

MEETING SUMMARY  
ALASKA WATER RESOURCES BOARD  
Soldotna, Alaska  
December 9, 10, 11

The Alaska Water Resources Board Meeting was held in Soldotna, Alaska, December 9, 10, 11, 1981, in the Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly chambers. The members of the Board in attendance were:

Richard Sims (Chairman), Kodiak  
Wayne Westberg, Anchorage  
Peg Tileston, Anchorage  
Frederick Boness, Anchorage  
David Vanderbrink, Homer

Chairman Sims called the meeting to order. He stated that due to the delay in receiving the minutes from the previous meeting that approval of those minutes would be held off until later in the session.

Chairman Sims announced that since the last Water Board meeting he had had two meetings on behalf of the Board. The first meeting was with the new DNR commissioner, John Katz. Katz indicated that he wants to give water activities in the state a high profile and complimented the Board on their good work. Katz also indicated that he plans to work closely with the Board in the future. The second meeting was with the new Director of the Division of Land and Water Management, Jack Sedwick. Sedwick also indicated strong support for water activities in the state.

The first presentation was on State Agency Geothermal Resource activities. Giving presentations were David Hedderly-Smith, Division of Minerals and Energy Management, John Reeder, Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, Patty DeJong, Alaska Power Authority, and Don Markle, Division of Energy and Power Development.

Major points:

- \* Don Markle itemized the history of geothermal studies in Alaska. One initial study produced a compendium, identifying the resources and what the constraints to developing them were. A more recently funded study developed a program guideline and identified 15 sites that had near term potential and was called a geothermal development plan for the state. A new study has been funded for geothermal development at Pilgrim Hot Springs north of Nome. More work is being done to determine the potential of the area this winter.
- Q) Have you identified any areas that potentially have enough heat to produce power.....electrical power?
- A) Don: Those ones that I have given you on the hand-out. The resource is probably going to be more likely to be of the type that could produce power than the

social and economic environment. You may have a real nice resource, but you don't have a large enough load to go in and produce anything.

Q) Isn't that the case in Unalaska?

A) Don: Our economic projections are that there is going to be a significant rise in population and energy demand.

Q) Wayne: Isn't the place to drill for geothermal in Unalaska quite a way from the projected town centers?

A) Don: About nine (9) air miles, Patty will talk about that. Initially, the costs go astronomical then start leveling off. Getting the rig in is the major cost. Once your road is in, you don't have to do it again if you need to expand the area.

\* John Reeder, DGGS, gave a run-down of the various geothermal studies DGGS is working on in the state. The purpose of the current geothermal program is to try to obtain as much knowledge and information about the state's geothermal resources as possible. In approximately one year, a hot springs atlas for the whole state should be published. A regional or more specific site atlas will be published in the future as a result of these studies.

Q) How many people are working on these projects?

A) John: Right now two (2) and three (3) will be hired.

Q) Peg: How much funding do you have, and is it spread over the life of the four (4) or five (5) year studies?

A) John: About one million dollars for FY 82 but we will have to be re-funded every year to complete the studies.

Q) Peg: In case you are not funded, do you have a finished product at the end of each fiscal year?

A) David: Yes, however, by the nature of these studies we'll get more in the 5th year than we will in the first year of the programs.

John: We planned all of the studies to get out a report after each fiscal year. But sometimes it will take five (5) years to get the most valuable results.

Q) Is anyone paying attention to land status in the geothermal areas?

