

ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1999-2000 8672

9981

HOUSE RESOURCES



AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL

Volume 22, Number 7

October 1996

*The State Factor*

**THE TENTH  
AMENDMENT:**  
*The Promise  
of Liberty*

---

*Strategies to Restore the  
Balance of Power Between the  
Federal and State Governments*

---

---

Board of Directors' Committee on Federalism

910 17<sup>th</sup> Street N.W. ■ Fifth Floor ■ Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 466-3800 ■ FAX (202) 466-3801

**ABOUT THE AUTHORS...**

Charles J. Cooper concentrates his practice in the areas of civil litigation and administrative law. From 1985-1988, he served as Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel. As Assistant Attorney General, he provided the President and the departments of the executive branch with formal legal opinions and informal legal advice. Prior to that appointment, he served as Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Civil Rights Division, supervising all appellate litigation from 1981-1985. Since leaving the Department of Justice in 1988, Mr. Cooper has been in private practice, litigating cases in the banking, civil rights, First Amendment, and other federal administrative areas. Last year, he served on the Scholars Advisory Committee on Federalism which was created by the States' Federalism Summit Steering Committee. The Scholars Advisory Committee presented proposals to restore balance to the federal system at the States' Federalism Summit held in Cincinnati, Ohio in October 1995.

During his tenure with the Department of Justice, Mr. Cooper also served as Chairman of the Domestic Policy Council's Working Group on Federalism, as well as a member of the National Security Council's Policy Review and Planning and Coordinating Groups.

From 1978-1979, Mr. Cooper clerked for Justice (now Chief Justice) William H. Rehnquist of the United States Supreme Court. The previous year, he clerked for Judge Paul H. Roney of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth (now Eleventh) Circuit.

Mr. Cooper, who graduated first in his law school class in 1977, earned his B.S. and J.D. degrees from University of Alabama. Among his many law school honors, he was inducted into the Order of the Coif. He served as Editor-in-Chief of the *Alabama Law Review* from 1976-1977 and, since then, has been a frequent contributor to policy and legal journals.

David H. Thompson is a constitutional lawyer in Washington, D.C. He has participated in cases challenging federal encroachment of state sovereignty in contravention of the Eleventh Amendment and has been an advocate for the restoration of federalism. He received both his undergraduate degree and his law degree from Harvard University.

*The State Factor: The Tenth Amendment: The Promise of Liberty*  
Volume 22, Number 7  
© October 1996

American Legislative Exchange Council  
910 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Fifth Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 466-3800

*Publications Order Code: 9608 Cost to non-members: \$10.00 plus shipping and handling*

*The State Factor: Tenth Amendment: The Promise of Liberty* has been published by the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) Board of Directors' Committee on Federalism, as part of its mission to discuss, develop and disseminate public policies which expand free-markets, promote economic growth, limit government and preserve individual liberty. ALEC is the nation's largest bipartisan, voluntary membership organization of state legislators, with nearly 3,000 members across the nation. ALEC is governed by a 21-member Board of Directors of state legislators, which is advised by a 23-member Private Enterprise Board representing major corporate and foundation sponsors.

ALEC is classified by the Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)(3) non-profit public policy and educational organization. Individuals, philanthropic foundations, corporations, companies, or associations are eligible to support ALEC's work through tax-deductible gifts. Nothing written herein is to be construed as necessarily reflecting the view of the American Legislative Exchange Council, its Board of Directors, or its membership, or as an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of any bill before the Congress or in state legislatures.

## MODEL RESOLUTION

GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE AMENDMENT  
TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

*A resolution for the purpose of petitioning the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for submission to the states to establish a mechanism for nullification of federal laws and regulations where the states determine that such laws or regulations exceed the authority of the federal government under the Constitution of the United States.*

**WHEREAS**, the federal government was established by the states through ratification of the Constitution of the United States; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal government was granted certain limited powers under the Constitution of the United States; and

**WHEREAS**, the Constitution of the United States requires, under the 10th Amendment that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;" and

**WHEREAS**, the Constitution of the United States established a system in which the states only ceded certain powers to the federal government; and

**WHEREAS**, the framers recognized that separation of powers is essential and ensured that the rights of the people would be protected by establishing checks and balances not only between the branches of the federal government, but also between the federal government and state governments; and

**WHEREAS**, the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the federal government have by many actions usurped powers reserved to the states and to the people; and

**WHEREAS**, by the combined actions of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the federal government, the relationship between the federal government and state government established by the Constitution; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal Judiciary, itself a branch of the federal government, has failed to stop many of these federal excesses; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal government is more distant from the people than state governments and is thereby less efficient and effective in providing for functions that, under the Constitution of the United States, were to have been reserved to the States and to the people; and

**WHEREAS**, to achieve government of the people, by the people and for the people, government must become closer to the people; and

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF (INSERT STATE), A MAJORITY OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE TWO HOUSES CONCURRING SEPARATELY HEREIN**, that the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to propose the *Government of the People Amendment* to the Constitution of the United States, for submittal to the states for ratification, providing for the states to nullify federal laws and regulations, in such cases as the states deem that the federal government has exceeded the limits of its authority.

---

AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL

---

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that to achieve the purpose expressed above that the *Government of the People Amendment* shall provide that:

1. Any act of Congress, or provision thereof shall be null and void upon the adoption of a Resolution of Disapproval by the legislatures of two-thirds of the states, provided that two-thirds of the states have adopted without subsequently rescinding resolutions of disapproval within any seven-year period.
2. Any regulation, administrative directive or provision thereof shall be null and void upon the adoption of a resolution of disapproval by the legislatures of two-thirds of the states, provided that two-thirds of the states have adopted without subsequently rescinding resolutions of disapproval within any seven-year period.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the *Government of the People Amendment* shall contain reasonable limitations on the use of resolutions of disapproval with respect to issues of national security and foreign policy.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Secretary of State of the State of (insert state) transmit copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of each state legislature in the United States, and each member of Congress from the state of (insert state).

**MODEL RESOLUTION****STATES' INITIATIVE AMENDMENT  
TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES**

*A resolution for the purpose of petitioning the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for submission to the states to provide the states a method of offering amendments to the Constitution of the United States.*

**WHEREAS**, the ratification of the Constitution of the United States by the states created a balance of power between the federal government and the states; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal government was granted certain limited powers under the Constitution of the United States; and

**WHEREAS**, the Constitution of the United States requires, under the 10th Amendment that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;" and

**WHEREAS**, by the combined actions of the Congress, the Executive and the Judiciary, today, power is concentrated in the federal government; and

**WHEREAS**, the original checks and balances created by the founders have been eroded and the national government has consolidated power and authority; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal government is more distant from the people than state governments; and

**WHEREAS**, to achieve government of the people, by the people and for the people, government must become closer to the people; and

**WHEREAS**, there is a need for an effective mechanism by which the states can offer amendments to the Constitution of the United States;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF (INSERT STATE), A MAJORITY OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE TWO HOUSES CONCURRING SEPARATELY HEREIN**, that the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to propose the *States' Initiative Resolution* as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for ratification by state legislatures. This resolution shall be submitted to the states for ratification, providing for the states a method through which they may amend the Constitution of the United States.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that to achieve the purpose expressed above, the *States' Initiative Amendment* shall provide that: Whenever three-fourths of the legislatures of the states deem it necessary, they shall propose amendments to this Constitution. These proposed amendments are valid for all intents and purposes two years after they are submitted to Congress. The said amendments will be invalid if both houses of Congress, by two-thirds vote, disapprove them within two years after their submission.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Secretary of State of the State of (insert state) transmit copies of this Concurrent Resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of each state's legislature of the United States of America, and the (insert state) Congressional Delegation.

## MODEL RESOLUTION

ACCOUNTABILITY IN GOVERNMENT AMENDMENT  
TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

*A resolution for the purpose of petitioning the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for submission to the States to prohibit the federal government from imposing: (1) regulatory mandates on the States or their political subdivisions; (2) unfunded mandates on state and local governments; and (3) spending conditions that are unrelated to the actual expenditures of funds allocated by Congress.*

**WHEREAS**, the federal government was established by the States through the ratification of the Constitution of the United States; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal government was granted certain limited powers under the Constitution of the United States and the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or the people;" and

**WHEREAS**, state authority has been increasingly eroded through federal assumption of powers reserved to the States under the Tenth Amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal government has impermissibly expanded its power beyond its constitutional bounds at the expense of the state and local governments by imposing federal mandates and conditional spending grants on unrelated federal policies; and

**WHEREAS**, federal encroachment on state authority obscures the lines between state and federal policy, thereby decreasing the political accountability of elected officials of both governments. To ensure political accountability, the People must be able to discern which governmental actors are imposing obligations and expenses upon them; and

**WHEREAS**, the United States Supreme Court has ruled in New York v. United States, 112 S. Ct. 2408 (1992), that Congress may not simply commandeer the legislative and regulatory processes of the States; and

**WHEREAS**, federal mandates are being imposed at an alarming rate on the States without the accompanying tax dollars necessary to implement the mandated programs; and

**WHEREAS**, the impact of unfunded federal mandates threatens the fiscal integrity of the States as well as the States' right of self determination;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF (INSERT STATE), A MAJORITY OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE TWO HOUSES CONCURRING SEPARATELY HEREIN**, that the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to propose the *Accountability in Government Amendment* to the Constitution of the United States, for submittal to the States for ratification, prohibiting the federal government from: (1) imposing regulatory mandates on the States or their political subdivisions; (2) imposing unfunded mandates on state and local governments or mandates that are not enacted pursuant to the enumerated powers of the federal government; (3) imposing spending conditions that are unrelated to the actual expenditures of funds allocated by Congress.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that to achieve the purpose expressed above that the *Accountability in Government Amendment* shall provide that:

---

AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL

---

1. No State shall be obligated, without its consent to enact or enforce any State law or regulation, or to administer any federal regulatory program imposed by or pursuant to a law enacted by Congress acting pursuant to its enumerated powers.
2. Any obligation imposed upon a State by or pursuant to a law enacted by Congress shall not be enforceable against such State unless the federal government has acted pursuant to its enumerated powers and has provided the State with the funds needed to pay the States' cost of compliance with the obligation.
3. No condition on the receipt of federal funds by a State, imposed by or pursuant to a law enacted by Congress is valid unless such condition is clearly stated, directly related to and does no more than specify the purposes for which, or manner in which, the funds are to be spent.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Secretary of State of the State of {insert state} transmit copies of this Concurrent Resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of each state's legislature of the United States, and the {insert state} Congressional Delegation.

---

 AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL
 

---

## MODEL RESOLUTION

### RESOLUTION REQUESTING CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION THAT REQUIRES CONGRESS TO SPECIFY THE CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR THE ENACTMENT OF LAWS

*A resolution for the purpose of petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that requires Congress to specify the constitutional authority for the enactment of law; prohibits federal agency rules or regulations from preempting or otherwise interfering with state or local powers without express statutory authority; and requires a list of factual findings, establishing a substantial nexus between the regulatory effect of the proposed law and interstate commerce if Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution is identified as the Constitutional provision granting authority to Congress for its proposed law.*

**WHEREAS**, the federal government was established by the states through the ratification of the Constitution of the United States; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal government was granted carefully limited powers under the Constitution of the United States and the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"; and

**WHEREAS**, the Constitution of the United States established a system in which the states ceded only certain powers to the federal government; and

**WHEREAS**, the framers recognized that separation of powers is essential and ensured that the rights of the people would be protected by establishing checks and balances not only between the branches of the federal government but also between the federal government and state governments; and

**WHEREAS**, the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the federal government have by many actions usurped powers reserved by the Constitution of the United States to the states and to the people; and

**WHEREAS**, by the combined actions of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the federal government, the relationship between the federal government and state governments established by the Constitution of the United States has been severely unbalanced; and

**WHEREAS**, the federal judiciary, itself a branch of the federal government, has failed to stop many of these federal excesses; and

**WHEREAS**, less federal preemption means states can act as true laboratories of democracy, seeking novel social and economic policies without risk to the nation; and

**WHEREAS**, to restore the balance of power between the federal government and state governments intended by the framers of the Constitution of the United States, the federal government must carefully consider, and be accountable for, the constitutional boundaries of its jurisdiction to protect the states and the people from the unwarranted assumption of power by the federal government.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Legislature of the state of {insert state}, a majority of all members of the two houses concurring, that the One Hundred and Fourth Congress of the United States enact legislation requiring the Congress of the United States to cite the section of the Constitution that grants Congress the authority to enact proposed laws. The {insert state} Legislature supports the inclusion in such legislation:

---

AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL

---

- (a) That Congress be required to state explicitly the extent to which the proposed section of law preempts any state, local or tribal law, and if so, an explanation of the reasons for such preemption.
- (b) That Federal agency rules or regulations may not preempt or otherwise interfere with State or local powers without express statutory authority. Agencies must allow states notice and an opportunity to be heard in the rule-making process.
- (c) That if Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the Constitution of the United States, is identified as the Constitutional provision granting authority to Congress for its proposed law, Congress must report a list of factual findings establishing a substantial nexus between the regulatory effect of the proposed law and interstate commerce.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Secretary of State of the State of (insert state) transmit certified copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States; and to each Member of the Senate of the United States; and the House of Representatives of the United States; and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of each state legislature in the United States.



**AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL**

910 17<sup>th</sup> Street N.W.  
Fifth Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 466-3800  
FAX (202) 466-3801

# Here is the research you requested from *PolicyFax*, by The Heartland Institute.

To: Hon. Scott Ogan  
State Representative  
State of Alaska

January 19, 1988 3:34 PM

5 page(s) inclusive of cover

Following this cover page are the documents you requested from PolicyFax. We hope you found the service quick, convenient, and easy to use, and that the information satisfies your needs.

You requested the following documents:

0852601 Colorado State Sovereignty Act

Thank you for using PolicyFax!

*PolicyFax* is free for journalists and elected officials who use their *PolicyFax* account numbers. Call 312/377-4000 to request a number.

Things you should know about  
The Heartland Institute:

☛ An independent, nonprofit, and nonpartisan research institute established in 1984.

☛ Dedicated to providing journalists and elected officials with the best available research on a wide range of public policy issues.

☛ Supported by approximately 1,000 individuals, foundations, and corporations.

☛ Research assistance and peer review conducted by a national network of nearly 100 academics and professional economists.

☛ Publisher of:

*School Reform News*  
*Environment News*  
*Intellectual Ammunition*  
*The Heartlander*  
*Heartland Policy Studies*  
*Heartland Perspectives*

☛ Tax exempt under Section 501(c)3 of the Internal Revenue Code. We do not accept government funding.

## Instant Survey

How would you rate the documents you received with this order?

Excellent    Good    Fair    Poor

How did you learn of the availability of these documents?

Catalog    Intellectual Ammunition    School Reform News

Colleague    Environment News    "Hot Docs" fax

How will you use these documents?

Conduct background research    Send to a constituent

Draft a bill    Prepare for a speech    Other

## Do you have a story to tell?

Did *PolicyFax* enable you to convince colleagues, change a vote, or introduce a bill? Did a *PolicyFax* document change your mind, or lead to some action that otherwise would not have occurred?

