

ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE / SUBJECT FILES 86/2

854 SCOMM30: CONFERENCE ON ALASKA'S FUTURE FRONTIERS 1979

1 who is being served? Are the children to be educated being
2 served, or is the state being served? That's what I want
3 answered before I can vote on that.

4 THE MODERATOR: If I could add something that I'm --
5 maybe you are not aware of, that there are local boards
6 elected in all of these areas where the people serving on
7 almost -- Ron's more familiar with that than I am, but most
8 of the people serving on those boards are native Alaskans
9 from those villages who determine the policy in the schools.

10 MS. KINCA: But Georgianna brought up there were
11 villages in her area that felt very strongly about
12 continuing their own school.

13 THE MODERATOR: That's right.

14 MS. KINCA: That's what I'm addressing.

15 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I think we're talking about
16 coordination.

17 THE MODERATOR: Through the years since statehood
18 there have been many, many schools that have been taken
19 over by the -- the people in the villages have voted to
20 become a part of the State system, and that's the way they
21 do it.

22 MR. BOHMAN: To answer your first question: The
23 children would be the ones that would directly benefit from
24 all of this, in terms of special education programs that
25 the bureau does not provide. They just do not have them.

1 There's one down in the Bethel area. But I know there's
2 support in the State as well as the basic needs. The State
3 is supporting their schools much better than the borough is
4 now. I talked to Dr. Barlow right here in Anchorage, who
5 is the new director in Washington, D C, he assumed the
6 responsibility and he came to Anchorage and we discussed
7 some of these problems. He sees a gloomy future for Mount
8 Edgecumbe because of the lack of funding they're
9 anticipating.

10 I think your issue, your question about the
11 community vote -- I've gone through that for 13 years now.
12 Generally speaking, if the custodian and the cook are
13 making more money than what the state is, then the BIA
14 system is better. I know the delivery system for
15 instructional purpose cannot be denied. The State is doing
16 a much better fact, that's part of the factual information.
17 I think it's a credit to the educational in the state,
18 which Katy was Chairman of the Board for several years and
19 fought diligently for it. You can't deny the programic
20 needs. The State is providing much more.

21 THE MODERATOR: Are we ready? Where are we now? That
22 goal. What was the wording of that?

23 MS. HEDLAND: I liked his wording better than what's
24 up there.

25 THE MODERATOR: Read it.

1 MR. TOMA: "All educational funds for compulsory
2 education shall be participated under one department to
3 eliminate duplication of programs."

4 THE MODERATOR: Edin, would you accept the regions
5 that Ron has there? You read something a little bit ago,
6 Ron.

7 MR. HOLMAN: "The State assumes its constitutional
8 responsibility for educating all publicly aged children."

9 MS. HUNTER: All what?

10 MR. HOLMAN: Publicly aged children. I didn't know
11 whether that was right.

12 THE MODERATOR: Publicly aged.

13 MS. LAYES: Numerically.

14 MR. HOLMAN: Public school-aged children is a better
15 way of saying it.

16 THE MODERATOR: Do you all understand that? Are you
17 agreed --

18 MR. KELSEY: Question.

19 THE MODERATOR: -- that that should be a goal?

20 MR. KELSEY: Question.

21 THE MODERATOR: That is accepted. Will you get that
22 wording to the --

23 MR. TOMA: Is that replacing this?

24 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

25 MR. TOMA: I'll put Ron's initials down here.

1 THE MODERATOR: Scratch it out.

2 Is there any other -- is there another education
3 goal there, or are they all means?

4 MR. TOMA: This one here, I think, "alternative
5 methods of certification for teacher, teacher aides, in
6 rural areas."

7 THE MODERATOR: That's a means.

8 MR. TOMA: And how about establishing the student
9 exchange program? Is that a means?

10 THE MODERATOR: That's a means.

11 MR. TOMA: Okay.

12 THE MODERATOR: Is everything else accounted for?

13 MR. TOMA: And here we have "funds shall be made for
14 suitable buildings in which to teach."

15 MS. HEDLAND: That's a means.

16 THE MODERATOR: With what?

17 MR. TOMA: And "commitment to bilingual education."

18 MS. HEDLAND: That's a means.

19 MS. HUSS: Means.

20 THE MODERATOR: That's a means. What was the one
21 before that?

22 MR. TOMA: Funds for suitable buildings in which to
23 teach.

24 MR. KILCIER: That's a means.

25 THE MODERATOR: That's a means.

1 MR. TOMA: Okay. On the government.

2 THE MODERATOR: It's now quarter of five. Are we

3 going to have to move?

4 MR. TOMA: Let's stay here till they move it.

5 MR. KILCHER: I somehow disagree bilingual is means or

6 goal. I think it's a goal, but I won't argue about it.

7 MS. HEDLAND: It's a means.

8 MR. TOMA: Well, it's incorporated anyway.

9 THE MODERATOR: We got it, so we're going to use it.

10 Anybody else objecting? Georgianna.

11 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I'm not objecting, but

12 before you move on to education, Carolyn and I came up with

13 some new language on this one that we had some problems

14 with. I don't know if you just want us to submit it to the

15 group.

16 THE MODERATOR: Are you going to switch that one over

17 and put it in education?

18 MS. JONES: Yes.

19 THE MODERATOR: Unless it changes the meaning for the

20 group, the editorial changes can be made in the editing.

21 MR. TOMA: "The State should increase greatly the

22 amount of dollars going to the permanent fund. Oil

23 revenues should not be hastily exhausted, but conserved for

24 the future."

25 THE MODERATOR: Any objection? Carolyn?

1 MR. JONES: I suggest it be shifted to No. 8, economy.

2 MR. TOMA: Okay. Okay. Do you want to vote on it now
3 since we discussed it? Do you want to just vote on an
4 economy one right now?

5 THE MODERATOR: We better move on over, because --

6 MR. TOMA: "One in which there is a maximum of
7 flexibility in the types of government available on the
8 local level and where experimentation and the means by
9 which we govern ourselves is encouraged."

10 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that?

11 MR. KELSEY: I want a clarification. Do you envision
12 that there has to be enabling legislation on a new form,
13 new type of, because I don't think it's addressed at this
14 point.

15 MR. KADEN: That's the problem, is that the State
16 structure, the legislative structure or the legal structure
17 is such that it doesn't allow for any flexibility at all.
18 It has to fit into a certain type of governmental unit,
19 first, second-class city, or different types of boroughs.
20 There needs to be in other forms.

21 MS. HEDLAND: But those are real specific means of
22 achieving it, right?

23 MR. KADEN: Right, yes. I'm just saying that's the
24 reason.

25 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn, did you have a question?

1 MS. JONES: I just didn't understand it.

2 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection then to that as
3 a goal? Okay.

4 MR. TOMA: And decentralized State decision-making by
5 maximum local public involvement.

6 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that as a goal? John?

7 MS. HUSS: Would it be useful to say involvement and
8 control?

9 MR. TOMA: Involvement and control? Decentralized --

10 THE MODERATOR: Karen?

11 MS. HEDLAND: Is that not incorporated in what we just
12 passed?

13 MR. KADEN: No.

14 THE MODERATOR: No, according to Kaden, it isn't.
15 It's his motion. His other goal.

16 MS. HEDLAND: Why isn't it? I don't care, the concept --

17 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to this now? Okay.
18 Let's go.

19 MR. TOMA: Okay. Under Economics, "The State should
20 increase greatly the amount of dollars going to the
21 permanent funds."

22 THE MODERATOR: Isn't there something more to that?

23 MR. TOMA: No?

24 MS. EYLEN: All revenues shall not be --

25 MR. TOMA: That seemed like a clause to me, all oil.

1 "The State should increase greatly the amount of dollars
2 going in the permanent funds. Oil revenues should not be
3 hastily exhausted but conserved for the future."

4 THE MODERATOR: Any objection to that as a goal
5 statement?

6 Bev?

7 MS. ISENSEN: I object, you know, since we got the 900
8 million. Everyone talks about how we wasted it. We didn't.
9 We have a permanent fund now. We haven't been able to
10 figure out what to do with the permanent fund. In the
11 meantime, whenever we want to undertake the program we
12 really need, the excuse is, "Well, we haven't the money to
13 spend," or "We should be putting it in the permanent fund."
14 That is the argument I would hear when the Malahooch case
15 came up, and I thought it was really atrocious. The people
16 would want to put away money for the future, in addition to
17 what we're already putting away, when we're not meeting our
18 future needs. I think we're shorting ourselves and we're
19 shorting our children. If we think that putting money away
20 for the future is a good thing, while we don't even have
21 the kind of education we ought to have now or the kind of
22 health system.

23 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman, by restricting too great
24 a flow of money and by putting some away for the future,
25 hopefully intelligently that we don't lose any of it, we

1 create certain pressure for the people and the government
2 to be willing to look into ways of saving money. Money is
3 wasted within the operations and all the tightening of the
4 belts, a little depression is good once in awhile. The
5 people start to save money where it belongs in the
6 operation. 30 percent of the money that is wasted. I
7 don't want to use judicious words, what happened to the 900
8 million dollars? It would have happened if they didn't put
9 it in the permanent fund. Leave it there. Put more in.

10 THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

11 MR. BARON: Even if we put more money into the
12 permanent fund, I don't think we're going to be suffering
13 in depression. The point is, we've got so much money, I
14 don't think we know what we can do with all of it. We have
15 3.5 billion this year, and each year, successive years,
16 we're going to have more and more, and it's actually our
17 future to put away and save it.

18 THE MODERATOR: Carolyn, and then Ellen.

19 MS. JONES: The goal as stated doesn't say it's all
20 going into the permanent fund.

21 THE MODERATOR: No.

22 THE MODERATOR: Ellen.

23 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman, I think the -- our problem
24 is it's a negative statement. We will be committing some
25 of those funds to some of the means that we'll be

1 discussing later on. It's not that this is our only focus
2 is the future. We will be, and I think responsibly,
3 addressing, you know, our present needs and, therefore,
4 commitments of those funds. And it doesn't sound like
5 we're doing that here. But I think that that's why it's --
6 it's offensive in a sense, because it isn't positive in the
7 sense of responsible actions now. It just says "Should not
8 hastily -- "

9 THE MODERATOR: "The State should increase greatly
10 --"

11 MR. TOMA: This is the negative.

12 MS. HAYLES: It says "revenues should not be hastily."

13 THE MODERATOR: Oh, yes.

14 MS. HAYLES: That's where I think --

15 THE MODERATOR: What does it say?

16 MR. TOMA: Just say, "should be conserved for the
17 future," and instead of "hastily exhausted," just cross
18 that out. "Should be conserved for the future." "Oil
19 revenues should be conserved for the future."

20 THE MODERATOR: Is that agreeable with everyone, that
21 amendment?

22 MR. KILCHER: No.

23 THE MODERATOR: Maybe you changed it before people had
24 voiced themselves. Karen.

25 MS. HEDLAND: I would be in favor of scratching

1 everything, as Celia said, after in the permanent -- I
2 can't see it.

3 THE MODERATOR: Right. Fund. head -- in the
4 permanent fund.

5 MR. TOMA: "The State should increase greatly the
6 amount of dollars going into the permanent fund."

7 MS. HEDLAND: Period.

8 MR. KILCHER: Without moral icing.

9 MR. TOMA: There is a period there.

10 MS. HEDLAND: But I mean delete the rest of it.

11 THE MODERATOR: Andy before we do -- excuse me, finish
12 it.

13 MS. HEDLAND: To me that does not say you cannot spend
14 any of it for roads, if that's what you need, or a hospital,
15 or whatever, but it does say that you don't need to give it
16 away.