- A) David: DGGS is focused on state lands primarily, however, a lot of the geothermal resources are not on state land. (60-70%)  
John: We are currently looking at the Pilgrim area for resource development. However, there isn't much demand in the area to warrant a major electrical production. We don't have a lot of information yet but we are doing more resource evaluation. I think we can assume that we have a significant resource, whether it is taxable is probably the question.
- \* David Hedderly-Smith gave a run-down of the new geothermal leasing regulations which should be out in early 1982. The hope is to get the regulations out so geothermal resources on state owned land can be made available to industry for prospecting and leasing. Most of the resources on state land are relatively distant from population centers however. Competitive areas may be identified by competitive interest or geological information. Non-competitive areas would have a prospecting permit disposal system. If a discovery was located in commercial quantities, the prospector would be entitled to a non-competitive lease. DNR wanted to put in a leasing system where they would be able to exert extensive control over development. DNR plans inter-agency review between DEC & ADF&G on the lease development plans.
- Q) Wayne: Would the development plan include a detailed drilling program?
- A) David: Absolutely.
- Q) Wayne: Who will you utilize to evaluate their drilling program?
- A) David: I will, I'd be consulting with some of our petroleum engineers, but at this point it would be me.
- Q) Wayne: Does the Oil & Gas Commission come under DNR?
- A) David: The Oil and Gas Conservation Commission so far has avoided taking a stand on conservation on these. We do have a statute aside from the geothermal leasing statute in AS 21, which essentially dictates that thou shalt not waste geothermal resources and vests a lot of authorities under that statute in the Commission of the DNR.
- Q) Wayne: But don't the state inspectors..drill-site inspectors, don't they come under the Oil and Gas Conservation Commission?
- A) David: Yes, they do. We, frankly, don't want to enforce these things, we would rather they do it, but thus far they have hedged off from it.

C) Wayne: Yes, when it really comes down to it, that's where the seed of drilling expertise, as you will...is located in the state, and that's who's going to have to...either that or you're going to have to informally get some information from them, or even hire a consultant.

C) David: Yes, I suspect that when this does come to a head in the near future, they'll suddenly re-assert themselves and increase their bailiwick a little bit.

Q) Wayne: I guess it was kind of fortunate that they did look into what was being done at Pilgrim Hot Springs, from what I heard, is that correct? Wasn't it Oil and Gas who asked for a converter or something on that hole that was done up there?

A) Well, actually there were quite a bit of negotiations back and forth on it... The division had hired a consultant on it..one of the reasons I think that Oil and Gas stayed out of it is because there are some substantial differences between geothermal and oil and unless you've actually been involved in them, those differences aren't that easily learned and what we did was hire a consultant to kind of advise both of us on the Pilgrim project, which we weren't really looking at high temperatures like at Unalaska.

Q) Is the Oil and Gas Commission supposed to, based on statute?

A) David: It quite frankly, hasn't been determined who is supposed to look after them.

Dick: Oil and Gas Commission has the expertise, I think that's what we're after.

Well, it's fairly obvious where you are going to have to go, it's either that or you're going to have to hire a consultant.

A) David: Yes, and also in that we are the leasing agency, you might have the situation where the fox is guarding the chicken field.

C) Wayne: Well, you certainly don't want the liability of passing judgment on the program yourself, without covering yourself if you're going into a high pressure, high temperature situation.

C) I think, either way, they will probably have to hire a consultant. I don't think we have the expertise in the state outside of the U of A.

- C) Wayne: Oh, I think we do. You've got people working for the oil companies who came right from geysers up here..you've got all kinds of drilling people if you really look.
- C) But those are consultants.
- A) David: Okay, to further answer your question, a plan of development has to include such things as the long-range proposed development activities and the plan of operations, I think that's where you can get into trouble. Someone can hit something they weren't expecting to hit, before they expected it, because our level of knowledge really is quite low on this resource.
- C) David: We are planning a lease sale in May, probably in the Mt. Drum or Chena Hot Springs area. But we are favoring the Mt. Drum area.
- \* Patty DeJong, Alaska Power Authority, gave a presentation on APA's geothermal projects. APA is mandated to develop lowest cost energy alternatives for power production, statewide. There is a three (3) step process used to accomplish this. First, an energy reconnaissance study is done to look at various alternatives. Second, a feasibility assessment of favorable looking alternatives is done. Then finally, the design and construction of power projects is carried out.
- \* In the future, the Division of Energy and Power Development will be doing the reconnaissance studies.
- \* APA is currently working on the Unalaska/Dutch Harbor Project. The resource being developed there will require deep drilling. Public Geothermal was awarded the contract on this project. Phase one of their project will be compiling existing information and detailing a drilling plan.. The second phase will consist of a shallow drilling program before locating the site for the deep hole. Funding may be a problem if we don't get the information we need from the first deep hole. If we do get lucky, an economic analysis will be made.
- Gordon Nelson, USGS, gave an update on programs and work products in the Kenai Borough. There are two (2) kinds of programs, one is federally funded, the other is 50% federally funded and 50% local or state funded.
- \* One cooperative program has produced 6 reports and an ongoing program which provides monitoring ground and surface water within the Borough.

