

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1999-2000 8672

9920 HOUSE LABOR & COMMERCE

<p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$99,500 MATCHING FUNDS: \$102,818</p>	<p>arsenic removal for mining water discharge. The technology also could be applied to public water supplies both in Alaska and in the rest of the United States.</p>
<p>Ps. 49 Project Project # 97-3-115S Project Manager: Miller, Leonard Start Date: 09/25/1997 End Date: 12/01/1998 TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$20,000 MATCHING FUNDS: \$20,000</p>	<p>The focus of this project is to validate the concepts underlying the grantee's device which is a unique method for holding and deboning salmon. The newly developed technology is in the process of being protected by a patent application. Under this project, a prototype unit will be constructed and tested to validate the concepts underlying the design. Once this has been successfully completed, the next step will be to introduce the design to an established manufacturer of seafood processing equipment for further development and refinement. At least one manufacturing company has voiced interest in working with the design and its designer once this stage has been successfully completed.</p> <p>The Alaskan seafood industry would benefit from equipment development that would process fish more efficiently and effectively than existing equipment. A successful outcome for this project could have this benefit as well as enhancing the State's technological knowledge base and perhaps its employment base.</p>
<p>Improving the Quality of Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim Salmon Project # 96-4-076S Project Manger: Mitchell, Christopher Start Date: 01/07/1997 End Date: 01/31/1998 TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$19,804 MATCHING FUNDS: \$12,000</p>	<p>The project will support the Arctic-Yukon Kuskokwim (AYK) Salmon Targeted Marketing Project, an effort managed by the Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation (AFDF) and supported by the State of Alaska to develop demand and sales in targeted domestic markets for AYK salmon products (primarily chums) through promotion of their flavor, higher oil content, value, natural qualities, and capability and potential to meet customer specifications. Toward this end, this project will identify quality characteristics unique to chum salmon from the Yukon and Kuskokwim areas and provide assistance to fishermen and processors seeking to improve the quality of their catch. Successful completion of the project will contribute to the development of guidelines.</p>
<p>Development of Functionally Enhanced, Fabricated Longline Baits from Alaskan Seafood Wastes Project # 97-1-053 Project Manager: Mitchell, Christopher Start Date: 07/16/1997 End Date: 09/30/1998 TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$319,000 MATCHING FUNDS: \$132,000</p>	<p>Develop novel, processed, functionally enhanced baits for the longline fisheries. Baits will be composed of waste-derived flavors and attractants, integrated into a manipulable matrix; the whole being designed and manufactured to meet industry needs of economy, consistency, soak time, tensile strength and species specificity. Baits will utilize Alaska seafood processing wastes and will be manufactured in Alaska.</p> <p>Currently, most longline bait is imported into Alaska. This project will keep in state many of the millions of dollars currently exported out of state to purchase bait. The project could result in a technological breakthrough that could be applicable to Alaska, as well as worldwide. Successful development of the artificial bait would change longlining worldwide by liberating from its reliance on a small number of bait species, unpredictable in price, size and quality, and moving it to baits manufactured from seafood processing wastes, designed and fabricated to target particular species and thus reduce bycatch.</p>
<p>Commercial Application and Adaptation of Fish Drying Methods to Produce and Market Dried Alaskan Salmon Products</p>	<p>The objective of this project is a concentrated effort to economically develop fish drying technology that can be readily placed into rural areas of Alaska in order to develop localized dried salmon industrial</p>

<p>Project # 96-1-007</p> <p>Project Manager: Mitchell, Duff</p> <p>Start Date: 05/05/1997</p> <p>End Date: 10/31/1998</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$279,365</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$1,280,843</p>	<p>operations. A parallel objective of the project is to analyze Pacific Rim markets and analyze foreign-produced dried salmon products for these Pacific Rim markets.</p> <p>The method utilized in this project will be to develop containerized and computer-controlled salmon smoker/dryers adapted from existing dryer technology. The market analysis and product development will be completed using Federal Saltonstall-Kennedy funds.</p> <p>The project takes the problem of wasted and underutilized salmon, applies new and adapted technologies, and develops product forms that could do to Chum and Pink salmon what Surimi did to bottomfish. The prototype salmon dryer will be tested and fine tuned during the 1997 salmon season. This project not only designs and develops the key component being the salmon dryer, but it also addresses the ancillary components so that the sum of the components can be rapidly and inexpensively fielded to urban as well as remote sites throughout Alaska in time for the 1998 season.</p>
<p>Wave Barrier Procedure Development</p> <p>Project # 95-3-110</p> <p>Project Manager: Nottingham, Dennis</p> <p>Start Date: 06/04/1996</p> <p>End Date: 07/31/1999</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: ARCTIC STUDIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$119,000</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$236,500</p> <p>Wave Barrier (Cont.)</p>	<p>The focus of this project is to develop a new set of guides and procedures for designing permeable wave barriers for use as an economical method of providing protection from wave action in small boat harbors. An ASTF-funded earlier study revealed that the existing design guidelines overstated the wave transmission which in turn resulted in overly conservative calculations of wave force. The objective of the current project is to more accurately measure wave attenuation and wave loading on structures by conducting scale model tests in a laboratory setting and comparing and verifying the data with measurements to be made on completed wave barriers in Elliott Bay, Seattle, as well as others. The desired outcome would be a new design procedure that would be accepted by the design community for general use in designing permeable wave barriers for all typical applications. (cont.)</p> <p>The results will be presented to the design community at professional meetings and conferences and in professional journals. The new guidelines will undergo peer review in the introduction process and will be adopted as the new standard for designing permeable wave barriers. Moreover, the new procedures can have direct benefits to the State since there are numerous locations in the State that are contemplating harbor expansions where wave barriers may be used and the improved design capability and reduced costs will have immediate benefits for Alaska.</p>
<p>Product Development Utilizing Hatchery Brood Salmon</p> <p>Project # 96-4-079S</p> <p>Project Manager: Nottingham, Lori</p> <p>Start Date: 01/07/1997</p> <p>End Date: 04/15/1997</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$17,889</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$16,162</p>	<p>This project will research and apply specific drying techniques to harvested hatchery brood chum salmon in developing a value-added animal food/supplement. Proof of concept will be accomplished after freeze dried and dehydration pilot tests are conducted using the brood chum salmon. Laboratory analysis on nutritional content, shelf life and/or decomposition will be conducted. Market research will validate the viability of a freeze dried and/or dehydrated product. The use of salmon carcasses from the hatchery at Douglas Island Pink and Chum, Inc., (DIPAC) will increase the utilization of the salmon resource, reduce DIPAC's cost of disposal and provide sufficient raw material to conduct pilot-scale operations on the production of their product.</p>
<p>Prototype Development Utilizing Brood</p>	<p>The focus of this Stage II project is to produce a prototype animal food</p>

<p>Salmon</p> <p>Project # 97-1-0632</p> <p>Project Manager: Nottingham, Lori</p> <p>Start Date: 07/07/1997</p> <p>End Date: 02/15/1999</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$203,420</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$160,518</p>	<p>using brood stock and other low-value salmon as its core ingredient. Initially, an animal training treat and an animal supplement/food mix will be developed and tested in several test markets. Concurrent activities include shelf life testing for rancidity and nutritional value as well as the development of marketing collateral such as logos, labels, and packaging for the products. The project builds on the findings of the first ASTF-funded project and is projected to lead to full-scale commercialization by attracting investment capital to fund manufacturing of the newly developed products and acquiring channels to markets identified during the research.</p> <p>The desired outcome for this project will be the development of relatively high-value products using the abundance of brood stocks and other low-value salmon that are so plentiful among the salmon runs around Alaska. This superior use of the State's salmon resources would lead to expanded employment opportunities for the fishing communities and generally would allow the retention of more of the State's resource value to remain within the State.</p>
<p>Levelock Smoked Salmon</p> <p>Project # 98-1-071S</p> <p>Project Manager: O'Neill, Mike</p> <p>Start Date: 04/15/1998</p> <p>End Date:</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$11,550</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$1,338,450</p>	<p>This project involves three tasks for developing a cold smoked native-style salmon product that needs no refrigeration and should be shelf stable. These tasks include 1) evaluate some current products to determine moisture, salt, water phase salt, water activity and microbial condition; 2) develop a process that meets DEC criteria for shelf stable seafoods; and 3) develop a new process using the technology for "intermediate moisture" products where food additives are used to bind water and produce shelf stable products.</p>
<p>Development of Ergonomic Pickup-based Camper</p> <p>Project # 95-1-024S</p> <p>Project Manager: Pruitt, Ken</p> <p>Start Date: 05/03/1995</p> <p>End Date: 10/15/1995</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$14,627</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$56,296</p>	<p>The design and construction in Alaska of an innovative prototype camper unit that will provide expanded living quarters when setup and will collapse into a streamlined size and shape for travel purposes. The unit will be completed in time for display at the Alaska State Fair in Palmer in September 1995.</p> <p>Successful outcome of the project will be the start of new business manufacturing units in Alaska that will benefit the Alaskan economy by providing new employment opportunities and as an import substitution.</p>
<p>Recycled Glass Tile Project</p> <p>Project # 98-2-082</p> <p>Project Manager: Raudenbush, Terri</p> <p>Start Date: 07/20/1998</p> <p>End Date: 02/28/1999</p>	<p>This project will focus on recycling used glass beverage containers into decorative glass tiles. The innovative aspects of this project include the application of established technologies such as glass crushing/processing, glass fusing, and tile manufacturing, in a remote Alaskan community with limited opportunities to create value-added products from waste material. The project will additionally research a potentially patentable fluxing application that greatly increases the aesthetic appearance of the tile through decreasing the devitrification of the glass particles during fusing. The project is separated into two</p>

<p>TECHNICAL AREA: ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$80,000</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$45,960</p>	<p>phases consisting of linear progressive tasks, directed to the goal of creating an independent recycling glass tile manufacturing business. ASTF has initially funded the first phase.</p> <p>Potential project benefits include reducing the amount of landfilled wastes; creating a product with an increase in life cycle; increasing public awareness of recycling; and potentially decreasing state-funded assistance for the disabled. Ultimate project success will be obtained through the completion of the second phase, and identified with the development of a business sustained independently of continued financial support, that helps to establish an infrastructure for future recycled products.</p>
<p>Displacement of Diesel Fuel with Wind Energy in Rural Alaskan Villages</p> <p>Project # 96-3-064</p> <p>Project Manager: Reeve, Bradley</p> <p>Start Date: 10/20/1997</p> <p>End Date: 01/31/2000</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: ENERGY</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$422,723</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$943,097</p>	<p>Design, build, install, and test a high penetration wind-diesel system in the Village of Deering, Alaska. The new components of the system (wind turbines, power conditioning, energy storage, control system) will be integrated with the existing diesel power generation system. The project will also demonstrate the effective use of community heating loads to absorb excess wind energy and maintain system stability. The Deering project will be a prototype to validate the technical feasibility and economic viability of wind-diesel hybrid electric generation systems for widespread applicability to rural villages, both in Alaska and internationally.</p> <p>Kotzebue Electric Association (KEA) has formed partnerships with the U.S. Department of Education's National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), and the Alaska Department of Community and Regional Affairs (DCRA), Division of Energy to demonstrate the technical and economic feasibility of the Atlantic Orient Corporation 15/50 wind turbine (AOC 15/50) for use in Arctic conditions.</p> <p>The success of this project will show that the installation and operation of a combined system of diesel and wind-powered generation will provide the energy needs of the village at a lower cost than diesel power generation and fuel oil fired heating systems.</p> <p>One of the unique elements of this project is the ability to fully utilize all of the wind-generated electrical power without incurring the capital and maintenance costs associated with an energy storage and retrieval system. Due to the year-round need for utility and building heat in the village, all of the power generated by wind can be utilized at the time it is generated.</p> <p>A second measure of success is providing electrical power with the same level of quality as is currently being provided. The components of power quality which will be measured are frequency distortion and the frequency and duration of power outages.</p> <p>A third measure of success will be the ability to install and operate this type of system in a small arctic village environment. This will be demonstrated by the successful installation of the system with equipment which is normally locally available or transportable with normal freight services such as barge or aircraft which can access these small villages; the system reliability with respect to the ability of the local personnel to operate and maintain the system; the reliability of the equipment to operate in the arctic environment.</p> <p>While economic viability is the cornerstone to the success of this project, it should be noted that the ability to utilize wind energy as a significant source of power and heat will reduce air emissions proportionately.</p>

<p>P.E.T. Bottle Indexing Device Project # 97-4-138S Project Manager: Riordan, Joseph Start Date: 10/15/1997 End Date: TECHNICAL AREA: UNCLASSIFIED ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$18,200 MATCHING FUNDS: \$7,500</p>	<p>A feasibility study for a device to index clear plastic bottles containing Alaska glacier water to eliminate defects caused by the bottle mold seams. The project would produce a device to orient plastic bottles in an assembly line to reduce or eliminate bottle mold seams and air pockets which hinder the appearance of a striking 3-D effect created by the bottle labels.</p>
<p>Alaskan Field Trials for Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning Test Kits Project # 97-4-154 Project Manager: Roberts, Raymond Start Date: 05/06/1998 End Date: 03/31/1999 TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$91,704 MATCHING FUNDS: \$124,010</p>	<p>The focus of this project is to field test a new PSP diagnostic testing procedure in Alaska that was developed by a Canadian biotechnology company. The new technology uses mouse cells rather than live mice in detecting and quantifying the presence of toxin in a sample. The project will entail performing a course of parallel trails using both the new maritime in vitro shellfish test (MISTTM) test kits and the currently used live mouse bioassay test at the state's DEC laboratory. In addition, the project will include performing a series of PSP-screening tests using a derivation of the quantitative MISTTM tests at three different aquaculture sites. The desired outcome of the project would be the acceptance of the new MISTTM technology by the State's Department of Environmental Conservation for use in Alaska and the development of a satisfactory strategy for transferring the technology to Alaska.</p> <p>A successful outcome of this project would allow the use of a PSP detection test in Alaska that would be more convenient, more cost-effective, more humane, and potentially more accurate than the currently used bioassay test. These benefits would improve the development of shellfish harvesting both in the wild and from farms as well as the profitability of this sector for participants. The transfer of the technology to Alaska would also provide new employment opportunities to the State.</p>
<p>Human Services Management Information System Project # 97-4-152 Project Manager: Rogers, Brian Start Date: 07/02/1998 End Date: 08/01/2000 TECHNICAL AREA: SOFTWARE & HARDWARE ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$598,534 MATCHING FUNDS: \$2,016,823</p>	<p>The project will develop a Human Services agency management information system, HS Info, and market it to state and local government and to nonprofit agencies. HS Info will be based on technology created in 1997. Some of the features to be included are use of a common interface by remote users--preferably via the Internet, providing user-customizable data elements for consumer and provider demographic information, and creation of a geographic information system (GIS) component of the software that would allow the agencies to pair consumers with the nearest geographic provider of the service desired.</p> <p>The project provides immediate benefits to the State of Alaska and dozens of nonprofit agencies who implement state policies for the developmentally disabled through improvements to management, reporting and accountability for public funds. It provides further potential benefits to other Alaska state agencies that use the technology and to those human service agencies outside Alaska. The project strengthens an Alaska software development firm, allowing it to extend its market reach outside Alaska.</p>
<p>BIDCO Development Project</p>	<p>This project is to assist in implementing the BIDCO assistance program</p>

<p>Project # 95-3-089B</p> <p>Project Manager: Rose, David</p> <p>Start Date: 07/27/1995</p> <p>End Date: 12/15/1995</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$9,684</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$11,184</p>	<p>described in AS 37.17.200 - 37.17.390.</p> <p>The purpose of the BIDCO assistance program is to assist in the formation and capitalization of one of more BIDCOs that have a highly qualified management team and a good business plan, and that are designed to operate in a profit-oriented, market-disciplined manner, with excellent prospects for long-term financial success and viability; promote economic development by providing a new source of risk capital and management assistance for businesses, especially small- and medium-sized businesses, in geographic areas throughout the state, including businesses in rural areas and distressed areas, and including minority-owned businesses; using state resources to attract other capital resources; and promoting the successful operation of BIDCOs.</p>
<p>Invention New Tie down Rails</p> <p>Project # 98-3-104S</p> <p>Project Manager: Rowe, James</p> <p>Start Date: 08/25/1998</p> <p>End Date: 03/31/1999</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$15,000</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$45,876</p>	<p>Complete prototypes of Beta model tie-down rails. Test market these tie-down rails through consumer use. Research interest in tie-down rails from end consumers, retailers, and distributors. Funding to obtain a patent registration number to protect design of tie down rail.</p>
<p>Assessment of Puccinellia Arctica, a Native Alaska Grass, for Habitat Alteration as a Means to Deter and Control Local Canada Goose Populations</p> <p>Project # 98-2-090</p> <p>Project Manager: Scorup, Peter</p> <p>Start Date: 06/30/1998</p> <p>End Date: 04/30/2001</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: AGRICULTURE</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$197,232</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$180,830</p>	<p>The results of this project will address a nonlethal means of controlling a critical problem: over population of geese in urban areas. The focus of this technology project is to demonstrate 1) that Puccinellia arctica (PAR) is an effective, long-term solution for deterring geese under certain mowing and fertilizer regimes; 2) that PAR is capable of withstanding foot traffic in high-use areas; 3) to determine if PAR provides for the nutritional requirements of geese, a key factor for controlling goose populations; and 4) to explore possible reasons for PAR's unpalatable characteristics by performing leaf toughness tests and laboratory analysis for common nutritional elements and toxins.</p> <p>If PAR proves to be unpalatable, its use as a goose deterrent would have a major impact on people, their safety, and the Alaska economy, which would grow and distribute PAR seeds for use in circumpolar regions. PAR is already recognized as a native plant that can be used for revegetating disturbed sites in the Arctic, another market for the seed.</p>