If so please call Eric Caron at 312/377-4000 or fax us a written account of the case to 312/377-5000. You will receive a free Heartland coffee cup (made in the U.S.A.) for sharing your story with us.

Fax this page to The Heartland Institute, 312/377-5000, or mail it to Heartland at 19 South LaSalle, Suite 903, Chicago, Illinois 60603.  
**Questions? Call 312/377-4000.**

**HJR**

**53**

# FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
2000 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HJR53

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction) \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. Affected Office of the Governor  
 Title Constitutional Amendment: wild food BRU Elective Operations  
 resources \_\_\_\_\_ Component Elections  
 Sponsor Representative Masek  
 Requester House Resources Committee Component No. 21

**Expenditures/Revenues** (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual	1.5					
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUND SOURCE** (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	1.5					
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type)						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Estimate of any current year (FY2000) cost: 0.0

**POSITIONS**

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This figure includes the cost of providing information about this issue in the Official Election Pamphlet, as required by AS 15.58. However, only six measures can be printed on an 8-1/2 by 14 inch ballot. If this measure requires printing an 8-1/2 by 18 inch ballot, the cost will increase by \$22.0.

Prepared by: Gail Fenumai *Gail Fenumai* Phone 465-3935  
 Division Division of Elections Date/Time 2/23/00 3:20 PM  
 Approved by: Lt. Governor Fran Ulmer *Fran Ulmer* Date 02/23/2000  
 Agency Office of the Lieutenant Governor

**PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE**

For further distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office



## Alaska State Legislature

### Information from Representative Beverly Masek

[Site Search  
by Keyword](#)

[Home](#)

[Our Promise  
to Alaskans](#)

[What's New!](#)

[Member Pages](#)

[E-News  
Subscription](#)

[Press Release  
Archives](#)

[Research  
the Issues](#)

[Help](#)

[Get  
Real Audio](#)

[Get  
Adobe Acrobat](#)



*Session:*  
State Capitol, Room 432  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182  
*Phone:* (907) 465-2679  
*Fax:* (907) 465-4822  
[Send E-Mail](#)

*Interim:*  
600 E. Railroad Ave., #1  
Wasilla, AK 99654  
*Phone:* (907) 376-2679  
*Fax:* (907) 373-4745

### Sponsor Statment for HB 349

## Fish and Game/Refuges/Habitat & Use Areas

An Act relating to powers of the Board of Game, means of access for hunting, trapping, and fishing, the definition of 'means' and 'methods', and hunting safety education and game conservation education programs; relating to the purposes of game refuges, fish and game critical habitat areas, and public use areas.

Posted: February, 2000

HB 349 was introduced, along with HJR 53, to alleviate the problems many Alaskans face due to the inability of the State to provide adequate management and protection to those traditional uses of wildlife that have sustained many Alaskans, including Native Alaskans throughout time.

Since the mid-1970's, the imposition of "urban" values on those Alaskans who choose to remain in a culture that is tied closely to the land has escalated. Although little or no scientific evidence exists to discredit traditional management techniques of wildlife resources for human consumptive uses, the zealots in the environmental movement continue to try and force their belief system on the rest of society by denying access to proven remedies supportive of human consumptive values.

Although Alaskans who fish, hunt and trap may not be able to agree upon specific allocation remedies due to competition inherent among all consumptive users of the resource, including non-human predators, we should be able to agree on the necessity of protecting those cultural values from constant attack by those whose values differ. HJR 53 and HB 349 is part of the plan to move us back towards rules that require respect for differing values. I have never heard of a fisher, hunter, or trapper speak in front of the Board of Fish or Board of Game requesting non-consumptive uses be eliminated in any part of Alaska; however we constantly hear from the environmental community about how their beliefs are somehow superior to the beliefs of others and

should therefore be imposed upon the rest of us.

Mankind has been competing with non-human predators for thousands of years and part of that competitive struggle has included a variety of measures intended to lesson the competition. With the advent of modern wildlife conservation sciences, we reached a stage where we could insure the health of all species and sustain meaningful levels of human harvests. That is until recently when animal rights activists essentially eliminated sustained yield management.

HJR 53 and HB 349 should mark the beginning of our attempt to fight back by once again allowing for proven management techniques to take place. Sound scientific measures minus the emotional hysteria will insure that the important cultural values attendant to fishing, hunting and trapping are protected. It is also important to make sure that we continue the prohibition against using the government to impose personal values held by one segment of the population on others. And make no mistake about it, the use of government processes by environmentalists has only one intended goal, and that is to impose their values on the rest of society regardless of the facts.

###

| [Top](#) | [Representative Masek's Page](#) |



750 W. 2nd Ave. #109, Anchorage AK 99501 / Ph. 907-258-6171 / Fax 907-258-6177

P.O. Box 22151, Juneau AK 99802 / Ph. 907-463-3366 / Fax 907-463-3312 / unite@akvoice.org

## HJR 53 ~ Constitutional Amendment: Wild Food Resources

TO: House Resources Committee Members  
FROM: Susan Schrader, Conservation Advocate  
DATE: February 28, 2000

Alaska Conservation Voters, formerly Alaska Conservation Voice, is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to protecting Alaska's environment through public education and advocacy. Our 40 Alaskan organizations and business members represent over 22,000 registered Alaskan voters. Our members can be found in all user groups of Alaska's wildlife, including subsistence users, recreational hunters, wildlife viewers, and photographers. We respect and appreciate the long, rich tradition held by Alaskans, Native and non-Native alike, that surrounds our state's wildlife resources. We also acknowledge that opportunities to use and appreciate our wildlife belong to all Americans and to visitors to our state from other countries.

Alaska Conservation Voters supports wildlife management actions that are based on unbiased scientific studies and that reflect the values of most Alaskans. We are greatly concerned by the continued positions taken by the State Legislature that fail to recognize the legislators' responsibilities under the Alaska constitution and the public trust doctrine to care for our wildlife for the benefit of *all* Alaskans.

We are opposed to HJR 53 for the following reasons:

- In Section 1 of the resolution, the substitution of "enhanced" for "developed" appears to be an effort to enshrine the near-sighted principles of intensive game management into the Alaska constitution. Whereas the development of replenishable resources embodies a range of policies that address the long-term benefits of these resources for all user groups, the enhancement of them clearly mandates policies aimed, single-mindedly, at increasing the resources without consideration of other biologic principles.
- Section 2 creates a preferred use for wildlife, and in turn, a preferred user group. Instead of facilitating a constructive public policy debate on the balanced use of our wildlife resources, this language will only result in tremendous problems in its application in management decisions. The potential could exist that, as a result of this language, other groups would be essentially excluded from use of the resource, a situation that may run afoul of the "common use" safeguards of the constitution.

Clearly recognizing the volatile and divisive nature of issues surrounding wildlife management, the members of Alaska Conservation Voters join with other Alaskans who are calling for balanced, fair and far-sighted wildlife management decisions based upon the best, most comprehensive, unbiased scientific data available. The amendments to our constitution proposed in HJR 53 will do little to help resolve this difficult public policy debate.

  
Susan E. Schrader

Conserve Alaska. It's Only Natural.

**HJR**

**54**

# Alaska State Legislature

Member:

House Finance

Subcommittee Chair:

Transportation

Environmental Conservation

Subcommittee Member:

Fish and Game

Representative William K. Williams

During Session:  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182  
(907) 465-3424  
Fax (907) 465-3793

In Ketchikan:  
50 Front Street, Suite 203  
Ketchikan, AK 99901  
(907) 247-4672  
Fax (907) 225-7157

## House Joint Resolution 54 Sponsor Statement

House Joint Resolution 54 was introduced to protest yet another politically motivated attack on the working people of Alaska. The President of the United States has proposed policy that would end any further road building in the National Forest system. As Alaska is home to the two largest National Forests in the country and the health and diversity of our economy is directly related to our resource industries, I vehemently object to the inclusion of the Tongass and Chugach National Forests in the proposed plan.

There are several specific reasons for my objections and I will summarize a few in the following paragraphs. First, the policy is illegal. The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) specifically prohibits such withdrawals without the expressed direction of Congress. The President and his attorneys are relying on legal semantics to justify their actions. While lawyers can split hairs over wordsmithing, the clear intent of Congress in ANILCA is that the Congress will oversee any further land withdrawal proposals regarding Alaska.

Second, we spent 10 years and over \$13,000,000 to create the Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP). This obvious dedication of time, money and public process used to create a plan that would bring "peace in the valley" would be thrown out the window. The TLMP document has already been compromised with Under Secretary Lyons' unilateral TLMP amendment in 1999. This attack is yet another attempt at circumventing proper forest management for the sake of political science and posturing.

-more-

Third, we are currently spending time and money creating a plan for the Chugach National Forest. Once again the public process is being followed to produce a plan for the future use of this forest. Of great concern to those who live and work in the Chugach is the spruce bark beetle infestation. This infestation will continue, against the sound forest management opinions of forestry professionals, if the policy is implemented. The roadless policy will trump the public process on the Chugach in the same manner the TLMP was trumped by Under Secretary Lyons' action and will be trumped again by this same roadless policy.

Enough is enough. We, on the Tongass, have compromised during the Tongass Timber Reform Act of 1990, the TLMP and its revisions and amendments. We have compromised down, down and down again. In fact, it is not a compromise at all. Compromising means both sides give up something. We have given and given and not received. Now the same process is playing out on the Chugach. Why are we even spending the time and money to come up with a plan?

I, like many Alaskans, am frustrated with the level of Federal intervention in our lives. The timber industry had been at the forefront of this intervention during the last decade. We must continue to strongly oppose such Federal actions. I urge your support in sending our message back to Washington, D.C.

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
2000 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HJR 54

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title: Exclusion of AK National Forests  
from roadless initiative  
 Sponsor: Rep Williams  
 Requester: \_\_\_\_\_

Dept. Affected None  
 ERU \_\_\_\_\_  
 Component \_\_\_\_\_  
 Component Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_

**Expenditures/Revenues**

(Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06
Personal Services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Travel						
Contractual						
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES [ ]						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUND SOURCE**

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
1091 Designated Program Receipts						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Estimate of any current year (FY98) cost: \_\_\_\_\_

**POSITIONS**

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Prepared by Liz Cabrera  
House Resources Committee

Phone 465-6890

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Date 2-16-00

ern Alaska. This report shall include, but not be limited to, (1) the timber harvest levels in the forest since the enactment of this Act; (2) the impact of wilderness designation on the timber, fishing, and tourism industry in southeast Alaska; (3) measures instituted by the Forest Service to protect fish and wildlife in the forest; and (4) the status of the small business set aside program in the Tongass Forest.

(c) The study required by this section shall be conducted in cooperation and consultation with the State, affected Native Corporations, the southeast Alaska timber industry, the Southeast Alaska Conservation Council, and the Alaska Land Use Council.

#### ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 707. Except as otherwise expressly provided for in this Act wilderness designated by this Act shall be administered in accordance with applicable provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act, and any reference to the Secretary of Agriculture for areas designated in sections 701 and 702 shall, as applicable, be deemed to be a reference to the Secretary of the Interior.

#### RARE II RELEASE

SEC. 708. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the Department of Agriculture has completed the second roadless area review and evaluation program (RARE II); and

(2) the Congress has made its own review and examination of national forest system roadless areas in Alaska and of the environmental impacts associated with alternative allocations of such areas.

(b) On the basis of such review, the Congress hereby determines and directs that—

(1) without passing on the question of the legal and factual sufficiency of the RARE II Final Environmental Statement (dated January 1979) with respect to national forest lands in States other than Alaska, such statement shall not be subject to judicial review with respect to National Forest System lands in the State of Alaska;

(2) with respect to the National Forest lands in the State of Alaska which were reviewed by the Department of Agriculture in the second roadless area review and evaluation (RARE II), except those lands remaining in further planning upon enactment of this Act or the area listed in section 704 of this Act, that review and evaluation shall be deemed for the purposes of the initial land management plans required for such lands by the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 to be an adequate consideration of the suitability of such lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System and the Department of Agriculture shall not be required to review the wilderness option prior to the revision of the initial plans and in no case prior to the date established by law for completion of the initial planning cycle;

(3) areas reviewed in such Final Environmental Statement and not designated as wilderness or for study by this Act or remaining in further planning upon enactment of this Act need not be

16 USC 1600  
note.  
16 USC 1600  
note.

managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation pending revision of the initial plans; and

(4) unless expressly authorized by Congress the Department of Agriculture shall not conduct any further statewide roadless area review and evaluation of National Forest System lands in the State of Alaska for the purpose of determining their suitability for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

## TITLE VIII—SUBSISTENCE MANAGEMENT AND USE

### FINDINGS

16 USC 3111.

SEC. 801. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses by rural residents of Alaska, including both Natives and non-Natives, on the public lands and by Alaska Natives on Native lands is essential to Native physical, economic, traditional, and cultural existence and to non-Native physical, economic, traditional, and social existence;

(2) the situation in Alaska is unique in that, in most cases, no practical alternative means are available to replace the food supplies and other items gathered from fish and wildlife which supply rural residents dependent on subsistence uses;

(3) continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses of resources on public and other lands in Alaska is threatened by the increasing population of Alaska, with resultant pressure on subsistence resources, by sudden decline in the populations of some wildlife species which are crucial subsistence resources, by increased accessibility of remote areas containing subsistence resources, and by taking of fish and wildlife in a manner inconsistent with recognized principles of fish and wildlife management;

43 USC 1601  
note.

(4) in order to fulfill the policies and purposes of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and as a matter of equity, it is necessary for the Congress to invoke its constitutional authority over Native affairs and its constitutional authority under the property clause and the commerce clause to protect and provide the opportunity for continued subsistence uses on the public lands by Native and non-Native rural residents; and

(5) the national interest in the proper regulation, protection, and conservation of fish and wildlife on the public lands in Alaska and the continuation of the opportunity for a subsistence way of life by residents of rural Alaska require that an administrative structure be established for the purpose of enabling rural residents who have personal knowledge of local conditions and requirements to have a meaningful role in the management of fish and wildlife and of subsistence uses on the public lands in Alaska.

### POLICY

16 USC 3112.

SEC. 802. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that—

(1) consistent with sound management principles, and the conservation of healthy populations of fish and wildlife, the utilization of the public lands in Alaska is to cause the least adverse impact possible on rural residents who depend upon subsistence uses of the resources of such lands; consistent with management of fish and wildlife in accordance with recognized

ACCESS

Nonfederally owned lands. 16 USC 3210.

SEC. 1323. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, the Secretary shall provide such access to nonfederally owned land within the boundaries of the National Forest System as the Secretary deems adequate to secure to the owner the reasonable use and enjoyment thereof: *Provided*, That such owner comply with rules and regulations applicable to ingress and egress to or from the National Forest System.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, the Secretary shall provide such access to nonfederally owned land surrounded by public lands managed by the Secretary under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701-82) as the Secretary deems adequate to secure to the owner the reasonable use and enjoyment thereof: *Provided*, That such owner comply with rules and regulations applicable to access across public lands.

