



NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
Aquaculture Association, Inc.

P.O. BOX 756 SITKA, ALASKA 99875

(907) 747-6350

RM. 205, OLD CITY HALL BLDG.

6 April 1978

The Honorable Mike Gravel  
United States Senate  
3121 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg.  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Gravel:

After reviewing the "National Aquaculture Organic Act of 1978", S-2762 received from your office, I have the following comments for your consideration.

Your aide, Mr. Tom Roach, contacted me last fall at which time we briefly discussed national aquaculture legislation and the possibility of your action. Since that time, Mr. Roach has kept me informed, and I have followed the progress of the legislation with interest. Your efforts to improve the legislation which passed the House are greatly appreciated. Your bill will be much better for Alaska and our fishermen than the House bill.

I have discussed the bill with Mr. Bill Hall of the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation, and I have read his comments and recommendations. I am supportive of Mr. Hall's comments and recommendations for amending the bill.

Additionally, I would like to add some comments.

- (1) I am especially supportive of the regional subcommittee concept in your bill and believe funding and any other support to maximize its effectiveness should be promoted. By developing the plan close to the people, the end product will reflect their interests, experience and expertise. I know that in Southeast Alaska the Forest Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have personnel very knowledgeable about the potential for aquaculture development. Hopefully, these people, state biologists and local fishermen will be able to either serve on a regional subcommittee or provide input directly to the subcommittee.
- (2) The NSEMA Board of Directors has taken a strong position in favor of rehabilitation of natural salmon

stocks. The preferred emphasis is on cost-effective projects which complement and enhance rather than conflict with or replace natural production. A matching federal, state or local grant program to stimulate the efforts of fishermen and other groups to this area would greatly benefit Alaska.


- (3) I am requesting, in a separate letter, that your Juneau office send copies of your comments in the Congressional Record prefacing introduction of S-2762 to each NSRAA Board member to keep them informed of developments on the national legislation. You may receive some additional comments from them.

Enclosed are copies of our latest informational brochures which were sent to fishermen explaining our program. These materials may give you some ideas on how to coordinate our plans with the national aquaculture plan and possibilities for our Association to work in partnership with the federal and state governments through a combination of grants, loans and insurance to enhance our fisheries.

Finally, I would like to restate my support for your bill S-2762, and the proposed changes recommended by Mr. Bill Hall. S-2762, especially with the suggested changes, will benefit Alaska more than Mr. Leggett's bill HR 9370.

Thank you for keeping us informed.

Sincerely,



Derek Poon, Ph.D.  
General Manager

DP/EJ/vf

cc: Bob Palmer, Office of the Governor  
Keith Specking, Office of the Governor  
Dr. Ronald A. Skoog, Commissioner, ADP&G  
John A. Saador, Regional Forester, U.S.F.S.  
Dr. Bill Smoker, Sr., NMFS  
Jack Milnes, Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Assn.  
Armin Koernig, Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corp.  
Floyd E. Heimbuch, Cook Inlet Aquaculture Assn.  
Senator Ted Stevens  
Senator Henry Jackson  
Senator Warren Magnusson

Enc.

TESTIMONY OF

DR. RONALD O. SKOOG

COMMISSIONER DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

STATE OF ALASKA

BEFORE SUB COMMITTEE ON:

NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ORGANIC ACT OF 1973

APRIL 18, 1978

## POTENTIAL FOR AQUACULTURE IN ALASKA

ALASKA, OF ALL THE STATES, IS UNIQUE BECAUSE OF ITS TREMENDOUS SIZE, NOT ONLY IN LAND MASS, BUT IN COAST LINE. SHE IS ADJACENT TO EXTREMELY PRODUCTIVE ESTUARINE AND MARINE ENVIRONMENTS SUCH AS THE GULF OF ALASKA,, THE BERING SEA, AND THE ARCTIC OCEAN. MILLIONS OF METRIC TONS OF A VARIETY OF SPECIES ARE HARVESTED ANNUALLY IN THOSE WATERS BY UNITED STATES FISHERMEN AS WELL AS FOREIGN FLEETS. WITH THE 200 MILE EXTENSION A NEW DIMENSION HAS BEEN CREATED THAT WILL HAVE A MAJOR IMPACT ON THE FISHERMEN OF ALASKA AS WELL AS OTHER STATES.

ALASKA IS ALSO UNIQUE BECAUSE SHE POSSESSES VAST FRESH-WATER RESOURCES THAT IN SOME INSTANCES ARE HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE, SUCH AS THE MAJOR CYCLICAL RED SALMON PRODUCING LAKES ADJACENT TO BRISTOL BAY, BUT IN OTHER INSTANCES SOME OF HER FRESH-WATER ENVIRONMENTS ARE RELATIVELY NONPRODUCTIVE. LOW LEVELS OF PRODUCTIVITY IN THE FRESH-WATER ENVIRONMENTS MAY BE ATTRIBUTABLE TO MANY CAUSES, SUCH AS THE LACK OF BASIC NUTRIENTS, THE INFLUENCE OF RAPIDLY DISCHARGING GLACIERS, EXTREME FLUCTUATIONS IN TEMPERATURES, DISSOLVED OXYGEN AND WATER FLOWS, AND ABSENCE OF ESTABLISHED FISH POPULATIONS, FROM

BARTER ISLAND IN THE NORTHEAST ARCTIC WESTWARD AND SOUTHWARD TO THE NORTH SIDE OF THE ALASKA PENINSULA, WITH BUT FEW EXCEPTIONS, ALASKA'S COASTLINE IS EXPOSED DIRECTLY TO HIGH WINDS AND SEAS AND LOW WINTER TEMPERATURES. ESTABLISHMENT OF ESTUARINE AND MARINE AQUACULTURE FACILITIES IN THIS REGION COULD BE COSTLY. HOWEVER, MAJOR PRODUCTIVE BUT UNUTILIZED FRESH-WATER RESOURCES ARE AVAILABLE FOR INCREASING THE PRODUCTION OF SALMON, TROUT, CHAR, WHITEFISH, GRAYLING, AND SHEEFISH. THOSE SPECIES HAVE EVOLVED AND ARE ADAPTED TO HARSH ARCTIC AND SUB-ARCTIC ENVIRONMENTS. THEREFORE, EFFECTIVE AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT IN THAT REGION OF THE STATE MUST BE TAILORED TOWARDS UTILIZING THESE FRESH-WATER ENVIRONMENTS IN CONJUNCTION WITH SPECIES NATURALLY ASSOCIATED WITH THOSE ENVIRONMENTS.

WITHIN AN ARC BEGINNING ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE ALASKA PENINSULA, CURVING NORTHWARD TO COOK INLET, AND THEN SOUTHERLY TO THE BORDERS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ARE MANY FJORDS PROTECTED FROM WIND AND WAVE THAT ARE SUITABLE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ESTUARINE AND MARINE AQUACULTURE FACILITIES. FURTHERMORE, A MYRIAD OF RIVERS AND STREAMS DISCHARGE INTO THOSE FJORDS THUS PROVIDING THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF MULTIPLE SPECIES AS WELL AS MULTIPLE ENVIRONMENT FACILITIES. UNFORTUNATELY, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SALMON AND TROUT, LITTLE RESEARCH EFFORT BY EITHER THE STATE OR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN DIRECTED TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF AQUACULTURE TECHNOLOGY REQUIRED FOR OTHER INDIGENOUS SPECIES, AND ESPECIALLY FOR

THE INVERTEBRATES SUCH AS CLAMS, SCALLOPS, ABALONE AND SEA CUCUMBERS. UNDOUBTEDLY, LACK OF THAT TYPE OF BASIC RESEARCH HAS BEEN A FUNCTION OF MARKET DEMANDS, FUNDS, AND PRIORITIES.

WITH THAT BRIEF BROAD BACKGROUND OF THE POTENTIAL FOR AQUACULTURE IN ALASKA I WILL DIRECT MY TESTIMONY BRIEFLY TO THE PRESENT STATUS OF AQUACULTURE IN ALASKA.

### STATUS OF AQUACULTURE

WITH PASSAGE OF THE STATEHOOD ACT THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA ASSUMED MANAGEMENT CONTROL OVER COMPLEX FRESH WATER, ESTUARINE AND MARINE ECOSYSTEMS IN WHICH A VARIETY OF VALUABLE COMMERCIAL, SPORT, AND SUBSISTENCE SPECIES DWELT. IN SOME INSTANCES, SPECIFIC STOCKS OF CRAB, SHRIMP, TROUT, CHAR, WHITEFISH, STEELHEAD, GRAYLING, SHEEFISH, AND SALMON HAD NOT BEEN OVER UTILIZED.

IN OTHER INSTANCES, PARTICULARLY IN THE CASE OF SALMON, MANY STOCKS HAD BEEN DECIMATED BY OVER-UTILIZATION. CONSEQUENTLY, FOLLOWING STATEHOOD, AND CONTINUING SINCE, EXTREMELY RESTRICTIVE REGULATIONS HAVE BEEN PASSED, WHEN DEEMED NECESSARY, IN AN EFFORT TO REBUILD OR REHABILITATE DECIMATED NATURAL SALMON STOCKS. UNEORTUNATELY MANY NATURAL STOCKS COULD NOT RECOVER IN A TIMELY MANNER THROUGH THE MECHANICS OF EITHER RESTRICTED HARVEST OR THE TOTAL ABSENCE OF HARVEST.

RECOGNIZING THAT PROBLEM, COUPLED WITH THE KNOWLEDGE THAT ALASKA ALSO POSSESSED A TREMENDOUS POTENTIAL FOR ENHANCEMENT OF THE SALMON RESOURCE AND ALSO WAS FACED WITH RAPID ACCELERATION OF TROUT AND SALMON SPORT EFFORT, THE 1971 LEGISLATURE, WITH CONCURRENCE OF THE GOVERNOR, CREATED A SPECIAL DIVISION--THE DIVISION OF FISHERIES REHABILITATION, ENHANCEMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT--WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO TACKLE AQUACULTURE PROBLEMS. THE DIVISION WAS REMOVED FROM THE REGULATION ASPECTS OF HARVEST (A MAJOR DEPARTMENTAL EFFORT) SO THAT THE DIVISION COULD CONCENTRATE ON DEVELOPING AND APPLYING REHABILITATION AND ENHANCEMENT TECHNOLOGY. SPECIFIC STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS WERE ENACTED AND ARE AS FOLLOWS:

SEC. 16.05.090. ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT.