<p>Alaskan Shellfish Broodstock Development Products</p> <p>Project # 98-1-074S</p> <p>Project Manager: Sczawinski, Dave</p> <p>Start Date: 04/23/1998</p> <p>End Date: 12/01/2000</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$18,185</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$7,950</p>	<p>The focus of this project is the development of genetically superior oyster broodstock suitable for use by the Alaskan aquaculture industry. This small knowledge seeking project is interfaced with a USDA-funded Molluscan Broodstock Program (MBP) underway at the OSU Hatfield Marine Center located in Newport, Oregon, under the direction of Dr. Chris Langdon. Growout testing of oyster seed provided by the MBP will be performed at Sczawinski's Pristine Products Sea Farm located in the northern fjords of Prince William Sound. At least five brood lines will be selected over the life of the project, and adults from each of the selected broodlines will be delivered to the new shellfish hatchery in Seward for use as broodstock for production of oyster seed that is optimal for rapid growth on Alaskan farms.</p> <p>The Alaskan shellfish mariculture will benefit from the development of a source of seed that is genetically adapted to good survival and growth characteristics in Alaska. This Broodstock development dovetails with the opening of the shellfish hatchery in Seward to provide a local source of dynamic oyster seed to Alaskan farms. This has been one of the major hurdles for this industry to overcome for it to reach its considerable potential and grow to become an important sector of the Alaskan seafood industry.</p>
<p>Mineral Exploration Application of TRACER Technology</p> <p>Project # 95-3-102S</p> <p>Project Manager: Senftle, Joseph</p> <p>Start Date: 09/19/1995</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/1995</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: MINING</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$17,632</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$9,681</p>	<p>A demonstration to test the ability of an instrument capable of analyzing metals in rocks, soils, water, and industrial waste. The operational principle of the instrument is based on the analysis of a spectrum generated by a laser-induced discharge. The system, called tracer, is based on a patented approach developed by Advanced Power Technology, Inc. The project team would also like to use tracer to analyze treatment plant waters and natural runoff in the Fairbanks area. With vast areas of Alaska that have not been geologically mapped in detail, a rapid and low-cost means of mapping mineralization, ore deposits and hydrology systems will enhance mineral and petroleum exploration. The proposed concept can lead to development of a hand-held system for rapid identification and measurement of trace amounts (ppm-ppb) of elements in water and solid matrices to be used by mineral explorationists and environmentalists.</p>
<p>Seawater Purification System</p> <p>Project # 91-2-118</p> <p>Project Manager: Sewell, Richard</p> <p>Start Date: 07/13/1998</p> <p>End Date: 03/31/2000</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: HEALTH</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$227,073</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$201,200</p>	<p>The focus of this major technology development project is to construct and test a commercially sized seawater purification system using ozonation technology. This system will be used to process the buildup of nitrogen and bacterial wastes produced by live seafoods when being transported from harvest areas to distant markets in closed loop marine holding systems. The systems effectiveness would be demonstrated by using it to restore lobsters and other shellfish being shipped to Asian markets from the East coast of the U.S. and from remote harvest locations in Alaska. The desired outcome would be the development of a successful system that would improve mortality rates experienced when holding and transporting live shellfish.</p> <p>A successful outcome for this project will benefit Alaska since it will allow Anchorage to become a major site for collecting and transporting live shellfish. This would take advantage of Anchorage's strategic geographic location of being close to sources of live shellfish and a world-class transportation hub.</p>

<p>Integrally Heated Arctic Pipe Project # 96-3-061S Project Manager: Shaffer, Brent Start Date: 09/06/1996 End Date: 03/15/1997 TECHNICAL AREA: ARCTIC STUDIES ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$19,100 MATCHING FUNDS: \$45,300</p>	<p>Development of an integrally heated arctic piping system that has advantages over systems currently in use. Customers will be able to buy a pre-engineered integrally heated arctic piping system package from a single manufacturer rather than buying pipe and heaters separately and having to coordinate the integration in the field. These series circuit heaters are far superior to the self-limiting heating cables which predominate the market and also overcome disadvantages often associated with constant wattage heaters. The heaters will be less expensive, more durable, and safer. The system will be licensed to allay the concerns associated with constant wattage heaters and provide a customer with a more durable, factory-engineered and assembled product that can be produced in Alaska. This solution is primarily aimed at nonconductive piping systems used extensively in Alaska, but may be adapted to other systems.</p>
<p>Growing Wild Ginseng Project # 96-3-066S Project Manager: Smith, David Start Date: 04/15/1997 End Date: 09/30/1998 TECHNICAL AREA: AGRICULTURE ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$20,000 MATCHING FUNDS: \$28,000</p>	<p>Test and evaluate the growth of ginseng in different Alaskan environments; primarily birch and poplar old growth (mature) stands in the Mat-Su Borough and Anchorage area. One or more test sites that are primarily lacking in shade will be selected to evaluate full sunlight, cool soils, and the effect of long hours of daylight in June and July. The primary goal is to identify the types of forest that will support the growth of American ginseng; the potential fungi, insects, pests; the percentage of shade that is required for good growth characteristics; and the economic feasibility of growing ginseng in rural Alaska. Lower 48 ginseng growers need 65% to 80% shade because of the soil temperature. The Project manager believes that because of Alaskan soil conditions, Alaskan-grown ginseng may need only up to 25% shade. The Project Manager has identified well over 10,000 acres in the region that meets the basic criteria for the growing of ginseng in Alaska.</p>
<p>Growing Organic Ginseng in Alaska Project # 97-4-140 Project Manager: Smith, David Start Date: 04/16/1998 End Date: 10/31/2001 TECHNICAL AREA: AGRICULTURE ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$80,000 MATCHING FUNDS: \$189,000</p>	<p>The stage 2 project will grow American ginseng in the Matanuska Valley under typical commercial agriculture conditions in open fields and birch forests to verify its profitability and the ability to control soil-borne disease pathogens through the use of various biological control soil amendments. Several different growing environments and fungal preparations will be evaluated for adaptation to Alaska's unique growing conditions over a three-year period.</p> <p>If successful, this project has the potential to exceed the income of vegetable production in Alaska, using a very small part of the available agriculture land in the Matanuska Valley. American ginseng is the most profitable, sustainable herbal agricultural product in North America, capable of yielding profits of over \$5,000 per acre year in cultivated fields in Wisconsin and up to \$8,000 per acre year in the forest of Appalachia. Because of the quality of lightness, lack of weed control expenses, and the availability of suitable land, growing ginseng in Alaska may be even more profitable.</p>

<p>Mobile Dry Kiln Project # 98-2-084S Project Manager: Smith, Ted Start Date: 05/01/1998 End Date: 11/31/1998</p>	<p>Vast amounts of construction lumber is imported annually into Alaska. Until recently Alaska did not have a grading service to supply the necessary grade stamps to meet construction specifications for all public and/or architect-designed projects. Dried and surfaced lumber is necessary for accurate grading, but there are few operating dry kilns in the Interior since most of the mills currently operating are too small to afford their own dry kiln and are located far from a kiln where that service might be provided. This project intends to build a prototype to demonstrate an affordable, effective mobile dry kiln that can be used to</p>
---	---

<p>TECHNICAL AREA: FORESTRY ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$15,225 MATCHING FUNDS: \$28,200</p>	<p>improve the product of a small rural sawmill anywhere in Alaska.</p>
<p>Modeling Riverine Fisheries Acoustics: new Methods to Estimate Fish Abundance. Composition, and Uncertainties in Data Analysis Project # 97-4-147 Project Manager: Sonwalkar, Vikas Start Date: 05/19/1998 End Date: 02/28/2001 TECHNICAL AREA: ENERGY ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$111,743 MATCHING FUNDS: \$210,860</p>	<p>The focus of this project is to gain a greater understanding of how to better use sonar in rivers to estimate fish size, kind, and populations. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has teamed with the University of Alaska Fairbanks School of Engineering to undertake this three-year knowledge project. The tasks involved are UAF personnel to construct theoretical/numerical hydro-acoustic models that will compliment experimental and field work performed by AKF&G staff. The desired outcome of the project is to develop tools that improve methods for using and analyzing acoustic data to manage salmon runs. This information is important to understanding fish migrations and distributions, which in turn is a key to managing the resource for the subsistence, commercial, and sport fishers competing for the fish resource.</p> <p>Project succes: would bring improved fisheries resource management to the State's river systems such as the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers.</p>
<p>BIDCO Administrative Plan Project # 95-3-088B Project Manager: Steadman, Stanley Start Date: 07 11/1995 End Date: 12/ 5/1995 TECHNICAL AREA: UNCLASSIFIED ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$8,223 MATCHING FUNDS: \$1,300</p>	<p>This project is to assist in implementing the BIDCO assistance program described in AS 37.17.200 - 37.17.390.</p> <p>The purpose of the BIDCO assistance program is to assist in the formation and capitalization of one of more BIDCOs that have a highly qualified management team and a good business plan, and that are designed to operate in a profit-oriented, market-disciplined manner, with excellent prospects for long-term financial success and viability; promote economic development by providing a new source of risk capital and management assistance for businesses, especially small- and medium-sized businesses, in geographic areas throughout the state, including businesses in rural areas and distressed areas, and including minority-owned businesses; using state resources to attract other capital resources; and promoting the successful operation of BIDCOs.</p>
<p>Chinook Manufacturing Jager Project Project # 97-3-134 Project Manager: Stuebaker, Kirk Start Date: 04/29/1998 End Date: 12/31/1999 TECHNICAL AREA: UNCLASSIFIED ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$200,000</p>	<p>Chinook Mfg., Inc., has applied for patent protection on modifications to a skid-frame suspension system that allows it to be used in an all-season, all-terrain, two-tracked vehicle called the "JAGER." This project will develop the beta prototype for mass production. The JAGER will be built on a basic platform, consisting of a cab, chassis, drive train, tow tracks in the rear, and two steering skis in the front. For summer use the skis are replaced with interchangeable standard rubber tires. The proof-of-concept prototype is remarkably light, yet it travels at speeds above 60 MPH over uneven snow or ground.</p> <p>A wide range of payload configurations can be fitted onto the basic platform. The JAGER can be configured for uses including search and rescue, police, fire engine, utility van, passenger bus, open truck, ambulance, and more. It has been designed for low maintenance and easy repair. The simplicity of the</p>

<p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$205,825</p>	<p>mechanical features provides for a high degree of adaptability, of tremendous value in remote and extreme arctic conditions.</p>
<p>Seasoning Softwoods and Hardwoods Project # 98-2-099 Project Manager: Sumrall, John Start Date: 08/18/1998 End Date: TECHNICAL AREA: FORESTRY ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$164,910 MATCHING FUNDS: \$164,910</p>	<p>The funding requested in this proposal will be used to provide proof of concept test results for seasoning of high value-added hardwoods and softwoods. The proposed seasoning technique offers several advantages over conventional drying techniques such as faster drying times, lower operating costs, and reduced rates of drying defects. The requested funding will be used to further develop, for commercial purposes, the technology protected by the patents held by the authors for this technology. Royalties will be paid to ASTF upon subsequent licensing of the process after proof of concept testing.</p>

<p>Alaskan Ecotechnology for Commercial Lingonberry Production Project # 95-3-094S Project Manager: Talbot, Vickie Start Date: 08/10/1995 End Date: 10/30/1996 TECHNICAL AREA: AGRICULTURE ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$20,000 MATCHING FUNDS: \$63,348</p>	<p>This project will test the effectiveness of recreating a forest environment for commercial production of lingonberries. Domestication of the lingonberry in Alaska is potentially valuable for commercial production and is a viable agricultural development option with a high resale value for value-added commercial applications, such as candy, jam, and jelly. Testing the forest replication technology could provide valuable information to potential growers.</p>
---	---

<p>Ecotechnology for Commercial Lingonberry Production Project # 97-1-0622 Project Manager: Talbot, Vickie Start Date: 07/18/1997 End Date: 09/01/1999 TECHNICAL AREA: AGRICULTURE ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$75,645 MATCHING FUNDS: \$493,245</p>	<p>This project will identify optimum conditions for cultivating, irrigating, marketing and distributing lingonberries as a commercial operation in Alaska. This project will promote diversification of the Alaskan economy by developing a prototype for lingonberry production which can be replicated in many areas of Alaska. Specifically, this operation can be used in areas with high unemployment and large public assistance roles. Lingonberries grow in the wild in many areas of the State, but are difficult to harvest in their natural environment. This product does not require the extensive adaptations of other warm climate crops transported to Alaska and has tremendous market potential.</p>
--	---

<p>Nomad Shelter Arctic Ger Project # 97-1-060 Project Manager: Tenhoff, Lee Start Date: 11/06/1997</p>	<p>Design and research of new technologies to create a compacting frame and floor for a portable shelter, Arctic Ger. Build a prototype Arctic Ger that is light and compact that exhibits technological improvements in both design and manufacturing processes. The Arctic Ger structure will be a unique value-added product meeting a distinctively Alaskan need. Many resource-based industries in Alaska have a need for seasonal remote</p>
--	--

<p>End Date: 07/31/1998</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: ARCTIC STUDIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$46,700</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$68,638</p>	<p>housing that is portable and steerable. The final design for the Arctic Ger is expected to be more portable and complete than comparable tubular steel structures and will break down to fit in a Cessna 207. Potential markets for the Arctic Ger are the Park Service, Fish and Game, Native Corporations, and the general public.</p>
<p>IEB 2000/GenMan/Application Software</p> <p>Project # 97-3-122</p> <p>Project Manager: Thompson, Scott</p> <p>Start Date: 10/13/1997</p> <p>End Date: 04/01/1999</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: ENERGY</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$1,500,000</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$1,500,000</p>	<p>The project will produce controller technology interfaced to software applications for the distributed power generation industry which allows users to select their power source and operate it. The project is comprised of several major activities: hardware development, firmware development, software which resides in a personal computer, manufacturing, marketing, sales, and services. The hardware will be designed to receive and digitize signals from various sensors located within a distributed power generation (DPG) plant, this data is then acted upon by the firmware to produce various commands for running the power plant and communicating with the PC software. The firmware controls the process and applies algorithms on the data to maintain the DPG at top efficiency and low cost. Combined, the hardware and firmware offer a breakthrough in controller technology; the software closes the loop by providing an interface to the controller and collecting the power plant data for use in managing the DPG.</p> <p>This project is expecting to reduce the cost of electricity in Alaska. An estimated 40-100 additional jobs in Alaska could be created as Alaska becomes an exporter producing switchgear controllers and power related software, greater utilization of waste heat from electric generation plants, and more reliable electricity at less cost. The ultimate goal is to provide an integrated circuit that is essentially the operating system for controllers and surround that core with an array of software developed by Distributed Systems, LLC., and others.</p>
<p>An Innovative Method of Marine Magnetic Compass Adjustment and Compensation</p> <p>Project # 98-2-089S</p> <p>Project Manager: Thynes, Russell</p> <p>Start Date: 08/18/1998</p> <p>End Date:</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$18,696</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$9,740</p>	<p>No project description provided.</p>
<p>Tidal Power Generation Prototype Feasibility Studies and Generation Optimization Program</p> <p>Project # 97-3-116</p> <p>Project Manager: Ullman, Peter</p> <p>Start Date: 03/25/1998</p> <p>End Date: 06/30/1999</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: ENERGY</p>	<p>Alaska's southern coastline has some of the largest tidal ranges in the world. This study will determine the feasibility of installing a prototypical plant in Cordova to produce electricity from tidal power using the latest technology. Previous technologies have yielded plants with environmental and economic drawbacks which have limited their use and success. These studies will result in information needed to design the plant, secure financing, and obtain the necessary permits to construct the plant. Concomitantly, a generation optimization program will be developed incorporating the load demands of the city and the tidal cycles of the site.</p> <p>Tidal power is a clean and renewable source of energy. It is envisioned that the Cordova plant will be cost-competitive and provide solutions to power demands for Alaskan coastal communities. If the feasibility is demonstrated,</p>

<p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$200,000 MATCHING FUNDS: \$327,000</p>	<p>it is estimated that many cities may be able to use this technology for power production.</p>
<p>Birch Bark Manufacturing Technology Project # 98-1-002 Project Manager: VonFintel, Florence Start Date: 06/16/1998 End Date: 07/31/1999 TECHNICAL AREA: UNCLASSIFIED ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$202,808 MATCHING FUNDS: \$147,984</p>	<p>This project will bring cutting-edge specialty manufacturing equipment and technology from around the world to Alaska. It will bring availability of services to a wide variety of Alaskan specialty manufacturers not currently available in Alaska. This cutting-edge specialty manufacturing system package will advance Alaska's capabilities to produce existing and new products.</p> <p>Upon completion, this project will be instrumental in assisting numerous entrepreneurs to overcome production problems which currently are preventing or limiting its opportunities to establish viable businesses. There are 21 businesses already signed up to utilize the specialty manufacturing system package.</p>
<p>Total Bone Removal System Project # 96-3-065 Project Manager: Wadsworth, Ray Start Date: 10/24/1996 End Date: 03/31/1997 TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$45,000 MATCHING FUNDS: \$55,000</p>	<p>The focus of this project is to determine the feasibility of a total bone removal process for fish that would remove the entire skeleton including pinbones in a single step. This proof-of-concept level project will refine the shape and design of the jig and cutting blades and how they would pass through the fish as a first step. If this project has a successful outcome, the next step would be to fabricate a bench-level prototype to further refine and test the device before field testing with an engineering prototype.</p> <p>This novel concept for deboning salmon could revolutionize the processing sector of the industry and change the economics of the salmon business if it proves successful. This in turn would allow the Alaskan salmon industry to better compete in the world markets with the State's abundant fish resources. This will help stabilize an important economic base for coastal Alaska and provide the basis for improved and expanded employment opportunities for Alaskans.</p>
<p>Total Bone Removal for Salmon Project # 97-1-0042 Project Manager: Wadsworth, Ray Start Date: 03/03/1997 End Date: 10/31/1998 TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$519,164 MATCHING FUNDS: \$660,836</p>	<p>An engineering prototype machine will be fabricated based on what was learned in the proof-of-concept stage and will be field tested at a salmon processing plant located in Kodiak for the 1997 summer season. This second unit will be used for a series of engineering tests to determine efficiency, throughput, product quality and reliability of the design for further evaluation and refinement. Once the results of the tests have been evaluated, the project team will be able to develop a commercialization strategy and a beginning business plan for implementing the strategy. The schedule for completing these tests and commercialization planning is October 1997.</p> <p>If the results of the testing are encouraging, this work could lead to a solution of a problem that has been identified by the processing sector as a major hindrance for the industry to realize greater efficiency and profitability in providing market acceptable products from Pink and Chum salmon. A commercially viable unit would favorably alter the cost structure of processing these low-value, high-volume species which would allow the products to better compete with other convenience-style products made from white fish and poultry. This outcome would promote higher ex-vessel prices paid to harvesters and increase product sales for the processors of salmon.</p>
<p>Leading Edge Exhaust Collector Systems</p>	<p>Manufacture a prototype exhaust collector system for Cessna 205 through 210 series normally aspirated aircraft. Document the optimum production</p>

