

ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE / SUBJECT FILES 8672

853 SCONM30: CONFERENCE ON ALASKA'S FUTURE FRONTIERS 1979

1 you mean by expense.

2 THE MODERATOR: Whose goal is that?

3 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That's mine.

4 THE MODERATOR: Georgianna?

5 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I don't think it was looked  
6 at as expense in the word dollar expense, but that the  
7 extraction --

8 MR. KILCHER: Impact.

9 THE MODERATOR: Maybe you mean -- use the word "Impact"  
10 instead of expense?

11 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Like the oil and gas maybe  
12 being, you know, pulled out and --

13 MR. KILCHER: Sucked out.

14 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) -- and there's no doubt given to  
15 what alternative energies should be developed in these  
16 areas where that's done, and not just come in and do it  
17 because there's a national crisis.

18 It sounds good to me still. I don't know how --

19 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

20 MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, I would suggest that's  
21 something we come back to, because alternative energy is  
22 not actually addressed in that, and I also do not believe  
23 that we are willing to have people freezing to death in  
24 nursing homes in Kansas or someplace, because, you know,  
25 they can't get the oil from Iran. I don't just think

1 that's really what was intended originally and I would  
2 suggest we come back to that one.

3 THE MODERATOR: We'll pass this over. Are you making  
4 a mark so --

5 MR. TOMA: I made a check. Are we going to --

6 THE MODERATOR: No, we're not. We're going to pass  
7 this one over.

8 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Why don't we take a vote?  
9 I get the feeling we're starting to say, "Let's come back  
10 and come and back."

11 THE MODERATOR: Karen had an objection, thinking that  
12 the wording should be changed.

13 MS. HEDLAND: My suggestion came from her statement in  
14 terms of alternative energy sources. There is no way that  
15 addresses alternative energy sources being explored, the  
16 extraction of our nonrenewable resources.

17 MR. KILCHER: But you talk about mean. I think she  
18 talks about means when she talks about this. I think the  
19 goal is very close. I personally think we can vote.

20 THE MODERATOR: All right, we'll vote then. Any  
21 objection to this goal?

22 (Responding)

23 Two objections -- three objections. Four. Did I  
24 get them all? Four objections, okay.

25 MR. TOMA: "There should be a commitment to

1 agriculture for local and state. It should be commitment  
2 to -- " oh, I see, "there should be a commitment to small-scale  
3 agriculture for local and state food self-sufficiency as  
4 opposed to large agriculture just for export."

5 MS. HUNTER: Madam Chairman, I think if you look up  
6 under Economy, that's almost duplicated, and I'm not sure  
7 where it should be, but those two are very similar.

8 MR. KILCHER: Yes, right.

9 MR. TOMA: Under development then we have an  
10 agriculture here.

11 THE MODERATOR: "One which -- " okay. Well then,  
12 which one do you want to discuss now?

13 MR. JACK: I move to table that, take that under  
14 Economy.

15 THE MODERATOR: Take it up under Economy? We'll hold  
16 that one to discuss economy.

17 MR. FARUN: Madam Chairman, I agree with that goal up  
18 there under Economy, but I think that one is getting  
19 something else, too, and I think what we should always be  
20 getting at, is production for food self-sufficiency. In  
21 other words segregating that as a separate item. There  
22 it's lost as business, agriculture. I think we need to  
23 send a message to the legislature that we need to produce  
24 more food in our own state rather than importing it.

25 I was just reading today in the Anchorage Daily

1 News if the lines were cut off to the Lower 48, we'd have  
2 hardly enough moose in the state to feed Anchorage for a  
3 year if we killed every one of them.

4 I think with transportation costs going up as  
5 they are, and with possible things happening in the future  
6 with energy and transportation problems, we should try to  
7 develop, as best we can, some agriculture self-sufficiency.

8 MR. TOLMA: I might add, Madam Chairman, that the State  
9 has a committed development goal, you know, on this  
10 agriculture. I think it fits here also.

11 THE MODERATOR: Well, I don't think -- that's fine.  
12 Perhaps we should vote on this now and --

13 MR. JACK: Point of order, Madam Chairman.

14 THE MODERATOR: Yes, you've made a motion to table it.

15 MR. JACK: Tabling motion does not require a second  
16 unless there's an objection.

17 MS. HAYES: We can adopt any rules of order though.

18 (Laughter)

19 THE MODERATOR: Motion to table is undebatable if  
20 we're going to go by Roberts Rules of Order, and I should  
21 not have recognized anyone after Jack spoke, but I didn't  
22 think we were running such a tight ship, but I will defer  
23 to his motion and the motion to table is before us.

24 MR. KILCHER: Point of order, Madam Chairman. As the  
25 lady said, since we have not adopted any rules of order,

1 the point of order is that we have no order. Consequently,  
2 you're free not to accept his motion, which I strongly  
3 suggest, --

4 THE MODERATOR: Well, I will --

5 MR. KILCHER: -- on the point of order.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. HOPE: I'd like to ask for a short recess.

8 (Laughter)

9 MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, it does seem we should  
10 have a show of hands, how many want agriculture under  
11 Development, and let's just ask that question.

12 MR. KILCHER: No, Madam Chairman.

13 THE MODERATOR: Yes, Yule.

14 MR. KILCHER: I agree with the young gentleman over  
15 there. The two things are different, one is socioeconomy.  
16 The other one is subsidization, everything else is  
17 subsidized. And we're talking about surplus money for the  
18 next ten or 20 years, and it's a strong case for  
19 subsidization funds and they need help outside the normal  
20 economic pattern. The state has agriculture and  
21 development, but precisely for large export. I think that  
22 there's a good --

23 THE MODERATOR: Jack, would you be very upset if I  
24 ignored your motion to table and that we took a vote on  
25 this right now?

1 MR. JACK: I withdraw that with one exception, --

2 THE MODERATOR: Everybody is being so cooperative.

3 MR. JACK: -- and that is as far as exporting, that  
4 does not exclude exporting of the goods.

5 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

6 MS. LONGPRL: I'd prefer the words as "opposed to" to  
7 be changed to "in addition to" instead of separating the  
8 two forms of agricultural development to be more positive  
9 and --

10 THE MODERATOR: Any objection, the author of that?

11 MR. HARUN: No.

12 THE MODERATOR: Kevin? Okay. Change that "in  
13 addition."

14 Chris.

15 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, my objection to that would be you  
16 have the words "in addition to" prioritize the two, making  
17 the exportation of more importance than the commitment to  
18 our own use of the products, and I'd like to see it  
19 reversed in some way, so that that has first priority.

20 MS. HEDLAND: Would you read it again?

21 THE MODERATOR: Read it now, please.

22 MR. TOMA: All right. "A commitment to small-scale  
23 agriculture for local and state food self-sufficiency, in  
24 addition to large agriculture just for export."

25 MR. JACK: Madam Chairman.

1 THE MODERATOR: It does change.

2 MR. TOMA: I'll change it, "There should be a  
3 commitment to small-scale agriculture to local and state  
4 food self-sufficiency. "

5 THE MODERATOR: Period.

6 THE MODERATOR: Okay, any objection to that goal as  
7 stated?

8 MR. KILCHER: Now we got it.

9 THE MODERATOR: Would you read it, please?

10 MR. TOMA: Yes.

11 THE MODERATOR: Mike.

12 MR. LADNER: I've got a little problem with that,  
13 because if we take off that last part, it does eliminate  
14 the Delta agricultural projects.

15 MR. JACK: Yes.

16 MR. TOMA: No.

17 THE MODERATOR: No, it doesn't. It doesn't talk to  
18 that, does it?

19 MR. JACK: It doesn't talk to importing. That's what  
20 I was --

21 MR. LADNER: Then does it include an agricultural  
22 project of that magnitude?

23 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

24 THE MODERATOR: Because this is just a commitment to  
25 small farms, isn't it?

1           MR. LADNER: Well if it's a commitment to small farms,  
2 then I think we're talking about again two different things.  
3 Granted the State has funded as a development project,  
4 where it's correctly categorized, the Delta Ag project, for  
5 example. For two years they've been saying they're going  
6 to be exporting grain, not for food, but for protein  
7 supplement. Well that's a food, but it's also for soybean  
8 for oil, but they haven't exported a pound. Currently  
9 they're looking, they've changed some of their philosophy,  
10 and they're looking at developing the Delta Ag project to  
11 develop the red meat industry within the state.

12           So, you know, we are developing an industry that,  
13 as Kevin wants, or has suggested, that does provide some  
14 State self-sufficiency. But I think if we take off, you  
15 know, the way it's written now, it's written towards  
16 everybody having a garden out in their back yard.

17           MS. HEDLAND: Not me.

18           THE MODERATOR: No, it's just meaning that it -- I  
19 take it that the State should have a commitment and the  
20 means would be that they should appropriate some dollars to  
21 see that that is being done, and it doesn't take away from  
22 the fact that they're already doing the other business. Am  
23 I wrong?

24           MR. HOUMAN: You can grow night tomatoes, because I  
25 can't.

1 THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

2 MR. HARUN: To give you an example, we have 25,000  
3 acres coming up for State disposal. A lot of the tracts  
4 had been scheduled in large acreages, in other words, to  
5 where local people couldn't afford to get into the business.  
6 And what people in Two Rivers have asked for by petition is  
7 that they be gotten down to under 300 acres, to 40-acre,  
8 160-acre parcels. I agree what Mike is saying is true.  
9 We've changed our thoughts on this large-scale agriculture,  
10 and we're finding a lot of stuff we're planning on  
11 exporting is going to be used locally for the red meat  
12 production, and the State has that as a goal at present,  
13 but I really think -- I can see putting in a support of the  
14 Delta barley project as well, but that's already supported.

15 What I think isn't supported at the state-wide  
16 level are the smaller farms, I don't mean garden, but 40,  
17 hundred-acre tract farms, and perhaps if we did have a  
18 commitment to that, I think it would really help out.

19 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to the way it's  
20 written now, or are we going to -- Jack?

21 MR. JACK: I would propose to add a wording such as  
22 "inhibiting exporting of the agricultural products where  
23 feasible."

24 THE MODERATOR: That's a suggestion. Did you all hear  
25 that?

1 MR. MATHISEN: I'm wondering if we aren't trying to  
2 decide whether we want a higher, lower or equal priority to  
3 this commitment, if that isn't what we're trying to  
4 establish here, whether we want an equal commitment to  
5 small farms or higher commitment or a lower commitment.

6 THE MODERATOR: I think that is a problem of --

7 MR. HUSS: Could we just add possibly a commitment to  
8 both large and small agriculture for local and State food  
9 self-sufficiency? Would that --

10 THE MODERATOR: I think we need to give the secretary  
11 a break, and I think that maybe during the recess you can  
12 come up with something. I think we should have a ten-minute  
13 break, but please let's not make it longer than ten minutes,  
14 because we want to -- we're going along and we need to move.  
15 So we'll now have a ten-minute break, and get together on  
16 that one issue.

17 (RECESS: 2:45)

18 THE MODERATOR: These forms that Chip is passing  
19 around are the suggested form that the committee in charge  
20 of arranging this conference came up with. It isn't  
21 anything that we need to necessarily use, but I thought if  
22 we passed them around now, that if you had some ideas of  
23 means as we're discussing it, you could just make a note on  
24 there now rather than bringing it up, but we could -- you  
25 know, it might help when we get back to it tonight. That

1 was all the reason for giving it to you now.

2 So, Chip, --

3 MR. TOMA: Yes, ma'am.

4 THE MODERATOR: -- may we continue then?

5 MR. TOMA: Yes.

6 THE MODERATOR: We're on this agriculture one.

7 MR. TOMA: Okay.

8 THE MODERATOR: I think during the recess the authors  
9 got together and will accept that change, I believe.

10 Is that correct, Kevin?

11 MR. HARUN: We're just going to end it with a period?

12 MR. TOMA: Yes, right here. "There should be a  
13 commitment to small-scale agriculture for local and State  
14 food  
15 self-sufficiency."

