

751 SCRA

SB

2

751

carry on .. discussion to....

The Dept. of Envir. Cons.
to deterime the impact as well. I don't mean to speak for them
~~have~~ indicated to ~~ask~~^{us} that that they have concerns about the language
which may preempt all ~~other~~^{other} statutes dealing with litter and perhaps
~~lose some of those~~
~~that~~ we don't want to see removed, ah, changed. They, I would
like a further clarification of the definition of administrative
costs because if our personal services are considered administrative
costs, you are not going to get this type of program, for 35 percent
of the total.

your
Sen Kelly: Mr. Lee, why was the, ~~xxxx~~ Dept. selected to administer
the program rather than the Dept. of N. Res., for example.

Lee: Senator, I, I, could not answer, I suggest that the original
sponsor and the ^{referring} The language ~~referred~~ to three months
after fiscal year .. ^{to determine the} report is a bit too restrictive, because
the books don't actually close for a couple of months after ~~that~~
the end of the fiscal year and we would like to see an extension
of 6 months, rather than 3 months.

Stur. : On that point, though, that would mean, the possibility
ther, of that program not possibly getting, would that bring it
back before the Legislature for that immediate year, then?

Lee: It had, what, what occurs now, we have a similar type of
situation with the day care assistance program, which we adminster
..... Legislature, and we have that report prepared
and ready for ~~xxx~~ the Legislature before it convened in Jan. ~~in~~ And
three months after the frist of the year would be Oct. and, it would
be, fiscal would be very difficult because the time frame and close
down of all the books. We are somewhat concerned about the Dept.'s
ability and mechnism ~~xxx~~ for receiving and expending contributions
of either cash or in kind in terms of the day-to-day operations.
We have not had experience in this area and would like the language
establishing so it is clear ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ that the intent that we
can take in gifts, domations, and turn around and spend those on
behalf of the program. Tehre has been some concern indicated to
us from other states that, if you absolutely mandate a specific
size, color, shape of a receptle, that they have a lot of difficulty

in the public relations aspect getting some of the businesses to support that because they may have spent a large amount of money on the decor of their building, and you want to put a purple trash barrel alongside of their/^{blue}building, they would object, so we would like to see a little more flexibility, perhaps in, in that language.

Also, we^{are} somewhat concerned would like some further investigation on the impact of the dollar amounts levied on the . This

would like at least some indications as to what is expected and the intent of the establishment of the fine ~~xxxx~~, it appears in some cases, ... fines have been reduced and we are not sure if that is the intent. Another item we would like to see added to the available use for the, the general use of the grant money to municipalities, and would like to see that, ah, allow them to also purchase .. purchase the required receptles, & so forth, that that is their primary need; and the current language ...

Sturg: Eric, in that case are you thinking of smaller communities where that would be the difference of the beginning of the program?

Lee: Yes, right. If that, that's the primary need, and primary situation they have no other basic resource, we will, at least, have that ^{be a} ~~the~~ possibility. I don't think we want to see that because the sole use of the grants at all, certainly not support that idea.

Sturg: Other questions of, you might have of Eric Lee? Were you going to be giving some testimony today or are you here as the back up man?

Kanouse:

~~Sturg~~ Sturg: Fine. We'll obviously be having work sessions on this, and we appreciate your testimony. Senator Kelly? Fine, thank you very much. The next person to ~~gt~~ sign in was Chris Foster. I don't in all cases have the organization that is being represented.

Stug: Oh, And Virginia del Piaz, if you'll introduce yourself for the record, please?

My name is Christine Foster. I am appearing today as a member of the sponsoring committee for ballot proposition No. 5 in the 1978 Gen. election.

Any I am Virginia del Piaz, I was chairman of the Ballot Proposition Chris was speaking of, properly known as the Alaska bottle Bill Initiative. We'd both also like to state that it is general knowledge we are legislative staff this session. We ~~are~~ ^{received} have permission to testify on this bill. O.K. Last year, or several years ago, we undertook an initiative drive to place a proposal for a ^{term of beverage} ~~... legislation~~ container Legislation before the public, because we were concerned about two problems. That was recycling and litter. The initiative was defeated in the Nov. Gen. election, but our interest in addressing these two important problems has not diminished. It is our hope that the Legislature will give serious consideration to making any new program the very best possible for the State of Alaska. We are concerned that any legislation deal meaningfully and not just cosmetic in this problem. IN that spirit we would like to make a few suggestions on this bill. We ~~do~~ ^{did} not have the Committee Substitute to look at when we read the measure before us, so some of this might be a little out of line in sequence. Probably the most important thing we'd like to suggest to ~~you~~ the Committee, and this is already somewhat been brought up by C/RA, is that this program would most appropriately be administered under the Department of Envir. Cons., rather than the Com. Reg. Aff. Dept. DEC has the existing litter control measures, it has solid waste management, in general, as a Div., as a Dept. DEC is the lead state agency for solid waste management planning, the regulation for enforcement, ^{for} technical assistance, ~~was~~ ^{both} under the State law and the Federal 1976 resource recovery and Conservation Act. DEC already distributes litter bags they've already done litter surveys, they provide local assistance to governments, they ^{have} also promote the Alaska Clean-Up Month, which I believe is the month of May, and ~~has~~ done so for a number of years, and have also been involved in policing television spots and other public literature. So, it's pretty evident/~~this~~ ^{that} particular agency has been involved in this type of thing for some time and it is our feeling that they would be more of an appropriate agency to deal with this program. The lead, as it should be, and should continue to be with the Agency most logical, which would be DEC. It could be put, ^{as was also} suggested by R/CA in

Terrestrial
~~CELESTIAL~~

in an existing Division, in DEC, which would probably be their celestial programs Division. That already handles most of what the proposed division, of what this legislation needs, would handle. Secondly, the section on the Advisory Council; whereas you have two different ways of working with this. No. 1, if you are going to move the program to DEC, DEC already has an existing advisory Committee that could very possibly, easily expand their charge to the concerns expressed in this bill. This would, to our way of thinking, be a logical extension of the need to DEC, of course, and also there is existing funding, & so forth, for this particular committee. They are very well constituted, they are a working committee, there're, they are used to dealing with these things and they're very familiar with these types of problems, so that this would be the more logical way to go; but, if the Committee decides to keep the program in the Community & Reg. Aff. ^{we} ~~same~~ feel the Advisory Council should very definitely not represent just the main interest group, as is currently there, which would on page 4, ~~lines 7 through 10~~ lines 7 through 10, Section B, on the old bill. Some of the, we feel, that it should be expanded to and for a different interest group, rather than just the businesses; and some suggestions might include a public member, members of the education community that deal in ~~education~~ education in the State, local government officials, perhaps a rural representative, somebody from the recycling grup, youth gruos are involved in this, obviously, of course, some type of business representative; possibly one from a consumer ^{group and} environmental group, or for service organizations which have epxressed quite a lot of interest in this bill. We'd also suggest that they don't need to meet as many times a year, possibly twice or three times, rather than 4 or more times, would be adequate and would also help on the fiscal implications of per diem and travel. On the proposed litter patrol this, in following ^{this} bills over the years, has changed quite a bit. And in the current bill, the duties and purposes of this litter patrol are very vague and not very well specified, and so we suggest that this be a lot more ^{truly} ~~truly~~ tied down to what their purposes ^{are}; and also, just make the observation that if this is to be an effective part of this program, it would probably have to go pretty large in order to cover ~~the~~ State the size of Alaska, so there might be some ~~with~~ problems with the ways its constituted. We would like to make a comment on the grant section of the bill. If this is to remain, in fact a grant section, we suggest there be some definite limitation on the grants indicated in the bill. As far as we could see there was no limitation or lower limitation on the grants to be made. But, actually, when you look at the things as they are listed and there are 10 things listed, they break down in a different way than just getting grants.

