

HOUSE/SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES - 1967-1982 2776

private sector just has too heavy a burden to bear in this case and its my opinion that they can't be competitive. That would place a greater burden on the State with that type of arrangement... relationship with the private sector. I have heard people that have observed this aircraft indicate that they'd come in at say 85 knots on a lake and can in something less than a minute, fill their capacity for water - about 3,500 gallons - and they're off attacking a fire. They don't have an access problem to the fire since they're airborne - they can discharge and turn around. And, I've not read this document, but I did open it to a page that talked about a fire in the Interior of Alaska which utilized the aircraft there, the CL-215's, utilized Brown Lake (?) as a source of water, and that they had a five minute turn-around time from water source. And, in their evaluation, they're talking...the people that are talking in this memo - Dale Anderegg, Forest Technician III, Acting Fire Boss on this particular fire, Kenai Peninsula Area Office...it released... "The Cl-215 was the ultimate fire suppression tool for this fire and more than likely saved more acres from burning...". Didn't require the great personnel involvement.

END OF TAPE # 19, SIDE 2

May 8, 1980 (FCC-80 on HB 60 Tape No. 20, Side 1 001[004]-501[464])

MONTGOMERY - For information which gives us what we paid for fire suppression air last year? Did we use planes last year to fight fires?

GROGAN - Mr. Chairman, that's correct, we did.

MONTGOMERY - Did we use this type of plane?

GROGAN - Only to the extent that it was a demonstration. Now the state may have paid perhaps hangaring charges and fuel and things like this. I could check into that but I don't have that information.

MONTGOMERY - I don't know anything about that particular plane except what I've heard, and I'm not an expert in this field, but I am concerned about the State of Alaska going into the aircraft business. And I question...and if statistics could prove otherwise, well I would certainly back off, but it seems like we would have to compare our price of fighting fire where we lease as what it will cost us if we buy two airplanes. The age of the airplane, do we know the age of these two planes? Or the number of total hours on them?

GROGAN - I don't know but I'm sure I could get that information.

MONTGOMERY - Who is the option with? Do we know that?

GROGAN - It's with the Canadair Company.

MONTGOMERY - With the company itself, do we have a signed option with them?

GROGAN - That's my understanding.

HOHMAN - See, we're at a loss because we don't have any administration people here to respond to your questions, or my questions.

MONTGOMERY - And then one other statement. You mentioned earlier who . . . you said you had . . . there was several people supported this type of plane. Do we have documentation of people supporting it?

GROGAN - (Inaudible) from the department and people actually in the field last year (inaudible) conducting a test, they were just trying to evaluate the plane in an actual fire suppression situation.

MONTGOMERY - Then I guess I would be interested, very interested, in . . . is there lease equipment available? In other words, the purchase is not the only thing. The purchase is a small part of it, and the price may be attractive but if we don't know the age of the plane, number of hours since major overhaul--the price may appear good, but what will the maintenance and operation be? I'm a little suspicious of that. I think that the power plant on those are the same things that are used on the DC-6, the old Pratt & Whitney R-2800 or something like that. I would be a little suspicious of that until I checked to see if parts were available because I think maintenance is going to be a shocker. And then my . . . Another question I haven't heard is the insurance. I think the insurance rates is something the State would have to look at very carefully.

And I don't have a preconceived notion, but I, and I will stand to be convinced, but I think those questions that I asked and probably that many more it would take to satisfy me before I could recommend purchase. I just . . . the other thing, how many hours per year would the State anticipate using that equipment?

GROGAN - Mr. Chairman, based on the prior experience, that's a very difficult thing to do, and I think the idea of the language that's in the bill now was to simply put funding in there to initiate a contract and leave that open depending upon the fire season, because it's a highly variable thing.

MONTGOMERY - But if we purchase it, then it's our plane and it's the same as the xerox machine out in the hall. If we can't afford to buy that machine out in the hall if we're only going to xerox eight letters a day, you know. So the point is, the utilization factor of especially a technical piece of equipment that's equipped basically for fire fighting, which this is, will have a relatively short period of use. And if that period is too short, and those expenses which I brought up are high, I question the viability of buying rather than considering leasing. Has anyone looked to see if there are other types of planes in the State to lease? Because we're talking about a major purchase when you're talking about this type of purchase. Maintenance and operation can be a tremendous problem with an airplane. So I . . . it bothers me, I'm very concerned about it. Very concerned.

HOHMAN - I know you haven't flown, but I understand that you've had some experience with the

MONTGOMERY - No, these planes?

HOHMAN - No, with big airplanes.

MONTGOMERY - I wouldn't want to brag about that. (Laughter)

Someone else paid the repair bill on that over in Europe and I wasn't worried about maintenance and operation. (Laughter) That was someone else's responsibility.