17 MR. KILCHER: Right.

18 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

19 MR. HOPE: Just a comment. We had a number of
20 resource people here, and some of these -- we're talking
21 about broad generalities, but they have some real
22 implications, and I wish we could have, you know, like
23 Milton Lipton was here, I wish he could have come in and
24 made a few comments on some of the implications that he
25 would think, and then Marshall listened on the education

1 issues. I'm sure maybe if we do this again, we could take
2 advantage of some of these resource people. I don't know
3 if they just come here to watch us or what, I think that's --
4 that's just a comment.

5 MR. TOMA: They were here to do that, but the way this
6 happened, they weren't here at the time these were being
7 discussed. They were all discussed at once.

8 THE MODERATOR: Now, we have before us this goal
9 statement. The suggestion has been made that we delete the
10 rest of it. Is there any objection to deleting that and
11 putting a period at fund and deleting the rest of that?

12 MR. KILCHER: Yes.

13 MR. JACK: I'm somewhat leery about the word greatly
14 increase.

15 THE MODERATOR: Greatly.

16 MR. JACK: Greatly increase, because, as everyone
17 recalled in the questionnaire that we filled out initially,
18 there were some substantial amounts of questions with
19 respect to the problem --

20 MR. KILCHER: Increase is sufficient.

21 MR. JACK: -- ranging from one-eighth to one-fourth to
22 one-half of the revenue.

23 THE MODERATOR: But what I was asking now whether
24 there was any -- you were not objecting to taking out of
25 the rest of that sentence?

1 MR. JACK: No.

2 THE MODERATOR: Now you have a suggestion that the
3 word "greatly" is maybe editorial icing.

4 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman, I support his idea there.
5 Increasing already is sufficient. Increasing, it means
6 growing. Cut greatly out, and everything after fund, after
7 the period. Second sentence, strike it all out.

8 THE MODERATOR: Do you agree all agree to take out the
9 word greatly? Should increase -- Carolyn?

10 MS. JONES: I don't know what to put in instead, but
11 once you take out the word greatly, it really weakens it.
12 Two dollars would be enough, I guess.

13 THE MODERATOR: "Substantially." How about "substantially"?

14 MR. KELSEY: That's better.

15 THE MODERATOR: "Substantially," I think, is a better
16 word than greatly.

17 MS. HEDLAND: That's still three dollars.

18 THE MODERATOR: David, I'm sorry, I didn't see you.

19 MR. KEENER: I just came back, I'm sorry, but there's
20 some of the things that they asked us to direct our
21 attention to in the original letter. Might not be able to
22 do both of these after we get through considering those
23 points for which we were brought here to consider.

24 THE MODERATOR: I don't think that --

25 MR. KEENER: I said it's a possibility. It might not

1 happen.

2 THE MODERATOR: Well, I think that this group can make
3 that decision whether they want to have this as a goal or
4 whether they don't want to have this as a goal, and that's
5 what's before us right now.

6 I believe that they're pushing us to get out of
7 here.

8 MS. HEDLARD: I remain convinced that one of the
9 things we are charged in that letter was Alaska's future,
10 and they're billing us on everything we carry around as
11 future frontiers, and I do not feel we should be limited by
12 what was dealt with in that letter.

13 MR. TOMA: Right.

14 MR. KELSEY: Let's have the question.

15 THE MODERATOR: Okay, the question is right now, read
16 it.

17 MR. TOMA: "The State should substantially increase
18 the amount of dollars going into the permanent fund."

19 THE MODERATOR: All in favor raise your hand.

20 (complying)

21 THE MODERATOR: Those opposed.

22 We have two in opposition.

23 MR. TOMA: I told them five minutes. Let's just stay.

24 THE MODERATOR: My only problem is, I don't want us to
25 be rushing and not giving thought to these just to get out

1 of here. If we could break now and come back or go
2 upstairs and finish.

3 MR. TOMA: We have 1416.

4 THE MODERATOR: Where is it, 1416?

5 Please, everyone go up there so we can finish
6 these goals today.

7 And our schedule is that we are to come back at
8 eight o'clock, and we should work until six. I think if we
9 go up there now, we should be able to finish this by six
10 o'clock and give us a two-hour break for dinner and then
11 come back. But we need your cooperation of really moving.

12 (RECESS: Five o'clock)

13 (Whereupon the Gamma group reconvened in Room 1416)

14 THE MODERATOR: I'll stand out here so we can talk. I
15 know all of you can't see this goal list, but I think we'll
16 just go ahead without the facilitator.

17 MR. KADEN: He said he wasn't going to be here.

18 THE MODERATOR: So that under economy, which is where
19 we are, "One which provides maximum possible self-sufficiency
20 by and for the people through the encouragement of small-scale,
21 self-sustaining business, agriculture, manufacturing, and
22 resource and energy utilization."

23 Is there any objection to that as a goal?

24 MS. JOHNSON: Katy, I'm sorry, can you read the first
25 part of that again?

1 THE MODERATOR: "One which provides the maximum
2 possible self-sufficiency by and for the people through the
3 encouragement of small-scale self-sustaining business."

4 I believe this is Haden Kaden's. Isn't this
5 yours? We had it, but we didn't have it all written out on
6 the board this morning.

7 Anybody want to ask any questions or do you have
8 any objections?

9 It's a goal.

10 "Responsible fiscal actions be applied to all
11 goals suggested herein." And I know who this is, John
12 Kelsey's. Any objection?

13 Okay. I didn't see any hands.

14 You want some more, David?

15 MR. KEENLE: Just a comment. There's another
16 government form, or direction we might also want to -- well,
17 there was.

18 MS. KINGRA: They have gone with the Editorial
19 Committee to bring it back to us tonight.

20 THE MODERATOR: But there were some other ones that we
21 hadn't acted on on that list we passed over.

22 MR. KADEN: There were? On seven.

23 MR. HUSS: We did that, and we moved permanent fund
24 over.

25 THE MODERATOR: I thought there was one earlier one.

1 There was one, I know.

2 Okay, David, what is your problem?

3 MR. KEENER: No, I'm just I -- I -- forget it.

4 THE MODERATOR: Well, actually, what this is is not
5 necessarily a goal, John, if I may comment, seems to me
6 what you want, because those other statements are long-range
7 goals. What you're saying is that you want to be sure that
8 all of the actions that are taken by this group, that are
9 the wrong -- am I wrong in interpreting you?

10 MR. KELSEY: It's certainly a goal. If we're not
11 going to act in a responsible manner, then we -- we're not
12 going to leave anything for the future generations, and I
13 think it's certainly a goal.

14 THE MODERATOR: Well, I guess what bothers me is the
15 "suggested herein" is what makes me sort of look at it; it
16 narrows it.

17 MR. KELSEY: I guess I'm trying to apply it to all the
18 goals that we have.

19 THE MODERATOR: "Responsible fiscal action be applied
20 to all goals," period. Wouldn't that be better than to say
21 "suggested herein"? Or does that bother anybody else?

22 MR. MATHIESEN: Well, it should be incorporated in the
23 first one. If we're going to stimulate the economy with
24 some type of thing, well, we should have it fiscally
25 responsible of some sort, I think probably is what is

1 trying to be accomplished here. We don't want to encourage
2 a business scale that is not a responsible thing, just for
3 the -- just for encouraging a business.

4 THE MODERATOR: Okay. When if we leave it up to the
5 editors editing to be be sure it makes sense with all of
6 our other goals, is that okay then?

7 MR. KADEN: Is that to apply as well to government
8 action?

9 MR. KELSEY: Absolutely.

10 MR. KADEN: That's what I was thinking you meant. It
11 was not just to stimulation of the economy, but --

12 THE MODERATOR: Well, that's why I was worried about
13 those two words, "suggested herein," that's why I brought
14 that up.

15 MR. KELSEY: You know, I didn't have it under economy.
16 I was talking about the suggestions in toto.

17 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Georgianna.

18 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I would not want that to be
19 a cop-out for the State to say on any of the goals that,
20 "Well, this would not be a responsible fiscal action on our
21 part if we went ahead with it." Some of the goals were so
22 strong, and I think that the objectives to reach those
23 goals are going to be equally strong, and I don't want them
24 to use that as a cop-out of why they can't do that, because
25 we want responsible fiscal action with each one, and

1 they're going to measure that. I would be very worried
2 about that being incorporated.

3 MR. KELSEY: May I respond to that?

4 THE MODERATOR: Yes, John.

5 MR. KELSEY: Well, I think that we -- I had the
6 feeling that we have been somewhat irresponsible in the
7 past and I submit that the increase in the budget has over
8 the last ten or fifteen years demonstrates that, and I
9 think that we should consciously be responsible, more
10 responsible, than we have in the past in the spending of
11 the money. I just would have to feel that if we're not
12 going to be responsible, then we're going to be
13 irresponsible. I think we should say so.

14 THE MODERATOR: Does anyone have any problem with this
15 as a goal?

16 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I do.

17 THE MODERATOR: Yes, I meant anyone else. I'm sorry,
18 Georgianna. Anyone else?

19 MS. HAYES: Could I have it read again? I can't see
20 it very well.

21 THE MODERATOR: "Responsible fiscal actions be applied
22 to all goals suggested herein."

23 MS. LINCOLN: I have a little problem with that in
24 that all of what we're doing is going to the legislature,
25 right, for their review?

1 THE MODERATOR: I don't know. I gather that's what
2 the message was, that this is being done to help the
3 legislature make decisions.

4 MS. LINCOLN: Right. Well, I don't know if it's
5 really that important, but it would seem like having
6 something like that to show to them would maybe suggest
7 that we're saying they're not fiscally responsible.

8 MR. KELSEY: That's what I'm saying

9 THE MODERATOR: I think that's what John's been saying,
10 they haven't been in some cases.

11 MR. KELSEY: Absolutely.

12 THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry, did you speak already,
13 David? No, go ahead David.

14 MR. KEENER: I was just going to say that in the same
15 light it shows we're concerned about our own judgment as
16 far as fiscal responsibility in our suggestions, in that
17 that adds validity to the thought that not only do we want
18 certain ideas about the native life being sustained, but we
19 also have in the back of our mind the fiscal responsibility
20 of this type of thing.

21 THE MODERATOR: Whether we're making the decisions as
22 to the means of carrying out all the goals?

23 MR. KEENER: Yes, right.

24 THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

25 MR. HARUN: It really all comes down to what you mean

1 by responsible. You know, the goal in general is a good
2 one, and it just depends on what the means are as to
3 whether I would agree with it all the time. So I would go
4 along with it, and I have no problem with it being applied
5 to all the different goals, but it just depends on what the
6 means are that we come up with to institute that fiscal
7 responsibility.

8 MR. KELSEY: That's right.

9 MS. HAYES: I'll support it because it is responsible
10 and we have -- there are things that need to be taken care
11 of by the State with funds that we have, and it requires
12 spending as well as not spending.

13 MR. KELSEY: Sure, absolutely.

14 MR. MATHIESEN: I could give a good example of that,
15 if you want to hear it.

16 THE MODERATOR: Okay, Andy.

17 MR. MATHIESEN: A few years ago we had a bond issue
18 that provided funds for port facilities, and our town of
19 Petersburg was eligible for something over a million
20 dollars to put in a port facility. We put in the port
21 facility because we didn't want to let the million get by.
22 We didn't need the port facility. What we needed was
23 facilities to tie up fishing boats, but the restrictions on
24 the port facility didn't allow it to be used for that. So
25 we have what could be called another boondoggle, simply

1 because a chamber-type didn't want to let that million in
2 construction get by. It ended up two million, and I don't
3 think that's fiscal responsibility.

