

ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE / SUBJECT FILES 86/2
SCOMM 9: HOUSE SPEC. COMM. ON PERMANENT FUND 1977-78
200

In Kotzebue, people voiced expressions of satisfaction with the new independent school districts in the Northwest but accompanied the praise with concern that the funding was not adequate to maintain a high quality education.

In the North as in other regions, education was viewed as the link to many other human needs. A young native leader in Kotzebue broadened the education process explaining why it was an important issue to him. "Education is a very high priority but the part that has not been dealt with is that education can apply to all those programs that you've listed as problems...we're dealing with these issues after the fact. Alcoholism, after the fact, health care after the fact, but with education we can learn about these problems and deal with them before they get out of hand and then, education really becomes a number one priority."

In Barrow, on the other hand, several participants had trouble separating the importance of education and employment. "I can't do it," said one middle-aged engineer. "You can't get employed without having a good education...and a lot of times, if you don't have a job other things don't follow."

In most other communities, from Nome to Deering, participants chose education as their top human need priority. However, in several cases health was listed as the number one concern.

Health: People in Barrow along with those in Kobuk and Stebbins put health care at the top of their list of human needs. In most of the meetings, the health concerns centered around inadequate village health care, like the man from Pt. Hope who told workshop participants in Barrow, "I'm in more of an isolated area so I take health for one(priority) because we're about 170 miles from the Native hospital and at home we got a health aide who only can pass out aspirins and bandages."

People in Kobuk echoed the need for some health facilities for their

village which is isolated at the end of the plane route to the far east of Kotzebue.

Alcoholism: was a well-discussed topic in Nome and Kotzebue but did not receive the same attention in the smaller villages with the exceptions of Gambell and Stebbins where people made it their second priority and Barrow, where it was treated as a part of health care. In Kotzebue participants felt so strongly about the issue, they made it a part of their local concerns under question 7.

Probably the single most important recommendation coming out of the Kotzebue workshop was one suggesting that a tax be placed on alcohol to rehabilitate the alcoholic. A young, native fisherman from Kotzebue explained his feeling on the tax. "If we had a two or three cent tax on a drink...the state could conceivably generate revenues of \$4 million in the period of a year. So if we're going to drink, we might as well not only have a tax, but know that it is contributing to alcohol problems. I only wish that we could institute it right away," he added.

There were strong pleas for more staff from people involved in alcohol rehabilitation programs in both Kotzebue and Nome. As a middle aged woman in Kotzebue said: "Everything that is under question two is affected by alcohol. Children don't get to school to get a proper education; we have families that are broken up; we have illness and it is a community problem. One person can't solve it...When you have a total of 167 clients and you've got one counselor...its just not realistic to think that one person can handle it."

A woman from Nome echoed this feeling describing the need in the Norton Sound area: "The problems that I've seen are all related to alcoholism. And not only alcoholism but drug abuse in not only Nome and Kotzebue but the outlying villages also. Just two weeks ago there was a young boy - 13 years old - who was found frozen to death from

drinking. First of all - who's selling alcohol to a 13 year old kid and why aren't the police doing something about it? .In Nome" she added, "there are only four people to deal with all these problems."

Employment: Although this option rated third behind education and housing, the subject prompted very little discussion beyond the statement of need for job opportunities and the general concern that without employment, many people cannot meet their other needs.

Housing: This subject on the other hand, was the topic of a great deal of discussion as both federal and state housing efforts came under fire at almost every meeting throughout the North. In Kotzebue, participants picked this as the second most important human need priority and went on to cite case after case of slipshod building and unfinished projects.

A middle age construction worker summed up his experience: "I hired out to Unalakleet to finish 19 homes there. I looked at the plans first in Anchorage at the ASHA office and I told them that they weren't up to the national standard building codes....I'd already been to Selawik and that's the disgrace of disgraces. Twenty six houses up there and there's not one of them that anybody would ever call a house."

The problem becomes even more severe for elderly people who can't possibly maintain the ASHA houses, indicated a young woman from Nome. Further, she commented: "There's a real need for facilities for people to have some place to go when they are unable to take care of themselves any more. They are often sent to Pioneer Homes. There they are away from their own culture and their friends. They are away from the foods they are used to. They are away from the dialect and languages they are used to. It is a terrible problem."

Other: Although there was concern in turn with each of the issues on the needs list, it is probably more significant to note several new areas of discussion.

First, people in several of the communities brought up the problems in criminal justice system and correctional facilities in the state. A woman in Kotzebue cited the lack of in-state facilities for offenders. "I have a son in jail and I'm very much aware of the needs that are there. How can we help rehabilitate offenders if we take them out of their element, out of their whole lifestyle, often even out of state. They become regressed and there's no way to help them."

In Barrow, a legal aide explained the problem from his perspective. He indicated that "young delinquents are often put in jail because there is no place for them to go. People are forced to spend days in confinement waiting for a hearing and then they have to go to Fairbanks; the child advocacy program is suffering financial setbacks and the villages are in need of help but there is no one to serve them."

Another theme, was the need for efficient management of all the human need programs and more effective outreach into isolated communities. In Nome, participants were so frustrated with the poor service delivery, they repeatedly urged that local programs be managed at the local level rather than in Juneau.

"Quite often there's a lack of outreach for certain social or public assistance programs" a Barrow man observed. "If people in charge of the various programs - - education, alcoholism, housing throughout the state are made aware of rural Alaska's needs, perhaps we would receive better services - - or receive the services better. Let me put it this way - - the problem is outreach."

A young woman in the same community working in the alcoholism program quietly reinforced this idea. On seven different occasions she was notified that employees from Juneau were coming to discuss her program. "Seven times I went to the airport to meet them. They never came and never called to tell me. The needs in rural Alaska just aren't that important to many of the people who run these programs."

QUESTION 2
SOUTHCENTRAL

"I don't think that there's a person here who wouldn't agree that the kids are our primary renewable resource and I'd always opt to put the dollars there."

What areas of human need do you feel require the most attention?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 1,618

12% Alcoholism
6% Care of Children
26% Education
9% Programs for Elderly
27% Employment
6% Health Care
5% Housing
8% Other

Meeting Results:
Anchorage

Education
Health Care
Alcoholism
Employment
Care of Elderly
Care of Children
Housing
Other

Outside Anchorage:

Employment
Education
Health Care
Alcoholism
Care of Elderly
Care of Children
Housing
Other

Education and Employment: Employment and Education fared far better than the other human need priorities with people from throughout the area. In almost every case, young or old, men or women and one occupational group or another made little difference. These two were the top priorities.

"It's not that education needs a lot of cleaning up," volunteered a participant in the Homer meeting, "but it's from education that we can attack all of those other human needs that you outlined." The woman, a bank assistant, said "I don't think that there's a person here who wouldn't agree that the kids are our primary renewable resource

and I'd always opt to put the dollars there."

In every age group, education was the first or second priority, but the younger a participant was, the more inclined he or she was to make it a heavier priority. Those over 45 generally made employment their top priority and education followed as the second choice. Also, the professional-technical workers favored education as their top priority while the blue collar, white collar and non-workers placed employment first and education second among their choices.

The two top issues jelled for one man, a blue collar worker from Soldotna, who said, "The two of these things should be one and the same; if you just put more emphasis on vocational education, then you would have more employment potential". Several people from Kenai voiced their concern for the lack of vocational facilities to break the substantial unemployment rate during off-work season when fishing and construction are down.

Education was the number one priority for both the Anchorage and Kenai Peninsula participants (in fact, the priorities in Anchorage and on the Peninsula were exactly the same from the first priority to the last). However, the Matanuska Valley residents stressed employment as their top concern while further north in the Susitna Valley, Talkeetna residents put employment at the bottom of the list behind education, alcoholism and crime prevention.

Alcoholism: Although people in each of the meetings heard a great deal about alcoholism as a human need, it ranked third among people's top concerns. "Sure, there isn't a person here who doesn't feel a bit ashamed about the state's alcoholism problem, but we'll probably see half of you in the bar after this, too", said one Kenai service station attendant.

"The problem is not that we're oblivious to the situation, but pouring dollars into more rehabilitation programs doesn't strike me as

the answer when the present programs aren't making much progress", he continued.

A tax on alcohol was raised independently in almost all of the South-central meetings as a good way to meet the increasing expenses of alcoholism programs. People in Homer wanted tighter controls on those who drink and drive and people in Kenai wanted to put alcohol tax money into recreation and church programs to offer an alternative to drinking.

Interestingly enough, people here in the state for a shorter period of time (under 10 years) and those under 45 were more apt to rank alcoholism as a higher priority compared to older and more seasoned residents. Health: Health care appeared to be a major concern among people responding to the mail-in questionnaires. Only at the Homer meeting was it a strong favorite of the group. Yet, in counting up the questionnaire responses, health ranked third, younger people giving it the highest priority. The older the participants were, the less important health care seemed to be.

Programs for the Elderly: Programs for the elderly was a high priority to the older age participants. It ranked fourth overall but did not fare quite so well at the local meetings where it was seldom mentioned as a priority, sparking one 67 year old woman to comment at the Old Pioneer School House meeting in Anchorage:

"You young whipper snappers are all going to be old someday, you know!"

At which point, a 69 year old gentleman from Tyonek got up from across the room and retorted, "Yes, maybe that's so, but let's hope that when I get there, alcoholism and employment aren't the problems they are now!"

Other: Of those people who took time to write out an "other", the vast majority simply put: an efficient management of all the above.

QUESTION 3
SOUTHEAST

"After all, a building is not an education."

Ketchikan

How should public school construction be financed in both organized and unorganized boroughs?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 464

- 26% 100% State Funding
- 9% 100% State funding from a statewide sales tax.
- 17% Local property taxes in all areas and supplemental funding where needed.
- 39% Continue the present system which provides for land taxes plus supplemental State funding in organized areas, and 100% State funding in unorganized areas.
- 9% Other: local participation

Meeting Results

Continue the present system which provides for land taxes plus supplemental State funding in organized areas, and 100% State funding in unorganized areas.

Question three provided interesting discussions in the meetings because generally no one seemed to care for the options offered. Although participants ultimately chose to continue the present system of financing school construction moving toward local participation whenever possible, many new ideas were brought up before making this selection. It is not clear if these ideas emerged because people didn't want to select one of the existing answers or because they did not like the issue as it was stated.

First, as a frame of reference, it is important to note that people in Southeast towns, very early created municipalities to handle community affairs at the local level. This included their schools -- both the construction and operation of them. Only several small

villages such as Angoon, Thorne Bay and Metlakatla still look to the state for all their operational and construction needs.

What this means in Southeast for question three is that with the exception of those towns just mentioned, most of the communities are paying 50% of the construction costs of thier schools through local property taxes in the same way that major boroughs such as Juneau, Anchorage and Fairbanks pay for theirs.

In this light then, it is interesting to note that throughout Southeast, the two options most often chosen were first, to continue the present system and second, fund construction from the general fund.

In Ketchikan, out of six workshop groups, three of them chose to continue the present system of financing school construction; two groups chose 100% funding from the General Fund and one group suggested that there be local participation on a sliding scale. The group spokesperson explained it this way" "for those who could afford it, construction would be 50% state funded and 50% from the local community. This rate would change based on the ability of a community to pay and could reach funding levels of 90% from the state and 10% from the local community, if needed."

