

Meeting Summary

ALASKA WATER RESOURCES BOARD Juneau, Alaska

April 14, 15, 16, 1982

The spring meeting of the Alaska Water Resources Board was held in Courtroom A of the Courthouse in Juneau, Alaska, and was called to order at 1:15 p.m., April 14, 1982, by Chairman Sims.

Members of the Board in attendance were:

Richard Sims, Chairman, Kodiak
Peg Tileston, Anchorage
Wayne Westberg, Anchorage
David Vanderbrink, Homer

Chairman Sims on behalf of all the Board members thanked those persons responsible for setting up the trip to Noranda earlier in the day. Sims said the trip had been most enlightening and asked that a thank you letter be sent to Noranda.

A welcome to Mohan Nayudu, who was recently appointed chief of the Water Section of the Department of Natural Resources, was extended by Chairman Sims.

Chairman Sims indicated that approximately 25 Canadian Water Board members were expected to be attending the meetings but had been delayed in their travels.

Sims announced that in response to the proposed budget cuts, it has been proposed that funding for the Alaska Water Resources Board be deleted. He indicated that John Katz and Jack Sedwick would elaborate on this later in the meeting.

Minutes

MOTION - by Tileston, seconded by Vanderbrink, to approve the minutes of the July 1981 meeting in Sitka, Alaska.

There being no objection, it was so order.

Chairman Sims indicated that the minutes of the Soldotna meeting were only half completed at this time and review and approval would be done upon their completion.

Anchorage Bowl Related Water Problems

Peg Tileston and Wayne Westberg of the Subcommittee on Anchorage Bowl Related Water Problems reported that they had met with Mr. Smith, manager of municipal water and sewer utilities, and John Harshman, who is over all municipal utilities. The meeting consisted of a review of their programs, questioning by Water Board members of future plans, and discussion of development and efficient management of available water sources in the Anchorage Bowl. The adjudication of Ship Creek was also discussed and it was reported that John Harshman may pursue that a little more aggressively. Water problems in Eagle River and possible solutions were reviewed. One thing that should be helpful in raising people's water conservation consciousness, Tileston said, is that, because of a dredging operation in Ship Creek that will take place in June and July, which are high water use times in Anchorage, a water conservation campaign has been started by the city. Tileston reported that Brent Petrie has been appointed to the Water and Sewer Utility Commission in Anchorage.

The Subcommittee briefly discussed basinwide adjudication of Ship Creek. There is still no quantification out of Elmendorf, Westberg said, and related that Fred Boness had made the point that according to current status of the law, the State could take the stand that all the water belongs to the State and, if they wanted to appropriate an amount of water, the onus would be on the military to quantify their water needs, at which time the State could determine if that would exceed the available amount. Westberg said this becomes more meaningful all the time when the city is actively pursuing a \$150 million bond issue for an alternate source. Richard Sims suggested that since this has come up so many times that the Board attempt to determine the State's position on Ship Creek from the Attorney General's office.

208 Project Review

George Franklet, 208 Program Manager, Department of Environmental Conservation, introduced 208 staff members Helen Fritz, Bill Leach, and Leon Kolankiewicz. Franklet submitted a written summary of the project's status and requested that Board members bring up any questions they might have on the project.

Franklet reported that under the FY 83 budget, there will no longer be any Section 208 money from EPA. Budgeting was done for Water Quality Planning in the FY 83 budget and depending

on the House or Senate versions, funding was granted in varying degrees. At this time, it is anticipated that only one position will be lost.

Franklet summarized the completion dates of the grants under 208.

Sludge Disposal Project

In response to Board questioning, Franklet reported that the first three tasks of the sludge project have been received and further updated the Board on the status of the contract. The contractor is presently over budget and behind schedule, Franklet said. Westberg suggested that direct contact be made with the subcontractor to try to streamline the project.

Waste Oil

The waste oil project is proceeding and it is felt the contractor has done a very good job of identifying the sources and amount of oil in the communities of St. Mary's and Cordova. Bill Leach said that most of the waste oil in Cordova is presently being used by DOT for road oiling, although a portion of it is recycled and put into the fuel used in the turbo generators.

Problem Assessment Project

Franklet elaborated on his written summary discussing the fourteen sources of water pollution. He said the project of problem assessment has given them a mechanism to identify, prioritize, and continue water quality planning on an ongoing basis. Gary Hayden gave a brief overview of the Water Pollution Control Work Plan.

Forest Practices Training

In response to Board inquiry, Hayden reported that for southeast Alaska the number one water quality impact is forest practices. In conjunction with the Forest Supervisor of the U.S. Forest Service, the Department has planned 50 inspections of logging sites and log transfer facilities, and will be holding a forest practices training program. The Tri-agency Memorandum of Agreement on Forest Practices became effective in the last couple of weeks, Hayden said, although all agencies have been functioning under that MOA for some time.

Peg Tileston requested that she receive a copy of the summary on the Placer Mining Conference/Sediment Workshop held in Fairbanks. Franklet indicated that an identical workshop is being considered for Anchorage.

Franklet said that the first draft of the final report of the demonstration project has been received, it has been reviewed in-house and is presently in the process of being redrafted. It is anticipated it will be completed in a very short time.

Agriculture BMPs

Bill Leach, in response to Board questioning, explained that there is a great deal of confusion as to who takes care of agriculture in the state. One of the purposes of the inter-agency memorandum of agreement that was referred to in the written summary will hopefully reduce some of the confusion in the water quality aspects.

Village Facilities Assistance Project

George Franklet reviewed the Village Facilities Assistance Project and asked the Board for a letter of support for this project to EPA.

Water Quality Standard Revisions

Gary Hayden indicated that the Department will be soliciting public comment before proceeding with these revisions.

Waste Water Disposal Regulations

In spite of earlier reports, Hayden said, Waste Water Disposal Regulations have not been finalized. Although the Department had been ready to adopt them, they have been informed by the Attorney General's Office that since a year's time has passed since public notice has been given, it will have to be repeated. Public notice will again be given the end of April.

DEC Budget

Hayden reported that the Department took about a \$1.8 million cut from the House version of the proposed budget. This would be about \$800,000 less than the Department's current budget. Some of the programs to be severely affected by this are the litter and hazardous waste programs. The House is proposing a 10 percent cut but, of course, at this time it is not known what the actual outcome will be.

On-Lot Inspections

Due to proposed budget cuts it is presently planned to reduce this program drastically. Hayden said it is hoped this effort can be turned over to private industry. The On-lot program consumes a lot of resources for the amount of benefit derived from it. Although DEC will no longer be involved in the private individual inspections, they will continue to review subdivision plans to determine the type of waste disposal systems needed.

EPA

Gary Hayden said EPA has moved its main office from Anchorage to Juneau. A small staff has remained in Anchorage but their Alaska Area Operations' director and staff have been re-located in Juneau.