4 MR. HOPE: Same thing happened in Sitka.

5 THE MODERATOR: Beg your pardon?

6 MR. HOPE: Same thing happened in Sitka, too.

7 MR. HUSS: The Editing Committee is not here, right?

8 THE MODERATOR: One of the members of the Editing
9 Committee is.

10 MR. HUSS: I think rather than "goal" would be "recommendation"
11 because our goals aren't spending money. It's our
12 recommendations that we are going to spend money.

13 THE MODERATOR: I was going to make the suggestion
14 this be part of the preamble of our report.

15 MR. KELSEY: That's what I was going to do, Madam
16 Chairman.

17 THE MODERATOR: Because it just somehow doesn't sound
18 like -- we're supposed to be looking to the future in a
19 long-term goal. It is a goal, but it seems to me to make
20 more sense if it were part of the preamble, but that's up
21 to the body.

22 MR. JACK: So moved.

23 MS. JONES: Second it.

24 THE MODERATOR: What? I didn't hear the move. Did
25 somebody move?

1 MS. JONES: Carl moved.

2 THE MODERATOR: Andy? Who moved?

3 MR. LARON: Carl moved.

4 THE MODERATOR: Oh, Carl, to make this a part of the
5 opening statement regarding our report?

6 MR. JACK: Yes.

7 THE MODERATOR: Are you all agreed with that?

8 MR. KELSEY: I want a clarification. Is it going to
9 say it is a goal? Or are we going --

10 THE MODERATOR: We're going to vote on it right now so
11 it can be --

12 MR. KELSEY: I mean in the preamble. How is it going
13 to be couched?

14 MR. KEENER: It's a goal of both our movement and what
15 we recommend for the government.

16 MR. RUSS: That's a great point.

17 THE MODERATOR: Part of our recommendations as to what
18 the future should be, and it could -- yes, it could be a
19 goal, but it doesn't seem to be under economy, I guess is
20 what's bothering me.

21 MR. RUSS: It will carry the same weight as a goal
22 though.

23 MR. KELSEY: Okay, that's my point.

24 THE MODERATOR: That's the main thing, the Editing
25 Committee.

1 MR. KELSEY: I don't want the meaning to get lost in
2 the couching of it.

3 THE MODERATOR: We don't need a motion, I don't think,
4 to say where it should go. I want to know whether you
5 support this as being something that the body, this group,
6 wants to go on record as saying. Is there anyone who
7 objects to this?

8 MR. KELSEY: Question.

9 THE MODERATOR: Georgianna? One objection.

10 Okay, we go on to "fishery resources should be
11 made available for local consumption. Why can it and ship
12 it out?"

13 MS. HUNTER: I don't think that's a goal, Madam
14 Chairman, frankly. Seems to me that's an economic fact of
15 life and, you know, --

16 THE MODERATOR: What fishery resources should be made
17 available for local consumption?

18 MS. HAYES: Madam Chairman?

19 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

20 MS. HAYES: I think it -- this falls in with my other,
21 hm, goal and that is, you know, the small agriculture
22 places for self-sufficiency. Those things that are natural
23 to the area and can be grown in the area should be
24 available to us in the State. We shouldn't have to import
25 everything, like, you know, people who come to Alaska think

1 they're going to be able to get king crabs at the king crab
2 capital. They can't. They think that because they're in
3 southeast, they could go and -- to the market and buy fresh
4 local things. You really can't. None of the things, you
5 know, and maybe that's the rule and very acceptable, but I
6 think this says that the markets, you know, for the
7 fisheries, whatever it brings, could be available for local
8 consumption. It is available, but through Seattle.

9 THE MODERATOR: Well, are you saying then that you
10 don't believe it's a goal; it may be a means of achieving
11 the number -- the first goal?

12 MS. LAYES: Maybe it fits right in with the other
13 sentence.

14 THE MODERATOR: Yes. David.

15 MR. KEENER: Of course, this is what I do, so I know
16 that it's available. The reason why it's not available as
17 much as you would expect it to be is because either the
18 people here catch their fish on subsistence and use it
19 themselves, or else they aren't going to pay the price,
20 because they think it should be at such -- a much lower
21 price. They feel that because it's here, it should be
22 exempt from the overall economy of the world. And it
23 happens in apples, it happens in -- down in California you
24 can't get a head of lettuce down where you grow thousands
25 of them, because you get second-rate lettuce because people

1 think they should be getting it for much less.

2 It's just like Celia said. It's a fact of life.

3 MS. KINGRA: I have to disagree with you, because I
4 resent paying more for king crab or fish here in Fairbanks
5 or even on Kodiak than I have to pay back in Philadelphia
6 or Stone Harbor, New Jersey, where I came from, and that's
7 a fact of life. I pay a lot more for stuff caught right
8 off our shores here than I paid for it back there.

9 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

10 MR. HOPE: The way I interpret it would be to keep the
11 resources, channel them to American markets, instead of
12 channeling them to, say, the Korean market or the Japanese
13 market, and then be dependent on the fluctuations of their
14 economy. Right now that's where a lot of our fish is going
15 to, to the Japanese market, and not too much to the
16 American market. I know that the fishermen are working on
17 that problem, but I think that, you know, that could be a
18 goal.

19 THE MODERATOR: Celia?

20 MS. HUNTER: Well, I just think it's -- usually there
21 are places where you can find these products at less money.
22 I go to a fish wheel up in Fairbanks and get my fish. I
23 think, you know, I was just reading, I was going to New
24 Zealand, I was reading some of the facts of life down in
25 New Zealand, and down there they claim they can't get top-

1 quality lamb; it's all exported.

2 These are the things that you can't really
3 legislate, because it's simply an economic condition, and I
4 think you've got to somehow develop the market here and I'm
5 not going to buy Alaskan salmon at the prices they want for
6 it. Not when it goes through the processing. I'll just
7 not eat salmon. You know, it's a product of inflation and
8 a lot of other things.

9 THE MODERATOR: Kevin?

10 MR. HARUN: I wrote the thing and it's exactly why --
11 we both live in Fairbanks. Not only, you know, can you not
12 afford it; they don't even have it in the store. They just
13 don't have it there. The resource is not available. Not
14 only do we import everything we eat and live on, we export
15 everything else we've got left, and it just disturbs me.

16 MS. HUNTER: How are you going to change it?

17 MR. HARUN: It disturbs me. Maybe it is a means, if
18 you're going to category it towards self-sufficiency, but
19 it seems to me we can encourage a State policy which would
20 somehow try to develop those market instate. Because I'm
21 sure they exist. Maybe we don't want to pay the prices.
22 Maybe also that's somewhere the State could step, too? I
23 don't know. It's something we'd have to analyze as far as
24 the fiscal responsibility of something like that --

25 MR. KEENER: Just one small statement is that

1 businesses in America in general take a larger percent at
2 the retail level than at the wholesale. We wholesale at a
3 price that is very low compared to what you're paying.
4 They increase the price at the retail store by 200 percent,
5 because I know what we sell it for and I know what they're
6 on the market for.

7 If you could buy from Lavco down here, which you
8 can't, because it's a wholesaler, you would be surprised
9 how cheap you could get it for, but it's just -- in other
10 countries, like in Japan, they take our fish, they put them
11 on an open market, and it's a fish market, starts at five
12 in the morning, and you pay just about maybe five percent
13 over what it cost them to get it there, which is cheap.
14 And then it goes into the retail markets and their mark-up
15 is only about 20 percent. But here the mark-up is very
16 high.

17 THE MODERATOR: Does anyone else have anything to say
18 on this?

19 MR. MATHIESEN: I think it's a problem, but I'd like
20 to move we just strike that and move on.

21 MR. KEENEK: Second.

22 THE MODERATOR: Maybe we can work it in as a means.

23 MR. HUSS: It's a resource anyway, so it fits the
24 other one. I think it got too --

25 THE MODERATOR: Was that the only one we had?

1 MS. JONLS: Yes, there was only one sheet.

2 THE MODERATOR: There was another one left.

3 MS. JONLS: There's another one.

4 THE MODERATOR: I hope we have a majority here. I
5 guess we do, of our group. There were 23 before.

6 MS. JONES: We have 18.

7 THE MODERATOR: Okay, community development. "The
8 State should discourage urban sprawl and strip commercial
9 development through a massive commitment to reshift
10 transportation funding from projects which promote
11 automobile dependence to mass transportation."

12 Any objections?

13 THE MODERATOR: Carried.

14 MR. KEENER: I totally disagree with the whole thing.
15 The State stepping into the private sector of development
16 totally disagrees with the natural concept of the way -- of
17 the development of the natural process in the private
18 enterprise. Transportation is expensive, and if what is
19 being said is "Let's create transportation, so that people
20 can move out into the outer lying districts and develop
21 those," where in actuality the center of the mass of people
22 is in one area, it's going to cost more because of the
23 costs of the transportation. It's not a natural balance.

24 THE MODERATOR: Andy.

25 MR. HOPE: It's negatively worded, which is, I don't

1 know --

2 THE MODERATOR: What?

3 MR. HOPE: It's negatively worded, which I thought was
4 against the policy.

5 THE MODERATOR: Right.

6 MR. HOPE: However, if you're going to have a hundred
7 percent subsidessides on Marine Highway system in
8 Southeast, it's okay.

9 THE MODERATOR: Beverly?

10 MS. ISENSEN: I don't know if any other cities have
11 much in the way of mass -- internal mass transit systems,
12 but here in Anchorage, we have a bus system and it is
13 largely funded by the Federal Government, and because the
14 federal bureaucracy moves so slowly, we are about 20 buses
15 behind than we would like to. Our ridership on the bus
16 system has risen by about 35 percent over the last year,
17 and we are the second fastest growing mass transit city in
18 the nation.

19 And what this means is that instead of putting
20 more federal and State and local money into roads, making
21 two-lane roads to four-lane and four-lane to six-lane and
22 so on, and having more people want more parking lots, which
23 aren't particularly attractive and really not the best use,
24 what we've got is a lot of people who are climbing on the
25 bus at 7:30 in the morning. Mass transit has made an awful

1 lot of difference to this community in the last year and
2 probably will continue to. And while it is expensive, it
3 is less expensive than doing the other things you have when
4 every individual wants to drive around in a car all by
5 herself or himself.

6 THE MODERATOR: Edin?

7 MS. LINCOLN: I have a problem with the first part of
8 that statement "The state should discourage urban sprawl,"
9 because I envision if people are going to come into an a
10 city or a town, they're going to come in anyway, and if you
11 restrict where they're going to set their house on, you end
12 up with nothing but slums.

13 MR. BUSS: Nothing but what?

14 MR. KEENER: Slums.

15 MR. FARON: The point is, that statement isn't telling
16 people where you place your house and where you develop.
17 The fact is the government is encouraging by their present
18 highway policies strip development project. Who wants to
19 live on a four-lane? That's the case in Fairbanks. You
20 have a two-lane road with houses on it, you put a -- it's
21 going to go commercial, you naturally lose the downtown
22 core, because there's nowhere else to go.

23 The point was, why you don't let private
24 enterprise take its course? But the fact is in the
25 interior of Alaska we're spending about a hundred million a

1 year on highway construction. We spend about a million on
2 public transit. Of that, the local government puts in
3 about 200,000 of that. If we put one-tenth the effort we
4 put into highways into incorporating the highways for
5 transit purposes, bus turnouts, new buses, we'd have a
6 system that would be so fantastic that everyone would want
7 to ride it. And it just seems to be a never-ending thing.
8 There are alternative ways of developing, and the fact that
9 is that in Alaska, in fact, in Fairbanks, many of us refer
10 to Anchorage Los Anchorage, because it's gone that
11 direction, it's gone like Los Angeles. There's many ways
12 urbanize. You can consolidate your commercial. You have
13 green belts. You have mass transportation. There are ways
14 of organizing. You can fit 400,000 people here a lot
15 better than the 200,000 that live here now. That is the
16 basic point, that we as an American culture, as an Alaskan
17 culture, have got to get into it a little bit differently
18 than being a carbon copy of Los Angeles or the Lower 48.
19 That's why I support that.