<p>Project # 95-4-120</p> <p>Project Manager: Wagner, Dane</p> <p>Start Date: 05/22/1996</p> <p>End Date: 09/30/1997</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: UNCLASSIFIED</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$176,513</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$249,809</p>	<p>processes, receive FAA product approval and develop a comprehensive business plan.</p> <p>The product is being developed in direct response to customer requests and is expected to resolve a number of problems inherent in existing products and improve the performance and safety of the aircraft on which it is installed. Research conducted will assist in the future research and development of a series of follow on products that, together, will support a new light manufacturing industry in Alaska.</p>
<p>Digital Mapping System (DMS)</p> <p>Project # 94-1-004</p> <p>Project Manager: Watson, William</p> <p>Start Date: 11/08/1995</p> <p>End Date: 01/31/1999</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: EDL</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$180,000</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$141,180</p>	<p>Develop a comprehensive data acquisition and processing digital mapping System (DMS). The system will collect, process, and display real-time data from seafloor sonar imagery, seismic profiling data, bathymetry, and satellite navigation. Among the DMS's most useful capabilities is the integration of sonar, seismic, and bathymetric (depth) data to give a three-dimensional representation of the seafloor and subseafloor.</p> <p>The project will produce a unique tool applicable to Alaskan resources and scientific concerns. The DMS technology will be marketed to organizations who require powerful digital map processing including oil, Mining, Environmental, seafood processing, classified concerns, and government. The outcome of this project will expand the use of topographic seafloor data. By making the seafloor maps easy to understand and analyze, the DMS system will be an essential tool in seafloor and subseafloor mapping.</p>
<p>Reverse Engineering</p> <p>Project # 97-1-077</p> <p>Project Manager: Welles, Stanley</p> <p>Start Date: 10/28/1997</p> <p>End Date: 12/31/1999</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$240,924</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$359,598</p>	<p>Create Reversed Engineering Design and Analytical Databases for the Piper PA-18 Super Cub yielding a cost curve per 100 pound increment of gross weight increase and an FAA-approved Gross Weight Increase. The tools and methodology developed will be directly applicable to providing engineering support to the rest of the Alaska fleet of aircraft.</p> <p>There are some 10,000 general aviation aircraft in Alaska. This represents approximately 5% of all general aviation aircraft in the entire United States. Therefore, Alaska has a very high potential for aircraft modifications. The state of Alaska currently has very limited private aircraft engineering resources to provide the needed service. Since the results of this project can be used for engineering support for aircraft similar to the Piper Super Cub, it will greatly enhance the utility and safety of a majority of airplanes flying in Alaska.</p>
<p>Research & Development of Birch Sap Beverages</p> <p>Project # 96-1-009S</p> <p>Project Manager: Weltzin, Jeff</p> <p>Start Date: 03/12/1996</p>	<p>Development of birch sap beverage formulas tailored to meet specific export markets; design demonstration production technology; produce prototype products and deliver to markets; identify consumer preferences and market strategies; evaluate consumer preferences and production requirements to develop commercial level production capabilities</p>

<p>End Date: 01/31/1997</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: AGRICULTURE</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$19,835</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$55,750</p>	
<p>Catch Data Uploading in Bristol Bay</p> <p>Project # 96-4-085</p> <p>Project Manager: Wiebe, William</p> <p>Start Date: 03/18/1997</p> <p>End Date: 11/30/1998</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$29,866</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$52,184</p>	<p>This is a further demonstration of utilizing computer technology to capture and report salmon harvest information between the tender fleet and the processors. It will develop software to relay catch data compiled by the fish ticket printer system to the processor's office for interface with their existing accounting software. The project will take place in the Bristol Bay with two processors and numerous tender operators during the 1997 salmon season.</p> <p>The desired outcome would be to improve the accuracy of the catch data at the harvest delivery site as well as to improve the timeliness of getting it to the processors in a useful form that would interface with existing counting software. The long-range goal is to build a system that would also allow electronic reporting of harvest data to fishery managers and regulators for real-time management of the fisheries.</p>
<p>Natural Convection Dry Kiln</p> <p>Project # 97-1-007S</p> <p>Project Manager: Yamamoto, Rodney</p> <p>Start Date: 03/28/1997</p> <p>End Date: 01/31/1999</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: FORESTRY</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$21,797</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$50,027</p>	<p>This project will design and construct a 15,000-board foot dry kiln that small sawmill owners can acquire and build for under \$25,000. The kiln will be designed to burn waste wood from the sawmill to create the primary heat for the kiln. The kiln temperatures should be suitable for the proper drying of Alaska hardwoods, such as birch. If successful, this project should provide Alaska's small sawmill operators with a valuable tool to produce marketable materials and products from currently underutilized species of Alaskan woods.</p>
<p>Chunk/Flake Style Pink Salmon Meat Packed in Retortable Pouches</p> <p>Project # 95-1-0142</p> <p>Project Manager: Zimmerman, Peter</p> <p>Start Date: 04/13/1995</p> <p>End Date: 02/01/1996</p> <p>TECHNICAL AREA: FISHERIES</p> <p>ASTF FUNDS AWARDED: \$435,000</p> <p>MATCHING FUNDS: \$2,585,892</p>	<p>A Pilot Project will build on knowledge learned in an earlier "proof of concept" grant, and expand production to commercial scale. Project will result in a unique chunk/flake style skinless, boneless pink salmon product that is demonstrated at precommercialization levels. A goal of this project will be production of 1,000,000 pounds of the new salmon product using a prototype processing line to be developed and located in Kodiak. Product manufactured on the new line will be sold to institutional and wholesale consumers for continuing market assessment and evaluation.</p> <p>This project will benefit the Alaska Seafood industry by producing a modern, consumer-oriented product designed from one of the State's lower-valued salmon species. This project will significantly enhance value-added economic development of the resource in-state, while providing additional employment opportunities in Alaska's coastal communities.</p>

APPENDIX C

Teacher Grants
Funded from January 1995 through September 1998

Grant No.	Date	Teacher	Project	ASTF
97-1-014T	02/97	Albert	Constellations of the Arctic & Antarctic	\$6,795
97-1-015T	02/97	Allen	Copper Valley Plant Guide	\$7,168
97-1-016T	02/97	Allor	Wild Water	\$5,541
96-2-039T	05/96	Angaiak	Kilbuck Outdoor School	\$6,900
95-2-040T	09/95	Atoruk	Arctic Watershed Project	\$6,289
96-2-047T	05/96	Barkman	Kenai Fjords National Park Website	\$5,620
96-2-027T	05/96	Bartley	Kaktovik Inupiaq Numerals	\$9,993
97-1-017T	02/97	Bear	Ticasuk Science and Math Fest	\$7,249
97-1-018T	02/97	Beaudin	Kid's Eye View of Prince William Sound	\$7,019
96-2-031T	05/96	Belcher	S.A.M. Link Alaska (Science & Math Linking Alaskans)	\$7,300
95-2-041T	09/95	Berg	Glacier Valley Science Station	\$5,963
95-2-042T	09/95	Bifelt	JHS Seismology Study Project	\$5,615
97-1-019T	02/97	Bivins	Sixth Grade Winter Survival and Environments Project	\$6,821
97-1-021T	02/97	Bohanan	Community Nature Trail System	\$7,263
97-1-022T	02/97	Brook-Keyes	Primarily Marine Science	\$6,789
98-1-016T	02/98	Buckley	Analysis of the Arctic Biome	\$8,480
95-2-043T	09/95	Butler	Glacial Ski Science Learning Expedition	\$5,832
95-2-044T	09/95	Castor	Energy, The Engineering Design Process & Wind power	\$5,553
98-1-017T	02/98	Castor	Operating Models of Power Plant and Coal Mine Systems	\$7,175
96-2-043T	05/96	Clark	Talkeetna Weather Kids	\$6,163
96-2-032T	05/96	Cole	Learning Math, Science & Technology Using Remote Sensors	\$7,272
98-1-018T	02/98	Collins	Experimental Archaeology: Re-creation of Lapp "Bow"	\$4,018
98-1-019T	02/98	Concilus	Interactive Distance Delivered Instruction	\$8,424
97-1-023T	02/97	Cooper	Calculator-based Labs in the Science Classroom	\$6,996
95-2-045T	09/95	Corsetti	Year-round Solar Power in Interior Alaska	\$2,434
97-1-024T	02/97	Corsetti	Coho Salmon Counting Station	\$7,368
97-1-025T	02/97	Cox	Sitka Black-Tailed Deer Population Research, Kodiak Island	\$7,425
97-1-026T	02/97	Crawford	Completing the Cycle, From Garbage to Garden	\$5,760
96-2-026T	05/96	Dallin	Radio Tracking of Black Bears	\$6,707
98-1-020T	02/98	Dallin	Satellite Tracking of Peregrine Falcon Migration	\$7,842
98-1-021T	02/98	Darrow	A Study of the Foraker River Delta	\$8,702
97-1-027T	02/97	Davis	Alaska Stream Monitoring Network	\$6,793
96-2-028T	05/96	Dean	Baseline Ecological Study of Squaw Creek	\$7,075
96-2-035T	05/96	Decker	The Alaska-Oklahoma Connection	\$6,652
98-1-022T	02/98	Decker	Let's Talk Science	\$6,598
98-1-023T	02/98	DeGray	Alakanuk Culture Camp	\$7,157

97-1-028T	02/97	Dietzel	Our Arctic Ocean Environment	\$8,418
98-1-024T	02/98	Drew	Sharing and Showcasing What We Learned About Alaska	\$6,736
98-1-025T	02/98	Eck	Study of Natural Timber Regrowth of SE Alaska	\$2,399
97-1-029T	02/97	Eddy	Frederick Sound Water Profiles	\$7,506
97-1-030T	02/97	Edwards	FishNet	\$6,805
98-1-026T	02/98	Eller	Killer Whales, Brown Bears, and the Double Helix Teaching DNA the Alaska Way	\$7,128
96-2-041T	05/96	Exe	Chukchi Aquarium	\$8,167
97-1-031T	02/97	Farr	Bogged Down in Math & Science	\$6,795
96-2-048T	05/96	Fellenberg	Remote Robotic Exploration	\$6,955
98-1-027T	02/98	Fellenberg	Discovering the World by GPS	\$6,684
97-1-032T	02/97	Fish	What's Bugging Our River	\$7,217
98-1-028T	02/98	Floyd	Classroom Salmon Egg Incubation	\$3,288
95-2-046T	09/95	Foster	Baseline Ecological Study of Squaw Creek, Dillingham, AK	\$6,264
98-1-029T	02/98	Gaquin	Ethnobotany of Point Hope	\$7,414
98-1-030T	02/98	Girard	The Polaris Schoolyard Habitat for Learning and Growing	\$6,800
97-1-033T	02/97	Good	Dredge Creek Salmon Enhancement Project	\$6,208
95-2-047T	09/95	Griffin	Exploring Science, Math, & Technology Through Ham Radio	\$5,254
97-1-037T	02/97	Haase-Bushong	Baseline Ecological Study of Squaw Creek, Dillingham, AK	\$7,819
95-2-048T	09/95	Hall	Camping with Science & Math	\$6,208
97-1-035T	02/97	Halverson	Cube Cove in the Year 2025	\$7,546
97-1-036T	02/97	Hanna	Exploring the Potential for Wind-generated Power in Coastal Alaskan Villages	\$7,729
95-2-049T	09/95	Hegg	Arctic Engineers	\$5,812
97-1-038T	02/97	Hegg	Alaskan Soil--The Layer of Life	\$6,905
98-1-031T	02/98	Hermon	Tree Growth and Reclamation	\$4,321
97-1-039T	02/97	Hodge	Nunaka by the Sea	\$6,805
95-2-050T	09/95	Hoffman	Evaluation of Sewage Outfall Impact on Water and Nearshore Habitat of East Landing, St. Paul Island	\$6,682
98-1-032T	02/98	Hooker	Science Explorers Program	\$5,831
98-1-034T	02/98	Hull	Off to a Healthy Life	\$4,398
98-1-035T	02/98	Imhof	Koyukuk's Web	\$7,954
95-2-051T	09/95	John	Alaska Native Science	\$6,012
97-1-040T	02/97	Johnson	Project Sealab	\$7,086
98-1-036T	02/98	Jones	A Season of Discontent: What can be done to counteract SAD in Alaska	\$5,509
96-2-046T	05/96	Keep-Barnes	A Northern Boreal Museum	\$6,548
97-1-041T	02/97	Kennedy	Village Math	\$4,949
98-1-037T	02/98	Keplinger	Surf and Turf - Sea Resources for Land Use	\$7,038
96-2-038T	05/96	Klopper	Athabaskan Environmental Physics Trail	\$5,450
96-2-050T	05/96	Klunder	Alaskan Environmental Research Network	\$6,493
95-2-052T	09/95	Knopp	Hatcher Pass Ski Resort Project	\$5,852
98-1-038T	02/98	Knopp	Environmental Engineering in the Valley	\$6,929

98-1-033T	02/98	Koberstein	Emergency Medical Technology Training for High School Students	\$8,316
96-2-029T	05/96	Kristich	Are You Dressed for Winter?	\$6,523
98-1-039T	02/98	Langbauer	Sitka Statistics	\$4,828
98-1-040T	02/98	Larson	DNA Analysis of Kenai River Fish	\$6,738
98-1-041T	02/98	Lasher	Creating and Exploring Alternative Growing Environments in Alaska	\$6,740
97-1-020T	02/97	Lehman	Interconnections:Community, Natural Resources, and Technology	\$7,457
95-2-053T	09/95	Lennihan	Geology of Alaska	\$4,911
98-1-042T	02/98	Lewis	Leave No Trace	\$7,138
98-1-043T	02/98	Loudermilk	Chester Creek Community Watershed Project	\$6,798
95-2-054T	09/95	Love	Calling All Birds	\$5,711
97-1-042T	02/97	Lundquist	Composting Local Barley and Fish Wastes	\$6,538
97-1-045T	02/97	Lundt	Is the Reintroduction of Ruffed Grouse Affecting the Spruce Grouse Population? "Radio Telemetry	\$6,905
97-1-043T	02/97	Marvin	The Growing Place	\$8,068
98-1-044T	02/98	McBee	First Grade Science in the Local Community	\$7,138
98-1-045T	02/98	McCarthy	Giants in our Midst: The Mt. Edgecumbe Volcanic Field	\$6,805
98-1-046T	02/98	McDowell	Stream Exchange	\$6,929
96-2-033T	05/96	McWilliams	Weather--A Kid's Eye View	\$5,679
97-1-046T	02/97	Miller	Weather Surveillance	\$7,285
97-1-047T	02/97	Million-Gilbert	Picturing Science	\$7,104
98-1-047T	02/98	Miner	Follow the Tulips	\$6,700
96-2-040T	05/96	Mwary	Takotna River Fish Counting Tower: Abundance and Run Timing of Chum	\$8,724
98-1-048T	02/98	Nolting	Reclaiming Alaska's Lost Resource	\$6,929
98-1-049T	02/98	Okland	One for Oil and Oil for One	\$6,295
98-1-050T	02/98	Onslow	Snowmaking - Mathematics & Microclimates	\$6,800
98-1-051T	02/98	Ooka	Chicken Project	\$7,611
95-2-055T	09/95	Parker	Tuyuryarmiut Indigenous Food Cookbook	\$6,258
98-1-052T	02/98	Parkin	Simulating Whale Bones	\$7,247
98-1-053T	02/98	Peterson	Where's the Wolf?	\$6,616
95-2-056T	09/95	Ricker	Environmental Atmospheric Science by a High School Science Team Using Acoustic Radar	\$5,186
98-1-054T	02/98	Roschy	The People's Oral History of Alaska Through Subsistence and Language	\$6,700
96-2-037T	05/96	Ross	Unalakleet Middle School Poultry Project	\$6,778
95-2-057T	09/95	Sander	Calculator-based Labs in the Math Classroom	\$5,027
96-2-051T	05/96	Sargent	Monitoring for Carbon Monoxide: Connecting Students with Science and Math	\$6,718
98-1-055T	02/98	Schandelmeier	Simple Air Pollution Monitoring	\$7,218
98-1-056T	02/98	Scharf	Bringing the Ocean into the Class	\$6,022
98-1-057T	02/98	Schneider	The Alutiiq Way of Knowing	\$7,038
98-1-058T	02/98	Schwartz	Petersburg Living Laboratory	\$7,291

97-1-034T	02/97	Serbula	TRIP (Tanana River Ice Project)	\$7,204
95-2-058T	09/95	Sheppard/Gillam	The Effect of the Aurora on Brassica Rapa Seeds	\$2,844
95-2-061T	09/95	Sinnott	Project Habitat	\$5,862
96-2-036T	05/96	Slaven	Salmon Streams & Sherrod School	\$6,765
98-1-059T	02/98	Sloat	Alaska Applied Forest Technology	\$6,772
96-2-044T	05/96	Smith	Solar Heated Garden	\$5,613
97-1-044T	02/97	Sotelo	Project Lift-Off	\$7,295
95-2-059T	09/95	Squires	Laser Communications	\$6,030
95-2-060T	09/95	Szarzi	Water Quality of Subarctic Lakes	\$6,266
96-2-034T	05/96	Taylor	Central School of Science Forensic Science Project	\$7,406
98-1-060T	02/98	Taylor	Potter's Marsh Watershed Project	\$6,800
98-1-061T	02/98	Taylor	Voyage of the Yukon Canoes	\$6,929
96-2-030T	05/96	Taylor	Atomic Signatures on the Farm	\$6,760
95-2-062T	09/95	Terrill	Kaltag School Wetlands Project	\$4,849
96-2-045T	05/96	Thomas	Project to Understand our Glacial Environment	\$5,610
96-2-042T	05/96	Thompson	St. Michael Island Clear Lakes Study	\$4,243
98-1-063T	02/98	Thompson	St. Michael Island Clear Lake Study II	\$5,982
98-1-062T	02/98	Tierney-Sword	Baseline Ecological Study of Squaw Creek, Dillingham	\$7,910
97-1-048T	02/97	Warne	Flight Learning Center	\$7,990
97-1-049T	02/97	Washington	The Graded Gardeners	\$6,778
98-1-064T	02/98	Weaver	Moose in a Pot	\$6,899
98-1-065T	02/98	Webber	Science Concepts In-public Hands-on Investigation	\$6,919
96-2-052T	05/96	Webber-Werle	Parents as Partners in Science	\$8,892
98-1-066T	02/98	Webber-Werle	Backpacks for Noatak: A Bird Project	\$8,855
95-2-063T	09/95	Weimann	Northern Regions On-line	\$4,722
96-2-049T	05/96	Wellman	An Alaskan Epidemic:Coming to Terms with the Spruce Beetle	\$7,677
95-2-064T	09/95	Whitmore	Bugged By Beetles	\$5,422
97-1-051T	02/97	Whitmore	The Role of Fire in Alaska	\$7,864
97-1-050T	02/97	Wingo	Science Creatively Unifying Marine Mathematics (SCUMM)	\$6,775
98-1-067T	02/98	Wood	Tuluksak Hydroponics Project	\$7,480
98-1-068T	02/98	Yatsik	Life and Pollution Beneath the Lake Surface	\$7,038

Total Amount All Proposals: \$945,885 Highest Proposal Amount \$9,993 Average of All Proposals: \$6,615

Lowest Proposal Amount \$2,399 Total Proposals This Batch: 143

APPENDIX D

Internet Grants
Funded from January 1995 through September 1998

Project No	Date	Grant Manager	Project	ASTF	Matching
------------	------	---------------	---------	------	----------