YUKON FLATS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE AGRICULTURAL USE

16 USC 3211

SEC. 1324. Nothing in this Act or other existing law shall be construed as necessarily prohibiting or mandating the development of agricultural potential within the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge pursuant to existing law. The permissibility of such development shall be determined by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis under existing law. Any such development permitted within the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge shall be designed and conducted in such a manner as to minimize to the maximum extent possible any adverse effects of the natural values of the unit.

TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT IN KODIAK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

16 USC 3212

SEC. 1325. Nothing in this Act or the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd) shall be construed as necessarily prohibiting or mandating the construction of the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project within the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. The permissibility of such development shall be determined by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis under existing law.

FUTURE EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

16 USC 3213

Publication in Federal Register; notification of Congress.

SEC. 1326. (a) No future executive branch action which withdraws more than five thousand acres, in the aggregate, of public lands within the State of Alaska shall be effective except by compliance with this subsection. To the extent authorized by existing law, the President or the Secretary may withdraw public lands in the State of Alaska exceeding five thousand acres in the aggregate, which withdrawal shall not become effective until notice is provided in the Federal Register and to both Houses of Congress. Such withdrawal shall terminate unless Congress passes a joint resolution of approval within one year after the notice of such withdrawal has been submitted to Congress.

(b) No further studies of Federal lands in the State of Alaska for the single purpose of considering the establishment of a conservation system unit, national recreation area, national conservation area, or for related or similar purposes shall be conducted unless authorized by this Act or further Act of Congress.

SEC. 1: addition operatio and app Transpo imposin; cerning

SEC. 1 made pt (44 Stat Stat. 10 within t in Alas. statutes hundrec except subjecti adjuste approve the tim

(2) W unit of Refuge System before t land w Native land w which tentati Alaska to sect from tl the Act 11(b) o of this cated p 1328(a other :

(3) F apply on or effecti

th er wi A.

st ac a th

ALASKA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Position 2000 - 33

United States Forest Service proposed "Roadless Policy"

The Alaska State Chamber of Commerce urges the Governor and Legislature to support all efforts to stop the United States Forest Service (USFS) proposed "Roadless Policy" by requesting the State of Alaska to sue the USFS and the U.S. Government to block application of the "Roadless Initiative".

RATIONALE:

The Clinton Administration is awaiting results of a public comment period on whether roadless areas of the Tongass National Forest should be included for review under its roadless initiative. The roadless issue for the Tongass was already completed in the 13 year, 10 million dollar Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP). If any part of Alaska is reviewed for the purpose of considering conservation measures, it is a violation of the "No More" clause in ANILCA. The Chugach is currently under that review.

ADOPTED

December 3, 1999

BY Pamela La Bolle  
Pamela La Bolle  
President

BY Dennis Brandon  
Dennis Brandon  
Chairman



United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters  
PO Box 22427  
Juneau, Alaska 99802  
(907) 586-5860 Fax (907) 586-5648  
E-mail: usag@gillnetters.org

February 18, 2000


House Resources Committee,  
Representative Bill Hudson, Co-Chair  
Representative Beverly Masek, Co-Chair  
State Capitol, Room 124  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

RE: HJR 54

The United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association supports HJR 54 sponsored by Representative Williams and Phillips. We have enclosed the letter we submitted to the Forest Service on the roadless initiative.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hansen  
Executive Director



United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters  
 PO Box 22427  
 Juneau, Alaska 99802  
 (907) 586-5860 Fax (907) 780-6621  
 E-mail: usag@gillnetters.org

December 14, 1999

USDA Forest Service CAET  
 Attn: Roadless Area NOI  
 Box 221090  
 Salt Lake City, UT 84122

Dear U.S. Forest Service:

RE: Roadless Proposal  
 Position: Oppose

The United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association (USAG) would like to state that we oppose the roadless initiative suggested by President Clinton. In particular, we oppose the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest in Alaska as part of the policy.

This initiative is bad public policy based on the desire of the President to leave a legacy and has no basis in sound science. The current planning process mandated by the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) and NEPA takes in the needs of the fish, wildlife, habitat and the public while allowing reasonable access to the land by all. We question the appropriateness of performing a nationwide "super-EIS" that will overturn decisions made through the land management plan process which involves local decisions based on public and agency review. Let the decisions be made at the local level involving the people involved in the area and not by Washington DC politics and nationwide environmental groups.

The Tongass National Forest should not be included for the following reasons:

- The Tongass had just gone through an extensive, 11 year plan revision, which cost the public more than 13 million. The 1997/99 TLMP withdrew more than half of the land previously available for development in the Tongass.
- Most of the non-roaded areas of the Tongass are already protected in some fashion. This includes wilderness area; Congressionally designated LUD II areas, administrative land use designations for non-development such as "remote recreation," and Wild and Scenic River designations. The only roadless acreage under consideration for protection in this proposed policy are those few areas currently left open for resource (primarily timber) extraction. The available timberlands have already been reduced to the point that mills have closed and more may yet be forced to close.
- The 1999 Record of Decision placed many thousands of acres of unroaded areas off-limits to development, reducing the land available for timber production to approximately 10 % of the Commercial Forest Land in the Tongass. This has already put serious restraints on the economy of Southeast Alaska. Additional roadless withdrawals would be economically devastating to the communities of the region.
- The State of Alaska Governor, Congressional Delegation, members of the State Legislature and many community leaders have all spoken out against the

application of the roadless policy to the Tongass. Governor Knowles has classified this decision as a "double cross and an outrage" were the policy be applied to the Tongass. We agree, and urge the Forest Service to specifically exempt the Tongass from any further consideration of roadless "protections".

- Any application of the roadless policy to the national forests of Alaska would violate the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). This act was passed in Congress in 1980 and includes in law the agreement between Congress and the Carter White House Administration that any further conservation unit decisions in Alaska would be under the sole purview of Congress.

President Clinton's original announcement of the withdrawal of roadless areas was to encompass some 40 million acres. His inclusion, of the Tongass and of additional smaller non-inventoried unroaded areas may push that number to higher than 60 million acres. How much land is actually being considered in this policy decision and how much of that area is in Alaska? If the public is to evaluate the effect of this policy proposal, it needs to know with some precision where the areas in question are located. To make the scoping period meaningful and effective, the Forest Service should produce maps showing where the roadless areas are located, and should extend the public scoping comment period to allow sufficient time for the mapped information to be reviewed by the public. At a minimum, the extension should last for 120 days (until late April 2000).


At a recent Senate hearing the Forest Service will not request a reprogramming of funds to do this roadless analysis. The Forest Service has said they will use existing funding to pay for the initiative. In the House hearing they stated that the initiative is estimated to cost \$6 million and the agency will pay for it out of land management planning funds. What planning activities in Region 10 will go unattended to offset the money and time devoted to the roadless initiative?

In summary, we would like re-state our opposition to this roadless policy and in particular the inclusion of the Tongass National Forest in the policy. Our national forests should be managed in accordance with existing federal laws. The comment period should be extended – the sixty day comment period which affects 37 states and 40 60 million acres of forest land does not allow sufficient time for the public to comment. To date, the forest service has not identified the specific parcels of land to be included which essentially asks the public to make uninformed comments on this proposal. That situation tends to make a person feel that this is a pre-determined decision and that you are pretending to solicit public comments. We hope that we are wrong.

United Southeast Alaska Gillnetters Association is a non-profit group representing Southeast Alaska drift gillnet fishermen since 1978.

Please count this testimony as our formal comments on the Roadless Proposal.

Sincerely,



Kathy Hansen

CC: Congressional Delegation, Governor Knowles, Lt. Governor Ulmer  
Alaska Forest Association, United Fishermen of Alaska, Alaska Trollers Assoc.,  
Southeast Alaska Seiners, Petersburg Vessel Owners Assoc.



# ALASKA + WOMEN IN TIMBER

111 STEDMAN ST.  
KETCHIKAN, ALASKA 99901  
PHONE/FAX: (907) 247-2948

## STATEMENT OF SUPPORT

The Board of Directors of Alaska Women In Timber would like to go on record in support of House Joint Resolution No. 54.

Our national forests should be managed in accordance with existing federal laws. The proposed roadless withdrawal is bad public policy, which is being pursued for purely political reasons. It is not appropriate on all national forests and it is particularly unacceptable in the case of the Tongass National Forest. After an extensive plan revision period that lasted more than eleven years and cost the public more than \$13 million dollars, more than half of the land previously available for development in the Tongass was withdrawn. Additional roadless withdrawals would be economically devastating to the communities of the region.

The elected representatives of Alaska have spoken with rare unanimity on this issue – this is a blatant double cross by the federal government. The years of planning and millions of dollars spent to craft the Tongass Land Management Plan and the planning currently taking place for the Chugach National Forest will all have been for nothing.

Inclusion of Alaska's Tongass and Chugach National Forests in this roadless proposal denies the rights of those most affected by policy changes to play any sort of significant role in the decision making process.

Alaska Women In Timber urges the full support of the Alaska State Legislature for HJR 54.

## Testimony of Alaska Center for the Environment on HJR 54

Contact: Rion Schmidt phone: 274-3674

Alaska Center for the Environment believes it is appropriate for Alaskan forests to be included in the roadless initiative, particularly the Chugach, as it is our area of primary focus. For years, citizens have cited their concerns about the damaging effects of road building, and the use of taxpayer dollars to subsidize corporate development interests on our national forests. Clearly, public sentiment has moved towards the protection of our public resources, rather than the exploitation of them.

In HJR 54, the issue of timber dependant economies is brought forth as reasoning for exclusion of Alaskan forests in the President's policy. On the Chugach the reality is quite different from the position put forth in this resolution. There are no timber dependant communities on the Chugach, logging has never provided a substantial economic base for any of the areas in question, and the small amount of logging that does occur could still continue in un-inventoried areas. In fact, by maintaining the Chugach's roadless areas, rural economies are likely to enjoy greater economic benefits through a continued diversification of their economies. Tourism, recreation, Watchable Wildlife programs, outdoor guiding and sightseeing, cabin industries, local businesses, and enhancement of property values, are some of the ways in which local communities would benefit from this policy.

The next argument that HJR 54 makes on behalf of exclusion is the assertion that the Roadless Policy would be a violation of ANILCA. We strongly disagree. Section 1326(b) of the Alaska Lands Act provides: "No further studies of Federal lands in the State of Alaska for the single purpose of considering the establishment of a conservation system unit, national recreation area, national conservation area, or for related or similar purposes shall be conducted unless authorized by this Act or further Act of Congress."

This section does not prohibit the continuing Forest Service review and planning for roadless area management. This process is not being conducted to consider the establishment of a conservation system unit or any other new congressionally designated "defacto wilderness area". The Forest Service review is only a process for the Forest Service to decide how to manage the lands under its jurisdiction. The process is not a study for the single purpose of establishing new protected areas by Congress.

In recent surveys conducted by Alaska Pacific University, Alaskans have indicated that they want the Chugach National Forest managed as it has been traditionally: for the protection of fish and wildlife and for low impact recreation/tourism uses. In these surveys, Alaskans have clearly stated that their prosperity and quality of life are closely linked to scenic values, habitat integrity, roadless areas and biological diversity on the Chugach. Local economies are directly tied to these values through: subsistence hunting, fishing and gathering of resources, as well as commercial and sport fisheries.

ACE's 9,700 members, including a thousand members who reside in Southeast, also support inclusion of the Tongass in the policy.

Please reconsider your opposition of the National Forest Roadless Policy. The Chugach and Tongass National Forest should be considered for management under the roadless policy, and our public land is a treasure that should not be diminished by outside corporate dominated exploitation interests.

**TONY KNOWLES**  
GOVERNOR  
*governor@gov.state.ak.us*



**STATE OF ALASKA**  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
JUNEAU

P.O. Box 110001  
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0001  
(907) 465-3500  
Fax (907) 465-3532  
*www.gov.state.ak.us*

October 12, 1999

Mr. George Frampton, Chair  
Council on Environmental Quality  
722 Jackson Place  
NW Washington, DC 20503

Dear Mr. Frampton:

It is our understanding the White House may be considering a directive to the U.S. Forest Service to include the Tongass National Forest in the services' national roadless area review. If so, I would consider this to be an outrage and a doublecross.

It would be an outrage because we were assured previously that the Tongass would not be included in this review because of the finalization of the Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP). In fact, Undersecretary Jim Lyons recently visited Southeast Alaska and, to our knowledge, said nothing about the Tongass' inclusion in national roadless planning.

TLMP took 15 years and millions of dollars to complete, and was one of the most elongated and thorough resource planning processes in the history of the nation. The public was involved on numerous occasions. The roadless area review, together with harvest cycles and other relevant matters, was very much a part of this process.

A purpose of TLMP was to bring stability and certainty to the economy of Southeast Alaska. Many jobs and families, not only in the timber industry, are dependent on such stability.

When I brought all the mayors of Southeast Alaska to speak with White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on this subject, we were assured that TMLP would be concluded with finality to provide that needed stability to the families of Southeast Alaska. A change now in that course and direction would constitute a doublecross of the citizens of the State of Alaska.

Mr. George Frampton

October 12, 1999


Page 2

Application of a new roadless area policy in the Tongass would constitute a major modification of the current management plan. If modifications are deemed necessary for this or any other reason, they should be accomplished through the structured and well-established process for amending a forest plan.

My Administration has long advocated the "doing it right" principle of resource planning and management. This approach involves sound science, prudent management, and an open and fair public process. A unilateral decision by the White House to include the Tongass in the Forest Service's roadless area review would be a complete repudiation of this policy.


Accordingly, as Governor, I would be compelled to do everything within my power to protect the families of Southeast Alaska.

Sincerely,

  
Tony Knowles  
Governor

cc: John D. Podesta  
Chief of Staff to the President

## Alaska Forest Association, Inc.



111 STEDMAN SUITE 200  
KETCHIKAN, ALASKA 99901-6599  
Phone 907-225-6114  
FAX 907-225-5920

February 16, 2000

The Honorable Bill Williams  
Alaska House of Representatives  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801

### Re: House Joint Resolution 54

Dear Representative Williams:

Thank you for introducing HJR 54, urging the exclusion of national forests in Alaska from President Clinton's proposal for withdrawal of roadless areas in the national forest system. The Alaska Forest Association fully supports HJR 54 because Alaska will be disproportionately harmed if the federal government imposes the President's proposed roadless withdrawal on the Tongass and Chugach National Forests.

As you are well aware, the Tongass Land Management Plan was revised in 1997 after the Forest Service spent 11 years and \$13 million on the revision. In 1999, Under Secretary of Agriculture Jim Lyons unilaterally amended the plan under the guise of granting appeal points to some radical environmental groups. Whether his action was legal under federal laws and regulations is presently the subject of a complaint filed in federal district court by the AFA, the Metlakatla Indian Community, Coffman Cove, Wrangell, Ketchikan Gateway Borough, Southeast Conference, Concerned Alaskans for Resources and Environment (C.A.R.E.) and some individuals. The result of Mr. Lyons' decision was a plan that is able to produce a maximum annual offering level of only 153 million board feet of timber, and is likely to produce much less, based on historic Forest Service performance. As a point of reference, existing sawmills in Southeast Alaska (including some that are currently closed) have a normal annual operating capacity of 355.5 million board feet.