This same type of solution was recommended by participants at the Juneau meeting but there the figures ranged from 0 to 20% from the local community depending on its financial capabilities and 80 to 100% from the state. All other options were rejected in favor of the sliding scale method. "Small communities should pay for their schools and improvements on a percentage basis," a 25-year-old secretary from Juneau wrote on her questionnaire.

In Ketchikan, despite the range of options, almost every group felt that there should be some sort of local involvement but no one provided any solutions. "Perhaps in the future," said a middle-age realtor, "rural areas will be in a better financial position to participate than they are now."

Ketchikan participants also spoke out clearly against the state-wide sales tax. This was echoed in Wrangell. However, both Petersburg and Haines suggested it as a possible second option.

Other interesting ideas came out of the community meetings in Southeast. For example, Wrangell people suggested that the state should set standards for a basic school building and pay for its construction 100%. Any additional facilities or new rooms would be paid by the community.

In Petersburg and Sitka, participants had a difficult time reaching a consensus although Sitka people did feel that the state should provide education for those communities who cannot pay for it themselves.

Conversely, Skagway felt that the unorganized borough should start assuming some of its own costs. If this couldn't be done, the boarding home method of sending students to urban areas for high school should be resumed.

In Haines, participants suggested that resource revenues could cover school construction costs, a thought brought up later in other regions. On the other hand, "School funding should be on a fair tax base," offered a Haines welder and five-year resident of Alaska. "Only 100% from the General Fund will do this. Then everybody pays equally."

From a Juneau resident, and 26-year-old air traffic controller comes the suggestion to use the capital move monies. "Are the benefits of a capital move worth the costs? The finances poured into such a project....the billions of dollars could build our 126 high schools we need so much."

Veering off the subject of financing methods and on to educational needs, Southeast participants proposed some interesting ideas. For example, a participant at the Ketchikan workshop opened up the possibility of improving correspondence courses as a means of limiting the number of new schools in areas with only a few children. "After all, he said, "a building is not an education." This recommendation drew comments pro and con as people jockeyed around with the merits of correspondence courses. Many women in the room had brought up their children on these courses in logging camps and although some women favor the method, more seemed to feel that schooling is more than just books and homework. As one woman, formerly of Thorne Bay commented, "School involves, among other experiences, children relating to each other.

The people in Craig also felt the building was not the important issue but went on to suggest that when school construction is necessary, it should modestly fit community needs and not try to meet unapplicable and extravagant Federal standards.

Metlakatla provided another alternative to constructing new buildings, suggesting that the state make use of its satellite communications system to provide schooling for students in small isolated communities.

However, none of these comments get to the heart of the question and when all the suggestions are put aside, the majority opinion remains

to continue the present system of financing school construction,
with a qualifying clause reading -- until local participation becomes
a realistic option.

QUESTION 3
NORTH

"Public school operation and construction should be funded on a statewide basis equal for all areas, not unequal as it is now because of property taxes."

Nome

How should public school construction be financed in both organized and unorganized boroughs?

Questionnaire Results

Meeting Results

Number of Respondents: 127

- 44% 100% State funding from the General Fund
- 8% 100% State funding from a statewide sales tax
- 19% Local property taxes in all areas and supplemental funding where needed
- 23% Continue the present system which provides for land taxes plus supplemental State funding in organized areas, and 100% State funding in unorganized areas
- 6% Other; oil and gas revenues

100% Funding from the General Fund.

The clear majority for question three in the North was to provide 100% state funding from the General Fund for school construction in both the organized and unorganized boroughs. As a 16-year Alaska resident and civil engineer in Nome suggested: "Public school operation and construction should be funded on a statewide basis equal for all areas, not unequal as it is now because of property taxes."

It is interesting to note that on the tabulated questionnaires, newcomers to Alaska chose option 4 -- continue the present system--by 43%.

100% State Funding from the General Fund: In Kotzebue, participants at the Alaska Public Forum regional workshop urged 100% state funding from the General Fund for both construction and operation in order to provide, as one older participant said: "Equal educational programs in both urban and rural places in Alaska."

People also suggested that the state should, in the words of a young woman, "Lend an ear to the local school boards when determining the quality and specific needs for each school."

Both Nome and Barrow repeated the priorities established in Kotzebue. In Barrow, there was a great deal of discussion about the high costs involved in building schools in rural Alaska. It was pointed out that a school with a gymnasium, kitchen facilities and a space for school health services costs about \$4.5 million for approximately 120 children in the North Slope. Participants in general were concerned that even the taxes collected by the borough from Prudhoe Bay, could not cover these excessive costs.

A young man from the North Slope Borough commented, "I would go for an educational system which is 100% funded by the state and 100% local control...it's the type of educational system we need 'cause we have so many cross-cultural types of experiences."

Finally, people in smaller village meetings throughout the Northern regions supported the choices of people in the regional centers and in almost every instance felt that school construction should be financed 100% through state funds.

Statewide Sales Tax: This option was discussed and dismissed as an unsatisfactory solution throughout the region. There was strong opposition to this choice in Kotzebue as participants discussed the

inequities of a tax that makes no allowance for income levels.

People also suggested that more affluent residents often order goods from outside and these people would not be sharing in a sales tax burden.

There was also negative reaction in Nome where people commented that "village property and sales taxes would not generate enough revenue to build very much in this part of the state."

In Barrow, a woman indicated that she would rather have an increase in her income tax than a sales tax at which point another participant recommended looking at the new wealth the state would receive from oil and gas revenues and stop thinking about taxation. (It should be noted here that most of those people in the North who marked "other" for an answer generally recommended using oil and gas revenues for school construction).

Continue the Present System: This option was suggested by the people in Stebbins, St. Michaels and Unalakleet, all of whom have schools run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Consequently, these communities are not directly involved in the state school system or the problem of financing school construction in their communities.

QUESTION 3
SOUTHCENTRAL

"I have the feeling I'm paying more than my share but I don't think I've ever griped about it. Consider this fair warning that I'll be watching in the future."

Anchorage

How should school construction be financed in both organized and unorganized boroughs"

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 1,633

- 12% 100% State funding from the General Fund
- 14% 100% State funding from a statewide sales tax
- 22% Local property taxes in all areas and supplemental funding where needed
- 32% Continue the present system which provides for land taxes plus supplemental State funding in organized areas, and 100% State funding in unorganized areas
- 20% Other; oil and gas revenues

Meeting Results: Anchorage

Other.
Continue the present system which provides for land taxes plus supplemental State funding in organized areas, and 100% State funding in unorganized areas. Local property tax.

Outside Anchorage:
Continue the present system which provides for land taxes plus supplemental State funding in organized areas, and 100% State funding in unorganized areas. Local property tax.
Other.

The people who did the most to influence the results of this question were the participants who mailed their questionnaires in from their own homes. A substantial 32 per cent wanted to keep things the way they are now. As one homesteader who lives in the Mat-Su Borough wrote: "I guess the present system must be all right, as I don't really remember feeling a big pinch."

The same thoughts were echoed by an Anchorage businessman on his questionnaire, "I have the feeling I'm paying more than my share, but

it can't be that outrageous as I don't think I've ever griped about it. Consider this fair warning that I'll be watching in the future, however."

The people who most preferred to continue the present system of financing the cost of school construction were the blue collar workers. Although every occupational group favored the present funding system, 42 per cent of the blue collar workers favored it, compared to 29 per cent of the professional/technical workers and 26 per cent of the white collar workers.

In the different age group distributions, those people under 25 and over 55 favored the present system than other age groups.

In meetings, most people were inclined to accept the present method of funding. However, those people who were aware that the school bond approved in the last election would not cover all the new school construction costs talked of a heavier commitment on the part of the unorganized borough to bear some of these costs.

This feeling was also repeated in the Anchorage meetings where several people wrote on their forms that they would be more inclined to accept the present system of funding if there was some sort of contribution the local communities could make--even if it were only some in-kind contributions.

To follow-up on the meeting results, a large percentage (32 per cent) of all meeting goers opted for the "other" option. One recurring alternative in the "other" category was to increase funding through oil and gas monies. One man from Eagle River wrote: "In Question number one, we're all millionnaires and you can't give the money to us

fast enough. Now, as I read on, you're sneaking up to pounce on us for a sales or income tax increase. What gives here? Couldn't we use some bucks from up there (arrow points to Question 1) and plug it in down here?" An overwhelming 68 per cent of Talkeetna's good-sized turnout voted to use the new oil and gas revenues for building public schools.

Three of the Anchorage workshop meetings came to the same conclusion, but all reiterated the need for some kind of local control and local contribution from every community.

Property tax, including a property tax on homes in rural communities was a second option for most people no matter what their age, sex or occupational category. Very little comment was generated in support of this measure, however.

A sales tax or income tax increase was an unpopular avenue for funding school construction. Besides the familiar argument that a sales tax is a regressive tax that most affects the people who are least able to pay, several people just crossed that option out completely on their questionnaire.

In a few of the local meetings, a suggestion was voiced to make exemptions for people without children so they would not have to share the burden with people with children. Ironically, in Homer a father of seven brought up the idea at which time he was answered by a 45-year-old woman who was married and had no children. She simply said, "Children are one resource we all will have to live with in the future whether I choose to have them or not."

QUESTION 4
SOUTHEAST

"Alaskans are really no different than many people in other states -- they want all the amenities of life at the front door and wilderness at the back door."

Juneau

What should be the primary objective for managing Alaska's land?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 395

Meeting Results

4%	To raise revenues for the State.	To provide land for public needs.
40%	To provide land for public needs.	
44%	To promote renewable resource development.	To promote renewable resource development.
10%	To promote industrial growth and development.	
2%	Other: Multiple Use.	

Southeasterners led the way for the rest of the state in selecting land for public needs and renewable resource development as the two most important land management schemes for Alaska.

Land to a Southeasterner is a very valuable commodity. Small and large communities alike are surrounded by the water ways of the Inside Passage and mountains covered by national forests. They are locked in and there is no room for expansion. But that is what they want; not tremendous growth or development, but personal expansion. As a young teacher at the Ketchikan workshop put it in a question to the Governor: "I'm asking the basic question, when am I and fellow people, fellow 'I's' going to get five acres to raise chickens and a garden on. We don't want a handout. We don't want to be subsidized. I'll buy it. When can I count on buying it?"

Despite the extremes in Southeast geography, there is some land that can be used for homesites. This land presently belongs to the

U.S. Forest Service. However, the State, through the Statehood Act, has the right to select acreage in these forested areas and this indeed would solve much of the problem that participants outlined at the Public Forum. Consequently, it is not surprising that one of the recurring themes throughout most of the Southeast meetings was to get on with state land selection in Forest Service areas.

Maybe it should be noted at this point that the results of the tabulated questionnaires differ only slightly, but they do differ from the results of meeting discussions. Renewable resource land management was selected as the first choice of people filling out questionnaires but land for public needs was the preference of people at meeting after meeting.

Land for Public Needs: At the Ketchikan workshop, most of the participants favored managing Alaska's land to meet public needs. In many cases, people marked "other" and wrote in "multiple use." They then went on to define multiple use as largely home-site and recreational land uses. Reiterating the option to manage the land to meet public needs.

Here, as in most of Southeast, participants went on to decry the lack of lands for hom-sites, the slowness of state land selection in the region and the state's failure to rid the public of land speculators. This last was a major concern as an outspoken 55-year-old legal assistant protested: "Large real property investors from Lower 48 should be precluded from buying up tracts of land, developing and selling it back to us for huge profits. Let's keep our land for Alaskans."

