

SCOMM

#22:67

## To Oppose Udall D2 Bill

Udall's D2 lands measure failed Friday at a meeting of the Standing Council on Alaska Lands. It was the second time the same motion to oppose the bill failed to gain the group's support.

However, another motion to endorse H.R. 39 was turned down by the panel.

H.R. 39 is a bill proposed by Rep. Udall, D-Ariz., to classify 116 million acres of federal land in Alaska as wilderness.

Sen. Joe Orsini, R-Anchorage, said the afternoon vote to oppose H.R. 39 failed because "The panel thought it was premature to say anything unless it could say something positive.

"The votes put the committee in the position of not having favored or opposed anything," Orsini said.

The motion against H.R. 39 was first proposed last week when the legislature-created panel met to hear Anchorage attorney Ronald G. Birch and associates as lobbyists in Washington. Birch is to receive not more than \$7,500 a month working for the panel.

Council Chairman Rep. Steve Cowper, D-Fairbanks, ruled on July 22, that the council could not vote on the motion because there were no copies of the Udall Bill available to the panel.

The Anchorage senator said he offered the proposal against H.R. 39 "because as I read it, there's nothing good to say about it."

According to Orsini, he and Rep. Joe Hayes, D-Anchorage, voted to oppose H.R. 39.

By failing to oppose H.R. 39 the council has failed to show a solid position before the Leggett subcommittee, Orsini said.

The Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation chaired by Rep. Robert Leggett, D-Calif., has scheduled hearings on wildlife refuge areas in Alaska Aug. 7-12.

# STATE OF ALASKA

JAY E. HAMMOND, Governor

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF LANDS, 323 E. 4TH AVENUE, ANCHORAGE 99501

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 18, 1977

Governor Jay Hammond announced today that the State has nearly completed a project to tentatively identify approximately 60 million acres of Federal, and Native overselected lands in Alaska which are suitable for State land selection purposes. Hammond said, "We are identifying more than our entitlement because we want to insure this valuable land is not placed in d-2 withdrawals and thus will remain eligible for State selection."

The Governor also said, "The presentation before the Seiberling Committee is simply to identify the pool of land from which we hope to select. I want to make it absolutely clear that no final selections have been made and none will be made until extensive public hearings are held all across Alaska."

"The process to identify upwards to 60 million acres of land generally suitable for State ownership has been based on over two years of intensive resource inventory work and land selection analysis within State government." The identification process relied on data analysis from the Department of Natural Resource's Statewide Inventory and Assessment which has been added to by information from industry and citizens over the last 10 months. The assessment also incorporates resource information from the Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission, and the collective expertise of State land managers and resource experts.

Hammond said, "This land is being identified primarily for its developmental and habitation potential. This is the most public land selection process in which the State has engaged. For the first time, State selections are being made following public input rather than behind closed doors."

In response to Chairman Seiberling's request, the Governor said that the State will make available its preliminary identification of State interest lands to the House Subcommittee for d-2 lands late this month. "This will allow committee members to consider statewide land selection interests as they address the d-2 legislation," Hammond said. "Without this information Congress would be left to give the State what they chose, rather than the land Alaskans choose. This action is part of our major effort to secure conveyance of 20 to 30 million acres to the State as part of d-2."

The next phase of this process will be to present initial identification efforts for public review on these proposals throughout Alaska. Public meetings will be held in January and February of next year and a written comment period will be open until March 1st. Governor Hammond urges Alaskans to take advantage of this opportunity for review of State land selections in the months ahead, "for this is our last major chance to select our birthright of state land."

February 28, 1978 - Juneau, Alaska

ROWAN GROUP INC.

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS BY MICHAEL ROWAN,  
PRESIDENT, ROWAN GROUP Inc., ON THE  
FINDINGS OF A STATEWIDE ALASKAN SURVEY  
RELATING TO THE (d)(2) LANDS ISSUES  
AND COMMISSIONED BY THE STEERING COUNCIL  
FOR ALASKA LANDS.