97-1-059I	04/97	Gorsuch	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(1)	\$4,378	\$19,700
97-1-061I	04/97	Johnson	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(2)	\$7,242	\$3,000
97-1-065I	02/97	Comeau	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(3)	\$960,000	\$4,050,000
97-1-066I	04/97	Bowling	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(4)	\$150,000	\$120,025
97-1-070I	04/97	Billingsly	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(5)	\$10,000	\$192,000
97-1-071I	04/97	Key	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(6)	\$20,000	\$100,000
97-1-072I	04/97	Knudsen	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(7)	\$129,874	\$115,724
97-1-073I	04/97	Palenske	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(8)	\$279,961	\$269,378
97-1-074I	04/97	Hebhardt	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(9)	\$18,322	\$0
97-1-078I	05/97	Bromenschenkel	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(10)	\$399,892	\$1,000,000
97-2-081I	05/97	Johnson	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(11)	\$90,112	\$110,000
97-2-083I	05/97	Pratt	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(12)	\$28,955	\$28,955
97-2-084I	05/97	Langton	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(13)	\$85,568	\$90,000
97-2-086I	05/97	Ververs	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(14)	\$10,000	\$5,000
97-2-088I	06/97	Greseth	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(15)	\$10,000	\$10,208
97-2-095I	06/97	Beck	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(16)	\$59,954	\$315,000
97-2-096I	06/97	Tolzin	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(17)	\$60,000	\$11,570
97-2-097I	06/97	Evans	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(18)	\$80,000	\$12,540
97-2-098I	06/97	Doyle	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(19)	\$85,339	\$157,381
97-2-101I	06/97	Bush	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(20)	\$110,000	\$27,500
97-2-102I	06/97	Van Wechel	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(21)	\$200,000	\$200,000
97-2-103I	06/97	Kinna	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(22)	\$29,435	\$22,070
97-2-104I	06/97	Hargraves	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(23)	\$79,967	\$114,500
97-2-105I	06/97	Leath	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(24)	\$20,000	\$1,000
97-2-106I	06/97	Swenson	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(25)	\$159,987	\$150,000
97-2-107I	06/97	Carden	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(26)	\$19,539	\$9,500
97-2-108I	06/97	Walters	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(27)	\$160,000	\$299,000
97-2-109I	06/97	Weise	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(28)	\$60,000	\$60,000
97-2-111I	06/97	Robertson	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(29)	\$20,000	\$70,000
97-2-113I	08/97	Monahan	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(30)	\$310,000	\$39,569
97-3-119I	08/97	Hopkins	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(31)	\$6,176	\$27,000
97-3-120I	08/97	Francis	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(32)	\$27,949	\$48,362
97-3-123I	08/97	Griffin	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(33)	\$28,133	\$13,533
97-3-126I	08/97	Wilson	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(34)	\$29,727	\$74,313
97-3-127I	08/97	Bentley	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(35)	\$10,045	\$6,843
97-3-129I	09/97	Gilley	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(36)	\$10,000	\$6,606
97-3-136I	10/97	Cathers	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(37)	\$20,000	\$83,987
97-4-139I	10/97	Fryrear	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(38)	\$80,000	\$88,338
97-4-144I	12/97	Beckford	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(39)	\$150,000	\$69,537
97-4-145I	12/97	Knapp	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(40)	\$64,241	\$15,000
97-4-146I	12/97	Novak	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(41)	\$30,000	\$70,000

97-4-149I	12/97	Halverson	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(42)	\$19,944	\$251,240
98-1-011I	02/98	Holt	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(43)	\$49,629	\$55,635
98-2-096I	06/98	Ferguson	Internet	Connectivity	Project	(44)	\$270,000	\$324,000

Total Matching:	\$8,560,214
Total Amount All Proposals:	\$4,454,369
Average of All Proposals:	\$101,236
Highest Proposal Amount:	\$960,000
Lowest Proposal Amount:	\$4,378
Total Proposals This Batch:	44

APPENDIX E

Small Business Innovations Research Bridge Grants Funded from January 1995 through September 1998

Fish Return Forecasting with Neural Networks

Project # 95-3-103R

Project Manager: Simpson

ASTF Funding: \$50,000

Matching Funds: \$34,825

This SBIR bridging grant project will result in the extension of its neural network forecasting methodology from the Bristol Bay area to major Alaska river systems. SBIR Phase I project for the first phase evaluation of the use of neural networks to the forecasting of fish returns has been completed and the final report submitted to NSF. Phase II application has been submitted to NSF and is currently under review. ASTF funding is for three reasons: (1) it will help Scientific Fishery Systems, Inc. (SFS) win the Phase II proposal, (2) based on the result of Phase I, neural networks appear to offer a great deal of promise for improved fish forecasts, and (3) the funding, combined with SFS cash will allow SFS to continue forecasting fish returns.

This project will develop an approach that can yield improved fish forecasts. Improved accuracy will provide Alaska with a greater ability to manage its salmon resource. In addition, improved accuracy can reduce international disputes concerning the size of salmon returns under multinational jurisdiction.

Fisheries Management GIS

Project # 95-3-104R

Project Manager: Simpson

ASTF Funding: \$55,000

Matching Funds: \$34,825

The SBIR Phase I project for the first phase development of a fisheries management geographic information systems (GIS) has been completed and the final report submitted to NSF. The Phase II application has been submitted to NSF and is currently under review. This SBIR bridging grant project will focus on the development of a prototype fisheries GIS product that will result in a software product ready for beta testing. Scientific Fishery Systems, Inc. (SFS) will use the bridge grant funding for three proposers: (1) the bridge grant funding will help SFS win the Phase II proposal, (2) as other software developers may begin similar efforts, the bridge grant funding will keep this product development ahead of

competition from outside Alaska, and (3) the bridge grant funding, when combined with SFS cash, will allow the prototype to be completed even if the Phase II SBIR funding is not granted.

This project develops a technology that improves fishery efficiency. The product is a software tool that will allow fishers to quickly and easily utilize every piece of available information related to their fishing operation. As such, fishers will be able to reduce their bycatch (which reduces the stress on the ecosystem) and increase efficiency (catching their total allowable catch with less expense makes Alaskan fishers more able to compete).

AGENCY RESPONSE

Alaska Science and Technology Foundation

January 4, 1999

Ms. Pat Davidson
Legislative Auditor
Legislative Budget and Audit Committee
3305 Arctic Blvd. Suite 101
Anchorage, AK. 99503

Dear Ms. Davidson:

Here is the ASTF response to the LB&A management audit letter of November 4, 1998 and the preliminary audit report dated September 30, 1998.

In Part I, Findings and Recommendations, ASTF accepts the LB&A recommendations and agrees to implement the recommended changes this fiscal year. Part II, Discussion, is attached which includes a more detailed explanation of the issues raised in the sequential order of sections of the LB&A report.

Findings and Recommendations

Recommendation No. 1: ASTF should increase its efforts to monitor large ongoing grants

ASTF will improve its grant monitoring system this year. For large ongoing grants, ASTF will expand its recent practice of forming advisory panels or engaging the services of an expert in the field. ASTF agrees with the findings of Ms. Fairchild that the responsibilities of the grants administrator are very demanding and this concentration of responsibility does contribute to a less than desirable level of monitoring of grants. This also applies to recommendations Nos. 2 and 3. Continual improvement of grant monitoring and strengthened reporting has and will be achieved but the cost and effectiveness of that improvement will be considered.

Because of staff vacancies and the requirement to maintain a lean operation, ASTF has spent only 75-85% of its operating budget in the last three years while the number of projects and their scale has substantially increased. The ASTF Board will review with staff plans to increase grant monitoring and post-grant reporting. With the filling of a funded vacant position, it can be expected that more staff attention will be devoted to grant monitoring and post-grant reporting and evaluation without breaking the ASTF's Board's 1995 commitment to maintain a flat operating budget.

Recommendation No. 2: ASTF should enforce post-grant reporting requirements

See above comment. ASTF agrees with the recommendation that we take a more pro-active approach to enforcing post-grant reporting requirements. In the past, we have sent a reminder letter to appropriate grantees and if they did not respond within a few months, we sent a follow-on letter, and in several cases telephone calls and meetings resulted. The McDowell Study currently underway should provide ASTF with a meaningful evaluation on the impact of ASTF projects on the economy of Alaska. This study will provide:

1. A broad survey of the impact of ASTF projects based on the performance measures negotiated by ASTF with

the Legislature.

2. A deeper analysis of those projects which have had a larger or more structural economic impact.
3. A recommendation on a system for tracking the performance measures of ongoing ASTF projects and revising grant application and reports to collect these data.
4. A comparison of ASTF with other state funded technology programs to provide context for the general reader interested in state technology programs.

Recommendation No. 3: ASTF should implement procedures to ensure it is receiving all the repayment to which it is entitled from past grantees

ASTF will continue to improve its procedures to ensure it is receiving all the repayment to which it is entitled from past grantees. This is especially true since the 1995 statutory change that enabled the Foundation to receive grant repayment from all sources of income related to technology developed by ASTF funds.

ASTF agrees that it needs to strengthen annual efforts to remind grantees of the obligations contained in the grant agreement that they signed when they accepted grant funds. Additional information, such as annual certified financial statements, could be required to ensure such compliance.

Recommendation No. 4: The legislature should consider amending ASTF's peer review statute to reflect the Foundation's current practice

Board members who are assigned as a peer reviewer for a proposal under \$20,000 will complete the standard Proposal Evaluation Form that other peer reviewers complete or staff will obtain other written reviews. That would complete the review process and the proper documentation would be retained in the files. No change in statute should be required.

Recommendation No. 5: ASTF should submit complete and timely conflict-of-interest reports to the AG's office

ASTF will provide quarterly statements to the AG's office. ASTF has submitted all Board and staff conflict statements to the AG on at least 6 month basis, but such statements will now be provided quarterly.

Recommendation No. 6: ASTF's board should document the statutory authority for each grant

ASTF believes this is an excellent idea and it was implemented starting with the December 10, 1998 Board meeting.

Sincerely,

Jamie Kenworthy
Executive Director

cc: Commissioner Debby Sedwick

II Discussion

Statutory Changes gave ASTF extraordinary broad grant authority

Any discussion of ASTF's broad authority should also mention ASTF appropriate related selection criteria to ensure that authority is exercised only when narrower investment criteria are met. ASTF has 3 selection criteria:

1. Expected significance of knowledge or technology
2. Demonstrates measurable benefit to Alaska and Alaskan presence, and
3. Appropriate shared risk and reward.

In addition there are project standards which must be met. (See ASTF Grants and Information Booklet pp. 15-18.) ASTF believes that it is in the interest of the state to give ASTF the broad authority to look at where science and technology can produce benefits but have ASTF exercise that authority with these investment criteria so only worthy projects are funded.

No other State of Alaska program has a focus on investment in technical innovation. While other departments have a regulatory or economic development mission, ASTF alone has the mission to develop science or technology to address issues regarding health, natural resources, or economic development. As examples, ASTF is looked to fund the science or R&D stage on such issues as total dissolved solids in water quality standards, assessing appropriate technology for rural sanitation, or processing technology to assist the salmon or timber industry. It is the "holes" rather than the "overlap" which concerns ASTF and individuals contacting ASTF.

ASTF identified the "sustained growth and development of Alaskan science and engineering capabilities" as the statutory authority for the grant to Industry Network Corporation (INC) to match federal funds as part of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program funded by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The ASTF project provides grading and other technical assistance to sawmill owners to adopt technology to process Alaska timber.

Prior to this project ASTF had co-funded work at UAF to define the superior design properties of Alaska white spruce and organized sawmill owners around the state to indicate the technical competitiveness issues facing them. The project with INC was a subsequent award to follow through on that previously funded grading work (Project 91-1-050 and 95-1-002S) as well as other forms of technical assistance and technology utilization issues facing mill owners seeking to add value to Alaska timber. The technical assistance language of the BIDCO statute may be an even closer fit to ASTF's mission than "science and engineering capability." However, ASTF believes grading Alaska wood to certify its design properties and thereby ensure that it can be sold in the building code areas of the state or in government contracting is a technical task. It ensures wood is produced which meets specifications necessary for sale in the 70%-80% of the in-state market which requires graded dimensional lumber. The ASTF funds also support such technical work as modeling and data collection to demonstrate the maximum utilization of lumber from logs. This work is also the type of practical value adding next step necessary to achieve "the economic development and technological innovation" purpose cited in the statute.

The \$20,000 grant to Anchorage Economic Development Corporation to work with the Oil Industry Support Alliance had as its stated purpose the development of a secure method of the transfer of electronic data interchange (EDI) between Sakhalin and Anchorage. The purpose of this grant was not to subsidize the marketing costs of oil service firms. The ASTF funds supported a project focused on the encryption and organization of company specific data in a format which allowed companies to communicate with each other and potentially bid on projects as a group. This technical demonstration is the first step to putting in place an efficient way for companies to team and bid projects. It was the demonstration of this technical task which ASTF found was an appropriate use of funds.

ASTF agrees with LB&A that the ability to grant funds for "management assistance" without the tie-in of related technical work is too broad. Any management assistance co-funded by ASTF is tied to technical innovation or commercializing technology.

Grant approval process

ASTF agrees with this section.

The LB&A letter states that technology development proposals undergo a business review by a business assistance contractor informally called a circuit rider. Generally, when we request a business peer review, it is performed by a peer reviewer in the banking industry or external business consultants.

Grant monitoring

We would agree that continued improvements to the grant monitoring system are necessary and appropriate, but disagree with the description of the current system as being weak.

ASTF monitors the benchmarks and results during the projects and if ASTF sees problems during the course of the project, special efforts are made to correct the problem or terminate the project. And, the Board reviews the final project report before taking action. Since 1996, ASTF has had three small management reviews to evaluate grant monitoring, to select random project files to review proper documentation, and recommend better procedures. The first review was by Coopers & Lybrand in 1996, the second by Altman, Rogers & Co. in 1997, and a third by Deloitte & Touche LLP in 1998.

Currently, there are 101 active small and regular grants that are administered by the grants administrator, support staff of one, and two circuit riders who may average up to 20 hours per week for ASTF. The circuit riders assist grantees with the business development phase of the project, assist in grant monitoring, find new potential projects, and assist people who may be interested in submitting a grant application to ASTF.

Generally, after a grant agreement has been signed, the monitoring of grants is handled through the progress and financial reports that are submitted on a quarterly basis throughout the period of the grant. The progress reports are reviewed by the grants administrator and in most cases by a circuit rider. The information in the progress reports is compared to the project benchmarks as shown in the grant agreement for the period the report covers. For several larger projects (the Anchorage Microzone Seismology project, the INC forest products project, the UAF Coal project, the SeaAlaska Forest Regeneration Project, etc.) ASTF has involved an industry advisory group to review and comment on progress reports before they are submitted. There may be questions raised as a result of the information contained in the report which results in a telephone conversation with the grantee. When it appears there may be problems with the project; i.e., not meeting benchmarks, reports are submitted late, level of matching funds is less than budgeted, etc., we take further action. This may include a meeting with the grantee, visiting the project site, revising the benchmarks, revising the budget, and in some cases terminating the project.

On page 10 of the Report Conclusions section, the \$122,000 project is an example of grant monitoring. The applicant requested a grant for \$357,096. After the Board approved the project at a reduced funding level, the grant agreement was negotiated for \$171,820. As progress and financial reports were received, the grants administrator and a circuit rider became concerned about the progress of the project. There were several meetings with the grantee, which resulted in revised benchmarks and more oversight of the project including the circuit rider visiting the remote site location. This project was terminated six months after the field trip by the circuit rider. ASTF retained the remaining grant funds, but did not attempt to recoup the grant funds that were expended because it was decided that seeking to recoup funds in this case could not be cost effective. The death of the co-applicant, who was also the spouse of the grantee, was a sad fact that made this an unusual project for all concerned.

ASTF believes that the few examples cited of incomplete or questionable monitoring on projects is an unrepresentative sample of ASTF projects funded to date. In addition, funding projects at the early research and development stage or pre-startup phase is inherently risky and success rates cannot be expected at the same level as the commercial sector or for investments in ongoing concerns.

Finally, the report states that ASTF customarily approves an initial payment of 50% of the grant amount. For most projects over \$20,000, an initial payment of over 50% is the exception and not the rule. Budget items such as equipment purchase and ongoing match requirements dictate initial payments. All projects require a 10% hold back until acceptance of the Final Report by the Board.

Procedures for closing grants

ASTF agrees with this section.

The agreed-upon review procedure performed by a CPA is required at the end of the project for grants up to \$150,000. The formal audit by a CPA is required for grants over \$150,000. Audits may be waived by ASTF for projects of less than \$50,000. This action to change the audit criteria was taken by the ASTF Board at its April 8-9, 1997, meeting. This action was taken because it was not considered cost effective to pay for the cost of a formal audit for all smaller projects. No matter the size of the project, audits are required when ASTF has any reason to believe there are questionable expenses or uncertain documentation.

Post-grant requirements

ASTF agrees with LB&A that ASTF improvements in this area are warranted.

Unresolved questions on earlier APS grants existed when current grant was approved

Three additional clarifications:

1. The Remote Monitoring project was approved by the Board in October 1994, a grant agreement was signed on December 13, 1994, and the original completion date was August 31, 1995. There were two extensions

approved through May 1, 1996. There were four written reminders concerning the Final Report sent to the Grantee between June and December 1996. There were also verbal reminders. It was understood that because the grantee was continuing to refine the technology, and applications for patents were filed, the grantee was hesitant to submit the final report. ASTF was also receiving several requests for information from the public about the project as well. The final report was received on February 12, 1997.

2. APS had applied for five patents. Three patents have been issued and are incorporated in the current grant agreement. Two other patents were disallowed and later consolidated into one application whose status has not yet been determined.
3. Fuel efficiencies are a very important component of the technology. The current grant agreement includes provisions for addressing the fuel efficiencies, including the ability of ASTF, in its sole and absolute discretion, to install fuel meters to measure the amount of fuel actually used and meters to measure actual energy generated and sold at each location.

In regard to the 1995 fuel consumption comparison between APS and the Division of Energy, ASTF has not verified whether this information is actually comparing the same 12 month period, as that could have effect on the outcome. In the course of negotiating the DSI agreement, staff had extensive contacts with the Division of Energy and the Public Utilities Commission staff in regards to fuel consumption figures for communities eligible for PCE. There were extensive notes in the files on the fuel efficiency achieved in different size villages. The comment that ASTF should have obtained full assurance of fuel efficiency standards achieved by the earlier technology misses the point of the incentive in the grant to achieve higher fuel efficiency. ASTF was investing in the R&D stage to improve the earlier generation technology and the efficiencies of that technology. If this next generation technology funded by ASTF was deployed by any provider and achieved efficiency greater than 12.5 gallons per KWH in villages generating less than 300,000 KWH/year, 13.0 KWH/gallon in villages generating 300,000 KWH-775,000 KWH/year or 13.5 KWH/gallon for villages generating 775,000 KWH-4,000,000 KWH/year then the repayment obligation is reduced. There were conversations between ASTF and the Division of Energy and APUC on these goals and extensive work with APUC staff to assure ASTF that technology meeting these goals would be a significant improvement over existing practice as documented in existing PCE reports. Since this was an R&D project to develop technology, and not utility procurement for proven technology, the job of ASTF was to set the incentive or target efficiency appropriately high enough.