20 THE MODERATOR: Chris.

21 MS. JOHNSON: I would like to see the first part of
22 that, which is -- stricken, which is in my opinion is
23 editorializing, and could we just say it should be the
24 State's policy to shift transportation funding from
25 projects? Do you see the cut I'm making?

1 MR. HARUN: Well, we should editorialize, I think.
2 It's a statement of values.

3 THE MODERATOR: I was going to suggest maybe you have
4 two subjects in there.

5 MR. HARUN: Yes.

6 THE MODERATOR: And maybe you should address the mass
7 transportation as one and then the other one could come
8 under a statement that had to do with the State handling
9 planning and zoning, which would certainly make the
10 difference. That was my suggestion.

11 MR. KELSEY: Madam Chairman, back to what Andy was
12 saying though. I don't think we should take a negative
13 point of view. Let's say we encourage something, rather
14 than discourage something.

15 THE MODERATOR: It's more encourage than he wants. He
16 wants the state to really --

17 MR. HARUN: I think there's a real problem in this
18 State. I think the problem of our urban area is that we're
19 allowing them to go to rack and ruin. We're not taking
20 care of them. I think it's a negative thing we're doing.
21 I think we should point it out to the legislature and say,
22 "Look, it needs some attention. Fairbanks, here's the
23 problem," everybody agrees. Chuck Konigsberg said the
24 other day, "Oh, yes, we want a livable city, a livable
25 environment, but when we come to the specifics, we back off."

1 we're not willing to support it." I think this is
2 something that's got to take both local and State action to
3 solve. It's one of the major problems in the State,
4 because if you don't check urbanization, if you don't care
5 to take quality urbanization, then you're going to have it
6 splintering all over to the hinterlands. People want to
7 move out to the Mat-Su Valley and you see the same thing,
8 Rabbit Creek, Eka or Cold Stream in Fairbanks, Gustavus,
9 because they want no State lands out there, they want to
10 get out of this mess. They come to Alaska because they
11 want a better life-style. What do we do? We create the
12 same thing. I think the legislature has to be made aware
13 of that and correct it.

14 THE MODERATOR: But, Andy, I think, made the point.
15 We have have been trying to make all our statements maybe
16 positive statements. If you could turn it around and make
17 it a positive statement and say what you're meaning is a
18 criticism that --

19 MR. HOPE: You know, traditionally, too, whenever
20 you're making a -- writing a resolution or --

21 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

22 MR. HOPE: -- it has to be stated positively.

23 MR. HARUN: What actually is technically stated
24 positively. It doesn't say "not" in it.

25 THE MODERATOR: Except it's in shift.

1 MR. HOPE: Why is it in transportation? Cumulative
2 development?

3 THE MODERATOR: David.

4 MR. KLENER: I don't know. My -- I studied some
5 history, and a lot of it was industrialization of the U S
6 society. What we found in New York, back in the early days,
7 was a small cottage environment inside the city. And it
8 shifted to mass transit trains, because people wanted to
9 live outside the city and commute into the city on mass
10 transportation and have a centralized urban development.

11 Then the businesses started moving out closer,
12 because they didn't want to make this long trip. The
13 businesses -- in the present day, you'll find the Sears
14 Mall; they moved clear out to Northern Lights. The
15 Boniface Parking Center; they're expanding to get closer to
16 the residential centers. And what happens is, that what's
17 left downtown is so far away and removed from the mass
18 people, that it creates a problem where it's not a
19 desirable place to live.

20 I think here in Anchorage they're having a
21 problem trying to keep the downtown area downtown. They're
22 having problems with parking lots.

23 Maybe, Bev, maybe you could expand on this, but
24 if you're going to say, "We want mass transit to alleviate
25 the problems of the sprawling city," it just compounds it.

1 No. 1, green belts and public systems back then, only the
2 most affluent people could afford them. And all the
3 housing projects, it is green belt housing projects, began
4 with a level of income to afford it. And if you're going
5 to do this, you're limiting it to the level of income also.

6 THE MODERATOR: I think that you want mass transit not
7 just because of the urban sprawl, but because it helps
8 people.

9 MR. KELNER: Right, right.

10 MR. HARUN: There's many reasons for wanting transit.

11 THE MODERATOR: Right. I think what all of you are
12 saying is that your statement should, you know, Chris's
13 suggestion, take out that first part so that you have the
14 emphasis on what you really mean.

15 MR. HARUN: As the maker of it I'm trying to say
16 something different than maybe what you're saying. There
17 are many reasons for supporting transit, but what I'm
18 saying is that the leading determinant of urbanization in
19 this state is our transportation systems. The leading
20 cause of everything that we've got is the way in which we
21 have -- develop our transportation systems. The same thing
22 we were talking about Wasilla the other day. They didn't
23 put a bypass through there the way they directed. The road
24 encouraged that strip commercialization.

25 THE MODERATOR: I know.

1 MR. BARON: That transportation should be addressed,
2 but somewhere I think we got to address the question of
3 urban roads.

4 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

5 MR. MATHIESEN: I have some wording you just might
6 think about that perhaps might accomplish that, "And that
7 the State should encourage alternatives to transportation
8 dependent upon automobiles."

9 Does that help your situation any?

10 MR. BARON: Yes.

11 MR. MATHIESEN: Because as an example, an alternative
12 to having these massive highways getting to the country
13 might even be more apartment complexes downtown that are
14 attractive that do not even require an automobile at all,
15 things of that sort. It's an alternative that does not
16 necessarily mean more of --

17 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That sounds good.

18 THE MODERATOR: We're getting bogged down again in an
19 issue that is important, but I would like us to try to
20 resolve it. Chris.

21 MS. JOHNSON: I have two things. One of them is a
22 message from Chip and I wanted to give it now before I go.
23 he says that Room 305 has a conference table and he thinks
24 it will handle all of us and that we can move down there to
25 start again at eight o'clock, if you would prefer, or we

1 could come back to this room or we could divide into groups.
2 That was his groups.

3 THE MODERATOR: I don't want us to divide into groups,
4 or ever really, but -- I mean that's my --

5 MS. JOHNSON: I just wanted to tell you it was
6 available.

7 THE MODERATOR: 305 is a lot better than this setup.

8 MS. JOHNSON: It does have a conference table.

9 MR. HOPE: It has a bar in it.

10 THE MODERATOR: We'll need that.

11 MS. JOHNSON: I wanted to make one point. It seems to
12 me that several of these points in this area could be
13 grouped. It seems like we're talking in a way about means,
14 that mass transportation is again a means. And it seems to
15 me that one statement that we're trying to make, and I like
16 the wording that you used is, we would like the State to
17 assist us in quality urbanization. And then I see mass
18 transportation as a means in this regard. I don't know.
19 Carl.

20 MR. JACK: Just a comment first to qualify my
21 statement. I'm not speaking against this goal here. A
22 question just came around. I'm just thinking out loud.
23 We're talking about government and its regulatory authority
24 and we seem to be talking about cares of government here,
25 where we have a State dictating, to a borough where the

1 borough may have that regulatory authority, too.

2 MR. ISENSEN: In the case of Anchorage, the State has
3 done very little to help reverse the decline of downtown,
4 and much to help create another Los Angeles. And so a
5 statement like that, maybe Andy's wording would be
6 sufficiently broad so it's applicable for any community,
7 whether it's a village or a state, but I feel very strongly
8 we need something as an example of what the State is doing.
9 They have a -- They're looking for office space now for 400
10 employees and their ad says "Any place outside of a two-mile
11 radius of downtown," which is crazy.

12 THE MODERATOR: I didn't get your wording, Andy. Can
13 you say it?

14 MR. MATLIESEN: Well, if it is in fact you wanted, you
15 know, to change the auto dependent type of highway, well,
16 then we should encourage alternatives to transportation,
17 that is, modes or access that are dependent upon auto type
18 transportation, because there's a jillion alternatives to
19 that, and if you just leave it up to the State, why, the
20 highway department is part of the State. The they think
21 the urban center is cloverleafs and underpasses and over-
22 passes and God knows what known to man.

23 MR. HUSS: I think Chris's definition was even broader
24 than and better than that, the "Cne where," said, "the State
25 should strive to help the cities achieve an equality

1 urbanization," or something like that.

2 MR. BARON: Yes, that's good.

3 MS. HAYES: Then you could have means under that; is
4 that right?

5 MR. HUSS: All these, like alternatives to the
6 automobile, green belts, all that could be the alternatives
7 to what we have now, and that would be --

8 MR. KELSEY: Means.

9 MR. HUSS: Means, that's what I mean to say.

10 THE MODERATOR: The State should strive to achieve a
11 quality urbanization.

12 MS. KINGRA: To assist.

13 THE MODERATOR: The State should assist --

14 MS. KINGRA: In quality urbanization.

15 MR. BARON: What you're trying say is quality with
16 urbanization is taken. You don't want quality.

17 THE MODERATOR: It's difficult to try to amend this
18 from the floor. Do you think you could take it back and
19 come up with a -- now that you've heard what everybody is --
20 everybody is happy with the idea, but they don't like the
21 language there.

22 "The State should assist --

23 MS. KINGRA: There was something else in there besides
24 the State should assist in achieving quality urbanization.

25 MR. HUSS: Just cities in achieving. That way it

1 would put in the cities.

2 THE MODERATOR: The State should assist cities or
3 communities.

4 MS. ISENSEN: Communities, communities.

5 MR. HARUN: Quality urbanization taking place.

6 THE MODERATOR: Everybody is telling me what it was
7 and I can't get it.

8 What is the language you prefer?

9 MR. HARUN: Well, the State should assist in achieving
10 quality in urbanization, or a quality where urbanization is
11 taking place. Quality development.

12 THE MODERATOR: This is what I'm saying. You know, to
13 try to get this. I mean without having it written down.
14 Could we -- could I ask you to come back with it at eight
15 o'clock?

16 MR. HARUN: Sure.

17 THE MODERATOR: Now, these other --

18 MR. KELSEY: Do you want to vote on that, on the
19 concept. I think we're agreed on that pretty well.

20 THE MODERATOR: The concept of mass transit?

21 MR. KEENER: Sure, sure.

22 MS. DAVES: No it's not true mass transit we've been
23 talking about.

24 THE MODERATOR: No. 1, I don't like to vote on the --

25 MR. HUSS: We got to vote on the one you got basically,

1 those are going to be our means. That's going to be our
2 goal, what you have down basically.

3 THE MODERATOR: I'm not sure I have it. "The State
4 should assist cities in achieving quality urbanization."

5 MR. HUSE: Something like that. I mean let Kevin edit
6 and we'll vote on that concept.

7 THE MODERATOR: Okay, any objection to that as a goal?
8 Okay. Do you have it? for your editing?

9 MR. KADEN: (nodding head)

10 THE MODERATOR: "The State should consolidate State
11 land disposals to discourage further strip
12 commercialization and sprawl and rural areas along the
13 State highway system."

14 Any comments?

15 MR. KADEN: I think that that is a much bigger issue
16 than just the sprawl along the highways. I think what has
17 happened the State is disposing of huge quantities of land
18 without any planning at all, and they haven't looked --
19 they haven't looked at the effects, the social, economic,
20 any other effect upon the areas in which they're disposing
21 of land. So I mean that's part of the same problem. But
22 it's a much greater problem than just that. I mean it's
23 one that bush people are experiencing, urban people,
24 everybody's getting nailed by this -- these land disposal.