Nos 1 through 4 are pretty much already existing; and 5 and 6 could, I think, very effectively be made into a loan program, either ^{with} one existing, or create a new one ; and Nos 7 through 10 could be done by the Dept. or the division, or could be subcontracted, or could ~~be~~ possibly be grants, if this was ^{deemed} one.

I would like to go over them briefly to explain how we came to that conclusion. The first one goes with the instruction at the distribution of informative material to ~~at~~ elementary or secondary schools, and so forth. This is already, there are a lot of sources for this already, mainly for Keep America Beautiful program and some ~~the~~ ^{through} Federal programs, we feel this, in a large part already does exist . The second one, purchase and erection of road side signs. This one is pretty vague , and to give grants for this is real?y There are already is an existing statute for the address of road side signs for littering and that ~~date~~ ~~1901~~- Sec. 19-~~0100~~ 17-010, which states, very briefly, a Commissioner of DOT and Pub. Serv. shall place a sign near state boundaries, ^{each} primary and secondary highway, which informs the public of the prohibition~~s~~ against.....

and highway littering and ~~we~~ shall place some more signs in other locations within the State when considered necessary. It was our ^h thought, ~~xx~~ that this kind of, it's already covering ^{that} ~~xxx~~ contingency. Third, the organization, operation of the clean-up drive conducted by local agencies, private organizations or service groups, ^{even} ~~through~~ volunteer help. Now this is something that already does exist in the private sector of the volunteer effort and we just wonder at the wisdom of using State monies to fund something that is already essentially ^{being} ~~xxx~~ taken care of in the private sector. And fourth, any other public information that is selected by the division including the use of media; as I mentioned earlier there is already a, DEC is already doing some media spots against the litter and I think everybody familiar with, the National Ed Council, TSA Time, which you see on television and hear on the radio quite frequently; so, ^{feel this} ~~xxx~~ in a large part is already being done. The fifth and sixth one, speak to number 5, the expansion ~~and~~ of existing and creation of ^{new source} ~~of~~ separation programs, and six expansion of existing and creation of new community recycling centers. This, as I said once, ^{that this} might more appropriately be under a loan program, because it is speaking of capital expenditures for structures, and so forth, equipment, and that this might be more appropriate for that particular type of program. And the last one, 7 though 10, felt that these might more appropriately be under ^{the section} ~~that~~ gives the charge to the division, whether ~~xx~~ it's in DEC, or C/RA; but this is essentially telling them the things they should be working on and they are, in fact, pretty similar to what is charged to the division; and lastly

the litter control assessment, which was in the original bill that we ~~were~~ ^{were} ~~dealing~~ ^{are} dealing with ~~Ma~~ and now you have separated them out but our point still remains pretty consistent. No matter how this assessment, or tax, or whatever is to be called when it's done, it should be tied to the amount of litter generated by a business. There should be some relation ^{there} between non litter generated to the tax put upon ^a particular business or operation. Now, we'd like comments and suggestions ^{but} we offered haven't been real specific and we don't have the language drafted, but we'd be more than happy at any time to work with the Committee on specifics. We do have specific language worked for the loan program, if you'd be interested in that, that's why we've done possible language.

Sturg. We definitely would want that information. Any questions of Virginia?

Sen. Kelly - ^{Virginia,} Just one. Are you satisfied with the recycling provisions in this bill?

Virginia: Quite frankly, there aren't too many. I would certainly like to see ^{in the} that strengthened. There is quite a lot of interest going on with that ~~inter~~ state currently. I know Anchorage is getting started with the program and I think this would have to be strengthened. I don't have any specific suggestions for you right now, but we could certainly work on it.

Sturg: Other questions? Chris, did you care to give testimony also?

Chris: NO, Virginia covered all our major points for both of us.

Sturg: Fine. ^{major} thank you very much. I think a very/basic issue has been raised, and I am sure there will be other testimony. I wonder if Sen. Colletta might wish to speak and I, to the reason for the designation of C/RA and also possibly to the Youth Patrol. I think those will be of interest to other groups and I ~~will~~ know the Committee will be interested.

Col: Madam Chairman, Yes, I see that Sen. Rodey raised those and if you will recall in my introductory remarks, ~~but~~ I stated the bill hadn't, a great evolution because of that hitting us occurred over 8 years of implementation. C/RA was picked for ... reason. This is not a State bureaucracy. this is, for all practical purposes, a people's activity; and who thus can do that, but the agency that's

their
dealing with people on a daily basis; as is ~~there~~ prime charge of community and regional affairs . DEC is limited in their scope, although they have activities statewide, it's not a normal recurring daily function. They go and ... on specific issue. Dept. of Nat. Res. the same way. They have statewide responsibilities but they don't work on a daily basis statewide. The Litter ~~sanitary~~ patrol, the fiscal note that Sen. Rodey alluded to has been a source of controversy from the day that it was requested, and ironically and for your information, it was never requested by myself. It was requested by those who were in opposition to the litter acc; and I don't wish to open up that controversy. But that's where this 2.8 million dollars came from . At one time, in the course of introduction, Commissioner Max Brewer, from DEC, had suggested to me that he had some approximately 40 people, that he would delegate an additional responsibility to, Somehow, or another, 40 people got into the act that we were going to start funding and paying. Put 40 people on the payroll. This ~~was~~ ^{is} the intent. The Youth Patrol is very much alive and .. In Anchorage I would suspect they have no less than 2,000 youngsters in a Youth Patrol. They are being run through nonprofit and civic organizations. They are not State employees. You can interpret any kind of wording whichever manner you wish to fit the need that you wish. I would like to take the latitude of thanking Virginia and Chris. I offered ^{an invitation} indication, when it became on election night that this was not a victory for those people who, philosophically were in ^{able} tune with me, I offered an invitation to them ~~for~~ ^{to cooperate to} properly make this a working bill. And, I'm now happy that they have come forward to do that.