EPA is currently considering a general permit concept to help them out on some of their permit problems. They are developing general permits for seafood processors, placer miners, and offshore development.

Beaufort Sea Drilling Operations

The 1979 lease restrictions which confined exploratory drilling operations in the Beaufort Sea to only winter months is up for review this year. The agency responsible for that review and decision is the Department of Natural Resources. National Marine Fisheries has just recommended for federal waters that drilling be restricted for two months during the fall whale migration.

DEC's primary concern regarding the restriction focuses on the ability of the oil companies to respond to cleaning up oil spills during the broken ice periods. The oil companies have developed a cooperative to pool their resources so they can purchase oil spill cleanup equipment, provide training, and devise a model contingency plan in helping the individual companies to plan responses to spills. This absorption plan has focused primarily on oil spill cleanup during the winter months with ice cover. However, if the restriction is lifted, DEC is concerned about the companies' ability to respond to broken ice cleanup. The Department has done a fairly comprehensive review of both the U.S. and Canadian work in this field, and the general conclusion is that the existing equipment is very limited and that the oil companies do not currently have the capability in the Prudhoe Bay area

to respond to spills during broken ice periods. Hayden indicated that the Department could not at this time approve any contingency plan to allow drilling during broken ice periods because the technology and equipment does not exist in Prudhoe Bay. The Canadian Beaufort area has developed some limited response capability, although they too are in a developmental stage, Hayden said.

DEC has proposed an alternative until the oil companies can demonstrate their cleanup abilities during broken ice periods which would extend their drilling period from November 1 through May 15 with no restrictions (or October 15 through May 15 depending upon the ice conditions), then during the period May 15 through October 31, drilling can be done down to a predetermined threshold depth (which would be just above any oil-bearing formation).

Hayden gave a brief overview of equipment for spills in broken ice conditions which is being tested in other areas.

On-Site Disposal Project

George Franklet explained that the On-Site project was funded under the 1979 grant and was contracted out to Quadra Engineering.

Jordan Suhr distributed some of the graphic display work that will be in the final report which will be presented to the Department in mid-May and gave a general overview of the project. The study was broken down into seven separate tasks: (1) Evaluation of the existing State and municipality statutes; (2) literature search on existing information on cold climate waste water treatment and disposal; (3) evaluation of existing disposal techniques employed in the state of Alaska and the identification of typical cases; (4) analysis of typical cases in greater depth and to develop some conceptual designs to overcome those particular site constraints; (5) development of a selection matrix which theoretically could be distributed to the public at large; (6) implementation strategies for dispersing this information to the public and determining exactly how the municipal bodies in various governmental entities can mesh with DEC in its existing regulatory framework; (7) executive summary to be aimed at public comprehension. Essentially, Suhr said, these seven tasks can be looked at as two separate issues: (1) What regulatory framework presently exists and if there is a more appropriate regulatory framework that could be implemented as a result of this study; and (2) the technical aspects of on-site treatment, what it is, why it's important, what is

accomplished by it, and, if there are problem areas, how they can be overcome.

Suhr recommended that distribution of this study be made to constructors/builders/developers, system installers, lending institutions, and real estate agents.

Board members discussed some specific and general cases with Suhr and commended Quadra Engineering on a job well done.

Board members asked that they be placed on the mailing list for any further materials resulting from this study.

U.S. Coast Guard Oil Spill Response Procedure

Lt. Jack Kelley outlined interagency cooperation regarding oil pollution response reporting procedures between the U.S. Coast Guard and the State of Alaska.

Kelley reviewed the legislative history of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 which declared that it is the policy of the United States that there should be no discharge of oil or hazardous substances into or upon navigable waters of the United States, adjoining shorelines, or the contiguous zone. The Act provides that any person in charge of a vessel or offshore facility shall immediately notify the appropriate agency in the case of any discharge of oil or hazardous substance. Failure to do so could result in a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment of not more than one year or both. An added stipulation under the Act provided that nothing shall be construed as preempting any state or political subdivision thereof from imposing any requirement or liability with respect to the discharge of hazardous substances. Thus, under this provision, each state was empowered to make laws and issue regulations over and above those promulgated by either the Coast Guard or the Environmental Protection Agency.

Kelley stated that Coast Guard regulations concerning notification procedures in Alaska require that any spill shall be immediately reported to either the government official predesignated in the applicable regional contingency plan as the on-scene commander for the geographic area in which the discharge took place or to the commanding officer of any Coast Guard unit in the vicinity of the discharge, or the commander of the applicable Coast Guard District. To assist providing notification to the Coast Guard in Alaska, the toll-free Zenith 5555 number was established. Once hazardous spill information is received by the local field

unit, it is standard policy of the Coast Guard to notify the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation. Likewise, DEC notifies the Coast Guard of any incidents reported to them. Kelley emphasized that the cooperation between the Coast Guard and DEC relative to reports of pollution have thus far been excellent.

Several pollution incidents in Alaska, the responses to them, and the definition of what constitutes a spill were discussed.

Recess

The meeting recessed at 4:40 p.m.

Wednesday, April 14, 1982

Call to Order

Chairman Sims called the Public Comment Session to order at 7:50 p.m.

Molybdenum Presentation

Chairman Sims explained the Board's function to the public present. Kit Katasaki from the Government and Public Affairs Division of U. S. Borax was present as well as Geron Bruce, representing the United Southeast Alaska Gillnet Association.

Mr. Katasaki indicated that he did not have a prepared statement for presentation, but was merely present to provide rebuttal to comments of Mr. Bruce. Chairman Sims asked that he give the Board an update on U. S. Borax's activities since their last meeting. Mr. Katasaki explained that the company was presently engaged in exploratory and environmental baseline studies only, due to a federal court proceeding prohibiting test borings which they had been engaged in.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Katasaki explained that the studies being conducted were hydrological, water quality, marine biology and such other studies required to meet the environmental impact statement and permitting requirements. When asked if U. S. Borax was looking at other mining operations such as AMAX and Kitsap, he indicated that they were. In response to a question as to whether they had some projected date as to when the EISs would be completed and they could go forward, Mr. Katasaki indicated that the access road EIS should be final sometime in August of 1982.

and the final project EIS was still down the road away, although much data for it has been completed. In response to a question concerning how much material they envisioned processing per day, he indicated that they presently envision 60,000 tons per day, which could vary up or down depending on engineering, economics, etc.

Geron Bruce indicated that, although he was representing the United Southeast Gillnet Association, his remarks would also be supported by the United Fishermen of Alaska, as well as the Alaska Trollers Association and the Southeast Seine Boat Owners and Operators.

