument used to measure is not reliable and consistent
- Compensation not large enough to provide incentive for change
- Weak commitment to the program

February 17, 2006

5



Value Table

School Performance Incentive Program

Previous Year Level ↓	Current Year Level					
	Far Below Prof. Minus	Far Below Prof. Plus	Below Proficient Minus	Below Proficient Plus	Proficient	Advanced
Far Below Prof. Minus	0	140	170	200	220	220
Far Below Prof. Plus	0	80	140	170	200	200
Below Prof. Minus	0	40	90	140	180	180
Below Prof. Plus	0	10	50	90	140	150
Proficient	0	0	20	50	100	130
Advanced	0	0	20	50	100	110

Values may change as a result of 2006 data analysis, public input, and State Board regulations.

February 17, 2006

6



Computing Index

School Performance Incentive Program

Student	Last Year	Current Year	Points
Student A	Proficient		
Student B	Below Prof. Minus		
Student C	Advanced		
Student D	Below Prof. Plus		
Student E	Far Below Prof. Plus		
Student F	Proficient		
Student G	Far Below Prof. Plus		
Student H	Below Prof. Minus		
Student I	Below Prof. Plus		
Student J	Advanced		
School Index Score			

February 17, 2006

7



Computing Index

School Performance Incentive Program

Student	Last Year	Current Year	Points
Student A	Proficient	Advanced	
Student B	Below Prof. Minus	Below Prof. Minus	
Student C	Advanced	Proficient	
Student D	Below Prof. Plus	Far Below Prof. Plus	
Student E	Far Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Minus	
Student F	Proficient	Below Prof. Plus	
Student G	Far Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Plus	
Student H	Below Prof. Minus	Below Prof. Plus	
Student I	Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Plus	
Student J	Advanced	Advanced	
School Index Score			

February 17, 2006

8



Computing Index

School Performance Incentive Program

Student	Last Year	Current Year	Points
Student A	Proficient	Advanced	130
Student B	Below Prof. Minus	Below Prof. Minus	90
Student C	Advanced	Proficient	100
Student D	Below Prof. Plus	Far Below Prof. Plus	10
Student E	Far Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Minus	140
Student F	Proficient	Below Prof. Plus	50
Student G	Far Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Plus	170
Student H	Below Prof. Minus	Below Prof. Plus	140
Student I	Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Plus	90
Student J	Advanced	Advanced	110
School Index Score			103

February 17, 2006

9



Performance Levels

School Performance Incentive Program

Growth Index Level	Index Point Value
Strong	102-104.99
High	105-107.99
Excellent	108-109.99
Outstanding	110 and Greater

Model is built on 100 as one year of growth.

February 17, 2006

10



Performance Level Incentive

School Performance Incentive Program

Level	Certificated	Non-Certificated
Strong	\$2,500	\$1,000
High	\$3,500	\$1,500
Excellent	\$4,500	\$2,000
Outstanding	\$5,500	\$2,500

Multiple levels provide greater incentive and achievable gradations, but recognize real growth in achievement.

February 17, 2006

11



School Performance Incentive Program Recap

- Based on growth in student achievement
- Empowers expertise of educators and school personnel
- Includes all staff: all make it or no one makes it
- SBA used to measure growth

February 17, 2006

12



SB235 – School Performance Incentive Program

April 19, 2006

What the bill does –

- Increases student achievement
- Creates the environment for every school employee to work together and focus on greatly increasing student achievement in reading, writing and mathematics
- Rewards school staff for exceeding expectations and accelerating student learning
- Implements proven private sector practice into public education
- Links student academic performance to the bonus
- If we don't see significant increases in student achievement then there is no financial liability
- When schools and kids achieve exceed expectations and more than a years worth of academic growth – Alaska benefits!

Finance CS

- Limits participation to 850 certified staff.
- Requires LB&A review and recommendations to continue beyond June 30, 2009.
- Reduces fiscal note from estimated \$15 million to \$5.8 million.

More details:

The School Performance Incentive Program -

- Awards bonuses to a school's teachers, administrators and support staff each year that its students show more than a year of academic growth
- Certified Staff may receive bonuses of up to \$5,500
- Non-certified staff may receive bonuses of up to \$2,500

The program is based on -

- Each student's scores on the state's standards based assessments are compared to his or her performance in the previous year.
- Schools earn points based on how each student does compared to last year. The points are totaled and divided by the number of students in the school to produce a school score.
- The school score is applied to an index that has several levels. There are four bonus levels: the higher the school score, the larger the bonuses.
- If no progress is shown, no bonus is earned.
- The procedures for calculating and awarding the bonus will be established by department regulation.