- \* The Nikiski area of North Kenai is in a sort of equilibrium right now. The effects seen will not get worse unless there is a drought or another large industry moves into the area.
- \* A report on the Seldovia area, found that for other than small residential wells everything looks terrible for any kind of water development. There doesn't appear to be anything you could get any big production wells out of in the Seldovia area.
- \* A study of the 4th of July Creek near Seward showed that the creek, about 30 cfs, vanishes at the top of the fan and becomes groundwater. It is a significant aquifer with good quality water but there is no good filter material between the land surface and the aquifer. They will have to use caution to protect the aquifer from pollution. The creek would not be a good back-up due to the glacial sediment content.
- \* Ground water development at the Granite Point proposed methanol plant site does not look favorable, however, development does look favorable at nearby McArthur Flats.
- Q) What is the status of the Beluga coal development. Has there been any decisions made how waste water will be disposed of over there?
- A) Gordon: No. The mining plans themselves have not been formulated yet, and until those plans are formulated, its a little difficult to even tell where they are going to be diverting water, or what streams are going to be affected, or where the roads will be and so on.
- Q) Peg: What's the ratio, when you have cooperative studies. What's the ratio of federal to other participants of funding?
- A) Gordon: Generally 50-50. Each agency comes up with 50% of the money. There are exceptions to that. The APA has more money than we can match, we don't have that much available and so many of our programs are funded entirely by them.
- Q) Peg: If the state can or feels inclined to come up with say 75%, do you have the flexibility of matching the 25% ?
- A) Gordon: Yes.

An informal joint meeting with the Alaska Transportation Planning Council was held after the lunch break. Members of the council present at the meeting were:

Vern Smith, Anchorage

Marvin Taylor, Skagway-White Pass and Yukon  
Route, and SE Stevedore, Inc.  
Ed Christianson  
Cecil McLain, Sitka  
Jack Foster, Sand Point  
Frank Chafadose, Fairbanks

A brief description of the council's function was given.

Major Points:

- \* The council serves as advisor to the Governor on transportation issues. They have been in existence for about 6 or 7 years. The main function is to look at long range plans and try to anticipate any problems that may come up and suggest ways that they can be avoided.
- \* Dick Sims then gave a brief description and history of the Water Resources Board's main functions.

Sam Best was next on the agenda representing the Kenai Peninsula Borough. A report was given to the Board concerning the Port and Harbor Study. The Borough was not very pleased with the study. Before another port is built, port and harbor authority must be attained. Also, it will depend on what industries will be developed on the inlet and where other ports may be built.

Major Points:

- \* Other water resources studies are being conducted on the Kenai Peninsula to pinpoint where the large industrial users are effecting lakes and drawdown on earlier existing wells. The Borough is watching development plans on both sides of the inlet to correlate the relationships of industrial and private water users in order to meet their needs.
- \* Because of expressed concern in the area, many industries are going to air cooling instead of water cooling or recycling the cooling water to preserve water for other users.

Steve Mack addressed the Water Board and Transportation Council pointing out some problems with sharing information from data collection programs.

Major Points:

- \* There is no formal mechanism between DNR and DOT for exchanging information. Cooperation does exist on an informal project-by-project basis, however, if DNR doesn't know of a DOT project they don't usually get any information. If DNR knows of a project they ask

for the information and DOT is more than willing to cooperate.

- \* When DOT is drilling wells, they are not coming in for a water right. There usually is not conflict problems with a prior appropriator, but the well log information is useful data and the water rights process is one way of getting that data over to DGGS and into the statewide well log collection program. We are not getting those well logs presently.
- C) Elliott: The biggest problem is building the data base itself. Sometimes the work is done by contractors or project people. They collect a lot of data on their own initiative, it doesn't go anywhere, it goes into that project and ends up in someone's files. Maybe there needs to be some uniform provisions in state contracts for turning over data collected to the appropriate agencies.