(A) THE COMMISSIONER MAY, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE GOVERNOR, ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENTAL DIVISION OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES, A DEPARTMENTAL DIVISION OF SPORT FISHERIES, A DEPARTMENTAL DIVISION OF GAME, AND OTHER DEPARTMENTAL DIVISIONS AS ARE NECESSARY.

(B) THE COMMISSIONER SHALL ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENTAL DIVISION OF FISHERIES REHABILITATION, ENHANCEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (15 ART I CH 94 SLA 1959; AM 1 CH 113 SLA 1971).

SEC. 16.05. 092. DUTIES OF DIVISION OF FISHERIES  
REHABILITATION, ENHANCEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT. THE  
DIVISION OF FISHERIES REHABILITATION, ENHANCEMENT AND  
DEVELOPMENT SHALL:

- (1) DEVELOP AND CONTINUALLY MAINTAIN A COMPREHENSIVE  
COORDINATED STATE PLAN FOR THE ORDERLY PRESENT AND  
LONG-RANGE REHABILITATION, ENHANCEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT  
OF ALL ASPECTS OF THE STATE'S FISHERIES FOR THE PERPETUAL  
USE, BENEFIT AND ENJOYMENT OF ALL CITIZENS AND REVISE  
AND UPDATE THIS PLAN ANNUALLY;
- (2) ENCOURAGE INVESTMENT BY PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN THE  
TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC UTILIZATION OF  
THE FISHERIES RESOURCES;
- (3) THROUGH REHABILITATION, ENHANCEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAMS DO ALL THINGS NECESSARY TO INSURE PERPETUAL  
AND INCREASING PRODUCTION AND USE OF THE FOOD RESOURCES  
OF ALASKA WATERS AND CONTINENTAL SHELF AREAS;
- (4) MAKE A COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE,  
CONTAINING DETAILED INFORMATION REGARDING ITS ACCOMPLISHMENTS  
UNDER THIS SECTION AND PROPOSALS OF PLANS AND ACTIVITIES  
FOR THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR, NOT LATER THAN 20 DAYS AFTER  
THE CONVENING OF EACH REGULAR SESSION. (2 CH 113 SLA  
1971).

IN 1974, RECOGNIZING THAT THE FISHERMEN SHOULD BECOME DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE REHABILITATION AND ENHANCEMENT EFFORT, THE LEGISLATURE PASSED THE PRIVATE NON-PROFIT HATCHERY LOAN ACT. BY AMENDMENT IN 1977 OF THE 1974 ACT, REGIONAL PLANNING TEAMS COULD BE ESTABLISHED THROUGHOUT THE STATE. REGIONAL PLANNING TEAMS ARE COMPRISED OF DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL AND MEMBERS OF REGIONAL FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS. REGIONAL FISHERIES ASSOCIATIONS CONSIST OF A CROSS SECTION OF USER GROUPS INCLUDING COMMERCIAL, SPORT, AND OTHER INTERESTED USERS.

REGIONAL PLANNING TEAMS ARE CHARGED WITH DEVELOPING AND RECOMMENDING TO THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND GAME A COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL PLAN FOR THE REHABILITATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE SALMON RESOURCE. FOUR REGIONAL PLANNING TEAMS PRESENTLY ARE FUNCTIONING IN THE STATE: TWO IN SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA, ONE IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, AND ONE IN COOK INLET. (I HAVE FOUR COPIES OF A RECENTLY DRAFTED PROCEDURES MANUAL THAT I WILL LEAVE FOR YOUR REVIEW.)

CONCURRENT TO THOSE DEVELOPMENTS, THE CAPABILITIES OF THE DIVISION OF FISHERIES REHABILITATION, ENHANCEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (FRED) WERE EXPANDED TO INCLUDE PATHOLOGY, GENETICS, AND ENGINEERING AS WELL AS FISH CULTURE AND BIOLOGY. A MODERN FISH PATHOLOGY LABORATORY HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED IN ANCHORAGE WITH FULL DIAGNOSTIC CAPABILITIES. A REGIONAL PATHOLOGY

LABORATORY WAS OPENED RECENTLY IN JUNEAU. THE JUNEAU PATHOLOGY LABORATORY ALSO SERVES AS THE GENETICS LABORATORY FOR STATEWIDE WORK.

STATE REGULATIONS AND POLICIES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED THAT PROHIBIT MOVEMENT OF ALL LIFE HISTORY STAGES OF FISH AND WILDLIFE INTO, WITHIN, OR OUT OF THE STATE UNLESS APPROVED BY THE COMMISSIONER. INSPECTION FOR DISEASE IS MANDATORY PRIOR TO ANY TRANSPORT.

SINCE 1971, OVER 50 MILLION DOLLARS HAVE BEEN APPROPRIATED TO THE FRED DIVISION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MULTI-SPECIES HATCHERIES AND FISH PASSES, HABITAT IMPROVEMENT, RESEARCH, AND DISEASE PREVENTION RESEARCH AND CONTROL.

THE STATE OF ALASKA'S LONG RANGE SALMON PLAN CALLS FOR ACHIEVING AN AVERAGE ANNUAL HARVEST OF A HUNDRED MILLION SALMON. IT IS DOUBTFUL THAT THAT LEVEL OF HARVEST MAY BE ACHIEVED WITHOUT ASSISTANCE FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. BENEFITS FROM THE STATE'S PROGRAM ARE SHARED WITH NON-RESIDENTS. IN ADDITION, THE PRIVATE-NON PROFIT HATCHERY LOAN ACT ESTABLISHED A 200 MILLION DOLLAR REVOLVING LOAN FUND. SALMON PRODUCED BY THAT LOAN FUND WILL YIELD BENEFITS TO RESIDENTS AND NON-RESIDENTS.

THUS, MR. CHAIRMAN, SINCE 1971, THE STATE OF ALASKA HAS ACTUALLY ESTABLISHED THROUGH ITS MAJOR COMMITMENT TO THE

SALMON RESOURCES THE FRAMEWORK FOR A RATIONAL APPROACH TO ALL AQUACULTURE WITHIN THE STATE THAT COULD EASILY DOVETAIL WITH SENATE BILL 2762.

I CAN MAKE THAT STATEMENT BECAUSE:

PLANNING TEAMS ARE ALREADY BEING ESTABLISHED CONSISTING OF USERS AND RESOURCE MANAGERS. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE EXPANSION TO SPECIES OTHER THAN SALMON IS A MINOR TRANSITION.

MATCHING MONIES WILL BE OR ARE AVAILABLE IN THE PUBLIC AS WELL AS THE PRIVATE-NON PROFIT SECTOR AS EVIDENCED BY THE LOAN PROGRAM AND CATCH ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.

EXISTING ALASKA STATUTES PERMIT THE DEVELOPMENT OF AQUACULTURE.

A SPECIAL FISHERIES DIVISION HAS ALREADY BEEN CREATED TO CARRYOUT SUCH A PROGRAM AND IS STAFFED BY ALL PREREQUISITE DISCIPLINES.

## PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT IN ALASKA

FIRST, THE STATE DOES POSSESS MANY VALUABLE NATURAL STOCKS OF A VARIETY OF SPECIES. THUS AQUACULTURE SHOULD BE INTEGRATED INTO THE EXISTING ECOSYSTEMS WITHOUT DAMAGE TO VALUABLE NATURAL STOCKS. AS LONG AS THE STATE MAINTAINS CONTROL OVER THE MANAGEMENT OF HER NATURAL FISH POPULATIONS AND IS ABLE TO INTEGRATE THE DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF AQUACULTURE TECHNOLOGY INTO THE NATURAL PRODUCING ECOSYSTEMS REGARDLESS OF LAND OWNERSHIP, WE ARE CONFIDENT THAT NATURAL STOCKS WILL BE ADEQUATELY PROTECTED. IF OTHER LAND OWNERS ASSUME CONTROL FOR MANAGEMENT OF AQUATIC RESOURCES WITHIN THEIR BOUNDARIES, WE CANNOT GUARANTEE PROTECTION OF WILD STOCKS THAT MAY PASS THROUGH NON-STATE CONTROLLED ECOSYSTEMS.

WITH THE DIVERSE FEDERAL AND PRIVATE LAND AND WATER OWNERSHIP PATTERNS EVOLVING IN THE STATE AS A RESULT OF ACTIONS UNDER THE ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT, SUCH AS THE PROPOSAL "D-2" LEGISLATION, IT IS DIFFICULT TO ENVISION A RATIONAL APPROACH TO AQUACULTURE IN ALASKA UNLESS ONE AGENCY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND FINAL ADMINISTRATION OF A PLAN. THE STATE OF ALASKA, IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, IS IN THE BEST POSITION TO DEVELOP THAT PLAN AS WELL AS CONTROL ITS APPLICATION. THAT PARTNERSHIP SHOULD NOT ABROGATE THE STATE'S RIGHT TO MANAGE HER FISHERIES

RESOURCES BUT SHOULD REFLECT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ASSIST THE STATE WHEN IT IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES. SINCE MANY NONRESIDENT COMMERCIAL AND SPORT FISHERMEN FISH THE WATERS OF THE STATE, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS AN OBLIGATION TO SUPPLEMENT STATE EFFORTS, NOT CONTROL.