16 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

17 (No response)

18 We'll accept that then.

19 MR. TOMA: "The State should be a place where  
20 technology and material development works in the service of  
21 man, not vice versa."

22 THE MODERATOR: That was the goal from ten years ago  
23 from the Alpha group that we discussed yesterday.

24 Chris?

25 MS. JOHNSON: I just have to register an objection to

1 that. I think that's basically rhetoric. I really don't  
2 think it says anything.

3 MR. TOMA: Okay.

4 THE MODERATOR: Any other comments?

5 MS. JOHNSON: Could we vote on it?

6 THE MODERATOR: We did discuss it yesterday, but we  
7 didn't accept it, so now do you wish to accept this as a  
8 goal?

9 MS. JOHNSON: I object.

10 THE MODERATOR: Any other objections?

11 MR. HUSS: I object.

12 MR. MACK: I object.

13 THE MODERATOR: Object? Four, five? Is that an  
14 objection, Carolyn?

15 MS. JONES: M-hm (nodding head).

16 THE MODERATOR: Let's take a vote, there's so many  
17 objections. All those in favor of this as a goal please  
18 stand.

19 (complying)

20 THE MODERATOR: Those opposed stand.

21 (complying)

22 THE MODERATOR: That one will be stricken.

23 MR. JACK: One abstention.

24 THE MODERATOR: One abstention, okay.

25 THE MODERATOR: Excuse me, I'm sorry, Stan.

1 MR. MACK: Before the vote, I was just going to tell  
2 you, if it's already been established as a goal ten years  
3 ago, you know, it's there already, if we don't vote on it.

4 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

5 MR. MACK: Are we voting to strike it from the ten-year  
6 plan or are we --

7 MS. HUNTER: No. No.

8 THE MODERATOR: No.

9 MS. HUNTER: Just not reiterating it.

10 THE MODERATOR: Right.

11 MR. TOMA: Under human resources "The State should  
12 guarantee the dignity and well-being of Alaskans of all  
13 ages and economic status."

14 MS. JONES: Madam Chairman?

15 THE MODERATOR: Yes, Carolyn.

16 MS. JONES: I handed Chip a third page.

17 MR. TOMA: Excuse me, I forgot. Under Development, "No  
18 oil and gas leases should occur until the Coastal Resource  
19 Service Area plans have been completed and approved by the  
20 cognizant agencies."

21 THE MODERATOR: That's under Development?

22 MR. TOMA: That's under Development, yes.

23 MS. HYLEN: Would you read it again?

24 MR. TOMA: "No oil and gas leases should occur until  
25 the Coastal Resource Service Area plans have been completed

1 and approved by the cognizant agencies."

2 THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

3 MR. KELSEY: What does she mean? I'd like to have it  
4 explained.

5 THE MODERATOR: Could you explain it? Is that yours,  
6 Carolyn?

7 MS. JONES: No.

8 MR. JACK: The author is here.

9 THE MODERATOR: Who? Yours?

10 MR. JACK: Yes.

11 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

12 MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, according to the State  
13 schedule of leasing time tables, Norton Sound Basin is up  
14 for leasing in '82. Kound Basin is involved, St. George  
15 Basin is involved. And the State has formed under the  
16 Coastal Zone Management enabling that legislation. We  
17 formed the Coastal Resource Service Area District  
18 encompassing all of the Yukon-Kuskokwim area. Our concern  
19 is that the governor under his authority should postpone  
20 those oil and gas leases until such time the Coastal  
21 Resource Service Area plans have been completed, otherwise  
22 it would be like putting the cart before the horse.

23 THE MODERATOR: Do you understand what the --

24 MR. KELSEY: But isn't he talking about a regional  
25 thing? I don't understand that to apply to the rest of the

1 state.

2       MR. LARKIN: It does apply in the Beaufort Sea. Right  
3 now there's a suit against the oil sale on behalf of the  
4 North Slope Borough, and the way it works is that they have  
5 to develop a Coastal Zone Management plan and that plan has  
6 to be approved by the legislature. Now if that plan is  
7 approved, then the existing laws as they are take effect  
8 and there is no regulation on it. It seems to me the main  
9 point that is being brought up is local control over the  
10 resource extraction, and my personal feeling on that is  
11 that it's a good thing, in that it hasn't been abused today.  
12 In the North Slope Borough they didn't object to the oil  
13 and gas lease sale. They just objected beyond a certain  
14 depth in the water, up to the Barrier Islands. So it's a  
15 laudible objective, I think. Maybe it might be rewarded a  
16 little bit.

17       THE MODERATOR: Marion?

18       MS. HYLEN: I've sat here and said nothing. I am  
19 against our being blackmailed by the Arabs, and every place,  
20 you want more money, more money, money for this. You want  
21 the State and the Federal Government to provide roads,  
22 ports, assistance. Every place you want money. Now, where  
23 in the heck is the money going to come if we don't extract  
24 some oil, if we don't take care of the South 48? They have  
25 to have this, if we're going to become self-sufficient. If

1 the Arabs cut off the oil, you haven't even got the oil to  
2 supply the planes. And for us to sit here and say "we  
3 don't want any of this, we just want money," I think is  
4 really self-serving, nor is it thinking of anyone else but  
5 our own little selves. And there's more people in this  
6 country than just Alaskans.

7 THE MODERATOR: Celia?

8 MS. HUNTER: I don't think what is being discussed  
9 here is necessarily eliminating oil production on State  
10 lands or within State waters in Alaska. Of course, this is  
11 offshore leasing. But I think that we're looking at a  
12 collision of State interests and not necessarily purely  
13 local parochial interests either. The Coastal Zone plans  
14 which are being adapted are designed to take into  
15 account all of the resources in an area, and I think it's  
16 much better for us and much better for the welfare of  
17 Alaska and of the whole country to take into account those  
18 resources, because it doesn't make sense to eliminate a  
19 fisheries resource in order to have a short-term oil  
20 resource, if you can have both by care. And I think this  
21 is one of the major things that the Coastal Zone plans are  
22 trying to promulgate, is a matter of how do we judge the  
23 impacts that this oil production is going to make? What  
24 are we going to lose? Can we afford that cost? And is  
25 there a way to mitigate it?

1           And I think further in terms of our own financial  
2 well-being that, if you go on into really major oil and gas  
3 policy, that if Alaska looks ahead to leasing all of its  
4 oil potential within the next few years, we're going to  
5 lose a lot of money. What we need to do is to space our  
6 leasing out to such an extent that we maintain an even flow  
7 of income from that leasing, because that's a one-time-only  
8 resource, and we'd be crazy to just commit it all at  
9 current prices when everything is going up like mad. And I  
10 think that the point is very definitely that we have to  
11 have some protection of coastal resources other than oil  
12 along with oil development.

13           THE MODERATOR: Are you speaking in favor of the goal?

14           MS. HUNT: Well, I think what they're trying to do is  
15 to not stop the oil development, but to put it in  
16 coordination with a planning process.

17           THE MODERATOR: John Kelsey?

18           MR. KELSEY: Madam Chairman, I just feel that the  
19 Coastal Zone Management Law takes care of that. It  
20 addresses that. And I really don't see the reason for this.  
21 I believe there are safeguards in that management law.

22           THE MODERATOR: Carl?

23           MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, currently the leasing  
24 schedule does not affect the Norton Sound Basin, which is  
25 scheduled for '82, and Round Basin in '85, it's all

1 state-wide, you have Cook Bay '84, Kodiak '83, Aleutian  
2 Shelf in '85, St. George Basin, '85, the Hooper Bay Basin  
3 in '85. I think that the people here should be cognizant  
4 of the fact that there are a lot of people out there in the  
5 villages that have that have great concerns about this, and  
6 this does not necessarily mean that we're all out for  
7 stopping such leases, but to put this in a perspective  
8 through which everyone will be involved in the planning  
9 process.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Carl.

11 Chris?

12 MS. JOHNSON: I agree with what Carl has said, and I  
13 would like to speak in favor of the idea which Carolyn is  
14 expressing, but I'm concerned about the areas that -- let's  
15 say, we are developing our resources in the interior of  
16 Alaska where there is no Coastal Zone Management plan, and  
17 I would like to broaden what she has said into something  
18 that says, "The development of our natural resources should  
19 respect the needs and desires of the regions affected."  
20 I'd like to see something broad like that and not so  
21 specific.

22 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

23 MR. HARUN: Well Georgianna had one up there that I --  
24 did we table or approve, "goal of natural energy  
25 independence not be reached at the expense of Alaskan

1 citizens and its environment."

2 THE MODERATOR: That was passed over.

3 MS. KINGA: No, we passed it.

4 MR. TOMA: No, we passed it.

5 MR. HARUN: I thought we had passed it. If we had  
6 passed that, then the Coastal Zone Management tools might  
7 be a means underneath that, that goal, as well as perhaps  
8 some other suggestions for on-land resources in the  
9 interior. Maybe you want to go stronger on that, but it  
10 could fit, if you want it to, because that's what we're  
11 talking about. We're talking about energy extraction and  
12 its effect upon people in the environment.

13 THE MODERATOR: Carl? Did you want to respond to that?

14 MR. JACK: I've just been advised that there is  
15 basically no coordination between the federal -- with the  
16 Coastal Zone Management enabling legislation which resulted  
17 in the time frame that has been established by the federal  
18 Government for offshore leasing.

19 THE MODERATOR: Then what you're saying is that this  
20 is an important goal that should be separate from the other?

21 MR. JACK: It is. Should be.

22 THE MODERATOR: Okay, are you ready to accept or  
23 reject this?

24 MS. HEDLAND: Yes.

25 THE MODERATOR: All those in favor --

1 MR. HAKUN: Could we have it read one more time,  
2 please?

3 THE MODERATOR: Yes. Would you read the goal, please?

4 MR. TOMA: Yes. "No oil and gas leases should occur  
5 until the coastal research -- completed and approved by the  
6 cognizant agencies

7 THE MODERATOR: We did say we weren't going to make  
8 negative statements. So could we --

9 MR. TOMA: okay. "Oil and gas leases should occur  
10 until the Coastal Research Service Area plans have been  
11 approved by the cognizant agencies."

12 THE MODERATOR: Ellen.

13 MS. HAYES: Yes, are we, Madam Chairman, then looking  
14 at this as a means under development or is it an end in  
15 itself?

16 THE MODERATOR: No, I understand it's a goal.

17 THE MODERATOR: Stan?

18 MR. MACK: I have trouble with the wording of the goal.  
19 There is a difference between leasing of a plot and  
20 developing that plot. Are we assuming then that  
21 immediately upon leasing we are then taking for granted  
22 that activity will start in in regard to, in this respect,  
23 drilling of the well? Or are we addressing the issue of  
24 merely leasing an area? I have trouble distinguishing  
25 between the two.

1 THE MODERATOR: I hope someone around here can answer  
2 that. Not me.

3 MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, there's basically three  
4 methods, as I understand it, I could stand corrected on  
5 this, that there's two major steps that it will take. One  
6 is the nominations for sale for the affected areas.  
7 Following that, exploration will start. And after the  
8 exploration starts, then the development would occur, and  
9 at the development stage, which is probably the time frame  
10 between exploration and development, is probably about five  
11 years in general, I believe. At the time of the  
12 development, that's when they go out and drill for oil.