After a dinner break, the Board reconvened for the evening public comment session.

Floyd Hymba, Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association, gave a brief history of the legislative actions that established aquaculture associations in Alaska.

#### Major Points:

- \* He then gave a run-down on their plans to build a hatchery near the Eklutna Powerhouse. They are in the permit stage now. A question was raised as to whether the Association has applied for water rights for the proposed hatchery. Mr Hymba was not sure.
- \* The Municipality of Anchorage is looking at the same area to supply future water needs.
- Q) Steve: Did the Municipality of Anchorage have any comments about the site of the proposed hatchery?
- A) Floyd: The Municipality has a seat on our board. Dave Walsh occupies that seat and he was busy and has never come down to a meeting so the Municipality has never attended one of our meetings.
- Q) Dick: What about a hearing?
- A) Floyd: We've had lots of public hearings on the hatchery.

The Board recessed until 9:00 AM Thursday morning and began DEC's portion of the meeting.

The Board was called back to order at 9:00 AM Friday morning.



The first person on the agenda was Dean Brown giving a report on the Water Management Section.

Major Points:

- \* The Division of Land and Water Management has delegated authority for sign off of Certificates of Appropriation for approximately 95% of all water rights cases to the districts. In order to maintain quality control statewide, the Central Office has instituted an audit procedure. The audit seems to be working quite well and has increased the communication level with the districts. The delegation should help the districts produce the final products more rapidly. The delegation has also freed up Central Office staff so that we now can get more involved in the management end of things where we should be.
  - \* The Central Office has delegated out some positions from Water Management to districts to ensure that they had both the level of expertise that they needed there and they had additional staffing. A rotational system was started whereby each person working in the Water Management Section would work 2 months adjudicating case files in a district. This is serving two purposes. It makes the staff have hands-on experience with the adjudication process and it allows the problems that are being encountered by the public and simple administrative problems to come back to Water Management. This increases awareness and improves communication back and forth.
  - \* Water Management has implemented the computer programming for water case files within all of the districts, they can update and access information statewide and also use it to track case file routing.

The system will be compatible with the ALARS project when it is done. The well log data that USGS has will be compatible when ALARS is implemented and we'll be able to put that into the state computer also.
- Q) Dick: I attended a meeting with some of the water adjudicators. During the brief time I was able to spend at the meeting, they discussed the quota system that is now established in the budget, and some of the comments that I heard were a little bit disturbing because their feeling was that what that was doing was encouraging them to complete the easy ones and the harder ones just kept getting further and further backlogged. Have you heard that?
- A) Dean: Oh, yes, I've heard that, and I think that's a very valid comment. I think there's some major problems we've gotten into with the quota system. One

problem is we're not doing fieldwork in any proportion to what we should be. Additionally, the easier case files are getting done ahead of the harder ones. However, the commissioner's office and Water Management both have put priorities on No. 1 mining case files and No. 2 on grandfathers. The fact is, in order to stay up with their quota, they are going to do the single-family domestics, anything that's easier. For the next year, I've put in and it's been approved, a reduced quota from 2,000 case files statewide to 1,400 with the additional emphasis that we would have to do 600 field inspections. I feel very strongly that first of all, if we can achieve the 2,100 quota this year, we will essentially have the backlog wiped out. An additional area where I think the quota has been quite detrimental has been in the morale of the water officers statewide.