In addition, the ASTF Executive Director had conversations to encourage cooperation of APS with the Division of Energy study cited and with the Division of Energy on the issue of keeping proprietary data so as to ensure sufficient cooperation so the study cited could be completed.

Current DS grant awarded despite ASTF's awareness of potential problems

As a general comment, the Board was aware of the financial instability of Alaska Power Systems and the controversial nature of the grant because of the possible impact of the technology to restructure the Alaska industry. The promise of digital technology to improve fuel performance and avoid operating and maintenance costs was such that the Board decided the investment was the type of high risk/high reward investment ASTF should make considering the potential payoff to the state economy and lower costs to villages. Extensive work was done prior to the agreement to show where costs could run to \$0.60/KWH and less than 10 KWH were generated per gallon of diesel fuel. The agreement was crafted to provide incentives for the technology to be deployed by any provider to achieve efficiencies above their current levels.

The Board and staff therefore went to extraordinary measures to inform the public about the potential investment (participation at an APS Open House to describe the technology in July 1997, meetings with critics of the proposed grant, comment at multiple public hearings, commission of an engineering evaluation of the technology made available to the public, etc.) prior to the Board adoption of the project and to communicating the reasons for Board's decision after that decision was made. It also explained the lengthy agreement and the legal expenses to protect ASTF's interest in the Alaska rights to the technology. Whether the Board should have been more wary of the investment will be a judgement that can finally be made when the commercial future of this technology is certain, the ability of any digital monitoring technology to achieve cost savings in rural Alaska is demonstrated, and the structure of the funding to pass any savings through to consumers and the state is clearer than it is today.

Benchmarks modified but still not met

DSI financial reports have been received through July 31, 1998. Grantee has also provided a balance sheet and profit and loss statement and other financial information.

ASTF's public relations (PR) contract

The ASTF public relations contract includes a number of tasks and functions that could be done by in-house staff, but ASTF staff decided these tasks can be more efficiently and effectively done by contracting out these services. These tasks include production of annual report, monthly faxes to ASTF stakeholders, communication to local press regarding actions taken at six Board meetings per year, assistance on logistics and promotion for annual teacher conferences, science lecture series with UAA, and entrepreneurs showcase as well as general communication tasks.

ASTF believes all expenditures for public relations fall under the recent LB&A definition of public relations: "the management function that evaluates public attitudes, aligns the policies and procedures of the State with the public interest, and executes a program of action and communication to earn public understanding and acceptance."

ASTF believes that "public service announcement" (PSA) is a more accurate description than "TV spots" to describe what ASTF paid to have produced and the stations ran for free. PSA criteria published by the FCC, in keeping with the mandate of The Federal Communications Act, state that the PSA sponsor be a non-profit organization providing material on the basis of public interest considerations and not the private economic interests of the TV station or any company featured in the PSA, and that the TV station receive no gain from airing them. A number of state agencies produce PSAs and ASTF believes ASTF's PSAs should be considered in the same light.

ASTF agrees that it is not an appropriate use of public funds to pay for general commercials in the media nor in the last four years ASTF has done so. The \$50,000 cost to produce 10 Public Service Announcements (PSAs) was expended to assure the high quality video required for free air time as PSAs. No ASTF funds were spent to place the PSAs on the air. (The PSA's were awarded second prize by the Alaska Public Relations Society for PSAs in November, 1998. United Way was first.)

ASTF agrees it is not a proper use of public funds to lobby legislators and can document from billings that the public relations contract with Bernholz and Graham did not pay for any such activity.

The LB&A report correctly identifies one goal of the public relations effort raising the awareness of ASTF's role among the general public, media, community, business leaders and legislators. Legislators are one of the many audiences of the ASTF annual report and monthly faxes but mention of this one audience should not be construed as the primary purpose of the public relations contract.

In the LB&A interviews, the primary audience for the PSAs was identified as potential grantees who may have ideas on how to use science or technology for projects which could qualify for ASTF funding. There was a significant increase in contacts with ASTF after the PSAs were aired. To omit this purpose for the PSA campaign and this audience for the public relations effort is to quote so selectively from interviews as to mislead the reader of this report as to the purpose of the outreach effort.

LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR'S ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

January 6, 1999

Members of the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee:

We have reviewed the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation's (ASTF) response to our preliminary audit report on ASTF grant procedures. Nothing contained in the response gives us cause to modify our findings.

While we did not always agree with ASTF on its approach and handling of certain activities, we did appreciate the candid responses and cooperation we received from the foundation's board and staff during our audit.


Pat Davidson, CPA
Legislative Auditor
















































































































































































 [Audit Report
PDF Format *](#)

[Back to the
Digest Summary](#)

[1999 Audit
Report List](#)

[Legislative Audit
Home Page](#)

* Requires Acrobat Reader 

Welcome!

Welcome to the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation (ASTF) web site! ASTF is a state agency created in 1988 that invests money to improve Alaska's economy and to increase the state's science and engineering capabilities.

We offer grants for small and large business development and research projects. We also coordinate a teachers grant program that encourages the development of the state science, math, and statistics curriculum. Visit the "School Zone" section for more information!

What's New

- [Agenda for June 22-23, 1999 Meeting in Dillingham](#)
- [Anchorage SBIR Bridging Grant](#)
- [Juneau Small Project Grant](#)
- [McGrath Teacher Grant](#)
- [Send Us Your Feedback!](#)
- [Tentative Board of Directors Meetings & Grant Deadlines Schedule](#)



Copyright 1999 Alaska Science and Technology Foundation. All Rights Reserved.

REPORT CONCLUSIONS

As stated in the Objectives, Scope, and Methodology section of this report, this audit focused on the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation's (ASTF or the foundation) grant procedures. We note that statutory changes since 1995 have allowed the foundation extraordinarily broad authority to fund a wide variety of grants. We believe that ASTF's overall grant procedures are generally consistent with this broad authority. Finally, we believe the board is committed to funding those projects that have potential to generate beneficial results for Alaskans.

However, we have concerns regarding the manner in which the foundation is monitoring ongoing grants and its lack of enforcement of post-grant reporting requirements. We are also concerned with the foundation's actions in relation to its grant to Distributed Systems, LLC. While it appears the foundation's board took public testimony in deciding on this grant, we believe ASTF overestimated the feasibility of the project when it awarded the grant and it failed to enforce benchmarks or heed signs that the project's success was doubtful.

The scope of our audit also included a review of ASTF's contract with an Anchorage public relations firm. We do not believe such a use of public funds is appropriate.

Our detail conclusions follow.

Statutory changes gave ASTF extraordinarily broad grant authority

In a 1994 audit report, we noted that ASTF was operating outside its statutory authority by soliciting and funding technology projects.² At that time, ASTF had the authority to grant funds for basic and applied research. In 1995, statutory changes³ were made to allow grants for technology projects. This specifically included grants for the development and commercialization of technology. In 1996, ASTF was authorized to make grants for a new Business Industrial Development Corporation (BIDCO) program.⁴ This program was designed primarily to provide "risk capital and management assistance for businesses" throughout the State. In addition to grants from a new BIDCO fund, ASTF was authorized to expend up to \$2,000,000 of endowment income for BIDCO purposes.⁵ The net result of these statutory changes is that ASTF now has extraordinarily broad authority to fund a wide variety of grants.

ASTF has increased its emphasis on economic development over the course of its ten-year existence. It requires that a feasible business plan be included in all technology project proposals. It has also funded several projects targeted purely at the promotion of economic

² See Division of Legislative Audit Control No. 04-4481-94, *Department of Revenue, Alaska Science and Technology Foundation*, April 15, 1994.

³ See AS 37.17.

⁴ See AS 37.17.200 - 37.17.390.

⁵ See AS 37.17.225.

development within the State. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership Center project is an example of such a grant. This \$600,000 grant is targeted at economic development of the forest products industry and has little or no research or technology associated with it. The stated purpose of this grant is to promote the forest products industry by providing businesses with free or low-cost business assessments, establishing lumber grading⁶ within the State, and facilitating joint business ventures. It is also to provide low-cost technical assistance for production and marketing, and to establish a forest products business center. ASTF believes projects such as this are within the foundation's authority found in AS 37.17.010(a)(1)(D). This statute states that the foundation is to promote and enhance "*sustained growth and development of Alaskan scientific and engineering capabilities.*" However, we believe that there is little if any connection between this grant and the growth or development of scientific and engineering capabilities. Although ASTF has declined to identify it as such, this \$600,000 grant may fall under the broad umbrella of "*management assistance for businesses*" allowed under the BIDCO program. See Recommendation No. 6.

Although this grant authority is very broad, in most cases it appears there is a potential benefit to the State in the grants approved by ASTF. However, we did note a few grants where such potential for benefit is limited. While these were generally older grants for under \$20,000, a grant to the Alaska Resource Alliance is a more recent grant with which we are concerned. The alliance is a group of Alaskan companies active in the oil industry. These companies have banded together with the intention of supplying oil exploration, development, and production operations to instate and world markets. A \$20,000 grant was requested and approved to fund the formation of a for-profit corporation, to prepare a business plan, and to electronically connect each participant to an Internet web page through which its supplies or services can be purchased. It is our belief that the companies associated with the Alliance are well able to finance such a project without state assistance. In our opinion, the formation of this for-profit corporation is not of significant benefit to the State.

As stated above, we believe most ASTF grants are of potential benefit to the State. However, we note that ASTF's expanded authority now permits the it to grant monies for research, *management assistance.*" Traditional, basic economic development projects may be funded, rather than focusing on research and technology. Such grants blur the line between ASTF and other economic development vehicles in state government, such as the Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority and the Department of Commerce and Economic Development. The legislature may wish to reevaluate the role of the foundation from time to time to prevent an unnecessary duplication of agency missions.

ASTF's grant approval process is generally adequate

ASTF grant procedures are described in the *Grant information and Forms* booklet published by the foundation. The application process begins with the submission of a pre-proposal which briefly describes what the proposed project would be expected to accomplish. ASTF's technology administrator reviews the pre-proposal and either invites the applicant to submit a full proposal, or informs the applicant of how the project does not meet ASTF requirements.

⁶ Lumber grading is the process by which lumber quality is established.

Full proposals for projects requesting grant funds greater than \$20,000 are submitted to a peer review panel of recognized experts.⁷ This peer review process is an important mechanism for providing the board with independent expert opinion on the merits of proposed projects. In addition, proposals for technology development undergo a business review by a circuit rider⁸ to determine the commercialization potential of the project. Summarized peer review and business plan evaluations are given to board members for their review as they consider proposed projects. Board members serve as peer reviewers for grants under \$20,000. By not submitting proposals requesting between \$5,000 and \$20,000 to peer review, the board violates AS 37.17.090(b). This statute requires peer review for all proposals over \$5,000. Although an independent peer review is not conducted for these grants, given the dollar value associated with these projects, the current board procedures appear reasonable. We believe that the statute should be amended to reflect the board's current procedures. See Recommendation No. 4.

Select board members are given the full project proposal and full peer review evaluations prior to the board meeting when the proposal is to be voted on. The selection of which member is to review a particular proposal is based on considerations such as the member's area of expertise and availability. These members report to the full board on the proposal. Other members receive only a summary of the proposal and peer review reports. This summary is prepared by ASTF staff.

Time is allotted at all board meetings to hear public testimony on any grant proposal. In our review of 38 grant files, public testimony was offered on only one grant proposal.⁹ The foundation advertises all meetings and makes a meeting agenda available to anyone who requests it.

In many instances, applicants whose proposals are to be considered attend board meetings. Board members often question the applicant. If the proposal is not approved in its current form, the board often advises the applicant on what can be done to make the proposal acceptable.

Often, projects are approved contingent on modification of some aspect of the proposal. Each grant includes benchmarks that are used to measure the project's progress and success. Benchmarks are unique to each grant and are the aspect of the proposal most likely to be modified in the approval process. ASTF's grants administrator is responsible for ensuring these modifications are made. Grant agreements are reviewed and signed by the executive director.

Overall, procedures for approving new grants appear reasonable.

⁷ Peer review panels generally consist of between two and four members of the scientific or engineering community who have recognized expertise in the appropriate discipline. Each member of the panel rates the project and makes recommendations to the board as to whether the project should be funded, funded at a lower level, or not funded.

⁸ The board contracts for services with two to three circuit riders who provide grantees with technical and business development assistance. Circuit riders also review proposed business plans and grantee reports.

⁹ See subsequent discussion of grants to Alaska Power Systems and Distributed Solutions.

ASTF grant monitoring is weak

Although ASTF has commissioned three management reviews over the last few years, we still noted several deficiencies in ASTF's grant monitoring process. While grant funds are disbursed throughout the grant period, little if any independent verification of information reported to ASTF by grantees is obtained until the final report phase of the project.

Once a grant agreement is signed, an initial grant payment is made. This payment is often as much as 50% of the total grant amount. Subsequent payments are scheduled to follow due dates for progress and financial reports. Enforcement of reporting requirements is limited almost exclusively to the withholding of subsequent payments until progress and financial reports are received and reviewed. Either the grant administrator or a circuit rider performs this review. Unless grantee reports indicate that there are problems with the project, no other monitoring efforts are generally employed. As long as the grantee is submitting reports that indicate benchmarks and budgets are being met, subsequent payments are generally forthcoming with no additional oversight until the final report is issued.

The final grant distribution, which is usually 10% of the total grant amount, is withheld until the final report is approved. An audit or some sort of agreed-upon review procedure is generally required at the end of the grant project and in some instances an on-site visit is conducted at that time. However, by the time these independent reviews generally occur, 90% of the grant funds for the project have been disbursed.

If a grantee is not submitting reports or if ASTF becomes aware that progress is not being made toward the project benchmarks, ASTF staff or circuit riders contact the grantee to try to determine what problems exist and to offer any assistance possible. If progress is still not made, the grant is deemed to be in default. After default status is established, circuit riders again try to work with the grantee to correct the deficiencies that lead to the default. If the problems with the grant are still not corrected, it is terminated.¹⁰ However, ASTF appears slow to pursue the default/termination process.

During our audit, we reviewed all funded grants that ASTF has terminated since its inception. We found ASTF actions in relation to these grants to generally be reasonable. However, as stated above, we noted that ASTF appeared slow to terminate grants. In one instance, the last progress report on a grant was received three years prior to the date the project was terminated.

In addition, we found one instance in which progress reports were being received, but it was clear that the grantee was not working toward the objectives described in the grant agreement. A \$26,000 disbursement was made after a circuit rider report questioned whether the grant should be terminated. A total of \$122,000 was disbursed for the grant, and ASTF has not made any effort to recover these funds even though the final audit of the project contained a disclaimer of opinion because the grantee refused to give their auditors access to financial records relating to the grant funds.

¹⁰ Termination means that a grantee is no longer eligible for subsequent ASTF grants. However, no action has ever been taken to recoup grant funds that may not have been expended appropriately.

We believe that these problems are a direct result of the foundation's weak monitoring controls over ongoing grants. We note that the grants administrator is responsible for drafting the grant agreements, negotiating grant modifications, and monitoring ongoing and closed grants. These responsibilities appear very demanding and this concentration of responsibility may contribute to this weakness. See Recommendation No. 1.

Procedures for closing grants are generally reasonable

Final progress reports, including requests for equipment disposition¹¹ are reviewed by the grant administrator or circuit riders. On occasion, site visits are conducted at the end of the grant period. Based on these reviews, a project summary is drafted and recommendations to the board are made regarding whether the final report should be accepted, whether the final payment should be disbursed, whether the equipment disposition request should be approved, and in rare instances, whether a bonus¹² should be awarded.

In addition, a financial audit or an agreed-upon review procedure performed by a CPA is required at the end of the project for grants over \$20,000. These requirements are at the board's discretion for grants under \$20,000.

Once the board approves the final report and the CPA review or audit, the final payment is disbursed and the grant is considered closed.

We found ASTF's approach to the disposition of equipment purchased with grant funding to be reasonable. In most instances, ASTF gives title to equipment purchased with grant funds to the grantee after successful completion of the project. In the case of terminated grants, ASTF takes possession of such equipment if it is practical to do so. ASTF then donates the equipment to another research institution such as the University of Alaska.

Post-grant requirements are not enforced

ASTF's relationship with its grantees does not simply terminate after the grant is finished. The foundation's standard grant agreement requires grantees to submit five annual update reports to ASTF after the grant is closed. Additionally, if the grant is proprietary in nature, the grantee is required to reimburse ASTF based upon the profits received as a result of the project's success.¹³

¹¹ Grantees usually request that title to equipment purchased with ASTF funds be signed over to the grantee at the completion of the project. In the case of grantees who have completed successful projects, this request is almost always granted.

¹² According to ASTF, bonuses are awarded only in rare instances. They are contingent on the grantee having performed above expectations and are given for a specific purpose. Bonuses are not subject to any repayment provisions. ASTF was unable to provide totals for the number of bonuses it has approved, or the dollar amount paid; the foundation's records do not permit easy extraction of such information.

¹³ These repayment provisions are specified in the grant agreement. Typically, grantees agree to repay 5% of profits from technology developed with ASTF funds up to 1.5 times the grant amount if the grant is successful. If a grantee fails to maintain an Alaska presence as defined in the grant agreement, repayment provisions typically double to 10% of profits up to three times the grant amount. If a project is not successful, no repayment is required.

However, ASTF efforts to enforce these grant agreement provisions are not sufficient. On an annual basis, the grant administrator sends out a letter to past grant recipients asking for an update report. These letters are written in a very informal manner. They simply ask the grantee to send in an update. They do not refer to the fact that these updates are required, and no action is taken if the update is not forthcoming. See Recommendation No. 2.

No independent verification is required to show whether a past grant recipient owes any repayment to the foundation. To date, ASTF has received approximately \$100,000 in repayment from seven grantees. Of this total, \$89,000 has been received from a single grantee. We note that prior to a 1995 statute change, the foundation was entitled to repayment from royalty income only. While several projects resulted in some type of income for the grantee, very few produced royalty income. Thus, ASTF was entitled to few repayments from pre-1995 grants and monitoring for repayment provisions was not as important as it is now.

Since the 1995 statutory change, however, the foundation is entitled to repayment from all sources of income relating to technology developed in ASTF funded projects. Therefore, it is incumbent on the board to implement procedures to ensure that ASTF is receiving all the repayment to which it is entitled. See Recommendation No. 3.