The people in Wrangell suggested that land be sold at a reasonable cost, but that length of residency be required as a safeguard against speculation and a rush of people from outside.

In Petersburg, people echoed this theme recommending that land should be set aside specifically for resident Alaskans.

With the exception of Juneau, Haines and Metlakatla, every Southeast community chose lands for public needs as their first option, further indicating the need for land on which to build a home. The most emphatic cry came from Sitka, where the problem has been severe for some time. Angoon participants suggested that if land were available for public needs, there might be fewer complications over the lands set aside for Natives through the Land Claims Settlement Act.

Thorne Bay people had difficulty relating to this question. The community is a logging camp and a company town whose land is under lease from the U.S. Forest Service. Although people expressed a real interest in buying a piece of the land for a homesite, there appears to be many obstacles along the way.

Land for Renewable Resource Development: The second option chosen by workshop participants in Ketchikan was the management of lands for renewable resources, referring generally to fishing, timber and tourism, the renewable resource industries that are the economic mainstays in Southeast.

The people in Juneau indicated that renewable resource management was their first priority because as a participant said: "local resources are, in fact, also public lands."

Most of the communities in Southeast chose this option as their second choice in meetings although as already mentioned, they voted for it as a first priority when filling out the questionnaire. Although the people of Angoon suggested this should be a third priority for land management after raising revenues for the state, they did urge that subsistence needs be protected in conjunction with developing renewable

resources.

Land for Industrial Development: This option prompted the most controversy. In Ketchikan, there was a minority concern that the state promote industry which immediately stirred up those people who insisted on preserving the traditional Alaskan way of life.

So it went throughout much of Southeast, several people supporting the opinion of a 56-year-old, fourteen year Alaskan resident who makes her living through rentals. "There is the need to open up more land for additional industrial development," she said. Alaska is such a large state with such a small population, that all living costs are higher than in the South 48. More people would generate more money in the economy thereby lowering the cost of living."

Conversely, others supported the thinking of the 36-year-old Juneau biologist who has lived in Alaska for nine years. "Why industrial development?" he asked. "It benefits few Alaskans for a short time and cheats all of us who came here to escape the environmental destruction and population expansion that is absolutely inevitable with it."

People attending Public Forum meetings in the communities of Craig and Haines supported industrial development among their top choices. Both groups stressed the need for more employment opportunities and suggested this could be done by developing renewable resources industries and diversifying their local economies.

The issue of land management was perhaps the most important to people attending the Public Forum in Southeast and their direction is fairly clear. However, as a 17-year Alaska resident from Juneau said,

"Alaskans are really no different than many people in other states -- they want all the amenities of life at the front door and wilderness at the back door."

QUESTION 4
NORTH

"Industrial development? Sure we're in favor of it --
in Anchorage."

Kotzebue

What should be the primary objective for managing Alaska's land?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 100

Meeting Results

18% To raise revenues for the state.
30% To provide land for public needs.
41% To promote renewable resource
development.
11% To promote industrial growth and
development

To promote renewable resource
development.

Land for public needs.

Generally, the tabulated responses on questionnaires supported the meeting discussions which, in both instances, indicated a preference for managing state lands to promote renewable resource development and to meet public needs.

In the North, these two categories are very similar. Renewable resources provide an income for people who fish commercially during the summer or herd reindeer, but more important in this area, the fish, reindeer, the caribou and sea mammals are the food -- subsistence for most people. That makes it not only a livelihood but a "public need."

Here it is interesting to see that among the people responding to this question, long-term residents gave 45% of their vote to the renewable resource option whereas newcomers to the state gave the same answer only a 12% vote.

Land for Renewable Resource Development and Public Needs: The dual role of renewable resources and public needs was stressed by participants at

the Kotzebue workshop. It was further pointed out that "native lifestyles must be considered with land use." One local resident reported that his group felt: "The land belongs to the individuals of the state and, it should be treated as theirs by concentrating primarily on renewable resources. This can be done in the areas of agriculture, reindeer herding and such things that would not necessarily damage the land and then, the same land could be enjoyed and used by the public."

On the issue of public needs, a familiar comment, and one reminiscent of Southeast, was made by Kotzebue workshop participants. "It's ridiculous to have so much land available and not be able to build a house on one little portion of it," protested a young social worker.

In Nome, participants were fairly evenly divided between using the land for renewable resource development and using it for public needs. In Barrow, however, participants rated managing the land for public needs slightly higher than renewable resource development which they placed second. Repeatedly, Barrow people referred to public needs as the preservation of a subsistence lifestyle.

in several of the smaller meetings, the options were the same. In Stebbins, people recommended that the first priority for managing state lands should be to provide for public needs and its second concern should be for renewable resource development. Unalakleet selected the same two priorities but in reverse order.

Land for Industrial Development: This issue was brought up at several meetings throughout the North. There were two divergent views coming

out of the Kotzebue workshop. A long-time Alaskan and teacher in the Northwest indicated: "I was very emotional about this and I carried the group along with me.. We could have industries for tanning of hides, mineral development, oil from belugas, making dog and cat food. These items could be hauled back with every carrier that leaves here empty and it would make it cheaper for the items coming up here," he added.

A second group at the same workshop wanted it known they vehemently opposed industrial development. Or, as one middle-aged man said: "Industrial development? Sure we're in favor of it -- in Anchorage."

These sentiments were echoed in Barrow by a young subsistence hunter who was concerned that industrial growth could be a "conflict of interest with our subsistence form of hunting and the type of pollution industrial development provides has a natural habit of wiping out our game and their habitat."

On the other hand, people in the communities of Gambell and St. Michaels recommended that the land be managed for industrial development which more closely translated to public works projects, i.e., people in St. Michaels were anxious to build a connecting road between that village and neighboring Stebbins.

Other: Several other interesting suggestions came out of the discussions on land. In Nome, participants suggested that the state promote cooperative management of lands with Federal interests as long as many state priorities will rest heavily on Federal policies.

This idea was repeated in Barrow only the perimeters were extended to include Native landowners. Here, participants encouraged a cooperative arrangement between state, federal and Native interests.

In Nome there were a series of suggestions included under "other" which ranged from creating a land bank to preserving game areas from promoting tourism to leaving the land alone.

In Barrow, a sense of regionalism prevailed, particularly evident in this question. Several of the comments included one from a concerned woman who asked: "Is it possible that after you're (the state) through mining or whatever, you can give the land back... to local governments?"

Another participant expressed concern that revenues from the land would go into an amorphous state General Fund and the region that produced the wealth for the state would not have its needs met when the money came out the other side of that Fund. Her solution? "My priority would be to use the lands both in an economic way and in a land use way that would promote regional private enterprise."

QUESTION 4
SOUTHCENTRAL

"It would be such a waste to see Spenard Road extended through state lands from the Anchorage Borough to the Mat Valley Borough through the new capital and beyond."

Anchorage

What should be the objectives for managing Alaska's land?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 1,579

- 7% To raise revenues for the State.
- 34% To provide land for people's needs.
- 26% To promote renewable resource development.
- 9% To promote industrial growth and development.
- 19% To preserve the natural environment.
- 5% Other; Multiple Use.

Meeting Results

Anchorage:

- 1) People's Needs.
- 2) Renewable Resources.
- 3) Preserve Natural Environment.

Outside Anchorage:

- 1) People's Needs.
 - 2) Renewable Resources.
 - 3) Preserve Natural Environment.
-

Land for People's Needs: "With all this land up in Alaska, why is it that we can't have any of it to build a home or to use for ourselves?"

This question tells the story on the land issue for almost every meeting and most of the questionnaires. People in different parts of Southcentral may have had varying definitions of how they would use the land for "people's needs," but meet that need was the resounding answer, regardless of the participants location, age, occupational classification, sex or length of residency within the state.

To the people in the Anchorage area, people's needs meant getting a piece of the state to be able to build a home and raise a family. "But, we need some insurance that this disbursement of state land does not end up in the cutthroat real estate market where the land gets

speculated out of our means. Now, I don't mean I want a giveaway program or free land. I'd be willing to pay for it," so stated a 38-year-old pipeline worker who has been in the state for eight years.

The Palmer people wanted to look into the possibility of agricultural homesteading, which would combine the first and second priorities listed above. Both Palmer and Talkeetna respondents criticized the "Hippy Homestead Bill" designed to give small tracts of two acres to Alaskan citizens: "Fat load of farming you can do on two acres," chided one Talkeetna farm man as the crowd guffawed in agreement. In Kenai, "people's needs" meant some small park land tracts and land for bike trails.

One person who attended the Dimond High School meeting in Anchorage said he sat beside a few environmentalists "who, to my surprise, weren't arguing for preserving the natural environment. They seemed to believe that a lot of the federal withdrawal lands were going to be used for that, so they too, opted for people's needs first," he said.

Land for Renewable Resource Development: Renewable resources was also a familiar response for people throughout the area. Every age group, except those under 25, favored renewable resources as the second alternative for use of the lands. Blue and white collar workers, as well as those in the non-working category ranked this second.

Land to Preserve the Natural Environment: The people under 25, especially those who were professional or technical workers favored

preserving the natural environment as their second choice. There also was a direct correlation between how long one had been in the state and how strongly she or he felt about preserving the natural environment. Those who were in the state less than three years ranked preserving the natural environment as their second priority by 37%. Those in the state from four to ten years gave 24% of their support to preserving the natural environment. And those who have been here more than ten years gave 14% of their support to environment preservation.

In Homer and Talkeetna, preserving the environment was a major priority. Those who attended in Homer also voiced their concern over offshore oil and gas activity. Talkeetna protested being "capital-ized and dam-ized to death" (the capital move and Devils Canyon Dam), as one local government employee put it. The people explained that time and effort should be taken to insure the land is kept environmentally sound -- no matter what the future might bring.

Land was a sensitive issue at the Mat Valley meeting. Several people voiced their opposition to the State decision not to transfer lands over to the Borough immediately. "How can you come up here and ask us what we want the state to do with the lands," asked the Borough Mayor, "when the state won't give us what we are already entitled to." Other: The majority of people who voiced an option of "other" wrote or talked about using the land in multiple use schemes.

Several people who wrote comments on their questionnaire

specifically mentioned the need for regional planning and a state-wide land-use plan. "With the impending capital move, it will become more important than ever to have some definite state land plans that stretch over the borders of one borough to another," said an Anchorage dentist. "It would be such a waste to see Spenard Road extended through state lands from the Anchorage Borough to the Mat Valley through to the new capital and beyond," he said.

QUESTION 5
SOUTHEAST

"Do Alaskans really have any choice or say in the oil or gas policies or will Federal demands and monetary gains by industry overriding citizen's desires?"

Sitka

What should be the State's policy on future oil and gas lease sales?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 468

Meeting Results

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 5% | It should sell leases as fast as possible to maximize its oil and gas revenues. | It should sell leases at a moderate rate to assure a steady flow of income for a long period of time. |
| 60% | It should sell leases at a moderate rate to assure a steady flow of income for a long period of time. | |
| 7% | It should lease when the State needs large sums of money to meet public needs. | |
| 22% | It should do no further leasing and make the best use of present income. | |
| 6% | Other: Environmental and community safeguards | |
-

The overwhelming choice in Southeast meetings and questionnaire responses for Question five was to sell leases at a moderate rate to assure a steady flow of income over a long period of time. Here, as well as almost every other region, this answer was given with some reservation for the most part related to community and environmental impacts. In Southeast, people also felt that some of the resource wealth should be saved for future generations.