ALASKA IS THE LAST STATE IN THE UNION TO POSSESS VAST ACREAGES OF PUBLIC-OWNED, UNEXPLOITED TERRESTRIAL AND AQUATIC ECOSYSTEMS. MANY OF THOSE PUBLIC-OWNED AQUATIC ECOSYSTEMS ARE HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE, OTHERS ARE NOT. MANY POTENTIAL AQUACULTURE SITES LIE WITHIN FEDERAL LANDS, WHETHER IT BE HATCHERY OR FISH-LADDER SITES OR UNDERUTILIZED LAKE SYSTEMS. WE HAVE ATTEMPTED TO IDENTIFY MANY OF THOSE POTENTIALS IN OUR TESTIMONY REGARDING PROPOSED "D-2" LEGISLATION. MANY POTENTIAL ESTUARINE AND MARINE AQUACULTURE SITES MAY LIE WITHIN BOUNDARIES NOW BEING ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS. WITHOUT SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE THESE SITES ARE DIFFICULT TO IDENTIFY, BUT THE BOUNDARIES ARE BEING DRAWN ANYWAY. WE BELIEVE AQUACULTURE IS A VERY REAL PART OF MULTIPLE USE. IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT THOSE WILDERNESS, REFUGE, AND PARK AREAS NOW UNDER CONSIDERATION BY CONGRESS WILL NOT PRECLUDE A RATIONAL APPROACH TO AQUACULTURE IN THE FUTURE.

ONE OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS THAT WE FACE IS LACK OF KNOWLEDGE REGARDING POTENTIAL AQUACULTURE SITES, WHETHER IT BE FRESH-WATER, ESTUARINE, OR MARINE. FURTHERMORE, MUCH BASELINE DATA MUST BE COLLECTED IF AQUACULTURE IS TO BE INTEGRATED WITH

NATURAL STOCK MANAGEMENT. DEVELOPMENT OF AQUACULTURE AT THE EXPENSE OF NATURAL STOCKS IS IRRESPONSIBLE, BOTH ECONOMICALLY AND ECOLOGICALLY.

ANOTHER MAJOR PROBLEM THAT WE HAVE AS RESOURCE MANAGERS IN ALASKA RESULTS FROM COLD WATER TEMPERATURES AND HIGHLY SEASONAL FOOD AVAILABILITY. MANY OF OUR VALUABLE NON-ANADROMOUS SPORT SPECIES ARE VERY SLOW GROWING AND EXHIBIT OLDER MATURITY SCHEDULES THAN OBSERVED IN THE LOWER-48. THUS, IF EFFORT INCREASES SUBSTANTIALLY IN THE STATE BECAUSE OF AN INFLUX OF SPORT ANGLERS, MANY TROPHY NATIVE STOCKS COULD BE HARVESTED QUICKLY AND IMPACTED ADVERSELY. WE HAVE OBSERVED THIS PROBLEM ADJACENT TO MAJOR POPULATION CENTERS IN ALASKA. THUS, THE CREATION AND ADVERTISING OF REFUGES, PARKS, AND WILDERNESS AREAS, WITH THE ATTENDANT INCREASED INTEREST IN ALASKA ANGLING, COULD HAVE A SIGNIFICANT DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON PRESENTLY UNEXPLOITED FISH POPULATIONS.

SOUND PLANNING BASED UPON CAREFULLY DEVELOPED HARVEST STRATEGIES DERIVED FROM RELIABLE INVESTIGATIONS IS ESSENTIAL, OR OLD-AGED TROPHY FISH AREAS COULD DISAPPEAR RAPIDLY. WITHOUT CAREFUL PLANNING AND PREREQUISITE DATA, PUT-AND-TAKE FISHERIES WILL BE DEMANDED. OBVIOUSLY, AQUACULTURE PLANNING MUST CONSIDER THE NEEDS OF TROPHY ANGLERS AS WELL AS THE LESS ESTHETICALLY INCLINED ANGLERS. TROPHY AREAS SHOULD NOT BE OPENED UP TO HIGH RATES OF EXPLOITATION OR ALTERED BY SUPERIMPOSITION OF HIGH PRODUCTION AQUACULTURE SYSTEMS.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON AQUACULTURE  
BILLS NOW BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE

MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE REVIEWED CAREFULLY AQUACULTURE BILLS HR 9370, S 1043, S 2582, AND S 2762. THERE ARE BASIC SIMILARITIES IN ALL THOSE BILLS, BUT WE FEEL S 2762 MOST NEARLY COINCIDES WITH OUR VIEWS OF DEVELOPMENT OF AQUACULTURE IN ALASKA BECAUSE OF:

- (1) THE TREMENDOUS RANGE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS IN ALASKA;
- (2) OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE DIVERSITY OF USER GROUPS' NEEDS, RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT ALIKE;
- (3) THE STATE'S MANAGERIAL AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAINTAINING AND DEVELOPING THE AQUATIC RESOURCES;
- (4) THE KNOWLEDGE THAT RESIDENTS AND STATE AGENCIES POSSESS REGARDING THE STATE'S WIDE-RANGING ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AND COMPLEX HARVEST PROBLEMS;
- (5) THE INITIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF A COORDINATED PUBLIC-RESOURCE MANAGER PLANNING SYSTEM;

(6) THE DIVERSE STATE-FEDERAL-PRIVATE LAND OWNERSHIP WHICH ENCOMPASSES POTENTIAL AQUACULTURE SITES; AND

(7) RECOGNITION BY THE STATE OF NATIONAL INTERESTS.

THEREFORE, MY TESTIMONY AS COMMISSIONER OF THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME IS DIRECTED TOWARDS SPECIFIC CHANGES IN S.2762 THAT WILL YIELD THE BEST AQUACULTURE PLAN FOR ALASKAN ECOSYSTEMS. THAT PLAN MUST BE DERIVED INITIALLY FROM DATA SOURCES AND FROM PUBLIC AND PRIVATE NEEDS AS CLOSE TO THE RESOURCE AS POSSIBLE. THUS THE STATE AND HER PEOPLE SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD IN ESTABLISHING PRIORITY SPECIES, DATA-BASE NEEDS, POLICY GUIDELINES, AND REGULATIONS THAT WILL PRODUCE AND IMPLEMENT AN ACCEPTABLE PLAN.

MR. CHAIRMAN, AS POINTED OUT EARLIER, MY DEPARTMENT IS DEVELOPING A VERY CLOSE WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH ALASKAN AQUACULTURE ASSOCIATIONS. WE HAVE CAREFULLY REVIEWED COMMENT ON S.2762 TRANSMITTED IN A LETTER OF MARCH 31 TO SENATOR GRAVEL FROM MR. A.W. HALL, BUSINESS MANAGER OF THE PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND AQUACULTURE CORPORATION. WE ENDORSED THOSE COMMENTS. WE ALSO HAVE REVIEWED A LETTER OF APRIL 6, 1978, TRANSMITTED TO SENATOR GRAVEL FROM DR. DEREK POON, GENERAL MANAGER OF THE NORTHERN SOUTHEAST REGIONAL AQUACULTURE ASSOCIATION, AND WE ENDORSE THOSE COMMENTS ON S.2762 ALSO. I WILL LEAVE A COPY OF THESE TWO LETTERS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S PERUSAL AND FOR THE RECORD.

IN ADDITION TO THOSE DEPARTMENTALLY ENDORSED COMMENTS, I  
OFFER THE FOLLOWING FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION:

UNDER "SEC. 4. NATIONAL AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
(A)(2)(C) MEMBERSHIP OF REGIONAL ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEES...."  
WE SUGGEST THE ADDITION OF FISH PROCESSORS TO THE LIST  
OF REPRESENTATIVES.

UNDER "SEC. 5. FUNCTIONS AND POWERS (A)(3)" WE DO NOT  
BELIEVE, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT IT IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS  
OF THE RESOURCES OF ALASKA FOR THE SECRETARY TO PRODUCE  
AND SELL SEED STOCK WITHOUT STATE CONTROL. THE STATE  
NEEDS CONTROL OVER THE SALE AND MOVEMENT OF SEED STOCK  
INTO, WITHIN, OR OUT OF THE STATE IN ORDER TO CARRY OUT  
ITS MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PROTECTING NATURAL  
STOCKS AND FOR MAINTAINING DISEASE AND GENETIC CONTROL.  
WE CONSIDER THIS AUTHORITY AS BEING ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY  
BECAUSE OF THE PRESENT LACK OF FEDERAL CONTROLS IN THIS  
AREA OF CONCERN.

UNDER "SEC. 5.(A)(4)" BECAUSE ALASKA HAS SUCH A COMPLEX  
LAND OWNERSHIP PROBLEM, AND BECAUSE ANADROMOUS STOCKS  
OF SALMON, TROUT, SHEEFISH, AND CHAR MAY PASS THROUGH  
SEVERAL LAND OWNERS, WE BELIEVE IT IS TO THE BEST INTERESTS

OF THE RESOURCES OF ALASKA THAT FEDERAL ENCOURAGEMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REHABILITATION AND ENHANCEMENT TECHNOLOGY BE GIVEN ONLY AFTER APPROVAL BY STATE REGULATORY AGENCIES. WITHOUT ADDITION OF THAT LANGUAGE IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE FOR A FEDERAL AGENCY TO ENCOURAGE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HATCHERY OR OTHER FACILITIES THAT MAY HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON SIGNIFICANT NATURAL STOCKS PASSING THROUGH THE SAME WATERS.

UNDER "SEC. 5.(A)(5)" WE SUGGEST THE ELIMINATION OF THE WORDS "IN AREAS WHERE MULTIPLE LAND AND WATER USES EXIST" AND THE SUBSTITUTION OF THE WORDS "ON ALL FEDERAL AREAS, NOTWITHSTANDING PRESENT LAWS TO THE CONTRARY, AQUACULTURE..." ALASKA'S FISHERIES ARE OF SUCH TREMENDOUS VALUE TO THE STATE AND TO THE NATION AS A WHOLE THAT WE CANNOT AFFORD TO PRECLUDE FISHERY ENHANCEMENT WORK ON ALL OF THE RELATIVELY FEW ACCEPTABLE SITES IN ALASKA SIMPLY BECAUSE OF PRESENT CLASSIFICATIONS, E.G. "WILDERNESS" OR "WILDLIFE REFUGE".