Sturg: We'll appreciate it as Committee and certainly use their services. Sen. Rodey?

Sen. Rodey: Sen. Colletta, my concerns, of course, the cost of the bill; I know you share that concern with me and the reason I referred to the previous memo, is because it is one piece of evidence that relates to the cost of the bill. And, I'm particularly concerned because the cost of the bill would be borne by Alaskan businesses, small and large alike, and quite frankly, I'm somewhat reluctant, perhaps reluctant in the extreme, to put any additional burdens on Alaskan businesses this year. I would rather stand neck deep in the Gastineau Channel than ask another burden on business this year. Certainly it's passed on to the consumer too and it affects all Alaskans in that regard. That's why I'm concerned about the funding because it will reach the point of making a decision; and if we do have a bill, of course, I would like to see the lowest possible fiscal note and I know you share

that concern with me and that's why I 'm looking at some of the alternatives and also the funding of the litter ~~xxx~~ patrol, which appears to be an unknown quantity at this point, particularly in, in future years.

Sen. Colletta: Sen. Rodey it's apparent one of two things is occurring. Either you're not hearing me, or I'm not making myself understood; but I thought I had addressed that. The litter patrol is alive, it's not State funded. The litter patrol is comprised of youngsters who are assisting their parent organization in the earning of some dollars. It's a volunteer effort. The only paid individuals are those that the State will furnish to assist communities in accomplishing a Litter Act activity.

Sen. Rodey: Madam Chairman, let me point out, though, that in no where in the bill does it say that - it merely says that the division shall adopt mandatory requirement for adoption of regulations which established the letter patrol; and I think it is something we ought to consider in our draft. And certainly in our work on bills, I find your assurances to be absolutely gold plated. And, I think this is one of the things which we need to deal with in the draft of the bill. And, let me bring one other concern up. There is on page 6, Section C, places the responsibility on people owning or operating in a public place and that does include a very category; and includes a great many businesses; if perhaps not most businesses in the State of Alaska, certainly all retail businesses. And, it deals with a question that Eric mentioned earlier; and that requires the businesses to ^{procure} secure place and maintain those receptles. ^{should be at} at their own expense, after their ^{own} expenses here. What reaction have we had from the community in regard to this? This was alluded to previously.

Sen. Colletta: I don't know if there has been any other specific language that it's probably 6 months ahead of what this measure hopes to accomplish. They have already through specific organizations such as the Chamber ^{of} Commerce implemented the litter and recycling activity, totally private funded. It is my understanding in talking with the Chairman of that activity ~~it is not a probability~~ ^{it is not a probability}, the only assist that he would want out of the passage of this bill, would be the education ^a aspects

and conceivably on occasion a little ^{bit} of receipt money to tide them over on some of the contractual things ~~to~~ ^{that} deal with the nonprofit organizations in the pick-up of litter. But the responsibility you are referring to in Sec. "C", Pat, I, don't know how to answer that to you other than that the normal course of activity, they do have designated spots, receptles now and the responsibilities for policing their own yards still remains theirs, All we are doing is assiting and hoping that the accumulation of that ~~litter~~ would be the central place for them, again benefiting them. They still sweep their own parking lots and everything else. So, I don't think its' that cntroversial of an issue; it could be, but I doubt it, very much.

Sen. Rodey: I'm not sure it is controversial, Madam Chairman, and perhaps we could hear from members ~~of~~ present from these groups, or the Chamber on that and see if they have any question or

Sen. Coll: Madam Chairman, if I might have a, I really want to clarify that litter Patrol, I think maybe we're grasping at words. Originally there was a litter patrol; these were uniformed youghsters working for a State agency and so forth, but, experience has shown that that's not the most practical way; because what's you've done is just expand a refuge picking up activity, which just doesn't accomplish, and they have had greater success in utilization of the local candidates ^{canopies} instilling the pride in each community.

Sturg. Sen. Rodey?

Sen. Rodey: Madam Chairman. I'd be happy to work with you ^{Mike} on this and redo the language, because the language Litter Patrol is ^{still} in there, and we need to redo the language in that section because it's a bit unfair to me . I think you're absolutely correct, certainly we can look at Europe and see what they have done to be at these means, ^{which} that, some of them/are very traditional.

Sturg. Thank you. Are there other questions? Thank you very much

Senator Colletta. The next asked to testify - Mr. Gravo and Ms. ~~_____~~ Municipality of Anchorage, or possibly a private citizen today, I don't know. Mitch?

GRAVO: Sure. My name is Mitch Gravo. I am testifying as a resident of the Municipality of Anchorage. Litter is a major problem for the municipality and any legislation which helps us deal with that problem, we support. My comments will be very brief and they just deal with a few housekeeping matters. The first one, on legislative intent, suggest the Committee discuss the possibility of including the public sector also in that Section. ^{where you indicate encouraged stimulation} ~~assimilation of private~~ recycling efforts. For example, the Municipality works with, very closely with the Chamber of commerce on the program that Sen. Colletta was just speaking about. Last year it was a tremendous success and this year because ^{of changes} the changes, new approach, I think it will be even more of a success. The Advisory Council possibility that not only the people that are mentioned in there, be part of that Council, ^{with} but also solid waste professionals, also being ~~included~~ ^{that} included, people of considerable expertise. The survey section, you indicate/6 months after the bill goes into effect there should be a survey to determine if its working. You might take a ^{would} look at that, in that if it goes into effect in July, the survey/be conducted in Jan., and in Anchorage, all litter is covered up in Jan., and we see it in May. So, you might take a look at that.

Sturg: Fine, I think that's more of a technical thing we do need to look at, because it's more of a question look at, because it was a question of when that program begins, and it's going to take a little time to get it underway. Good point.

GRAVO
When you speak of, when the bill speaks of garbage or refuse, that's somewhat vague and our solid waste people suggested, quite publically, that perhaps you use the word solid waste, instead of garbage or refuse, because it's ^{specific} and has a ~~particular~~ definition. Finally, when the legislation speaks to the receptacle, the costs to those individuals may be significant depending on the design, and the bill speaks of the design will be the responsibility of the director, and we suggest that perhaps you look at some ^{that} better responsibility being placed with professional with a design in the least costly manner possible.

I have no further comment.

Sturg: Fine. Are there questions of Mitch?

Rodey: Madam Chairman, just one comment briefly with regard to the 10th intent section of the bill since Sen. Ziergler, the Senate grammarian is not with us, let me, let me offer some comments. The English language is a beautiful thing and I think perhaps we could include its useage in the intent clause by perhaps by cutting down some of the existing verbage. I think it would be interesting for the press to take a look at it and see how it, we might say what is intended to be said and in fewer words and discretion?....~~dry~~ set aside.