Alaska Power Systems (APS) and Distributed Systems, LLC (DS) granted \$1.83 million

Since 1992, ASTF has awarded two grants to APS and one grant to APS' wholly-owned limited liability company, DS. For a number of years, APS provided and maintained power generation systems for a variety of entities including some small, rural Alaskan communities. DS was established to conduct product development research for APS, but only after APS was experiencing significant financial difficulty. Each grant is briefly discussed below.

In 1993, ASTF approved an award to APS for \$249,438. This project is titled Village-scale Hydro/Diesel Generation System (the Hydro/Diesel Project). As presented in the grant proposal project description, this project was to develop an innovative hydro/diesel power generation system to be used in the village of Akutan on the Aleutian chain. Existing available technology was to be adapted and transferred to this new application.

In 1994, ASTF awarded APS a second grant of \$81,167 for a project titled Remote Control and Monitoring for Multiple Diesel Generation (the Remote Monitoring Project). This project was to involve the development of technology necessary for simple automated control of multiple paralleled diesel generating systems in rural Alaska, including improving remote monitoring, troubleshooting, and reprogramming.

In 1997, ASTF awarded DS a \$1.5 million grant over the ardent objections of some members of the public. The project title is IED 2000/GenMan/Application Software (the IED 2000 Project). The project was to develop technology capable of monitoring and controlling power

generation systems from remote locations. To date, \$700,000¹⁴ has been disbursed for this project, which is reportedly ongoing. In deciding whether to fund this proposal, the board had to consider the project's strengths and its weaknesses. On one hand, the project appeared to have the potential to bring high paying technology jobs and capital to the State. It also had potential to provide lower-cost power generation to rural Alaska. On the other hand, the cost of the grant was very high, the company had a history of delays on earlier grants, and the company's financial position was shaky. We acknowledge that this was not a clear and easy decision, however, for reasons outlined in the following sections, we are concerned with the board's actions in relation to this grant.

Unresolved questions on earlier APS grants existed when current grant was approved

The \$1.5 million IED 2000 project is among the largest ever approved by the foundation.¹⁵ Given the size of the project, we believe the board was obliged to exercise extreme care in approving this grant. This included an obligation to establish confidence in the grantee's ability to meet its projected goals. From its two prior grants, APS had an established track record of grant performance available for ASTF to consider when determining funding for the IED 2000 project. In reviewing these prior grants, several issues of concern came to our attention.

- An ASTF circuit rider questioned the disposition of equipment purchased with grant funds from the Hydro/Diesel Project prior to the board's approval of that project's final report. ASTF did not adequately pursue answers to these questions before accepting the final Hydro/Diesel Project report or before the two subsequent grants to the company and its subsidiary were made.
- We noted several areas of concern in our review of the Remote Monitoring Project.
 1. It was originally scheduled for completion within six months. In actuality, it took approximately 26 months for the foundation to receive the final project report. This indicates that APS had trouble meeting the deadlines it established.
 2. As part of the final review for this project, an ASTF circuit rider examined the final report submitted by APS. This report stated that APS had applied for five patents. We have only been able to verify that three were applied for. Two of these patents have been granted and one is pending. No explanation regarding the other two patents was ever obtained by ASTF. This indicates a lack of oversight on ASTF's part.
 3. We also noted statements in the final Remote Monitoring Project report regarding fuel efficiencies achieved using technology developed during the project. Based on a study

¹⁴ A \$500,000 disbursement was made shortly after the grant agreement was signed and two subsequent disbursements of \$100,000 each have also been made.

¹⁵ The only projects larger than this were grants to the Kodiak Launch Facility, the Aurora BIDCO project, and the Low Rank Coal Water Fuel project. Each of these projects received a special legislative appropriation of ASTF funds.

commissioned by the Division of Energy regarding power systems using this technology, these statements appear overly optimistic. ASTF did not obtain any independent verification of this reported information. We believe such verification should have been obtained, not only because it was necessary to adequately assess this project, but also because the IED 2000 project was, to some degree, an extension of this project. It would seem prudent for the board to obtain full assurance that the results of this project were favorable before it approved funding for the IED 2000 project.

- At the time the IED 2000 Project was approved, the third annual post-grant report for the Hydro/Diesel Project was approximately eight months overdue. Also, the first annual report on that project, dated April 11, 1995 states, in part,

Akutan has a powerhouse that has over the past 12 months generated 338,176-Kilowatt hours of electricity from the combination of hydro and diesel consuming 11,900 gallons of diesel.

However, Division of Energy records show that from April 1994 through April 1995, 366,613-Kilowatt hours of electricity were generated using 31,229 gallons of diesel. ASTF did consider fuel efficiencies when drafting incentives in the repayment provisions of the grant agreement.¹⁶ However, we note that efficiency incentives are of no consequence if the technology is not sound. As in other instances mentioned above, ASTF did not verify information reported to it by the grantee. We believe that such verification is essential for accurate assessment of projects previously funded, and so that knowledgeable decisions regarding future grants can be made. See Recommendation No. 1.

Current DS grant awarded despite ASTF's awareness of potential problems

When the IED 2000 grant award was approved, the board believed that the project had great potential to create a high technology export industry within the State. It appears that potential may still exist. However, the board was also aware of many potential obstacles to achieving this success.

- The board voted to fund the IED 2000 grant on September 5, 1997, contingent on grant agreement negotiations. A follow-up teleconference meeting was held on September 26, 1997 to discuss two modifications to the grant agreement provisions approved at the prior meeting. In addition to the negative input received in the months leading up to these meetings, the board heard significant negative public testimony regarding funding this project at each of these meetings. Much of this testimony, as well as a significant amount of correspondence, was received from individuals who had direct dealings with APS. In addition, members of the rural power industry cautioned the board about the project. This is particularly significant given the fact that although the board

¹⁶ Repayment obligations would be reduced if the IED 2000 technology resulted in lower power generation costs in Alaska.

provides time for public testimony at all its meetings, it is extremely rare that such testimony is offered. The board took the testimony offered, but approved the IED 2000 grant despite the ardent objections it heard.

- The board was aware that APS was in serious financial difficulty. In fact, it appears that DS was established, at least in part, to protect assets from APS creditors. ASTF included language in the grant agreement stipulating that grant funds were not to be used to pay APS debt.
- At its September 26 meeting, the board was made aware that a key member of the development team was leaving the company. Retention of this person, as well as other key employees was one of several grant benchmarks. Thus, ASTF was aware that grant agreement benchmarks had been violated even before the agreement was signed. By the time the grant agreement was signed, ASTF was aware that this member of the development team was leaving, at least in part, due to nonpayment of salary.
- Review of the IED 2000 grant file indicated that the technology development was taking place in California prior to the signing of the grant agreement. DS did move these operations to Alaska, but it is not clear exactly when. We note that DS moved all its operations back to California in February or March 1998. The board apparently believed that even if DS developed the technology for the IED 2000 system in California, it would return to Alaska for actual production.

In addition to the initial grant payment of \$500,000, ASTF disbursed another \$200,000 to DS after it moved its operations back to California. According to AS 37.17.090(h) the board is required to give preference to Alaskan applicants. The statute also stipulates that the board award only grants that benefit Alaska. According to the foundation's mission statement, all projects must bring direct and significant benefits to Alaskans. As DS' ties to the state diminished, the chances that the project would benefit Alaska decreased substantially. We believe it was incumbent on the board to take this into consideration.

- In response to the negative indications the board had been receiving regarding this project, ASTF commissioned an independent engineer's report on the IED 2000 technology. The engineer's report indicated that the IED 2000 power generation control system was viable and had potential for success. However, the report also contained indications that the project might not be as beneficial to the State as ASTF might have hoped. Although IED 2000 was being designed to provide a range of functions not available in existing power generation control systems, the report also noted that each individual function or some combinations of the functions included in the IED 2000 system were currently available from systems produced by other manufacturers. Many companies in this market sector were conducting significant research and development on similar projects. Thus, competition was strong, and timeliness was of the essence. As discussed above, APS had performed slowly with the Remote Monitoring grant. The technology, or a variation of it, was sure to be developed and made available in Alaskan markets in the near future. If another company beat DS to market with similar technology, DS' potential success would be severely hampered.

Given all the above mentioned indications that the IED 2000 project might be troublesome, it appears that the board should have been wary of approving this project.

ASTF board chairman disclosed potential conflicts of interest with APS/DS

In July 1997, ASTF's board chairman, who is also the president of an Anchorage-based telecommunications company, disclosed that APS and his company shared office space in two villages and that APS owed that company \$20,000 for phone services, some of which was past due. His company's annual revenues are approximately \$200 million, and the ASTF board chairman owns 3% of its stock. He also disclosed that he is a personal friend of APS/DS' principal owner. The board substantially followed state procedures in determining that the disclosed facts did not constitute a conflict of interest for the board chair. Those procedures included voting on whether the disclosed information constitutes a conflict and submitting a report to the Attorney General's (AG) Office regarding all disclosed potential conflicts. See Recommendation No. 5.

According to another member of the board, all were satisfied that no true conflict existed. The board apparently believed there was no potential for the board chairman to benefit directly from the project. The appearance of conflict was also reportedly considered. In determining whether the appearance of conflict of interest was significant enough to exclude the chairman from the decision-making process on the IED 2000 grant, board members considered the fact that he was one of the members most knowledgeable in the area of the technology applicable to the grant.

Usual grant approval procedures require review of peer review recommendations and staff reports. In this case, in addition to those processes, significant board involvement occurred. Prior to the board's approval of the grant award for the IED 2000 project, two board members, including the board chairman, spent time reviewing the project. One member reviewed the technology development work being done by the company, and the other reviewed the company's business plan. These members recommended that the grant amount be increased from \$950,000 to \$1,500,000, although peer reviewers did not indicate the project was underfunded. Based on their review, these two members believed that the \$1,500,000 was needed if the project was to be a success. Such involvement in the project by board members is controversial. Close scrutiny by board members leads to more informed decisions. However, there is a danger that board members may lose their objectivity if they become too involved in the project.

Standard grant repayment provisions enhanced for the IED 2000 grant

In modifying the grant agreement, the board negotiated terms that have potential to increase the benefit of the grant to the State.

To its credit, ASTF combined repayment provisions from prior grants into the current grant agreement. Both grants to APS were made before the 1995 statutory changes discussed

earlier in this section. Under the old statutes, repayment provisions were based only on royalty income received by the grantee as a result of technology developed with ASTF funds. Because neither grant project generated royalty income, repayment requirements did not apply.

In drafting the provisions of the IED 2000 grant agreement, however, ASTF included repayment provisions that covered not only the current grant funds, but also the two earlier APS grant monies. According to the agreement, if DS maintains an Alaska presence, its repayment obligation will be 1.5 times the total grant proceeds from all three grants. Thus, the repayment provision totals \$2,745,908, subject to credits earned if IED 2000 systems are installed in Alaska and shown to reduce the cost of power generation within the State. If Alaska presence is not maintained according to the original grant agreement, DS repayment provisions increase to five times the grant amount, up to \$7,500,000. However, all repayment provisions are moot if the project is not a success, or if those provisions are not enforced. See Recommendation No. 3.

Benchmarks modified but still not met

Many benchmarks contained in the original IED 2000 grant agreement have not been met, yet funding for the project continued until May 1998. For example:

- Key technical and financial personnel were to be committed to the IED 2000 project during the first two years of the grant. Currently, one year into the project, only two of these key personnel, the company's owner and a financial consultant, are still associated with the project. The person most involved in actual development of the project had resigned before the grant agreement was signed. In January 1998, ASTF became aware that other key personnel, including the grant manager, had left the company. Their actual departure dates are not clear.

The agreement stipulates that if any of these individuals left, ASTF could determine at its discretion if equivalent talent was committed to the project. In all these cases, ASTF determined that equivalent talent was available for the project. It should be noted, however, that time was supposedly of the essence for the project's success. Changing personnel under these circumstances was an obvious impediment for timely completion of the project.

- Monthly financial statements based on generally accepted accounting principles, and annual audit reports for both DS and APS were to be submitted. These requirements have never been met. In lieu of monthly financial statements, ASTF was provided with a checkbook register printout. This register showed payments to APS that were reportedly to cover personnel costs. However, ASTF did not obtain supporting documentation to determine if these expenditures were proper. No audits for either company have been provided. See Recommendation No. 1.

- A beta test of the system was to be performed demonstrating system capabilities in terms of several functions. The actual beta test, performed in March 1998, included only one function.

Disbursements were made through May 1998. Further disbursements have been held pending DS compliance with grant agreement stipulations, as outlined in a May 1998 amendment to the grant agreement.¹⁷ DS reportedly has potential customers for its product outside the United States. However, whether any sales will actually occur remains to be seen. Even if the company becomes a success, there are few indications that Alaskans will benefit from the funding ASTF has contributed to the project.

Based on the preceding aspects of grants to APS and DS, it appears that ASTF poorly handled the IED 2000 grant. Not only did ASTF overestimate the feasibility of the project when it approved the grant, it also failed to enforce benchmarks or heed signs that the project's success was increasingly doubtful.

ASTF's public relations (PR) contract of questionable value to the State

We are concerned that certain functions provided to ASTF by a public relations firm on contract to the foundation are inappropriate for a state agency. Specifically, we do not believe state monies should be used in an effort to influence legislative decisions on funding. Further, we question whether contracting with such a firm is the most efficient manner of reaching potential grantees to solicit interest in the foundation's program.

ASTF currently has an Anchorage public relations firm under contract. The three-year contract, signed June 16, 1996, is for \$110,000 per year. Additionally, a \$50,000 amendment was signed in 1997 that requires the firm to produce a series of television spots for the foundation.¹⁸

Tasks required by the initial contract include issuing press releases and monthly news faxes, one-on-one media briefings, advertising and promoting teacher conferences and an ASTF lecture series, issuance of the annual report, and Internet web site enhancement and support.

¹⁷ Certain aspects of the grant agreement are proprietary in nature and are not subject to public disclosure.

¹⁸ We note with interest that the television spots did not explicitly state that ASTF was soliciting new proposals. While the foundation's web page address was included in each spot, ASTF's phone number and address were not.

The stated goal of the contract is:

To increase awareness and understanding of ASTF's role in growing and diversifying Alaska's economy among the general public, media, community and business leaders, and Legislators. [Emphasis added.]

ASTF's executive director stated that the foundation required such a firm on contract for the following reasons.

1. To get the attention of industry leaders so they would think of ASTF when they are considering doing projects. To inform people that ASTF is ready to "do projects."
2. To get the attention of "opinion leaders" because they have the ear of the legislature. He spoke of fears that the ASTF endowment could be "raided." Opinion leaders are also important because they can influence the attitude of Alaskans as a whole. By promoting a "we can produce it here" attitude, the foundation furthers its mission to sustain growth and development of Alaskan scientific and engineering capabilities. Capability is fueled by attitude.
3. A public relations firm can more effectively "get the word out" regarding ASTF projects and programs. Foundation staff do not have the expertise or time to do what the public relations firm does.

We realize that a small agency such as ASTF may wish to use a contractual public relations service to generate interest in its program with the intent of attracting additional proposals for projects. However, this does not appear to be what the contract in question is primarily designed to do. Indeed, if attracting new proposals was the primary reason for the contract, we believe it is a highly inefficient means of accomplishing this task. We are concerned that the thrusts of many of the services performed under this contract are tantamount to an attempt to protect ASTF's funding base. We do not believe such actions are appropriate for a state agency.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation No. 1

ASTF should increase its efforts to monitor large ongoing grants.

Monitoring of ongoing ASTF grants generally consists of a staff or circuit rider review of progress and financial reports submitted by the grantees. These reviews are performed to ensure that reports show that benchmarks and budgets are being met. However, independent verification of reported information is rarely obtained until the final report is submitted. Supporting documentation of reported financial or project information is generally not requested. Site visits are usually conducted only when there is a clear indication that problems exist or toward the end of a project.

Under current procedures, few if any measures are taken to ensure that the reported information is accurate until the final report is submitted. At the final report stage, agreed-upon review procedures or an audit by a CPA is required in most instances. While these measures appear adequate for smaller grants, we believe more stringent monitoring for larger ASTF grants is warranted. Payments are made on many grants over an extended period of time. Ongoing verification that reported information is accurate is necessary to ensure that ASTF grant funds are being expended properly. Such monitoring need not be burdensome for the grantee. It could simply consist of more on-site visits or the submission of supporting documentation for reported expenditures for review by ASTF staff. In some cases, periodic audits may be warranted. This would allow ASTF to better identify potential problems before the bulk of funding for a project has been disbursed.

We note that the grants administrator is responsible for drafting the grant agreements, negotiating grant modifications, and monitoring ongoing and closed grants. These responsibilities appear very demanding and this concentration of responsibility may contribute to the weakness in the monitoring function that we note in this recommendation and to the weaknesses we note in Recommendation Nos. 2 and 3.

Recommendation No. 2

ASTF should enforce post-grant reporting requirements.

Article IV section 22 of the standard ASTF grant agreement states:

During the Term of this Agreement and for a period of five (5) years thereafter, the Grantee shall provide ASTF with a detailed written report within forty-five (45) days after the end of each calendar year summarizing the Grantee's post-Project efforts, including, without limitation:

- a) *Its efforts and plans to Commercialize the Technology and Intellectual Property.*
- b) *Its efforts and plans to otherwise use, disclose or disseminate the Technology or Intellectual Property, such as publishing articles, lecturing, and distributing materials related to the Technology or Intellectual Property.*

Currently, the grant administrator sends a letter out annually requesting update information. The letter makes no reference to the above mentioned grant agreement clause. It does not convey any sense of urgency or authority, and in many instances grant recipients ignore it.

No follow-up action is taken when former grantees do not submit these annual reports. In at least one instance, ASTF made a subsequent grant to a company that was not current with post-grant reporting requirements associated with prior ASTF funded projects.

Without the post-grant information required by the grant agreement, the foundation is not able to accurately assess the effect of these projects on the Alaskan economy. It is unable to track how effective the grants it has made have been. Consequently, it is difficult, if not impossible, for ASTF to do any meaningful self-assessment as to the types of projects it has funded in the past or should fund in the future. Therefore, we recommend that ASTF take a more proactive approach to enforcing post-grant reporting requirements. This could include reminding past grant recipients that they are contractually obliged to submit these reports.

Recommendation No. 3

ASTF should implement procedures to ensure it is receiving all the repayment to which it is entitled from past grantees.

No enforcement mechanism is in place to ensure that the foundation is receiving the repayment to which it is entitled. Under AS 37.17.090(g), ASTF is required to obtain a fair and reasonable return from the revenue, economic value, or profits derived by the grantee from ASTF sponsored projects. ASTF's standard grant agreement requires the grantee to pay the foundation 5% of any profits up to 1.5 times the original grant amount so long as the grantee remains in Alaska. If the grantee moves out of the State, the provisions double to 10% of income up to three times the grant amount. Such provisions are applied to proprietary grants only and are subject to modification at the board's discretion. Repayment provisions are not applied to knowledge projects because no economic gain is expected to be received by the grantee.