13 THE MODERATOR: Are there any other objections or  
14 comments before we vote on this? Gary?

15 MR. ICLTHUS: I just wanted to sort of second what  
16 Carl said about the concern of the people around the coast,  
17 and point out that this one, while it's more specific, that  
18 Georgianna's is necessary, partly because I happen to be  
19 familiar with some developments in other states, like in  
20 Montana and Wyoming. Those places are being called  
21 national sacrifice areas, and the State governments are  
22 having terrific struggles to maintain any kind of  
23 constraints on the development of coal, especially, and oil.  
24 And I think this is another kind of constraint that gives  
25 the State a lever in dealing with the Federal Government.

1           Now, the issue in the simplest form is: Who is  
2 going to develop resources? Is it going to be the feds?  
3 Is it going to be the State? Is it going to be private  
4 industry? And on whose timetable? And so far we've been  
5 losing the battle with the feds in terms of the timetable.  
6 This gives us a little handle, or one more weapon to use in  
7 that kind of a struggle.

8           THE MODERATOR: Andy.

9           MR. HOPE: Did we start standing up again or --

10          THE MODERATOR: I don't know.

11          MR. HOPE: The one thing I have a question about is  
12 that agencies, how many agencies and what, from where? I  
13 think it would be best if it would be left up to the local  
14 agencies or local governments, as I have stressed.

15          THE MODERATOR: Carl?

16          MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, clarification on that, as I  
17 understand it, upon the completion of the coastal or CR,  
18 plans would be submitted to the Alaska Coastal Policy  
19 Council. So that's a State agency. So the cognizant  
20 agency is synonymous with the State agency in this case.

21          THE MODERATOR: Okay, we're ready to --

22          MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman?

23          THE MODERATOR: Yes, Yule.

24          MR. KILCHER: With the word "when" there, with the  
25 word "when," it almost looks like a dictate, that oil and

285  
1 gas leases should occur when, immediately after, but I  
2 think if we take "after" instead of "when," it's more  
3 important than to Style and Drafting, just say "after," or  
4 "only after" possibly.

5 MR. TOMA: "Only" might satisfy the "until" part of it.

6 MR. KILCHER: Yes, only after the Coastal Resource  
7 Service plans have been agreed. Not "when."

8 MR. TOMA: So we read, "Oil and gas leases should  
9 occur only after the Coastal Resource Area plans have been  
10 completed and approved by the cognizant agencies"?

11 THE MODERATOR: Carl, do you accept that?

12 MR. JACK: No objections.

13 THE MODERATOR: Carl accepts that. Do you have a  
14 comment, Andy?

15 MR. MATHIESEN: Yes, I should like to say that those  
16 leases should occur only when justifiable and after their  
17 resource service area plans have been completed. Otherwise,  
18 you're saying that those leases should occur no matter  
19 where, as long as you got a plan for it.

20 THE MODERATOR: Do you wish to change that?

21 MR. MATHIESEN: Yes, I would like to see that issue  
22 occur only where justifiable.

23 MS. HEDLAND: By whose standards?

24 MR. HUSS: Won't that be included in the Coastal Zone  
25 Management plan?

1 THE MODERATOR: I don't know enough about that, I  
2 can't answer that. Marion?

3 MS. HYLEN: May I ask a question? Is this coastal  
4 zone, or the -- let's see, I can't see that.

5 MR. TOMA: Excuse me.

6 MS. HYLEN: Coastal Resource Service Area plans, is  
7 that -- that isn't the State coastal zone. This is the  
8 regional that he's talking about?

9 MR. JACK: No.

10 MS. HYLEN: Or is it the state?

11 MR. JACK: It's state.

12 MR. TOMA: State local and regional. I mean it's  
13 federal, state, local and regional. All four entities have  
14 been brought into these planning agencies.

15 MR. HOPE: Under whose legislation?

16 MR. TOMA: Under federal legislation. These are under  
17 federal -- these are federal monies that are pumped in to  
18 set these up.

19 THE MODERATOR: Is Jane knowledgeable -- Jane Anvik is  
20 here, and I think maybe she could straighten that out for  
21 us.

22 MS. ANVIK: This is a quick resource background. The  
23 Coastal Policy Act is passed by the Federal Government.  
24 The state of Alaska then has the opportunity to develop its  
25 own coastal policy act, which it did do. What that then

SCOMM

#30:18

FILE COPY

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, STATE OF ALASKA

Conference on Alaska's future frontiers

Friday, December 7, 1979

Sheraton Anchorage Hotel

Anchorage, Alaska

VOLUME 11

Legislative Reference Library  
Legislative Affairs Agency  
Pouch Y State Capital  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Reported by: Charlene Leovich, FR

1 provides for is that Local Resource Planning Councils can  
2 be established to develop a plan about how the coastal  
3 areas in their region will be developed.

4 In the areas where you have a local unit of  
5 government, such as a borough, the borough represents and  
6 is that agency that develops the coastal policy. Such as  
7 the North Slope Borough, the municipality of Anchorage, the  
8 Kenai Borough or the Mat-Su Borough. However in the areas  
9 of the unorganized borough an election must be held whereby  
10 the people in the region must duly agree through an  
11 election to form such a council; then, secondly, they must  
12 elect members to that council who are regional  
13 representatives.

14 They then go through the process of developing a  
15 plan. That plan must be approved by the local council. It  
16 must be approved by the State Coastal Policy Council, which  
17 Carl mentioned, and must then be approved by the Federal  
18 Government. What that then does is says that no federal  
19 action may go against the policies as established by that  
20 plan. And it's called consistency. It also says that no  
21 State action can go against the policies that are laid out  
22 in that plan.

23 So that it really provides local regions a  
24 tremendous clout in determining what both the State and the  
25 Federal Government will do in relationship to development

1 along the coast.

2 THE MODERATOR: So actually the suggestion of Andy's  
3 really isn't necessary, that wording, or is it?

4 MR. HOPE: Well, it helps to know these things.

5 MS. ANVIK: Okay, the decisions about whether or not a  
6 lease will occur, also, as Carl mentioned, the coastal  
7 management, the coastal zone planning legislation, operates  
8 totally independently from the legislation and the agencies  
9 that govern leasing. And they are in fact at this time not  
10 coordinated. So that the Bureau of Land Management governs  
11 leasing and NOA governs other agencies, which are different  
12 agencies within the Federal Government, which is one  
13 problem why the timing is a little out of sync right now.

14 The decision to hold a lease sale or not will in  
15 the future be based in compliance with those coastal plans  
16 as well as other kinds of considerations, such as whether  
17 or not they anticipate there's any oil there, a very  
18 extensive both socio-economic and environmental assessment  
19 of the area. The issue of justifiable, the federal and the  
20 state government would probably argue that no lease would  
21 ever occur unless it was justifiable through going through  
22 several checks anyway. The coastal policy, the coastal  
23 zone plans will represent yet another measure in  
24 determining whether or not it's justifiable to lease in the  
25 area.

1 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Jane. Marion?

2 MS. BYLEN: Then why do we need this?

3 MS. ANVIK: Currently the federal leasing schedule is  
4 not in sync with the same federal and state law that says  
5 that coastal management plans will be developed. The  
6 leasing schedule is ahead of -- we're probably four or five  
7 years off. The leasing schedule says that there will be a  
8 lease sale, for example, in the Norton Basin in 1982. The  
9 Norton Basin Coastal Zone Plan will not be ready probably  
10 before 1982. The reason, for example, the Beaufort lease  
11 sale today is going back and forth is that the North Slope  
12 Borough raced to try to get their Coastal Zone Management  
13 Plan done prior to the lease sale which is to be held next  
14 week, and it's now before the Court trying to decide  
15 whether or not that will happen. So the issues, they're  
16 not in sync.

17 THE MODERATOR: Okay one more comment.

18 MR. HOPE: Rosita Whirl has worked pretty hard on this.  
19 Before we take any action, I'd like to hear from her or at  
20 least somebody from up there that's been working on it.  
21 Again, it's presumptuous for us to take action.

22 THE MODERATOR: Let's put this one over then. We have  
23 a request to hold this one over, so we'll hold it and go on.

24 Unfortunately we have to move again at 4:30, but  
25 we do have a room to go to, but it's going to be very --

1 I'd like us to get as far as we can now.

2 MR. KADEN: Who are we waiting for on this room?

3 THE MODERATOR: He wants to have some input from  
4 somebody who is not on our committee, but a --

5 MS. KINGKA: She's a delegate.

6 THE MODERATOR: Kosita Whirl from Barrow?

7 MR. HOPE: Anchorage.

8 MS. MEDLAND: Point of information on this Coastal  
9 Zone Management, which since I quit League, I've sort of  
10 gotten out of it again, but it's my understanding, Jane,  
11 correct me if I'm wrong, that every local community has to  
12 have input into the local management plan. I know I sat in  
13 on numerous meetings right here in Anchorage for what are  
14 they going to do, Tidewater Freeway and so forth. The  
15 concern which I think is a valid thing to address in our  
16 goal statement is that the mandates of the federal law,  
17 which were "Thou shalt have a local and a State plan in  
18 order to be eligible for federal funding and so forth for  
19 Coastal Zone Management" are not being dealt with, because  
20 they said we had to have a State Coastal Zone Management  
21 plan, you know, that took five years, or whatever, of  
22 hearings.

23 We came up with a plan. Then they said we had to  
24 have local plans. We did that. We came up with local  
25 plans. And now the Federal Government is on their own

1 timetable and they're ignoring exactly those things they  
2 said we had to have. So there is some validity to  
3 reemphasizing the fact that we should at least conform with --  
4 or they should conform with what they told us to do.

5 THE MODERATOR: Haden, were you objecting to the fact  
6 that there was no need to hold this over?

7 MR. KADEN: I don't see any reason. I don't know  
8 Kosita Whirl, but --

9 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That was my statement. I  
10 don't see any need to hold it over. I'm ready to vote.

11 MS. HEDLAND: Read it again.

12 THE MODERATOR: Read the statement.

13 MR. TOMA: "Oil and gas leases should occur only where  
14 justifiable and after the Coastal Resource Service Area  
15 plans have been completed and approved by the cognizant  
16 agencies."

17 THE MODERATOR: Now, Andy had a suggestion for some  
18 word change there.

19 Do you still want that change or are you  
20 satisfied with the explanation, that --

21 MR. MATHIESEN: They're in there.

22 THE MODERATOR: -- the concern would be there. It's  
23 in there okay. All those in in favor of this as a goal  
24 please stand.

25 (complying)

1 It's okay. I wasn't sure. Passed.

2 MR. TOMA: "The State shall develop bottom fisheries  
3 and the continued rehabilitation of existing renewable  
4 fisheries." I'll just put "continuing" in here.

5 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to this goal?

6 MS. REDLAND: Hooray.

7 MR. TOMA: That's a big commitment, you know.

8 MR. MATHIESEN: I could tell you I'm opposed to the  
9 State developing bottom fishery.

10 THE MODERATOR: You are?

11 MR. MATHIESEN: Darn rights I am.

12 THE MODERATOR: You think it should be done --

13 MR. KADEN: Why?

14 MR. MATHIESEN: The State is not obligated to develop  
15 anything. Their obligation is to perpetuate that resource.

16 MR. KILCHER: Right.

17 MR. MATHIESEN: The State doesn't owe fishermen a  
18 living, contrary to the limited-entry thing. They owe the  
19 rest of us the fact that the fish are going to be there a  
20 hundred years from now. And that's the sole obligation.

21 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

22 MR. HARUN: I was assuming within that that the State  
23 would encourage the renewability of the resource at the  
24 same time. I think that unless we do encourage renewable  
25 resources, we end up risking pulling communities which now

1 depend on it forcing them into nonrenewable areas, putting  
2 roads in there, doing a lot of different things that would  
3 be harmful, and so I personally feel that bottom fishing is  
4 a good economic development, but that it does imply, maybe  
5 we want to clarify, that the State has an obligation to  
6 maintain the long-term viability of that resource at the  
7 same time.