25 THE MODERATOR: Andy?

1 MR. HOPE: I'd like to know if there really is a
2 problem. You know, this is why we need resource people
3 here. I'd be making a judgment in ignorance if I -- you
4 know, because I haven't been up to Vasilka lately or
5 wherever this was supposed to be happening, and I thought
6 that the thrust of the lands legislation was to turn over
7 lands to the local municipalities or whatever, boroughs,
8 then they could --

9 THE MODERATOR: That's only one portion of their land
10 disposal.

11 MR. HOPE: See, like I say, I'm ignorant on it.

12 THE MODERATOR: Georgie.

13 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) In the interior, I don't
14 like the wording that the State should consolidate state
15 land disposals, because the areas that we're having
16 problems with is, if you consolidate the State land
17 disposal and you put in a tract that would accommodate 20
18 people in an urban -- I mean, excuse me, a rural area or a
19 village, it says the whole concept of what that village is,
20 and in fact the voting population at times is even greater
21 than the village itself. And it -- so I'm strongly opposed
22 to consolidating the State land disposal. It has a
23 detrimental effect on our villages.

24 THE MODERATOR: Kevin.

25 MR. TALON: That one was just meant in reference for

1 communities along the State highway system, such as
2 Cantwell and --

3 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) To the case.

4 MR. BARON: To the case.

5 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) To the case is one of our
6 villages.

7 MR. BARON: What they had planned, it varies I guess
8 from community to community. I guess the point is, as
9 Haden was saying, there could be a lot more local
10 involvement in these land disposals before they take place.

11 THE MODERATOR: Well, one of the things they're doing
12 is putting land at disposal out there where there are no
13 roads or anything to it, and the next thing you know you'll
14 have people there and they'll be asking for all of the
15 kinds of services that are available close in, schools,
16 roads and so forth, without -- I think that's one of the
17 things that you were talking about, in that it needs to be
18 a broader issue. John.

19 MR. KELSEY: That's precisely where we are. Where I
20 come from, Valdez, we're -- State disposing of the lands
21 and those people are demanding that we build roads to them,
22 and we're even thinking of going and litigating it. It's
23 that bad.

24 THE MODERATOR: Were you first?

25 MR. MATHIESEN: Well, I'd like to say that the

1 legislature demanded the administration to dispose of those
2 lands and we really can't put all the blame on the
3 administration. And as far as the planning part goes,
4 those that are in the planning now assure us, if you can be
5 assured with that, that in future land sales that the
6 planning will be much more comprehensive to accomplish
7 exactly what you're discussing. But in the initial land
8 disposal they had to get rid of so much.

9 MR. HOPE: Was it in a rush towards last year's
10 election or what?

11 THE MODERATOR: It was because of the Bierre
12 initiative that motivated the legislature to take this
13 action to tell, you know -- and the people spoke and said,
14 "we want land," and this is the way they reacted. This is
15 the reaction.

16 MS. HUNTER: Madam Chairman, I think there are
17 meetings all over Alaska with legislators right now before
18 they go back to Juneau, complaining about HB 66 and the
19 letter of intent. And I think it might be well to
20 acknowledge among the people here that we recognized the
21 problem of these very hasty and ill-planned State land
22 disposals which are doing, among other things, strip
23 commercialization, but worse than that are impacting
24 existing communities in ways that are costly and, you know,
25 downgrading the quality of life in those communities, and

1 that we feel that much more local involvement needs to be
2 present in the -- you know, rather than just disposing of
3 the land. I don't know how to say it exactly, but we're
4 all agreed on the same thing.

5 THE MODERATOR: I think all of these, they're too
6 narrow, I guess, is what you're saying.

7 MR. KADEN: Could we just restate it and say that a
8 directive from us to the legislature, which all these are
9 supposedly are, that the State should not dispose of any --
10 I mean make a negative out of it, because it's a negative
11 program, and the State should not dispose of any more State
12 land until proper planning has been done. You know, that's --
13 I mean if that's all it is, if they had planned at all, if
14 they had looked at the land they were disposing of, you
15 know, lot of the problems would have been alleviated. They
16 sold swamp land, you know, where we are.

17 THE MODERATOR: You can turn that into a positive
18 statement. Disposal of land shall follow only after proper
19 planning.

20 THE MODERATOR: I think you need to come up with a
21 statement rather than an offer. I'm afraid we're going to
22 come up with some sloppy goals and then we're going to look
23 terrible.

24 MR. ROPE: How about at eight o'clock. It's after six
25 now.

1 MS. HAYES: It's very taxing.

2 THE MODERATOR: It is.

3 MR. MATHIESEN: Let me try this one, "Existing
4 qualities of life must be maintained prior to a disposal of
5 State land."

6 MS. LUNTZ: Well, not prior to.

7 MR. MATHIESEN: See, when I say existing qualities of
8 life, you know, they have to be maintained before --

9 MS. ISENSEN: State land disposal should be in concert
10 with the existing quality of life.

11 THE MODERATOR: This is the kind of thing, it doesn't
12 do quite anything -- to try to put it together over the
13 dinner hour and come up. I know it's six o'clock and you
14 do need a couple hours. We're going to have to have ideas
15 about means tonight, because we have to finish.

16 MR. KEENER: This is our last goal sheet?

17 THE MODERATOR: Well, no, we've got -- yes, we got one
18 more.

19 MS. HAYES: Then we have the means.

20 THE MODERATOR: "Rural housing and water and sewage
21 disposal facilities and solid waste disposal shall be
22 designed for local needs."

23 MS. HAYES: Is that a means?

24 THE MODERATOR: Criteria should include energy
25 conservation, affordable, utilization of local resources

1 and know how and strong local input into planning and
2 implementation.

3 MR. KEENLEK: That's a means.

4 THE MODERATOR: I guess that's why -- that's a means.
5 What do you feel about this? Do you have any objections to
6 that?

7 MR. HUSS: Which one?

8 THE MODERATOR: Rural housing and water and sewage
9 disposal facilities and solid waste disposal --

10 MS. HUNTER: Solid waste disposal.

11 THE MODERATOR: -- solid waste disposal be designed to
12 suitability to local needs. Does everybody agree that's a
13 good goal?

14 MR. KELSEY: I think it's a great goal. I just think
15 it's in conflict with governmental requirements and I
16 wonder if we're going to look silly --

17 MS. HUNTER: I don't think so, John. I think it's
18 important to come out and say it, because the government is
19 going crazy in what they're doing.

20 MR. KELSEY: I agree.

21 MR. HUSS: Yes, I agree.

22 THE MODERATOR: I don't think we have to stand back
23 just because the feds say something.

24 MS. HUNTER: Or the State government does something,
25 you know.

1 THE MODERATOR: I agree.

2 MR. FALLOU: Designed for a suitability to local needs
3 and somehow getting a concept of aesthetics in there,
4 because oftentimes rural housing, they come in and they
5 just -- I mean it may be suitable, but they're totally ugly
6 and it's --

7 MR. HOLL: It's not suitable either.

8 THE MODERATOR: Well, designed to take into
9 consideration the -- why don't you edit that? If there's
10 no objection, if everybody agrees with it.

11 MS. HUNTER: I think we all agree on it.

12 THE MODERATOR: -- that that's important, I think you
13 could edit that.

14 MS. HUNTER: You could add a couple words or something.

15 THE MODERATOR: So you agree this is a goal?

16 (responding affirmatively)

17 THE MODERATOR: This group. Now we just have one more
18 sheet and then we can pretty much --

19 MS. KINGRA: I am past thinking.

20 THE MODERATOR: I know, I'm afraid that's what's
21 happening.

22 THE MODERATOR: A commitment to downtown core
23 revitalization and enhancements in urban areas.

24 MR. RUSS: I think that fit our other one.

25 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Yes, that would go into

1 the first one -- not the first one, the second.

2 MR. HUSS: The quality urbanization.

3 THE MODERATOR: That should go with the one up there
4 as a goal.

5 MR. HUSS: The one you have on your pad. It's the
6 same thing.

7 MR. KELSEY: Yes, same thing.

8 THE MODERATOR: What you're saying then is we should
9 rewrite this whole thing and include that; is that it?

10 MR. HUSS: No, I think you can just drop that and keep
11 the one you got.

12 THE MODERATOR: We haven't adopted anything yet.

13 MR. KADEN: We adopted a concept.

14 THE MODERATOR: "State lands selections and disposals
15 should reflect local desires to maintain quality of life."

16 MR. KELSEY: Same thing.

17 MS. HUNTER: That's what we're talking about.

18 THE MODERATOR: -- and adopt a land-use tax" -- I saw
19 Yule you'll put this on there. "Adopt lands-use tax
20 concepts, variations of Henry George."

21 MR. KELSEY: He's not here to defend that, so we'll
22 leave that.

23 MR. KEENER: When you talk about quality urbanization,
24 you talk about the residential areas surrounding the
25 downtown area, if that's what you want. I mean if you

1 don't want the Los Angeles urban, you should also say with
2 that quality urbanization say it's a quality revival.

3 THE MODERATOR: Someone is supposed to come up with a
4 statement that will cover those -- we'll leave that with it
5 and the drafters of that notion.

6 MS. HAYES: I think, Katy, I think the real statement
7 there is a result. And we in another statement are trying
8 to prevent such a need to revitalize places. They
9 shouldn't need it this soon, like the downtown Anchorage
10 area shouldn't be really needing revitalization, it's a
11 brand-new city.

12 MS. HUNTER: Fairbanks desperately needs it.

13 MS. HAYES: Yes, because, you know, there is no
14 attention given to this, we're going to be revitalizing a
15 lotta places all the time and it's a waste of construction,
16 all the building, you know, all the building needs. It's a
17 poor excuse to me, and I don't think a place as young as
18 Anchorage is, it's the youngest city, you know, needs to be
19 abandoned and there are places for lease, and they're
20 building new ones everywhere. It's incredible to me. I
21 think we want to avoid such.

22 THE MODERATOR: Yes, I can see to avoid --

23 MS. HAYES: This is the very thing we want to avoid by
24 the other action.

25 THE MODERATOR: All right, Carl, you had your hand up.

1 MR. JACK: Are we done with that?

2 THE MODERATOR: Well, we're done with it because the
3 very subjects, as I understand it, we feel have already
4 been touched and we need to come back with some better --

5 MR. KELSEY: Why don't we just tear it up then?

6 THE MODERATOR: No, he needs it to do his writing for
7 the ones we need to adopt.

8 MR. KELSEY: Let's have it understood we're not going
9 back to it.

10 MR. JACK: I was going to bring out what was thrown
11 back to me in regards to the goal. I was told to rewrite
12 it.

13 THE MODERATOR: I know there are some other things.

14 MR. JACK: Let me just throw it out just once more,
15 and then, this is on the roads. The original wording was "Roads
16 to be developed according to regional plans based on
17 existing transportation loads. The revised language is "Any
18 anticipated road construction, in parentheses,
19 transportation development, parentheses closed, should only
20 be implemented based on the expressed preference of local
21 communities to be affected."

22 THE MODERATOR: How does that sound? Do you have any
23 objection to that as a goal? That would be the -- to take
24 care of that one on another sheet.

25 Okay, are you too tired?

1 MR. RADEN: Would you reread it, please?

2 THE MODERATOR: Would you read it again, Carl?

3 MR. JACK: "Any anticipated road construction, in
4 parentheses transportation development, parentheses closed,
5 should only be implemented based on the expressed
6 preference of local communities to be affected."