From the tabulated questionnaires, it appears that these secondary concerns were very important to some of the people and could explain in part the number of participants who supported the option to do no further leasing but make the best use of present income. The tabulations also point out that younger people between the ages 25-34

were most in favor of doing no further leasing while people in the age brackets of 35 and over heavily supported moderate leasing. Sell Oil Leases at a Moderate Rate: Although this option was selected as a top priority in both the workshop and community meetings, it did not happen without much discussion. In Ketchikan people defined the term "moderate rate". As the middle aged lodge owner from Admiralty Island summarized: "We want to keep the oil flowing for 50 years and with it a moderate rate of income figured for the same 50 year period... we want all to see some left for future generations, but we still want to get a moderate rate over 50 years."

Some participants wanted it made clear that they felt moderate rate should mean minimizing the negative aspects of development. As one participant said: "We do not want another Prudhoe Bay situation where great numbers of people come in and upset the lifestyle."

Although people who attended community meetings supported the Ketchikan results, there were several additional comments worth noting on the subject of selling at a moderate rate.

In Wrangell, people thought this would be the best solution for overcoming Alaska's history of boom or bust. In Petersburg, participants urged cooperation between federal and native leasing policies adding that the state should have more of a say in Federal leasing decisions affecting Alaska. This was part of the same concern for a nurse in Sitka who asked on the Public Forum questionnaire: "Do Alaskans really have any choice or say in the oil or gas policies or will Federal demands and monetary gains by industry overriding citizen's desires?"

People in Skagway suggested that the state should base its policy on national needs as well as what's best for Alaska, but went to support leasing gradually.

Sell Leases to Maximize Revenues: In the Ketchikan workshop, in Juneau, in Metlakatla and to some extent in Skagway, people indicated a preference for maximizing revenues but deleted the part of the option referring to the rate at which this is done. In Juneau, participants specifically recommended that the state minimize hazards and sell when the market is right.

Do No Further Leasing: This option was an undercurrent throughout all the meetings in Southeast. Sitka alone made it their priority, but added that if the state must lease they should work closely with and respect the needs of local communities.

An 83 year old halibut fisherman from Petersburg explained his feelings on his questionnaire: "One of the world's richest fisheries must remain undamaged in this global exploding population increase."

Lease Only When the State Needs Revenues: This option was not well received in meetings and fared only slightly better on the questionnaire responses. One of the major concerns over this leasing method was that if the state waits until it needs the money, it very well might sell in a panic and receive less than the land was worth.

QUESTION 5
NORTH

"The social impact of oil development on native peoples has reached deep into their lives to an extent not seen or readily accepted. Due to the differences in environment past and present, cultures and 'sudden' change, the true natives of rural Alaska are unheard. Please listen. Subsistence living is a way of life that we wish to continue with."

Barrow

What should be the State's policy on future oil and gas lease sales?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 126

Meeting Results

- 5% It should sell leases as fast as possible to maximize its oil and gas revenues
- 51% It should sell leases at a moderate rate to assure a steady flow of income over a long period of time
- 15% It should lease only when the State needs large sums of revenue to meet public needs
- 13% It should do no further leasing and make the best use of present income
- 15% Other: (Community and Environmental impact)

Sell leases at a moderate rate to assure a steady flow of income over a long period of time with maximum safeguards against impact on communities and harm to fish and game. Above all, involve local communities at all times.

As the issue of land in Southeast was an intensely personal concern to the people of that region, so it was with the issue of oil exploration to the people attending Public Forum meetings in the North.

In both Nome and Barrow meetings, participants singled out aspects of leasing and exploration activities that concerned them most and listed them as separate items under regional issues in Question seven.

Although the overwhelming preference of people in the North was to pursue a moderate leasing policy, the following information appeared in the tabulated responses. It appears that more men than women prefer to lease rapidly, while older individuals seem more interested in

leasing moderately than younger people. (Those over 45 years of age prefer moderate leasing by as much as 68 per cent while those under 34 only tallied 46 per cent.) A moderate leasing policy is also more heavily supported by people who have lived here for longer periods of time.

Sell Oil Leases at a Moderate Rate: Generally, people were in agreement that the state should lease its oil and gas lands at a moderate rate but participants went on to add a series of cautions. Most of these recommended that the local communities be involved in all activities, that there be provisions for local hire and that every effort be made to see that fish, wildlife and other subsistence needs are not disturbed by the process...if its not too late.

A 27 year old subsistence hunter from Barrow made his plea on the questionnaire he sent to the Public Forum: "The social impact of oil development on native peoples has reached deep into their lives, to an extent not seen or readily accepted. Due to the differenced in environment, past and present cultures and 'sudden' change, the true natives of rural Alaska are unheard. Please listen. Subsistence living is a way of life that we wish to continue with."

At the Kotzebue workshop, most of the participants favored selling leases at a moderate rate. There were a number of recommendations to study affected areas and work with the communities who would suffer the most impact from leasing activities. One group suggested locating all support services in a separate area, away from any villages so that the disturbance to local life would be minimal.

In Kotzebue people recommended that local persons be trained for jobs in the oil industry if development is to take place on their doorstep.

In Nome, although participants agreed that the state's policy

should be to sell leases at a moderate rate, they stressed their concern for local communities affected by these activities. Nome urged that studies and planning activities begin soon to offset any severe impact from outer continental shelf exploration. As a middle age businessman said: "We need impact help now to move smoothly through some rough times ahead. We can't wait till Front Street in Nome becomes another Second Avenue in Fairbanks. And it will be just the same if we don't look ahead and get some help now."

Lease Only When the State Needs Revenues: A small group of Kotzebue workshop participants supported this option, unlike Nome participants who specifically cautioned against selling leases only when the state needs money. "If we sit back and wait for a time when the state is damned near broke," protested a middle-aged construction worker, "and have a lease sale then, we end up with no money from it because it's going to go right in the (General) Fund and be spent immediately."

Do No Further Leasing: On this option, Barrow participants added the phrase "until technological and environmental impacts have been studied." The village of Unalakleet also recommended that the state do no further leasing and make the best use of present income, while the village of Gambell suggested that the state lease only after safeguarding environmental impacts.

Other: The participants at Barrow recommended an option unique to that region suggesting that the state follow a policy of leasing onshore rather than offshore. This response came very clearly from people who rely heavily on the harvesting of sea mammals for their livelihood. If these mammals are placed in jeopardy, the people of the North Slope will suffer the consequences. As one native man observed: "I think that would be the best deal (to drill onshore rather than offshore) because when you drill in the water, you're going to

lose the mammals that we've had for centuries. They have already been disrupted now--we've seen that this fall. We didn't see any small whales. All we saw was big ones and we had to go so far out, we couldn't even save the meat. By the time we got in here, they got bloated."

Barrow participants also proposed that the idea that the state function as an oil company itself to break its dependency on the industry and keep 88% of the money instead of the 12% royalty share. This same thought was brought up and dismissed by Southeast and South-central participants who felt that the state had enough trouble managing its services now, and certainly would find the oil industry a difficult area to manage.

Question five caused concern in several small community meetings. Specifically, the communities of Shungnak, Kobuk and Kivalina felt unprepared to answer this question until they had more information on what actually happens to a community once a lease is sold.

QUESTION 5
SOUTHCENTRAL

"There's got to be some local control over these sales. We have to live with the impact before, during and long after the damn oil rigs are in place."

Seldovia

What should be the State's policy on future oil and gas lease sales?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 1,609

Meeting Results: Anchorage

2%	It should sell leases as fast as possible to bring in a lot of money immediately.	It should sell leases at a constant pace to assure a steady flow of income over a long period of time.
62%	It should sell leases at a constant pace to assure a steady flow of income for a long period of time.	It should do no further leasing.
8%	It should sell leases when the State needs large sums of money to meet public needs.	Outside Anchorage:
14%	It should do no further leasing and make the best use of present income.	It should sell leases at a constant pace to assure a steady flow of income over a long period of time.
14%	Other: Involvement of impacted communities	It should do no further leasing.

A moderate leasing plan that would take into account native and federal leasing programs polled strongest throughout the Southcentral area--regardless of whether the participant was young or old; male or female; a white collar or blue collar worker; short term or long time Alaska resident, in either an urban or rural setting.

"In fact, I rather thought this question was like 'when did you stop beating your wife?' explained a librarian from Anchorage. "Of course the most rational plan is to do it at a moderate, constant pace."

Anchorage residents along with the Matanuska Valley participants opted for a leasing plan that would stretch for many years. But, while the Anchorage and Valley residents tallied over 62 per cent majorities for a constant leasing pace, the people on the Kenai Peninsula and

Susitna Valley wanted the pace to be slow to none at all. And, in fact, at the meetings held in Homer and Talkeetna, a majority of the people preferred to halt the leasing schedule altogether.

Generally, those under 35 years of age, while supporting a moderate leasing schedule, preferred it by a smaller margin than did those over 35. A growing number wanted to stop the leasing for at least the time being.

Many people throughout the region mentioned plans by the native corporations and the federal government to begin oil exploration within the next few years. One federal employee in Anchorage explained how he regarded cooperation with the federal and native leasing plans: "The cooperation should mean that we cooperate and sell our leases next to the feds and native leasing platforms whereby we should place our drilling straws into the adjoining oil they are trying to siphon off of us."

Almost every person who took time to write a suggestion regarding this question mentioned the need for community involvement long before the date of the actual lease sales. Several people wanted the state to hold off leasing any tracts until the local communities could sign off and approve the sale. "There's got to be some local control over these sales. We have to live with the impact before, during and long after the damn oil rigs are in place," a Seldovia woman wrote.

The vast majority of participants had little use for either a fast leasing schedule or one that implied panic selling whenever the state needs money.

QUESTION 6
SOUTHEAST

"The best use of Alaska's royalty oil and gas would be to use whatever portion is necessary to make Alaska independent from the rest of the country (world) regarding fuel oil and gas..."

Gustavus

What is the best use of Alaska's royalty oil and gas?

Questionnaires Results

Number of Respondents: 459

Meetings Results

- 37% The State should take its royalties in money or substance to sell for a financial gain
- 19% The State should use its royalty oil and gas primarily for the purpose of promoting industrial development in the State
- 31% The State should provide in-state residential use of the royalty oil and gas
- 13% Other

Sell it for financial gain.

Sell Royalties for Financial Gain: Southeast people in general, chose to use the oil and gas royalties for financial gain and by selecting this response they differed from Public Forum participants in other regions of the state. Southeasterners often put forth this recommendation coupled with the fear suggested by a 45 year old bartender that "None of that oil and gas will get down to this part of the state anyway."

Participants in Ketchikan, concerned over the limited access they have to the state's oil and gas, suggested that Southeast consider getting its gas from Northwest Canada rather than Alaska through British Columbia. "It might be cheaper," recommended a middle aged accountant from Wrangell. This same concern appears in question 7 when participants look into alternate energy sources for Southeast.

There was also much support for the option to provide oil and gas for in-state residential use and many people chose this by checking "other" where they pencilled in "a combination of options (a) and (c)."