Mr. Bruce recounted the change of events that had transpired in the last six months concerning the U. S. Borax project. He advised that the initial draft EIS and the process leading up to it began last fall and was directed by an interdisciplinary team composed of 17 members including representatives from U. S. Forest Service, Alaska Department of Fish and Game and aquaculture associations. This team was charged with framing the questions that the draft EIS was to answer and included hydrologists, fish biologists, soil experts, engineers and the like. He advised that before their report came out it was learned that the members had voted for the Keete access route, which had always been preferred by the fishermen inasmuch as it had the least impact on the fisheries resources. He related their concern that only one drainage be affected and that the Keete area, as opposed to the Wilson-Blossom route, was the most logical. He noted that when the results of the interdisciplinary team's recommendation became public, U. S. Borax launched a publicity campaign supporting the Wilson-Blossom route, which he described as an act inconsistent with the spirit of the team's efforts. He also stated that as a result of pressure applied by U. S. Borax, decisionmaking authority was taken away from the local Forest Service office and now emanates from Washington, D. C., the result of which is that the decisions now more reflect the desires of U. S. Borax than that of the planning team.

When asked what activity U. S. Borax planned to have in the Wilson-Blossom area, Mr. Bruce advised that he understood it to be the access road and that this area was favored for the townsite. Mr. Bruce was questioned as to whether it was a proven fact that salmon would be affected by development in the area. Mr. Bruce replied that the history of industrial development throughout the United States has resulted in lower salmon production. It is the position of the fishermen that the mine can be developed using one drainage, so why

then take the chance of impacting two drainages. Mr. Bruce indicated he may have given the impression at the last meeting that the fishermen were willing to write off the Keete drainage in order to preserve the Wilson-Blossom drainage. Their hope is that any destruction of the fishery habitat can be minimized through careful practices on the part of U. S. Borax. In response to a question as to whether the hatcheries can fill the gap, Mr. Bruce stated that they are as yet still unproven and expensive and that they produce few kings, mostly cohos and chums. In response to a question as to whether U. S. Borax had offered to mitigate any damages, Mr. Bruce indicated that they had. However, the fishermen are skeptical. Mr. Bruce pointed out that another concern was that U. S. Borax would build a road and then not bother to develop the mine until market conditions improve. In response to a question concerning the size of the project, Mr. Bruce advised that they are talking about an operating staff of 800 people, which Mr. Katasaki confirmed. Mr. Katasaki emphasized that everything is still conceptual, nothing is engineered down to detail and there is still a lot of engineering work to do. Mr. Bruce was asked what the worst impact on the fishery might be, as compared to the 800 jobs opened up by U. S. Borax. Mr. Bruce indicated that there were 120 boats in the gill net fleet with an average of 2 people on each boat; 150 in the seine fleet with an average of 6 on each; as well as the processing jobs in various Southeastern communities. He suggested that if this were worked out over a long period of time, comparing the life of the fishing industry with that of the U. S. Borax operation, it would eventually balance out. At least one Board member felt that the permitting process might be undermined in the face of the loss of 800 jobs.

Mr. Katasaki answered several questions raised by the Board during their questioning of Mr. Bruce. He explained the appeal process; that they would be using heavy-duty equipment for bulk sampling and thus needed an adequate road; the location of the ore is on the drainage divide; and that there is no place for a townsite on the Keete side. He noted that previously actual development proceeds, it would have to be determined if the project is feasible based on the results of their samplings and the price for molybdenum. Mr. Katasaki pointed out that test runs on the receiving waters of at least one mining project were overblown as a result of new highly sensitive testing instruments which allow measurements before infeasible. He indicated that they had determined at the Island Copper site that there is no danger to fish as a result of the slurry and the escapement is as good or better than before the development. Mr. Bruce and Mr. Katasaki

disagreed as to the salmon escapements from the Wilson-Blossom drainage area.

Recess

The meeting recessed at 9:25 p.m.

Thursday April 15, 1982

Call to Order

Chairman Sims called the meeting back to order at 9:05 a.m.

Introduction of Visiting Boards

Chairman Sims asked the representatives of the Yukon Territory and Northwest Territories Water Boards to introduce their members in attendance.

Mel Stehelin introduced the Yukon Board members as well as other guests from the Yukon Territory. In attendance were:

H. McAlpine	J. Ganske
C. Wykes	D. Dimitroff
N. Olsen	J. Nickel
D. Granger	F. Wolsey
B. Fraser	G. Whitley
K. Byram	

Glen Warner introduced the Northwest Territories Board members and guests. In attendance were:

A. Redshaw	A. Cullen
C. Kennedy	D. Arden
D. Mercereau	G. Carter
J. MacQuarrie	

Presentation by Council of Science and Technology Regarding Water Resource Research Needs by Dick Dworsky, Committee Chairman, and Linda Perry Dwight, Science Advisor

Mr. Dworsky reiterated the Council's concern, as expressed at the last meeting, as to the apparent lack of water and water-related research. He advised that priority reports prepared by various State officials indicated a gap relating to the overall holistic issues of water resources in the state. When asked to conduct a study, they determined the most appropriate areas to cover were: how do we plan our water resources; what mechanisms are available; coordination of the

various agencies; how to manage the water resources; and how priorities are set for data collection, taking into account the numerous studies and reports previously done.

They determined they needed a firm footing of data collection and research needs sequenced with development projects. They held hearings in three cities, sent out questionnaires, received public testimony from 30 people and over 40 written comments from water research practitioners and managers. He presented the Board with their report entitled "Issues, Priorities and Recommendations." He indicated that they would like the Board's comments within the next 45 days, if possible.

Linda Perry Dwight expanded on the process they went through in preparing their report. She indicated this was their first preliminary draft and they planned to circulate it among the contributors for their comments. Once the report is in final form, they intend to present it to the legislature in a lobbying effort to gain support for implementation of their recommendations.

Two of the major concerns which came out during the meetings and as a result of public comment were: 1) the need for baseline data to evaluate proposed development which is missing in a lot of areas, and 2) it appears that at present the State is reducing water data collection programs while proposing development. She noted that many of the studies done were "after-the-fact" disaster studies rather than preventive studies. Further, there does not seem to be any prioritization of State-financed development plans or integration with private development plans. Further, there should be some central place where people can turn for data already collected in order that there be no duplication of effort. An issue which was raised frequently was, who has the authority to make final decisions on permitting or imposing stipulations on projects. It now is handled on a case-by-case basis. In response to a question as to whether the problem was also between State and federal projects, Ms. Dwight advised that it was, however, they had focused on State projects inasmuch as they have no vehicle to impact federal decisions. When asked if they had checked with the Permit Coordination Center to see what they were doing, she indicated that she had not. Mohan Nayudu noted that the Commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources has the ultimate authority for issuing permits and establishing any conditions. Chairman Sims took exception to Ms. Dwight's comments which indicated that they were still back where they were four years ago with no coordination of the permitting

process, when in fact there is much better coordination as a result of the Permit Coordination Center. Mr. Dworsky noted that the people who testified were concerned over time lags and agency coordination. He also pointed out that presently it takes 22 years for the average Corps of Engineer project to go on line. Therefore, any push should be within the State. He noted that several federal agencies had cut funds for water resources research. Phil Emery with U.S.G.S noted that they are working with D.G.G.S. in an attempt to coordinate data collection and research. He noted that U.S.G.S. has been charged by the Office of Management and Budget with coordinating with all the other federal agencies for data collection. However, he noted that that coordination has not been done in Alaska although they are attempting to commence doing so. It is their hope that D.G.G.S. will do the same with the other State agencies. He agreed that there must be some duplication of effort going on while other areas are being totally neglected. He further noted that this lack of coordination was not unique to Alaska and was occurring in the other 49 states as well.