7 THE MODERATOR: Any objection?

8 MR. FELELY: I'm just -- may I?

9 THE MODERATOR: Yes, John.

10 MR. KESLY: I'm wondering now if we're precluding
11 something that, you know, might be desirable. I'm thinking
12 of, let's just say -- let's take another area, the North
13 Slope Road, for example. If you wanted to go from point A
14 being Fairbanks to Prudhoe Bay and they have to go through
15 Anaktuvuk Pass or something, and yet they have to get the
16 permission of the people in Anaktuvuk in order to
17 accomplish that. I think they did have a problem, I'm just
18 wondering by adopting you might be precluding something
19 that might be desirable by the rest of the state.

20 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) No way.

21 THE MODERATOR: No, I think that's exactly what the --
22 what they want to do is let it be a decision to the people
23 there whether they want a road or not.

24 MS. LUNTER: Madam Chairman, seems to me the Hall Road
25 is really the first instance we've had where there has been

1 a debate in which a lot of the values of local people got
2 into the debate. Mostly we've never had a chance to debate
3 where a road goes, or whether a road should go. The
4 highway department generally comes to you after they have
5 decided on a road and they say, "Should it go here and here?"

6 You say, "I don't want it to go either place,"
7 and they say, "Tough." I think what is requested is that
8 this form of local input get into the planning at a stage
9 when it can influence what happens, and I think, you know, --
10 maybe it will preclude something, but I think -- this is a
11 democratic society, and if it is a will of the majority
12 people that a road go through ultimately to develop
13 something, it will be done. You aren't going to stop it,
14 but you're certainly going to give local people some input.

15 THE MODERATOR: John.

16 MR. KELSEY: Madam Chairman, but aren't you precluding
17 the possibility of what's going for the vast majority by a
18 minority, a very small group? I just have a little problem
19 with that.

20 MS. HUNTER: I can't see that happening.

21 MR. KELSEY: Oh, I can.

22 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) And I think that that is a
23 great opportunity for the minority, because rural people
24 are minority people, that it's a great opportunity for the
25 minority voice, I don't mean the minority, the minority

1 voice to be heard. It's always majority rule. I think
2 there has to be some kind of equal justice for the minority
3 voice, too.

4 MR. KELLEY: I would certainly agree, but, you know, I
5 wouldn't think -- I wouldn't want to give them the tool to
6 preclude something that was in the best interests of the
7 entire state. I certainly wouldn't want to be in a
8 position to take a vote and cancel out something that was
9 good for the state if I were against it. I don't believe
10 in that.

11 MS. LAYES: We are the state.

12 THE MODERATOR: Gene had something she wanted to say.

13 MS. KINCH: Our stenographer is going downhill as
14 fast as the rest of us, and I think we should consider her
15 in our zeal to finish, because she doesn't rest for two
16 hours.

17 And as I understand, you go and transcribe your
18 notes.

19 And I wish we would take her into consideration,
20 and ourselves, adjourn until eight and come back fresher
21 than we are now.

22 THE MODERATOR: We'll vote on yours at eight o'clock,
23 Carl.

24 (RECESS: 6:20)

25

SCOMM

#30:19

276
FILE COPY

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, STATE OF ALASKA

Conference on Alaska's Future Frontiers

Friday, December 7, 1979

Sheraton Anchorage Hotel

Anchorage, Alaska

VOLUME III

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

Reported by: Charlene Beovich, RPR

GAMMA GROUP MEETING PROCEEDINGS

(December 7, 1979, 8:00 p.m.)

THE MODERATOR: We'll start out with our political, they called it Political Justice. "Gamma group envisions the future for Alaska as one in which," and then the first heading is "The political representation reflects both population and geographic diversity," and how do we see that this would be put into effect?

MS. HUNTER: Well, I'd just think that we should go back to the business of having senators come from the district, from, you know, representing areas and representatives representing people.

THE MODERATOR: Andy?

MR. HOPE: That's one thing I didn't understand. Why both the senate and the house have to be on a population basis where in the United States congress the senate is not. Why does the whole legislature have to be structured that way? I couldn't understand that.

THE MODERATOR: Well, that was the result of reapportionment back after the '70 census and taking the Supreme Court's decision, one man, one vote.

1 MR. HOPE: I realize that, but why vote --

2 THE MODERATOR: That's why we have this plank now, so
3 we --

4 MR. KILCHER: Madam Chairman.

5 THE MODERATOR: Yule.

6 MR. KILCHER: Actually our present apportion is in
7 total contradiction of our constitution. You're well aware.
8 I'm a constitution delegate. Was. Will be next time.
9 When that federal ruling came out, I think Governor Egan, a
10 good friend of mine, was hasty in changing the senate
11 apportionment. It was under political pressure, political,
12 personal or otherwise, I don't know. I've never agreed
13 with it.

14 We have never since then changed the constitution.
15 We should have changed the constitutional amendment adopted
16 years ago to conform with the deep fact of reapportionment
17 that was unconstitutional just because of what the federal
18 decision should be. I agree with you, it shouldn't have
19 been done and there's no reason why we should have the --
20 as a sovereign State, as the federal Government has, and
21 has geographic consideration in the senate.

22 However this is probably a moot question in the
23 near, if there is one, because the sentiment for it is
24 quite high. There's no use we have a system if we don't
25 have one house based on the geographic concentration. It's

1 unconstitutional. Unconstitutional.

2 MR. BOSS: I'd like to make a recommendation then that
3 we go ahead and reapportion on the federal system with the
4 senate being by region and the house one vote one man and
5 just challenge the Supreme Court ruling.

6 MS. JOHNSON: I second.

7 THE MODERATOR: I'm sorry, that was Paden and -- we
8 have a problem. Excuse me, I'll have to. They're not
9 finished and they feel that they've got to finish in order
10 for us to be able to -- that they'll never -- we'll never
11 see it and we'll never be able to finish, so they would
12 like to have the rest of the committee come up there and
13 help. John, Yule, unless you want to stay here and

14 MR. HOPE: Aren't they just taking care of kind of --

15 THE MODERATOR: Well, --

16 MR. HOPE: -- proofreading type and grammatical type --

17 THE MODERATOR: Well, they've written them down so the
18 statements are here and they're on the six categories, so
19 they, you know, don't have too many more, but --

20 MR. HOPE: You're saying this is those guys.

21 THE MODERATOR: Right.

22 MR. KEENER: But they also deserve the same.

23 THE MODERATOR: I told them that if they would like to
24 have a say in the implementation, but I felt when they come
25 down, that they could look at what we've done and they

1 would still have an opportunity, we could open it up for
2 them to have some additional say.

3 MR. KILCHER: Reconsideration if they disagree. Grant
4 them that courtesy and that should work as you suggested.
5 It's good idea.

6 THE MODERATOR: I didn't hear what you said, but I
7 gather, about this first issue then, you would agree to go
8 back to the --

9 MS. HUNTER: Alaska's constitutional setup.

10 THE MODERATOR: Is there a motion?

11 MS. JOHNSON: Yes and seconded.

12 THE MODERATOR: Okay, what is the motion?

13 MR. LUSS: That we reapportion similar to the federal
14 structure with the senate being based on a regional
15 criterion and the house being a one man, one vote system
16 and just challenge the Supreme Court on that decision.

17 THE MODERATOR: Right on.

18 If Chip isn't here, Christine, are you -- is
19 there some other body around here who can assist us from
20 the interns or something? Some of the groups, they tell me,
21 have typists and so forth to help.

22 MS. JOHNSON: As I understood, Chip was trying to get
23 a typewriter in here and a typist, but I haven't seen him
24 for three hours. Or two hours. So --

25 THE MODERATOR: It's going to be rather hard to --

1 someone, I need someone to write them.

2 MS. JOHNSON: Can't we use this form?

3 MS. HUNTER: We can't use that form over and over
4 again.

5 THE MODERATOR: We have several copies of the form.
6 but don't you think you want to see it up here?

7 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Yes.

8 THE MODERATOR: The motion is to implement this goal
9 by having the house elected on the one man, one vote, and
10 the senate by senatorial districts represented as stated in
11 the constitution. Is that what the motion was?

12 MS. HUNTER: Yes.

13 THE MODERATOR: Any discussion?

14 MS. HUNTER: I think it's great.

15 THE MODERATOR: Is part of the motion to challenge the
16 Supreme Court? Do you want that in the motion?

17 MR. LUS: Just an apportionment. Reapportion
18 according to this method and this challenges the Supreme
19 Court, you know.

20 THE MODERATOR: Do you think you want to put that
21 right in the motion, challenging the Supreme Court?

22 MS. JOHNSON: You must put on the other hand a
23 positive statement, like, in accordance with the Alaska
24 constitution.

25 MS. HUNTER: I think that's better.

1 THE MODERATOR: Yes, in accordance with the Alaska
2 constitution, the senate shall be by area and sociological --

3 MS. HUNTER: Geographical area, isn't it?

4 THE MODERATOR: Geographical areas and the house by
5 one man, one vote.

6 MS. HUNTER: by one man, one vote.

7 THE MODERATOR: Any further question?

8 MR. BUSS: Question.

9 THE MODERATOR: All those in favor say aye.

10 (responding)

11 THE MODERATOR: Those opposed.

12 MS. ISENSEN: Aye, nay, whatever.

13 THE MODERATOR: Julie is there any way you can find
14 somebody? Do you know what's happened to Chip or is he
15 going to be around?

16 JULIE: I can go find him.

17 THE MODERATOR: I just wondered why we've been left.

18 Okay, the next item is -- goal was justice and
19 enforcement of the law is applied equally without regard to
20 race, ethnic group, geographic location, sex or social
21 status. Are you looking at those things of Carolyn's? I
22 suspect she might have something on this one.

23 MR. HOLTHUS: She has two specific recommendations
24 with regard to that. One is state-wide data bank, can't
25 read the next word. Anyhow, it's for rape reports and

1 their ultimate disposition. And a judicial council study
2 that compares rape prosecutions, dismissals, bail,
3 sentences and probations with the same statistics for other
4 violent crimes, for instance, assault. And I don't think
5 she really means this, but she wants a rape advocate and
6 every law enforcement that wasn't suspect the victim
7 throughout the process. I think she wants somebody to
8 support the victim throughout the process, but I don't
9 think she wants any advocate for rapes.

10 MS. HUNTER: Well, she calls them advocates in the
11 women's resource --

12 MR. HOLTHUS: It's bad. Do you want the major factors
13 listed or not?

14 THE MODERATOR: On this subject? I guess --

15 MR. HOLTHUS: I think we don't want --

16 THE MODERATOR: The major factors, no. I would assume
17 that the major factors are leading to the specific regions
18 is our goal. But am I wrong?

19 MR. HOLTHUS: Well what she has listed here under
20 specific recommendations, those three things I read are.
21 Under justice and law enforcement applied to even handling
22 without regard to race, ethnics, social status, et cetera,
23 she has a professional permanent law enforcement service in
24 rural areas and the reasons she has for that are there is
25 slow or no response to calls for assistance, village police

1 are often related to the offender, have difficulty
2 enforcing the law; villagers are held captive by someone
3 out of control, so on.

4 THE MODERATOR: Could we take them just one at a time
5 and see what the group feels as to that recommendation?

6 MR. HOLTEUS: I think the regions, the specific
7 recommendation for that one is just a professional
8 permanent law enforcement service in rural areas.

9 THE MODERATOR: Is there any objection? Do you all
10 agree that's a good solution? Andy?

11 MR. HOPE: I wonder. I know the State has recently
12 recruited quite a few native State Troopers. Are there
13 efforts currently under way to resolve this problem or --

14 THE MODERATOR: Well, do you think that matters? I
15 mean we have, this is a goal and I mean if we're going to
16 try to figure out what the State is doing, that's up to the
17 legislature to find out whether if they are already doing
18 it, they can scratch that off as something that they don't
19 have to address, but I don't think we can spend the time
20 trying to figure out what the State is doing.