HOHMAN - My point is that you're not a greenhorn in these areas.

MONTGOMERY - No, but I'm really concerned in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, about the buying of something that's this expensive with those points that I mentioned. I'm really concerned about that because we could have a pig in a poke and the first thing that usually happens when you buy a plane, and you buy it for one specialized thing, and then you don't have very many fires that year but you've still got the equipment, you're paying the insurance, you've got the upkeep, you've got maintenance, you've got somebody that's going to be able to fly it, and you're going to start to use it for something else, you're going to think about that. And that could be bad, unless you have a real need for it.

HOHMAN - In that regard, had the administration not looked into other uses for the aircraft?

GROGAN - I think again, Mr. Chairman, this report is supposed to be an evaluation where they considered leasing, buying and various types of aircraft and everything else. I can only assume, since they made the request in the first place, that they evaluated all the considerations and they chose this one because it seemed to be the best way to go.

MONTGOMERY - Mr. Chairman, who did the evaluation?

GROGAN - The Department of Natural Resources.

MEEKINS - Ted Smith's division?

GROGAN - Right.

MEEKINS - Mr. Chairman.

HOHMAN - Wasn't there testimony earlier before the committee that California was interested in leasing this equipment?

GROGAN - Right.

HOHMAN - That's what I meant, alternative uses for the airplane.

GROGAN - They were interested in possibly leasing these aircraft from the state, assuming the state owned them, during the winter which is their fire season in Southern California. I did hear that they have a proposal right now in the state Senate to purchase some

of these aircraft themselves, so if that should come to pass perhaps they wouldn't be interested. Again, as far as I'm concerned this is just hearsay; it's not backed up with any documentation.

HOHMAN - But there has been some discussion between the two state governments, the people here in Natural Resources (inaudible).

GROGAN - Right, apparently so.

HOHMAN - And then isn't there another use other than fire suppression that these aircraft, with additional accessories, might be used?

GROGAN - I think that's mentioned in here. It's not really well detailed. As I recall but other departments expressed interest in using the airplanes.

HOHMAN - And that's in pollution control. One of the other uses is pollution control?

GROGAN - I can't recall. The aircraft, as I understand it, would be available for a wide variety of uses inasmuch as it is capable of carrying men or machinery, or, you know, equipment, not just water. So it could be used for . . .

MEEKINS - Can it scoop down and pick up equipment? (laughter)

HOHMAN - Money is always a burning cash problem. (laughter)

MEEKINS - How about oil on the North Slope?

HOHMAN - My point is that the administration has been actively pursuing, with the State of California, sort of a joint venture thing, or leasing the aircraft in the fire suppression use, and they've been looking at other uses for the aircraft other than fire suppression. Whether it's pollution control and I don't know what else, those two just stuck in my mind, and what I'm afraid of is that we're going to sit here and make a decision that may preclude the administration from operating in some of these other areas, when they have been pursuing, right? the same kinds of questions that Representative Montgomery is asking--valid questions--they've been pursuing, and they have done some research. Senator Kerttula.

KERTTULA - Mr. Chairman, like Joe, in my years I had equipment on fire lease from 1952 BLM to 1960; I fought in a lot of fires. I had at least one Cat at all times available for BLM--it was on the register--even this one year in the scenic and populated and well forested--heavily forested--the good forested areas--of which we had very few, a major fire with old PBY equipment using pumpers has the distinct chance and far greater opportunity of getting out of control than with this equipment. Private enterprise can bring in some competitive price, and equipment can really move in and do it. You and I agree. But if in fact this is remote or conjecture and can't happen, or isn't apt to happen, the loss or the cost to the state may not be even excessive cost for the use of this

equipment. It may be those horrible losses that you might be able to predict by virtue of the fact of not having the equipment, and that really bothers me; and again, I can tell you the difference. I've only been told about these pieces of equipment; I haven't seen them, but I've had it explained to me by a flyer, and they come in and scoop and dive, dump and are back at it again. I'd worry about a log injection or something, but that's what they do. Of course this pumping on and going over there and dumping, I'll tell you, you might . . . at first, an initial . . . and you know attack on a fire it can get into it is the one where you save the dollars when you save everything. And if you don't get in there fast enough and quick enough, you know, any other alternatives may be disastrous. I'm not trying to be a scare tactic, but I do think that that's one of the things that we ought to think about. And I, as I said, I was at it for eight years. And I've never mentioned this or brought it in but it's a fact. And I think that we ought to be concerned with that too which has never come up in this part of the debate as part of the discussions on the Senate side at least when we went through this before. And I know it was a House proposal originally, or thought it was. We had it before us too, but . . .