- \* Report on the status of the Instream Flow Regulations. Draft regs were sent out on a mailing list to approximately 27 different groups and Dean met with a group of 8 environmental representatives as to the effect they feel the regs will have on their interests. One of the major things that was identified, almost unanimously by comments that came back in from all the groups, was the issuance of an instream flow certificate to the state, to DNR, now this had originally been put into the draft regs based on a AG's opinion that they felt this was a public trust and as such should be administered by the state. However, in looking at the expenditures, the responsibility that individuals, or agencies, groups, the applicant as you will, puts into getting information together for an instream flow application, there was a general feeling that the application should go to the applicant. Additionally, in Water Management, we have some concerns about the effect of issuing it to the Division. For example, if we issue an instream flow water right with specific requirements that would require monitoring, particularly things that require additional monetary expenditure to determine if conditions had changed at periodic intervals, we then are looking at not only the regulatory function, but additionally a budget function. There are additional concerns I think from other agencies, too, that the agency involved may in fact, or the applicant may be in fact the person most interested and most diligent in monitoring requirements to ensure that instream flow applications or final issuance that any conditions are being followed.

- Q) Fred: We were talking about the situation where you have a small creek and you have a fisheries resource and a mining resource or some development related resource on the same creek, if the appropriator sought to appropriate the entire stream for his development

use, there's no doubt but that the state could deny that appropriation request because of the impact on the fishery and the public interest. Turn it around. Suppose that ADF&G comes in and asks for a reservation of water, instream flow reservation for the protection of the fish, and supposing no one else has made an application, but someone points out that this stream may be very valuable, the water from this stream may be valuable, of course, in development purposes, could DNR deny ADF&G the instream reservation on the theory that there are other public uses that may be best served?

A) Dean: My opinion is no. Primarily because then the department by making that type of decision would be saying we foresee a future use coming along that may be needed that of higher benefit than this, but there's no existing use. It's almost a water speculation. For example APA could do the same thing, all the areas they propose for hydro sites, well we're going to do a feasibility study, we need an instream flow reservation for the complete amount of the stream. You're almost into a water speculation area there, and that's a concern. This is one other topic that we've looked at with the instream flow reservation, as a possible mechanism for water speculation, because if you put an instream flow reservation in or granted that reservation, hold it for 10 years, then essentially relinquish it with timing such that a major development thing could come in right behind it, what have you done, you've speculated in the water use, so there's some concerns like that. I'm not sure what we could do about that, or what we should do about that. But, once you have something, an instream flow into a trust situation, it puts the trustee into a problem of either its perpetual, or are you actually manipulating water use in a speculative manner.

Q) Fred: Aren't what you're really saying is that the instream flow is simply another way to recognize what are perceived to be as public concerns, whether they're protection of fishery resources, or protection of recreational resources, or preservation of the water so that a dam could be built on it. The instream flow really is simply another way to identify or attempt to protect some perceived public interests and public resources and that what the instream flow really does is attempt to give that particular public interest or resource a leg up, or a position of standing before there's any real conflict, and it seems to me, if you look at it that way, the whole concept of an instream flow is highly questionable, because preserving the fisheries resource, preserving the water resource for a dam or whatever the particular public element is, that decision shouldn't be made except in the context of competing decisions and to grant the rights for a

fisheries resource, and then not be in a position to say, well, you can't build a dam because an instream flow for the fisheries resource is really to prejudge the question of the relative merits of the fisheries resource and the merits of the dam. I don't understand why we want to do that at all.

- A) Dean: I think there's two things there you're looking at. One is, if the statute was strictly to public agencies, I would agree with you partially, the fact is that individuals, any entity corporation on down can come in for a water use application. So, in fact, its not strictly public interest, a miner may well come in and say I want such and such amount of water left in the stream because by the time it gets off my claim it's diluted, you know my settling pond siltation problem and I can meet DEC requirements, so we're not talking about a public benefit totally then.

Fred: That's fine, but all that really does is complicate things, it doesn't really undo what I'm suggesting at all. To the extent that you're talking about public benefits they are already protected. The other part of the problem you're talking about is sort of a legalistic one that developed a long time ago as a result of some court cases, that said if the miner diverts the stream over to his mining operation over here, then he has appropriated the water and he's entitled to protection, but if he is in fact mining in the very bed of the stream, he's therefore not diverting the water, he's entitled to no protection because he hasn't appropriated the water, he hasn't diverted it. It's a whole heck of a lot easier to deal with those kinds of problems without building up the whole concept of an instream flow, particularly without mixing the concept of the instream flow where its designed for public purposes to protect public resources, than where its designed for private benefits. If the idea is, this guy's not diverting the water but he's really making use of a certain quantity of water in the stream for an essentially private purpose, then it would be a very minor problem to deal with and to simply redefine appropriation to include use of the water for a specific private benefit to private purpose, even though no diversion has occurred. And that would not be a difficult problem to deal with I don't think, although quite frankly, I think if the miners wise up, they're going to go out and apply for instream flows on every creek around. I mean that's certainly what I would advise them to do, if I was their counsel in this type of situation. Because what better way to protect your future speculative interest.