Bill Long of D.G.G.S. stated that the Water Resources Board was the largest single coordinating water resources organization in the state at this time. He noted that he hoped the Board would continue to fulfill this role.

Linda went on to discuss the concern that had been expressed by many on the analyzing of proposed hydroelectric projects and how one adequately assesses the cost/benefit of hydroelectric projects. In response to a question concerning whether they had gone through APA's qualifying process for hydro projects, Ms. Dwight noted that she had not but that the statement in the report came from a hydro specialist on the Senate Advisory Council. The Chairman noted that APA's process is very thorough. Ms. Dwight noted that there had been complaints about the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission being involved in the issuing of licenses for hydro projects in Alaska due to the time lapse involved.

The next concern was that the State personnel system had no positions classified as water resource managers. Presently, the positions are classified as land management officers. Mr. Mack of DNR advised that the Department currently has plans to revamp the land management officer series although he doesn't know what those plans are. Mr. Nayudu advised that the proposed reclassification would still be broad in order to allow them flexibility to fill these positions. There is also a series for engineers wherein they get more specific to allow for hydrologists and the like.

Ms. Dwight went into their priorities and recommendations section of the report. Priority number one relating to hydrologic, climatological and water quality stations is presently assigned to D.G.G.S. In response to a question as to what will happen if the Institute of Water Resources does not continue to get funding, Ms. Dwight advised that she was informed by Mr. Carlson that they have enough funds to go on for one year and that if they do not receive further funding, the members, who are tenured faculty with the University of Alaska, will remain with their individual departments and continue to teach but that the information and dissemination system would cease to function with the library being incorporated in either the University library or the Department of Civil Engineering.

Mr. Dworsky advised that there is a bill in Congress at present to fund, to a limited extent, water research centers.

In response to a question from the Board concerning item 5 under Data Gathering relating to sharing of information, Ms. Dwight felt they could be more specific and make suggestions of possible groups to be involved in the process as opposed to funding further studies. She noted that some sharing is already going on between U.S.G.S. and D.G.G.S., but that other sharing needs to be explored such as DOTPF studies. She pointed out that legislation was enacted several years ago requiring that copies of all studies go to the State Library for cataloging but that the program has not been very effective due to insufficient funding and lack of knowledge of the provision by divisions within departments. A case in point are studies by consultants which seldom reach the library or are improperly cataloged. It was noted that the specific provision involved requires that 20 copies of the report go to the library. Some reports prepared, such as the Watts Study, are thousands of pages long, encompassing a variety of data, thus making it burdensome.

Water Requirement Studies for Large-Scale Agriculture Projects, Presented by Bob Palmer, Governor's Office

Mr. Palmer related the history of agricultural development in Alaska. He noted that a study was conducted which resulted in a finding that the yield per acre of grains is better although not cheaper than in an area such as Nebraska. As a result, 60,000 acres were sold at public lottery in the Delta area, divided up into 22 farms of approximately 2,600 acres each. They have just about completed clearing on Delta 1 and it should be finished by July of this year, and they expect

to have 20,000 acres in production in 1982. He related the unfortunate circumstances which damaged the crops during the 1981 growing season which were largely natural disasters such as an early freeze and the greatest amount of rainfall in 25 years in that area.

A land sale in March of 1981 encompassing 15,000 acres at Point McKenzie has been classified for farming and 19 tracts have been set aside for dairy farms. They hope to supplement the dairy farms in the Matanuska Valley in order to make dairy production economically feasible. He noted that by the 1990s they expect to have 500,000 acres in productive farming land. Palmer explained that their first priority was for instate consumption but that they had to also find an export market. They are looking at the Nenana area for future development as well as Yukon Flats, Fish Creek, Kuskokwim and the Yukon.

He quoted from a study which had been done on the Delta area indicating that Alaska would have lower per bushel production costs than other U. S. farmers. He noted that Alaska cost of production was \$.70 per bushel below the Northwest in per bushel cost. Add to that the cost of export and Alaska can still deliver barley for \$.21 a bushel under that of the Pacific Northwest. In response to a question from the Board as to whether this includes the State subsidies for agriculture, Mr. Palmer advised that it covered the lower cost of the land and the 6 percent loans to farmers for clearing. He noted that they would have to underwrite the Seward grain elevator for six years until the production of grain reaches the capacity of the elevator.

In regard to water resources, the three kinds of data that he sees as valuable are: aquifer identification and evaluation that may be necessary for irrigation; ground water supply for domestic uses; baseline and continuing monitor data that will tell the quality of the water both above and below the ground and monitoring of changes as time goes by. In response to a question by the Board concerning the amount of fertilizer necessary to make the land productive, Mr. Palmer advised that they had not quantified it yet due to the undeveloped nature of the farming land but that there appears to be no environmental danger involved to waters adjacent to farming land through leaching. Further, wildlife appears to be using some of these lands more since they have been developed for farming than previously, at least in the case of the barley farms.

In response to a question from the Board as to how he saw coordination and cooperation with other State agencies and his project, Mr. Palmer noted that the lesson he had learned thus far about cooperation was: get it in writing rather than verbally. When asked who specifically he was working with as far as baseline data and monitoring, Mr. Palmer indicated that Commissioner Katz serves on the AG Action Council and is aware of the decisions being made, and from there should flow the necessary studies. In response to a question as to whether the majority of the farmers were Alaska residents, Mr. Palmer advised that the only requirement is 30 days residency in the state. However, at the last auction, only 3 out of 13 purchasers were nonresidents. In response to a question concerning whether foreign corporations could purchase the farm land several years down the road, Mr. Palmer advised that it is all fee simple land and that the only restriction is that its use be confined to agricultural purposes. He explained the existing loan programs and noted that they are prioritizing these to make sure the money goes where it is most productive. In response to a question from the Chairman as to his relationship with the Agriculture Division of the Department of Natural Resources, Mr. Palmer advised that the money for specific projects such as water quality standard study projects would come out of their budget but would be transferred on a project basis to D.G.G.S. He noted as well that there are contingency provisions in the individual contracts requiring that the successful purchaser must have a soil and conservation plan approved by the division.

Recess

The meeting recessed at 11:30 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 1:10 p.m.