Sturg: Thank you Pat. Thank you Mitch. Apprecate that, Ron Murphy?

Murphy: Madam Chairman, and members of the Committee. My name is Ron Murphy, I'm a lawyer from Seattle, and the reason I am here is because it is my understanding that the Committee would like to hear from me about the experience we have had in that State and other states that I am familiar with. I represent the industry group that has been involved in this kind of a program in other states, especially in Washington State; and I have had a great deal of experience, good and bad, and made some mistakes, and hopefully have learned from them and my purpose here, I believe, is to hopefully answer questions that you might have that might help you in making determination of how to-make your determination. I should also say that I have worked with, closely with, the Alaska industries people, and tried to work with Sen. Colletta, and some of the other people here in Alaska, within the government, to give them the benefit of

our experience.

Sturg: Mr. Murphy, I think it would be very helpful to us. I am sure you have had a chance to look at Senate Bill 2 and the Committee Substitute what we have on the table in basic form, very similar to that. I wonder if you might be able to say what we have presented here, how that compares to ~~Washington~~ what's happening in Washington and what you feel, or percieve has happened in Washington as a result of their bill. Or, have we strengthened areas where they have had weaknesses. What about this program? What can it do for Alaska, if there is a commitment of those that have said/we will make this bill work. What might happen in Alaska as a result of a bill like that?

Murphy: I'll do my best.

Sturg: Yes, just a little, kind of an overview, and comparison and what will this do for us.

Murphy: All right. And then if I don't answer something, or raise other questions, I hope you'll shoot straight at me and I'll try to do my best. If I don't know the answer, I'll Tell you.

Sturg: I may not, but I bet Sen. Rodey will.

Murphy: All right. First of all, I think you asked me what, how does this bill compare with what my experier has been in other states and observations. This bill was put together as I understand it, as

an attempt, to take the best of those bills and weed out the poor portions of those bills and then it was tried to be tailored to the situation here that exists as best to be determined for Alaska. A lot of thought went into that and a lot of work went into it and it was an attempt to put it together in a fashion that would work here. For instance. The Washington approach, in the beginning, was entirely a litter bill approach. Back in 1970-71 when the Washington approach was put together, it pertained entirely of litter. Now we find that there are these recycling solid waste problems that have developed and so the bill that you have before you is an attempt to incorporate and address itself to those problems and solving them. I should start right out though and try to be specific and say, it is not the intention as I understand this bill, and Sen. Colletta certainly has more and better knowledge of what this is about and what he wants to accomplish, and you might want to accomplish than I do. But industry, and speaking for industry I can say, I can say honestly and candidly industry is behind this bill, ~~and~~ as I understand in Alaska, and I can tell you its behind the bill in Washington. And I understand from talking to the industry people here that they don't intend to have a cosmetic bill ~~here~~, as stated here earlier, they want a bill to work. And they'll stand behind it and attempt to make it work. Now this bill is addressed somewhat to recycling, where the Washington bill was not. Now we are amending the Washington bill now to incorporate and strengthen recycling sections; but fortunately, when we drafted the Washington bill, we made it flexible enough, by luck, that it could address itself somewhat to recycling and we were able to incorporate recycling in it and in the State of Washington we have got a tremendous increase in recyclers

and recycling, which I think in large measure is due to this situation we have down there. We have some 500 recyclers in the St. of Wn. now, ~~and~~ almost more than any other st. and part of that is due to the bill. Not all of it, I assure you. Going back, the, what we did in Wn. is, we were told in the St. of Wn. as industry that if we didn't come up with something to solve the problem of litter back in those days that we'd, the State would solve it for us. And we had some good Senators and Representatives that we know, and we sat down with them, and we said, hey, we don't know how to solve the litter problem. We don't. We know it's a big one now because of what's happening in this country. But we said we'd go out and see what we can come up with. So we got together, a group of industry people like the ones you have here, and we'll try to get together here now, and come up with a program that we can present the Legislature and they take a look at it in that stage and say o.k. - it makes sense, or it doesn't make sense. And that's what we did. And we studied, spent about \$15,000, doesn't seem like much money now, but then it was quite a bit, to study the litter situation in the various states by the municipalities, by the states, by the individuals, businesses, and so forth, and come up with what we thought was the way to solve it. And we came up with basically/what is known as the Wn. model litter law now. That's how we ... The idea behind this is, as I stated earlier, it's not to have the State solve all the problems that we had in the recycling and litter, and it's not to have the State tax everybody, industry, or anybody else, to solve all the solid waste and recycling problems, we haven't got that much money. But the purpose is to put the problem of litter control and now recycling into one central agency in a given state

and get some control over it, get some guidance over it, get some standards set, and get a program going, so people will know how to deal with the problem. So we, in Wash. and other states now, and we hope in Alaska will put this under a government agency that will take control of setting these standards and start working on the problem instead of a mishmash like we had with one industry doing one thing and one city doing another thing and we don't know where we are going. People need guidance and we need study and we need work, so this is what the idea was. But we also put in here after our studies were made some specific things which we thought should be done, so we didn't say the state solved the problem. We found out that there weren't enough receptacles out in given communities, given areas where people were apt to litter like beaches, parks, playgrounds, you know, marinas; and the receptacles weren't placed ~~at~~ ⁱⁿ the right places at the right time; and the receptacles weren't the kind of receptacles that people could see and recognize. So, one of the things ~~xxxx~~ we require in this Act and in the other ACTs, is that the State sets standards, just like we have with stop lights today, just like we have, all restaurants have to have toilet facilities. The state sets standards on these receptacles and they should be. Somebody said/earlier, and I know it was a good thought and we wrestled with this, we think standardize, and color it and design. It doesn't mean they have to be expensive; but they should have some way people could recognize wherever they go that's ~~xxxx~~ a litter receptacle and that's what it's for and there should be enough of them out so that they can use them. How many times have we gone down a city street, and I've done it in Seattle, and I've done it in Yakima where I grew up, and I think I did it in Anchorage