However, ASTF takes no actions to ensure that past grantees are meeting the repayment provisions they agreed to or that repayments are adequate. Past grantees are essentially on an honor system when it comes to repayment. ASTF takes no measures to seek out past grantees beyond those described in Recommendation No. 2, nor does it require independent verification to ensure that the repayments it does receive are adequate.

Recommendation No. 6

ASTF's board should document the statutory authority for each grant.

The foundation appears to be operating under the assumption that any grant that promotes the purposes of the foundation as defined under AS 37.17.010 is appropriate. That is to say, any grant that promotes and/or enhances "*economic development and technological innovation in Alaska; public health; telecommunications; and sustained growth and development of Alaskan scientific and engineering capabilities*" is appropriate. There does not appear to be acknowledgement of the constraint that such purposes are to be accomplished either "*through basic and applied research and the development and commercialization of technology*" or through means specified in other sections of ASTF's statute.

On several occasions during the course of our audit, ASTF staff were unable to tell us what statute allowed them to approve a particular grant. The grant for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Center discussed in the Report Conclusions is an example. It appears that this grant may be appropriate under AS 37.17.225. However, the foundation is limited to spending no more than \$2 million in endowment income for grants approved under this statute and this grant alone was \$600,000. If ASTF does not determine what statute allows a particular grant, it is unable to ensure compliance with requirements such as this. Therefore, we recommend that clear statutory authority be documented for all ASTF grants.



HOME FOUNDATION NEWS GRANTS PROPOSALS APPLICATIONS SCHOOLZONE CONTACT LINKS

ABOUT THE FOUNDATION



ASTF's Mission

The mission of the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation is to enhance the development and application of science and technology for the direct benefit of Alaskans. The Alaska Science and Technology Foundation will help establish an environment where Alaska has the confidence, know-how, technology, and risk capital to grow an economy of sustainable wealth.

ASTF's History

The Governor and the Alaska State Legislature established ASTF in 1988. ASTF's statutory purpose is "to promote and enhance, through basic and applied research and the development and commercialization of technology, economic development and technological innovation in Alaska; public health; telecommunications; and the sustained growth and development of Alaskan scientific and engineering capabilities."

- [1995 Annual Report](#)
- [1996 Annual Report](#)
- [1997 Annual Report](#)
- [1998 Annual Report](#)



HOME FOUNDATION NEWS GRANTS/EDUCATE APPLICATIONS SCHOOL/2000 CONTACT URL

ABOUT THE FOUNDATION

01 - 1998 Director's Report

The Honorable Tony Knowles, Governor

The Honorable Members of the Alaska Legislature

Citizens of the State of Alaska,

We are pleased to offer this report on the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation's (ASTF) 1998 operations.

ASTF is having an increasing impact on growing Alaska's entrepreneurial economy. Funded projects in 1998 totaled \$13.4 million with a record \$64.5 million match.

A McDowell survey of recent grantees reports:
 100 jobs a year since 1995 have been added by ASTF projects;
 \$13 million in additional sales;
 84 percent report that the project would not have happened without ASTF; and
 more than a third report that they would not be in business without ASTF co-investment in their project.

Since the process from idea to sales takes seven to 10 years for most start-up technology companies, we think this shows ASTF's growing impact on Alaska's future economy.

ASTF would like to credit its partners in business, the university and the community in working with us to develop science and technology for the benefit of Alaskans. Our grantees willingness to share risk, to develop clear research and development and business plans, and to directly involve end users of the science or technology being developed, are key criteria for both ASTF funds and ongoing success.

The reader of this report will see the impact ASTF is having working with different parts of the state's economy.

Mining

ASTF's work with state regulatory departments and the industry on a simpler test for measuring the impact of total dissolved solids promises to bring better science and more certainty to this key permitting issue. ASTF's work with mining and remote sensing companies on producing maps that integrate the latest technology with existing geotechnical and topographic data has been well received by mining representatives.

Forest Products

In 1998, a lumber grader was stationed in the state as a first step to recapturing the state 70-90 million board feet of

imported lumber each year. Seven mills are now producing graded lumber. More mills are undertaking improvement projects and improving the technology and training necessary to compete.

Energy

Working with the resource owners and a long-term marketing focus on selling coal water fuel to Asian utilities, ASTF renewed its \$4 million commitment to the coal water fuel demonstration plant being built at UAF. A number of other ASTF projects aim at using digital technology and alternative energy to bring lower cost electricity to rural Alaska.

Seafood

This summer, Alaska will see the first beta test of an integrated system to remove pinbones from salmon. ASTF investments in the seafood industry continue to exceed other sectors because of the opportunity to apply the latest technology to processing salmon into food and to expand the state's shellfish industry to new markets.

Internet

Most of Alaska's classrooms are now wired to the Internet with the help of thousands of NetDay volunteers, businesses, schools and ASTF's \$10,000 per building grants to cover one-time wiring and router costs. This increased demand and the new federal e-rate program is resulting in improved high-speed connections to Alaskan schools and communities. In the coming year, ASTF will continue to work with communities and schools on integrating the technology into the curriculum and widening the discussion on the appropriate use of the technology. In addition, our work with science museums, schools, and regional economic development organizations will continue so Alaska can realize the full educational and economic promise of being connected.

Thanks

In the coming year, ASTF will spend more time communicating the impact of its work. Part of that task is to offer a clearer picture of the technical and commercial challenges in each industry sector so we can build a broader economic base for the state. We continue to have the highest appreciation for the foresight and participation of Alaska's political leaders and citizens in our work.

Respectfully submitted, Ronald Duncan, Chair
Dr. Jamie Kenworthy, Executive Director

[[Back to '1998 Annual Report'](#)]



ALASKA SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION
—Putting Innovation to Work for Alaska—

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Transmitted To:

JANET SEITZ

Fax Number _____

Date: _____ Time: _____

Number of Pages (including this one): _____

Sent By: Jamie Kawentz

MESSAGE:

THANKS for your message. Would still like better feel for other issues on agenda because I can line up a fair number of industry folks who believe this is a BAD IDEA. But I don't want to wreck the L&C schedule.

THANKS.

Please deliver this facsimile transmission to the above addressee. If you do not receive all of the pages in good condition, please advise us at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your assistance.

FORMS FAX

4500 Diplomacy Drive, Suite 515, Anchorage, Alaska 99508-5918

Telephone: (907) 272-4333

Fax: (907) 274-6228

ASTF STANDARD GRANT AGREEMENT

26. Gross Receipts.

For the purposes of Section 4 of the Agreement, the term "Gross Receipts" shall include, without limitation, all the gross revenues and receipts received by or for the benefit of the Grantee from (a) sales, leasing, subleasing, licensing or sublicensing of any goods, products or services covered by the Intellectual Property or involving the Technology, in whole or in part, (b) royalties or any other form of income received from the Intellectual Property or the Technology, in whole or in part, and (c) that portion of the sales price received from the sale or exchange of any of its securities, equity or assets that has been allocated or should be allocated, to the Technology and/or the Intellectual Property.

27. Transfer of and Security Interest in Intellectual Property.

a. Until ASTF has received all of the Repayment due it under Section 4 of the Agreement and the repayment of any Grant funds repayable to ASTF by the Grantee under the Agreement, the Grantee shall have no right, power, or authority to assign, convey or otherwise transfer any or all of its right, title or interest in or to the Technology and/or Intellectual Property, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, voluntarily or involuntarily, and regardless of whether by license, sublicense, lease, sublease, sale or by transfer of a controlling interest (as defined as AS 10.06.990(12)) in a corporate Grantee (analogously applied for a non-corporate Grantee), except as follows:

- i. (A) the assignee, conveyee or other transferee of such right, title and interest in and to the Technology and/or Intellectual Property expressly agrees to assume, and to fully, faithfully and timely perform, all of the Grantee's obligations and liabilities to ASTF under the Agreement, including, without limitation, the Repayment obligation to ASTF, and
- (B) ASTF has approved the assignee's, conveyee's or other transferee's technical, financial and business capabilities to perform such obligations and satisfy such liabilities, which approval may be withheld in the sole and absolute discretion of ASTF; or
- ii. ASTF receives full (A) payment of the Repayment and (B) repayment of all Grant funds repayable to ASTF by the Grantee under this Agreement.

In no event shall any such assignment, conveyance or other transfer or ASTF's approval thereof result in any release or discharge of any of the Grantee's obligations or liabilities to ASTF under the Agreement or with respect to the Grant or Project, in whole or in part, unless ASTF, in its sole and absolute discretion, elects to expressly do so in writing.

b. The Grantee hereby grants and assigns to ASTF a first, prior and paramount security interest in, all of the Technology and Intellectual Property which it now has or may hereafter acquire to secure the full, faithful, and timely performance of all of the Grantee's obligations and satisfaction of all of the Grantee's liabilities to ASTF under the Agreement and/or with respect to the Project or Grant. The Grantee shall execute and deliver to ASTF such UCC financing statements, continuation statements, assignments and notices of assignment of copyrights, trade secrets, technical know-how, patent applications and patents, together with such other instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to make or perfect such grant and assignment for security as may be requested by ASTF from time to time. In the event the Grantee fails or unreasonably delays in doing so, ASTF is hereby granted a power of attorney to do so by the Grantee, which power is (a) irrevocable, unconditional and durable, (b) shall survive the death, bankruptcy, dissolution and incompetence of the Grantee, and (c) is coupled with an interest in ASTF.

28. Maintenance and Retention of Books and Records.

The Grantee shall (a) maintain all of its business, tax and financial books and records in written and/or electronic form according to generally accepted practices consistently applied and (b) account to ASTF for all matters relating to the Project, the Grant and/or the Repayment in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") consistently applied, including, without limitation, all revenues and receipts directly or indirectly derived from the Technology and/or Intellectual Property and all Project costs. The Grantee shall retain all such books, records and other data pertinent to the Agreement ("Grant Information") for a period of five (5) years following fulfillment of the Grantee's obligation to make the Repayment to ASTF.

29. Rights to Site and Records Inspection.

At any reasonable time, and from time to time, ASTF, and its employees, representatives, professionals and agents shall have the right during normal business hours to visit and inspect the Project site(s) and Equipment. The Grantee shall cooperate with and assist such ASTF employees, representatives, professionals and agents during each such visit and inspection. ASTF shall also have the right during normal business hours to inspect or audit the Grant Information upon five (5) business days advance notice, and the Grant Information shall be made available by the Grantee to ASTF at a location designated by ASTF within the State of Alaska unless otherwise agreed to by ASTF in writing. Such inspection or audit may be performed by ASTF, other State of Alaska personnel, independent accountants, auditors or attorneys selected by ASTF or the State of Alaska or any combination of such persons. Exercise of the right to inspect or audit under this Section 29 does not relieve the Grantee of its obligation to submit any information, audits or reports to ASTF required by the Agreement. The audit and inspection rights under this Section 29 shall survive for a period of five (5) years after fulfillment by the Grantee of its obligation to make the Repayment to ASTF.

30. No Lobbying or Political Activities.

The Grantee shall not use any Grant funds, directly or indirectly, for any lobbying or political activities, including, without limitation, any attempt or effort to directly or indirectly (a) influence a (i) political, legislative or administrative process, or (ii) consideration, reconsideration, enactment or determination by the Alaska State Legislature, Executive Branch or any State agency, body or instrumentality or (b) make any political contributions of any type to any person, party or organization.

31. Permits, Laws and Taxes.

The Grantee shall, at its expense, acquire and maintain in good standing all permits, consents, licenses, approvals and other entitlements necessary or appropriate for its performance of the Agreement. The Grantee shall timely pay all taxes, charges, assessments and fees in any way pertaining to, arising out of or resulting from the Agreement or the Grant.

32. Compliance with Applicable Laws.

The Grantee shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local statutes, laws, rules, code, ordinances and regulations, including, without limitation, those relating to equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, civil rights, the handicapped and environmental protection.

33. Use of ASTF Name.

The Grantee shall list ASTF as an independent funding and supporting source in all materials published by the Grantee relating to the Project, except for literature pertaining to Commercialization of the

HB

121

SUPPORT PETITIONS

HOUSE BILL 121

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to those provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Laura A. Stewart</i>	Laura A Stewart	21649 Portler Pl Anchorage AK	yes	907-272-9571	✓	✓
<i>Kris Hughes</i>	Kris Hughes	17139 Coronado Rd. Eagle River	yes	604-5955		
<i>Launa J. Gebel-Buck</i>	Launa J. Gebel-Buck	28510 Alindenfall Dr ER	yes	694-6939	✓	
<i>Joe Case</i>	Joe Case	416 Lakeland Cir Anch AK	yes	248-5992		
<i>William J. Mueloe</i>	William J Mueloe	10144 Chaudalun Eagle Rk	yes	694-1460	✓	
<i>Bethanne D. Couture</i>	Bethanne D Couture	19701 Shumagin Circle ER	yes	696-5829	✓	
<i>Rebecca Hanson</i>	Rebecca Hanson	11005 Box 9413 ETR AK	yes	694-6500	X	X
<i>Pamela Rice</i>	Pamela Rice	11011 Eldon Rd #8	yes	694-7844		
<i>Brenda L. Dunai</i>	Brenda L. Dunai	19927 Unimak Cr. Eagle River	yes	694-7207	X	X
<i>Betty Koehler</i>	Betty Koehler	Po. Box 671445 Chugiak, AK	yes	688-0159		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Vote?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Isabel M. Graft</i>	ISABEL M. GRAFT	9725 Independence Dr Anch	yes	522-5008	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Mary L. Harper</i>	Mary L. Harper	7600 Upper DeArmon	yes	345-1042		
<i>Kathleen Walsh</i>	Kathleen Walsh	24-370 B. Lewis St	YES	337-9523		
<i>Thomas C. Scott</i>	THOMAS C. SCOTT	716 DE. CHESTER HTS. CIR. ANCHORAGE	YES	337-1488	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Marcia Lowe</i>	MARCIA LOWE	5121 CURRIN CIR Anch AK	yes	345-6140		
<i>David Polymark</i>	David Polymark	5006 Cape Sullivan	yes	345-3120		
<i>Sharon Nait Hubl</i>	Sharon Nait Hubl	8624 Boundary #1 99504	yes	333-1320		
<i>Neil Spencer</i>	Neil Spencer	13050 Sues Way 99516	yes	333-4520		
<i>Lara Cooley</i>	Lara Cooley	2645 Lee Street	yes	337-8542		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Dennis W. Jeffers</i>	DENNIS W. JEFFERS	2058 Tobacco Lane Fairbanks, AK 99701	yes	907-455-6530		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>[Handwritten Signature]</i>	Todd Critchies	2841 Banta Dr #40	yes	357-4000	-	-
<i>[Handwritten Signature]</i>	JOEL CHARLES	3429 W 83rd Anch AK 98502	yes	243 7844	-	-
<i>[Handwritten Signature]</i>	Katie M. Henning	PO Box 141542 Anch AK 99514	yes	279-8273	-	-

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>[Signature]</i>	Harly Hobson	PO Box 364 GIRDWOOD AK	YES	783-2904	X	X
<i>[Signature]</i>	Fritz Loschky	2629 Brookstone	YES	522-0058		X
<i>[Signature]</i>	Tom Fairchild	9430 Marshfield Pl.	Yes	347-5174		
<i>[Signature]</i>	JON PFEIFER	6531 BRIDGE CT	YES	243-0080		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Janva Pricor	490 Sandy Beach Dr.	Yes	248-9935		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Barbara Gentry	158 Ocean Park Dr	NO	344-5418		
<i>[Signature]</i>	KAREN FRANK	8321 FRANK	YES	8563-8000		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Daniel Philis?	4030 LOW RD SPR	YES	338-4445		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Daniel Philis	4030 LOW RD SPR				

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Linda S. Lansing</i>	Linda S. Lansing	199 W. Hillcrest Soldotna AK 99664	yes	907-262-5362		
<i>Norma Osborn</i>	Norma Osborn	703 Cypress Dr Kenai AK	yes	907-283-4525		
<i>Betty L. Smith</i>	Betty L. Smith	280 Rodman St Soldotna AK 99664	yes	907-262-7119		
<i>Jana Query</i>	Jana Query	520 Knoll Circle Soldotna 99664	yes	907-262-7017		
<i>Julie Martner</i>	Julie Martner	507 " " " "	yes	907-262-7167		
<i>Michelle McArdle</i>	Michelle McArdle	PO Box 8104 Nikiski	yes	907-776-8248		
<i>Nancy A. Lafferty</i>	Nancy A. Lafferty	1605 Tanaga Kenai	yes	907-283-8418		
<i>Leslie Hall</i>	Leslie Hall	445d Cosms St Kenai	yes	907-282-7777		
<i>Debra Harriman</i>	Debra Harriman	PO Box 779 Kenai	yes	907-283-9482		
<i>Carolyn S. Buxton</i>	Carolyn S. Buxton	PO Box 1376 Soldotna	yes	907-262-4165		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL SOCIETY FORM 10-19-98

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Sandy Chappel</i>	Sandy Chappel	2405 Naomi Dr Wasilla	YES	(907) 576-4755		
<i>Don Kattner</i>	Don Kattner	3601 C St/ Suite 600	YES	207-278-8878		
<i>Amel Naji</i>	Amel Naji	9730 Vanover Blvd #7 Anchorage	NO	907-749-4925		
<i>Brent C George</i>	Brent C George	1513 Sunrise Dr Anch AK	YES	(907) 272-6485		
<i>Donald W. Hill</i>	Donald W. Hill	3421 N. Shore Dr	YES	907 248-9798		
<i>Alex O'Hara</i>	Alex O'Hara	P.O. Box 52282 Big Lake, AK	YES	(907) 812-7039	✓	
<i>Jennifer B. Edwards</i>	Jennifer B. Edwards	1200 E. St. Unit B Anchorage AK	YES	907 277-0821		
<i>Sheary Switer</i>	Sheary Switer	930 Shorecrest Dr A/A	YES	907 243-9946		
<i>V. Ferguson</i>	V. Ferguson	9451 Spruce Hill Dr	YES	346 1553		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Sandra Hill</i>	Sandra Hill	2345 Willow Dr. W. Wasilla AK 99594	yes	376-2456		
<i>Bobbie Stepp</i>	Bobbie Stepp	920 Brawley Dr Wasilla AK 99592	yes	357-1248		
<i>Lisa M. Battles</i>	Lisa Battles	P.O. Box 874483 Wasilla AK 99587	yes			
<i>Donna M. Maguire</i>	Donna M. Maguire	P.O. Box 873506 Wasilla AK 99587	yes	376-8130		
<i>Pat Hulsey</i>	Pat Hulsey	P.O. Box 872046 Wasilla AK 99587	yes	376-2456	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Rhonda Daigle</i>	Rhonda Daigle	750 McAdoo Way Wasilla AK 99591	no	373-3183	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Michelle Cottrell</i>	Michelle Cottrell	PO box 1112 Palmer AK 99645	yes	746-2158		
<i>Camille Samson</i>	Camille Samson	501 Carpenter Circle #3 Wasilla AK 99594	yes	357-6404		
<i>P.C. Hillis III</i>	P.C. Hillis III	P.O. Box 77264 Eagle River AK 99577	NA	376-2456	yes	yes
<i>Helen Georff</i>	Helen Georff	2815 Brawley Dr Wasilla AK 99594	yes	376-8187		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Stephen R. Libby</i>	STEPHEN R. LIBBY	10981 TRAILS END ANCH 99501	Yes	346 3575	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Christina Libby</i>	CHRISTINA LIBBY	''	''	''	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Rebecca Florio</i>	Rebecca Florio	3361 D.J. DRIVE ANCH	Yes	562-2551	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>JoAnn Nogle</i>	JOANN NOGLE	1410 Kelly Cir ANCHORAGE	YES	333-2442	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Linda Christie</i>	Linda Christie	Eagle River, Alaska	Yes	696-2426	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Yvonne Lary</i>	YVONNE LARY	FT RICHARDSON AK	yes	428 2009	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Martin N. Swink</i>	MARTIN N. SWINK	7601 Big Spruce Cir AK	Yes	248-663	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Lisa J. Anderson</i>	Lisa J. Anderson	PO BOX 477 King Salmon AK 99603	yes	246-3039	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Dr. W. Smith</i>	Dr. W. Smith	2200 WILSON TRAIL DR	yes	346 2026	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Mary R. Geibe RDH</i>	Mary R. Geibe RDH	PO BOX 22292 ANCHORAGE, AK 99512	yes	522-8222	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to those provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify
<i>Debra Neel</i>	Debra Neel	10946 Iditarod Cir ^{SP} ₂₉₅₇	YES	696 6289		
<i>James Goodman</i>	James Goodman	15129 Kourie Loop, So.	YES	644-4263		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return post

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.
4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.