Remarks of Commissioner of Natural Resources, John Katz

Commissioner John Katz and the Director of the Division of Land and Water Management, Jack Sedwick, appeared before the Board. Commissioner Katz advised they have completed restructuring of the Divisions of Land and Water and Forestry and it is his belief that that restructuring has inured to the benefit of the Water Section of the Department. He noted that he realized several members of the Board had wanted to see a separate water division, to which he has been opposed. However, he explained that under Mr. Sedwick's leadership, the Water Section was achieving the status in the Department that it should have had previously.

He noted that another concern of the Water Board had been the lack of cooperation by the Department with both other State agencies and the federal government in order to reduce the possibility of duplication of effort. He indicated that they have entered into cooperative agreements with both the federal government and other State agencies to this end.

As far as the water adjudication issue which had been raised by the Board, he advised that the Department and the Attorney General's Office formulated legislation which would form the basis of basinwide adjudication. He indicated that he felt that that was timely but that, for a number of reasons, he did not believe it would be enacted this session.

Another concern of the Department is their position with respect to the water well drillers. It is the belief of the Department that they must comply with applicable laws and regulations. To that end they have been giving technical assistance to bring about compliance but he noted that if the voluntary efforts were unsuccessful, they would have to resort to coercive enforcement. His technical people advise that they have reached the end of what they can do on a voluntary basis.

The next item he addressed was the Resource CIP, the basic inventory function of the department. This is contained in the capital budget and due to legislative cutbacks it appears that cuts will have to be made in some areas. He indicated that the hydrological function is surviving well and he is informed that most of the essential functions authorized under that category will continue.

He noted that the instream flow regulations are now out for public comment and that hearings will be conducted around the state within the next three months.

Lastly, he spoke to funding for the Water Board. He advised that it had been deleted from the operating budget. He agreed that it was an important function, although not as important as some functions that were very closely related to day-to-day operations. He advised that an alternative might be an ad hoc advisory board consisting of experts in a particular area such as water resources. He noted that all of the directors in his department are receptive to public input and that should the Board not receive funding, they will increase their public notice time in those areas which were formerly within the Board's authority.

During the question and answer period the Commissioner was asked what he used for criteria for setting priorities for water resource management. He advised that the Division of D.G.G.S. recommended those priorities relating to the inventory function after consultation with other divisions. After examining it, he noted that the first priority was the need to obtain data in those areas where conflicts already existed and where there was likely to be conflicts in the near future. Mr. Sedwick presented the Board with a budgetary analysis on the management portion of the budget to date after it left the House. It was noted by a member of the Board that what was lacking was funds for interagency review. Commissioner Katz commented that there was no impairment of the cooperative agreements which they have now with various State and federal agencies. Mr. Sedwick noted that their own opportunity to review other agency activities had been severely constrained due to budget cuts. He advised that on his one opportunity to speak before the legislature on the budget, the committee had expressed skepticism on the value of interagency review. In response to other questions, he advised that their capacity for indepth studies on large projects was severely curtailed and that the \$25,000 item for dam safety was just enough to handle imminent danger in connection with dams.

Chairman Sims noted that, assuming they received funding from some source to continue the Water Board, they felt it essential that either the Commissioner or a policy-making person on his staff have a seat on the Board. Commissioner Katz observed that he thought that had been occurring by virtue of his directors being present at prior meetings. The Commissioner advised that should he not be able to be present in the future, he will have someone with policy-making authority present. In response to a question as to how a board which has been statutorily mandated can have their funds cut off, Commissioner Katz advised that according to an Attorney General's opinion, the legislature has the prerogative to fund or not fund any agency it wishes. In closing, Commissioner Katz noted that he pays a lot of attention to the Board's written recommendations and resolutions and will continue to do so if the Board exists.

Jack Sedwick commented that the development of water resource management was at least as important as the development of the land. He suggested that an area which was lacking was education and if there was more knowledge and information on the significance of water resources of the state, there might be more legislative support. To this end, he advised that encompassed in the '82 budget is an expansion of DNR's oppor-

tunity to appear before the public by way of numerous hearings on adoption of the end stream regulations. He advised that particularly in remote parts of the state, people will be encouraged to ask questions concerning general concerns they may have for water and land resources. He noted the importance of consideration of water in the land disposal program. He advised that he had asked his section chiefs to closely examine existing programs to determine whether their emphasis is properly placed so that for FY 84 they can present either a new slate of programs or a combination of old and new which reflects the needs of the state.

In response to a question as to how he saw the quota system working as far as water rights adjudication, he indicated that there had been some problems within the Department with personnel handling the easy cases first but that he is attempting to resolve that by instituting the "first in, first out" practice except where some compelling need exists in that a project might be lost due to placing it at the bottom of the stack. As far as whether he feels comfortable with a practice of only averting disasters, he indicated that he did not and would like to see the Board continue to give the Department the long-term perspective and guidance to manage the resource. The Board questioned whether they could still rely on DNR for administrative support services should they gain funding from somewhere else. Mr. Sedwick indicated that some funding might be possible, but definitely not at the existing level. He questioned the cost of the verbatim transcript in addition to lengthy minutes which had been done in the past. The Board and Mr. Sedwick discussed the importance of the Ship Creek project due to the shortage of water in the Anchorage area. A Board member noted that the problem was really compounded during the annual cleaning process of the Ship Creek dam at a time when water was least plentiful.

Welcoming Address to Canadian Visitors by Lieutenant Governor Terry Miller

Lieutenant Governor Terry Miller welcomed the visiting water boards from the Yukon and Northwest Territories. He addressed the impact on Alaska of the oil wealth, the fact that land was now being put into the hands of the State and private individuals as opposed to the federal government, and the impact of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act resulting in different patterns of development. He went on to cite statistics on the water resources of the state and hydro potential. He also noted the necessity to adopt a high standard of care to preserve these resources. He spoke of the cooperation between British Columbia and Alaska, and more

specifically, the proposed hydro project on the Stikine.

Joint Meeting with Yukon and Northwest Territories Water Boards

Glen Warner explained the statutory authority promulgating the appointment of the water board. He advised that they were appointed for the conservation, utilization and development of water resources for the benefit of all Canadians and for the people of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. He advised that their budget could not be abolished at the stroke of a pen as the Alaska Statute is written in that their legislation states shall as opposed to may. He explained the make-up of the board. He noted that they are a decisionmaking board as opposed to an advisory board. They are accountable to the Minister of Northern Affairs. They are advised by technical boards which gives them the technical expertise to assist them in their decisions.