If the roadless policy is applied to the Tongass, the land available for scheduled timber sales will likely be reduced to approximately 183,000 acres, from the 576,000 acres presently available. If this occurs there will certainly be more mill closures and loss of employment in the region. Given the dramatic decline in timber-related economic activity in Southeast Alaska over the past decade, it is time Alaska said "enough is enough" to these unnecessary and unacceptable federal preservation actions.

Aside from the immediate harm that will accrue to the industry and communities of Alaska's coastal region, the roadless policy should also be opposed by the State of Alaska because of the promises embodied in ANILCA. As HJR 54 clearly spells out, ANILCA contains provisions which were intended to prohibit the very kinds of actions that are at issue here. Whether the Clinton Administration chooses to call these roadless withdrawals "wilderness" or not, it amounts to the same

thing. As HJR 54 states, these new areas will be *de facto* wilderness, the designation of which, or even the study of which, is prohibited by ANILCA.

With respect to the Chugach National Forest, 98 percent of that forest is presently inventoried roadless. Application of the President's proposal would prohibit all new transportation infrastructure in that forest without the benefit of a public planning process specific to the Chugach. The Chugach Land and Resource Management Plan is presently undergoing revision under terms set forth in the National Forest Management Act of 1976. AFA and several other user groups have been very actively involved in the Chugach planning process. That is the proper venue for land use allocation decisions to be made in the Chugach, as it is with all the other national forests in this country. Such decisions should not be made through a national super-EIS initiated for the purposes of establishing an "environmental legacy" for the President and furthering his political aims.

Sincerely,



Jack E. Phelps  
Executive Director

cc: The Honorable Tony Knowles, Governor of Alaska

HJR 54

# Alaska Conservation Alliance / Alaska Conservation Voters

P.O. Box 22151  
Juneau, AK 99802  
Phone: 907-463-3366  
Fax: 907-463-3312  
Email: sue@akvoice.org

## FAX MEMO

TO: House Resources Committee Members  
Rep. Masek 465-4822  
Rep. Hudson 465-2273  
Rep. Cowdery 465-2069  
Rep. Barnes 465-4565  
Rep. Harris 465-3799  
Rep. Morgan 465-2197  
Rep. Whitaker 465-2070  
Rep. Joule 465-4586  
Rep. Kapsner 465-4589

FROM: Sue Schrader, Conservation Advocate

DATE: February 16, 2000

RE: HJR 54: relating to the exclusion of the Tongass and Chugach National Forests from the Roadless Proposal of President Clinton

# of Pages: 2

**MESSAGE:** We hope you will take a few minutes to read this editorial that appeared in the Anchorage Daily News and in the Juneau Empire. Written by two highly-repected Alaskan scientists, it provides the firm scientific basis that Representative Williams suggested was lacking in President Clinton's Roadless proposal.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

# Tongass, Chugach would benefit from road ban

By DAVID R. KLEIN  
and JOHN W. SCHOEN

The Tongass and Chugach national forests represent the largest remaining tracts of old-growth temperate rain forest in the world. Established in 1907 by President Theodore Roosevelt, the Tongass and Chugach are the country's largest national forests (approximately 17 million acres and 5.4 million acres respectively). Unlike most national forests, the Tongass and Chugach still encompass many undisturbed watersheds with a full complement of all native species including productive populations of bald eagles, wolves, brown and black bears, moose, black-tailed deer, mountain goats and five species of anadromous salmon.

Roadless areas are crucial to the protection of our nation's wildlife, fisheries and water resources because they represent the least disturbed habitats in an almost universally disturbed landscape. Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck has recognized that roadless areas have become refugia, places where remnant populations of native species persist. For this reason, Dombeck stated there are "compelling ecological reasons to take a cautious approach to new road construction particularly in roadless areas."

In the Tongass, 2 million acres of roadless areas have been left open to development, including 450,000 acres of roadless old-growth forest. These reserves are especially critical because only 4 percent of the



Tongass land base encompasses the low elevation, large old-growth forest most important to fish and wildlife and much of this rare forest type has been clear-cut. In addition, steep, rugged terrain makes roads in this region vulnerable to erosion and landslides and very expensive to construct. The ecological risks associated with developing these areas are extremely high and may jeopardize commercial and sport fishing, hunting, tourism, recreation and subsistence in Southeast Alaska. These multiple resource values of the Tongass are basic to maintaining and increasing economic diversity in Alaska, as well as for maintaining the quality of life for people who live in Southeast Alaska.

Protecting roadless areas on the Tongass National Forest would not eliminate commercial forestry. There are already at least 4,650 miles of permanent roads within the Tongass, and more than 10 billion board feet of timber exist that are accessible from that road network. This timber supply should be capable of supporting a small-scale timber industry for the region.

The Chugach National Forest was established primarily to protect its fish, wildlife and recreational resources. Much of the Chugach

is roadless and provides exceptional opportunities for outdoor recreation, including fishing, hunting, kayaking, biking, skiing, wildlife viewing and photography, as well as an expanding tourism industry. Both of Alaska's national forests encompass an unusual system of coastal islands and fjords that provide unique marine access from kayaks and small boats to the Alaska ferries and major cruise ships. The Seward Scenic Byway and Alaska Railroad bisect the Chugach forest, providing additional access for many activities.

In a 1997 speech calling for better stewardship of our nation's roadless areas, President Clinton said: "These unspoiled places must be managed through science, not politics." The Tongass forest has been the focus of considerable scientific research that has demonstrated the importance of critical forest habitats for spawning and rearing salmon, winter cover and forage for deer and mountain goats, feeding and cover habitat for bears and wolves secure from human disturbance, and the habitat diversity necessary for supporting the unique plants and animals that characterize the northern rain forest. Research carried out on the Tongass has also clarified the need for better inventory of all forest resources and for development of forest management practices that are less detrimental to fish and wildlife than large-scale clear-cut logging. Though a better scientific under-

*Roadless areas are crucial to the protection of our nation's wildlife, fisheries and water resources because they represent the least disturbed habitats in an almost universally disturbed landscape.*

standing of the ecology of the Tongass is needed for the sustainable management of all of its living resources, there has not been even a comparable level of research directed at understanding the Chugach.

The Tongass was left out of the Forest Service's initial roadless moratorium. However, the Forest Service recently requested public comment regarding inclusion of the Tongass in the new policy. In response, more than 300 North American scientists (including more than 100 Alaskans) have sent a letter to the president stating, in part, "There is no scientific basis to exclude the Tongass National Forest from the Forest Service's national roadless policy. Excluding the Tongass would severely compromise the scientific legitimacy of any national policy on the protection of roadless areas in our national forest system. We encourage you, Mr. President, to please afford the remaining roadless areas within America's largest national forest and our nation's most substantial old-growth forest ecosystem the

same level of protection and precautionary management as those in national forests throughout the rest of the United States."

Including the Tongass and Chugach in the national roadless policy will help safeguard the ecological integrity of Alaska's rain forest. The action will also ensure the conservation and sustainable productivity of our valuable fish wildlife and recreational resources in perpetuity for our continued use as well as for use by future generations of Alaskans and all Americans.

David R. Klein, Ph.D., is a professor emeritus at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. He has more than 40 years of research and teaching experience in Alaska. He and his graduate students have been involved in numerous wildlife studies on the Tongass. John W. Schoen, Ph.D., is a senior scientist for the Alaska office of the National Audubon Society. He is also an affiliate as society professor of wildlife biology at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Formerly a research biologist with Alaska Department of Fish and Game, he has conducted research on brown bears, black-tailed deer and mountain goats on the Tongass.



## Sitka Conservation Society

P.O. Box 6533

Sitka, Alaska 99835

(907) 747-7509 Phone

(907) 747-6105 Fax

sitconsv@ptialaska.net E-mail

House Resource Committee:

For hearing Wednesday February 16, 2000 1 PM on

HR 54: resolution against including the Tongass and the Chugach in Clinton's roadless policy

Dear Committee Members:

The Sitka Conservation Society has a diverse membership of Sitka and area residents who take their living and enjoyment from the waters and lands of Southeast Alaska. We believe the state of Alaska should not oppose the Forest Service in continuing their analysis of the benefits and costs of forest roads. The decision to include the Tongass and Chugach in the analysis will provide the legislature with additional information to use in their evaluation of forest policy. The draft EIS will be structured with multiple alternatives, and the legislature would have an opportunity to comment at that point in the process.

Currently, the Forest Service has a huge deficit in maintenance funds for roads already built. Non-maintained roads cause continuing damage to fisheries habitat, forest productivity, and wildlife. It does not make sense to build new roads without the funding to maintain them once built. The roadless policy would simply acknowledge that undamaged watersheds should remain that way. Healthy watersheds are the key to maintaining commercial and sport salmon fisheries, guided bear hunting, deer and other wildlife populations, and tourism opportunities.

While the acreage of roadless lands in Southeast is great, it should be remember that on average, less than a third of each roadless area is actually forested. The bulk of the landscape is muskeg, alpine areas, and other unproductive regions. Of the forested acreage, much of that is not commercially viable. The reality of the history of the timber industry in Alaska is that the premier value timber was harvested first, which also constituted the most critical wildlife habitat. Undisturbed watersheds now are critical to maintaining our wildlife populations. We are just beginning to see the impacts of previous clearcuts as the canopy closes and understory forage plants can no longer receive light to grow.

10 billion board feet of timber remain within the 1/2 mile buffer of existing Forest Service roads. It is not necessary to incur the extensive costs of new road building to access timber.

In summary we cannot support the proposed resolution. We believe it is not in the best economic interests of our membership to discourage this analysis from moving forward.

Sincerely,

*Page Else*

Page Else, GIS Analyst  
For the SCS Board


Dear Committee Members,

My name is Caleb Wardlaw. I have lived in Sitka, Alaska for five years. I believe that there are far more reasons to include the Tongass in the new Roadless policy than to exclude it. Reasons to include it include environmental and economic whereas the reasons to exclude it only include economic. However, the economic benefits that would result from the inclusion of the Tongass into the new policy far outweigh the economic benefits that would result should the Tongass be excluded.

I moved here to attend school at Sheldon Jackson College and quickly came to appreciate the rarity of this pristine place in today's world. In the lower 48 here are no forests as pristine as the Tongass. In fact, everyday pristine forests become scarcer and scarcer. Pristine forests offer incomparable recreational experienced and valuable fish and wildlife habitat. These qualities will soon be recognized as golden. In other words the Tongass, if left pristine, will be a gold mine. The Tongass would be the largest unroaded expanse of forest in the United States. That means it will be a commodity unequaled anywhere in the United States.

Recycling is an increasing practice, science is constantly finding cheaper substitutes for wood products. This is not to say that the future does not hold a demand for timber, simply that there will be less demand than today. However, the Tongass road system already access's up to 10 billion board feet of timber. With diversification and an increase in value added products Southeast Alaska could be incurring greater economic benefits than it does today just from harvesting along this road system. This being considered, why would we convert our gold mine (a pristine Tongass) to a silver mine (a not as pristine Tongass). The future is in tourism, commercial fishing, and a value added timber industry. The combination of these industries can best be met if the Tongass is included in the new roadless policy.

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Caleb Wardlaw". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with some loops and flourishes.

- ten habitat preferences in the northern Sierra Nevada. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **47**, 1181-1186.
- Spies, T.A., Ripple, W.J. & Bradshaw, G.A. (1994) Dynamics and pattern of a managed coniferous forest landscape in Oregon. *Ecological Applications*, **4**, 555-568.
- Stevenson, J.D. & Major, J.T. (1982) Marten use of habitat in a commercially clear-cut forest. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **46**, 175-182.
- Taylor, S.L. (1993) *Thermodynamics and energetics of resting site use by the American marten (Martes americana)*. MS Thesis. University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY.
- Thomas, J.W. (1979) *Wildlife Habitats in Managed Forests: the Blue Mountains of Oregon and Washington*. United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Agriculture Handbook Number 533. US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
- Thompson, I.D. (1994) Marten populations in uncut and logged boreal forests in Ontario. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **58**, 272-279.
- Thompson, I.D. & Colgan, P.W. (1994) Marten activity in uncut and logged boreal forests in Ontario. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **58**, 280-288.
- Thompson, I.D. & Harestad, A.S. (1994) Effects of logging on American martens, and models for habitat management. *Martens, Sables, and Fishers: Biology and Conservation* (eds S.W. Buskirk, A.S. Harestad, M.G. Raphael & R.A. Powell), pp. 355-367. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- Turner, M.G. (1987) *Landscape Heterogeneity and Disturbance*. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Turner, M.G. & Dale, V.H. (1991) Modeling landscape disturbance. *Quantitative Methods in Landscape Ecology* (eds M.G. Turner & R.H. Gardner), pp. 323-352. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Turner, M.G., Gardner, R.H., Dale, V.H. & O'Neill, R.V. (1989) Predicting the spread of disturbance across heterogeneous landscapes. *Oikos*, **55**, 121-129.
- Verboom, B. & van Apeldoorn, R. (1990) Effects of habitat fragmentation on the red squirrel *Sciurus vulgaris*. *Landscape Ecology*, **4**, 171-176.
- Voss, R.F. (1988) Fractals in nature: from characterization to simulation. *The Science of Fractal Images* (eds H.O. Peitgen & D. Saupe), pp. 21-70. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Wallin, D.O., Swanson, F.J. & Marks, B. (1994) Landscape pattern response to changes in pattern generation rules: land-use legacies in forestry. *Ecological Applications*, **4**, 569-580.
- Weckwerth, R.P. & Hawley, V.D. (1962) Marten food habits and population fluctuations in Montana. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **26**, 55-74.
- Whitcomb, R.F., Robbins, C.S., Lynch, J.F., Whitcomb, B.L., Klimkiewicz, M.K. & Bystrak, D. (1981) Effects of forest fragmentation on avifauna of the eastern deciduous forest. *Forest Island Dynamics in Man-Dominated Landscapes* (eds R.L. Burgess & D.M. Sharpe), pp. 125-205. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Wiens, J.A., Stenseth, N.C., Van Horne, B. & Ims, R.A. (1993) Ecological mechanisms and landscape ecology. *Oikos*, **66**, 369-380.
- Wilcox, B.A. (1980) Insular ecology and conservation. *Conservation Biology: an Evolutionary-Ecological Perspective* (eds M.E. Soulé & B.A. Wilcox), pp. 95-117. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA.

Received 2 October 1997; revision received 24 November 1998

# Forest Resources



A Report on Forestry Issues from the American Forest & Paper Association

December 13-20, 1999

## Proposed Planning Rule Comment Period Extended 30 Days

The Forest Service has extended the public comment period on its proposed planning rule by 30 days; the new deadline is Feb. 3, 2000 (AF&PA and many others had requested a 120-day extension). Extra time is needed due to the complexity of this proposal to completely rewrite the national forest planning regulations that have been in effect since 1982, not to mention a complete rewrite of the statutory purposes of the National Forest System. At the same time, the Forest Service also sought comments on the scope of its proposed environmental impact statement on President Clinton's roadless area initiative. The timing of these two major proposals and EPA's proposed TMDL rule, with overlapping comment periods, has generated considerable confusion not only with the public but also within the agency. To provide the Forest Service with your concerns about the proposed redirection of forest management, use the electronic comments under the Washington Watch icon on the AF&PA website, [www.afandpa.org](http://www.afandpa.org). For more information, contact either Bob Bierer at 202/463-2753 or Mary Coulombe at -2752.