If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Jacqueline Scott</i>	JACQUELINE SCOTT	7705 LINDA LN	YES	344-1847		
<i>Alvin Johnson</i>	ALVIN JOHNSON	8050 PIONEER DR	YES			
<i>Kell L. Johnson</i>	Kell L. Johnson	6720 C, H St EAGLE	yes	753-9287		
<i>Jeanne Kay</i>	Jeanne Kay	3113 Westvard Drive	no	333-9080		
<i>Michael Scott</i>	Michael Scott	7400 E. 17th Ave	NO	333-3347		
<i>Julie Sathall</i>	Julie Sathall	3226 100 St	YES	333-3544		
<i>Mark Christiansen</i>	MARK CHRISTIANSEN	316 Price St	yes	279-4913		
<i>Jan Holley</i>	JAN HOLLEY	P.O. Box 90917	YES	242-5885		
<i>June Ann Scott</i>	JUNE ANN SCOTT	7705 LINDA LN	YES	344-1847		
<i>ANA M. Edwards</i>	ANA M. Edwards	1404 W. 45th Ave	NO			

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Lori Somellan</i>	LORI SOMELLAN	991654 666 W. HOLIDAY, WASILLA AK	YES	(907) 373-6039	✓	✓
<i>Larry Huling</i>	LARRY HULING	3905 Red Fox Cir. Wasilla AK 99659	YES	373-3905		
<i>Jack L. Williams</i>	JACK L. WILLIAMS	281 N. MAIN ST #202, WASILLA 99654	YES	373-1630		
<i>Penny A. Rosseter</i>	PENNY A. ROSSETER	3705 Mountain Cir. Wasilla 99647	YES	371-3437		
<i>Florence N. Scott</i>	FLORENCE N. SCOTT	P.O. Box 4314, Palmer AK	YES	373-4118		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

04-15 99 004 10-00 FAX 907 300 4002 ALASKA DENTAL SOCIETY

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>W. P. ...</i>	William M. ...	925 ...	✓	376-8486		
<i>Donna ...</i>	Donna ...	PO Box 878196	✓	376-0727		
<i>Mandy ...</i>	Mandy Arndt	1360 ...	✓	376-0410		
<i>Nicki ...</i>	Nicki ...	PO Box 873151 Wasilla 99687	✓	357-2385		
<i>Curt ...</i>	Curt A. Youngberg	HC 34 Box 2116 Wasilla 99654	yes	373-1205		
<i>Lori ...</i>	Lori A. ...	HC 31 Box 5061 Wasilla 99654	yes	373-5938		
<i>Brian ...</i>	Brian J. Pillars	2005 Caribou Loop Prudhoe Bay 99554	yes	374-1345		
<i>Lloyd ...</i>	Lloyd Grover	831 Gail Dr. Wasilla, AK 99654	yes	376-5484	✓	
<i>Leslyan ...</i>	Leslyan J. Casey	POB 873814 Wasilla AK 99687	yes	376-1033		
<i>Heidi ...</i>	Heidi S. Huling	8905 Red Fox Cir. Wasilla AK 99654	yes	373-3905		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Paul Kriester</i>	Paul Kriester	14101 Sullivan DR 99515	Yes	*		
<i>Loraine Anderson</i>	LORAIN ANDERSON	512 Togiak Circle 99507	Yes			
<i>Wesley G. Hibben</i>	Wesley G. Hibben	19000 Sparkling Ave. Anchorage AK 99515	Yes			
<i>Marilyn B. Bungay</i>	MARYLIN BUNGAY	5733 N. LANE ST. Anchorage AK 99508	Yes			

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

Wolke 5

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

- 1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
- 2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
- 3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



- 4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
- 5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
- 6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>[Signature]</i>	SIM H. JOHNSON	1232 MIDVIEW RD	Yes	479-8844		
<i>[Signature]</i>	STACY JOHNSON	1411 19 TH AVE.	Yes	450-5803		
<i>[Signature]</i>	JOE B. KINNON	1106 NENANA ST.	Yes	488-8323		
<i>[Signature]</i>	ALEX CHUDAK	PO BOX 16544	Yes	488-0844		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Katie Osth	PO Box 10679	Yes	490-9062		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Lin Huffaker	2753 Alaska ^{FBK AK} Fulk FBK AK 99709-324	Yes	487-2232		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Judy Rhenner	1038 PA SQUIP ST ^{FBK AK} 99712	Yes	457-4311		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Susan Burrows	413 Haines Ave FBK AK 99724	Yes	451-0985		
<i>[Signature]</i>	Sigvald J. Stenroos	P.O. Box 80787 FBK AK 99708	Yes	457-2840		
<i>[Signature]</i>	PAUL REKHARST	2086 Johnson Lane FBK 99724	Yes	455-6703		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.

2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.

3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.

5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.

6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Megan Amy</i>	Megan Amy	PO Box 83643 Fairbanks	Yes	479-8823		
<i>Carly Cummings</i>	Carly Cummings	3292 Jefferson Dr Fairbanks	yes	479-2112		
<i>Heather Fager</i>	Heather Fager	PO Box 73104 FDKS AK99707	yes	488-8756		
<i>Paul Bill</i>	Paul Breuille	PO Box 58302 FDK 99711	YES	488-3214		
<i>Flora Spaulding</i>	Flora Spaulding	15 Foxwell #07 Fair 99701	yes	456-7006		
<i>Donna Michael</i>	Donna Michael	651 7th Ave	yes	488-6121		
<i>Renate Benesch</i>	Renate Benesch	1811 MUSTON TRAIL FOX	yes	479-2386		
<i>William N. T. ...</i>	William T. ...	Box 80826 Taylor College	yes	455-6723		
<i>Don Triplehorn</i>	Don Triplehorn	Box 80826 College, AK 99708	yes	455-6723		
<i>Dan A. Naske</i>	Dan A. Naske	Box 80721 FDKS AK 99708	Yes	479-2966		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Carmen C. Whitmire</i>	Carmen C. Whitmire	7th Bx. 10505 FBKs AK 99701	Yes	479-0891		
<i>Sandra Besser</i>	Sandra Besser	PO Box 82261 FBKs AK 99708	YES	457-1294		
<i>Patricia Mohmann</i>	Patricia Mohmann	POB 83688 FBKs AK 99708	YES	479-5294		
<i>Marcia Hajdukovich</i>	Marcia Hajdukovich	Box 72036	yes	457-4956		
<i>Sandra Laduman</i>	Sandra Laduman	2292 Lirissa Dr FH 99712	yes	488-9765		
<i>Judith A. Hoganson</i>	Judith Hoganson	450 Valley View Dr. FBKs 99712	yes	457-1613		
<i>Pamela Wentz</i>	Pamela Wentz	3213 River view Dr. FBKs 99709	yes	479-8871		
<i>Gary Napiewski</i>	GARY NAPIEWSKI	420 FAREWELL AVE. FBKs AK.	YES	452-3372		
<i>Iris Lindsey</i>	Iris Lindsey	P.O. Box 10272 FBKs 99710	yes	457-7766		
<i>Tom L. Chapin</i>	Tom L. Chapin	PO Box 83944 FBKs AK. 99708	YES	479-2031		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Jonathan P. Weller</i>	Jonathan P. Weller	460 McKinley View Dr. FBKS AK	Yes	907-452-5896		
<i>Kathy Helmiak</i>	Kathy Helmiak	378 Stanford Dr FBKS AK	Yes	907-452-7627		
<i>Corrie Seekatz</i>	Corrie Seekatz	4730 Princeton FBKS AK	Yes	907-474-2192		
<i>Mary LeBon</i>	Mary LeBon	P.O. Box 84912 FBKS AK	Yes	907-457-6999		
<i>AL GILHLEY</i>	AL GILHLEY	194 EAGLE RIDGE FBKS AK	YES	907-457-3651		
<i>Pam Leekmore</i>	Pam Leekmore	1136 Ivy Dr FBKS	YES	907-479-7530		
<i>John Olson</i>	JOHN OLSON	1543 Science Loop FBKS	Yes	907-479-2648		
<i>Malle Buregraf</i>	Malle Buregraf	P.O. Box 80405 99708	Yes	907-479-2734		
<i>Mary A Lynch</i>	Mary A Lynch	4608 Stanford Dr. 99709	Yes	907-479-6091		
<i>James Powersberg</i>	JAMES POWERSBERG	1016 Jena Knolls Dr FBKS 99708	Yes	907-488-6758		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to those provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Christine Hume</i>	Christine Hume	PO Box 82797 Fairbanks AK 99708	Yes	907-479-0431		
<i>Leeann Schlott</i>	Leeann Schlott	471 Hillside Dr Fairbanks AK 99712	Yes	457-5635		
<i>Don Ian Gray</i>	Don Ian GRAY	399 Hillside Drive - Fairbanks AK 99711	Yes	457-5737		
<i>Martha E. Thomas</i>	Martha E. Thomas	PO Box 60309 Fairbanks AK 99706	Yes	455-6612		
<i>Anthony F. Gasbarre</i>	Anthony F. Gasbarre	2627 Benedict Trail Fairbanks AK 99709	Yes	455-6287		
<i>Donald E. West</i>	Donald E. WEST	P.O. Box 82213	Yes	479-4453		
<i>G.T. WENNER</i>	G.T. WENNER	304 18th Ave Fairbanks AK 99701	YES	456-4806		
<i>Jim Butta</i>	Jim Butta	2511 St. E Fairbanks	Yes	479-2522		
<i>Sharon Couce</i>	Sharon Couce	1715 Chena Bridge Fairbanks AK 99709	Yes	479-2852		
<i>Mark Stelckow</i>	Mark Stelckow	1015 Joyce Dr Fairbanks AK 99709	YES	457-7728		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.
4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.



If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter? Testify?
<i>Michael McCarron</i>	MICHAEL McCARRON	704 OAKWOOD DR. ANCHORAGE	YES	344-3987	X
<i>Kneeland Taylor</i>	KNEELAND TAYLOR	2244 LOUSSAC DR. ANCH. 99508	YES	278-4040	X

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided

APR 16 1999 02:28PM P6

PHONE NO. : 9072763868

FROM : TOOTHDOCS00000000

04/18/99 FRI 13:04 [TX/RX NO 8110] 0000

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.
4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.



If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Cindy Haase</i>	CINDY HAASE	3750 Furrow Creek	YES	345 4348		
<i>Dorothy Wenzel</i>	Dorothy Wenzel	9566 Canton Loop	YES	346-1848		
<i>Carol Planaich</i>	CAROL PLANAICH	2072 Stanford Dr 99508	YES	274-6168		
<i>Cindy McCann</i>	CINDY MCCANN	7041 Parkwood Dr.	YES	45-3141 3927		
<i>Stephanie B. Ueda</i>	Stephanie B. Ueda	13521 Seachant Cir. 99516	YES	345-7850		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

APR 16 1999 02:27PM PS

PHONE NO. : 9072763828

FROM : TOOTHDOC@30303030

TX/RX NO 51301 @006

04/16/99 FRI 13:04

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.
4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.



If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Ray A. Englund</i>	RAY A. ENGLUND	3504 Iowa ST	YES	243-4591		
<i>Mary Ann Lin</i>	MARY ANN LIN	14900 Longview Dr	YES	245-2257		
<i>James Bartula</i>	JAMES BARTULA	4675 CASCADE TR	YES	243-5253		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>David E. Lowry</i>	David E. Lowry	3622 Culeston Ave Anchorage AK	YES	907-243-6462	X	
<i>Mark R. Mahore</i>	Mark R. Mahore	1803 Roosevelt Dr.	NO	907-561-4159		
<i>Laura Mahoric</i>	Laura Mahoric	1803 Roosevelt Dr. Anchorage AK 99517	YES	907-561-4159	X	
<i>Dale A. Fossler</i>	Dale A. Fossler	145 Dr 99614 Palmer	YES	907-746-6176		
<i>Barb Underwood</i>	Barb Underwood	PO Box 87-7161	yes	907-395-0512		
<i>Michael Cuculla</i>	Michael Cuculla	1565 Fifth rd wasilla AK	YES	907-276-0718		
<i>Melissa Cuculla</i>	Melissa Cuculla	1565 FIFTH RD WASILLA AK 99664	YES	907-576-0718	X	
<i>Julie A. Hammond</i>	Julie Hammond	8440 menara Ct	no	907-249-7904		
<i>Peggy Hinchen</i>	Peggy Hinchen	8561 Cross Pointe Ln. Anchorage AK 99504	YES	907-338-7706		
<i>Annie Vitt</i>	Annie Vitt	7430 BRAUN Cir	YES	907-522-6166		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

Apr. 16 1999 02:25PM P3

PHONE NO. : 9072763608

FROM : TOOTHDOCC000000000000

[TX/RX NO 5110] 0003

04/18/99 FRI 13:04

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.
4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.



If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experience related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Holly R. Layton</i>	Holly R. Layton	2050 MINERVA WAY Anch AK 99515	Yes	349-2652		✓
<i>Carol Braggford</i>	Carol Braggford	13541 Windward Blvd 99576	Yes	345-4592	✓	
<i>Carol Hastings</i>	CAROL HASTINGS	12313 WINDY PINE PL 99571	YES	194-4908		✓
<i>Theresa Kutzweil</i>	Gloria KURTZWEIL	12200 RAINBOW AVE Anch 99516	YES	345-0716	✓	✓
<i>Cindy McCarran</i>	CINDY MCCARRAN	7041 ORCHARD DR 99507	YES	344-3987	✓	✓
<i>Marilyn Roth</i>	Marilyn Roth	9040 King Ct 99518	Yes	345-0133	✓	✓
<i>Teri Lovin</i>	Teri Lovin	8570 Brookway Cir Anch AK 99504	Yes	338-6438	✓	
<i>Robert H. McCormick</i>	ROBERT H. MCCORMICK	7220 HUNTERS CIR	Yes	344-9998	✓	
<i>Mark V. Gregory</i>	MARK V. GREGORY	727 DENALI ST, Anch AK 99501	YES	274-7236		
<i>Warren Uida</i>	Warren Uida	13521 Seacham Cir 99516	Yes	345-3813	✓	

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 10, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.

ALASKA DENTAL CARE BILL OF RIGHTS

A bill currently before the Alaska State Legislature entitled the "Alaska Dental Care Bill of Rights" speaks to certain issues as they pertain to your rights as a dental patient both in terms of the care you receive and the reimbursement of benefit claims for that treatment. The key points of the bill are as follows:

1. A health care insurer may not prohibit a person from obtaining dental care services from a dentist of the patient's choice, including a specialist.
2. A health care insurer may not restrict a patient's right to receive full information from their dentist regarding the care or treatment options available to the patient.
3. If a health care insurer wishes to review dental treatment, a dental treatment plan or conduct a utilization review, such review must be completed by a dentist licensed in this state.



4. A health care insurer may not directly or indirectly reimburse a patient for the cost of treatment at a different rate because of the patient's choice of dentist.
5. A health care insurer may not deny coverage, cancel a health insurance plan or otherwise take action against a patient or dentist because the patient has asserted one of these rights.
6. A person may bring civil action against a health care insurer to enforce these rights.

If you support this legislation, please sign your name in the space provided. Also, if you are willing to write a letter or testify before the State Legislature in support of this bill based on the above provisions or if you have had experiences related to these provisions, please indicate your willingness to do so by placing a check mark in the appropriate box. Thank you for participating.....The Alaska Dental Society

Signature	Printed Name	Address	Registered Voter?	Phone	Letter?	Testify?
<i>Cynthia Tiradelli</i>	Cynthia Tiradelli	4930 A. Phyllis, W. Anchorage AK 99511	NO	357-5559		
<i>Nathan Binkley</i>	Nathan Binkley	11002 Box 7582, Anchorage AK 99545	YES	746-7531		
<i>Jared Hodgson</i>	Jared Hodgson	PO Box 977536, Anchorage AK 99574	YES	357-3827		
<i>Dan Heil</i>	DAN HEIL	425 Box 6797, Anchorage AK	YES	745-6788		
<i>Adel Neuman</i>	Adel Neuman	P.O. Box 52106, Big Lake AK	YES	892-7000		
<i>DICK CRATER</i>	DICK CRATER	P.O. Box 4523, Anchorage AK	YES	376-0140		
<i>JANET L. PETTY</i>	Janet L. Petty	PO BOX 873022, WILLOW AK	YES	376-1234		
<i>MIKE PETTY</i>	MIKE PETTY	PO Box 873022, WILLOW AK	YES	376-7234		
<i>JACK WARD</i>	JACK WARD	P.O. Box 13, Willow AK	YES	495-1166		

Please return this form to the Alaska Dental Society no later than April 19, 1999. Simply fold and tape this page. Return postage is provided.