Dean: Frankly, I think that's a problem that we'll have with several groups. Besides strictly miners. The environmental groups, I'm sure are going to be quite concerned about that because, the statute already mixes private and public, and it also as the regulations state now, includes aesthetic uses.

Q) Fred: Well, take another example. The Sierra Club and the Alaska Miners Society both come in for an instream reservation on some creek that may have both recreational potential and gold, you going to grant water to both of them for what purpose?

A) Dean: I think it goes right straight back to the concept of instream flow. One of the reasons an instream flow was put together was because there was a general feeling that although, state and federal governments had a responsibility to be protecting the public interest, that they were too responsive to individual major projects for instance, individual political pressures on the short term, and that the only way to adequately protect the long-term public interest was an instream flow and I think there's definite examples to support that. That the water quality concerns, environmental concerns have been overridden by things like that by the very agencies pledged to protect those interests and I'm not using Alaska as an example there, but the other states have definitely had that problem. So, you're points are well taken, and they're correct.

#### Major Points:

- \* Report on Basinwide Adjudication: Water Management intended to initiate basinwide adjudication on Ship Creek and additionally hope to initiate one on Indian River which is a similar situation. Both of them involving federal reserve rights. We did have an opportunity to attend a seminar given by the Western States Water Council on basinwide adjudication. The consensus we came away with was that we need a change to the Water Use Act before we start into basinwide adjudication. The amount of commitment of money and time involved was very impressive. A typical example, Wyoming is doing a modestly sized federal adjudication, that has gone into it's 4th year of litigation with the federal government. They have spent 5 million dollars and anticipate that it will take 8 million dollars before they finish it.

It is a very significant, time consuming, expensive process. Also, the earlier you get them started, the fewer users the better.

The majority of federal adjudications do have a problem because of indian water rights involved, which we have only 2 instances where that would apply. The one thing that became very evident was, before you go into these, you need to have your statute well in order. You also need to have a very definite commitment by not only the department, but also by the Legislature, because they do require a number of years commitment of subsequent finding.

The actual decisions in adjudications are done in the court by a water master. The initial work, particularly on identification of the aquifers is critical. It has to be well substantiated because in some of these cases they've run into technical testimony among the federal government experts, the state experts and private consultants who didn't agree.

The initial work done in defining what your aquifer is, what the parameters of the case are, is critical in the later proceedings in the case. It's a major undertaking. I think it's going to be a case of having to take a hard look at how important it is to quantify that federal reserve, because it is going to cost a great deal of money and it's going to be a major commitment that will go beyond this administration.

Next on the agenda was Ross Schaff, Larry Dearborn, Bill Barnwell and Bill Long of DGGS. Also present were Phil Emery and Ray George of the USGS. Ross gave a report on the water data collection program now called AWARE.(Alaska Water Resource Evaluation Program.)

\* Through a Memorandum of Understanding, the USGS is responsible for the coordination of all federal agencies who are involved in water data collection in the state and DGGS is responsible for coordination of water data collection from other state and local agencies. A five year plan is being developed and will hopefully reflect all of the water data needs for the entire State of Alaska.

- Q) Fred: Don't agencies like APA have contractors collecting water related data?
- A) Ross: Yes, on a routine basis. If they contract private concerns to collect data, it would be an automatic provision that we would receive the information.
- Q) Fred: Their contract would require data submission?
- A) Ross: Yes.
- Q) Peg: This will be part of the MOU?

- A) Ross: Yes, it will be part of the MOU. We have not signed it yet, but that is our intention.