8 MR. TOMA: This right here means building docks and  
9 support facilities on the Aleutian chain. That's what the  
10 meaning of this phrase is right here.

11 THE MODERATOR: John?

12 MR. KELSEY: I would suggest that you insert the word,  
13 first word to be "encourage."

14 MR. KILCHER: Or "favor," or "favor."

15 THE MODERATOR: The State should encourage, what? the  
16 development?

17 MR. KILCHER: That's right.

18 THE MODERATOR: How does that read now?

19 MR. TOMA: "State should encourage the development of  
20 'ottom fisheries."

21 THE MODERATOR: Ellen?

22 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, just a question raised  
23 here by these two men, for me then I need clarification.  
24 Does the language here then indicate that the State is in  
25 business --

1           MR. TOMA: No.

2           THE MODERATOR: --

3           MS. HAYES: -- of developing? Or the facilities. You  
4 know, the way it looks now is that without discussion by a  
5 group whose ideas come around verbally, that without that  
6 verbal exchange, the State is in business to develop bottom  
7 fisheries, the State of Alaska. So it looks like they  
8 would be the business entity from the way I'd read it.

9           THE MODERATOR: David?

10          MR. KEENER: I get the feeling that we're here to  
11 determine how to spend a certain amount of money for the  
12 future. What we have are expenditures in government for  
13 telecommunications, for expenditures from which you will  
14 never get an economic base, unless you keep subsidizing.  
15 The development of bottom fisheries may not prove to be  
16 viable, because it may not be competitive on the world  
17 market. But if it is, you're creating an industry, a  
18 community, an economic base, that will get on its feet and  
19 be able to perpetuate itself in private industry without  
20 further governmental assistance. So it's one program where  
21 it helps itself.

22          THE MODERATOR: Any other comments?

23          MR. MATHIESEN: I disagree with that completely. The  
24 country's full of places where we have developed something  
25 to an entity, a production entity, is what I think he's

1 talking about, to utilize a natural resource. And without  
2 proper management of that natural resource, then we have a  
3 community that needs further support. I'll give you a  
4 prime example on bottom fish, seeing as how that's what  
5 we're talking about.

6 We encouraged a few years ago a drag fleet to  
7 come around from the east to harvest scallops. Most of  
8 them couldn't afford to go home, in spite of record catches,  
9 world record catches of scallops here for a short period of  
10 time. And I think if you asked me to stop and think, I  
11 could think of a few more. We shouldn't be in a  
12 development business.

13 MS. BEDLAND: Madam Chairman, what it sounds like  
14 we're looking for is support for expanded expertise in  
15 technology for our renewable industries, and bottom fish  
16 and fisheries in general and so forth all come under that.  
17 I think I'm a little disturbed by limiting it to bottom  
18 fish and not just the whole technological concept, and  
19 that's probably someplace else, but maybe that's the draw-  
20 back. It looks like we're subsidizing one industry over  
21 another.

22 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

23 MS. JOHNSON: I have exactly the same concern. I  
24 think we're becoming overly specific. We are addressing  
25 ourselves to bottom fish, but we're not addressing

1 ourselves to the crab industry or the salmon industry. I  
2 think if we want to talk at this point, I see that, Chip, I  
3 see that --

4 MR. TOMA: Okay.

5 MS. JOHNSON: -- but at this point. These are our  
6 goals. They're supposed to be broad. We're going to talk  
7 about narrow things later. We can't just discuss the  
8 bottom fish industry here in three minutes. I mean I think  
9 we need to look big right now and then narrow later. I  
10 think this is much too narrow.

11 THE MODERATOR: Anyone else before I call on David  
12 again? Kaden?

13 MR. KADEN: In several of the papers there was a plea  
14 for setting up an institute or a number of them and pumping  
15 a lot of this money into just basically research and research,  
16 you know, that relates specifically to specific rural  
17 countries, to Alaska's peculiar environment, their natural  
18 resources. Maybe that's the way we should be looking at  
19 some of this resource development, you know, and maybe make  
20 that a goal that part of that money should go into having  
21 local, you know, research in Alaska, top quality, you know,  
22 with the -- and that would deal with alternative energy  
23 sources and, you know, fishing, you know, the whole gamut  
24 of, you know, technological skills as applied to life in  
25 the northern countries.

1 THE MODERATOR: Well, that would be more in line with  
2 what Andy thinks should be done, as far as renewal of the  
3 fishing industry, to have research, which would preserve --

4 MR. MATHIESEN: Madam Chairman, that is really true,  
5 because part of research, as it relates to the fishery, may  
6 even include having the Japanese harvest the fish. We get  
7 the money. We go to Mexico and South America and have a  
8 glorious winter. We don't have to go out there and pound  
9 our butts on the ground floor. That may prove to be a  
10 better alternative.

11 THE MODERATOR: Would you like to scrap this statement  
12 and coming up with a broader statement? Is that the  
13 feeling, the consensus of the group?

14 (Answering affirmatively)

15 THE MODERATOR: We'll scrap that, and someone comes up  
16 with a good strong research statement for resources.

17 Excuse me, Stan, you're going to have to scream  
18 at me.

19 MR. MACK: There's a program. I think the program is  
20 already incorporated where the State has subsidized some  
21 industries in respect to the bottom fishing. That program  
22 I believe is already in effect.

23 THE MODERATOR: We're down to human resources section,  
24 right?

25 MS. HAYES: Up to.

1 THE MODERATOR: Up to human resources.

2 MR. TOMA: The State should guarantee the dignity and  
3 well-being of Alaskans of all ages and economic status.

4 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

5 (No response) Okay.

6 MR. TOMA: The State should support systems for all  
7 family structures, including adequate housing, preventive  
8 and crisis, medical treatment, day care and aid for elderly  
9 as essential.

10 THE MODERATOR: Gary, I'm sorry, you had your hand up,  
11 I didn't see you behind him.

12 MR. HOLTHUS: That was fine. I just think once again  
13 we've got our ends and means mixed up.

14 MR. TOMA: Okay.

15 THE MODERATOR: Oh.

16 MR. HOLTHUS: I'd rather see it say something like a  
17 place where adequate mechanisms are provided for the health  
18 and safety of families. And then we'll have time during  
19 the meetings to get into the support systems that provide  
20 for that. I'm not just interested in support systems and  
21 not just interested in support systems, but some more --

22 THE MODERATOR: Well, that was your goal and I guess  
23 somebody else wrote it up for you, because --

24 MR. HOLTHUS: It's got everything in it. It's just  
25 that I think it's got the means as well as the end.

1 MS. HEDLAND: I did write it up and I did try to put  
2 it all in there, but I think the word mechanisms was also a  
3 means --

4 MR. HOLTHUS: Yes.

5 MS. HEDLAND: -- therefore, and I do believe after  
6 thinking about it, that just a goal of support systems is  
7 an achievable and valid goal, and in the means you have to  
8 get into the administering of these and the mechanisms for  
9 them.

10 MR. HOLTHUS: Madam Chairman, I don't agree at all. I  
11 think it's possible to have an infinite number of support  
12 systems and still have, as we have some now, and still have  
13 unhealthy families and unsafe families. So I think the  
14 goal is to have healthy, safe families, and that's --  
15 that's the goal.

16 THE MODERATOR: Can you change it right now by looking  
17 at it?

18 MR. HOLTHUS: Sure, what we want is healthy safe  
19 families.

20 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

21 MS. HEDLAND: However, I'm very concerned that the  
22 implication of family will include a single person, a  
23 divorced person --

24 MR. HOLTHUS: I hope so.

25 MS. HEDLAND: -- with two children and the elderly,

1 and somehow it never does. That's why I wanted to somehow  
2 get in there all types of family units or something like  
3 that.

4 MR. HOLTHUS: Yes, okay. Well, let's just say healthy  
5 and safe conditions for everyone then or something like  
6 that. I hate to water it down all that much, but maybe in  
7 the means we can get to the rest of it. But health and  
8 safety I guess is the thing that really concerns me.  
9 Dignity is fine, but you can be sick and dignified, too,  
10 and you can be in poverty and dignified. So I think we  
11 need something more than that, and health and safety is  
12 fine, and just say that and we'll include the definition of  
13 families in the means.

14 MR. TOMA: Support health and safety systems?

15 MR. HOLTHUS: For everyone.

16 MR. TOMA: Okay for everyone.

17 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

18 MR. MATHIESEN: Couldn't we say like for instance the  
19 welfare of our human resources should hold the highest  
20 priority?

21 THE MODERATOR: The what?

22 MR. HOLTHUS: Well, welfare can be such a bad word.

23 MS. HEDLAND: I was afraid of that word myself.

24 MR. MATHIESEN: Well, you might choose something  
25 different, but I think the meaning is not complicated.

1 THE MODERATOR: How does it read now?

2 MR. TOMA: "The State should support health and safety  
3 systems for all Alaskans."

4 THE MODERATOR: Well, maybe just state it health and  
5 safety should have a high priority, should be a high  
6 priority.

7 MR. HOLTHUS: I think the State's minimum obligation  
8 is to provide for the health and safety of its residents,  
9 period. If we get the systems in there, then we're still,  
10 you know, the State's goal is to provide systems. It's not  
11 to provide health. That's not where we're at.

12 MR. KILCHER: That's where we're at.

13 MR. HOLTHUS: That's where we are at, that's right.

14 MR. TOMA: "The State should support the health and  
15 safety of all Alaskans."

16 THE MODERATOR: Does that really say though what you  
17 mean?

18 MR. HOLTHUS: Well, provide for -- I'd say provide for  
19 instead of support.

20 MR. TOMA: Okay.

21 THE MODERATOR: Ellen, did you have a comment on that?

22 MS. HAYES: While he's writing on that one, Madam  
23 Chairman, I'm trying to figure out the top one that went by.  
24 We are saying that we will guarantee the dignity of  
25 economic status, the well-being of economic status, that

1 economic status, in my head, I don't know how it hangs in  
2 there very well. In the future we want to guarantee the  
3 dignity and well-being of Alaskans. Then how does the  
4 economic status, what does that mean? To me it isn't in  
5 good form.

6 THE MODERATOR: Well, right now, Ellen, I think this  
7 is confusing. If we can finish what we're on right now.

8 MS. HAYES: While he was writing, I had to make a  
9 point. I'm not satisfied with it.

10 THE MODERATOR: All right, I'll make a note of that.

11 MR. TOMA: The State should provide for the health and  
12 safety of all Alaskans." Okay.

13 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

14 MR. MATHIESEN: What if you see somebody, just, you  
15 know, laying out in the street and doesn't want to  
16 contribute anything? Then what we're saying is that we  
17 should have some entity come along and pick him up? Buy  
18 him a nice set of clothes like John's got here and furnish  
19 him a nice house and make sure he's back in the mainstream?  
20 Is that what we're saying?

21 MR. TOMA: I don't think so.

22 THE MODERATOR: I don't believe so.

23 MR. MATHIESEN: They're guaranteed these things.

24 MS. KINCKA: But you're not specifying how you're  
25 guaranteeing.

1 THE MODERATOR: We're on the second one now. We're  
2 discussing the second one now.

3 Will you read it again?

4 MR. TOMA: "The State should provide" or "shall  
5 provide for the health and safety of all Alaskans." "The  
6 State should provide for the health and safety of all  
7 Alaskans."

8 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Question.

9 MR. HOLTHUS: I don't guess it's worth going back for  
10 one of us I guess. We can talk about it a little bit.

11 THE MODERATOR: Are we in agreement on this?

12 MR. KILCHER: Yes.

13 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Let's vote on it.

14 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to the wording  
15 of this second goal under human resources? I see no  
16 objection.

17 MR. TOMA: Is there any distinction between "shall"  
18 and "should"? Should we make it "shall" consistent the  
19 whole way through here? Do you have some feeling on that?  
20 I guess we shall. The State shall provide for the health  
21 and safety of all Alaskans."