UNDER "SEC. 5. (B)(1)(A)" WE BELIEVE IT IS TO THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STATE'S FISHERY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM THAT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES BE PERMITTED ONLY AFTER CONSULTATION AND APPROVAL BY THE STATE'S REGULATORY AGENCIES. ADDITION OF THAT LANGUAGE, MR. CHAIRMAN, WILL HELP TO PREVENT NEEDLESS DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS AND AGENCIES WORKING AT CROSS PURPOSES.

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT THIS DEPARTMENT'S  
VIEWS. MY STAFF AND I WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR CONSULTATION  
AS MIGHT BE NECESSARY DURING THE COMMITTEE'S DELIBERATIONS.  
PLEASE LET ME KNOW IF YOU WISH OUR HELP AT ANY TIME.

**Northern Southeast Regional  
Aquaculture Association, Inc.**

P.O. BOX 786 SITKA, ALASKA 99835

(907) 747-6850

RM. 205 OLD CITY HALL BLDG.

6 April 1978

The Honorable Mike Gravel  
United States Senate  
3121 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg.  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Gravel:

After reviewing the "National Aquaculture Organic Act of 1978", S-2762 received from your office, I have the following comments for your consideration.

Your aide, Mr. Tom Roach, contacted me last fall at which time we briefly discussed national aquaculture legislation and the possibility of your action. Since that time, Mr. Roach has kept me informed, and I have followed the progress of the legislation with interest. Your efforts to improve the legislation which passed the House are greatly appreciated. Your bill will be much better for Alaska and our fishermen than the House bill.

I have discussed the bill with Mr. Bill Hall of the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation, and I have read his comments and recommendations. I am supportive of Mr. Hall's comments and recommendations for amending the bill.

Additionally, I would like to add some comments.

- (1) I am especially supportive of the regional subcommittee concept in your bill and believe funding and any other support to maximize its effectiveness should be promoted. By developing the plan close to the people, the end product will reflect their interests, experience and expertise. I know that in Southeast Alaska the Forest Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have personnel very knowledgeable about the potential for aquaculture development. Hopefully, these people, state biologists and local fishermen will be able to either serve on a regional subcommittee or provide input directly to the subcommittee.
- (2) The NSRAA Board of Directors has taken a strong position in favor of rehabilitation of natural salmon

6 April 1978

Page 2

stocks. The preferred emphasis is on cost-effective projects which complement and enhance rather than conflict with or replace natural production. A matching federal, state or local grant program to stimulate the efforts of fishermen and other groups to this area would greatly benefit Alaska.


- (3) I am requesting, in a separate letter, that your Juneau office send copies of your comments in the Congressional Record prefacing introduction of S-2762 to each NSRAA Board member to keep them informed of developments on the national legislation. You may receive some additional comments from them.

Enclosed are copies of our latest informational brochures which were sent to fishermen explaining our program. These materials may give you some ideas on how to coordinate our plans with the national aquaculture plan and possibilities for our Association to work in partnership with the federal and state governments through a combination of grants, loans and insurance to enhance our fisheries.

Finally, I would like to restate my support for your bill S-2762, and the proposed changes recommended by Mr. Bill Hall. S-2762, especially with the suggested changes, will benefit Alaska more than Mr. Leggett's bill HR 9370.

Thank you for keeping us informed.

Sincerely,

  
Derek Poon, Ph.D.  
General Manager

DP/EJ/vf

cc: Bob Palmer, Office of the Governor  
Keith Specking, Office of the Governor  
Dr. Ronald A. Skoog, Commissioner, ADF&G  
John A. Sandor, Regional Forester, U.S.F.S.  
Dr. Bill Smoker, Sr., NMFS  
Jack Milnes, Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Assn.  
Armin Koernig, Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corp.  
Floyd E. Heimbuch, Cook Inlet Aquaculture Assn.  
Senator Ted Stevens  
Senator Henry Jackson  
Senator Warren Magnusson

Enc.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

March 28, 1978

Honorable Jay Kerttula  
Alaska State Senate  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Jay:

Last week I sent to you a copy of my recently introduced Aquaculture bill, S 2762.

The accompanying letter stated that hearings on this bill will be held on April 18, 1978. That is a mistake. The hearings are scheduled for April 17, 1978 in the Senate Commerce Committee hearing room. I apologize if this may have caused you any inconvenience.

With best regards,

Sincerely,



Mike Gravel

MG/tr

*File  
Aquaculture*

# United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

April 19, 1978

Honorable Jay Kerttula  
Alaska State Senate  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Jay:

Activity on the several Aquaculture bills has picked up considerably this past week in the Senate. Hearings were held on Monday and Wednesday of this week before Senate Magnuson of the Senate Commerce Committee. Hearings were also held on Tuesday and Thursday before Senator Stone of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

The Commerce Committee considered the Leggett bill (HR 9370), the Weiker Bill (S 2582) and my bill, S 2762. The Agriculture Committee focused on the Stone bill (S2218), the Bentsen bill (S 1043), which I co-sponsored last year, and my bill, too.

I have enclosed a copy of my testimony here for your interest. It seems that the two Committees are receptive to the three proposals I have initiated. General acceptance is growing for the necessity to include (1) regional input in the National Plan, (2) rehabilitation and enhancement measures, and (3) aquaculture as a coastal activity deserving of consideration along with all other competing activities.

The next step will probably be a single bill written by the staffs of both the Commerce Committee and the Agriculture Committee working together. Hopefully this cooperative Committee print will include our proposals.

Honorable Jay Kerttula  
April 19, 1978  
Page 2

---

This should bring you in the State up to date on where the legislation stands down here. I'll keep you informed of further developments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mike Gravel".

Mike Gravel

MG/tr  
Enclosure

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE GRAVEL  
BEFORE THE  
COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION  
COMMITTEE  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
APRIL 17, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, I THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TODAY TO COMMENT ON THE SEVERAL PIECES OF AQUACULTURE LEGISLATION WHICH ARE PRESENTLY UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE. AQUACULTURE IS PRACTICED IN VARYING DEGREES OF INTENSITY THROUGHOUT THE WORLD AND I BELIEVE THE TIME IS NOW RIGHT TO PROVIDE LEGISLATIVE ENCOURAGEMENT FOR AQUACULTURE ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES.

AQUACULTURE - AN OVERVIEW

THE WORLD ACTIVITY IN AQUACULTURE IS WIDE AND VARIED. CHINA HAS BEEN CULTIVATING FISH FOR OVER 2000 YEARS. JAPAN NOW PRODUCES MORE THAN TEN PER CENT OF ITS SEAFOOD NEEDS THROUGH AQUACULTURE. AND RUSSIA HAS BEEN GIVING AQUACULTURE INCREASED ATTENTION.

PAGE TWO

THE UNITED STATES HAS BEEN DABBLING IN VARIOUS FORMS OF AQUACULTURE FOR A CONSIDERABLE PERIOD OF TIME, BUT A LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REPORT INDICATES THAT AQUACULTURE IN THE U.S. HAS GROWN INSIGNIFICANTLY COMPARED TO SUCH ACTIVITIES IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD.

MY HOME STATE OF ALASKA HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN THE CULTIVATION OF FIN FISH SINCE THE LATE 1890s. WITH MORE THAN 50% OF THE ENTIRE U.S. COASTLINE LOCATED WITHIN THE STATE OF ALASKA, ONE CAN UNDERSTAND WHY MY INTEREST IN AQUACULTURE IS GREAT. THE POTENTIAL FOR MARINE AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN ALASKA IS TRULY INCREDIBLE, NOT TO MENTION THE VAST POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE FRESH-WATER CULTIVATION.

#### AQUACULTURE - MARKET POTENTIAL

WORLD FISHERY RESOURCES WERE ONCE THOUGHT TO BE PRACTICALLY UNLIMITED. THIS HAS BEEN CLEARLY SHOWN NOT TO BE THE CASE. THE WORLD FISHERY RESOURCES ARE NOW ESTIMATED BY SOME EXPERTS TO BE

PAGE THREE

CAPABLE OF YIELDING A MAXIMUM GLOBAL HARVEST OF 100 TO 150 MILLION METRIC TONS PER YEAR. MORE CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATES RARELY EXCEED 100 MILLION METRIC TONS, INCLUDING THAT OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, WHICH ESTIMATES THAT THE 100 MILLION METRIC TON FIGURE WILL BE MET BY 1980. THIS SUGGESTS THAT A WORLD SHORTAGE OF FISH PRODUCTS IS POSSIBLE IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

WORLD PER CAPITA FISH CONSUMPTION HAS INCREASED OVER THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS AND IN THE U.S. ALONE HAS RISEN TO A PRESENT LEVEL OF 12.9 POUNDS PER PERSON PER YEAR. RELIABLE ESTIMATES PROJECT AMERICAN CONSUMPTION TO INCREASE TO 15.2 POUNDS BY THE YEAR 2000. A LIBRARY OF CONGRESS STUDY HAS PREDICTED THAT IN THE SAME PERIOD OF TIME OVERALL DEMAND FOR SEAFOOD PRODUCTS IN THE U.S., BOTH EDIBLE AND INDUSTRIAL, IS EXPECTED TO INCREASE BY A FULL 80%.

ALL THESE INDICATORS SUGGEST THAT THE DEMAND FOR FISH

PAGE FOUR

PRODUCTS WILL ONLY CONTINUE TO INCREASE IN THE YEARS TO COME. WITH WILD FISH STOCK EXPLOITATION REACHING MAXIMUM LEVELS, PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF FISH PRODUCTS ON THE RISE AND THE WORLD POPULATION EXPECTED TO INCREASE FROM A LEVEL OF 4 BILLION TODAY TO 6 BILLION BY THE TURN OF THE CENTURY, AQUACULTURE MUST BE VIEWED AS A PROMISING POSSIBILITY IN HELPING TO MEET THESE FOOD DEMANDS.