The survey in question was fielded in late December, completed in the fieldwork phase in late January, coded and data-processed by mid-February, and is now presented for publication. It consists of 465 interviews, all of them face-to-face interviews with the exception of 24 self-administered questionnaires coming from very remote parts of the State, like Point Hope or Gambell. Our analysis of the sample, the methodology, and the demography leads us to the conclusion that the survey is an accurate expression of the Alaska resident population 18 or older, and that the chances are 95 out of 100 that the responses to the questionnaire would be within  $\pm 3\%$  if all 18-or-older residents of the state had been interviewed in exactly the same way. This is a standard deviation and it means the survey falls within the known tolerance levels, and can be interpreted as a representative view of the Alaskan adult public.

Every question as it was asked, and every response as it was given, is revealed in the accompanying paper entitled 'Data-Narrative Report'; this forms the basis of the statements about major findings, which now follow. Highlights of the survey are these:

\*The Alaska public endorses the permanent protection of lands and the expansion of national parks and wildlife refuges, even though they may not be able to visit these places, by a ratio of 61% to 21% (Q.16). The public also believes that Alaska can have these new parks and wildernesses classified by federal legislation without adverse effects on the equally fragile Alaskan economy(Q.35). Alaskans dismiss the "either-or" debate waged by environmentalists versus developers, and adopt a position similar to the Steering Council for Alaska Lands which has written:

"We ask all those who are interested in this vital issue to join us in dropping the easy cliches of battle stimulated by private and public interest groups, and get down to the hard work of striking a balance in which the Alaskan wilderness will be protected, and the Alaskan economy likewise protected. Because both of these values are truly in the 'national interest'."

-Washington Post, 1/31/77, p.A13

\*As for access to national parks in Alaska<sup>1/</sup>, 61.9% of the public -- including majorities of all income groups -- report that certain federal lands are inaccessible because of the cost of getting there. Transportation costs already are prohibitive for more than half the people who already live in the state, and who want to enjoy these national lands. This raises real questions about what Americans will

<sup>1/</sup>This survey deals almost exclusively with the access issue.

be able (or rich enough) to enjoy the millions of acres set aside for parklands and for use as a national recreational resource. (Note: the Americans in this survey are already living in Alaska, and do not have to go to the expense of traveling to the state to enjoy the parks; the median income of these people is the highest in the nation, and over 40% above the national average/.

\*Alaskans are American migrants to the 49<sup>th</sup> state in all but 17.6% of the cases -- and it is generally economic opportunity which brings people here (Q02,03). However, the reason people stay in Alaska and speak very highly of the place is the spectacular grandeur of the environment (Q04). Alaskans feel very deeply about the environment they live in, and do not want it sacrificed.

\*Alaskans recreate in their own state often, and take long trips ranging up to 3,000 miles in the state just to see what's there. A majority of Alaskans have flown into the wilderness and taken a trip down an Alaskan river, for recreation purposes; and a majority of those who have not, lack the experience only because of the cost of such trips (Q27,29,30,31,32).

\*Alaskans really have not experienced their own state. Only a few percent have been to most areas of the state, or most of the communities found in them(Q05-10). Looking at the state as one whole experience, it is reasonable to say that 'the average Alaskan hasn't been there'.

\*Only 12.2% of the Alaskan people feel satisfied with how much of Alaska they have so far actually seen and experienced.(Q14). Alaskans want to see more of their own state.

\*The favored means of traveling into remote areas of Alaska is by air(Q15), but the only practical means of getting into a remote area -- for recreation purposes -- is on the surface highway or railroad(Q13).

\*A majority of the Alaskans surveyed have been to Denali National Park -- the only park with a railroad and highway cutting through it, providing access. A majority of the Alaskan public said they intended to go into Glacier Bay, Kobuk Balley, Lake Clark, Gates of the Arctic, Katmai, and Wrangell-St.Elias national parks, but in each case only small percentages of the public had already done so. (Q17-23). The reason: no practical means of access. That is why the public believes that some sort of surface transportation should be built to these parks(Q24).

\*In over 80% of the cases, the purposes of a recreational trip into a national wildlife refuge in Alaska, and by Alaskans, is for recreational activities other than hunting or fishing. The most common activity is scenic walking or backpacking.