A young fisherman from Gustavus explained his thinking this way: "The best use of Alaska's royalty oil and gas would be to use whatever portion is necessary to make

Alaska independent from the rest of the country (world) regarding fuel oil and gas. The remaining royalty oil or gas could then be sold to provide money for the state's General Fund."

Most of these participants in Ketchikan and in other community meetings went on to recommend that whether the oil and gas stays in-state or is sold outside, it should provide some financial gain.

Other comments on the issue of oil and gas royalties ranged from using the revenues to develop alternate energy sources, an idea coming out of the Ketchikan and Craig meetings, to support of the all Alaska gas pipeline by Thorne Bay participants.

Royalties for Industrial Development: There was some support for the idea of using the royalty oil and gas for industrial uses, particularly in the community of Haines, but this appears to be a reflection of the current employment crisis and people's interest in diversifying the local economy in that town.

Other communities vehemently opposed the use of oil and gas for industrial development, specifically the people of Sitka who although they supported residential in-state use of royalties, were very much opposed to the industry which might accompany this in-state use. This thought was broadened by the people in Wrangell and Petersburg, who hesitated to approve the use of the royalties for in-state use at all, claiming that the industry necessary to refine the crude oil was not worth the gain by the State or its residents. As a participant in Wrangell said: "It could seriously affect the quality of life here in Alaska."

Some communities such as Juneau reached no consensus. Juneau participants ended by recommending a combination of all the concerns while expressing a caution against unwanted industrial growth.

QUESTION 6
NORTH

"If pipelines can replace oil barges they may pay for themselves in short order."

Nome

What is the best use of Alaska's royalty oil and gas?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 127

Meeting Results

- 24% The state should take its royalties in money or substance to sell for financial gain.
- 11% The state should use its royalty oil and gas primarily for the purpose of promoting industrial development in the State.
- 53% The state should provide in-state residential use of the royalty oil and gas
- 12% Other (combination of the above)

The state should provide in-state residential use of the royalty oil and gas

As the chart above indicates, participants at Public Forum meetings provided the same solution to Question six as those who responded through the questionnaires. This issue was particularly significant in the Northern communities because of the high prices people pay for fuel. Generally, participants looked to oil and gas royalties as a method of reducing the price of oil in rural Alaska. A 32 year old native leader from Nome suggested: "If pipelines can replace oil barges, they may pay for themselves in short order."

Sell Royalties for Financial Gains: Despite the regional findings, however, Kotzebue Public Forum participants selected residential in-state use of royalties as their second choice. Instead, people leaned toward the option of selling the royalties for financial gain as their first priority, often indicating that the state should not encourage the industrial development connected with the petro-chemical industry. The people in Stebbins also recommended using the oil and gas to sell for financial gain.

Royalties for In-state Residential Use: Kotzebue workshop participants indicated that they might find this option acceptable if the state could do something about the present inequities in the cost of fuel oil. It was brought out that the people in Shungnak must pay \$83 for a drum of oil and that people in Anchorage pay something closer to \$25 a drum. Participants suggested that the state might equalize the prices by using its royalty shares, and by subsidizing the cost of its transportation.

A Northwest resident and civil engineer suggested the following use for the royalty oil and gas. "Why not model it after the Native Claims Settlement Act and give each Alaskan 100 shares for a certain portion of the royalties and establish a corporation," he said. "Give each Alaskan 10% in cash."

In Nome, participants recommended using royalty oil and gas for all three of the options with preference for in-state residential use and then in-state industry, i.e., to aid some of the mining activities in the Nome area. They suggested the state sell the remainder, if there is any, at the highest market price.

In Barrow, participants also chose to use the royalty oil and gas for in-state residential use, indicating a preference for the state to distribute the oil and gas at the regional level where it could then be further allocated by the regional government based on the needs of the people.

In the smaller communities of Shungnak, Gambell and St. Michael, comments supported the idea that the state should use its oil and gas royalties for in-state residential use. In Unalakleet, people suggested the state use the royalties to meet all in-state residential needs and sell whatever was left over.

QUESTION 6
SOUTHCENTRAL

"...I think it's important to cut us into that oil and gas market directly--even if the price doesn't go down. At least we'll have the resource!"

Kenai

What is the best use of Alaska's royalty oil and gas?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 1,620

- 14% The state should sell its royalties to make money
- 25% The state should use its royalty oil and gas primarily for promoting industrial development in the state.
- 42% The state should provide in-state residential use of the royalty oil and gas
- 19% Other - all of the above with environmental considerations

Meeting Results: Anchorage

In-State use
Other

Outside Anchorage:

In-state use
To make money

The preference among participants of what to do with the state's 12½ per cent of royalty oil and gas was clearly to use the petroleum products within the state. The first priority was to use the oil and gas for residential use.

The younger the participant, the stronger the preference to use the oil and gas for residential use as opposed to promoting industrial development.

"You would think", said a worker from the Kenai Cook Inlet oil fields, "that if we mandated the oil and gas stay within the state, that would mean that your and my gas and oil prices would go down. That's probably not necessarily so. But, in any event, I think it's important to cut us into that oil and gas market directly--even if the price doesn't go down. At least we'll have the resource!"

A borough assemblyman from Talkeetna opted for increasing the royalty cut for Alaska to somewhere between 40 and 65 per cent "as the Arab states do". Nearly 70 per cent of the meeting goers agreed and added the stipulation - - with "in-state use".

Where the Greater Anchorage Area people wanted to make sure the oil and gas stayed within the state for residential use, they were not as sure as the people from

the Matanuska Valley and the Kenai Peninsula. Anchorage came up with only a 39 per cent preference compared to the Valley's 61 per cent in favor of residential use. Peninsula people tallied a 45 per cent preference for in-state use.

The professional-technical, blue collar workers and the non-workers all agreed that in-state residential use was the best use of the royalties, but the white collar workers were more in favor of using them to promote industrial development within the state.

The questionnaires filled out by participants in their own homes favored the in-state residential use. But, in the meetings, where several innovative plans were discussed, the majority opted to favor the "other" alternative.

Other: Some of these plans indicated there should be a "mixed-bag" policy of using the oil and gas royalties. If just the railbelt were to profit in lower prices through development and refining of oil and gas, then Southcentral participants felt there should be some compensation for other parts of the state which did not have ready access to the refined products.

Many felt the gas package worked out with El Paso, Tenneco and Southern Gas should be studied to see what changes should be made for future royalty commitments.

There were words of caution, especially by the people in the Homer area, that without assurances of lower oil and gas prices, development and refineries should not be allowed.

Almost everyone who checked the "other" category asked that stringent environmental precautions be taken before development began on any refinery.

"It sounds enticing to us all to be really independent and produce our own products from our own resources, but if we become just another conduit for big oil production with little control or benefit, then we really won't accomplish much at all", said one economist working in Kenai.

Those who mentioned selling the oil and gas royalties outside Alaska to make money were in the minority, but these people identified with many who outlined their preference in the "other" category. Many felt that any revenues to be derived from the royalty oil

and gas sales or the refining of the product should go to develop alternative energy resources, especially solar, tidal and wind energy.

QUESTION 7
SOUTHEAST

"That ferry system is our road to the south and you keep reading in the paper about the profit its making or money that they're losing. There ain't no talk about the profits they're making or how much money that they're losing on the roads into Anchorage and Fairbanks."

Ketchikan

What other state problems do you feel should be considered?

Questionnaire Results

Renewable Resources
Health & Social Services
Land & the Environment
Alternative Energy
Non-renewable Resources
Transportation
Communications
Government Operations
Economic Issues
Capitol Move
Alaskan Lifestyles
Education

Meeting Results

Transportation
Fisheries Rehabilitation
Alternate Energy Sources
Communications

The three local issues Ketchikan workshop participants chose to discuss were transportation, fisheries rehabilitation and alternate energy sources. These concerns remained consistent throughout most of the smaller community meetings and only communications stood out as a topic to be added to the Ketchikan list.

Transportation: This subject proved to be the major concern among Southeasterners. At the Ketchikan Public Forum, participants discussed the ferry system in some depth and roads and air service as secondary transportation problems. A number of criticisms were leveled at the Marine Highway ferry system, among them inappropriate schedules and

unacceptable sanitary standards. More than this, participants repeatedly echoed the sentiments of a middle-aged logger who said: "That ferry system is our road to the south and you keep reading in the paper about the profit its making or how much money you're losing. There ain't no talk about the profit they're making or money that they're losing on the roads into Anchorage and Fairbanks. I think that this ferry system is our road and it should be treated that way and people should stop talking about the profit and loss."

This theme was repeated throughout Southeast in Sitka, Wrangell, Petersburg, Skagway, Haines and others. Metlakatla participants explained their problem with the Marine Highway. "We've got nothing but that little Chilkat ferry coming in here four days a week," explained a middle-aged fisherman. "It carries up to 40 people and with one full van on it there's no room for cars."

In Skagway, people returned to the issue of the ferry system, particularly its inadequate service and schedule. As a young teacher said, "We have four or five ferries a week in the winter and that sounds real good, but three of them are on Sunday." Thorne Bay added the recommendation that the state look into the use of hydrofoils to transport people and goods throughout the region.

There were comments on the inadequacies of air transportation and particularly the need to upgrade the navigational aides at the Southeast airports. On the subject of roads, it was suggested that smaller communities might be connected by roads and that logging roads might be upgraded and incorporated into the public highway system.

Additionally, people in the Petersburg-Wrangell area were anxious that the state complete the road linking them to Canada. Thorne Bay and Klawock discussed the need for improving roads that connect various towns.

A final note on transportation was the wide sweeping concern that local communities be included in any transportation plans that will affect them.

Fisheries Rehabilitation: On the issue of fisheries, there was a reaffirmation of the region's commitment to rehabilitate the struggling industry through more planning, research and technical assistance.

There was support for hatcheries. "We have a pattern of destroying and then trying to build after the damage is done." "Why can't we use sensible management now?" demanded a frustrated Craig fisherman. "I don't think that there's a fisherman in this country that wouldn't pay his fair share. I personally have signed an agreement with the Aquaculture Association to take three percent of my catch next year and put it into hatchery rehabilitation...but what I'm trying to say is that it's my job to catch fish; I want to go on and do my job, but I also want to make sure...someone isn't going to point a finger at me 20 years from now and say 'that guy was a fisherman and he used to catch lots of fish, but the fish are gone because he caught them all'."

There was criticism of the Department of Fish and Game. Said another long-time Southeast fisherman, "I want to know that when the Fish and Game are telling me I can go fish that they're right and I can leave something for posterity -- myself or my children."

There was great concern over the rapidly disappearing herring runs, important because the herring is the primary food of the sought-after salmon. "Do you know what they (Fish and Game) do? They go out all over the State of Alaska and sell these herring with the eggs to Japan. What are you going to feed the fish when you get rid of all the herring? You're going to have less fish and the ones you got will be smaller..."

Angoon participants discussed the abuse of herring fishing in the waters off their village. The conversation was long and heated and ended with a petition to the Governor. (This petition has subsequently been honored and herring fishing in the Angoon area has been stopped).

Alternative Energy Sources: On the subject of alternative energy sources, Southeasterners at the Ketchikan workshop voiced a strong concern that the state begin to work on hydroelectric power to service the region. There were suggestions of tidal and wind power research but hydroelectric power was recommended most often. New energy sources for local use was also the subject of meetings in Craig, Klawock and Juneau.