AQUACULTURE - ECONOMIC POTENTIAL

FOR A NATION PRACTICALLY SURROUNDED BY WATER AND REplete WITH POSSIBLE SITES FOR RAISING INLAND FISH SPECIES, FISHERY IMPORTS INTO THE U.S. ARE SURPRISINGLY HIGH. IN 1976 THE U.S. IMPORTED 6.2 BILLION POUNDS OF FISHERY PRODUCTS VALUED AT \$2.2 BILLION. THE U.S. FISHERY EXPORTS IN 1976 AMOUNTED TO 241 MILLION POUNDS, VALUED AT ONLY \$330 MILLION.

THIS LEAVES A NET ANNUAL TRADE DEFICIT OF PRACTICALLY \$2 BILLION FOR FOREIGN FISH PRODUCTS WHERE CLOSE TO 65% OF FISH

PAGE FIVE

CONSUMED IN THE U.S. IS IMPORTED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

THE STUDIOUS APPLICATION OF AQUACULTURE TECHNIQUES COULD HELP TO REVERSE THIS UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE SITUATION. A PROMOTION OF AQUACULTURE WILL RESULT IN THE CREATION OF MANY NEW JOBS, FISHERY EMPLOYMENT ON A YEAR-ROUND RATHER THAN A SEASONAL BASIS, AND AN OVERALL STABILITY TO THE HISTORICAL BOOM OR BUST FISHERY ECONOMY.

NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ORGANIC ACT - INTENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ORGANIC ACT OF 1978 WILL PROVIDE LONG OVERDUE IMPETUS TO THE PROMOTION OF AQUACULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES. MY DESIRE IS TO ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF AQUACULTURE OF ALL TYPES IN ALL PARTS OF THE U.S. THIS WOULD INCLUDE ENCOURAGING AQUACULTURE FOR MARINE, AS WELL AS FRESH WATER, SPECIES: FOR AQUATIC PLANTS, AS WELL AS AQUATIC ANIMALS: FOR PRESENTLY CULTURED SPECIES, AS WELL AS SPECIES AS YET UNTESTED BY THE TECHNIQUES OF AQUACULTURE: AND FOR THE

PAGE SIX

REHABILITATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF PUBLIC FISHERIES, AS WELL AS THE PROMOTION OF COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES.

TO ACCOMPLISH THESE GOALS, MY LEGISLATION DESIGNATES THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AS THE AGENCY WITH ULTIMATE RESPONSIBILITY. THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT WILL, HOWEVER, OPERATE IN CLOSE CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND INTERIOR, AS BOTH THOSE DEPARTMENTS HAVE PROVEN THEMSELVES EXPERT IN MANY IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF AQUACULTURE. THERE ARE MANY FACETS TO AQUACULTURE, AND I BELIEVE NO SINGLE AGENCY CAN OR SHOULD BE NAMED THE EXCLUSIVE AUTHORITY. THE BETTER APPROACH IS TO TAP THE EXISTING EXPERTISE OF THE SEVERAL DEPARTMENTS AND COORDINATE ALL AQUACULTURE EFFORTS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

AN INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON AQUACULTURE WILL BE FORMED TO FACILITATE AND COORDINATE INFORMATION AND ACTIVITIES AMONG THE THREE DEPARTMENTS, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER AGENCIES AND PARTIES INVOLVED.

PAGE SEVEN

MY LEGISLATION ALSO PROVIDES FOR THE FORMULATION OF A NATIONAL AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN. THIS PLAN, TO BE DRAWN UP IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING ENACTMENT, WILL EMBODY CONCRETE SUGGESTIONS ON SPECIFIC DIRECTIONS AND PRIORITIES TO PURSUE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AQUACULTURE IN THE U.S.

A GRANT PROGRAM WILL ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION IN WHAT IS GENERALLY CONSIDERED A RATHER EXPENSIVE ENTERPRISE. THESE GRANTS WILL ALLOW THE PRIVATE ENTREPRENEUR TO GET INVOLVED IN A VENTURE THAT WOULD OTHERWISE, BY VIRTUE OF PROHIBITIVE START-UP COSTS, BE RESERVED FOR LARGE CORPORATIONS OR THE INDIVIDUAL OF GREAT WEALTH.

A FEDERAL AQUACULTURE ASSISTANCE FUND IS CREATED FOR THREE PURPOSES: (A) TO FACILITATE AQUACULTURE FINANCING BY GUARANTEEING LOANS MADE TO AQUACULTURE OPERATIONS SINCE SUCH LOANS HAVE HISTORICALLY BEEN UNREASONABLY DIFFICULT TO OBTAIN; (B) TO MAKE DISASTER LOANS FOR AQUACULTURE STOCKS WHICH ARE DESTROYED BY

PAGE EIGHT

UNAVOIDABLE DISEASES: AND (C) TO PROVIDE INSURANCE COVERAGE TO AQUACULTURE OPERATIONS IN THOSE INSTANCES WHERE INSURANCE IS NOT OTHERWISE AVAILABLE.

NATIONAL AQUACULTURE ORGANIC ACT -  
COMPARISON TO OTHER AQUACULTURE LEGISLATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, MY AQUACULTURE BILL, S.2762 IS IN MANY RESPECTS SIMILAR TO THE OTHER TWO PIECES OF AQUACULTURE LEGISLATION UNDER CONSIDERATION BY YOUR COMMITTEE TODAY. H.R.9370, THE HOUSE AQUACULTURE BILL, AND S.2582, THE WEICKER AQUACULTURE BILL, BOTH CONTAIN NUMEROUS POINTS WHICH COINCIDE WITH THE PROPOSALS I MAKE IN S.2762.

THERE ARE, HOWEVER, THREE IMPORTANT NEW AREAS WHICH MY BILL EMPHASIZES, AND I SHOULD LIKE BRIEFLY TO EXPLAIN THEM:

FIRST, UNLIKE THE OTHER AQUACULTURE LEGISLATION, I WOULD REQUIRE THAT THE NATIONAL AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT PLAN BE FORMULATED ONLY AFTER INFORMATION IS SYSTEMATICALLY GATHERED FROM ALL PARTS OF THE UNITED STATES. TO ENSURE ADEQUATE INPUT FROM INTERESTS AS DIVERSE AS

PAGE NINE

SHRIMP FARMERS IN FLORIDA, SALMON RANCHERS IN ALASKA, OYSTER RAISERS IN MAINE AND CATFISH FARMERS IN THE MID-WEST, INFORMATION MUST BE GATHERED ON A REGIONAL BASIS. ONLY AFTER THESE SUGGESTIONS ARE RECEIVED FROM ALL PARTS OF THE COUNTRY SHOULD A NATIONAL PLAN BE DRAWN UP. THIS WILL GUARANTEE THAT THE PLAN WILL BE TAILORED TO THE VARIED INTERESTS AND NEEDS OF AQUACULTURISTS THROUGHOUT ALL 50 STATES.

SECOND, I ADD THE ENHANCEMENT AND REHABILITATION OF TRADITIONAL PUBLICLY OWNED FISH STOCKS AS A MAJOR GOAL TO BE ADDRESSED BY THIS LEGISLATION. IT SEEMS OBVIOUS THAT IN ADDITION TO ENCOURAGING DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCIAL AQUACULTURE FOR THE PRIVATE SECTOR, WE SHOULD NOT OVERLOOK THE DESIRABILITY OF REHABILITATING THE NUMEROUS DEPLETED FISH STOCKS WHICH ARE OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO THE PUBLIC SECTOR.

THE THIRD AND FINAL ISSUE OF IMPORTANCE MY BILL ADDRESSES IS THE PROBLEM OF LAND AND WATER ACCESS FOR AQUACULTURE FACILITIES.

PAGE TEN

I BELIEVE THE CONTRIBUTIONS WHICH AQUACULTURE CAN MAKE IN HELPING TO MEET NUTRITIONAL NEEDS, STIMULATING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY, AND ENHANCING EXISTING FISHERIES WARRANT ITS BEING GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION IN LAND AND WATER USE MANAGEMENT DELIBERATIONS.

CONCLUSION

MR. CHAIRMAN, AQUACULTURE IS CERTAINLY AN ACTIVITY THAT HAS BEEN NEGLECTED IN THIS COUNTRY FOR TOO LONG. THE NUMEROUS BENEFITS TO BE GAINED -- COMMERCIAL, NUTRITIONAL AND CONSERVATIONAL, TO NAME BUT THREE, -- HAVE NOT YET BEEN FULLY APPRECIATED. PASSAGE OF THIS LEGISLATION WILL BE A POSITIVE STEP TOWARDS TRANSLATING THESE NUMEROUS POTENTIAL BENEFITS INTO TANGIBLE REALITIES.

# TELEGRAM

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS CO.  
PHONE 583-8640  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99901

1978 APR 24 PM 8 10

20059 NL KENAI ALASKA 50 04-24 0300P AST

PMS SEN KAY PLAND

JUNEAU

CIAA AGREES WITH SJR49 BY SEN KERTTULA. HIS IS A REASONABLE APPROACH FOR HELPING SALMON RETURNS IN CONTRAST TO THOSE WHO WOULD CURTAIL ALL AQUACULTURE EFFORTS UNTIL THEY WERE ASSURED OPPORTUNITY TO HARVEST NOW REGARDLESS OF CONSEQUENCES. PLEASE SUPPORT THIS RESOLUTION AND HELP SALMON, NOT VESTED INTEREST GROUPS.