22 This is a means I would imagine, educate doctors  
23 about nutrition.

24 THE MODERATOR: What was the next one there?

25 MR. TOMA: "The State shall have programs which

1 effectively address alcohol abuse as an independent -- oh,  
2 as an impediment, excuse me. "The State shall have  
3 programs which effectively address alcohol abuse as an  
4 impediment to full utilization of Alaska's human resource  
5 and nutritional --

6 THE MODERATOR: Means? That's a means, isn't it? If  
7 you're talking about the State having programs, that's a  
8 means.

9 MR. HUSS: Means.

10 MR. TOMA: Nutritional, means, okay. "The State shall  
11 provide programs which effectively address alcohol --

12 THE MODERATOR: Isn't that a means? The State shall  
13 provide a program? You're going to have to change that to  
14 make it a goal.

15 Kevin?

16 MR. BARON: It is covered, but it isn't, because what  
17 we're looking for under the means are specific solutions,  
18 and this, if you leave it as it is, is not a specific  
19 solution, it's a goal. It's a general goal. And so it's  
20 going to have to be refined more. But I think as a goal,  
21 it's a laudible goal.

22 MS. HYLEN: A goal is the elimination of alcoholism in  
23 Alaska, would be the goal.

24 MR. BARON: How do you do that?

25 THE MODERATOR: Could we have some order? I must tell

1 you that when you are talking like this, nothing goes on  
2 the record, because there's no way that she can get  
3 anything. So if you want it to be on the record, you will  
4 have to address the chair.

5 Okay, we're now back to this one. Would you read  
6 it again, please?

7 MR. TOMA: "The State shall effectively alcohol abuse  
8 as an impediment to full utilization of Alaska's human  
9 resource."

10 THE MODERATOR: Any objection? Marion?

11 MS. HYLEN: Why don't you just say that we -- the goal  
12 is really to eliminate alcoholism in Alaska?

13 THE MODERATOR: Is that an achievable goal?

14 MS. HYLEN: I mean you have a goal. These others are  
15 means. Your goal is still there.

16 MS. LONGPRE: I differentiate alcoholism from alcohol  
17 abuse. There is -- I believe there is some alcohol abuse,  
18 at least in the idea that I'm from, that is not -- wouldn't  
19 necessarily be called alcoholism or not alcoholics.

20 MS. HYLEN: You mean when he gets drunk and beats  
21 somebody else? That's alcohol abuse?

22 MS. LONGPRE: I'm talking about alcohol abuse in our  
23 area by children. I couldn't class them as alcoholics.  
24 But children, you know, there's a large percentage of  
25 alcohol abuse by children in our area. I wouldn't call

1 then alcoholics.

2 THE MODERATOR: Yes, Marion?

3 MS. HYLEN: Madam Chairman, that comes under the same  
4 thing that there's a lot of abuse on kids eating candy, too.  
5 But it isn't something that you can eliminate.

6 But the thing you have to work for is your  
7 alcoholic. He is the only one that's a detriment to  
8 society.

9 MS. LONGPRE: I think that --

10 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

11 MS. JOHNSON: Could I suggest that we pass the general  
12 idea of this and leave the wording up to the Editing  
13 Committee?

14 MR. TOMA: To the author? How about to the author?

15 THE MODERATOR: Do you agree with the concept that  
16 this is a goal that we need in the -- in our goals  
17 statements?

18 MR. KELSEY: We already have.

19 THE MODERATOR: You agreed, okay. I stand corrected,  
20 all right.

21 Style & Drafting will be sure that the point is --

22 MR. TOMA: Under Human Profit, "The State shall grant  
23 tax credits and/or investment incentives to industry, to  
24 encourage the provisions of services and to offset adverse  
25 impact from developing after the fact."

1           MR. KINGHA: After the fact of industry.

2           MR. TOMA: Impact developing after the fact.

3           MR. KINGHA: In fairbanks we still have the adverse  
4 impact of the pipeline and we're still trying to handle it,  
5 and if they had done -- if they had thought about what  
6 might have happened before they were allowed to go through  
7 and made some provision for services that would have offset  
8 that adverse impact, then we wouldn't have it now, and the  
9 company who developed the business would have paid for it  
10 instead of the citizens who are left there now. That's  
11 probably worded improperly, but that's what it is.

12           THE MODERATOR: Carolyn?

13           MS. JONES: I think some of what's up there is a means.  
14 And I would suggest that the general goal is probably  
15 something like this: The State will encourage Alaskan-owned  
16 and operated industries to assume their social  
17 responsibilities to provide needed services and to offset  
18 adverse developmental impact in the community.

19           MS. KINCRA: I'll accept that wording.

20           MR. TOMA: Okay, do you have that wording?

21           THE MODERATOR: Did you all hear it?

22           MS. JONES: Want me to read it?

23           MR. TOMA: You have the wording. Just hold onto it.  
24 We'll vote on that then.

25           THE MODERATOR: Would you read it? They didn't hear

1 it. Would you speak up?

2 MS. JONES: All right, okay. "The State will  
3 encourage Alaskan-owned and operated industries to assume  
4 their social responsibilities, to provide needed services,  
5 and to offset adverse development impact in the community."

6 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to that? John?

7 MR. KELSEY: Question: Do we want to limit it to  
8 Alaska-owned and operated?

9 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That was my question, too.

10 MS. KINGRA: To private industry.

11 MS. JONES: Fine, fine.

12 THE MODERATOR: Any other objections? Changes? It's  
13 accepted.

14 MR. TOMA: Okay, "Funds should be made available for  
15 building suitable medical facilities in rural areas."

16 MS. HYLEN: That is a means.

17 THE MODERATOR: That is a means to a --

18 MR. TOMA: No, that's a goal.

19 MR. KILCHER: Yep.

20 MR. TOMA: I mean health is already a goal, right?

21 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

22 MR. TOMA: But this is a goal, too, because I mean  
23 it's been a long-time goal.

24 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that as a goal?

25 (No response)

1 Accepted.

2 MR. TOMA: Under Education, "One which provides  
3 continuing education for all age groups," or an age group?  
4 All -- yes, excuse me, an education -- "The State shall  
5 have an education policy which provides continuing  
6 education for all age groups."

7 THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

8 MR. KILCHER: I think we had that.

9 THE MODERATOR: Beg your pardon? Do you have a  
10 comment, Yule?

11 MR. KILCHER: I think that exists.

12 MS. KINGRA: No.

13 THE MODERATOR: Continuing education, that means life-long.

14 MS. BUSS: The State has policies for bits and pieces  
15 of it, but not much of a whole policy for the State.

16 THE MODERATOR: Kaden?

17 MR. KADEN: One thing, Chip, where that says one in  
18 which, what that is is just continuing, "We envision a  
19 future for Alaska as "One which," that's why it states like,  
20 instead of saying "The state should do these things." That  
21 was the format these were being set up in.

22 THE MODERATOR: Well, the Style & Drafting is going to  
23 have to decide which form it's going to be.

24 MR. KADEN: But opposed to him scratching, you know --

25 THE MODERATOR: Don't edit. What they were using was

1 this form that was left from ten years ago.

2 MR. TOMA: All right. "One which provides continuing  
3 education for all age groups."

4 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection?

5 (No response)

6 MR. TOMA: Okay.

7 THE MODERATOR: It's accepted.

8 MR. TOMA: "better standards for village high schools."

9 THE MODERATOR: Whose is that?

10 MS. LAYES: Doesn't matter whose it is unless there's  
11 comment about it.

12 THE MODERATOR: Is there any comment?

13 MR. KELSEY: Doesn't the State have certain standards  
14 that they have to -- all high schools have to follow?

15 THE MODERATOR: Yes, there are standards, but someone  
16 is questioning and wants them improved, I guess.

17 MR. KADEN: Just seems like that's pretty narrow. You  
18 know it's creating sort of a division, thereby  
19 distinguishing --

20 THE MODERATOR: David?

21 MR. KEENER: I think possibly it might just be the  
22 word better. I mean better for us or better for them, for  
23 their own life-style. Somewhere it's got to be correlated  
24 where it meets their own needs.

25 THE MODERATOR: John?

1 MS. HUSE: I'm not sure what's meant by standards.

2 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

3 MS. JOHNSON: I'd go back to Haden's original point,  
4 that I think this is overly narrow and maybe should be  
5 addressed at another time in the means category.

6 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn?

7 MS. JONES: Over on Justice, R, which people said was  
8 in the wrong place, would that satisfy what we're talking  
9 about under better standards? Would that be the goal and  
10 that be the means?

11 MR. TOMA: "One where we have high expectations for  
12 all our students and where the opportunity for an enriched  
13 education is available to all Alaskans without  
14 discrimination."

15 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

16 THE MODERATOR: Yes, that sounds like that should be  
17 moved over there.

18 Georgianna?

19 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Well, Carolyn on that, it  
20 says, we have high expectations for our students, but --  
21 and an opportunities for an enriched education for all.  
22 heck, the State could have high expectations. I'm sure  
23 they do for all of our students. I'm more concerned about  
24 our high expectations for the standards for quality of  
25 education that they're receiving. And we all have high

1 expectations of the students.

2 MS. JONES: I don't have any quarrel with you on that.

3 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I think instead of students that  
4 needs to be changed somehow where we have high expectations  
5 for the quality of education.

6 MR. TOMA: For the quality of education? I don't know  
7 if we want to change what we've done.

8 MS. JONES: May I be recognized, Madam Chairman?

9 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn.

10 MS. JONES: We never discussed b or any of them, we  
11 just voted on them.

12 MR. TOMA: Yes.

13 MS. JONES: Could I have 30 seconds to explain my  
14 intent?

15 My intent in saying high expectations is because  
16 it's my observations in the school with my black child and  
17 other black children, and in conversations I've had with  
18 some native parents, that there are teachers in the school  
19 that do not expect a high performance from minority  
20 students. They do not encourage them. They do not demand  
21 excellence. They do not get upset when those children  
22 don't do their homework. And as a result they are rewarded  
23 with mediocre performances, and so my point in including  
24 high expectations is that I want the school systems to  
25 expect the highest from all the students. And my point in

1 putting enriched education indication is that I've been  
2 informed that while there are a lot of rural schools where  
3 you now can stay home, they do not provide all the courses  
4 that some of the students need to have an enriched  
5 education. They're getting a basic education. Maybe you  
6 want to say something else, Georgianna, but that's what I  
7 meant.

8 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I guess again it's  
9 just this high expectation from the students. That's the  
10 thing that's a hang-up for me, because that's true about,  
11 you know, the teachers not having a high expectations, but  
12 I think it's the teacher that we need to beat on the head,  
13 not the student. The quality of the teachers.

14 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman?

15 THE MODERATOR: Caroline, are you wishing to answer  
16 that?

17 MS. JONES: Could I suggest an amendment then, that  
18 "One where the school systems have high expectations for  
19 all the students"?

20 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman, --

21 MS. JONES: Do something with that. I don't want to  
22 fight. I just want to get it done.

23 THE MODERATOR: Perhaps that would be under the means  
24 that you would bring that in, that teach -- about the  
25 teachers, rather than changing that -- that wording now.

1 Yule?

2 MR. FILCHER: Madam Chairman, I think we could word it  
3 possibly, listen to this: Education to match our high  
4 expectations for." It's our high expectations, and the  
5 children's, too, but the State can -- there's no use for  
6 the State to have high expectations, you know. We have it  
7 all in the beginning, presumably. Every politician that  
8 runs for office has high expectations. But we want to  
9 furnish education that matches our high expectations or the  
10 children's expectations. Would you agree with that?

11 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

12 MR. HARUN: Well, Dave mentioned a point back here.  
13 He said something about he interpreted that, I don't know  
14 who wrote it, did you write it Dave?