## Continue Commenting on Roadless Areas Proposal

The deadline for comments on the Forest Service's Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the Administration's Roadless Initiative was Dec. 20. However, Forest Service officials have been advising the public that the scoping process continues through preparation of the EIS. Therefore, if you missed the deadline, you should still send comments urging the agency to provide more information on the specific location of the affected areas, if not in a new NOI then at least in the draft EIS. A quick way to provide your comments is to use the Washington Watch icon on the AF&PA website, [www.afandpa.org](http://www.afandpa.org). For more information, contact Mary Coulombe at 202/463-2752 or Bob Bierer at -2753.

## Third-Party Verification Opportunity on WA Public Lands

The Washington State Department of Natural Resources has issued a "Request for Proposal" to conduct a preliminary evaluation of the Department's forest management in regards to sustainable forest certification. The project will cost approximately \$20,000 and will be conducted over a two-month period. Proposals are due by 2:00 pm January 11, 2000 and should be sent to the Department of Natural Resources, 1111 Washington St., SE, Olympia, WA 98504-7011. Attn: Ms. Peggy M. Murphy, RFP Coordinator. The contact phone number is 360/902-1393 and the fax is 360/902-1783.

This may be an excellent opportunity to implement the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)<sup>SM</sup> program on public lands in the Western United States with third-party verification. The SFI<sup>SM</sup> team encourages AF&PA members and SFI program licensees to forward this information to interested parties and certification/verification contractors they work with as soon as possible. It would be a very positive step for the SFI program to have the Washington State Department of Natural Resources choose the SFI program and verification process as the vehicle to certify sustainable forestry on their forestlands. For more information, contact Rick Cantrell at 202/463-2432.

## AF&PA Honors Champion's Dick Porterfield


Champion International Corporation's Dick Porterfield is the recipient of AF&PA's "Outstanding Leadership and Service Award" for 1999. AF&PA Board of Directors Chairman, Rick Holley, presented the award on behalf of AF&PA membership, the CEO Forestry Executive Committee, and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)<sup>SM</sup> program during AF&PA's 1999 President's Forum. The award recognizes Dick's outstanding leadership in the development, implementation, and evolution of the SFI<sup>SM</sup> program. Dick has been with the SFI

AMERICA'S FOREST & PAPER PEOPLE <sup>SM</sup> - *Improving Tomorrow's Environment Today*<sup>SM</sup>

1111 NINETEENTH STREET NW • SUITE 800 • WASHINGTON DC 20036  
[WWW.afandpa.org](http://WWW.afandpa.org)

©1999 American Forest & Paper Association, Inc.

# Alaska Forest Association, Inc.



111 STEDMAN SUITE 200  
KETCHIKAN, ALASKA 99901-6599  
Phone 907-225-6114  
FAX 907-225-5920

December 20, 1999

USDA Forest Service-CAET  
Attn: Roadless Area NOI  
P.O. Box 221090  
Salt Lake City, UT 84122

## Via email, facsimile and Certified U.S. Mail

Dear Project Team Leader:

The letter constitutes the comments of the Alaska Forest Association in response to the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS), published at Federal Register Volume 64, pages 56306-56307, on October 19, 1999. The NOI seeks comments on "1) the effects of eliminating road construction activities in the remaining unroaded portions of inventoried roadless areas on the National Forest System; and 2) the effects of establishing criteria and procedures to ensure that the social and ecological values, that make both inventoried roadless areas and other un-inventoried roadless lands important, are considered and protected through the forest planning process."

The Alaska Forest Association is the trade association for the forest products industry in Alaska. A statewide organization, the AFA represents approximately 90 regular and 180 associate member companies doing business in the forest products sector throughout Alaska. Regular member companies are loggers, roadbuilding firms, sawmills and other primary manufacturing facilities, secondary wood products manufacturers, forest landowners and others directly engaged in the forest products industry. Associate member companies are businesses having some interest in or association with AFA regular member firms, such as vendors, lending institutions, and other related businesses. Nearly all AFA members (regular and associate) are small business firms.

The AFA, its members, their employees and the timber dependent communities of Alaska depend on the Forest Service to provide economic timber sales of sufficient volume to meet the needs of that portion of the Alaska timber industry that relies, either directly or indirectly, on purchases of timber from the Tongass and Chugach National Forests. Under the recently adopted Tongass Land Management Plan, a significant portion of the projected timber offerings must come from currently unroaded areas, some of which are RARE II inventoried areas.

In addition, some AFA members own private timberlands that are surrounded by, or are adjacent to, national forest lands. Roads across "remaining unroaded portions of inventoried roadless areas" may be necessary to provide access to these private lands. These private landowners are entitled to the reasonable economic uses of their lands which could be precluded by the proposed rulemaking.

AFA members also have a direct interest, both aesthetic and economic, in the health of the national forest lands in Alaska. In the Chugach National Forest particularly, this interest also includes public safety because of the increased fire hazard associated with heavy fuel loading. The proposed roadless action, particularly Part 1, would have a detrimental effect on forest health by limiting the agency's access to NFS lands for management purposes.

☞ For these reasons and others, AFA and its members are directly affected by, and have an interest in, the roadless area rulemaking proposed by the subject NOI.

### The Public Scoping Process is Flawed

#### 1. Violation of NEPA and NFMA regulations

The public scoping process implemented by the Forest Service under the NOI is inadequate and is contrary to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and its implementing regulations. It is also contrary to provisions of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) and its implementing regulations. NEPA regulations require "an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action." (40 C.F.R. 1501.7). NFMA regulations, developed under 16 U.S.C. § 1604(d), require the agency to provide for meaningful public participation in the development, review or revision of a forest plan. (36 C.F.R. 219.6).

Contrary to both these regulations, the Forest Service has failed to provide adequate information to the public for the public to meaningfully participate in the scoping process and to have any ability to help define the alternatives to be considered in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS).

The Forest Service did not, in the NOI nor in any subsequent forum of which the AFA is aware, provide information on the location of lands within the NFS that will be affected by Part 1 of the proposed roadless rule. While some maps may be available for some forests, there apparently are no comprehensive maps available which would allow the public to get a clear indication of the extent and location of the areas which would be affected by the proposed rule. In fact, at a Senate Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management hearing, held on November 2, 1999, Forest Service Chief Mike Dombeck said he was not sure how many acres would be directly affected by the rule. He indicated it could be anywhere from 40 million to 60 million acres, but said he did not know the actual number. Yet, without more accurate information than this, the public is expected to meaningfully participate in a scoping process that will set the direction for management of huge areas of public land. The public cannot meaningfully suggest an appropriate range of alternatives when it does not even know where the affected lands lie.

Additionally, the Forest Service has not made available to the public information that would help it understand the relationship between the proposed entry restrictions on roadless areas and those parts of the National Forest System that are at high risk of catastrophic fire. According to Forest Service figures, there are approximately 39 million such acres. As of November 3, 1999, the Forest Service did not have maps showing the overlap between those acres and the inventoried and un-

inventoried roadless areas that would be subject to Part 1 of the NOI, according to testimony provided before the Senate and House hearings on November 2 & 3, 1999. AFA has still not seen such maps and, so far as we can determine, they were not made available at any public meetings held during this scoping period.

The Forest Service has also failed to provide other information important to the public's ability to comment on the proposed policy. This includes the status of lands on which existing roads have been or will be decommissioned. The Forest Service has been actively abandoning, obliterating, decommissioning and otherwise removing roads on several national forests, including those in Alaska. Given the definitions contained in the handouts provided at public meetings during this scoping process, the public is left with legitimate unanswered questions as to the status of such lands. Without knowing that these lands might be included in the un-inventoried roadless areas discussed in the NOI, the public may be unlikely to consider this issue in its scoping comments.

Finally, the Forest Service has left an important term undefined. While a list of definitions was distributed to the public at the "listening sessions" and other public meetings, the term "protection" remains undefined. This is an important omission, since to some people the active management techniques generally associated with commercial timber production are "protective" activities with respect to insect and disease control and fire management. The point could also be made that all areas within the National Forest System are "protected" by virtue of their inclusion in the NFS (i.e., they are protected for multiple use forest purposes and cannot be converted to non-forest land use). Thus, in the absence of a definition of "protection," the Forest Service cannot know with any degree of certainty what a particular commentor might mean by saying he or she wants roadless areas "protected." Without a definition of the term "protection" many of the public comments received by the agency have been rendered meaningless or at least are open to various subjective determinations as to their meaning.

## 2. Unexplained relationship to other rulemaking

So far as the AFA can determine, the Forest Service has yet to clarify the intended relationship between the roadless proposal (both parts) and the proposed changes to the rules governing the National Forest transportation system (36 C.F.R., Part 212). Nor has the Forest Service clarified the relationship between the proposed roadless policy and the proposed amendments to the NFMA regulations which were announced in Federal Register Volume 64, page 54074, on October 5, 1999. To ask the public to set forth scoping issues on the roadless proposal without clarifying for the public the interrelationship between these clearly connected actions frustrates the purpose of scoping as envisioned by both NEPA and NFMA.

☞ The public scoping process set forth in the NOI is, for all the reasons stated above, fatally flawed and should be withdrawn. Comments resulting from this process can be expected to be skewed by the lack of information (or possibly in some cases the provision of misinformation) made available to the general public during the scoping period. Efforts to get the Forest Service to extend the comment period to correct these flaws have fallen on deaf ears, so the AFA has no choice but to insist that the NOI be withdrawn.

### National venue improper for dealing with roadless issues

In 1982, the Forest Service demonstrated that it had learned something from the frustrating experience of RARE I and RARE II (both of which failed NEPA tests). Because issues relating to roadless areas are complex and are interrelated with other decisions affecting the use and management of national forests, decisions on roadless area management are properly made in the context of individual forest plans. Thus, 36 C.F.R. 219.17 sets forth the proper venue for roadless area planning. The action contemplated under this NOI is inappropriate on a nationwide basis.

Decisions about the status of inventoried and un-inventoried roadless areas should be made through the forest planning process at the national forest level as envisioned in NFMA and its implementing regulations. A rulemaking process that will affect all roadless areas on all national forests through a single nationwide decision cannot address the unique forest conditions of individual roadless areas. The AFA therefore strongly opposes the unilateral decision to "protect" all roadless areas of the NFS, as set forth in the NOI. If the Forest Service persists in the present action under the NOI, it will frustrate the public's expenditure of countless man-hours in developing individual forest plans on forests where plans have been recently adopted or are in the process of being revised.

☞ For all the above-stated reasons, the AFA urges the Forest Service to withdraw the NOI and reconsider the decision to deal with unroaded areas in the National Forest System on a nationwide, rather than a forest-by-forest basis. If the agency is determined to go forward, it should take steps to make the public scoping process meaningful by providing needed information to the public prior to seeking the public's comments on the proposed action. This likewise will necessitate canceling the NOI and beginning a new public scoping period.

### The proposed roadless policy should not be applied in Alaska

Notwithstanding the AFA's position that the proposed roadless policy (especially Part 1) is inappropriate on a national basis, the Association asserts that the policy will be particularly egregious if it is applied in Alaska. This is true for the following reasons:

#### 1. The terms of the NOI make the proposed policy illegal to apply in Alaska

The NOI calls for a review of non-roaded areas in national forests with the purpose of determining the appropriateness of limiting or prohibiting road access and other development activities. The NOI specifically states that one possible alternative for the DEIS would be an alternative "prohibiting the implementation of all activities, subject to valid existing rights, that do not contribute to maintaining or enhancing the ecological values of roadless areas in remaining unroaded portions of inventoried roadless areas." If applied in Alaska, this would constitute a statewide review of roadless areas under Forest Service control. The roadless policy is therefore illegal in Alaska because it involves a statewide analysis of roadless areas in Alaska intended to create new set-asides, an action which is specifically and expressly prohibited by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA). ANILCA states that the need for set-asides for conservation system units and other

special restricted areas is met by ANILCA and that there shall be **no more** withdrawals in Alaska, except by act of Congress.

This was stated in Section 101(d) as an over-arching guideline for the entire Act:

(d) This act provides sufficient protection for the national interest in the scenic, natural, cultural and environmental values on the public lands in Alaska, and at the same time provides adequate opportunity for the satisfaction of the economic and social needs of the State of Alaska's people; accordingly, **the designation and disposition of the public lands in Alaska pursuant to this act are found to represent a proper balance between the reservation of national conservation system units and those public lands necessary and appropriate for more intensive use and disposition and thus Congress believes that the need for future legislation designating new conservation system units, new national conservation areas or new national recreation areas has been obviated thereby.** (Emphasis added.)

ANILCA also specifically and individually addressed administrative closures and studies by federal agencies. Section 1326(a) states specifically that administrative closures of more than 5,000 acres can no longer be used in Alaska and that if a larger area is administratively withdrawn,

(s)uch withdrawal shall terminate unless Congress passes a joint resolution of approval within one year after the notice of such withdrawal has been submitted to Congress.

Moreover, and especially applicable to the current roadless initiative, ANILCA Section 1326(b) states that **federal agencies are not even allowed to study lands for consideration for CSUs or other similar restrictive designations unless Congress specifically authorizes the study:**

(b) **No further studies of Federal lands in the State of Alaska for the single purpose of considering the establishment of a conservation system unit, national recreation area, national conservation area, or for related or similar purposes shall be conducted unless authorized by this Act or further Act of Congress.** (Emphasis added.)

## 2. The Tongass National Forest merits exemption because of its peculiar circumstances

With respect to the Tongass, the NOI specifically solicits comments as to whether the Tongass National Forest should be included in the proposed Part 1 of the policy. Alaska's elected representatives have spoken with unanimity on this issue. The Governor, the Alaska Congressional delegation, members of the state legislature and many city councils and community leaders have spoken out against the application of the roadless policy to the Tongass. Governor Tony Knowles went so far as to distribute a press release and a letter addressed to CEQ Chairman George Frampton saying that it would be "a double cross" and "an outrage" were the proposed policy to be applied to the Tongass.

There is good reason for this. The Tongass has just gone through an extensive, 11 year plan revision process which cost the American taxpayers more than \$13 million. The 1997/99 Plan withdrew more than half of the land previously available for development in the Tongass, leaving such a small amount of acreage available for timber harvest that a further decline in industrial timber jobs in the

region is a virtual certainty. At a gathering of Southeast Alaska mayors and other community leaders in Sitka in late September, Under Secretary Jim Lyons stated that the 1999 Record of Decision (ROD) for the Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP) was the final action of this Administration with respect to Tongass management. According to Mr. Lyons' statement, every effort from this time forward was to be made toward implementation of the new plan. Yet, a mere four weeks later the President announced the initiative which is reflected in the subject NOI. That initiative, if applied to the Tongass, would obviate the land allocations arrived at in the development of TLMP, and directly contradict Mr. Lyons' statement to the Southeast Conference.