HOHMAN - I think I've misrepresented the capacity of the airplane.

KERTTULA - Won't pick up that much tonnage?

HOHMAN - It won't pick up that much. It'll pick up 1500 gallons according to this one report: "This twin engine amphibious plane is designed to scoop 1500 gallons of water out of lakes or oceans and

drop it on fires, extinguishing flames on 18,000 square foot area every three minutes." And it goes on. This was written by someone in Malibu, California area. It points out that, had one or more CL-215's been available to the city in October, 1978, several homes destroyed by the fire might have been saved. (unidentified voice--inaudible comment)

HOHMAN - That's yours?

GROGAN - Well, yea, it's mine.

HOHMAN - Give it back to (inaudible)

HOHMAN - What I'd like to suggest to the committee, I see that Mr. Reinwand and Dr. Lehr are back again, is it 7:30 already:

(Unidentified voice - yea.)

HOHMAN - Is that we have a motion before us to delete the language that's in the marked up . . .

(Unidentified voice - In the draft, not the final.)

HOHMAN - Whatever.

(Unidentified voice - Yea, we know what you're talking about.)

HOHMAN - Okay, and that directs toward the purchase of the

aircraft. I wonder if a compromise might not be effected by adopting the more recent version--the language which gives the Administration the option, I think, as I understand it, to either go into purchase or to go into whatever other way of handling fire suppression.

KERTTULA - The first bill I ever carried on the floor of the House twenty years ago was the fire suppression bill, \$300,000.

HOHMAN - The first one I ever carried was a miscellaneous claims bill, \$15.00 checks.

MEEKINS - Mr. Chairman, I think the House members are interested in hearing from the administration in this area.

HOHMAN - Fine, lets...we have, I don't know how to background you, but we have this language adopted by the committee, these two sections here. And what they do is point you in the direction of purchasing aircraft for fire suppression. We have other language which appears . . . Do we have another copy of this bill? It's on page 20, section 152, which appropriates the same amount of money in this one section that's appropriated in the two that you have before you. And it gives the administration discretion. The green booklet there I think may have come from the administration--it talks about the effectiveness of the CL-215 and describes the use of those aircraft on a demonstration basis last year, I believe, in² the Delta fires and so forth. We're wondering about the aircraft, the administration's opinion on, and I might point out, we don't want to

...if there is any compromise we don't want to defer the question, we'd like to address it tonight.

REINWAND - I can understand that. I know the committee's worked hard and diligently over this bill. But, Mr. Chairman, in all candor, there have been some very serious questions raised about the efficacy of this appropriation, and until I have an opportunity to discuss those further with the Governor, I would request that the committee not act on this appropriation and take it from this bill. And one possible option to consider as Mr. Lehr presented earlier in the evening, it be taken up again with the administration's bill. I think it would be inappropriate to say anything more on the issue at this point. I would leave Mr. Lehr here to answer any technical questions. Thank you.

HOHMAN - So, we're back to the compromise that was suggested then. (unidentified laughter by members of the committee) That's the speech there that we could have received at 7:30 (more laughter) or at 5:00, you know.

MEEKINS - Could we have an "at ease"?

HOHMAN - We'll stand at ease.

HOHMAN - Call the meeting back to order.

MEEKINS - Question.

HOHMAN - On your motion?

MEEKINS - Yes.

HOHMAN - To delete? Or do you want to withdraw your motion?

MEEKINS - Uh, what is the question? The question is to delete, right. O.K., uh, yes, let's vote on it.

HOHMAN - O.K. The question before us, as I understand it, is to delete the language that is here...(paper shuffle).

MEEKINS - Right, thats correct.

(muffled voices...? These two...)

KERTTULA - Thank you very much. I'd like to look at it again. That's the detailed one?

HOHMAN - Uh huh.

KERTTULA - Yes.

MEEKINS - Delete from this bill. This appropriation.

HOHMAN - All in favor.... Are you ready for the question?² I object if its a unanimous consent. All in favor of the deletion motion signify by raising your right hand. All opposed, same sign. So,

the motion fails. I would move for the deletion of that language and the substitution thereof of the language in section 152 in this form.

MEEKINS - O.K., we know what it is.

HOHMAN - The sum of \$805,000, and so forth. The question is called for. Ask unanimous consent.

DUNCAN - Object.

MONTGOMERY - Object.

MEEKINS - Object.

HOHMAN - Question is...all in favor signify by raising your right hand. All opposed, same sign. The motion fails.

KERTTULA - Is there any other middle ground Mr. Chairman?

HOHMAN - I don't know.

MEEKINS - Adjournment.