15 MR. KEENER: No.

16 MS. JONES: I wrote it.

17 MR. HARUN: I interpreted it better standards for  
18 village high schools, that they be culturally relevant.  
19 That's how we got back to though

20 THE MODERATOR: Whose goal was that better standards?  
21 Was that yours, Georgianna?

22 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) No.

23 THE MODERATOR: Better standards.

24 MR. HARUN: The better --

25 MR. TOMA: Better standards, No. 6, the second one

1 there?

2 MS. LONGPICK: Yes.

3 THE MODERATOR: Whose was that?

4 MR. HARUN: That's how we got over to this.

5 THE MODERATOR: No one will admit authorship.

6 MR. HARUN: If I might just mention. He had a really  
7 good point -- excuse me, Madam Chairman, I wasn't finished  
8 with that.

9 THE MODERATOR: Sorry.

10 MR. HARUN: He made a really good point in that a lot  
11 of times that I have friends who are school teachers in the  
12 bush, his point was that they were not culturally relevant  
13 for a lot of standards. For instance they take SKA tests  
14 and Dick and Jane and the dog, but it doesn't fit with a  
15 villager.

16 MS. LINCOLN: In that connection, I disagree.

17 MR. HARUN: You do?

18 MS. LINCOLN: I think the cultural aspect and the  
19 expectational level are two completely different things,  
20 because the quality of education does not always mean that  
21 culture is involved. I don't know just how to say it, but  
22 I do disagree, in that they are two different things.

23 THE MODERATOR: Well, is this goal of better standards,  
24 is that a goal that we need, or do you want to put  
25 something regarding standards under a means to improve

1 education? So right now we'll pass over, that this is not  
2 a goal? Is that the feeling that I'm getting from you?

3 Okay, that's not a goal.

4 MR. TOMA: Okay, a means.

5 "One in which basic education is stressed."

6 THE MODERATOR: How does that start?

7 MR. TOMA: "One in which basic education is stressed."

8 MR. HARUN: Must be a means again.

9 THE MODERATOR: Any objection? Chris?

10 MS. JOHNSON: I don't understand what that means.

11 MR. TOMA: Can I get the full phrase, Haden? What's  
12 the term here?

13 MR. KADEN: We envision of future for Alaska as --

14 MR. TOMA: We envision a future for Alaska as one in  
15 which basic education is stressed."

16 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I remember this morning or  
17 yesterday, the remark that I remember was that we are  
18 graduating from the secondary level, young people who are  
19 not able to read was one of the examples, and to go into  
20 the -- the enriched without the basic, we're not even  
21 already doing basics very well.

22 THE MODERATOR: Well, if I might say something, in all  
23 the years that I was on the State Board of Education, no  
24 one has ever been able to come up with a definition of what  
25 basic education is, and they have been working on it -- for

1 I think hon Hohman will go along with that, they're still  
2 working on that, a definition; isn't that correct?

3 MR. HOHMAN: Uh-huh (affirmative response).

4 THE MODERATOR: So if you want to say that you believe  
5 that -- your goal is that every child should be able to  
6 read and write and cipher, maybe that is something that is  
7 more understandable, if that's what you mean by your  
8 interpretation of basic, because to me I would like to say  
9 I believe that basic is art and music and libraries and lot  
10 of things. And so that's why nobody has ever been able to  
11 get back to --

12 MS. KINGRA: If you read the next two on the sheet,  
13 under six, education, down here, these two, yes, they take  
14 in almost everything on the top except for all educational  
15 funds to be administered. They're broad. They're not  
16 goals -- I mean, they're not means, they're goals. And  
17 they incorporate just about everything that's up there.

18 THE MODERATOR: Chris?

19 MS. JOHNSON: I would make one exception, it says "Provide  
20 opportunity for all adults."

21 MS. KINGRA: But the next one is "Applied to the  
22 fullest extent possible, and all educational levels  
23 principles and practices."

24 MS. JOHNSON: Don't you want to include, like in the  
25 first one, all Alaskans?

1 MS. HUSS: May I respond to this?

2 THE MODERATOR: John.

3 MS. JOHNSON: I know.

4 MS. HUSS: I understand it should be all Alaskans, you  
5 and I talked about it before.

6 MS. JOHNSON: Right.

7 MS. HUSS: I have a particular reason for that, in  
8 saying adults. That is because if it's not said  
9 specifically, it will get passed over in the legislature  
10 and within the State Department of Education, that the  
11 funds for adult education is so slight it's necessary to  
12 keep stressing that all the time.

13 MS. KINGRA: But the next one says all levels.

14 THE MODERATOR: Yule.

15 MR. KILCHER: I think it will be clear if we say all  
16 Alaskans. You might think we address it as Alaska on the  
17 local, regional and racial level, and if you say it for  
18 Alaskans of all ages, then we have all Alaskans and of all  
19 ages. Will you go for that?

20 MS. HUSS: Oh, yes. I'd put children in there, too.

21 MR. KILCHER: Okay, for Alaskans of all ages.

22 MR. TOMA: All Alaskans of all ages.

23 MR. KILCHER: For Alaskans of all ages.

24 THE MODERATOR: For Alaskans of all ages.

25 MS. HUSS: How about youth and adults? Again, it's

1 just a practical point.

2 MR. KILCHER: Well, all ages, all ages, that includes  
3 adults.

4 MS. LUSE: Yes.

5 THE MODERATOR: John and Yule, we cannot amend like  
6 this. It just gets too confusing. If you want to, could  
7 you take a, you know, just --

8 MR. KILCHER: I thought I still had the -- I was  
9 recognized and have it --

10 MR. HOLMAN: Madam Chairperson.

11 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

12 MR. HOPE: I thought we were talking about the third  
13 one down. If you're amending the -- whatever it is down,  
14 I'd like to ask when issued submit a possible amendment to  
15 the one that Chip is pointing at?

16 THE MODERATOR: Well, I think what's -- what happened  
17 is that someone -- I think --

18 MS. KINGRA: I did.

19 THE MODERATOR: Rosemary.

20 MS. KINGRA: I just pointed out that these two appear  
21 to take in everything that we're talking about up there,  
22 except for educational funds, and stresses good health and  
23 nutrition, because it talks about adults in the first  
24 paragraph and to the fullest extent possible, all  
25 educational levels in the second paragraph.

1 THE MODERATOR: Well, first of all, maybe we should  
2 read through those first ones, because I can't see them  
3 from here.

4 MR. TOMA: "We envision future for Alaska is one in  
5 which basic education is stressed." Do you want to keep  
6 going through them?

7 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

8 MR. TOMA: All right. "To establish student exchange  
9 programs between all high schools, and alternative methods  
10 of certification for teacher aids in rural areas; and  
11 special programs for gifted and handicapped students."

12 THE MODERATOR: Those are all means.

13 MR. TOMA: And all educational funds be administered  
14 under the department to eliminate duplication of programs;  
15 and to stress good health and nutrition as a responsible  
16 part of the program.

17 THE MODERATOR: Gene?

18 MS. KINGRA: I eliminated those last two, educational  
19 funds and stresses good health, because --

20 MR. TOMA: Has been part of this.

21 MS. KINGRA: Has not been part of this.

22 MR. TOMA: So there's a consideration here that these  
23 take in as goals and then these are means of these goals.

24 MS. HEDLAND: Let's hear the suggestion.

25 THE MODERATOR: Ron, I'd like to hear from you.

1 MR. HOHMAN: Yes, if we're going back up to the third  
2 one down, "One in which basic education is stressed," not  
3 getting into the issue of defining what basic education is  
4 or what is basic need, I would submit, because you'd be  
5 able to satisfy the concern I have and a bias, by  
6 substituting the word "Stressed," leaving the rest of the  
7 sentence the same, except putting in at that point "Supported  
8 with 100 percent funding," so the sentence would then read:  
9 "One in which basic education is supported with hundred  
10 percent funding."

11 MS. HEDLAND: State funding?

12 MR. HOHMAN: Yes.

13 MS. HEDLAND: Would you like to say that?

14 MR. HOHMAN: Good point.

15 THE MODERATOR: Yes, John.

16 MS. HUSS: I'm not at all sure what basic education  
17 means up there. To my orientation, what I mean by basic  
18 education would be self-directed learning abilities on the  
19 part of a student, not any particular skill other than that.  
20 The ability to process the information and learn on their  
21 own and using a teacher as a learning Facilitator. I think  
22 that's extremely vague the way it is right there, and sort  
23 of an unusable term.

24 MS. HYLEN: I'm not an educator. I have been a mother  
25 in the last -- not the last few years, but my boys have

1 gone through high school within the last ten years, and  
2 from what I hear from people, basic education, and also  
3 what I read in books, the basic education is the ability to  
4 read, that they be taught to read, and that they be taught  
5 the multiplication tables, where they can be taught the  
6 simple multiplication, and where they can spell,  
7 particularly where they can read, because if they can't  
8 read, they can't do anything else.

9 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

10 MR. HUSS: I just want to reiterate what she said. I  
11 think we can take the two bottom ones and that covers  
12 everything we have up there.

13 THE MODERATOR: And then use the other. You don't  
14 think that some of those are means?

15 MR. HUSS: I think almost everything on the top is a  
16 means. We can take the A and B below here on the bottom  
17 sheet and add the part about the "All funds administered  
18 under one department," because even the good health and  
19 nutrition can be covered under life-coping competencies. I  
20 think those two cover everything we've got in the whole  
21 list up there. I think we're wasting a lot of time arguing  
22 about what basic education is right now. I mean that  
23 should be something we want to cover when we get to actual  
24 means. But as far as goals --

25 THE MODERATOR: First Karen, then Stan, then John.

1 Okay.

2 MS. MEDLAND: I fully agree. My definition of basic  
3 education may be much different from yours. My question is:  
4 The subject of 100 percent financing for all schools has  
5 been one that has been around for a long time. It could be  
6 considered a means, but it could also be considered a goal  
7 in terms of just plain coming right out and stating hundred  
8 percent State support for all school systems. I'm not sure  
9 of that. I'm violently opposed to discussing the  
10 definition of basic needs.

11 THE MODERATOR: Stan?

12 MR. HACK: I was just going to add to the discussion  
13 here. It seems to be a problem of defining "basic." So to  
14 eliminate any hangups, we might just eliminate the word  
15 "basic," from the discussion and all education be included.  
16 Thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Stan.

18 John?

19 MR. KELSEY: Well, I would agree with what they're  
20 suggesting, that those, the ones on the above sheet, are  
21 probably means. I do think we've lost sight of something  
22 that I think needs to be addressed. That is, we seem to be  
23 hepped on the idea of educating the normal child, but I  
24 think we have to address the blind, and the handicapped. I  
25 think it's not covered there. I think we should address

1 that.

2 THE MODERATOR: You don't think that providing  
3 opportunity for all Alaskans to acquire basic academic and  
4 life-coping competencies --

5 MR. KELSEY: I'm not too sure that's covered.

6 MS. HUSS: Excuse me. That was my concern about  
7 having the word "adults" in, too. It sort of assumed. But  
8 you wanted it stated just so nobody misses it?

9 MR. KELSEY: That's right.

10 MS. HUSS: My intent was it would be included within  
11 that.

12 THE MODERATOR: Gene?

13 MS. KINGRA: I don't currently deal with handicapped  
14 children, but I have dealt with them in the past. Deaf and  
15 multiple-handicapped. And I feel very strongly that  
16 providing an opportunity for basic academic and life-long  
17 competencies would cover those people.

18 THE MODERATOR: Couldn't you state those in the needs  
19 that that would be a --

20 MS. KINGRA: Yes.

21 THE MODERATOR: -- one of the ways you would  
22 accomplish that for everybody, that you would specifically  
23 do things for the handicapped, so forth?