The conclusions of the study, as this firm sees it, are outlined in our report. The basic thrust of our comments there raise the issue of access to national parks as an area where Alaskans can have something meaningful to say to the Congress. The discussion goes like this:

The authors and sponsors of HR39, now in consideration in the U. S. House, designate about 45,000,000 acres of land as new national parks. In justification of this they have cited the mounting demand of the American people for recreational opportunity, and none of this is to be denied. There is ample evidence

that the American people wish to preserve these lands as national treasures. It has been cited again and again that the federal parklands under consideration are the property of all Americans, not just the Americans who live in Alaska.

National parks are set aside based upon two criteria, one - the protection of the lands, and two - the creation of recreational opportunities for humankind. In fact, the dictionary meaning of "park" includes both these values, which are intended to be harmonious. Yet it is also true that the only Americans who will ever enjoy these parks being set aside, in part, for their recreational use must, in order to exercise this enjoyment, physically enter the parklands. This is a simple matter in the California Redwoods, Yosemite, Yellowstone, or the other great parks in America, of which there are many. But this is not a simple matter for the new national parks being designated in Alaska.

First, there is no established transportation access in place on the lands designated as new national parks (this is a generalization which applies in virtually all cases). Second, what existing, nearby access systems provide is limited access indeed (this can be ascertained by looking at an Alaskan map with existing transportation facilities overlaid by the new national park designations). Third, there is no reason to believe that the designations of new parklands in Alaska will make it any easier or more reasonable -- economically speaking -- for the Americans who live in the state to enjoy the parks. Fourth, there is a good argument that few other Americans but the rich will ever enjoy these parklands (Alaskans already have the highest family income in the USA by a large margin, and 61% of them report not being able to afford access into existing national parks in Alaska they would like to visit).

The survey clearly supports the previous statements, and provides ample evidence to the dubious observer.

Now HR39 does provide a means for access, and an approval mechanism if such access is requested. The means now require action by two Secretaries in the President's cabinet, a series of impact reports, and a resolution of the U. S. House and Senate -- a tedious constraint to access as we read the survey and look at the bill.<sup>4</sup> This means would have to be utilized for any trail, primitive road, etc. for recreational or other purposes on any land designated as a national park under this legislation (which would be 12.3% of all Alaska land under HR39). The access provisions are clearly intended as preventative if not prohibitive tools in discouraging access. Since no existing access system is in place, it appears to this researcher that the legislative design is meant to create new wilderness areas, not new national parks, and indeed, there is a "wilderness overlay" on these lands, indicating such an intention.

In summary, it appears from this survey that access is a major problem for the Americans who already want to use these national parks, and who do not have to go to the cost of transportation to Alaska, and who earn higher incomes than any other Americans, but who still cannot afford to get to these parks because of the cost. Thus, the limited access features presented in HR39, taken in this light, seem to negate or contradict the letter and spirit of what a "national park" means. It appears that these are national parks for whom no people and no recreation is intended.

<sup>4</sup>The writer is a former Legislative Assistant in the office of a United States Senator representing Alaska.

# Steering Council For Alaska Lands

REP. STEVE COWPER  
CHAIRMAN  
REP. ALVIN OSTERBACK  
REP. JOE L. HAYES  
SEN. CHANCY CROFT  
SEN. MIKE COLLETTA  
SEN. JOE ORSINI  
WALTER PARKER  
COMM. ROBERT LEPESCHE  
JAMES HOFFMAN  
C. G. HAWLEY  
DAVE CLINE



1018 WEST 8TH AVENUE, SUITE B  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501  
(907) 277-2415/16  
[POUCH V. JUNEAU, ALASKA 99815]

## CONGRESS WILLING TO HEAR ALASKA POSITION (d)(2) STEERING COUNCIL FINDS

Results of a survey in Washington, D.C. show that members of the U.S. House and Senate are willing to listen to the national interest Alaska land position developed by the Steering Council for Alaska Lands, according to Rep. Steve Cowper, its chairman.

"Preliminary tabulation shows that 84% of the members on key House and Senate Committees are willing to consider the position we have developed on the (d)(2) lands issue, with only 4% stating they are not interested," Cowper said.