Gerry Whitley reported on the Yukon River Basin Study. He advised that they will be completing their field work in December 1983 and making a final report in mid-1984. They will be attempting to fill in data gaps which have developed over the last 20 or 30 years. The area encompassed is the Yukon River excluding the Porcupine Drainage, an area encompassing 262,000 square kilometers. He related some of the more important studies which they are undertaking which are: In the field of hydrology they will be making up a data flow simulation model to allow them to assess the idealogical network in the basin and to allow them to look at the hydrograph downstream from some of the proposed dam projects to determine their impact. He advised that they will be looking at ice cover, breakup, and water quality. In terms of fisheries, they will be completing a broad inventory of chinook and king salmon in order to determine how many salmon will be entering the basin. The total funding for the project is \$2.2 million Canadian. The boards discussed the standards for turbidity. The Alaska Water Board noted that their standard was drinking water quality or 25 MTUs. The boards discussed the mutual difficulty in enforcing the water standards in the case of placer miners.

The boards exchanged ideas on water classification and its effect on fisheries and the like.

The Board explained to the Canadian boards what Alaska is doing as far as sludge disposal, effluent, settling pond

research, oil cleanup, and other developments in onsite disposal.

Recess

The meeting recessed at 5 p.m., scheduled to reconvene at 7 p.m.

Thursday April 15, 1982

Public Hearing

The meeting of the Alaska Water Resources Board reconvened at 7:40 p.m. Jack Sedwick, Director of the Division of Land and Water Management, opened the meeting for public comments on the proposed revisions to the Department of Natural Resources' water management regulations. Mary Lu Harle of Water Management assisted Mr. Sedwick in responding to comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Linda Perry Dwight, water resources consultant from Anchorage, indicated that she had submitted written comments to DNR on the last draft of the regulations that were circulated for public comment. She indicated she was pleased that a number of her concerns had been addressed in this latest draft.

Ms. Dwight commented on the following proposed regulations:

11 AAC 93.141 Application for Reservation of Water. Ms. Dwight questioned whether either the definition of "political subdivision of the state" or the definition of "person" includes Native organizations and special interest groups. She indicated the specific reason for her concern is that she noticed that further on in the proposed regulations that, rather than DNR being the trustee for holding the accepted permit, it will now be issued in the name of the applicant.

Mr. Sedwick replied that the term "person" as used in the proposed regulations was intended to include individuals and organizations. Ms. Harle further explained that Alaska Statutes define "person" to include an individual, partnership, association, public or private corporation, state

agency, political subdivision of the state or the United States.

Ms. Dwight commented that she appreciated the opportunity to read through the regulations to see exactly what will be required of the applicant but she wanted to know if this level of detail was appropriate and if perhaps some of it should be included in the Department's procedures manuals and instructions to the applicant. Mr. Sedwick noted that he felt that as much information as the public may need should go into the regulations which would be more readily available. If there was an expression of public desire to the contrary, a change would be considered, Mr. Sedwick said, and he didn't believe there was an inconsistency with other types of regulations, but that the final format will be reviewed and approved by the Attorney General.

11 AAC 93.142 Content of Application. (b) Each application must: (4) quantify the water requested to be reserved: The question of how the applicant would know how much water would be required for a particular use and how much detail would be required was asked by Ms. Dwight. Ms. Harle responded that there is no hard and fast rule as to how much information is necessary but that a measurement which is specific enough to indicate required amounts would be needed.

Ms. Dwight expressed her concern that the Department had eliminated from the regulations the provision that the Department will provide assistance in specifying requirements. Sedwick responded that there are several guidelines offered in the proposed regulations to assist the applicant.

11 AAC 93.143 Incomplete Applications. (b) Ms. Dwight said that in this section it is specified that only 30 days will be allowed to correct deficiencies unless a longer period of time is agreed upon between the applicant and the commissioner. She noted that the amount of time given to applicants to correct deficiencies for other sorts of water rights is not specified under 11 AAC 93.050(b) and she wondered if this was another inconsistency that would cause some problems in having a set time for this type and no particular specified time for other types of water rights applications. Also, since this is all so new, Dwight said, she could envision many situations that could not be resolved within 30 days. She suggested language to the effect that some agreed upon amount of time be given depending upon the particular situation.

Recess

The Hearing was concluded at 8 p.m. and Jack Sedwick indicated that additional public hearings would be conducted in other communities throughout Alaska.

Friday April 16, 1982

The Water Resource Board reconvened at 9 a.m. with Glenn Akins, Deputy Commissioner, sitting in for the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Conservation.

Discussion on Placer Mining Policy

Dave Hederly Smith, Deputy Director for Minerals with the Division of Minerals and Energy Management of the Department of Natural Resources, he commented that he could only speak for DNR's policies on placer mining and not for Fish and Game or DEC. He advised that their involvement with placer mining is mainly from the resource management end, and not as a regulatory agency. DNR gives two types of permits to the miner; i.e., a water use permit and a miscellaneous land use permit for anyone on State land. They have a set of general stipulations attached to their permits as well as stipulations requested by other agencies. He explained the tri-agency, 4-page permit application which encompasses all necessary permits required by the State and which covers all land in the state except for national park land. He advised that the Department is supportive of placer mining. There is room, he indicated, for better mining practices. In response to a question concerning the duration of the permit, Mr. Smith advised it is a one-year permit and that they can be extended for another year with the information be updated. However, if their operation changes, it is usually necessary to get another permit.

Dick Logan, with the Department of Fish and Game, outlined recent developments since the last meeting. He advised that with the passage of the instream flow regulations they were required to update their anadromous fish catalog by July 1, 1982. He indicated that they entered into a cooperative agreement with DEC for a joint permit in those areas above an anadromous stream to ensure water quality entering the stream where salmon spawn. He advised that the Attorney General has issued an opinion which gives F & G authority to control activities outside the stream bed which would effect the stream. He added that F & G's budget had been reduced by the House from \$9 million to \$1 million, which will extremely

curtail their activities, particularly in the area of placer mining. He noted that they are very concerned over the issue of turbidity because of its impact on salmon streams. He spoke to the controversy over the 25 JTU turbidity standard and indicated that hopefully further research will be forthcoming to determine the impact of various turbidity standards on the fisheries. In response to a question by the Board as to the Department's priorities if the cutback should stand, he advised that the North Slope was the most sensitive area. He further advised that they will only have 4 people dealing with Title 16 permitting to process 6,000 permits. He noted that pursuant to SB 84 they have to have the permits out within 30 to 65 days. If it is not out in 30 or 65 days, the Department must say no or they get the permit. He indicated that there had been some habitat losses and cited an incident where there were 200 placer miners on one stream. They discussed the operation on Peters Creek and Mr. Logan advised that they had shut down that operator on two occasions. They are trying to channel his operation so that the fish can get by him, as he is in a migratory portion of the stream as opposed to a spawning area. Mr. Logan explained to the Board F & G's working relationship with DNR and DEC. They subscribe to a joint enforcement effort in order to maximize personnel. He advised that the 3 agencies received \$600,000 last year in a budget agreement earmarked for placer mining. This year it appears it will not be there. Mr. Akins explained that even with their massive cuts in DEC there would still be monies for field enforcement personnel in their budget.