AFA points out that it is currently in litigation with the Forest Service over the legality of the revised TLMP as adopted in the 1997 ROD, and as amended by Mr. Lyons' 1999 ROD. We believe that the revised TLMP (pursuant to either the 1997 or 1999 ROD) will ultimately be enjoined and remanded to the agency by the Courts. Those facts notwithstanding, given implementation of the revised TLMP presently governing the management of the Tongass, it is completely inappropriate for the government to further reduce the available land base and force an additional reduction in the Allowable Sale Quantity by application of a national roadless policy to the Tongass National Forest.

We therefore agree with Governor Knowles that application of the proposed roadless policy to the Tongass would amount to a double-cross, and urge the Forest Service to specifically exempt the Tongass from any further consideration of roadless "protections" under any nationwide action. As stated previously in these comments, the only appropriate venue for considering land allocations on any national forest is through the NFMA-mandated individual forest plans in which all multiple use considerations and social and economic impacts must be considered.

Most of the non-roaded areas of the Tongass are already under some form of protection (even prior to the 1999 TLMP ROD). These include Wilderness, Congressionally designated LUD II areas, administrative land use designations for non-development such as "remote recreation," and Wild and Scenic River designations. The only roadless acreages actually under consideration for protection in this proposed policy are those few areas currently left open for resource (primarily timber) extraction. Forest Service data indicate that approximately 403,000 acres of the 938,000 presently listed as "suitable and available" under the Forest Plan would fall under the terms of the NOI. After application of the Management Implementation Reduction Factor (MIRF), this would likely force the agency to reduce the area open to timber harvest down to a mere 183,000 acres. It is impossible to believe that this small land base could produce more than a third of the current NIC I ASQ of 153 MMBF. It is further impossible to justify a reduction in the suitable land base because it will only further frustrate the Tongass Timber Reform Act's § 101 directive to the Forest Service to seek to provide a supply of timber to meet market demand.

Finally, it should be noted that Mr. Dombeck told Congress that the Forest Service will not request a reprogramming of funds to do the roadless analysis required under the NOI. He said the agency would use existing funds to pay for the initiative. Mr. Dombeck stated the initiative is estimated to cost \$6 million and the agency will pay for it **out of land management planning funds**. Given the promises made to Southeast Alaska at the time TTRA was passed by Congress, statements made by former Region 10 Regional Forester Phil Janik to the Senate Energy Committee during the TLMP revision process, and the recent declarations by Mr. Lyons in Sitka, the Forest Service simply cannot

reasonably take money from timber planning allocations in the Tongass and use them to perform a roadless review which has as its purpose (or at least its result) the further reduction of available timber from the Tongass. This is all the more true in light of the fact that the action is illegal under ANILCA, as detailed previously in these comments.

☞ The AFA, while again noting its objection to the intent of the NOI as a whole, urges the exclusion of the Tongass from any and all alternatives which may be developed under the proposed DEIS. The provisions of ANILCA and the unique circumstances of the Tongass and its recent plan revision demand this exclusion. Such an exclusion would also be in line with the expressed position of the Western Governor's Conference (including Alaska's Governor Knowles) which recently passed a resolution urging the Forest Service to exclude from the proposed roadless initiative any forest with a recently completed forest plan or a forest plan which is projected to be completed by the end of 2000.

### 3. The Chugach National Forest merits exclusion

The Chugach National Forest is afforded the same protection as the Tongass under ANILCA and therefore the establishment or study for establishment of roadless area withdrawals under the present NOI should not be considered for the Chugach.

Additionally, the Chugach is presently suffering from a pandemic of spruce bark beetles which has devastated more than 30,000 acres of Forest Service land on the Kenai Peninsula. An arbitrary ban on road construction in areas along the Seward Highway which qualify as "roadless" (whether inventoried or un-inventoried) would preclude some management options presently available to the Forest Service to deal with the extremely high forest mortality that has resulted from this insect problem. At this time, ecological and silvicultural considerations argue strongly against foreclosing options until the extent of appropriate management techniques can be fully assessed.

Furthermore, as is often the case throughout Alaska, there are private land access issues which must be considered with respect to the Chugach National Forest. The CNF has a long history of frustrating the attempts by private landowners with holdings adjacent to the forest to establish permanent access to their lands. Any permanent "protections" afforded to roadless areas in the Chugach will only exacerbate this problem.

Finally, the Chugach Land Management Plan Revision has been in process for more than two years and is now at the stage of finalizing alternatives for the draft EIS. The Alaska Forest Association and several other user groups and individuals have spent countless hours working with the IDT on the Plan revision process. As with the Tongass, including the Chugach National Forest in national roadless policy would make a sham of the Forest Service planning process established under NFMA.

☞ The AFA therefore urges you to exclude the Chugach National Forest from all alternatives developed for the DEIS under the NOI. The provisions of ANILCA and the unique management challenges and access issues indicate that it should not fall under the aegis of the proposed policy. As with the Tongass, such an exclusion would also be in line with the expressed position of the Western Governor's Conference which recently passed a resolution urging the Forest Service to

exclude from the proposed roadless initiative any forest with a recently completed forest plan or a forest plan which is projected to be completed by the end of 2000.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the roadless NOI. Should you have any questions concerning any of these comments, please contact me at (907) 225-6114.

Sincerely,



Jack E. Phelps  
Executive Director

cc: The Honorable Tony Knowles  
The Honorable Ted Stevens  
The Honorable Frank Murkowski  
The Honorable Don Young

HJR

56

# FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
2000 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HJR56

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction) \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. Affected Office of the Governor  
 Title Constitutional Amendment: Prohibiting certain BRU Elective Operations  
initiatives relating to wildlife Component Elections  
 Sponsor Representative Morgan  
 Requester House Resources Committee Component No. 21

**Expenditures/Revenues** (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006
Personal Services						
Travel						
Contractual	1.5					
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUND SOURCE** (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	1.5					
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type)						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Estimate of any current year (FY2000) cost: 0.0

**POSITIONS**

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary						

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This figure includes the cost of providing information about this issue in the Official Election Pamphlet, as required by AS 15.58. However, only six measures can be printed on an 8-1/2 by 14 inch ballot. If this measure requires printing an 8-1/2 by 18 inch ballot, the cost will increase by \$22.0.

Prepared by: Gail Fenunzia Phone 465-3935  
 Division Division of Elections Date/Time 2/23/00 12:04 PM  
 Approved by: Lt. Governor Fran Ulmer Date 02/23/2000  
 Agency Office of the Lieutenant Governor

**PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE**

For further distribution information, call the Governor's Legislative Office

FEB-28-00 MON 13:29

10-23-1995 3:00AM

FROM

FEB-26-00 SUN 04:33 PM

AK PUBLIC DEFENDER

FAX NO. 907 465 3247

P. 03

P. 1

P. 01

**ALASKA TRAPPERS ASSOCIATION  
POST OFFICE BOX 82177  
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99708**

Feb. 23, 2000

Rep. Carl Morgan  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capital  
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Rep. Morgan:


The Alaska Trappers Association has about 1200 members statewide. We are a group that supports humane and effective trapping and we stand up for trappers rights. Thus we are very happy that you have introduced House Joint Resolution 56 to finally stop the constant attacks by the Animal Rights groups that are trying to take over game management in Alaska.

As we saw in 1996, the well-funded groups like Friends of Animals can put a lot of money into an Alaskan campaign in a short period of time. And there is no truth in advertising. They ran ads on television that made people think that they were voting to outlaw AERIAL wolf hunting. It worked. The initiative to stop "same day airborne trapping was passed handily. They came back in 1998 to try to stop all wolf snaring and wearing wolf fur, but luckily trappers started the CAWL group and we were able to stop them.

But we do not have the money to keep fighting this battle every two years. That is why your bill is so important. We need to stop them. They can just use the BOG process like everyone else. They complain that this system does not work (for them) but I suggest that it DOES work. The fact that every goofy proposal they put in DOES NOT pass, is proof that our system works!

With your help, we will show them that you do not just circumvent the process and BUY Alaskan wildlife policy. Again, thank you very much.

Sincerely,



Joe Mattie, Board Member  
Alaska Trappers Association

Additional Letters Received in Support of HJR 56  
2/28/00

Alaska Native Harbor Seal Commission  
Coalition for the Alaskan Way of Life (CAWL)  
Joe & Candie Caraway

Harold Martin, Chair  
Ben Hopson, Jr. Co-Chair  
Beluga



## ALASKA NATIVE HARBOR SEAL COMMISSION

February 28, 2000

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Harold Martin  
Chair  
*Southeast Region*

Mitch Simeonoff  
Vice-Chair  
*Kodiak Region*

William Elvsaa  
Sec'y/Treas.  
*Cook Inlet Region*

Mark Snigaroff  
*Aleutian/Pribilof*

Norman Vlasoff  
*Chugach Region*

Ricardo Lopez  
*Bristol Bay MMC*

Daniel Alex  
*Cook Inlet MMC*

Monica Riedel  
*Executive Director*

Representative Carl Morgan  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

VIA FAX: 1-907-465-2197

### REFERENCE: IN SUPPORT OF HJR-56, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON WILDLIFE INITIATIVES

Dear Representative Morgan:

I feel that it's extremely important that we utilize all means to protect wildlife and wild areas from special interest groups outside Alaska in order to protect future generations' use of those wildlife resources. HJR-56 will protect those wildlife resources by preventing these special interest groups from using the initiative process to make wildlife policy in Alaska, policy that could be very detrimental to Alaska's subsistence users.

It has been proven over the years that Alaska's system of wildlife management has worked very well. ADF&G, along with the Board of Game and the state legislature, has ensured preservation of Alaska's wildlife for everyone to enjoy. ADF&G biologists have been trained in sound scientific methods and the professional management of Alaska's wildlife resources, which have served Alaska's people well. We do not need "Ballot Box Biology" as advocated by animal rights groups.

We should not have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to defend our traditional hunting and trapping rights at the ballot box every few years. HJR-56 would ensure that wildlife issues could no longer be a part of the initiative process, and therefore protected from the whims of animal rights groups.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment **in favor of HJR-56.**

Sincerely,  
*Monica Riedel for HM*  
Harold Martin, Chairman, ANHSC

**COALITION FOR THE ALASKAN WAY OF LIFE  
P.O. BOX 60954  
FAIRBANKS, AK 99706**

February 26, 2000

Representative Carl Morgan, Jr.  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Morgan:


RE: HJR 56

On behalf of our coalition, I want to thank you for your introduction of this important measure. Your resolution proposing a Constitutional Amendment to finally stop these animal rights groups from abusing Alaska's democratic game management system is an important first step in bringing sanity back to the process.

As you know, our group is extremely diverse. Beginning with the fight over Proposition 9 (Wolf Snaring) on the 1998 ballot, we were able to get a wide array of interests to come together to fight this common enemy. Urban and rural. Trapper and hunter. Village trappers and urban sport hunters. We have all agreed to put aside other differences and help fight this assault on our way of life. We are very appreciative of your efforts to solve the problem.

Do not hesitate to call on us. We stand with you in defense of Alaska's wildlife and peoples.

Sincerely,



Ben Hopson, Jr. Co-Chair  
Coalition for the Alaskan Way of Life

Joe & Candie Caraway  
Beluga River  
Beluga, Alaska 99516

February 28, 2000

Rep. Carl Morgan  
House District 36  
Aniak, AK

Dear Carl,


The State of Alaska has been under attack by outside animal rights groups for too long. The "anti" interest groups have attempted to dictate how we manage our renewable fish and wildlife resources. Our governor seems all too interested in catering to these uninformed, non-Alaskan voices.

Because of this unhealthy perspective that is being fostered by our administration, it is now necessary to take steps to protect our Alaskan way of life and many Alaskan traditions. Your House Joint Resolution No. 56 is just the remedy!

The State of Alaska has a fish and wildlife management system in place that allows for public input at every level. When it is allowed to function without political pressure--it is an incredible process. One, we should all be involved in and proud of as Alaskans. Our current administration is constantly thwarting the decisions of the Board of Game; and powerful money has made it's way to our state to fight Alaskans for the consumptive use of our resources. We must recognize that allowing issues dealing with fish and wildlife management to be voted on by all residents of the state is inappropriate. Management can not and should not be dealt with on an emotional level. Too often the issue is misrepresented to the uninvolved and uneducated voter. Often these same voters, when voting to stop the use of a wildlife resource feel they are paying homage, and are "doing their part". Users of Alaska resources do not have the time or monies to dispute each issue as it is comes before us--election after election. Carl, for these reasons, and many others not mentioned, your bill is so badly needed.

We thank you for your efforts on behalf of Alaska's renewable resources; and we pray for your success.

Most sincerely,



Joe Caraway  
Candie Caraway



750 W. 2nd Ave. #109, Anchorage AK 99501 / Ph. 907-258-6171 / Fax 907-258-6177

P.O. Box 22151, Juneau AK 99802 / Ph. 907-463-3366 / Fax 907-463-3312 / [unite@akvoice.org](mailto:unite@akvoice.org)


## HJR 56 ~ Constitutional Amendment: Wildlife Initiatives

TO: House Resources Committee Members  
FROM: Susan Schrader, Conservation Advocate  
DATE: February 28, 2000

Alaska Conservation Voters, formerly Alaska Conservation Voice, is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to protecting Alaska's environment through public education and advocacy. Our 40 Alaskan organizations and business members represent over 22,000 registered Alaskan voters. We have consistently opposed efforts by the legislature to limit Alaskan's constitutional right to participate directly in the law-making process through the initiative process. HJR 56 is yet another attack on that right.

We are opposed to HJR 56 for the following reasons:

- ◆ While this proposed amendment to the constitution appears to be limited to initiatives dealing with wildlife, on a more fundamental level it represents an erosion of public access to government. We can debate the "ballot box biology" issue endlessly, but when one group of Alaskans are denied an opportunity to address an issue they strongly believe in by the initiative process, the freedom of all Alaskans to express their will through direct democracy is threatened. Public policy issues addressed by the initiative process receive far more discussion and debate than many of the hundreds of bills passed by the legislature every year. The process is out in the open as contrasted to the often clandestine route bills can take to become law.
- ◆ Supporters of this resolution endorse placing the scientific process of wildlife management back into the hands of the ADF&G and Board of Game. Yet ADF&G takes direction from the legislature and the legislature essentially chooses the members of the Board of Game. Thus, the initiative process is an important check on the power of the legislature. Alaskans are being asked to relinquish their right to vote on wildlife management issues on the grounds that we are not competent enough to do so. Instead, we are being told to trust the decisions resulting from a unbalanced process that currently promotes the principles of intensive game management and the values of consumptive users to the near-exclusion of other users.
- ◆ Our constitution's sustained yield and multiple use provisions have served all Alaskans and our wildlife very well – it protects the interests of all beneficial users. Those same framers of our constitution who were wise enough to put Article VIII into it also included the initiative process. They had a faith in the ability of Alaskans to make informed decisions when voting - a faith that evidently is not shared by this legislature. As the passage of SB 74 last year exemplifies, the legislature has the power to amend or completely negate a citizen-passed initiative after two years. Thus, it is within the legislature's power to correct any legitimate problems that might result from the initiative process. Clearly, the system is not broken – the wildlife of Alaska will not be "safer" if this tool of democracy is taken away from the citizens of Alaska.