COOK INLET AQUACULTURE ASSN FLOYD E HEIMBUCH, MANAGER

SJR

50

COMMITTEE REPORT  
SENATE

4/18/78

FURTHER: Finance

Date: 4/18/78

Mr. President:

The Committee on RESOURCES has had SJR 50  
Alaska Power Authority / Susitna Hydroelectric Project

under consideration and (a majority of the committee) (the committee reports it back as follows)

- recommends it do pass                       recommends it do not pass
- recommends it do pass with attached amendment(s)
- recommends it be replaced with CS for \_\_\_\_\_

and \_\_\_\_\_  new title               same title

- AND attaches a Letter of Intent               New Fiscal Note
- reports it back without recommendation
- and recommends it be referred to the \_\_\_\_\_ Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING DO PASS:

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

H. Poland  
Chairman

Offered: \_\_\_\_\_  
Referred: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE \_\_\_\_\_

JOINT RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

Relating to the Alaska Power Authority, the Phase I environmental, economic, social and engineering studies of the Susitna Hydroelectric Project and the incurring of indebtedness for Phase I.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

WHEREAS, the Alaska Power Authority pursuant to AS 44.36.180 has submitted to the Legislature and to the Commissioner of Commerce and Economic Development a statement outlining the status of the Susitna Hydroelectric Project and the Plan of Study outlining the necessary feasibility studies of the project which is planned to be designed, and may be acquired or constructed by the United States under an agreement providing for ownership of the Project by the Authority; and

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States on October 22, 1976, enacted P.L. 94-587, the Alaska Hydroelectric Power Development Act, which Act authorized the Secretary of the Army and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to participate in the Susitna Hydroelectric Project; and

WHEREAS, there is now pending before the Congress a proposal which would amend P.L. 94-587 so as to authorize an agreement between the United States and the Alaska Power Authority which will provide that the United States will reimburse the Authority for any of the Authority funds expended in the Phase I stage of the Busitna Hydroelectric Project should the Phase I report not be favorable or should the Authority within three years of the completion of the report be unable to borrow money to pay the construction costs of the project, including the costs of the Phase I studies, based on the security of the project or its revenues; and

WHEREAS, the Phase I activities outlined delineate the environmental, economic, social and engineering studies requisite to informed decision making; and

WHEREAS, the cost to be incurred during Phase I is now estimated to be \$25,000,000 but may exceed that amount; and

WHEREAS, it is deemed to be in the best interests of the State of Alaska to proceed with Phase I of the project through the use of Alaska Power Authority sponsored financing.

WHEREAS, Phase I studies shall provide for substantive public involvement throughout the study process; and

WHEREAS, Legislative approval of project construction is required should project feasibility and desirability result from the study process conducted under Phase I activities.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislature of the State of Alaska urges the passage by the Congress of the United States of the proposed amendments to P.L. 94-587 so that the Alaska Power Authority may go forward with a program of financing and may enter into any necessary agreements pursuant to the proposed amendments; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED that, based on the plan outlined in the statement of the Alaska Power Authority to the Legislature and to the Commissioner of Commerce and Economic Development, the Legislature agrees to the incurring of indebtedness by the Alaska Power Authority contingent upon passage of amendments to P.L. 94-507 in an amount necessary to finance the cost of the Phase 7 feasibility studies of the Kusinac Hydroelectric Project, including interest.

Outline of the Present Status of the Susitna  
Hydroelectric Project and Action to be Taken by the  
Alaska Power Authority for Financing of the Phase I  
Advanced Engineering and Design of the Project

Historical Background: The tremendous energy potential of the Susitna River has been known for many years. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, along with private institutions have conducted numerous studies of Susitna's potential. Both of the Federal agencies conducted reconnaissance level studies in the late 1940's and each published their findings in the early 1950's. The more specific and detailed early studies were performed by the Bureau of Reclamation. In fact, in a 1960 feasibility report, the Bureau of Reclamation outlined a plan of development in the Upper Susitna River Basin consisting of four high-head dams with a combined firm annual energy capability of roughly 6.3 billion kilowatt hours. The Bureau studies were backed up by limited foundation exploration for three of the four damsites (Devil Canyon, Vee and Denali were drilled, Watana was not drilled). However, with the discovery of Cook Inlet natural gas, the economic attractiveness of the Susitna project plummeted. With the formation of the international oil cartel and the dramatic rise in fuel costs during the 1970's, Congress requested that the Corps of Engineers re-evaluate the Bureau of Reclamation proposal for developing the Upper Susitna River and to report its recommendations and findings to Congress. Because of questionable foundation conditions at the upper two damsites (Vee and Denali), and the attendant environmental impact associated with those two projects, the Corps modified the proposed development by raising the height of the second upstream dam, Watana, and deleting the Vee and Denali dams. The two-dam Devil Canyon-Watana scheme of development would provide 6.1 billion kilowatt hours firm annual energy but at a lesser cost and environmental impact than the four dam scheme. The Corps evaluated a number of energy alternatives and concluded that coal fired generation and Susitna hydroelectric are the most feasible long range options for the rail-belt energy demand. Of the two options, the economic attractiveness of the Susitna project appears to be significantly greater than coal fired steam generation. In October 1977 dollars, the estimated construction cost of the two dam scheme and attendant transmission facilities is \$2.1 billion. The average annual energy cost from Susitna is estimated to be at least 30 percent less than that of its coal counterpart.

Project Description: The Upper Susitna River Basin is a 5810 square mile area bordered on the North and West by the Alaskan Mountain range, and on the South by the Talkeetna Mountains.

## Attachment A

Present Susitna Status  
Page Two

Primary wildlife within the basin consists of moose, bear, dall sheep, caribou, wolf, raptors, and resident fish. Anadromous fish do not migrate into the Upper Susitna, but they do spawn in the streams and sloughs downstream from the basin outlet. The river is glacially fed and averages 7.1 million acre feet of runoff annually. The plan of development includes an 810 foot high earthfill dam at the Watana site, a 635 foot high thin-arch dam at Devil Canyon and 365 miles of transmission line. The Watana project would inundate 43,000 acres of land and 54 miles of natural river. Devil Canyon would flood 7500 acres of land and 28 miles of river. In tandem, the projects would produce a total of 6.1 billion kilowatt hours of firm annual energy and an average of 0.8 billion kilowatt hours of annual secondary energy. It is estimated that Watana could be on line by 1990 and as demand dictates, presumably five years later, Devil Canyon would be brought on line. Based on the preliminary design, the two projects would be capable of withstanding the effects of an 8.5 magnitude earthquake with an epicenter of 40 miles from the projects.

Present Status: The Corps of Engineers submitted their Susitna feasibility report to Congress in 1976. Pending the Chief of Engineers final report to Congress, the project was given conditional authorization to proceed to Phase I Advanced Engineering and Design as a federal project. (Section 160, Water Resources Development Act of 1976, P.L. 94-587). Contained in the same bill is Section 203 known as the Alaska Hydropower Development Fund. This section provides for a joint venture in developing hydropower projects in Alaska in which, for previously authorized hydropower projects, the Corps of Engineers would design and construct the project using state financing and the state would own and operate the project. Bradley Lake and Snettisham are the only authorized projects in the state which qualify for development under this program. Because the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) felt that there was insufficient field exploration to substantiate the project cost estimate contained in the Corps 1976 feasibility report, the Chief of Engineers did not make his final report to Congress. Thus, Susitna remains an unauthorized project, disqualifying it for participation under Section 203. However, in order to provide the necessary explorations the Corps has made \$3.0 million available for a twelve month foundation exploration program which should lead to final authorization of the project. That twelve month effort began on January 1, 1978, and the Corps is presently conducting its explorations at the Watana damsite.

1978 Water Resources Development Act: Since Section 203, as it presently reads, makes it difficult for the state to provide

## Attachment A

Present Susitna Status

Page Three

the necessary financing for Phase I studies, the Act will be amended under the 1978 Water Resources Development Act. State and federal personnel, along with their bond counsel and financial and legal advisors have agreed upon the proper language which should be contained in Section 203. Also included in the pending bill will be direct authorization of the Susitna Project thus making it eligible for Section 203 participation exclusive of the OMB desire for the \$3.0 million twelve month exploration program. The bill should reach the Senate Water Resources Subcommittee in latter April. The House version of the bill will probably not contain the amending language for Section 203 nor direct authorization for Susitna. Thus, these items will have to be added in conference committee. Considering the other national issues, it is estimated that the bill will not be authorized before July, 1978. Thus the Phase I Studies could begin by the latter part of the 1978 field season.

Alaska Power Authority Action: It is the intention of the Alaska Power Authority to participate under Section 203 for the Phase I studies. Financing for the studies would come from the sale of tax exempt municipal bonds; thus, the debt would not become a general obligation of the state. Should the \$25,000,000 plus Phase I studies indicate that the project is not feasible, the Federal Government would repay the cost and interest of the bonds. At the conclusion of the Phase I studies, the State would have the option to proceed into construction with the Corps of Engineers or to use the services of a private engineering firm. Many of the studies to be conducted under Phase I would be managed by the Power Authority rather than the Corps of Engineers.

Plan of Study: The Alaska Power Authority made \$100,000 available to the Alaska District Corps of Engineers in July, 1977 for the purpose of developing the Phase I Study program. The Corps submitted their first draft to the State in September, 1977. Based on the State's review comments, the Corps is now finalizing the Susitna Plan of Study.

Land Status: The Susitna project would flood roughly 50,000 acres of land of which roughly 24,000 acres have been classified as power withdrawal lands. This land, along with most of the remainder needed for the two proposed dams and reservoirs, has been claimed by the Cook Inlet Native Corporation and four native villages. Until the land can be transferred to the Natives, the Bureau of Land Management retains custody for the Federal Government. Prior to entry for Phase I studies, access permission would be necessary from either BLM or the Native Associations depending on the owners at that time. The Cook Inlet Region is presently

## Attachment A

### Present Susitna Status Page Four

negotiating with the four villages to trade them out of the Susitna land. Presumably, the region would then negotiate the Susitna land for possible excess military land on Fort Richardson. The State could then claim the Susitna land under the terms of the Statehood Act, if it so desired.

D-2 Classification: Although the Susitna River was included as one of twenty rivers that should be studied by the BLM for possible classification as a Wild and Scenic River in 1972, Susitna was dropped from the list during the early screening. It was suggested in the study, however, that Susitna should be studied further. The House Interior Committee has drafted their version of the D-2 Land Classification Bill and has excluded Susitna from any D-2 classification. If the project is classified as a river to be studied for Wild and Scenic River classification, without special exemption, the Phase I studies would not be permitted until the completion of the study.