Chris Beck was next on the agenda, and gave a short presentation on the Susitna Beluga Area Plan.

Major Points:

- \* There are four major coal leases in the area. Placer Amex, Bass and Wilson and Diamond Shamrock are the principal companies.
  - \* The demand for this coal is principally in the Pacific Rim countries, Asian countries, Japan, Korea and Taiwan. They have rapidly developing economies and they are shifting more and more to coal.
  - \* Transportation costs can be up to 50% of the cost of delivering coal to the market. At Beluga, the coal is only 10-15 miles from a potential port site, so it would be relatively inexpensive to deliver.
  - \* Diamond Alaska tentative plans are to apply for permits in 1983, begin construction in 1984, and begin exporting in 1987.
- Q) Peg: How are the cuts in the surface mining administration going to effect research? My understanding is that that program has been pretty well dismantled.
- A) Chris: The statute is in tact, its been tested in the Supreme Court. Right now the state is in the process of taking over the jurisdiction.
- Q) Peg: I'm talking about the research that has been going on under that on a national level.
- A) Chris: Right now, the state has just received a couple million dollars under the Office of Surface Mining grant to do some studies.

After Chris Beck's presentation the Board went into its business session.

Major Points:

- \* Send letter to Oil and Gas Conservation Commission asking to use their expertise in drilling in the geothermal program to prevent duplication and make use of their knowledge of safety reasons also. Send a copy to the Governor. If we don't get any favorable response, then write a letter to the Governor requesting action.

- \* Accept offer to visit the Noranda Mining Site.
- \* Invite the Yukon Water Board.
- \* Send a "Thank You" to the Alaska Transportation Planning Council.
- \* Write a letter to the federal DOT and request that they establish a joint reporting service with the state on oil spills.
- \* Invite the local commander of the U.S. Coast Guard to the next meeting in Juneau to discuss their approach to oil spills and enforcement of clean-up.
- \* Wayne indicated that he would like to review the on-site disposal information as it comes out of the 208 projects.
- \* Include a presentation on the Clean Air Act on the next agenda.
- \* Send Jerry Brossia on "atta boy" for his excellent presentation and applaud him for his approach with the miners.
- \* Set up a specific presentation and discussion with the policy makers of the three agencies involved in the tri-agency agreement for the next meeting. Discussion should include the summer field season and stream reclassification.
- \* Request the Agricultural Action Council to make a presentation at the next meeting on how they are dealing with water in their agricultural developments.
- \* The Board will make the offer to review the list and co-sponsor the paper on Water Resource Research needs with the Alaska Council on Science and Technology provided that: 1.) No conclusions are reached that the Board doesn't authorize and 2.) the Board will be able to have some input into it. Example, make sure the area covers from Southeast to the North Slope and covers at the very least the major industries, etc.
- \* The Board would like to see the latest copy of the Instream Flow Regs at the next meeting.
- \* After some discussion, it was decided that a letter should be sent to DNR requesting that someone be assigned to review the budget to look for projects that require water needs or data collection so that DNR can coordinate these needs with the agencies involved. This process could solve two problems: 1.) Duplicative



efforts of data collection and 2.) It would insure that DNR would receive data collected as a result of a project.

- \* Approval of the minutes from both meetings should be the first item of business at our next meeting. (Sitka and Kenai.
- \* A letter will be written to the Governor and state kindly that Levake has not attended 3 meetings in a row and the Board would appreciate that someone else be appointed. The person should be familiar 1.) with the mining industry and 2.) come from the Northcentral region of the state.
- \* The Board decided to form an Anchorage Sub-Committee comprised of those members of the Board that reside in Anchorage, namely, Peg, Fred and Wayne. The purpose of the Sub-committee would be to meet with the new mayor to discuss Anchorage water problems.
- \* In order to accomodate Dave and his commercial fishing season in the summer, the Board decided to hold the next meeting in April and the following one in September. That would eliminate the July meeting and allow Dave to attend every meeting.

The next meeting will be in Juneau on April 14, 15, and 16 1982.

Meeting adjourned.