  
Susan E. Schrader

Conserve Alaska. It's Only Natural.

Letters Received in Support of HJR 56

Tanana Chiefs Conference,  
Alaska Trappers Association,  
Alaska Trappers Association, South Central Chpt.  
Alaska Outdoor Council.  
Coalition for the Alaskan Way of Life (CAWL)  
Scientific Management of Alaska's  
Resource Treasures (SMART)

Peter R. Buist,  
Tom Lessard  
Alex Whiting  
Alan and Brenda Jones  
Jim E. Gallagher  
Carol Torsen

Steve Ginnis, President,  
Joe Mattie, Board Member  
Allen Dubord, Chair  
Dick Bishop, Vice President  
Gabriel Sam, Co-Chair

Patrick Wright, President  
Fairbanks  
Chugiak  
Kotzebue  
Fairbanks  
Anchorage  
Anchorage

**TANANA CHIEFS CONFERENCE, INC.**

February 22, 2000  
122 FIRST AVENUE, SUITE 600  
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701-4897  
PHONE 907/452-8251 • FAX 907/459-3850

Representative Carl Morgan  
State Capitol Building, Suite 409  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Dear Representative Morgan:

The Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc would like to express its support for HJR 56, which would remove wildlife management issues from the ballot initiative process.

When wolves enter into a village not because they are lost, but because they are hungry, there is a definite problem in how the wildlife is being managed. If there were enough moose and caribou out there the wolves would not come so close to a community. In January the children go to school in the dark and go home in the dark. This is also the time the wolves go out on their nightly hunt for food.

This is no longer an issue for just putting food on the table, it is now an issue for the children's welfare and safety. To manage fish and game resources by ballot initiative is not a sound method for wildlife management. The resources should be managed through the direction that the Board of Game assigns to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.


Through many of the public testimonies that were given by representatives from all over Alaska at the McGrath Rural Summit in McGrath, nobody spoke of totally eradicating the wolves. People spoke of how important the wolf is in their respective cultures. The problem is there are just too many wolves and not enough moose or caribou to feed them.

Because the terrain is so hilly and rough, it is difficult for the local trappers to successfully catch any wolves. The only way the wolf population can be controlled is by aerial hunts. An aggressive predator control program needs to be implemented.

Again, the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc supports HJR 56, because Alaska's resources should not be managed by outside special interest groups. Rather they should be managed based upon sound scientific principles. Thank you for your advocacy on this issue of importance to interior Alaskans.

Sincerely,

TANANA CHIEFS CONFERENCE, INC.

  
Steve Ginnis  
President

**ALASKA TRAPPERS ASSOCIATION  
POST OFFICE BOX 82177  
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99708**

Feb. 23, 2000

Rep. Carl Morgan  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capital  
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Rep. Morgan:

The Alaska Trappers Association has about 1200 members statewide. We are a group that supports humane and effective trapping and we stand up for trappers rights. Thus we are very happy that you have introduced House Joint Resolution 56 to finally stop the constant attacks by the Animal Rights groups that are trying to take over game management in Alaska.

As we saw in 1996, the well-funded groups like Friends of Animals can put a lot of money into an Alaskan campaign in a short period of time. And there is no truth in advertising. They ran ads on television that made people think that they were voting to outlaw AERIAL wolf hunting. It worked. The initiative to stop "same day airborne trapping was passed handily. They came back in 1998 to try to stop all wolf snaring and wearing wolf fur, but luckily trappers started the CAWL group and we were able to stop them.

But we do not have the money to keep fighting this battle every two years. That is why your bill is so important. We need to stop them. They can just use the BOG process like everyone else. They complain that this system does not work (for them) but I suggest that it DOES work. The fact that every goofy proposal they put in DOES NOT pass, is proof that our system works!

With your help, we will show them that you do not just circumvent the process and BUY Alaskan wildlife policy. Again, thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joe Mattie, Board Member  
Alaska Trappers Association



South Central Chapter  
of  
ALASKA TRAPPERS ASSOCIATION  
P.O. Box 201175  
Anchorage, AK 99520-1175

February 25, 2000

Dear Representative Morgan,

On behalf of the South Central Chapter of the Alaska Trappers Association (SCCATA) I want you to know that I support your efforts to put wildlife issues off - limits to the ballot initiative process. The initiative process has proven to be no friend of the trapper in many other states. We don't have the financial resources to confront these professional protesters every time we turn around. We believe in leaving these things to the professionals and that the Board of Game process allows for ample public participation.

Sincerely,

Allen Dubord  
Chair SCCATA



## Alaska Outdoor Council

PO Box 73902  
 Fairbanks, AK 99707-3902  
 TEL/FAX: (907) 455-4AOC (4262)  
 e-mail: outdoor@polamet.com  
 web: www.alaskaoutdoorcouncil.org

### Board of Directors

*President*  
 Rod Fano  
 Palmer

*Secretary*  
 Dave  
 Kelleyhouse  
 Tok

*Interior  
 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Pres.*  
 Dick Bishop  
 Fairbanks

*Southeast  
 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Pres.*  
 Carl Rozier  
 Juneau

*Southcentral  
 3<sup>rd</sup> Vice Pres.*  
 Bill Iverson  
 Anchorage

*At Large*  
 Walt Sheridan  
 Juneau

*At Large*  
 Brett Huber  
 Soldotna

*Fund Trustee*  
 Byron Haley  
 Fairbanks

*Executive  
 Director*  
 Rose Vander-  
 Zande  
 Fairbanks

February 25, 2000

The Honorable Carl Morgan  
 State Capitol, Room 409  
 Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Morgan:

The Alaska Outdoor Council strongly supports HJR 56, your measure proposing a constitutional amendment to restrict use of the initiative process in wildlife management.

Alaska currently enjoys a very open, democratic, and accessible system for development of policies and regulations to manage wildlife. Based on our constitution (among the best in the Nation for wildlife conservation and allocation), Alaska's statutory framework, and the Board and Advisory Committee structure, there is so much opportunity for public involvement that it is consistently underutilized. Putting wildlife management off limits to the initiative process will not diminish meaningful public opportunity to participate in Alaska's rigorous and rational wildlife management decision-making process, in fact, it may encourage it.

The initiative process, by contrast, has been used in Alaska and elsewhere to avoid the critical professional and public review of wildlife management proposals. Instead, the initiative process has been abused by promoting "Ballot Box Biology," a technique that markets an emotionally pitched and simplistic action to promote a single interest. Through clever advertising paid for by the single interest supporters, "Ballot Box Biology" takes advantage of a misinformed public to win issues based on the "majority of the moment." Professional management and the values held by people with different interests are simply ignored or dismissed.

"Ballot Box Biology" is not the way to manage renewable resources. The Board and Advisory Committee system works, as evidenced by the fact that the Board of Game most often rejects "Ballot Box Biology" demands. We applaud your efforts to head off further abuse of the initiative process and attempts to "end-run" the outstanding Alaskan system for managing our incomparable wildlife. Again, thank you for your efforts and we look forward to working with you on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Dick Bishop  
 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President

**COALITION FOR THE ALASKAN WAY OF LIFE**  
**P.O. BOX 60954**  
**FAIRBANKS, AK 99706**

February 24, 2000

Representative Carl Morgan, Jr.  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Morgan:

RE: HJR 56

On behalf of our coalition, I want to thank you for your introduction of this important measure. Your resolution proposing a Constitutional Amendment to finally stop these animal rights groups from abusing Alaska's democratic game management system is an important first step in bringing sanity back to the process.

As you know, our group is extremely diverse. Beginning with the fight over Proposition 9 (Wolf Snaring) on the 1998 ballot, we were able to get a wide array of interests to come together to fight this common enemy. Urban and rural. Trapper and hunter. Village trappers and urban sport hunters. We have all agreed to put aside other differences and help fight this assault on our way of life. We are very appreciative of your efforts to solve the problem.

Do not hesitate to call on us. We stand with you in defense of Alaska's wildlife and peoples.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gabriel K. Sam" followed by a circular stamp or mark.

Gabriel K. Sam, Co-Chair  
Coalition for the Alaskan Way of Life

**S**cientific  
**M**anagement of  
**A**laska's  
**R**esource  
**T**reasures

**PO Box 244001  
Anchorage, AK  
99524-4001**

*Founded in 1996 to  
ensure protection of  
the trust resources  
through scientific  
management of  
Alaska's fish and  
wildlife.*

**Directors:**  
Patrick Wright  
279-1340  
Nick Steen  
745-2739  
Mark Keller  
357-2520  
Keith Bayha  
694-4123  
Frank DiPofi  
344-6698



February 26, 2000

Representative Carl Morgan, Jr.  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Dear Representative Moragan:

Re: HJR 56

On behalf of Scientific Management of Alaska's Resource Treasures (SMART), we want to thank you for your introduction of this important measure. Your resolution proposing a Constitutional Amendment to finally stop these extreme groups from abusing Alaska's democratic game management system is a significant first step in bringing sanity back to the process.

"Ballot Box Biology" is not the way to manage Alaska's natural resources! Alaska has an extensive open and public process by which to determine wildlife management policies and regulations. Alaskans should use this system rather than deciding these critical issues on the basis of emotion from 30-second sound bites.

Do not hesitate to call on us. We stand with you in defense of Alaska's wildlife in the reasonable and systematic management of time tested established methods.

Sincerely,

Patrick Wright  
S.M.A.R.T. President

Peter R. Buist  
Box 71561  
Fairbanks, AK 99707

February 23, 2000

Representative Carl Morgan  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182


Dear Carl,

I enjoyed meeting with you in McGrath in early February. **I wish to take this opportunity to personally thank you for your introduction of HJR 56.** As you know I have spent a lot of time over the past few years working to get hunters and trappers to come together on this important issue that is common to both urban and rural hunters and trappers. It is an IMMEDIATE threat and I am most appreciative that you have risen to the occasion.

In 1996 we lost "same day airborne" because we were unprepared. In 1998, we won the wolf snare initiative, but it was terribly expensive. I do not believe it is fair to ask Alaska's hunters and trappers to keep coming up with hundreds of thousands of dollars every two years to fight these big Outside groups. The worst of it is that even when we work hard, raise the money and spend it on a campaign, WE DON'T GAIN ANYTHING! All we get is the status quo. That is not fair to Alaskans!

This effort that you have started is very much appreciated. It will be a tough fight, but we will win. Again, thank you very much for "taking the initiative!"

Yours truly,


  
Peter R. Buist

Dear Rep. Morgan,

February, 26 2000

My name is Tom Lessard and I live in Chugiak. I am sending this note to voice my support of HJR 56. I think it is good to add wildlife issues to the list in the Constitution of items that are not allowed to be placed on ballot initiatives. The animal rights/antis have severely hobbled consumptive users around the country by selling their emotional campaigns to city folks largely ignorant of the issues. We as trappers and hunters simply do not have the financial resources to repeatedly defend ourselves against these attempts to hog-tie consumptive users. I think these decisions are best left to the professional biologists and the Board of Game after looking at all sides of the issues. They don't call it fish and game for nothing. If the antis want to have wildlife viewing areas all to themselves, they've already got it in the big National Parks and such.

Thank You for Your Consideration,



Tom Lessard  
21670 Snowflower Loop  
Chugiak, AK 99567

**Subject: In support of HJR 56**

**Date:** Thu, 17 Feb 2000 08:28:49 -0900

**From:** "Alex Whiting" <sheep@ptialaska.net>

**To:** <Representative\_Carl\_Morgan@legis.state.ak.us>

Dear Representative Morgan,

I want to thank you very much for introducing HJR 56. I have been waiting a long time trying to see such a bill introduced. I hope you are finding support for this bill and I will be writing Rep. Ogan, Rep. Bunde and Rep. Joule, all whom know my position when it comes to ballot box management, and express my support for this possible legislation. If there are any other legislators I should contact or any way I can help, please let me know.

Thank you very much and best wishes to you.

Sincerely,

Alex Whiting  
Kotzebue, AK

**Subject: HJR 56**

**Date: Thu, 24 Feb 2000 20:30:40 -0900**

**From: "Alan & Brenda Jones" <acjones@mosquitonet.com>**

**To: <Representative\_Carl\_Morgan@legis.state.ak.us>**

Thank you! Thank you! Thank you! Thank you for introducing this legislation to make Fish and Game matters exempt from Ballot Initiatives. I feel strongly that the ballot initiative process is a good idea. It's just that it has no place in matters best handled by biologists and other Fish and Game experts. At present, a few mis-informed people can tell lies to people in the major population centers like Anchorage and Fairbanks and use emotions to get enough signatures to get an initiative on the ballot. Fish and Game issues are often charged with emotion and it is relatively easy to gather enough signatures from greenies to get the initiative on the ballot. This adversley affects the people who know better and the people who rely on a particular resource. Again I thank you!

Alan C. Jones  
acjones@mosquitonet.com



6151 A Street • Anchorage, Alaska 99518 • Telephone (907) 561-2323 • Fax (907) 563-8467 or (907) 261-3299 • TIN #92-0048392

Date: 2-25-00

To: The Honorable Carl Morgan  
State Representative

Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol ( MS3100 )  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182

Good afternoon Mr. Morgan,

I would like to express my support for your House Resolution Bill HJR 56.

Thank you,

Jim E. Gallagher  
Direct 261-3237

"WE STAY REDI • ER THAN MOST GET"

Carol T. Torsen  
1558 Thufa Avenue  
Anchorage, AK 99507  
Ctorsen@alaska.net 907-344-5956

February 24, 2000

Representative Carl Morgan  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

VIA FAX: 1-907-465-2197

REFERENCE: IN SUPPORT OF HJR-56, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT  
ON WILDLIFE INITIATIVES

Dear Representative Morgan:

Having grown up on Spruce Island, near Kodiak, I know what it's like to be dependent upon wildlife resources for food. I feel that it's extremely important that we utilize all means to protect wildlife and wild areas from special interest groups outside Alaska in order to protect future generations' use of those wildlife resources. HJR-56 will protect those wildlife resources by preventing these special interest groups from using the initiative process to make wildlife policy in Alaska, policy that could be very detrimental to Alaska's subsistence users.

It has been proven over the years that Alaska's system of wildlife management has worked very well. ADF&G, along with the Board of Game and the state legislature, has ensured preservation of Alaska's wildlife for everyone to enjoy. ADF&G biologists have been trained in sound scientific methods and the professional management of Alaska's wildlife resources, which have served Alaska's people well. We do not need "Ballot Box Biology" as advocated by animal rights groups.

We should not have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to defend our traditional hunting and trapping rights at the ballot box every few years. HJR-56 would ensure that wildlife issues could no longer be a part of the initiative process, and therefore protected from the whims of animal rights groups.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment in favor of HJR-56.