Funding: \$5.45 million has been included in the federal appropriation for input to the Alaska Hydroelectric Power Development Fund. This is the estimated cost of financing the first year of the four year Phase I study. However, since the total estimated cost including interest is in excess of \$25.0 million, it would be desirable that the entire amount be placed in the Fund. As a show of good faith, upon enactment of the 1978 Water Resources Development Act, the Power Authority, through the sale of revenue bonds, would make available the full study cost amount. This would be held in escrow and could only be used to finance the Phase I studies to the extent that matching funds are made available from federal funds. This show of good faith should provide the leverage for the Federal Government to put up the remainder of matching funds needed for Phase I.

Agreement: A mutual agreement between the Alaska Power Authority and the Corps of Engineers for the Phase I studies would be developed and signed pursuant to passage of the 1978 Water Resources Omnibus Bill.

5/4/78

Anch. News

## Dam project closer to realization, Gravel says

By the Associated Press

U.S. Senate approval Wednesday of two amendments to the Waterway Users Bill brings Alaska's proposed Susitna hydroelectric project closer to realization, according to the office of Senator Mike Gravel.

The Alaska Democrat wrote both amendments, which were accepted without a vote. They change the Alaska Hydroelectric Power Development Act of 1976, also written by Gravel. That act originally authorized the Alaska dams.

The project would involve construction of two dams on the Susitna River between Anchorage and Fair-

banks. It would have a capacity of 1,500 megawatts and would provide about 60 percent of electricity needs in Alaska's railbelt cities. The project could be completed as early as 1980, Gravel's office reports.

One of Gravel's amendments would allow the Army Corps of Engineers to go ahead with phase one planning work. Under the 1976 act, the Office of Management and Budget was to approve the corps' feasibility studies before phase one work began. But Gravel contends favorable studies of the Alaska project and three others in the lower 48 have been held up by the OMB.

# Senate Kills Gravel's Push Of New Canal

By BETTY MILLS

Times Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON — The Senate today defeated, 49-43, an amendment offered by Sen. Mike Gravel, D-Alaska, authorizing a study of the feasibility of a new sea-level Panama Canal.

Gravel offered the amendment to the waterway users bill now being considered by the Senate.

The Alaska Democrat, the leading champion in the Senate of the sea-level canal concept, pointed out that the present canal is obsolete, saying "we're wasting money."

"To not move forward to acquire knowledge is not very foresighted," he added. The amendment would authorize \$8 million for the study.

Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M., spoke against the amendment, saying the Panama Canal treaties ratified by the Senate provide for a study on the possibility of a new canal.

Alaska Republican Ted Stevens voted against Gravel's amendment.

The amendment was subject only to brief debate, with Gravel, the floor manager of the waterways bill in his capacity as chairman of the water resources subcommittee, telling the Senate that the issue had been discussed extensively during the canal treaties debate.

Gravel brought the amendment up late Tuesday and said, "I know of no objection to it but put the issue over for a vote today "because of the recent controversy involved over the treaty."

In other action on the waterways bill, the senate accepted two Gravel amendments which moved the Susitna hydroelectric project closer to realization. One amendment allows the Corps of Engineers to proceed with phase one work on the project, which involves the construction of win dams on the Susitna River.

When completed, the project would provide some 60 percent of the electricity needs in Alaska's railbelt region.

Also adopted were improvements in the technical language dealing (See Page 2, Col. 1)

# Senate Rejects Bid For New Canal Study

(Continued from Page One)

with financing of the project.

Both amendments were adopted unanimously by voice vote Monday.

The 1976 law authorizing the Susitna project, which was sponsored by Gravel, provided for a preliminary feasibility study by the Corps of Engineers, assessing the project. After a review of the feasibility study by the White House Office of Management and Budget, the corps would proceed to phase one work — design, cost/benefit analysis and final environmental impact statements.

Gravel sponsored the new amendment since the budget office has held up the favorable feasibility study on the Susitna project.

The 1976 law also provided for state bonding to pay for the project, with federal guarantees for phase one work. The state would own the dams, with the corps constructing them as contractors for the state.

The second amendment improved problems in the language of the 1976 law dealing with state bonding and the federal guarantees. They included time limitations on the corps work; necessary congressional appropriations; congressional approval of a corps-state contract; and state bonding.

Gravel believes that state bonding to pay for major water projects will overcome objections to the projects.

"If we're successful in bringing this about in Alaska, it will probably

be the way all future hydro projects will be funded," Gravel said.

Also adopted unanimously by the Senate was an amendment offered by Stevens to provide for a Corps of Engineers study of an erosion control project in Bethel. The amendment sparked a brief discourse between Alaska's two senators.

Stevens said the project "is desperately needed to protect the property and lives of the people who live in this growing community in Alaska."

Gravel said the Public Works Committee authorized a similar study last September.

"Let us put it in, and the senator can drop it in conference if it is not needed," Stevens told Gravel.

Gravel responded: "I think my colleague will recognize that I would not want the impression left in Bethel that I was not Johnny-on-the-spot in taking care of their interests."

"We are both Johnnies-on-the-spot. We just want to make sure the corps tells us the same thing," Stevens said.

Gravel replied: "The Public Works Committee has already done this, but if it takes redundancy to get the attention of the corps, I do not mind it."

**CHILKOOT  
CHARLIE  
SEZ**

Old-timer: one who remembers when a man did his own withholding on his take-home pay.



## The Anchorage Times

Published every afternoon and every Sunday morning except certain holidays by the Anchorage Times Publishing Co., 820 Fourth Ave., Anchorage, Alaska 99501. Mail subscriptions, including postage, per month in Alaska: Daily \$7.49, Sunday \$4.50.

Second class postage paid at Anchorage, Alaska, and at additional mailing offices.

Represented nationally by  
Cresmer, Woodward  
O'Mara & Ormsbee Inc.

**THE QUALITY JEWELRY STORE TO SERVE YOU**  
Diamonds, Watches, Gifts Alaskan Jewelry  
**YOUR JEWELRY HEADQUARTERS**  
REMEMBER!!

"If We Can't Repair Your Watch or Jewelry THROW IT AWAY"

*Carl's Spenard Jewelers*  
**AND GIFTS**

Main Store Northern Lights Shopping Center 279-2722  
Carl's Benifaze 5530 E. Northern Lights 333-4222  
Carl's Golden Lion Hotel 36th & N. Seward 278-4361 Ext. 271

SJR

54

# COMMITTEE REPORT

## SENATE

6/1/78

FURTHER: None

Date: 6/4/78

Mr. President:

The Committee on RESOURCES has had SJR 54  
exemption of Alaska from section 603 of the BLM Organic Act

under consideration and (a majority of the committee) (the committee reports it back as follows)

- recommends it do pass                      ( ) recommends it do not pass  
( ) recommends it do pass with attached amendment(s)  
( ) recommends it be replaced with CS for \_\_\_\_\_

and \_\_\_\_\_ ( ) new title                      ( ) same title

- ( ) AND attaches a Letter of Intent                      ( ) New Fiscal Note  
( ) reports it back without recommendation  
( ) and recommends it be referred to the \_\_\_\_\_ Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING DO PASS:

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

*[Handwritten signatures]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*[Handwritten signature]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

PHIL R. HOLDSWORTH, P.E.  
CONSULTING ENGINEER & LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL  
MINING - GEOLOGY - LANDS

PHONE 907-586-1383

326 FOURTH STREET No. 1009  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

May 31, 1978

The Honorable Ted Stevens  
United States Senate  
411 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Ted:

Enclosed is a copy of my comments on the BLM's draft Wilderness Review Procedures. Am sure you are familiar with Sec. 1307 of H.R. 39 as it moved between House Committees. I believe every effort should be made to see that a similar provision remains in the final bill as it passes the Congress.

As you may know, WGM has been denied a permit to construct an airstrip to serve two very promising deposits north of Kotzebue; one held by General Crude and Houston Oil & Minerals, and the other by Cominco. These deposits are near enough to each other to be served by a common airstrip. They are on 17(d)(1) lands. This action is, in effect, denying the right of reasonable access to develop valid existing mining claims which is guaranteed under the mining laws.

In another case, a supply train with tracked vehicles and sleds moving fuel and other supplies over the snow early this spring, and on an existing mine road along the upper Tok River southeast of Fairbanks, was stopped by BLM in the field. The destination was valid claims staked on state selected lands. In both cases the movement of needed materials by helicopter would be economically prohibitive, considering the advanced stage of development and the distances involved.

It is because of these incidents, and the policies of BLM as applied in the field, even before finalization of their Wilderness Review Procedures and the application of Sec. 603 of FLMPA, that serious consideration should be given to amending FLMPA. The provisions of Sec. 603 should not apply to the remainder of Alaska public lands following the final identification of the National Interest Lands.

Your comments on the above suggestion, and critique of the enclosed statement, would be appreciated.

Sincerely,



Phil R. Holdsworth, P.E.

cc: Senator Poland ✓  
Representative Osterback

HB

2

4/27/77

# COMMITTEE REPORT

\*\*Finance

## SENATE

5/11/77 Date

Mr. President:

The Committee on RESOURCES has had CSHA 2 and  
authorizing state land to be made available as homesites  
under consideration. A majority of the members of the Committee

- recommends it do pass
- recommends it do not pass
- recommends it do pass with attached amendment(s)
- recommends it be replaced with 5CS for CSHA 2 (Revised) and that  
3CS for CSHA 2 (Revised) do pass
- (and) recommends it be referred to the \_\_\_\_\_  
committee
- reports it back without recommendation
- AND attaches a report of its intent
- (other) \_\_\_\_\_

### MEMBERS SIGNING THE MAJORITY REPORT:

|                    |                    |       |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------|
| <u>[Signature]</u> | <u>[Signature]</u> | _____ |
| <u>[Signature]</u> | <u>[Signature]</u> | _____ |
| <u>[Signature]</u> | <u>[Signature]</u> | _____ |

### MEMBERS NOT CONCURRING IN THE MAJORITY REPORT:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_

[Signature]  
Chairman

Senator John L. Rader

ALASKA STATE SENATE  
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT



POUCH V  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99901  
OR  
P.O. BOX 2088  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99510

April 12, 1977

H B 2

Ms. Arlayne Klein, Coordinator  
League of Women Voters of Alaska  
S. R. Box 20809  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Dear Ms. Klein:

Thank you very much for providing me the position of the League of Women Voters, Land Use Resource Committee, regarding various legislative proposals on homesteading.