21 MR. HOPE: Well I mean if it's really a critical
22 problem. I don't know. I don't know that it is. I know
23 that in Sitka the critical problem that we have is the lack
24 of -- total lack of any personnel working that -- that
25 works with the police department, native personnel,

1 officers or whatever.

2 THE MODERATOR: That's another -- that would be
3 another item maybe that you should bring up. But could we
4 first address this question of Carolyn's recommendation?

5 MR. HOPE: Well, I question whether it's, you know,
6 really that much of a problem.

7 MS. LUDWIG: Yes.

8 MR. HOPE: If I heard it from the villagers.

9 THE MODERATOR: Could we hear from village that could
10 answer that? Carl.

11 MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, I would add between
12 profession and, professional and adequate permanent law
13 enforcement, the reason being, an example is, down in the
14 Chain there is one person that's supposed to handle 1500
15 miles of that Chain. And the same is true generally in the
16 Yukon area.

17 THE MODERATOR: Georgianna

18 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I just wanted to add that
19 the Tanakee region or the whole interior of Alaska is
20 trying to deal with that and not so much as looking at the
21 professional law enforcement agent, but a roving magistrate,
22 so that a person is not hired as a policeman or a law
23 enforcement agent in a village that is 50 or 100 people
24 there, and having to deal with their own relatives. This
25 way the roving magistrate could go around and not

1 necessarily be related. So I don't know, professional
2 permanent I --

3 MS. ISENSEN: Let me make this A and L, a circuit
4 riding magistrate or circuit riding judge.

5 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Not judge, magistrate.

6 MS. ISENSEN: Magistrate.

7 THE MODERATOR: Rosemary.

8 MS. LUDWIG: I was wondering if we could incorporate
9 legal aid in there. We had that in -- you know, they got
10 those sheets with some of the needs and legal aid was one
11 of the recommendations.

12 MR. HOPE: Lot of those were supposed to be
13 transferred and they never were transferred.

14 THE MODERATOR: Wasn't it legal aid?

15 MS. KINCA: It was there, but we decided it was a
16 means.

17 MS. LUDWIG: Oh, that's right.

18 THE MODERATOR: A means, yes, so it is a means.

19 MR. RUSS: Katy, can you read the goal again, please?

20 THE MODERATOR: "Justice and enforcement of the law is
21 applied equally without regard to race, ethnic group,
22 geographic location, sex or social status." And this goes,
23 you know, the phrase is, "Gamma group envisions the future
24 for Alaska as one in which," and then that's the rest of
25 the sentence. You have to go back to the beginning each

1 time.

2 MS. ISENSEN: I'd like to add something to part A. In
3 some urban areas, as the people have been willing to pay
4 for more and more local policemen, the State has pulled the
5 troopers out, and they're getting to a point where the
6 policeman -- all that done is, they're paying for the local
7 law enforcement that the State used to pay for. So I would
8 like to see it not confined to the rural areas, because I
9 think there's more needed in the rural areas and in the
10 urban areas.

11 MS. LUDWIG: Still back to the point of the legal aid,
12 where we are, you have to go all the way to Anchorage to
13 get a hold of a lawyer.

14 THE MODERATOR: That's another recommendation that you
15 would like to have added then, legal aid.

16 MS. LUDWIG: All right.

17 MS. ISENSEN: State-wide legal aid available until the
18 rural areas as well?

19 MS. LUDWIG: (nodding head)

20 THE MODERATOR: Do you all agree that these are ways
21 to answer the -- to achieve this goal? Are there any other
22 suggestions?

23 MR. HOLTHUS: Well, we don't have minority hire up
24 there, but I think that ought to be part of it, whether
25 it's local police or State Police doesn't make any

1 difference, but, yes, we need some minority hire.

2 THE MODERATOR: That was Andy's --

3 MR. HOLTHUS: To reflect the ethnic make-up.

4 MR. HOPE: Sitka Police Department is 0 for 21.

5 MS. ISENSEN: I'd like to work in here, what shall I
6 add? Which includes minority members of the force, or
7 something like that?

8 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) That's not strong enough.

9 MR. KEENER: The minority hired reflect the composite
10 of area or the composite ethnic or cultural.

11 MS. ISENSEN: Actually we need minority hire in all
12 three of these. You know, --

13 MR. HOLTHUS: That's why I think there should be a D.

14 THE MODERATOR: Gary, how do you want to word that?
15 Can you come up with a suggestion?

16 MR. HOLTHUS: Just say "minority hire" to reflect the
17 state's population, ethnic population, or minority. We
18 need though with regard to training, because, you know --

19 THE MODERATOR: Right.

20 MR. HOLTHUS: Do you want to comment on that, John?

21 MR. KELSEY: I would like to.

22 THE MODERATOR: John.

23 MR. KELSEY: I feel there's been a breakdown in the
24 abilities and the training of the State Troopers primarily
25 in the state compared to what it used to be. I think it

1 should be addressed here. I don't think they're nearly as
2 capable and qualified today as they were five years ago.

3 MS. KINGRA: Hear hear.

4 MS. HUNTER: Is it partly availability?

5 MR. KELSEY: Mostly training.

6 THE MODERATOR: More training for personnel?

7 MR. KELSEY: I don't know if it's totally training.

8 It may be, you know, it may be qualified applicants, too.

9 I see them taking in people that I feel are not qualified.

10 THE MODERATOR: How about this adequate professional
11 and adequate permanent law enforcement service? That
12 doesn't cover it enough?

13 MR. KELSEY: Doesn't strike me as it does, but maybe
14 it satisfies the rest of you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Well then, what would you
16 suggest as the wording to achieve what you mean? More
17 training for personnel?

18 MR. KELSEY: I don't know. We should limit it to
19 training. More qualified staffing.

20 MR. MATRIESEN: Higher qualifications.

21 THE MODERATOR: Better staffing?

22 MS. ISENSEN: Higher standards.

23 MR. KELSEY: Perhaps that would cover it all right.

24 MR. HOLTHUS: Higher entry standards at least

25 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) We have a time getting the

1 minority people in with the standards that are there now.

2 MS. HUNTER: I think the standards are very strange.

3 They have some ways of hiring people that really turn off a
4 lot of good people.

5 MR. FELSEY: Maybe that's probably part of the problem.

6 THE MODERATOR: Maybe it's not higher standards.

7 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna)

8 MS. HUNTER: It's the ways of screening people.

9 MS. LONCPRE: Hiring practices.

10 THE MODERATOR: Carl?

11 MR. JACK: Madam Chairman, I'll use my region as an
12 example in trying to achieve A, which under the CETA
13 program, we have trained at the basic level down at Sitka
14 Police Training Academy, some 19 village constables. And
15 there's going to be -- they're going to have another
16 training session to try to instill enough upward mobility
17 type of training program which, hopefully, sometime down
18 the road they will assume the professional responsibility.
19 Professional level of discharging their duties as law
20 enforcement officers.

21 So that's at least what we're doing, what we're
22 trying to do within the Bethel area. 19 villages out of 57
23 is still a far cry.

24 THE MODERATOR: You think there should be a career
25 ladder then? Is that, career ladder, so that people could

1 advance? /ndy?

2 MR. BUSS: The training down there I think could be --
3 there's room for expansion, for a little creativity. Like
4 some of the probation officers have mentioned there's a
5 pre-occupation with weapons training down there right now
6 at the academy. So some of the other law enforcement
7 people, the probation officers, the magistrates, I think,
8 you know, there's room for expanding the training in either
9 of those areas for those people.

10 THE MODERATOR: How specific can we be on --

11 MR. HOPE: Just improved training opportunities or
12 whatever.

13 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Maybe this E would be improving
14 training. Improving training?

15 MR. HOPE: All aspects of law enforcement?

16 THE MODERATOR: Beg your pardon?

17 MR. HOPE: For all aspects of law enforcement
18 personnel.

19 MR. BUSS: Would you include recruitment and training?

20 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) Yes.

21 MR. HOPE: Yes.

22 THE MODERATOR: Did you catch that?

23 MS. ISENSEN: Yes, recruitment and training.

24 THE MODERATOR: Does that about cover that? Chris?

25 MS. JOHNSON: I don't know anything about this, but I

1 was wondering if maybe one of the solutions to providing
2 law enforcement within these areas that are like, we'll say,
3 the Aleutians would be maybe not more people on the force,
4 although certainly one is inadequate, do they use
5 telecommunications at all?

6 MS. LUDWIG: (shaking head) have none.

7 MS. JOHNSON: This might go in another category, but I
8 think it might be that we should be exploring the
9 possibility for spreading the justice system through
10 telecommunications or this might go in the communications
11 category.

12 MS. ISENSEN: There are some training films that they
13 have done in times past for training village constables for
14 policemen. Is that what you're talking about?

15 MS. JOHNSON: No, I'm talking about if there is a
16 village which needs a Trooper, that -- and maybe the -- I
17 know that in some of the villages there might only be a
18 telephone and sometimes that doesn't work, or maybe there
19 is no telephone and the quickest way to get somebody is,
20 you know, to go 40 miles down the river. Maybe we should
21 be looking at an expanded communication system. We should
22 look at Troopers electronically if not physically. I don't
23 know if that's feasible. It's just an idea.

24 THE MODERATOR: I think that's visionary and I wish we
25 would get started thinking. I would think it would be

1 great to start thinking about something in a different way.
2 And if we did have a state-wide network of communications,
3 that kind of service would happen, but I -- whether you
4 want to plug that in here.

5 MR. JOHNSON: I certainly don't believe we should set
6 up an independent network of communications for --
7 telecommunications for education and telecommunications for
8 government and then telecommunications for justice. We
9 should be talking about an integrated network and maybe
10 that should be addressed under the communications category.

11 THE MODERATOR: John?

12 MR. KELSEY: Madam Chairman, as a matter of fact the
13 State Troopers have their own communications system and
14 it's quite adequate.

15 THE MODERATOR: Cary?

16 MR. HOLTHUS: I wonder, I tend to think of these
17 things in terms of enforcement on the one hand, and courts
18 and justice systems and judicial systems on the other. If
19 we've got enough policemen up there, maybe we could talk a
20 little bit about courts and make some recommendations about
21 those.

22 THE MODERATOR: Okay. Do you have a recommendation to
23 add to that?

24 MR. HOLTHUS: Not as far as policemen go, I guess.

25 THE MODERATOR: Courts?

1 MR. HOLTHUS: Courts, yes. Several things, I can
2 think of --

3 MR. RUSS: Would that come under the same goal?

4 THE MODERATOR: Beg your pardon?

5 MR. HOLTHUS: Yes. I think it could. One of the
6 things that's a current concern to the courts right now,
7 they're having a hard time believing it, is there's a bias
8 in sentencing, a racial bias in sentencing. Blacks get
9 longer sentences than whites for the same crime, natives
10 get longer sentences than either black or whites. So I
11 think one of the goals ought -- one of the things that
12 ought to be implemented is an end to racial bias in
13 sentencing. I think courts ought to be closer to home than
14 they often are, especially for village people. And that
15 probably means an increased number of magistrates at least
16 and court officials. I don't know how many more, but you
17 have one in Barrow one in Bethel, Nome. I don't know
18 whether there's a magistrate that sits in Kotzebue or not.
19 At any rate, there are too few and far between.