"What this means is that the issue will not be resolved without maximum Alaskan comment, and thats good news to us."

The (d)(2) lands legislation is currently in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee

The Steering Council survey included eightyfive respondents from the Senate, House, and Administration, selected on the basis of responsibility; virtually all members of the House Interior Committee were interviewed.

The survey also showed that 44% of the respondents had been to Alaska on a visit and only 32% said that they had "enough" information at this point to decide what to do on (d)(2).

"Not only is the Congress willing to listen to our position, they are not well enough informed to make these complicated decisions about classifying national interest lands here, Cowper said. "This is the reason for our information program in Washington, D.C.

Cowper said that the (d)(2) legislation would affect more land in Alaska than the Native Land Claims Act, and perhaps even the Statehood Act. "And less than half of the important Congressional members (47% to be exact) are now committed to a certain bill. The situation is wide open and Alaska is being invited in to have a say," he claimed, "and I believe its very important that we prepare a solid case and a powerful presentation of our position."

The Council is preparing a short film presentation for use in meetings with Congressmen, a brochure, and print and radio editorials for the Washington D.C. market, aimed at several thousand opinionleaders.

Mike Colbatta

# Feds drew d-2 boundaries from state resource survey

News-Miner Bureau

WASHINGTON—The Interior Department drew the boundaries for its Alaska d-2 lands proposal with the aid of a state resource inventory that was developed while Assistant Interior Secretary Guy Martin was Alaska's commissioner of natural resources, Martin told reporters today.

Opponents of the 93-million acre d-2 proposal suggested by Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus are "playing the potentials game," Martin said.

"But we think that with the exception of a few tough calls we drew the boundaries to exclude every known mineral area."

He said the Arctic National Wildlife Range (ANWR), which, under the Andrus plan, would be nearly doubled in size and become a wilderness refuge, was one of those "tough calls."

There was a major battle inside the Carter administration over the range, with Energy Secretary James Schlesinger arguing that as much as 15

billion barrels of oil might lie within ANWR boundaries.

Andrus and the Interior Department leadership, however, argued that the range was more important as a wilderness. The dispute was finally settled in the White House, with President Jimmy Carter deciding in favor of wilderness designation for the area.

The growing debate over d-2 lands  
(See FEDS, page 7)

## FEDS . . .

(Continued from page 1)

during the past two or three years, he said, has stimulated interest and exploration in areas such as the wildlife range. "Before d-2 there wasn't anyone talking about the range, now it's become an important issue."

In the same way, he said, discussion of the d-2 question had stimulated mining companies to stake claims in the Brooks Range Copper Belt.

But he called these claims and other mineral exploration in Alaska mostly "speculative." It will be "many years," he said, before mining for most minerals becomes economical in the state.

But despite that, he emphasized that Interior's d-2 boundary lines were drawn to exclude mineral areas.

Martin predicted that "there will be a few diehards who resist the whole notion of setting aside large areas of d-2 lands, and they will lose. Virtually every major segment of national opinion agrees that lands should be set aside, and that included the Nixon administration and three different Republican Interior secretaries."

"There will be a pretty good debate over management systems, but I look for the whole thing coming out pretty much like Andrus proposed it," Martin said.

On other issues, Martin said:

—That the pipeline haul road to the North Slope poses the greatest en-

vironmental threat to Alaska's arctic regions.

—That problems with the start-up of the oil pipeline were at least partially caused by the failure of Alyeska's owner companies to give Alyeska "the best" people and to allocate enough resources to pipeline start-up. He discounted Alyeska claims that accidents were caused by employees, saying "The company is responsible for its employees."

—He said federal-authorized officers in Alaska had threatened several weeks ago to shut down the line unless the companies gave Alyeska better people and more resources. The result, he said, was that Glen Simpson was assigned to head Alyeska's field operations. Simpson, Martin said, supervised the start-up of the ARCO portion of Prudhoe Bay oilfield, "and we never heard a word about problems there."

—That the Interior and Transportation Departments and the Environmental Protection Agency will all increase their staffs in Alaska to watch construction of the gas line. The Interior Department would still be in overall charge of the pipeline surveillance, he said.