Other Concerns: In Juneau, people provided a list of concerns with the Capitol move at the head. They went on in turn to discuss the need for long-range comprehensive state planning; problems with transportation, fisheries, boom and bust economy, communications, and maintaining the Alaskan quality of life. In several meetings, communications was mentioned as a problem for Southeasterners. In

Metlakatla and Haines, the participants recommended that the state expand its Telecommunications system.

QUESTION 7
NORTH

"We've got to plan now. We've got to make sure that the facilities they put in are high quality so that we know we won't be left with a pile of junk when everybody pulls out."

Nome

What other state problems do you feel should be considered?

Questionnaire Results

Renewable Resources
Alcoholism
Land and the Environment
Alternate Energy
Communications
Government Responsiveness
Economic Issues (Cost of
living, taxation, industrial
development)
Alaskan Lifestyles (subsistence)
Education

Meeting Results

Renewable Resources & Subsistence
Living
Oil & Gas Exploration
Transportation
Community Development
Alcoholism

Throughout the meetings in Northern communities, several important themes emerged in the areas of: 1) oil and gas exploration impact, and state outreach to isolated rural communities.

It is not surprising then that most of the comments both on the questionnaire and at meetings focus on these areas. Beyond these, three other major concerns surfaced: transportation, communications and alcoholism.

Alcoholism, Communications, Fisheries: At the Kotzebue workshop, participants elected to discuss the issues of alcoholism, transportation, communications and fisheries. They went over these at length, recommending that a tax be placed on alcoholic beverages to rehabilitate

the alcoholic (please see Question two). This suggestion was repeated throughout other regions of the state, but it was perhaps the most urgent recommendation made by the 100 participants in Kotzebue. Other comments were brought up by Northwest people at the regional workshop. One young native man suggested there is a lot of need for education on alcoholism, not only on the part of the state, but local communities themselves. Many people don't realize the choices communities have through statutes such as limiting the hours a bar may be open. With enough pressure, "perhaps," he continued, "municipalities would close the bars at two o'clock, rather than five."

On the issue of communications, participants indicated the need for more than one phone in a village and the desire to have television expanded to bush communities. They also discussed the flow of information as a communications problem to people living in isolated areas. One participant said in December, "I'm still receiving election news and at last count Carter and Ford were running head to head."

Finally, on the issue of fisheries, there was discussion of developing fish hatcheries to insure a regular harvest of fish. As a middle-aged Northwest resident outlined the problem: "I get out in these villages and I see there's no salmon coming up streams and that they should be full of salmon. This should be eliminated, but there has to be some planning and some effort and some money spent. But this money is returnable when the fish come in. It will create jobs. There can be a percentage or a price per pound of fish that

come back to repay the money that is spent to develop a hatchery in the first place."

Transportation: This was selected as a major concern at the Kotzebue, Nome and Gambell meetings.

Kotzebue criticism was leveled primarily at the air service and the apparent abuse of freight and mail delivery. Specifically, participants voiced concern over airport maintenance in the smaller villages, citing second-hand, inoperable or non-existing equipment in villages can mean weeks without plane service when the air strips are icy or muddy. Others went on to criticize the location of the air fields, indicating that planes often have to land and take-off in dangerous cross-winds. Further, people mentioned the need for lights and other conveniences, particularly to expedite medical evacuations.

People in the Nome area were also concerned about transportation. Again, freight was a major concern and participants felt the state should play a major role in providing a remedy to this problem. Air schedules and routing drew fire as people protested that there is no direct flight to Anchorage. "A poor patient," said one participant, "is left laying in the plane for three or four hours at a time when they should be right in Anchorage at the medical center."

A 42-year-old laborer from Gambell reiterated the needs of that community. "We very much need transportation and mail service like freight and packages at Gambell."

Oil and Gas Exploration Activities: In Nome, Public Forum participants expressed concern over the social, cultural and economic impacts of outer continental shelf exploration on Norton Sound communities. They

echoed many of the statements made by people discussing the state's oil and gas leasing policies (please see Question Five). Chief among their concerns was that Nome, as well as other affected communities, receive impact aid as soon as possible so that they can begin immediately to offset any environmental and social disruptions. Participants urged careful study before any action is taken and further recommended that the local communities participate in the leasing and exploration process to every extent possible.

"We've got to plan now," said one construction worker. "We've got to make sure that the facilities they put in are high quality so that we know we won't be left with a pile of junk when everybody pulls out."

A final concern voiced by the people in Nome centered around the proper management of fish and wildlife. People felt that realistic control should exist to make sure that there are always resources for those on subsistence. "If the animals are hurt, the villages are hurt."

In Barrow, the major concerns of the people centered around the distribution of oil and gas revenues and fear of offshore leasing impacts. Most often people questioned what more leasing might mean for them, "Now it seems our land is producing that money -- \$3 billion," said an elderly Native man. "I guess we would like to know what percentage of that money we might be getting." In response to this point, participants urged that the state give more of its revenues to regions that actually produce the oil to offset the costs they incur from exploration impact. Another Native Barrow resident posed a second problem: "As time goes on, we will have our taxes so high

to pay that we will run out of money and eventually (Native lands) will revert to state lands. "...why should we lose our land on which we are producing the biggest money?" From this point came the recommendation that oil money should go to local governments to reduce property taxes of new landowners.

The participants recommended that the state try to minimize the impact of oil and gas development in Pet 4. Further, they suggested that the state lease onshore rather than offshore to save the sea mammal population for subsistence needs, but added if there was offshore exploration, the state should research the effects of OCS activities on sea mammals first. (See Question Five). Barrow participants went on to recommend that the state work to coordinate its outer continental shelf development with Canada who has already begun work in the Beaufort Sea. And, finally, participants urged that local people be more involved in game management, particularly in determining the number and distribution of caribou permits.

Community Development: Another major concern for people in the North involved community development issues. People in several villages such as Barrow and Deering raised this issue. They discussed unemployment, poor quality of health care and the need for sewer systems in the villages. All communities recommended that the high cost of living considered in revenue sharing formulas.

The people of Deering talked of the need for a seawall to protect the village and that community, along with others, urged that state officials respond to the problems of isolated communities, "Weeks and often months go by with no word on grant or information requests," advised the city clerk, "We can't do anything."

QUESTION 7
SOUTHCENTRAL

"There's just too many new people coming up here and getting a free ride; normally, I wouldn't mind, except it appears that I'm the one that has to provide some of the free transportation."

Homer

What other State problems do you feel should be considered?

Questionnaire Results

Number of Respondents: 546

Government Efficiency
Economic Growth Throughout
Alaska
Transportation
Land & Environment Issues
Crime & Judicial System
Health & Social Service Problems
Education
Capital Move
Renewable Resources
Alternative Energy Sources
Labor Issues and Control
Natives and Subsistence Lifestyles
Non-Renewable Resources
Housing

Meeting Results

Anchorage:

Government Efficiency and State
Growth
Transportation
Criminal Justice System

Outside Anchorage:
Government Efficiency
Alternative Energy
Transportation

Government Efficiency: The growth of state government and the efficiency of its operation was the most popular new question brought out by the Southcentral participants. "Government's just getting too big," was a comment written on all the question boxes on a few of the questionnaires. The old attitude of government stepping in and doing more than the people think it should be doing, "just goes against what I thought Alaska was supposed to be all about -- a little bit of independent freedom," wrote a railroad worker from Palmer.

"I look around me and see two pages of state offices here in Anchorage in the telephone book and yet I just want to find out where

to get an income tax form and nobody can help me," said a 35-year-old woman from Spenard.

At all of the meetings, government inefficiency was a topic people kept coming back to, whether the groups were discussing what to do with the Permanent Fund or what their human need priorities were. A Kenai eye doctor cautioned that nothing be done with the Permanent Fund until the state sets a limit on how many new people would be hired to take care of the fund. "I hate to suggest any new and needed programs because it would only add another level to the bureaucratic structure," a Susitna Valley grocer objected.

State Growth: The growth of the state -- whether economic conditions or population increases -- were both mentioned as the region's second priority in this open field of questions.

"There's just too many new people coming up here and getting a free ride; normally I wouldn't mind that, except it appears that I'm the one that has to provide some of the free transportation they get," said one old-time barkeeper from Homer.

How to best control growth so that it doesn't get out of hand was mentioned by several people. The Mat Valley and Kenai Peninsula residents often wrote on their questionnaire that limits should be placed on the new people that would be allowed to settle here, "especially if they're just going to take jobs away from Alaskans or land on the unemployment rolls," offered a grocer from Anchorage.

Transportation: The potholes in front of a participant's home, the lack

of ferry service to Anchorage, the question of whether or not to open the North Slope haul road, expansion of the present road system and upgrading other roads were all concerns Southcentral people had about transportation. In fact, most people who identified more than one problem under question, seven wrote down one that was transportation-related. Miners from the Valley wanted new roads into the mining-rich areas there; Anchorage Sand Lake residents wanted to be able to get to work in the morning in less than 40 minutes and Kenai area people wanted more off-the-beaten-track accesses.

"It just galls me that there appears to be so much money going to come into the state with the oil pipeline and yet I can't get the roads sanded for weeks at a time," said one trucker from Anchorage.

Transportation planning and more mass transportation were touched on, but mostly people just wrote "Transportation -- a big problem."

Land: Land issues which included homesiting, land speculation problems, air and water pollution and fish and game management were all voiced as issues by participants. People on the Kenai Peninsula cautioned about spending so much time talked about oil and gas related issues. They were more concerned about preventing pollution from the development. Anchorage area people concerned about the environment mentioned air quality frequently. They also referred to their concern over the rising cost of land which was speculated out of their reach.

Criminal Justice: Within the Anchorage area, crime, criminal justice and the general operations of the judicial system were a key topic at all the Anchorage workshop meetings. But, especially in those areas

that do not now have police powers (i.e., outside the old city limits and Spenard), people were concerned about the lack of police protection and the enforcement of penalties imposed on criminals.

One man simply stated that he thought the judicial system was breaking down with "a lot of the hardened criminal types either not being prosecuted or getting off with an easy sentence and then getting back on the streets to strike again."

Other: Health and Social Services problems included a need for more and better child care with an extra effort directed at enforcing the present day care standards. Alcoholism, which was also detailed in question number two, was mentioned again in this open question. Drug abuse and control of drugs was discussed, mostly by older participants. Welfare abuses and a need for more vocational training programs to get people off the welfare rolls was also a recurring topic under this question.

Education, especially reforms in post-secondary education including the University of Alaska, was highlighted in a few questionnaires. The emphasis of education as a progressive system (as opposed to a human need for a construction issue) was voiced by a few people at the Anchorage meetings.

About 50 people mentioned the capital move as an issue they thought should have been discussed at the Public Forum meetings. One man offered, "Wouldn't it be nice to sit down and talk to neighbors like this from the Peninsula and the Valley about what kind of a capital we all want to see here in Willow." Only Talkeetna voted unanimously to abort that move, claiming it threatens their desired

lifestyle.

Renewable resource concerns of timber, fishing, agriculture, herding, tourism and wildlife were spotlighted by a majority of the participants as was alternative energy resource development. For example, many people in Homer wanted to see a percentage of money made from non-renewable resources go to research efforts for other energy methods such as solar, tidal and wind energy.