and you are a person who wants to see litter picked up, you pick up the litter and don't know what to do with it. So we've got to have the things out there for people to put them in and they should be standardized, we think, in color and design. So we found that people were being fined for litter, littering and charged \$100, \$150, \$500. This wasn't helping. One question answered earlier today was why was the fine low. Frankly we set the fines low down there and suggest it to you here, because the idea is to keep the fine low for the litterer because you don't want ^{him} to go and clog up the courts. We want it to be like a parking ticket, and so then, when a person litters and he is fined, he just takes bail and it's sort of an educational process. That's a little thing, but it's one of the more important things. The other thing that we found out is that motorists, driving ^{etc}, people going places have a lot to do with litter. They get in a car, out it goes, when they get in their cars and go picnicing, and so forth. So, it's mandatory in this Act to have litter receptles in automobiles. WE also found out, and this can be a litter bag. ^{You} We also find in here that litter receptles are required to be placed in all the, to be handed out by the St. agencies. They are inexpensive, the St. can give them out and the St. will send them out with motor vehicle registrations, this is all an educational process. So, we have followed this pattern in the St. of Wn, basically, and it's taken a long time to go through all of it; but basically, identification of litter receptles, plenty of them out, litter bags, plenty of them out, and a good strong educational program for the public. And I might stop here and ~~xxx~~ ask you to ask me some questions, it's not a boondoggle, but, but edcational program for the public is not just going out and buying some television spots

and don't litter, it's to get each community involved. Have this field Dept, with one other xxx man go to the communities like in the St of Wn we have an annual program in ~~Ellingsburg~~ Ellingsburg, Wn., where it's clean up the Yakima River. The field person from our Dept. goes out, starts the program there, for instance, to get those young people to school there to go out and clean up that River once a year and if, starts them out, gets them going and gives them receptles, gets their local community to get the trucks going; and these are the kind of programs that are coordinated under this Act. I can stop and talk about the Litter Patrol in a minute, but right now you may have some questions.

Sturg: Yes. Sen. Kelly?

Kelly: Mr. Murphy, in the St. of Wn, which Dept. admin\$trates this program?

Murphy: In the St. of Wn. we use the Dept. of Eucology. The reason we use that is that it had just been formed at that time and it seemed like the natural place for it to go; because they were going to be a Statewide agency talking about eucological matters. I, when, if you would ask me specifically why this Dept. was picked here, I wouldn't have known the answer and I was very pleased to hear what Sen. Colletta said that if you need an agency that works in the various communities at a local level, ^{so that} you can get that local touch and get self help programs going. And the Dept. of Eucology was the only Dept. we had that did that.

Sen. Kelly: And then you said something about 500 recycling plants in the St. of Wn? Is that 500 rebottling plants, or; what exactly are your recycling centers?

27.

Murphy:

Recycling centers in the St. of Wn. everything from a fairly large area, plant where you have maybe a scrap dealer ^{with} ~~where~~ you have several employees handling hundreds of thousands of tons of stuff down to a one or two man shop, where you've got a fellow ^{that} ~~who~~ believes in recycling and goes out and does it on a very insignificant small time basis, say one man.
~~day-to-day, one-man~~ Am I answering your question? That's what I mean we we don't mean a bottle shop, /we don't ~~mean~~ mean a manufacturer -

Kelly: You're not actually recycling the material, your not recycling alumin cans, or recycling bottles, your're just simple, kind of a scrap center?

Murphy: It would include both, collecting it, putting it in boxes, separating it, and selling it to somebody who does it. We would count the ones ^{ed} who collect it, just the little guy with the shop where he collects bottles and cans and gives somebody money for it, or paper, all those things. But it isn't always the fellow who processes it, no. It's the collection agency included. So when I say 500, really, it's the li-tle guy too. It's the little guy who picks it up, and has it there, and pays people to bring it in; and then he sells it to somebody else. Of course it might sell it to Northwestern Glasa, the glass, and they turn it into glass bottles. Does that answer your question?

Kelly: Yes. That answers that particular question and the last question I have, I suppose, I have some doubt whether standarized receptles are really necessary because I am assuming they are going

to be a great deal more expensive. If a person has ~~an~~ ^{the} option of ~~xxxx~~ ^{between just} buying a lobo and putting it on an existing receptile, or buying a standardized receptile that obviously ~~has~~ ^{has} been manufactured outside the State and brought in, I'm, I'm ~~xxxx~~ ^{pretty} concerned that the size, the weight, and eve ^{it's} thing, ~~xxx~~ going to turn out to be quite an expensive item. It's like looking for a bathroom, you know, it doesn't make any difference if it's boys, or men, or gentlemen, or has a silhouette, you know, when you need a bathroom, you know where to find one and you can find it relatively -

Murphy: Well, I didn't do a good job on that. You're exactly right on what we had in mind. We don't have in mind to standardize as to shape and buy outside the State of Alaska. What we have in mind ^{only} is that it be standardized in one color and have a lobo on it ^{logo}. That's all. Now our St. Dept went ahead and passed some other regulations as to where they should be placed, like shopping centers. They told, this is what your Dept. would do ^{we} I hope, in a shopping center in the St. of Wn., you're supposed to have, if you run a shopping center, so ^{of these} many/receptiles because of the amount of traffic that's in that center. Instead of one receptile for 500,000, well that's over exaggerated, one receptile for 10,000 people who go through a shopping center in a weekend, there's got to be a 100 receptiles in that shopping center. And they are not necessarily, although a rich shopping center does put out expensive ones, but if you are running a Mom and Pop Shoe Store, and you had a lot of traffic there and I don't know if a shoe store would be a good example. But a marina, it might be that you would put out a litter apparel painted green but you would have a logo on it ~~xxx~~ which the State supplies free. Our St. supplies all the logo stickers

so that if you are a little guy, you have to have this green receipt and you can paint a barrel if you want, then the St. will supply you with a sticker so everybody can recognize it, and they ~~st~~ stick it on the receipt. So you are right. There is no requirement that you have this expensive piece of hardware. No. But they should be standardized in the sense that you recognize them.

Sturg. Sen. Kelly what -

Murphy: The logo is the important thing and I would like to think the color is too, but I, I heard a man, this Mr. Lee say that he went around and found out this is a problem because some businessses do not want to go with the green color that we use because it destroys their decor. And we've had a terrible fight on this sometimes, and our position is, in industry is that, if you're, I shouldn't, let's not say MacDonalds, let's say if your ^u Joe^u Hugh's Drive In organization and you've got all green, no all brown, and your architect says you should have ~~xxxxxxx~~ brown receipts, because it's pretty, ~~xxxxxxx~~ our answer is ~~xxxxxxx~~ too bad. We want to see those receipts and we want them to be green and there has been some scraps on that.

Correct.

Further questions, Senator?

Sturg: Sen. Rodey?

Rodey: Just one question and what is your per capita costs in the

Rodey:
St. of Wn?

Murphy: Oh, for our program? ~~xxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ Anybody got a calculator? I don't have one. I could, I could divide, right now our program is going to be about, and we're very high now, our program started out \$x 600,000. We're spending about a million fo in the next bi-annum, so divide that 3 million 500,000 people and that will about do it.

30.

Rodey: Obviously, fairly, fairly low cost on that

Murphy: yes, what do you get, I'm interested to know myself.

Rody: That bi-annum, is that a two-year budget?