The benefits to Alaska are -

- Accountability: The money is directly linked to high levels of student learning.
- Effective instruction, staff collaboration, and shared responsibility.
- Enhanced Alaska teacher recruitment efforts.
- Targeting results: no progress, no financial liability to the state.

The expected results of the program are -

- Increases in student achievement.
- Instruction directly linked to outcomes.
- Incentives to work differently and create partnerships that will result in more than a year's growth in learning for students.
- Creative and effective use of instructional time in schools.
- Leveling the playing field for all schools; large or small, high or low – performing.

The changes made in the Senate Finance Committee Substitute -

- Limits the participation in the program to 850 certified staff.
- Requires a sunset review by Legislative Budget & Audit by December 31, 2008, to recommend whether or not the program should be continued beyond July 1, 2009.
- Reduced the fiscal note from estimated \$15 million to \$5.8 million.

Alaska School Performance Incentive Program

*Measuring Individual Student
Achievement*



What is the Program?

School Performance Incentive Program

- Performance incentive pay for improved student achievement beyond a year's growth
- Entire staff in a school receive incentive (all or none) includes administrators, teachers, classified
- Target based on individual student growth
- Compares the same student from previous year to current year
- All schools qualify if they meet growth target
- Measurement tool is the Standards Based Assessments (SBA) given annually in April

Benefits

School Performance Incentive Program

- Target not reached = no state financial liability
- Create a strong workforce for Alaska
- Enhance teacher recruitment efforts
- Accountability: directly linked to high levels of achievement
- Promote collaboration, effective instruction and spread responsibility across grade levels and content areas
- Requires focused instruction aligned to Alaska standards

Expected Outcomes

School Performance Incentive Program

- All staff have ownership of instruction and share responsibility for results
- Incentive to work differently, embrace innovation and create partnerships to improve student achievement
- Accountability and incentive to cause all students to reach proficiency and higher levels of advanced achievement
- Expand responsibility for the three Rs to all staff
- Instruction designed and delivered to meet student needs

Why Other Models Fail

School Performance Incentive Program

- Not based on student growth
- Unrealistic targets
- Conflict among staff: Some must lose for others to win
- Exclude building administrators
- Instrument used to measure is not reliable and consistent
- Compensation not large enough to provide incentive for change
- Weak commitment to the program



Value Table

School Performance Incentive Program

Previous Year Level ↓	Current Year Level					
	Far Below Prof. Minus	Far Below Prof. Plus	Below Proficient Minus	Below Proficient Plus	Proficient	Advanced
Far Below Prof. Minus	0	140	170	200	220	220
Far Below Prof. Plus	0	80	140	170	200	200
Below Prof. Minus	0	40	90	140	180	180
Below Prof. Plus	0	10	50	90	140	150
Proficient	0	0	20	50	100	130
Advanced	0	0	20	50	100	110

Values may change as a result of 2006 data analysis, public input, and State Board regulations.



Computing Index

School Performance Incentive Program

Student	Last Year	Current Year	Points
Student A	Proficient		
Student B	Below Prof. Minus		
Student C	Advanced		
Student D	Below Prof. Plus		
Student E	Far Below Prof. Plus		
Student F	Proficient		
Student G	Far Below Prof. Plus		
Student H	Below Prof. Minus		
Student I	Below Prof. Plus		
Student J	Advanced		
School Index Score			

March 17, 2006



Computing Index

School Performance Incentive Program

Student	Last Year	Current Year	Points
Student A	Proficient	Advanced	
Student B	Below Prof. Minus	Below Prof. Minus	
Student C	Advanced	Proficient	
Student D	Below Prof. Plus	Far Below Prof. Plus	
Student E	Far Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Minus	
Student F	Proficient	Below Prof. Plus	
Student G	Far Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Plus	
Student H	Below Prof. Minus	Below Prof. Plus	
Student I	Below Prof. Plus	Below Prof. Plus	
Student J	Advanced	Advanced	
School Index Score			