Summary

SUMMARY

Alaska Public Forum participants were asked to come up with answers to seven questions on major state issues. They were provided with six questions chosen by the Governor, legislators, state officials, people throughout the state and ultimately, based on all these suggestions, the Alaska Growth Policy Council. (The Alaska Public Forum is a program of the Alaska Growth Policy Council, an eleven member citizen participation group set up by Governor Hammond.) Participants in the program then choose a seventh question - - an area of state concern that they wish to discuss. All the questions (except 7) have a number of proposed choices, from which participants may choose an answer. They may also select "other" and provide their own answer.

What follows is a summary of question recommendations from the first half year of the Alaska Public Forum program in Southeast, the North and Southcentral. The information is based on the comments and suggestions recorded at meetings as well as the answers provided in the mail-in questionnaires. The base of background information and time spent on making each choice is different in each case and therefore it is strongly recommended that you consider both the meeting summaries and the questionnaire statistics before reaching any conclusions.

QUESTION 1

"I know we're talking about more money than I can ever conceive of but if I get to put my two cents worth in regarding the investment of the state's two billion dollars, then no matter what gets done with it, I'll have the feeling it's more mine."
(Anchorage)

The first question asks "How should the state use its new oil and gas money in the future?" Common to all three regions were the recommendations to promote renewable resource industries with the oil and gas revenues, and to save the money with Southeast and the North recommending community assistance efforts ahead of the suggestion to save.

SOUTHEAST	NORTH	SOUTHCENTRAL
USES OF THE OIL AND GAS REVENUES		INVESTMENT OF PERMANENT FUND AND USES OF REVENUES
1) Renewable Resources	1) Community grants and revenue sharing	1A
2) Community Development	2) Renewable Resources	1) Renewable Resources
a) loans	3) Save it	2) Save it
b) grants and revenue		1B
3) Save it and Tax cuts		1) Tax Cuts
		2) Renewable Resources

For the Southcentral region the question was divided into two parts because of some confusion in Southeast and the North over the role of the Permanent Fund in the original question as stated above. In Southcentral, question 1B is the question used for Southeast and the North--"How should the State use its new oil and gas money?" It is incorrect however, to compare the second part of question 1 in Southcentral with the question used in the first two regions despite the same wording because people in Anchorage and surrounding communities accurately viewed the answer to the second part of the question as surplus or extra monies. People in Southeast and the North were more reluctant to do so and provided answers which reflect a concern for investments and future security more in tune with solutions to Permanent Fund issues than surplus spending money.

Interestingly, whether people were specifically investing in the Permanent Fund, or using the new oil and gas wealth, there was across-the-board concern for the future of the "renewable resource industries" - fishing and agriculture in Southcentral with

tourism and combinations of the above spread throughout.

The option of using the new oil and gas money for "community revenue sharing and community grants" was the first choice of people in the North with "renewable resources" close behind. In Southeast, participants supported community assistance as their second choice although they were divided between using community revenue sharing and grants for this purpose or providing "loans to communities." In Southcentral, an area with far fewer isolated, rural communities this option which rated so high in the Southeast and the North fell to fourth position.

Southcentral chose instead, to "save" the Permanent Fund money and provide "tax cuts" with the new oil and gas wealth once the concern for renewable resources was met. Although "tax cuts" received a clear majority, largely as a result of Anchorage mail-in participants, most of the same people chose renewable resources as their first option for Permanent Fund investment and gave it second priority for uses of new oil and gas money. This would appear to give added weight to the renewable resource issue despite the high rating of "tax cuts".

Save it as an option for investment of the Permanent Fund question in Southcentral received a great deal of support. It was also selected as a third priority for using oil and gas money in both Southeast and the North, indicating statewide support.

QUESTION 2

"You can't get a job without a good education...and a lot of times if you don't have a job other things don't follow."
(Barrow)

The second question asked Public Forum participants "What areas of human need do you feel require the most attention? The responses to this were similar in all three regions. Both education and alcoholism appeared a priority in each region. Employment also ranked among the top three choices in Southeast and Southcentral but was replaced by health care in the North.

SOUTHEAST	NORTH	SOUTHCENTRAL
HUMAN NEEDS		
2		
1) Education	1) Education	1) Employment
2) Employment	2) Alcoholism	2) Education
3) Alcoholism	3) Health	3) Alcoholism

Education received the highest ranking in Southeast and the North and generally younger people were more concerned about education than older participants in the Public Forum. Employment ranked first in Southcentral.

There as well as Southeast, it was usually chosen by participants in the occupational categories of white collar and blue collar workers and those not in the labor force, but not as often by professional-technical people.

Alcoholism sparked the most discussion and comment. It ranked very high among people's top choices in both meetings and questionnaire tabulations, although when it was averaged with all seven human needs, its ranking fell. Perhaps the one consistent thought coming out of Public Forum meetings was the recommendation that a tax be placed on alcohol beverages to pay for the cost of rehabilitating alcoholics. A secondary suggestion encouraged local control and management of alcohol rehabilitation programs.

Health care was an important concern for people living in isolated communities in the North. There, lack of medical assistance in villages and extreme distances from hospitals and clinics, were repeatedly brought up as major concerns. Health was ranked fourth in Southeast and Southcentral.

The other human needs areas were generally the same throughout all three regions, with care of children, and programs for the elderly falling in behind the four issues mentioned above. In the North housing was high among people's needs and tied with employment as a fourth priority in that part of the state. It should be mentioned at this point that most of the choices for this question received very close ratings, perhaps supporting people's contention in meetings that it was difficult isolating one concern from another.

QUESTION 3

"Children are one resource we all will have to live with whether I chose to have them or not."

(Homer)

Question 3 asked: "How should public School construction be financed in both organized and unorganized boroughs?" Behind the question is the need to build a number of new schools throughout rural Alaska in the near future and the Public Forum answers try to get at the best method of financing this construction.

Initially, Southeast and Northern participants were presented with the option of financing school buildings through the General Fund. This option was later dropped in Southcentral and subsequent regions because it did not specify a method by which the General Fund will get the money to build schools.

SOUTHEAST	NORTH	SOUTHCENTRAL
3 Continue the Present System	100% funding from the General Fund	Continue the Present System

Both Southeast and Southcentral chose to continue the present system which provides for property taxes plus supplemental state funding in organized boroughs and 100% state funding in the unorganized borough. Interestingly enough, to continue this method places a heavier financial burden on organized boroughs such as those found throughout Southeast and Southcentral.

The North on the other hand chose to fund school construction from the General Fund. The North with the exception of the North Slope Borough, presently has their school buildings financed entirely by the state. Nonetheless, they chose to recommend that the state pay for not only their needs but the needs in organized boroughs (such as Southeast and Southcentral) as well.

In each region, the top choice was recommended by a 10 to 20 percent margin. Suggestions of other financing methods such as a statewide sales tax or an increase in the state income tax were generally received unfavorably.

QUESTION 4

"I'm asking the basic question, when am I and fellow people, fellow 'I's' going to get five acres to raise chickens and a garden on. We don't want a handout. We don't want to be subsidized. I'll buy it. When can I count on buying it?"

Ketchikan

Question 4 asked people "What should be the objectives for managing Alaska's land?" and in every region the responses were the same -- promote renewable resource development and manage the land to meet people's needs.

SOUTHEAST	NORTH	SOUTHCENTRAL
1) Renewable Resources 2) Public Needs	1) Renewable Resources 2) Public Needs	1) People's Needs* 2) Renewable Resources

*Language change a result of questionnaire revision.

In Southeast and the North, people supported the option of renewable resource development for land management as their first choice. In both regions, renewable resources were explained as the economic mainstay of the area and in the North a chief food source.

In Southcentral, while the need is not as great, except in the smaller communities outside of Anchorage, the people of that region gave renewable resources a strong second priority position.

Land for people's needs was a favorite topic in all three regions, particularly land poor Southeast, but it was Southcentral participants who ranked it as their first priority. In all areas, people generally spent a great deal of time discussing the need for more land for homesites at less expensive rates and with built-in safeguards against speculators.

In the North, the subject of people's needs was often interwoven with subsistence and renewable resource concerns as participants indicated that fish

and game resources were the people's needs. There was some support amongst the non-native population in the North for homesite land.

In Southeast and the North, there were recommendations to preserve the natural environment which was often written in as an "other" suggestion. In Southcentral, where it was listed as an option, natural environmental preservation ranked third behind people's needs and renewable resource development.

QUESTION 5

"We need impact help now to move smoothly through some rough times ahead. We can't wait till Front Street in Nome becomes another Second Avenue in Fairbanks. And it will be just the same if we don't look ahead and get some help now."

Nome

Question 5 asks Public Forum participants "What should be the state's policy on future oil and gas lease sales?" The response throughout all three regions was the same -- sell leases at a moderate rate to assure a steady flow of income for a long time.

SOUTHEAST	NORTH	SOUTHCENTRAL
Sell leases at a moderate rate	Sell leases at a moderate rate with safeguards	Sell leases at a constant pace*
*Language change a result of questionnaire revision.		

Despite the large response to the option to lease at a moderate rate, participants from every region felt the need to tack on addendums to their answers. In almost every case, their attachments expressed concerns over environmental and community impact stemming from oil exploration activities. Participants urged state leaders to involve the local community in any leasing activities and train local people for petroleum-related jobs. Over and over again, people from commun-

ities in Southeast, the North and Southcentral recommended that monies be made available in advance of severe impact and that the lives of people, and the preservation of the state's fish, game and environmental resources be given priority over the revenues to be gained from leasing activities.

There was some sporadic support for the option to do no further leasing but not enough to make much of a dent in the majority opinion discussed above. Finally, participants thought the state should steer away from leasing only when it needed money which, people felt, could lead to panic selling.

QUESTION 6

"It sounds enticing to us all to be really independent and produce our own products from our own resources, but if we become just another conduit for big oil production with little control or benefit, then we really won't accomplish much at all."

Kenai

Question six asked "What is the best use of Alaska's royalty oil and gas?" The responses in the North and Southcentral proved similar -- use it to provide in-state residential use of royalty oil and gas. In Southeast, people recommended the state use it for financial gain.

SOUTHEAST	NORTH	SOUTHCENTRAL
Sell it for financial gain	Provide in-state residential use	Provide in-state residential use

In the two regions, the North and Southcentral, where there is a better likelihood that oil and gas royalties can be used for individual needs by residents, this option was the top priority. Southeasterners, however, because of their physical separation from the main body of the state often expressed the option that it would be too expensive to get the oil and gas to them and would make more sense

for the state to sell its royalties for financial gain instead. However, there was a good deal of secondary support throughout the region for using the oil and gas to meet individual needs within the state.

Many participants in all regions indicated a preference for several of the options such as the recurring suggestion to use what is needed in-state and then sell the rest.

There was also widespread concern over the inequities in the prices of oil within the state today and many participants, particularly in the North, suggested using the royalty oil and gas to equalize prices by subsidizing transportation or selling shares of the royalties throughout the state.

QUESTION 7

"....What I'm trying to say is that it's my job to catch fish; I want to go on and do my job, but I also want to make sure someone isn't going to point a finger at me 20 years from now and say 'that guy was a fisherman and he used to catch lots of fish, but the fish are gone because he caught them all.'"

Craig

Question 7 provided the opportunity for Alaska Public Forum participants to discuss subjects they wanted recognized as problem areas. The question asks: "What other state problems do you feel should be considered?" The one concern that all three regions shared in common was transportation. Beyond this, the focus in the different regions varied.