Glenn Akins explained that DEC feels that the cooperative arrangement is the only way to handle the placer mining enforcement issue. He noted that they are called on to protect all the uses of the water as water is a scarce resource in some parts of Alaska. Their primary effort has been to control settleable solids and he noted the settling pond technology has been quite effective. However, the fact remains that even with all of their efforts, the 25 JTU standard is not always met and they have been subject to a great deal of criticism as a result. Many feel the answer is to change the standard, but not enough research has been done to determine what standard is necessary to protect the streams. The Board expressed concern that there be a standard that is meetable in order that the miner not be placed in jeopardy of losing his operation if it should suddenly been enforced. Mr. Akins advised before they could change the standard considerable research must be done because whatever they decide on must hold up in court. Another choice is reclassification of streams where there are not anadromous

and where the historic use has been mining. However, they are working on this on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Smith noted that he had talked to various miners and that they were reluctant to ask for reclassification because it would call attention to their operations.

Gary Hayden with DEC distributed a booklet on water quality standards. He outlined the priority uses of water on page 8 of that booklet and the parameters pertaining to each use. He pointed out that the only classification the miner could use would be the industrial water use. In response to whether the bulk of the complaints were coming from recreational users of the stream, Mr. Hayden replied that it was. Mr. Smith advised that in the State's land disposal program, they tend to stay away from areas where there has been active mining to avoid problems. The Board discussed EPA's statement that they are going to make their presence known in Alaska in the area of placer mining. It is the theory of the State that EPA's only enforcement laws are in the area of effluent. Gerry Whitley, a Yukon representative, advised that they had no turbidity standard with respect to placer miners. However, it was also noted that they don't have a high level of competing uses besides fishing. The Board addressed the complaint from Canada over the downstream mining activities on 40 Mile River. Mr. Hayden advised that they will have someone in Tok this summer doing routine monitoring as a result of conflicts between two types of miners. Canada's complaint is that miners on the Alaska side don't have settling ponds, while Canadians are required to have them.

Status of Clean Water Act and Pending Revisions, presented by Gary Hayden

Mr. Hayden noted that the Clean Water Act is up for reauthorization this year before the Congress. He distributed a summary of the main points which EPA is proposing. They are extending some of their deadlines to 1988. EPA is behind on guidelines for not only petrochemicals but many others as well. He noted that EPA is proposing to charge for permits and variance requests. He further noted that EPA is seeking the ability to levy fines of up to \$5,000 a day without going through the courts. He indicated that he would inform the Board by mail as to what the State's responses were going to be to the proposed changes. EPA also has a proposal to grant exemption on certain federal lands from the provisions of the Clean Water Act for up to 3 years. Mr. Hayden advised that they had already given preliminary comments on marine sanitation

requirements for vessels and further, the states' needs addressed as far as oil spill cleanup and damage compensation as well as a recognition of the states' abilities to respond to oil spills. They would also like to see 301(h) waivers applied to privately-owned treatment works such as logging camps and the like. He noted that they have people in Washington, D. C., monitoring proposed changes so Alaska doesn't get left in the lurch.

Glenn Akins addressed the Sec. 404 Program of the Clean Water Act. It is his understanding that the federal administration will be pressing only for procedural changes and not major revisions. He advised that a hearing will be held in Alaska the last week of May or first week of June to discuss wetlands permitting in Alaska. He indicated that DEC has prepared a position paper on Sec. 404 which has been distributed to other State agencies for their comments. He advised that DEC feels it is an important program and they would like to see the State eventually take it over. He also indicated that he favors general permits in such areas as placer mining, pipeline operations, and housing development. Mr. Akins explained that any budgetary cuts that were made were a result of priority setting by DEC. He advised that they had cut funds for on-lot sewer and waste inspections and that will now be handled by private engineers and contractors although DEC will still sign off on them.

Recess

The meeting recessed at 11:50 a.m., scheduled to reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

DGGS/USGS Five-Year Alaska Water Resource Evaluation Plan (AWRE), by William Long of DGGS.

William Long, Chief of the Water Resources Section of the Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, DNR, explained the difficulty of good data collection. He indicated he would be covering three general areas; i.e., ongoing and perceived needs for water collection data, the Five-Year Plan, and to introduce the new thrust of DGGS in the area of water quality. He noted that they agree there is a need for data as well as agency coordination. Good agency coordination takes experts in the field and dedicated personnel, which he feels they have in DGGS. Further, he believes that Alaska has better coordination than any of the other 49 states. He advised that their cooperative program is represented by USGS; DGGS; DNR, Land and Water Management; DEC; F&G; DOTPF; the municipalities of Anchorage, Fairbanks,

Kenai, Kenai Borough, Mat-Su Borough, Fairbanks North Star Borough; U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Weather Service; Soil Conservation Service; and University of Alaska as well as a number of private consultants. He advised that he had also touched base with the Corps of Engineers, which has a slightly different program, and indicated that they would be coordinating with them. He noted that the Five-Year Plan is undergoing extensive review by all of the agencies concerned. He explained the process of preparing the initial draft and project identification of 41 projects from 6 regions of the state. They are also preparing navigability studies within the Division of DGGs. He presented a map showing many of the 41 study areas and the DGGs gauging station locations. The Board expressed interest in the availability of the various studies being performed as well as the amount of time spent seeking out studies which had already been performed. He noted that they are doing that and that in the area of ground water, they are seeking records from DEC but indicated that there is no easy source for collection of this data. As far as results of their studies, he indicated that DGGs publishes an annual bibliography. USGS has their studies by area on the computer and DGGs hopes at some point in time to input their information as well. The Board and speakers explored the idea that sharing of nonproprietary data be attached as part of the permit condition process. Mr. Long pointed out that this plan was made under the FY 82 assumed budget which was the year they had the largest budget, and thus it will be scaled down as a result of budget cuts. In fact, it is certain that the concentration will be on the areas of South-central, East Central and Southeast, due to population.

Mr. Long introduced Dr. George McCoy who heads up the Water Quality program and who was formerly with USGS. He advised that the three areas of water quality they will be working on immediately are baseline and monitoring studies in the Beluga coal fields performed by them; placer mining studies which they will fund only; and lake studies, more specifically, lake studies in the Matanuska Valley. He advised that the Beluga studies will be undertaken through a cooperative agreement with DEC and coordinated with all other agencies performing studies in the coal fields and the Coal Task Force. The lake studies is a 3-part program to be implemented over the next year with input and cooperation still in the development stage. The first element is nutrient budget and cycling in the areas of Big Lake and Nancy Lake. The second element is lake fertilization and nutrient limitation study in cooperation with the Department of Fish and Game. Third is lake fertility studies also in conjunction with F&G to predict success for sport fish stocking in the Matanuska

Valley. The Board questioned a duplication of effort with Alaska Diamond Drilling's plans in the Beluga area. Dr. McCoy advised that their plans are tentative at this point and that they will be meeting with the contractors to avoid duplication of effort but will also be monitoring water quality studies by the contractor to ensure accuracy.