Murphy: No, that's a one year, a bi-annum would be double that, which would be about 3. What we did was we went ~~in~~ 1971 ~~from~~ ^{is from} ~~XXXX~~ at 600,000 like you've ~~done~~ done, up to this figure; but we have a different tax setup than you do. I think your tax proposal here is better because ours puts a heavier load on some industries. And, ~~in~~ incidentally, I want to be very level with you, we looked at this very carefully, how to make suggestions to this Legislature here, to carry this tax and I think that the tax program ~~it~~ ^{that} shows here, this assessment program makes a lot more sense than the one we have in the St. of Wn, for your ~~safe/~~ ^{safe/} ~~safe/~~. But you don't have enough base hereto isolate one or smaller group ... you get prohibited this way everybody shares in ~~the~~ ^{the} cost and it makes good sense.

Sturg: Alright, Mr. Murphy, you're talking about amount tied in the amount of litter so called, that's what your

Murphy: Yes, we break it, you know

Kelly: Madam Chair, how do you ~~break~~ pay for the program in Wn.

Murphy: Well, in Wn. we have a ~~very~~ very broad base tax like you do, but we were able there to tax broad, broad spectrum of industries that were related to the litter problem only. For instance, you wouldn't tax the Boeing Airplane co., but you would tax the Dept. store because the Dept. store puts out materials/in bags, ^{that are} sacks, toothbrushes, and so forth that end ~~up~~ up in ..

31.

Kelly: So, you're, you're much more restrictive.

Murphy: But we couldn't do that in your St. Yes, but we tried that kind of a tact in your St, we really tried hard to come up with that ~~positive~~ approach but because of the number of people in your ST, we had to do this in other states, we couldn't, we just couldn't, it was impossible. But the one you've got now, I think is really very good.

Stur: Sen. Rodey, I think we cut you off before you were finished there.

Rodey: No,

Stu: Did that answer your question.

Rodey: I think it did. Evidently you have a ^{very,} lower per capita cost than we do, which I think would be, be natural considering the situation of Alaska and the situation of. Really the two questions that I'm concerned about. 1. How effecient and effective can that litter program be and then secondly, how much will it cost us and I, I think that's all legislators. . . and those two points aside.

Stu: Mr. Murphy, do you have any further response to that?

Mur: Yes. He says, o.k. Murphy, you've got ^{this} that program down there and you haven't told me what it's worth. Isn't that what you are saying? I think that's what you are asking.

Rodey: that's what you are saying.

Stu: woudl you, would you like an answer to that question?

Rodey: I think so, because, that's why I asked the ^{cost worth} ~~question~~ and that's part and the other question is how much are you getting for your money?

O.K., is it workh it?

Mur: Right. /We started out in the St. of Wn. with not, you see when you start out in the State, how do you find out how much litter ~~as~~ you have in the State ~~to~~ begin with? I don't know how to find out, so we had Booth, allen and Hamilton make a study for us, it cost us some \$70,000 back in those days to tell us what to do about this program, what the ..., how to get it started and what have we got here in the way of litter, so we can see if we're making progress later on. They came up with a figure that we worked from, and according to the figures that have been done by outside measuring outfits, we have had upwards of a 60 percent reduction of litter, from what we would have had. NOW if you go to the St. of Wash. on a given day, Senator, I want you to notice, when you go down a certain highway on a given day after there has been a summer tourist season on the 4th of July, and that road hasn't been picked up, you're going to see litter. But if you do it on a ... basis throughout the State ~~throughout~~ ~~the~~ as a study not attempting to be done, and honestly as we know how to have them done, the State knows how to have them done, we have had a tremendous reduction of litter. We haven't solved it, I don't think we will ever all of the litter problem, but we have made a tremendous reduction, and we are very proud of what we've done. So I think it's workh the effort and the money.

Stu: Further qeustions?

Rodey: Just one comment, it would be interesting if we knew the perimenters of our litter problem, in the St. of Ak.-

Murphy: It would be very difficult to start out with because you're starting out with ¹⁰⁰ well 50 or 100 years of accumulation and you know you have to get a handle on it. ^{① (laughter)} ③ Were there any other -

② Stu - That's discouraging.

Stu: Mry Mur. I do have one specific question. The way the Advisory Council is set up, it's completely composed of business people and I

have had a number of questions raised and we've had that today about the fact that we should really be bringing in, on the one ~~hand~~ hand we have the technicians, the other the broader public interest; and, there's, true, the commitment of industry to make it work, but what's your comment as to ~~wh~~ how you bring in the various grps that have an interest in this?

Mur: I don't want to speak for Sen. Colletta, so I'm speaking personally; and I don't even know ^{whether} ~~if~~ he'd agree with me or not, haven't the slightest idea, and I also want to level with you. I think part of that was put in there, I can't say ~~that~~ ^{this} for sure, but put in there for all business because business was very concerned that this might get out of control if you got the wrong people on the Advisory Committee and tried to use this against them. I think that ~~this~~ was a frightening thing that they put in here. I myself would say personally, I'm not really speaking for the rest of the business in Ak. now, I, myself, would say, you ought to go ahead and put some other legitimate interests in here that want to solve the litter problem and not attack something else. You understand what I mean, I'm sure. Yes, that kind of an approach and some safeguards for the voter, you've got to pay a tax and ... in this case it's all business in Ak., so if they don't get overwhelmed, I say to try and strike a good balance. The other reason we'd like to see business on there with a good say is because we think business should be committed to making ^e this program work and if they are on there, in strong force, then they have a chance to really make it work.

Sut: Thank you for your comments. Any other questions from Mr. Murphy? Thank you very much. We have a dual, I believe they wish to appear together, for the St. Cham. of Commerce, Lou Harris and Don Dickey, is that correct?

and following that, the past person I have on my list here would be Commissioner Mueller from the Dept. of En. Cons.