24 MR. KELSEY: I'll buy that, if you're addressing me.

25 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

1           MR. KELSEY: But, you know, I think we should  
2 underscore it, because I think we tend to think of only  
3 educating our normal youngsters. I think there's a very  
4 crying need for the handicapped education and the blind. I  
5 think it's important.

6           THE MODERATOR: Karen?

7           MS. HEDLAND: It's the old phrase of exceptional  
8 children, and I must admit that I'm as concerned about both  
9 ends of the spectrum, those with learning disabilities that  
10 are not physically handicapped, and those that are supertalented.  
11 So I really hoped that we would deal with that in the  
12 specifics of the needs rather than now in a goal statement.

13          THE MODERATOR: Ellen?

14          MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, my reasons would be based  
15 on the subject that our statements use the two paragraphs  
16 on the second sheet and that we arrange the means in a  
17 later session.

18          THE MODERATOR: Can we then -- Ron?

19          MR. HOHMAN: I would agree with that, if you would  
20 take the first goal on the second sheet, right under the  
21 six education, where it said "Provide opportunity for --"  
22 is that all?

23          MS. KINGRA: Alaskans of all --

24          MR. HOHMAN: "Alaskans of all ages to acquire basic  
25 academic and life-long --"

1 MS. HUSS: "Life-coping competencies --"

2 MR. HOHMAN: " -- life-coping competencies, with  
3 hundred percent funding with all school districts."

4 MS. HUSS: That's an entirely new objective.

5 MR. HUSS: That's a means, too.

6 MR. TOMA: That's a means of bringing that about,  
7 right?

8 MR. HOHMAN: Then I'd like to go back and I'd like to  
9 object and put back in the top the fact that we have basic  
10 education for all school districts supported with 100  
11 percent State funding.

12 MR. TOMA: As a means? As a means, Ron?

13 MR. HOHMAN: I don't think it's a means. I think it's  
14 a goal to acquire hundred percent funding for all school  
15 districts in the State of Alaska, for all of the  
16 educational needs within those districts as defined by the  
17 local authority. I didn't want to when I initiated it. I  
18 didn't want to bring open the discussion of what is basic  
19 education and what is basic need. I thought, since I was  
20 absent this morning, there had maybe been some consensus  
21 regarding that, and so rather than disrupt it, I thought  
22 that you would accept that amendment better than rewording  
23 it. But I do think it is a goal to receive hundred percent  
24 State funding in all of the school districts for the  
25 educational needs defined by each of the districts.

1 THE MODERATOR: Is that all in there, hon?

2 Which one is it you're talking about?

3 MR. TOMA: This one right here. "One in which basic  
4 education is supported with a hundred percent funding."

5 MR. KILCHER: That's a goal.

6 MR. TOMA: As a goal.

7 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to that as a  
8 goal?

9 MS. HUSS: Yes.

10 THE MODERATOR: One objection.

11 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I'm still not clear on it.  
12 I'm ready to move on those two paragraphs and the  
13 accompanying means, with the exception of what that means,  
14 "a hundred percent," you know, that hundred percent item  
15 we're talking about, I need a little more discussion on  
16 that. Otherwise, you know, I think we can move, except for  
17 that one.

18 MR. KILCHER: You can move anyway.

19 THE MODERATOR: Marion?

20 MS. HYLEN: May I ask a question? On hundred percent  
21 funding, are they going to use the federal funding in that  
22 hundred percent statement? Or is it to be funded just by  
23 the State?

24 THE MODERATOR: This is not -- this group cannot make  
25 that decision. That's a legislative --

1 MS. HULEN: When you state "State funding," what are  
2 you meaning?

3 MS. HEDLAND: Madam Chairman, that's a technicality,  
4 and we are talking about federal funds and the difference.  
5 Right now the difference between what the federal  
6 Government and the State government provide is made up by  
7 local tax assessments, and I believe, correct me if I'm  
8 wrong, that's what he's proposing is the elimination of  
9 that local tax assessment against one of our -- one of our  
10 goals is hundred percent State financing, which has been an  
11 issue in political campaigns for the last ten years.

12 THE MODERATOR: Does that answer your question, Ellen?

13 MS. HAYES: No. I mean it's part of it. But it  
14 doesn't answer -- I'm not ready to say I'm still not ready  
15 to say that that should be a part of the goal. I don't  
16 understand it well.

17 THE MODERATOR: Could we, then, to make us move along,  
18 how about taking up those two down below, one at a time,  
19 the first one there --

20 MR. TOMA: "To provide opportunity for Alaskans of all  
21 ages to acquire basic academic and life-coping competencies."

22 THE MODERATOR: Anybody object to that as a goal?  
23 Georgianna?

24 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) It seems it's a little bit  
25 redundant to the goal we passed up there, that the State

1 shall have education policy which provides continuing  
2 education for all age groups. It seems like it's a bit  
3 redundant.

4 THE MODERATOR: Isn't that going to be the job of the  
5 style & drafting, if they have duplications, so that we  
6 don't have to decide that right now?

7 MR. TOMA: Right.

8 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I see.

9 THE MODERATOR: I think that's a good point.

10 MS. BUSS: Georgianna, also, continuing ed is usually  
11 thought of as post-high school on and not pre-graduation.  
12 That's the way that term is usually used, so it doesn't  
13 usually apply in K through --

14 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection to that goal  
15 being provide opportunity for," I can't read it --

16 MR. TOMA: Excuse me, to provide opportunity for  
17 Alaskans of all ages to acquire basic academic and life-coping  
18 competent ceases.

19 Is there any objection?

20 MS. BUSS: Just one, I'd like to add youth and adults.

21 MS. HEDLAND: It says all ages.

22 MS. BUSS: But it's most important to stress the word  
23 adult in there.

24 MS. HAYES: I object.

25 THE MODERATOR: There's an objection.

1 MR. TOMA: To the amendment?

2 THE MODERATOR: All those in favor of the way it is  
3 written, please raise your hand.

4 (complying)

5 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

6 MR. TOMA: "to apply to the fullest extent possible,  
7 and at all educational levels, principles and practices of  
8 self-directed life-long learning."

9 THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

10 MR. BACK: May I have that clarified, what it means by  
11 self-directing, life-long learning?

12 THE MODERATOR: What's the difference between that and  
13 continuing education?

14 MS. BUSS: Continuing education is usually thought of  
15 in a post-high school vein primarily for adults. Life-long  
16 education would be whereby education is viewed as a  
17 continuous process from birth to death.

18 MS. HEDLAND: If we accept a concept, I don't really  
19 think we have to get into, "Can I have this clarified with  
20 these two words?" It seems to me we're getting ourselves  
21 bogged down again and we have lost what we were first doing,  
22 of accepting a concept or not, and we have an editorial  
23 staff that you can talk to.

24 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to this as a goal?

25 Okay, it's accepted.

1 Now, --

2 MR. TOMA: Now we have means everywhere.

3 THE MODERATOR: Everything else is a means?

4 MR. HOHMAN: No. Object. Object.

5 THE MODERATOR: Except Ron.

6 MR. TOMA: Except for the State funding break. "One

7 in which basic education is supported with hundred percent

8 funding."

9 MS. HEDLAND: Let's just vote on it.

10 MR. KILCHER: Questions.

11 MS. HUSS: Two questions.

12 THE MODERATOR: The suggestion has been we vote on

13 this goal. Any discussion? You don't want discussion?

14 MS. HUSS: Yes, please.

15 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

16 MS. HUSS: I'm not clear. Maybe it's just my own

17 ignorance, on what's meant by "100 percent State funding,"

18 and "basic education." I think both terms are vague. It

19 makes it hard to vote.

20 MR. HOPE: Is this K through 20, K through 12, or --

21 or pre-school through 25 or pre-school through --

22 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman.

23 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

24 MR. KILCHER: Compulsory education is where --

25 compulsory education is hundred percent supported by the

1 State. That's the only place the State has a say. The  
2 rest is voluntary. We have that further down. Make it  
3 possible for everybody to be educated, life long, programs,  
4 et cetera, but we have a compulsory education program.  
5 That should be supported a hundred percent.

6 THE MODERATOR: Good, good suggestion.

7 MR. TOMA: One in which --

8 MR. HOPE: Madam Chairman.

9 THE MODERATOR: Andy.

10 MR. HOPE: My response to that is that the proposal  
11 that Mr. Merdes presented to us on the first day, like the  
12 University of -- well, in California, it's K through 14,  
13 the first two years of college are also funded, too, by the  
14 State, and that's not compulsory, but it's offered to the  
15 people. And that's hundred percent funding.

16 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

17 MS. HEDLAND: I agree with him, but I think that's a  
18 means underneath the expanded education thing, and I think  
19 what we are talking about is compulsory education. It is  
20 against the law to not go to school.

21 MR. HOPE: Well, the hundred percent figure is a means,  
22 too, then.

23 MS. HEDLAND: No, because --

24 MR. RUSS: It is though.

25 THE MODERATOR: This is what we're going to vote on,

1 as I understand it, whether this is a goal or whether it's  
2 going to become a means. So now you are to vote on whether  
3 you accept this as a goal, and I do believe that Yule's  
4 suggestion of putting in there "compulsory education" makes  
5 it stronger.

6 MS. KINGRA: I have a question. "hundred percent  
7 State funding," do you mean to State educational systems?  
8 Do you mean to nonprofit engaged in education, do you mean  
9 to private schools engaged in education? What do you mean?  
10 I'm really unclear about that?

11 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

12 MR. BOHMAN: In attending all public school systems, I  
13 would submit that maybe for clarification and possible  
14 consensus by the group, if you substituted the word, "all  
15 school systems" for basic education that would address what  
16 my goal is, which I should think should be a goal of this  
17 group. So then it would say one in which compulsory  
18 education in all school systems is supported with 100  
19 percent State funding.

20 MS. LUDWIG: Does that include --

21 MS. BEDLAND: Let's vote on whether or not it's a goal  
22 or a mean.

23 THE MODERATOR: Are you ready to vote on this? Ellen.

24 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, would you help me to know  
25 then, the existing support for himself comes from

1 municipalities and from the Federal Government and private,  
2 right?

3 THE MODERATOR: No.

4 MS. LAYES: The existing condition now is what we're  
5 going to be departing from another goal, and what we're  
6 departing from is the reason why we're going towards this  
7 goal. Could you elaborate?

8 MR. HONMAN: Yes. You have basically 52 school  
9 districts in the State of Alaska. I think it's one, is  
10 that right, Marshall? 21 of them supported hundred percent  
11 by the State of Alaska. Now, when I say they're supported  
12 a hundred percent by the State of Alaska, we do receive PL  
13 874 impact monies that comes to the State, and that does  
14 support the school district. We think of it as State  
15 funded. I think the State ultimately views it in the  
16 financing of the support of the school, that is State money,  
17 although technically it is federal money.

18 We also in the 21 R&A districts receive special  
19 and transitional funding through federal programs. But  
20 they are entitled supplemental programs, but they are  
21 special and transitional in the sense it's federal dollars  
22 coming in generally on a grant for one year or three years,  
23 as the worth of the program is evaluated that's either  
24 implemented into the basic program or not renewed.

25 For the remaining districts, first-class cities

1 and about your boroughs, you receive the minimum of 97  
2 percent of the full basic need. Then depending on what the  
3 local tax evaluation and some of the other kinds of  
4 considerations, they make up three percent or somewhat less  
5 than three percent.

6 MR. HOPE: Stumpage fees.

7 MR. HOLMAN: Pardon?

8 MR. HOLMAN: Stumpage fees.

9 MR. HOLMAN: Yes, stumpage fees, that's a good point.

10 MS. LUDWIG: Am I correct that you're asking -- you  
11 want to leave out the word "public" in school system.  
12 You're in favor of hundred percent support on private  
13 school systems also?