20 And the number has to do with urban areas as well.
21 We now have a big backlog in Anchorage and Fairbanks and
22 there ought to be a -- well, --

23 MS. ISENSEN: Increase magistrates and judges.

24 MR. HOLTHUS: Yes.

25 MS. LUDWIG: Yes.

1 MR. HOLTHUS: Increased number. There ought to be a
2 kind of rhythm to the Court system that it doesn't have
3 right now. If trials are too speedy, then they tend to go
4 for an easy quick conviction. If they're too slow, then
5 people are penalized because their case never comes up, if
6 they can't afford bail, they languish in jail. So you have
7 to have an adequate number of court personnel to kind of
8 keep that flow at the proper speed.

9 So courts closer to home is one.

10 THE MODERATOR: Did you get that? Courts closer to
11 home?

12 MS. ISENSEN: I'm going to make that 1, I guess.

13 THE MODERATOR: Yes.

14 MR. HOLTHUS: And did we get into racial bias in
15 sentencing?

16 MS. ISENSEN: Do you want to be more specific with
17 that?

18 MR. HOLTHUS: Courts closer to home and then C would
19 be an end to racial bias in sentences.

20 MR. BUSS: I just want to know if there's a way we can
21 recommend achieving that.

22 MR. HOLTHUS: Well, I think they've taken some steps,
23 you know, the last meeting they had in Sitka was to deal
24 essentially with that issue, and there were a number of
25 folks who just still didn't believe that it was an issue,

296
1 but all the data that they keep coming up with indicate
2 that it's really a problem. So sooner or later they're
3 going to have to do something about it. It's going to take
4 some more meetings with the entire judiciary with attorneys
5 and with advocates and others. And sooner or later they'll
6 take some steps to do it. I don't think we need to spell
7 out the steps.

8 THE MODERATOR: Um-hm, no.

9 MR. HOLTHUS: One of the things that's happened in
10 recent years is, Steve Kahn and Art Hickler have been
11 studying village law ways, aboriginal law ways, and there's
12 been some movement in the courts to maybe let those stand
13 in places where they're still viable, and not bother with
14 white man's law sort of, they let a lot of issues be
15 resolved at the village level by village people themselves
16 without magistrates or policemen or anybody else.

17 I don't know whether that's a goal we want to put
18 up there or that where it's viable, village law weighs out
19 the whole as opposed to legislative.

20 THE MODERATOR: David?

21 MR. KEENER: I would have to say that I'd like to see
22 us direct our -- tonight, the way we feel it affects the
23 life-styles, but I think that something as hard to explain
24 as that should be left to the professional people to decide
25 that, the bar or whoever, because I know I have no ability

1 to sit here tonight and say, recommend something like that,
2 when if that was adopted, it would affect the outcome of
3 some criminal trial in a village, because I'm not that
4 qualified.

5 THE MODERATOR: Christine?

6 MS. JOHNSON: I think we can make a statement --

7 THE MODERATOR: Speak up.

8 MS. JOHNSON: I think we can make a statement that we
9 would like to see those options explored. I think maybe
10 that's --

11 MR. KEEBEN: By qualified people.

12 MS. JOHNSON: Well, --

13 THE MODERATOR: Georgie? Andy.

14 MR. MATTHIEN: I get a little nervous about what
15 we're discussing here now. You know there's advantages and
16 disadvantages living in the bush like there are in the city.
17 And I don't care if the groups like this get together from
18 now to eternity. We're not going to correct every
19 advantage or disadvantage wherever we go. I think we're
20 getting -- I think this is impossible. I really do. If
21 we're going to correct every last thing here, why, hell
22 there isn't a soul that would want to live here, not one
23 soul of us. I don't think it's possible. Where's the
24 money going to come from? That oil isn't going to produce
25 enough money to do just what we've been doing this

1 afternoon, to pay for the things we suggested this
2 afternoon.

3 THE MODERATOR: What is the reaction of the group to
4 Andy's statement? Carl?

5 MR. JACK: As I look at this conference right from the
6 beginning, the document that's going to come out from this
7 conference is going to set a guideline for the legislatures
8 for the next ten years and try to achieve those -- the
9 goals that have been established in this conference through
10 the legislative process. It's necessary and I assume
11 through the -- through actually two means. One,
12 administrative remedy that can be handled, to correct it at
13 the administrative level, and if it cannot be done, through
14 the legislative remedy. Also at the same time I don't
15 think it would hurt at least to suggest to the legislature
16 the means by which these can be accomplished, because I've
17 noticed in my region that the representatives we have, with
18 all due respect to -- strike that off the record, is that
19 the generally -- well, the only type of input that they get
20 from the people are through the letters and through very
21 minimal hearing processes within the region.

22 So in essence we've entrusted to our
23 representatives to use their own best judgment to come up
24 with the legislation to remedy the need.

25 THE MODERATOR: Ellen's been trying to get something

1 to say down there. I saw your hand up, Ellen.

2 MS. MAYES: No, I didn't. I'm sort of just looking at
3 the board.

4 THE MODERATOR: Thanks. Georgie.

5 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) I think there are some
6 things that we're going to recommend that are not going to
7 be equal dollars and one of the things that was brought out
8 here was how to have the State support the villages'
9 concerns, I guess, on the judicial system. And I think one
10 way we just recently experienced was a village that voted
11 that they go dry, and that no booze come into the village.
12 This occurred three weeks ago, because of the high suicide
13 rate that was occurring in this small village. And the
14 State came back, "No, that was illegal." There wasn't any
15 alternatives given to that village, but just to say, "No,
16 that's illegal." Well, I think that's costly to the State
17 and to the citizens of the state to now come back and
18 assist that village in coping with the problems that have
19 occurred because of the drinking.

20 So I think that -- I don't know how to word it,
21 but I think there's a way, without it equaling dollars,
22 that the State support or it find ways to legalize things
23 that the village wants to do. You know, if they want it to
24 be dry and they don't want the airplanes coming in,
25 chartered with liquor, then I think that the State should

1 still aren't implemented, but many of them are, and I think
2 it is a long-term thing and I don't think that we have to
3 say -- I don't think we should pull back because we haven't
4 got money enough. But I think the thing we're lacking
5 right now is time between now and midnight and I think we
6 better move.

7 THE MODERATOR: Okay.

8 MS. ISENBER: I'd like to make a quick stab at what
9 Georgianna wants to do. The State is supposed to enforce
10 local liquor laws, whether the State is all that's on the
11 scene for enforcement. And that way if a town votes to go
12 dry at two AM and close all the bars, the State supposed
13 the that, but if they vote not to have any booze, they're
14 supposed to be doing that, too. There must be some wrinkle
15 that made them take exception here, but we could certainly
16 put down State enforcement of local option liquor laws.
17 Would that handle it?

18 MS. LINCOLN: (Georgianna) M-hm (nodding head).

19 THE MODERATOR: Go ahead, try it.

20 MR. KELSEY: Isn't that what they do in Bethel?

21 THE MODERATOR: Carl.

22 MR. JACK: I was going to comment, going back to the
23 point legislators use their own judgment to try to
24 alleviate the problems. The way it is right now, it's very
25 hard for the people from the village to travel to Juneau,

1 which is very costly, and by putting down the means right
2 now, should give them a fairly good idea as to
3 suggestions --

4 THE MODERATOR: Well, we have a goal --

5 MR. JACK: -- to achieve a goal.

6 THE MODERATOR: We had a goal that had to do with that
7 very thing. I don't know under which category it is, but I
8 remember a goal that said "There should be more opportunity
9 for people to be involved in the process of government," or
10 something like that and I think that item should be there.

11 Can we -- are we -- go ahead.

12 MS. LONCFEL: I would just like to support the
13 statement about State enforcement of local liquor laws. I
14 think that's something with --

15 MR. KELSEY: Let's go with it.

16 THE MODERATOR: We've got it there. Okay, you've seen
17 all these suggestions for Item 2. Is there anything
18 further or can we move on to the next --

19 MR. KELSEY: At the risk of extending this, I do think
20 that, and I'm not comfortable with this, but I'm also
21 uncomfortable with the situation that exists, it seems to
22 me that the system that we have of appointing judges is bad,
23 because we get some bad judges and they're in there for
24 life, and we can't get rid of them. It seems to me that
25 the Attorney General and others may -- or should be elected

1 and have the people have an opportunity to decide on their
2 track record. I'm not comfortable with what's happening
3 and I'm not comfortable with suggesting it, but I think it
4 should be addressed.

5 MS. HUNTER: Aren't some judges elected? because I've
6 voted for them.

7 MR. HUSS: They're not elected. They're reconfirmed.

8 MR. KELSEY: That's as far as, too.

9 THE MODERATOR: If you wish to have a consensus in
10 this group, we could do that right now, whether how many
11 people feel that the attorney general and judges should be
12 elected? How many? How many? Put your hands up.

13 (complying)

14 THE MODERATOR: One, two, three, four -- are you
15 voting, David?

16 MR. KEENER: Yes. I'd also like to say something, but
17 I'm voting.

18 THE MODERATOR: I'm trying to count how many, just to
19 get a consensus, see, one, two, three, four, five, six,
20 seven, eight. Is that correct?

21 MS. HUNTER: More than that.

22 THE MODERATOR: Are you voting nine?

23 MS. HUNTER: I'm going to vote for it, yeah.

24 THE MODERATOR: Nine is not a majority of our group.

25 MR. HUSS: May we hear some of the reasons people are

1 not voting.

2 THE MODERATOR: It isn't fair. I mean four of the
3 people are --

4 MR. RUSS: Can I hear some of the reasons why people
5 voted against it? I'm not that familiar with the issue, it
6 sounds like a good idea to me, but if somebody has some
7 arguments against it, I would like to hear those. Maybe I
8 wouldn't vote for it either.

9 MR. MATHIESEN: You might have a majority. You
10 haven't called for those opposed yet.

11 THE MODERATOR: Those opposed.

12 MR. ISLSEN: We didn't get a chance to discuss it.

13 THE MODERATOR: It's just a consensus. Okay there was
14 no motion or anything. I was just trying to get whether --
15 I was just trying to get a consensus to see whether it was
16 something that we should spend time on. It doesn't seem --
17 we have so many things that we got to get done tonight.
18 I'm trying to move it along and I thought if it was an
19 evenly divided issue, there would maybe be something that
20 we needed to address, but it doesn't seem to me that it is.
21 I could give you where I'm coming from, because I was at
22 the Constitutional Convention and heard all of the
23 arguments pro and con to why they came up with this system,
24 and the reason, as I recall, was because, with elected
25 judges, you get much more corruption than you do with the

1 appointed judges; and that the system that we have, where
2 the governor appoints a committee of citizens that are not
3 necessarily lawyers, they're from all walks of life, who
4 make the recommendations of judges, seems to be the -- was
5 felt to be the better system. And I really personally
6 would like to, you know, to see.

7 I know we have had some judges who maybe have not
8 fulfilled their job to the best, but I think by and large
9 in 20 years you can look at Alaska and how many judges have
10 been called corrupt or found to be not fulfilling their job?
11 I think that's the basis of why I --

12 MR. KELSEY: More than you realize.

13 THE MODERATOR: Well, it certainly hasn't been public.

14 MR. KELSEY: Right.

15 MS. HUNTER: I think we better move.

16 MR. ISENSEN: Should I put up elected judges and AG?

17 MS. HUNTER: I don't think so, because it didn't get
18 any consensus at all. We've got to move on.

19 THE MODERATOR: I don't feel we could do that without
20 calling the other people down to vote. Andy?

21 MR. HOPE: There's a number of issues like this that
22 have been, you know, that we briefly discussed. There's
23 the judges. There's the limited-entry issue. And there's
24 the apportionment representation and there's probably a lot
25 of other constitutional things. I wonder if we could just