Dickey: Madam Chairman, Member of the Committee, I am Don Dickey speaking on behalf of the Ak. St. Ch., of Com. The idea of comprehensive recycling or litter reduction program, I think is not only commendable but not new because for a number of years, dozen or so, Chambers of Commerce throughout this State, and some of your home committees have been carrying on, as you know, very aggressive and progressive programs as has been testified to before. However, the problem with that, our own community here has on one or two occasions national ...and yet it seems to have no, it's like a senate beed with/a hundred legs and no head to it, there doesn't seem to be any coordination statewide, there is some areas left out completely or not motivated enough to get started, and so I think the idea of looking at a comprehensive program with this magnitude has merit. I share, I was pleased to hear the Senator mention that, Rodey, his concern on the cost because certainly as business people we share that at a time when the economy is not particularly booming. At the outset offset, in the original bill, as you know it was tied to a gross business gross receipt tax, having, or from 18 to 20 found that the greatest thorn in the side of the business people, the inequities of that tax which are now repealed. I was not anxious to lead any ... movement that would ~~xxxxx~~ possible get that back on their backs; and so I felt that method of financing was objectionable, and I so stated to the Chairman, Senator Colletta, and others who were involved in this; and I am very pleased to see the substitute, which is being proposed and the method of funding, I think it has two virtues as I look at it quickly. One is simplicity,

and there are only 4 steps, and second, which is important equity. As for the funding method, asked about raising money, as I see the new proposal, you are asking only the \$25 business license now required. Those in the lower income brackets, more volumes of business would be asked only to add \$5, second step takes it up to 10; and I understand from State figures of about 33,000 business licenses that 73 percent of all those licenses would fall within \$5 or \$10 brackets, as far as the increase would go, were they are paying 25, now 30, 35, ah, 35, so 2 out of three businessmen in Alaska would only have to contribute no more than \$10 a year; and I don't think that's unrealistic at all. At the very top of that spectrum, the fourth step proposal in your bill, businesses having over a \$1,000,000 gross volume, I'd say, and there's only 7 percent in the State, but ~~only~~ with this small amount would only have to pay \$75 more than they are now paying, or a total of \$100. So at that top from going up \$5 step^{up} to a hundred, I don't think its excessive. I would like to start with the philosophy; and we have discussed, you and I senator, and others, that chicken and the idea/its a ~~chicken-in-the~~ egg thing do, should we tie the tax and the funding, to those people who contribute to the problem? And my responses, while that ~~sound~~ sounds logical and commendable, I don't think there are enough soldiers here or in China to police everybody that ~~who~~ contributes to the problem; and I am going to propose, and we are taking it from our viewpoint that all of us contribute to the problem, all of us ~~that~~ should contribute to the solution. So I think in this manner, instead of trying to pick who threw the most out at the waste-basket, or if it's a professional man, or chamber type, all of us are either someplace either in the picnic or in the cars are potential contributors to the trash problem. So, I think it's logical that all businesses be asked to contribute to the solution. I also say and commend

the Committee for a better for this step which in no case would anyone have to pay more than \$100, which is only a \$75 increase; in over a million dollars; and I think the small merchant who has that tough problem is protected with the \$5 step. Commenting on some of the other factors, I naturally, again getting back to the funding factor, I am not only pleased to see; but we'd be considered a watch dog to make sure that this action not include ~~the~~ for administrative expenses that exceed 35 percent. I think that's most important. I don't feel we have enough money in this state, or Washington State combined, to pay for all of these functions; nor is that suggested as I read this. What I think we need is to encourage, stimulate and not duplicate, but stimulate voluntary services that are already existing; whatever you want to call the Youth corp, boy scouts, girl scouts, civic groups, organizations of that nature who ~~xxxx~~ ^{long and hard} have toiled at the collection and reduction of litter. So I hope ~~that~~ that would be considered and that that factor would be watched and the goal met. As far as grants to the existing Advisory Committee, it has been suggested that that 7 member proposed committee be expanded; and I would, I believe that's realistic. I would concur with previous witnesses, Virginia and Murphy, that that has merit, certainly we shouldn't draw a circle that excludes anybody; we should make it big enough that it includes everybody, provided they share the same goal and that's to clean up litter. As far as numbers, I ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{have no magic} proposals, I do think it should be so, small enough that's it's practical if they meet somewhere; and not be a complete troop of them, if they have to go. Having served on, a number of occasions ~~over~~ the past 2 dozen years on St. boards ~~or~~ or commissions, I feel that the proposal of the council ~~not~~ meet not less than once every 3 months is perhaps unrealistic and may be unnecessary. I have, again,

no magic figure to substitute, but twice a year probably, and maybe 3; but I think merely the cost of that and the getting together, ~~of~~ with the size of our state, any of us who have served ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ as most of you have on various boards and commissions, I don't think it needs that much policing. As far as the receptles, I know, ^{that,} I think what is being proposed, and I have, well being Irish, I'm not going to propose green berets, or red or purple, or even brown for the Hickel establishments, I'm merely suggesting that we would probably save some dollars, to get what they are using ~~in~~ in Idaho, or in Wahsington, if we could order them in volume; and if all we do, ^{then} if we merely use our own oil barrels, but as has been suggested, use some decals from Alaska, so that the symbol is used on them, I think that would be a saving and it would also be an educational step for children or old folks to know that that's where they are to throw their refuse, trash. The, on, I note that there are, there is proposed also grants for public agencies, private, and also civic groups, municipal or gym types, and I think, whereas Anchorage particularly, Juenau to a letter degree, Fairbanks, some others, have had very fine clean-up programs. ~~Th~~ I think nothing should be done to discourage tho se, or minimize the voluntary help, it should merely supplement, and as I read the bill that's what they propose to do, and I think that's good. As far as the youth corp, and I know that's, gets to be a touch word on what we mean, I have no clarifying definition, but I think the key to this thing is getting young people involved, ~~that's~~ that's where it's at, and that's where we're really going to get to them to work on whatever banner, and I think these folks are more dedicated ~~than~~ the parents, in many cases, and that we should certainly utilize them, and the need for some job training and distraction from other activities that is perhaps not as desirable would come from having

an opportunity for young people who find it tough to find jobs to be involved in some of these positive steps. So, I do hope it is encouraged in some other manner. Certainly the idea of issuing bags and things, some has been done already, I feel that there ~~is~~ ~~no~~ ~~other~~ ~~your~~ ~~motor~~ registration or ~~registers~~ ~~others~~, ^{your} ~~cars~~, ~~boats~~ ~~has~~ ~~merit~~ ~~to~~ I think has merit and the receipts. I had noted also on the, as far as there as been some contention on which Dept. it should be placed, I am not quite as concerned with that, I think the most important ^{thing} ~~is~~ ~~to~~ determine the function. And the achievement of the goal is desire and not who's favored agency gets to run it. I think the real accomplishment, and the thing I'm also pleased to see, that it has, and Sen. Colletta at the offset testified, has a self destruct clause that in 3 years he has enough confidence, and that's how we would ~~ix~~ look at it, let's take, we've never been down this road before together, let's take a start, let's do the best we can, let's make corrections where needed, and if at the end of three years it produced nothing, or little, too little, then I think it should self-destruct as is proposed. ^{But} ~~And~~ ~~I~~ think that's a ^{very} favorable factor and I also would like, getting back to the financing end, the fact that apparently the proposed budget, and I only had a second to look, but the, starting at about 600,000; and if it could be done for less I would encourage that too, but I see for the three year period, but it's proposed that they indicate ^{'d} to us that they expect to raise under this 4-step funding method on the license, about \$668,000, and that appears to be an adequate money to carry it for three years. I think we would make a major mistake, in our public relations for the business people, if in about a year and 1/2 we have to go back and and put another tap on it. So I think that 3 year funding and I hope, I have no idea

that is correct, but I hope that, all the costs the Senator brought up are considered in there and that we don't find an overrun which finds us having to come back because that would be twice as tough as .. in the past. I certainly, for one, and it has been testified wouldn't take my time, nor yours, to try and come up to suggest something cosmetic approach. If this is a comprehensive, everybody get to it approach statewide, including the bush, and everywhere else, I say fine. If we all get our shoulder to it, I think we can make some accomplishment, so, even though the cost is involved, I think this this substitute is a reasonable approach to it and appreciate the chance to talk.