14 MR. HOLMAN: No, that's not the intent. One in which  
15 compulsory education for all public school systems is  
16 supported with 100 percent State funding.

17 Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: For the benefit of all, the  
19 commissioner of education is here. I don't know whether we  
20 want to drag this out anymore or not, but you're ready to  
21 vote?

22 MS. LUDWIG: M-hm.

23 MR. TOMA: Okay, "One in which --

24 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

25 MR. FARUN: Well, the only reservation I would have

1 about that, and I don't know whether this is accurate or  
2 not, but I strongly believe there should be some local  
3 autonomy in the administration of the funds, and I don't  
4 know what that would due to the local determination, and if  
5 it's -- because a lot of times you have the federal monies  
6 come down. They tell you how you spend it and they tell  
7 you what you do with it. I think that's important. It's a  
8 very important thing that we have that federal money. I  
9 agree with it. But the fact that we do provide a little  
10 bit, say, in our own community in Fairbanks, I think we're  
11 able to determine a little bit where it goes. So I don't  
12 know whether I'd go with a hundred percent, but I don't  
13 know.

14 THE MODERATOR: We're going to have a choice of  
15 whether you feel it's a goal or a means. So we will now --

16 MR. HAKUN: That's the question.

17 THE MODERATOR: That's the question. Are you ready to  
18 vote? All those in favor of this statement, read it.

19 MR. TOMA: "One in which compulsory education in all  
20 public school systems is supported with hundred percent  
21 State funding."

22 THE MODERATOR: Now, you're voting on whether this is  
23 a goal. If you vote it down, you put it into something  
24 else, I guess. So all those in favor of it is a goal,  
25 raise your hand.

1           MR. PILCHER: It's a goal, right.

2           THE MODERATOR: You're not in this group, are you?

3           MR. TOMA: Yes, she -- this lady in the red. Rev.

4           THE MODERATOR: Where have you been? I'm sorry, I got

5 thrown. All of you back there.

6           MR. PILCHER: It's a goal, okay.

7           THE MODERATOR: One, two, three, four, five, six,

8 seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven? Did I count you before?

9 Stand up.

10                   (complying)

11           12. Now those opposed.

12                   (Standing)

13           Seven. 13, 7.

14           MR. TOMA: There's a good basis for your minority

15 report there, too.

16           THE MODERATOR: It is now 4:30, almost 4:30.

17           MR. TOMA: I think we can stay till quarter of five if

18 we are fast about this.

19           THE MODERATOR: Are there any more goals in that

20 education?

21           MS. HEDLAND: We did adopt it as a goal?

22           THE MODERATOR: Yes.

23           MR. TOMA: Madam Chairman, if I may, if someone can

24 start getting this off --

25           THE MODERATOR: Weren't there a couple there that we

1 missed?

2 MR. TOMA: Just one that we passed by, and that was on  
3 the bottom fisheries.

4 THE MODERATOR: I just don't want you to lose those  
5 sheets when we move.

6 MR. TOMA: I won't lose them. I was hoping they could  
7 be transcribed so we don't have to put them up.

8 MS. KINCKA: Before we get involved in talking about  
9 these. Are we going to meet in the same room tonight that  
10 we're in now?

11 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

12 MR. TOMA: For those who are leaving early, we're  
13 going to 14 16, and we'll be up there in 15 to 20 minutes.  
14 That's a large suite.

15 MR. KADEN: Who is taking down all this stuff? Are we  
16 supposed to -- the editorial --

17 THE MODERATOR: Yes. Those sheets you will have.

18 MR. KADEN: Just take the sheets?

19 THE MODERATOR: Yes. The sheets you will have.

20 All right, where are we now? Are there any more  
21 education?

22 MS. LINCOLN: Katy, there are two educational issues  
23 that were --

24 THE MODERATOR: That's what I'm asking for.

25 MR. TOMA: As I understand it, these are means then.

1 THE MODERATOR: Not all of them.

2 MR. TOMA: Not all, okay.

3 THE MODERATOR: There's one up there about the one  
4 system. That's not a means.

5 MR. TOMA: All educational funds be administered under  
6 one department to eliminate duplication of programs.

7 THE MODERATOR: Isn't that yours, ahead?

8 MS. LINCOLN: Yes, it is.

9 THE MODERATOR:

10 MS. HUSE: Question. I'm not clear by what's meant by  
11 all educational funds. Federal funds? State funds?  
12 Private foundation funds?

13 MR. TOMA: We're only dealing with State, aren't we?

14 THE MODERATOR: I think what she's addressing is that  
15 there are now in the State of Alaska two school systems,  
16 there's the public -- the State schools and then there is  
17 the B I A schools, and this is what she's addressing.  
18 They're federal schools. Beg your pardon?

19 MR. HOPE: Community colleges. University.

20 THE MODERATOR: K through 12. That's true that may be  
21 misleading there, you better say K through 12, otherwise  
22 you're going to be saying there should be one system in the  
23 whole university and over the --

24 MS. LINCOLN: Why don't we be consistent and put in  
25 there "compulsory education"?

1           MR. HUSS: Because in the Department of Education  
2 there is a section on adult continuing ed, too; is that  
3 being included in there or (pause) --

4           MR. TOMA: All educational funds for compulsory  
5 education be administered under one department to eliminate  
6 duplication of programs.

7           THE MODERATOR: May I make a suggestion? Wouldn't it  
8 be better to just come out and say what you really want to  
9 say instead of beating around the bush and say there shall  
10 be one school system and there will not be BIA schools or  
11 something like that?

12           MR. HUSS: One school system isn't the right word  
13 though. That means Kenai is with Fairbanks. I mean one  
14 state-wide administration.

15           THE MODERATOR: Andy.

16           MR. HOPE: How would this affect Mt. Edgecumbe High  
17 School? Would it allow nonnatives to attend Mount  
18 Edgecumbe if the State took over the school? Right now  
19 it's a segregated school.

20           THE MODERATOR: Certainly. I don't know how that  
21 would be administered.

22           MR. HOPE: Would the BIA be willing to do this? They  
23 have a trust responsibility to the natives, where the State  
24 doesn't really have a trust responsibility. How would you  
25 reconcile that? The Federal Government has a trust

1 responsibility, to provide certain things to the native  
2 people.

3 THE MODERATOR: The constitution of the State of  
4 Alaska says the State has a responsibility for educating  
5 all the children of the State.

6 MR. ROPE: But what I'm saying is that you don't know  
7 that the BIA would give up that trust responsibility.

8 THE MODERATOR: It's a goal. It's not a command.  
9 It's a goal, if I may argue with you. I'm sorry, I should  
10 be getting off of this chair. Georgianna.

11 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Madam Chairman, that's  
12 exactly what I'm trying for bring out, your comment there,  
13 why don't we say what we mean, in that it should be all one  
14 State school system, that there are villages in my area  
15 that have a BIA school that want the BIA school. That's  
16 their choice. And because of that trust responsibility/  
17 between Federal Government and the Indian people, they can  
18 make that choice. And we shouldn't say that it shall be  
19 all one system. You know, that there is a choice there if  
20 we want.

21 MS. LINCOLN: If I may say something to that --

22 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead.

23 MS. LINCOLN: I don't mean to take the choice away  
24 from the people in the villages. What I would like to see  
25 is that both the BIA and the State get together and all the

1 knowledge that both of them have, get together instead of  
2 duplicating services and programs, that there just be one  
3 system. I in no way meant to take that choice away from  
4 the people. What I was looking for is a betterment with  
5 both educational systems.

6 MR. LUSK: Would it be possible to state it as  
7 advisable to the fullest extent, possible coordination  
8 between the existing systems rather than trying to get one  
9 system?

10 THE MODERATOR: Stan?

11 MR. MACK: Madam Chairman, we discussed the other goal  
12 there, we voted on, concerning the one up there, to all  
13 which compulsory education is stressed, whatever.

14 MR. TOMA: Yes, right in here, compulsory education in  
15 all --

16 MR. MACK: Can we relate this in with that goal that  
17 we just passed?

18 THE MODERATOR: Hundred percent funding?

19 MR. MACK: We're talking strictly of, what is it?  
20 public school being 100 percent funded, the BIA school  
21 would be a private school, strictly financed. Are we  
22 talking about two separate -- the State has no controls  
23 over the BIA school. Therefore, we -- the way you have it  
24 there, in your proposal, it's fine. But I couldn't quite  
25 figure out where the -- to eliminate duplications of

1 programs come into effect. And then we got into the  
2 discussion of the LJA versus the State. I believe we  
3 should concern ourselves strictly with the state programs.

4 THE MODERATOR: Perhaps under one of these goals, it  
5 would work that you could address that problem, ahead, as a  
6 means of improving the delivery of education to communities,  
7 that that is a way that that need could be met, to be sure  
8 that there is more responsibility on both sides, so that  
9 there isn't the duplication.

10 MS. LINCOLN: But what would that be a means to?

11 THE MODERATOR: I don't know which one of those goals  
12 that you could use it for.

13 MS. LELLAND: To the first one, to basic academic and  
14 life-coping competencies.

15 MR. KADEN: How important is this to the overall  
16 picture of education in Alaska? I mean, is this a great  
17 issue of import? There seems to be some --

18 THE MODERATOR: It's an important issue in the rural  
19 part of the State. Edin comes from a place out of Nome,  
20 and has served on the school board, and Georgianna --

21 MR. KADEN: But she's worrying about duplication of  
22 services; is that correct?

23 THE MODERATOR: Kon.

24 MR. BOHMAN: I think it's an important issue, because  
25 as it stands today, and Monday of next week, the Federal

1 Government is violating the State constitution, and I  
2 understand the business of higher authorities, but the  
3 point is, you come down and in several districts and in  
4 several schools you have this problem. And it's creating a  
5 great deal of disruption in the delivery system.

6 The Malahooch consent decree mandates that some  
7 parents that want children educated at home, the State is  
8 required to do so. We're in one of those situations where  
9 we have to deliver several programs. In ten villages we  
10 have the responsibility of the high school program and the  
11 Bureau, because of the trust relationship and the self-  
12 determination now have the authority for the elementary  
13 program. We've been talking about it for better than 20  
14 years. I don't know beyond that how long it had been  
15 discussed. But it has been a goal. It has been a platform  
16 on several state-wide offices to see that that end be  
17 reached.

18 And I think maybe the suggestion that was made  
19 would be that the State assume its constitutional  
20 responsibility for educating all publicly-aged children.  
21 Then you can discuss the other. But there is a specific  
22 point. And I challenge anybody to show me in the State  
23 right now where the BIA is delivering a better educational  
24 system than what the State is. The monies are not there.  
25 There are less advantages when you talk about handicapped

1 children, and the State having some requirements. In fact,  
2 the State does require that handicapped children be  
3 addressed from the year of one through 16 years old. So  
4 other than attending them at high school for five hours a  
5 day, those are about the very basic requirements. So I  
6 think it would help a great deal, better than 50  
7 communities in the State, if the constitution were  
8 respected and honored and enforced.

9 THE MODERATOR: Are you saying then that you suggest  
10 another goal there, that goal instead, or just use it as a  
11 means? Keyword it?

12 MR. HOLMAN: Yes.

13 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

14 MR. MCPH: I think we really have to work with the  
15 Federal Government on this issue. We can't ignore them,  
16 because there's so much funding from the Federal Government  
17 for education that comes down. And the one example that I  
18 could think of where the BIA might be doing a better job is,  
19 why is it enrollment in Mount Edgecumbe High School is  
20 increasing if the State is doing such a fantastic job in  
21 those new rural high schools?

22 THE MODERATOR: Gene.

23 MS. KINGRA: I have to ask a question as to who's  
24 being served by the State taking over. I feel very  
25 strongly about cultural communication and education, and