HOHMAN - Adjournment...(chuckle). Uh, I've signed the report. Is anyone else interested in signing the report?

MONTGOMERY - You three sign it over there and we'll fill out the top type (laughter) Go Head. (laughter)

KERTTULA - I'd like to sign it and be done with it. Unless there is some...(one word inaudible)....

MEEKINS - Mr. Chairman?

HOHMAN - Representative Meekins.

MEEKINS - I'm really not trying to be obstructive, but I'd be interested in an adjournment motion - if anybody made one.

HOHMAN - Uh huh. We have...we have, uh...(inaudible)...Senator Hackney...(inaudible)...?

KERTTULA - (...one word inaudible...) Isn't...its not an intent, that last motion that was defeated? (shuffled papers to find bill) It distinctly is not this bill. Looks like almost a halfway house.

HOHMAN - The Senate has signed the report and is ready to conclude its business on this bill. Representative Meekins?

MEEKINS - I move we adjourn.

HOHMAN - We stand in adjournment.

11/11/91
tape # 20
side 1
+12 [360] - 501 [460]
MEEKINS - Meeting come to order.

HOHMAN - Farmers come out the woodwork, huh?

MEEKINS - Ya. (laughter)

KERTTULA - Looking for my spectacles.

HOHMAN - So you can make a spectacle of yourself? (laughter)

MEEKINS - O.K. Where are we? We have, uh...on the House side we had two issues that we are still interested in resolving, and have been asked to do so by our Speaker and various others in the House majority caucus and, uh... I think what we'd like to try to do is see if we can reach some accomodation on those two issues. And the issues that are the request to fit into the budget with Legislative Intent that no appropriations to the Council shall be expended without approval of the majority of the Council. Did I say that right? And, also the deletion of the \$805,000, which is in two appropriations - \$100,000 and \$705,000. Uh, deletion of those two appropriations and that language.

HOHMAN - Let me...just to be sure that I understand. The language thats in there is language that was proposed by the House side. The language that expresses the Administration's position on that particular project. So far as we know, the Administration², uh....

MEEKINS - That language was worked out by representatives of DNR and Bob Grogan, and moved by the House side so you are essentially correct.

HOHMAN - Let me just say it.... That reflects the Administration's viewpoint in that particular area - so far as we can determine. Its a matter of conjecture because they have refused to set at the end of the table, as recently as yesterday, to clarify, or to answer questions on the project.

MEEKINS - There has been some speculation - don't know if I should say this on the record, but, uh - if you look at this the day today, and you take seventeen days from it you get to the very last day of this month, which is right before the Labor Day weekend. So, if you miss today on this budget and pick it up on Monday, you end up with the veto override day as June 3. It might be a lot tougher to be here June 3 than it would be the 29th or so of May.

KERTTULA - Sure.

MEEKINS - I've heard some speculation on that, but I don't know. Speculation...underlying....

HOHMAN - Mr. Chairman, so much for the second suggestion that's submitted. The first suggestion is a meaningless suggestion, since I think that whoever is pushing it from your side, if they were aware of Council actions, its an unnecessary move. Uh...

MEEKINS - Mr. Chairman, that point has been made. Or, I'm the Chairman, wait a minute...Senator.

HOHMAN - I mean, its a continuation of some kind of crazy mental machinations in the part of your...or aberrations...in the part of someone on the House side. And I would like to point out that what you're doing is taking action which is going to restrict - this "eating on ourselves" kind of activity - is going to restrict the operations of the Budget and Audit Committee, the Finance Commission as well as Legislative Affairs and Council. So, uh, with that in mind, you make your motions...because I'm telling you...that its upsetting to me to spend my time and energy in these "no production" kinds of activities...in these things that feed the public's image of the Legislature as a "play-around" type group. And, I'm going to devote some energy to see that there's equal treatment as we go from both of the two branches of this Legislature. Those controlled by the Council on the one side, and those controlled by the Budget and Audit Committee on the other. You make the motions that you think are appropriate now and I'll ask for unanimous consent.

MEEKINS - I move that we delete the appropriation for \$705,000 and its attendant language in regard to the purchase of the CL-215's, and delete the \$100,000 for the operation and maintenance, and its attendant language.

HOHMAN - Ask unanimous consent.

MEEKINS - Is there objection? (gavel) Motion carries. Stand at
ease.

DUNCAN - Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Free Conference
Committee adjourn.

MEEKINS - Is there an objection?

HOHMAN - What's implied in that now? Sign the report? I've lost
the report Mr. Chairman.

MEEKINS - Don't do that. (laughter)

HOHMAN - Oh, here it is. Ask unanimous consent.
(gavel)

END OF TAPE NO. 20

(Side 1)