Your suggestion regarding very clear language to ascertain actual land use has great merit, and I am confident your letter to the Legislature will be very seriously considered.

Sincerely,

  
John L. Rader, President  
Alaska State Senate

JLR: jm

bcc: Senator Kay Poland ✓

# *League of Women Voters of Alaska*

S.R. Box 20809, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

April 2, 1977

Senator John Rader  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Rader,

Once again the State Legislature has raised the subject of homesteading in Alaska with House Joint Resolution No. 10 addressing the availability of public land for homesteading and other residential uses. In 1974, many Alaskans regrettably saw the remaining unreserved public lands closed to homesteading with the enactment of Public Land Order 5418. Those people awaiting patents to their lands were granted them, the last being issued in 1976.

Land was brought into residential use with the aid of the Homestead Act. Wilderness areas were settled, as were areas within close proximity to towns. During the past few years, for various reasons, many homesteaders have developed their tracts of land, providing acreage and subdivision areas for the growing state population.

There now exists more than one reason for opening lands as happened under the Homestead Act. The original idea of settling lands and providing families with income and shelter has taken second place to the more prevalent idea of gaining large tracts of land at relatively little cost in order to sell the land at a profit. Individuals seeking homesteading land with such development ideas bend the intent of the law.

When land is again classified and made available for settlement, whether by state or federal agencies, it seems appropriate to take a truthful look at the use of the word "homesteading."

For many, "homesteading" still brings to mind obtaining 160 acres with 20 acres under cultivation, a chance to be self-sufficient and to build a life away from the crowding cities. For others, it still means a tract of land - but with a different slant on the "proving up" of the land. To these, the land is to be held just long enough to subdivide and sell to a willing public at a profitable price.

Since these differing ideas exist, the League of Women Voters of Alaska suggests that terms be used that more accurately reflect

# TELEGRAM

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

PHONE: 586-6440

JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

#

0013 NL ANCH AK 50 4-5 !145P AST

PMS SEN POLAND

JUN

THE MEMBERS OF THE SPORTSMAN GAME PRESERVATION ASSOC.

URGES YOU TO VOTE FOR THE APPROVAL OF BILL HB20

INTRODUCED BY RED SWANSPON TO BAN THE KILLING OF FEMALE MOOSE

DON RAMSEY PRESIDENT

SPORTSMAN GAME PRESERVATION ASSOC.

BOX 427 EAGLE RIVER AK

the actual use intended for the land. We believe that realistic classifications of intended use - residential, commercial, park, industrial or whatever, will help foster a better understanding of how lands can be, and are being, used in Alaska.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Arlayne Klein". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Land Use Resource Committee  
League of Women Voters of Alaska  
Arlayne Klein, Coordinator

HB-2

LA21 3622 17.32 04/25/77 JA01 0001 07.40 04/26/77

TO: CINDY, JNU  
FROM: APRIL, FBX

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE:

TO: ALL LEGISLATORS  
FROM: BOB BRILEY, P.O. BOX 2335, FBKS, AK 99701

DEAR LEGISLATOR,  
IN REGARDS TO HE 359, I AM FOR THE MOST PART OF THIS BILL.  
BUT SECTION 33.05. 430 AS A PERSON WHO HAS TO BE IN THE  
STATE FOR THREE CONSECUTIVE YEARS I COULD NOT BE FOR THIS  
BUT WOULD BE IN THE PLACE OF THIS ANYONE THAT HAD BEEN IN THE  
STATE FOR OVER A YEAR AND HAD LIVED HERE PREVIOUSLY FROM TWO TO  
FIVE YEARS OR MORE SHOULD BE IN MY EYES ABLE TO HOMESTEAD UNDER  
THIS ACT. I CAME TO ALASKA TO LIVE IN THE FALL OF 1963 AND  
WAS HERE UNTIL JUNE OF 1974 AND WENT OUT FOR ONE YEAR AND THEN  
RETURNED TO LIVE THE REST OF MY LIFE IN ALASKA. I AM AN  
ALASKAN THAT FEELS THAT I SHOULD NOT BE DEPRIVED OF THE RIGHT  
TO HOMESTEAD. I HAVE BEEN BACK OVER A YEAR AND A HALF IN ALASKA  
AT THIS TIME. AND LIKE I SAID PREVIOUSLY, I PLAN TO STAY FOR THE  
REST OF MY LIFE. IF IT HAD THIS IN IT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT ON THE  
BALLOT SO THE PEOPLE COULD VOTE IT IN AND I'M SURE IT WOULD GET  
VOTED IN.

SINCERELY,  
/S/ BOB BRILEY EOM

PLEASE ACK WHEN MESSAGE DELIVERED. THANKS. /A/ EOM

HB

54

COMMITTEE REPORT

SENATE

FURTHER: None

5/19/78

Date: 6/2/78

Mr. President:

The Committee on RESOURCES has had 3rd CSHB 54  
administration of state land

under consideration and (a majority of the committee) (the committee reports it back as follows)

- recommends it do pass                    ( ) recommends it do not pass
- ( ) recommends it do pass with attached amendment(s)
- ( ) recommends it be replaced with CS for \_\_\_\_\_

- and \_\_\_\_\_ ( ) new title            ( ) same title
- ( ) AND attaches a Letter of Intent            ( ) New Fiscal Note
- ( ) reports it back without recommendation
- ( ) and recommends it be referred to the \_\_\_\_\_ Committee

MEMBERS SIGNING DO PASS:

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS:

[Handwritten Signature]

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

[Handwritten Signature]

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

AGO 546624 +

[Handwritten Signature]

Chairman

[Handwritten Signature]



*Kay  
ask*

# Alaska State Legislature

## House of Representatives

Office of the Majority Leader

Official Business

Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

June 1, 1978

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Kay Poland  
FROM: Mike Miller

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mike Miller".

Kay--

This is a follow up to our brief conversation yesterday in which I indicated that there was a fiscal impact which should be considered in conjunction with House Bill 54.

The fiscal impact represents a net revenue gain. When the bill passes, it will be necessary to hire three full-time and one part-time employee at a cost of \$130,000. Please note however, that the stumpage sales would generate \$300,000 in direct revenue to the state plus \$600,000 worth of improvements (mostly in new road construction).

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA  
TENTH LEGISLATURE

FISCAL NOTE

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. 2d CS, HB 54

Title An Act relating to State land and providing an effective date

Requested by Representative Mike Miller Date May 30, 1978

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Natural Resources

Program Category Affected NREC

Budget Request Unit(s) Affected Division of Land and Water Mgmt., Southeast District

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

|                          | FY 77 | FY 78          | FY 79          | FY 80          | FY 81          | FY 82 |
|--------------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| 100 PERSONAL SERVICES    |       | 95.407         | 100.178        | 105.187        | 110.446        |       |
| 200 TRAVEL               |       | 15.000         | 15.000         | 16.500         | 18.000         |       |
| 300 CONTRACTUAL          |       | 16.800         | 21.800         | 25.070         | 28.830         |       |
| 400 COMMODITIES          |       | 1.000          | 1.000          | 1.150          | 1.325          |       |
| 500 EQUIPMENT            |       | 2.000          | 2.000          | 4.000          | 2.000          |       |
| 600 LAND & STRUCTURES    |       |                |                |                |                |       |
| 700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC. |       |                |                |                |                |       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>             |       | <b>130.207</b> | <b>139.978</b> | <b>151.907</b> | <b>160.601</b> |       |

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

|                 |  |         |         |         |         |  |
|-----------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|
| GENERAL FUND    |  | 130.207 | 139.978 | 151.907 | 160.601 |  |
| FEDERAL FUNDS   |  |         |         |         |         |  |
| OTHER (Specify) |  |         |         |         |         |  |
|                 |  |         |         |         |         |  |

POSITIONS

|           |  |   |   |   |   |  |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| FULL TIME |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| PART TIME |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| TEMPORARY |  |   |   |   |   |  |

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

It is anticipated that 2d CS, HB 54 will directly affect the timber sales program for the Haines-Skagway area.

Currently the Haines forestry program is understaffed which has made it impossible for the State to achieve its allowable cut objectives as well as adequately prepare and administer timber sales to minimize adverse economic and environmental impacts. Due to inadequate staff, past timber harvests were conducted with a minimum of road and sale layout preparation, resulting in environmental degradation and poorly planned and designed road systems and harvest units.

Sale access is considered among the most difficult in Southeast Alaska, necessitating a greater effort to locate and design transportation routes to optimize transportation benefits to the State and reduce adverse environmental affects. Remote, unroaded sale locations of future harvests as well as

IV. DATE May 30, 1978 PREPARED BY William J. Zufelt (continued)

AGENCY Division of Land & Water Mgmt.

Original: Legislative Finance

PHONE 465-2419

cc: Budget and Management

Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

AGO 546626

the necessity of harvesting in small scattered cuts to minimize environmental impacts, requires a large team effort to design and locate numerous miles of new access road as well as numerous individual cutting units, to achieve the allowable cut and environmental objectives.

Currently there are two permanent forester positions and one seasonal forestry technician position in Haines. This fiscal note adds three permanent forester positions and 1 temporary forestry technician position. These positions will permit preparation and sale of an estimated 15 million board feet of timber annually which will result in an estimated \$600,000 of improvements (mostly new road construction) and \$300,000 of direct revenue to the State, as opposed to a total estimated expenditure of \$230,000 (\$100,000 presently). In addition, there are economic benefits to the Haines community through direct employment and trade in the woods products industry as well as the indirect economic benefits of support services.