Stur: Don't go away, just a minutes. Questions of either of you?

Sen. Kelly?

Kelly: Yes, I'm somewhat chagrined on that you've taken ^{such} easy approach onto the reestablishment of the gross business license tax ^{in the} the State. You know, ^{we have} I suppose a philosophical .. on how do you fund a bill of this nature assuming that, you know, ^{we} you feel that it's comprehensive enough to ~~mean~~ mean anything. Washington, obviously, as Mr. Murphy testified, goes a different route and what they're saying I assume like something those businesses who contribute the most to the problem are picking up the tab. ^{we're} An Alaska ~~what-we-are~~ saying in essence, that everybody contributes to the problem, and that, but the businessman, be it the small businessman that might not in the least bit contribute to the problem, will pick up the tab. We're opening up the gross business tax again, and aren't you all worried that once we open it up and begin taxing on licenses again, that it will just be a simple step each year, just to increase it each year?

Dickey: No, I think that's a real possibility and I testified at
 offset
 the onset that we were not favorable when it was tied previously,
 1
 If you recall Senator, when you look at the proposal. There's a
 little difference. I guess it's kind of half horse, half rabbit,
 you're asking me which I like of the two 2, and what I'm saying
 I prefer this to the previous one which would have put at the top
 a fine or a fee of \$25,000, so I'm saying I like \$75 better than
 \$23,000; so, in proportion I think it's a much more realistic bill.
 I share your concern, and the possibility that this could be a
 vehicle to get back in the gross business license tax, which I would
 spend my full time arguing against it again, as I have for 18 years.

Stur: Sen. Kelly, any ~~more~~ ^{further} questions? Sen. Rodey?

Rodey: Just one, where would you draw the line, Don, in terms of
 Chamber support for this legislation in terms of cost? WE, unfortunately
 have seen costs rise and in some cases/^{all} out of proportion ^{of} ~~from~~ what
 we had anticipated. Certainly you've been a spectator as well as
 a participant in these activities, and where would the chamber draw
 the line in that regard? WE are talking about a ^{six hundred, seven} \$600-\$700,000 cost.

Dickey: Yes. I have no magic figure. I did talk to Sen. Colletta
 and the others, I expressed and repeat publically my concern that we
 are starting a little high. Now obviously the people in Administration
 are saying that they can hardly do it this cost, and I can understand
 it what are you paying for and what do you get? I was basing mine,
 you have to have some bench mark, and I asked Washington State, prior
 to Mr. Murphy's testimony, what do ^{you} ~~we~~ have, 5 years of experience in
 Washington, or six?

Murphy: Actually we really got rolling in 1972, but we had started in 1971.

Dickey: Seven years. But my thought when he responded ^{with that they started there} ~~there~~

with about \$600,000, and they are still holding, which appears pretty good based on their population; so, by comparison I was hoping we could get more for less, I guess, Now ~~is~~ how that would be done I realize you have to line for line go down. But I am stressing that I think one of the ways to do it, is that people who~~e~~ come in, as I understand it, into these communities to ~~we~~ help stimulate the cleanup of the river, or the communities y, the problem, that there only be one or two stimulators ~~is~~ ^{from} the State and that the rest of the volunteers, I don't think that everybody should have to be, or expect to be paid, or that the voluntters who were doing a good job in some communtties, be discouraged and say why should I go out and do this for free when across one street somebody is getting paid for this and let them do it. So I think that is a very real concern. I don't have a magic figure. I would hope that it would be less than this and somewhere, I'd say, under, we could do it for \$x 500 thousand, somewhere to start, and the~~y~~ work up. But I did stress to the sponsors and others this idea that the three of whatever they fund, I hope for those three years just from a sales point would be, would permit us to whatever growth is going to occur, and still not have to go back for seconds ..

Sturg: I wonder, have you gotten ...

Kelly: Let me ask, having spent 18 years in business Don and being Redey~~er~~ as close to the Ak. polical situation and the St. government budgetary process as you are, do you reasonably expect that budget ~~is~~ to stay at \$600,000 for 3 years?

Dickey: No. Nor do they propose that in here. They say \$~~ix~~ six hundred, six hundred seventy three, and I think in the 3rd year six hundred sixty

seven. And as I point out the total, I'm only using their figures, but they say it will raise six hundred sixty eight thousand the first year. ~~xxx~~ We hope that there will be more business licenses attracted to share this pleasantly with us, so that we can all contribute. But, ^{What} ^{Senator} so, /I guess my response/would be that it appears that figure is adequate even with the three steps and I also want to reemphasize and say again that I am pleased to see and would be here to see how it turns out, but there's a 3 year self-destruct because if that starts, as we are all a little concern^{ed}, if that starts getting into millions of dollars worth of program, then I think we might^{have} very quickly have second thoughts or other methods of skinning that same rabbit.

~~Stur~~

Stur: Any futher questions? Fine. I'll point out for the Committee. ^{litte} We have a/bit of a problem. Both Sen. Kelly and I should be over joining poor lonely Sen. Bradley, who's trying to run a meeting without a quarum. I wonder if I could get an indication, we've had Commissioner Mueller, who would like to speak .., are there others in the audience ~~xxx~~ that ~~xxxx~~ wish to speak on the subject. Alright, we have a couple of more. Commissioner, would we do you; 2 options here. One, we could allow Sen. Rodey to ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{continue} the meeting and we would then miss it, or we could take a very brief recess, and help Sen. Bradley get a quarum and get established at an official meeting and then slip back to hear your testimony. What's your schedule?

Mueller: I don't have a schedule, Senator.

Sturg: Could we, ah, we'll take about a 10 minutes~~g~~ recess and then we'll come back to hear the additional testimony.

Dickey: Senator, could I just

Sturg: Just a moment, Mr. Dickey go ahead.

43

Dickey: Just a last burst of wisdom.

Sturg: Oh, my, I can hardly wait. (Laughter)

Dickey: I would hope that the self-destruct on the bill would also
with
tie ~~in~~ the self-destruct on the tax. (Laughter)

Sturg: Very good. We'll ^{be} back in ten minutes. Thank you.