Placer Mining

Dr. McCoy advised that once they decided placer mining was going to be one of the Department's priorities, they determined to coordinate with a number of groups who had already expressed interest on the subject. Last week when they met, there were representatives from 13 agencies present including State, federal, and private consultants, and, although invited, there were no representatives from the mining industry. The first day was spent discussing research presently going on and the second developing proposals and research needs. The research presently going on is in the areas of settling ponds, the effects of sedimentation on the stream ecology and turbidity, and minor element contamination. Needed are studies on the effects of sediment and turbidity on aquatic organisms (including long-range effects after cessation of turbidity); the effect of fine sediment on the grayling's gills and stomachs (a study which one Board member pointed out may already have been done by Jackie Derrier in pursuit of her Ph.D); methodology of measuring bed load settlement deposition and changes in channel morphology due to increased sediment; and trace elements. He noted that several people brought up the need for research on placer mining methods. The thrust of the discussion was that if, a miner does a good job and is efficient, he will not only make more money, but he'll leave a cleaner stream. He suggested that what was also needed was miner education.

The Board suggested that Mr. Long follow up on the data at IWR in the event they fold up to ensure that it is not lost. The underlying note throughout the meeting was that results of private studies can be obtained if they are made a part of the permitting process.

Presentation on Research Study Availability at Alaska State Library, by Louis Coatney

Mr. Coatney indicated that he was from the State Study Distribution Center whose prime responsibility is collection of State publications in order that they not be lost. They have a historical library in Juneau and a circulating collection to back up other libraries in the state and the

rest of the country. They have 20 depositories throughout Alaska, the Lower 48 and Canada. He provided a list of these to the Board. He advised that in 1979 a state law was passed expanding the service of the center to a data center which would allow them to keep track of computer information as well as hard copy publications. They did not, however, receive the funding to implement it. The three sources of publications are: (1) those directly commissioned by the State and printed in State printing facilities; (2) those commissioned by the State and printed in private printing facilities; and (3) consultant reports, the most elusive. He indicated they used to publish an inventory of the publications but after they went on microfiche felt that would be sufficient. However, they anticipate returning to the inventory. In an effort to improve the reliability of their files, Budget Form 24 was implemented, which requires each agency to list all publications commissioned to which the library has access. He noted that they are still missing forms for various agencies including the University of Alaska. What the library would like to receive is a copy of the report in fiche format and a hard copy, as well as an abstract in card form of the information contained in the report. Failing all that, they would be happy to just receive a copy of the publication.

Chairman Sims announced the Water Resource Board had been tentatively funded by DEC, provided they are not cut following legislative deliberations.

Break

The meeting recessed at 4:00, scheduled to reconvene at 5:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Chairman Sims called the business meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. on April 16, 1982.

Chairman Sims announced that the information they had from DEC was accurate and that, given that information and the promise from DNR that they will supply administrative support, the Board will be able to continue their activities for another year.

A staff person from DEC suggested that they meet at a central location in order to conserve travel costs, as this item is limited. A Board member pointed out that the Water Use Act

requires that at least one meeting per year be held in the state capital.

The Board deferred approval of the minutes of the last meeting until the next meeting.

MOTION - by Westberg, seconded by Tileston, to adopt a resolution in support of the passage of SB 18 relating to the Anchorage Basinwide Adjudication to be transmitted to Senate Resources with an explanatory memorandum to the Anchorage delegation on the ramifications of the bill. It was further recommended that a copy be sent to the Mayor of Anchorage. On a voice vote the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION - by Tileston, seconded by Westberg, to transmit a letter to EPA in support of the village assistance project. On a voice vote the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION - by Westberg, seconded by Vanderbrink, requesting that DEC fund either an additional study or an extension of the present study of onsite disposal in permafrost areas. Further, that the Board commends the study done by Quadra Engineering as being very helpful. On a voice vote the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION - by Vanderbrink, seconded by Westberg, to send a letter to all State agencies recommending they learn what the State Library has to offer as far as the cataloging of State publications and encouraging them to file a copy with them for use by all other agencies as well as the public. Further, a letter be sent to the State Library noting that the Board was impressed to learn of their services, and recommending that they more widely publicize the availability of State publications and how copies may be obtained. On a voice vote the motion carried unanimously.

Karen Cantillon volunteered to work with the other Information Officers in the state to bring about more awareness of the Library's State publication services.

Chairman Sims noted that the Water Resource Research Needs report prepared by Dick Dworsky and Linda Perry Dwight was not what he had envisioned it to be. He indicated he takes exception to the issues and conclusions section as being stated too positively in light of the improvements they've seen in the last 3 years in some areas. They would have liked to see individual letters from the people providing the input to better assess the information provided.

The Board indicated their intent to write to Dworsky and Dwight with their individual comments on the report and indicating their desire to review the new draft at their next meeting.

The Board asked staff to invite representatives of the Soil Conservation Service, the Agriculture Division and the AG Action Council to the next Water Resources Board meeting to discuss water-related issues.

The Board asked staff to prepare a letter under their signature to Commissioner Katz requesting that a DNR representative at the policy level attend the Board's meetings.

The Board asked staff to prepare a letter to Commissioner Katz taking exception to the Citizen Advisory Technical Committee concept recommended by him, should they fail to be funded, as well as disagreeing that public hearings will take the place of the work of the Board. They also requested that a copy of this letter be transmitted to the Governor.

The Board asked staff to prepare a letter to Commissioner Katz, with a copy to Ross Schaff, requesting DNR's support of a placer mining study which would offer relief to miners should the classification of the stream they are operating in put them in jeopardy, and dealing with turbidity standards.

Staff was instructed to furnish the Board with a copy of Gary Hayden's response to the Clean Water Act proposed changes when it becomes available.

In response to Section 404 Clean Water Act proposed changes, staff was instructed to provide the Board with any responses that are drafted and to put that on the agenda for the next meeting.

MOTION - by Tileston, seconded by Vanderbrink, to approve the DGGs Five-Year Plan and to commend them for a well-written document. On a voice vote the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION - by Tileston directing staff to send a letter to Jack Sedwick, the Director of Land and Water Management, Department of Natural Resources asking that multiple use permits have a stipulation attached requiring that the permit holder provide a copy of any nonproprietary data resulting from exploration operations to the State. There being no objections, it was so ordered.

Staff was instructed to invite the Division of Parks to the next meeting to discuss non-established campsites.

Staff was instructed to send a letter to members of the Finance Free Conference Committee regarding the cuts to the Water Resources Board and explaining their role.

Staff was instructed to advise Dr. George McCoy that the Board was pleased that DNR is planning to pursue studies on gill erosion on steelhead and the effect of turbidity on feeding habits.

Staff was instructed to send a letter to DEC recommending that they look into research on the use of hydrocycloning for cleaning placer-mined streams.