SOUTHEAST	NORTH	SOUTHCENTRAL
1) Transportation	1) Transportation	1) Government Efficiency
2) Fisheries (renewable resources)	2) Oil & Gas Exploration	2) Transportation
3) Alternate Energy Sources	3) Subsistence/Renewable Resources	3) State Growth

Transportation spanned all three regions as a major concern, but in each area the needs were different. In Southeast, participants directed their criticism at the ferry system requesting that schedules and service be improved and that the Marine highway not be run as a profit-making venture but as any other highway system. Southeasterners voiced the secondary concern that air service schedules and airports maintenance throughout the region be improved.

These two areas were also the focus of transportation discussions in the North. Criticism was leveled at federal regulations which limit service in the North to one air carrier and complains of poor freight delivery seemed to head everyone's list. There was also concern over the poor maintenance of air fields in small communities which can isolate a village for weeks at a time.

Transportation in Southcentral was largely an issue of road improvement whether in front of people's homes or on major highways outside of the City of Anchorage. People also discussed transportation planning, the North Slope haul road, and the possibility of extending the existing highway system as secondary transportation problems.

In Southeast, people went on to discuss methods of rehabilitating the struggling fishing industry and developing hydroelectric power for the region.

In the North, Public Forum participants discussed their growing concern over oil and gas exploration impact in that area -- whether it was Norton Sound or the Beaufort Sea. Their concerns, while largely the same as those itemized in Question 5, were important enough for participants to repeat in this question.

Closely tied in with this were the reactions throughout the North that fish and game management be handled carefully and with local involvement to protect subsistence activities and renewable resource interests.

In Southcentral, participants in almost every area of that region decried the extravagant size of state government and its less than effective performance. There were concerns of people who didn't know where to turn for help and those who felt state government has become excessive in the services it provides. Tied into this theme was the concern over rapid state growth and the fact that too many people are arriving, ill-equipped to participate in Alaska's life and end up supported by the state.

There were many other concerns brought up in each region and for a more complete discussion, please see the section on Question 7. However, these appear to be the major problem areas voiced by Alaska Public Forum participants.

In this last section, we have attempted to capsulize the thoughts and recommendations of all the people who have participated in one way or another in the Alaska Public Forum in three regions of the state--Southeast, the North and Southcentral. If we suggested at the beginning of the report that some imaginative ideas might slip by for the sake of brevity, this is even more true for the summary of recommendations.

In an attempt to fit in a few more pieces before we end, we set forth some secondary concerns brought up by many of the Public Forum participants. Some of these suggestions may be existing programs or legislation. We repeat them nonetheless because we heard them from the people of the state. Other concerns may be new and again, because we heard them, we thought you too might want to know.

A tax should be placed on alcoholic beverages to pay for the cost of rehabilitating alcoholics.

Provide land for homesiting with safeguards against speculators.

Review fish and game management patterns and include more local involvement on policy decisions from opening and closing of fishing seasons to caribou hunting permits.

Provide for Outer Continental Shelf impact assistance before the leases are finalized.

Establish means now of involving local communities in oil and gas exploration activities.

Provide job training for employment on oil and gas exploration projects.

Provide an emergency fund for oil spills and have it available before the spill so that it may be put to use immediately if needed.

Take steps to improve government sensitivity and outreach to rural areas of the state.

Improve transportation: 1) the ferry system in Southeast
2) air service and airport maintenance in the North
3) road improvements and upgrading in Southcentral and wherever roads exist

Encourage local involvement both financially and educationally in schools around the state and move toward equal educational opportunities for all areas.

Develop hydroelectric power for Southeast and reassess the Devils Canyon Dam project in Southcentral.

EVALUATION

All participants at regional workshops were asked to respond to a series of questions about the Alaska Public Forum. The following evaluation form was used:

- 1) Was the workshop beneficial to you? ☐ Yes ☐ No.
If so, in what way?
- 2) How could the workshop be improved? What would you change about the workshop?
- 3) What did you expect from the workshop?
- 4) Were your expectations met? ☐ Yes ☐ No.
- 5) Was the discussion in your small group good? ☐ Yes ☐ No. Comments:
- 6) Did your opinions about the issues change as a result of the workshop?
☐ Yes ☐ No. If so, which ones?
- 7) How did you find out about the workshop? Newspaper ☐ Radio ☐ Television ☐
Personal invitation ☐ Notified by an interested organization ☐ Other ☐
- 8) Was the tabloid of any use to you? ☐ Yes ☐ No. Comments:
- 9) Does the tabloid give you enough information about the issues? ☐ Yes ☐ No.
If not, what additional information could you use?
- 10) Any other comments?

The evaluation forms were designed to allow members of the Growth Policy Council and the staff to identify areas where the workshop could be improved. We would like to share some of the most representative comments with you.

Was the workshop beneficial to you? If so, in what way?

"It gave me a chance to evaluate Alaskan problems with many different points of view and draw from it. It was gratifying that people were able to speak and be listened to." (Ketchikan)

"Helped bring my ideas on the issues into focus." (Ketchikan)

"We'll see what comes out of it." (Kotzebue)

"Wonderful to have state government interested in both urban and rural Alaska and especially rural Alaska." (Kotzebue)

"Yes, the workshop gave me a lot of information that I normally would not have had. It gave me the opportunity to meet people I normally wouldn't have known." (Anchorage)

"It was a diversion, but I'm cynical enough to doubt that it will have any effect." (Anchorage)

"Being a student I have learned the reasoning that goes into the more conservative school of thought." (Anchorage)

"To know that the executive branch of the state government wants my opinions has been beneficial to me so that I feel important in the overall state decision making process." (Barrow)

"Education on fundamental issues in Alaska." (Barrow)

What did you expect from the workshop? and
Were your expectations met?

"More commitment from Governor that results will become reality. I did not expect, really, that the Governor would listen to the public and he has not done so (nor will he)." Ketchikan

"At worst--little." "Wait and see." (Kotzebue)

"Nothing. I was surprised. The Public Forum people really seem interested in our input." (Kotzebue)

"Unknown? But hoped we could influence the way our state is managed. Only time will tell?..." (Anchorage)

"Yes and even more so. It was exciting to me that the Governor, Lt. Governor and representatives took the time to listen to each person's ideas, no matter how off-the-wall some seemed to be, and then to respond. I have left the workshop with a renewed interest in doing something personally to see that the State is wisely led through the growth and changes it is going through, and even more important, the feeling that I can help and do count as an individual in terms of State policy." (Anchorage)

"Unknown. I had no information other than the date and time and place prior to the meeting. That depends on whether my opinions will be incorporated into the plan." (Barrow)

10) Other comments.

"It will be interesting to see what effect, if any, these workshops have on governmental policies. Would it be possible to have same people on follow-up next year to evaluate year's progress and do another projection?" (Ketchikan)

"Forum must be ongoing with follow-up. If there is government implementation of forum recommendations then the public will be more encouraged and utilize forum more: A self reinforcing process of education-input-action. Good out of town attendance - keep it up." (Ketchikan)

"I think this is an excellent idea and I was happy to have participated. State government is often unresponsive to ordinary people and this is a step in the right direction. I hope it has direct results in state policy." (Kotzebue)

"Come again from time-to-time." (Kotzebue)

"Well run workshop. Please listen to our recommendations or we will vote you out of office." (Anchorage)

"Sunday morning is a busy time to hold the wrap up session for those of us who have a basic religious conviction we wish to honor." (Anchorage)

"You need to show people their participation is to be used if you expect to motivate people to participate." (Anchorage)

"I thought the choices presented were too narrow - Do you want to die by fire or drowning, etc. For instance, who will fund, not who will control or what kinds of lands, not whether we want state controlled lands at all." (Barrow)

"For a place like Barrow, so distant physically from centers of government and financial power; such a forum is a great way to exchange information on public issues. The question is, will policy makers remember to act on what they have heard. . . ." (Barrow)

APPENDIX
QUESTION CHANGES

QUESTION 1

Question 1 experienced the greatest change between the first and second printing of the newspaper. Originally the question asked: "How should the state use its new oil and gas money in the future?" This proved to be too open-ended and respondents were unsure whether the question included Permanent Fund monies or simply the surplus oil and gas wealth. Therefore, the issue was broken out into a two part question for the second newspaper. It now reads: 1A "How should the Permanent Fund money be invested? and 1B "How should the State use its new oil and gas money? (All revenues except those invested in the Permanent Fund)." It was hoped that by discussing the permanent fund directly, the confusion would be eliminated.

Additionally, in the first printing of the newspaper, the boxes in which participants indicated their recommendations were slightly out of alignment. Because of this, question one was recoded for the Southeast and Northern regions to verify the percentages. On this second run, only the top priority was coded. Whenever a potentially ambiguous code was found, responses to Questions #2-7 were read and a response consistent with the total questionnaire was chosen. For example, if Question #1 could have been either industrial development or renewable resources, responses to Question #4 and Question #5 and Question #7 usually pointed to a meaningful choice for Question #1. The tabulated responses to Questions #4 and #5 measured against Question #1 further supported this check.

QUESTION 1
New Newspaper

QUESTION 1
Old Newspaper

QUESTION 2

This question in the first newspaper asked people to prioritize nine areas of human needs and rate the effectiveness of the state's service. It seems significant that people repeatedly informed us that they didn't have enough information to make the program evaluation so the latter portion, part (b), was dropped in the second printing. Therefore, in the following discussion, we will deal only with part (a) to achieve consistency.

Similarly, two items, rehabilitation and income maintenance were dropped in the second newspaper questionnaire because the terms were confusing.

QUESTION 2 Southeast and North version

QUESTION 2 Southcentral version

QUESTION 3

Question 3 experienced a major change as well. One option -"100% state funding from the General Fund" was dropped in the revised newspaper because it did not answer the question of how the General Fund would get the additional money to fund school construction. Unlike the other options this one provides no source of revenue to cover building costs.

When the question was revised the option to increase the state income tax was included in place of the above alternative.

QUESTION 3
Old Newspaper

QUESTION 3
New Newspaper

QUESTION 4

The revised newspaper added a fifth option to the question on land - - "To preserve the natural environment." It also changed the second option from "public needs" to "people's needs." The other answers remain unchanged.

QUESTION 4
Old Newspaper

QUESTION 4
New Newspaper

QUESTION 5

This question experienced several word changes. Based on participants dissatisfaction with the words "moderate rate" in option b, they were replaced by the words "constant pace". Subsequent use of the newspaper indicates that now people often cross out the word "constant" and pencil in the word "moderate".

QUESTION 5
Old Newspaper

QUESTION 5
New Newspaper

QUESTION 6

This question did not change from the first to the second printing.

QUESTION 6

QUESTION 7

Question #7 has been included in the Public Forum agenda so that people may discuss what the state is or is not doing that concerns them personally, locally, or regionally as the participant chooses. In regional meetings, Question 7 usually consists of three of four concerns selected by the participants as a group dealing with subjects above and beyond those discussed in Questions #1-6.

The tabulated questionnaire, however, seems to indicate that people responding alone often chose to use the space to reinforce their thoughts on something in Questions #1-6, rather than to list new concerns. This could explain the wide range of responses to Question #7 when filled in on the questionnaire. In meetings, this part of the agenda usually includes no more than three or four issues and they are "new" concerns.