Sincerely,



Carol Torsen

# Alaska State Legislature

SSION  
ite Capitol Building, Suite 409  
eau, Alaska 99801-1182  
one: 907-465-4527  
x: 907-465-2197  
ll Free: 800-491-4527  
mail: Representative\_Carl\_Morgan@legis.state.ak.us

TERIM  
). Box 243  
iak, Alaska 99557  
one: 907-675-4413



MEMBER  
Community & Regional Affairs Committee  
Health, Education & Social Services Committee  
House Resources Committee  
Special Committee on Fisheries

## Representative Carl M. Morgan, Jr. District 36

### SPONSOR STATEMENT HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 56 Constitutional Amendment Wildlife Initiative Process

This legislation removes wildlife management from the ballot initiative process in Alaska. The framers of our Constitution restricted the ballot initiative process in Article XI, Section 7 of the Alaska Constitution. Section 7 exempts certain subjects from the ballot and referendum process. I believe wildlife management is an appropriate subject for exemption.

Our wildlife interests are best managed in Alaska by Alaskans. Removing wildlife from the ballot and referendum process will ensure that wildlife decisions are made in Alaska based on sound science, prudent management, and in an open and fair process. The alternative is a repeat of the last two elections where special interest groups from the Lower 48, using emotion and political agendas, attacked Alaska's outstanding wildlife management system.

Alaska is not alone in this fight. In 1998, the citizens of Utah and Minnesota passed constitutional amendments to protect wildlife management and hunting in their states. Presently, there are constitutional amendments to protect wildlife management and traditional wildlife uses working their way through the state legislatures of Arizona, Idaho and North Dakota.

Legislative counsel has advised that the Legislature possesses the power to amend the Alaska Constitution subject to a vote of the people, but does not have the power to make sweeping revisions that radically alter the powers of governmental branches. Counsel believes HJR 56 amounts to an amendment of the Constitution, not a revision, and within the power of the Legislature.

of a borough or city of the first class shall provide the procedure for the preparation and adoption or rejection of the charter. All charters, or parts or amendments of charters, shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the borough or city, and shall become effective if approved by a majority of those who vote on the specific question.

**SECTION 10. EXTENDED HOME RULE.** The legislature may extend home rule to other boroughs and cities.

**SECTION 11. HOME RULE POWERS.** A home rule borough or city may exercise all legislative powers not prohibited by law or by charter.

**SECTION 12. BOUNDARIES.** A local boundary commission or board shall be established by law in the executive branch of the state government. The commission or board may consider any proposed local government boundary change. It may present proposed changes to the legislature during the first ten days of any regular session. The change shall become effective forty-five days after presentation or at the end of the session, whichever is earlier, unless disapproved by a resolution concurred in by a majority of the members of each house. The commission or board, subject to law, may establish procedures whereby boundaries may be adjusted by local action.

**SECTION 13. AGREEMENTS; TRANSFER OF POWERS.** Agreements, including those for cooperative or joint administration of any functions or powers, may be made by any local government with any other local government, with the State, or with the United States, unless otherwise provided by law or charter. A city may transfer to the borough in which it is located any of its powers or functions unless prohibited by law or charter, and may in like manner revoke the transfer.

**SECTION 14. LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY.** An agency shall be established by law in the executive branch of the state government to advise and assist local governments. It shall review their activities, collect and publish local government information, and perform other duties prescribed by law.

**SECTION 15. SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICTS.** Special service districts existing at the time a borough is organized shall be integrated with the government of the borough as provided by law.

## ARTICLE XI. INITIATIVE, REFERENDUM, AND RECALL.

**SECTION 1. INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.** The people may propose and enact laws by the initiative, and approve or reject acts of the legislature by the referendum.

**SECTION 2. APPLICATION.** An initiative or referendum is proposed by an application containing the bill to be initiated or the act to be referred. The application shall be signed by not less than one hundred qualified voters as sponsors, and shall be filed with the lieutenant governor. If he finds it in proper form he shall so certify. Denial of certification shall be subject to judicial review.

**SECTION 3. PETITION.** After certification of the application, a petition containing a summary of the subject matter shall be prepared by the lieutenant governor for circulation by the sponsors. If signed by qualified voters, equal in number to ten per cent of those who voted in the preceding general election and resident in at least two-thirds of the election districts of the State, it may be filed with the lieutenant governor.

**SECTION 4. INITIATIVE ELECTION.** An initiative petition may be filed at any time. The lieutenant governor shall prepare a ballot title

and proposition summarizing the proposed law, and shall place them on the ballot for the first statewide election held more than one hundred-twenty days after adjournment of the legislative session following the filing. If, before the election, substantially the same measure has been enacted, the petition is void.

**SECTION 5. REFERENDUM ELECTION.** A referendum petition may be filed only within ninety days after adjournment of the legislative session at which the act was passed. The lieutenant governor shall prepare a ballot title and proposition summarizing the act and shall place them on the ballot for the first statewide election held more than one hundred-eighty days after adjournment of that session.

**SECTION 6. ENACTMENT.** If a majority of the votes cast on the proposition favor its adoption, the initiated measure is enacted. If a majority of the votes cast on the proposition favor the rejection of an act referred, it is rejected. The lieutenant governor shall certify the election returns. An initiated law becomes effective ninety days after certification, is not subject to veto, and may not be repealed by the legislature within two years of its effective date. It may be amended at any time. An act rejected by referendum is void thirty days after certification. Additional procedures for the initiative and referendum may be prescribed by law.

**SECTION 7. RESTRICTIONS.** The initiative shall not be used to dedicate revenues, make or repeal appropriations, create courts, define the jurisdiction of courts or prescribe their rules, or enact local or special legislation. The referendum shall not be applied to dedications of revenue, to appropriations, to local or special legislation, or to laws necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety.

**SECTION 8. RECALL.** All elected public officials in the State, except judicial officers, are subject to recall by the voters of the State or political

subdivision from which elected. Procedures and grounds for recall shall be prescribed by the legislature.

## ARTICLE XII. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

**SECTION 1. STATE BOUNDARIES.** The State of Alaska shall consist of all the territory, together with the territorial waters appurtenant thereto, included in the Territory of Alaska upon the date of ratification of this constitution by the people of Alaska.

**SECTION 2. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS.** The State and its political subdivisions may cooperate with the United States and its territories, and with other states and their political subdivisions on matters of common interest. The respective legislative bodies may make appropriations for this purpose.

**SECTION 3. OFFICE OF PROFIT.** Service in the armed forces of the United States or of the State is not an office or position of profit as the term is used in this constitution.

**SECTION 4. DISQUALIFICATION FOR DISLOYALTY.** No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party or organization or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the United States or of the State shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under this constitution.

**SECTION 5. OATH OF OFFICE.** All public officers, before entering upon the duties of their offices, shall take and subscribe to the following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Alaska, and that I will faithfully discharge my duties as . . . . . to the best

**UTAH CONSTITUTION 2/3<sup>RDS</sup> AMENDMENT LANGUAGE**

**PASSED NOVEMBER 1998;**

**ARTICLE VI, SECTION 1 [Power vested in Senate, House and People]**

**In the people of the State of Utah, as hereinafter stated:**

The legal voters or such fractional part thereof, of the State of Utah as may be provided by the law, under such conditions and in such manner and within such time as may be provided by law, may initiate any desired legislation and cause the same to be submitted to the a vote of the people for approval or rejection, or may require any law passed by the Legislature (except those laws pass by a two thirds vote of the members elected to each house of the legislature) to be submitted to the voters of the State before such laws shall take effect. **Legislation initiated to allow, limit, or prohibit the taking of wildlife or the season for or method of taking wildlife shall be adopted upon approval of two-thirds of those voting.**

**ARIZONA PROPOSED WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AMENDMENT**

**To be voted on November of 2000:**

**This State shall conserve and manage wildlife in public trust for the people using sound scientific and biological principles and no law or administrative rule may permit the management of wildlife that will reduce the population of any species below a level that is essential to its continued health and existence. An Initiative or Referendum regarding the conservation or management of wildlife that permits, limits, or prohibits the taking of wildlife or the methods or seasons thereof shall not become law unless approved by at least two-thirds of the votes cast on the proposition.**

**HJR**

**59**

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
2000 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HJR 59

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: Support Wildlife + Sport Fish Restoration Act  
Sponsor: House Resources Committee  
Requester: H-RCS

Dept. Affected \_\_\_\_\_  
BRU \_\_\_\_\_  
Component \_\_\_\_\_  
Component Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_

Expenditures/Revenues		(Thousands of Dollars)					
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	
Personal Services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Travel							
Contractual							
Supplies							
Equipment							
Land & Structures							
Grants & Claims							
Miscellaneous							
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE		(Thousands of Dollars)					
1002 Federal Receipts							
1003 GF Match							
1004 GF							
1005 GF/Program Receipts							
1037 GF/Mental Health							
1091 Designated Program Receipts							
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	

Estimate of any current year (FY98) cost: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITIONS							
Full-time							
Part-time							
Temporary							

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

No fiscal impact

Prepared by Lorali Meier, H-Resources Aide  
Lorali Meier

Phone 465-3715  
Phone \_\_\_\_\_  
Date 3-20-00

**U.S. House of Representatives**  
**Committee on Resources**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

March 14, 2000

**MAR 20 2000**

Representative Beverly Masek  
State Capitol, Room 128  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182

Dear Representative Masek:

Thank you for supporting my bill, H.R. 3671, the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000. It is my intent to rectify the abuses of the Pittman-Robertson and the Dingell-Johnson Acts. I am committed, with the bi-partisan coalition behind my bill, to ensuring that money collected from sportsmen and sportswomen is not spent wastefully or in ways that are not authorized by law.

H.R. 3671 will benefit Alaskans as well as other sportsmen and women nationwide who pay federal excise taxes on hunting and fishing equipment. This bill will ensure that the money collected will be passed on to the states to be used for on-the-ground fish and wildlife restoration projects.

I am certain that by introducing House Joint Resolution 59, you have aided in the passage of my bill. Again, thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

  
DON YOUNG

# Alaska State Legislature

## House Resources Committee

Co-Chair Beverly Masek  
(907) 465-3715  
FAX (907) 465-4822  
Capitol Building, Room 124  
Juneau, Alaska 99801



Co-Chair Bill Hudson  
(907) 465-6890  
FAX (907) 465-2273  
Committee Meetings  
M/W/F 1 - 3 p.m.

Members: Vice Chair John Cowdery, Representatives: Ramona Barnes, John Harris, Carl Morgan, Jim Whitaker, Reggie Joule, and Mary Kapsner

### SPONSOR STATEMENT

#### **House Joint Resolution 59 "Supporting the passage by the United States Congress of H.R. 3671, the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000."**

HJR 59 demonstrates the Legislature's support for proper use and management of money used to administer the Pittman-Robertson, and Dingell-Johnson Trust Funds.

The Dingell-Johnson Trust Fund was established in 1950. This fund levies a 10% tax on sport-fishing equipment, motor boat fuel, and some boat imports. The Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund, established in 1938, levies an 11% excise tax on sporting arms, ammunition, and other equipment and a 10% tax on handguns. Both acts mandate that the money generated by these taxes be reapportioned back to the states in the form of grants for programs that "benefit fish and wildlife."

In 1999 Congressman Don Young requested the General Accounting Office to audit the Pittman-Robertson administrative fund. Uncovered was waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. Instances include expensive foreign travel junkets and large bonuses for U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) employees. One career USFWS employee testified before the House Resources Committee that he was pressured to approve hand-outs of Pittman-Robertson money to so-called "animal rights" groups who are actively working to destroy hunting.

Last year, about 15% of Alaskans purchased hunting licenses, and about 30% purchased sport-fishing licenses. This minority deserves the benefits of the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Trust Funds to protect their rights and interests.

FVI - Eddie

Author: Jim Manown at ILA  
 Date: 02/17/2000 8:45 AM  
 Priority: Normal

TO: Mail List - #All NRA Employees at NRA-HUB, #Admin Services at NRA04,  
 Mail List - #Community Services Programs at NRA07, David Brant at NRAHQ,  
 #Competitions at NRA05, #Development at NRA05, Mail List - #Ed & Train at NRA07,  
 #Executive Office at NRA04, Mail List - #Field Operations at NRA07,  
 Tony Ansley at NRAHQ, Tom Audetat at NRAHQ, Marvin Blevins at NRAHQ,  
 David Bundesen at NRAHQ, Donald G. Chilcote at NRAHQ, Gayle Cook at NRAHQ,  
 John Crone at NRAHQ, Richard D'Alauro at NRAHQ, Darren DeLong at NRAHQ,  
 Fred Edgecomb at NRAHQ, Dennis Eggors at NRAHQ, Phil Gray at NRAHQ,  
 Kevin Greb at NRAHQ, Dean Hall at NRAHQ, Al Hammond at NRAHQ, Mike Huber at NRAHQ,  
 Brian Hyder at NRAHQ, Frank Ingrassia at NRAHQ, Todd Johnson at NRAHQ,  
 Dick Kingsafer at NRAHQ, Mike Krei at NRAHQ, Wil Lederer at NRAHQ, David Lee at NRAHQ,  
 Joe Lorsung at NRAHQ, J.P. Nelson at NRAHQ, Carl Provost at NRAHQ,  
 Bill Rawson at NRAHQ, Jay Rusnock at NRAHQ, Larry Tatom at NRAHQ, Rex Thomas at NRAHQ,  
 Tom Ulik at NRAHQ, Kelly Umenhofer at NRAHQ, Janey Wineinger at NRAHQ,  
 #Financial Services at NRA06, #General Counsel at NRA05, #General Ops - Admin at NRA04,  
 #Human Resources at NRA04, #ILA (All Users) at ILA, #Information Services at NRA04,  
 #Law Enforcement at NRA05, #Marketing & Data Analysis at NRA04, #Membership at NRA04,  
 Mail List - #Museum at NRA07, #Publications at NRA03, #Purchasing at NRA06,  
 #Secretary's Office at NRA05, #Treasurer Office at NRA04, #Welcome Center at NRA04,  
 #NRA Board Members at NRAHQ

Subject: NRA News Release on Pittman-Robertson

The following news release is being distributed to the national news media.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
 February 17, 2000

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:  
 Public Affairs, (703) 267-3820

NRA VOICES SUPPORT FOR HR 3671

(WASHINGTON, DC) -- James Jay Baker, chief lobbyist for the National Rifle Association, today expressed the organization's strong support for H.R. 3671. The Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000 has been introduced by Rep. Don Young (R-AK), Chairman of the House Resources Committee, to protect the interests of sportsmen and address on-going abuse and mismanagement of money used to administer the Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund.

In 1999, at Rep. Young's request, the General Accounting Office audited the Pittman-Robertson administrative fund and uncovered waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement involving tens of millions of sportsmen's tax dollars. Instances include expensive foreign travel junkets and large bonuses for U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) employees. One career USFWS employee testified before the House Resources Committee that he was pressured to approve hand-outs of Pittman-Robertson money to so-called "animal rights" groups who are actively working to destroy hunting. Even worse, another USFWS employee testified that she was directed by high-level Clinton-Gore bureaucrats to destroy computer records that could have shed light on these abuses and on those responsible.

"The administrative abuses uncovered by Representative Young constitute a fundamental breach of trust between America's sportsmen and their government, if not outright illegality," said Baker. "I want to thank him for introducing this important legislation and for his diligence on this issue. Opening day of hunting seasons in America this past year saw nearly twelve million men, women, and children take to the nation's farms, fields, hills, and mountains in active participation in a heritage that is alive and well. The Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund deserves much of the credit for hunting's