

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 1

ADVISORY NOTE ON LEGISLATIVE SESSION

(Committee Substitute for House Bill No. 983)

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" advises the legislature to place the proposed amendment before the voters.

A vote "AGAINST" advises the legislature not to place the proposed amendment before the voters.

FOR

AGAINST

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>13</u>	Nays <u>5</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>2</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>33</u>	Nays <u>4</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>3</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

The vote on this proposition does not amend the Constitution of the State of Alaska. The question merely asks for an advisory vote on whether the legislature should adopt a resolution placing before the qualified voters of the State at the next general election an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska providing for a maximum length for regular sessions of the legislature of 120 consecutive calendar days which may be extended in 10-day increments by a concurrent resolution concurred in by a majority of the membership of each house.

— Summary prepared by Legislative
Affairs Agency as required by law

**STUDY THE
BALLOT PROPOSITIONS
CAREFULLY**

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 1

Background

By necessity, legislative sessions nationally are more frequent and longer. In the forties, only four states held a session each year; in 1963, twenty states held annual sessions. Currently, thirty-six states hold annual sessions varying from twenty calendar days to an unlimited number. Twenty-one states have no session limitation whatsoever. Alaska is one.

The Argument Against a Limitation

The loudest cry in opposition to a limit heralds doom and gloom forecasts of "special interest" groups and "powerful lobbyists" manipulating any legislative body strapped with a time limit. However, if lobbyists or interest groups want to bombard the legislature with high-pressure tactics, it matters little whether that pressure is exerted on the twentieth day or the one-hundred-twentieth day. In fact, capitol hallways are jammed with lobbyists only during those final, meandering and uncertain days. Until then, most make only occasional visits to Juneau.

The Argument For a Limitation

1. Costly Trade-offs

In the helter-skelter approach to adjournment of our current system, the wheeler-dealers lay back until the ship of state is meandering, apparently rudderless, in the fog. That is the hour of the "I'll scratch your back if you scratch mine". No one wants his or her pet bill to be left on the table; concessions are readily made.

2. Timeliness in the Beginning

With a limitation, major issues will be presented to the legisla-

ture early in the session with adequate time for study, a practice not in current use. For example, during the last session, the Alpetco Royalty Oil Sale — a contract worth billions of dollars! — was not submitted until the 57th legislative day; the Northwest Gas Line financing proposal was not introduced until the 102nd day! Knowing this, it's not surprising the legislature went 162 days.

3. Order at the End

Time, often unfortunately, affects all of us. We rise at a certain time each day; we work and eat at a certain time; we relax in the evenings; we close the day. There is no reason that an orderly process, with a beginning and an end, should not be a part of the legislative process. During the last session, over half of the bills to reach the governor's desk were passed in the last ten days of the session, a confusing process at best.

4. A Goal to Reach

Be it a corporate vice-presidency for a businessman, a four-minute mile for an athlete or a diploma for a student, most people operate more efficiently with a goal. A session limitation is no different. It demands the work be planned and concluded within a reasonable time frame.

Conclusion

For many years, a limited session has been discussed in Alaska. For the first time, voters have a chance to speak directly to the issue. Support the limited session proposition.

— BILL MILES, Representative
Alaska State Legislature

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 1

Although limiting the length of a legislative session sounds attractive on the surface, such limitation is actually not in the best interest of Alaska. In fact, limitations of this kind have been found, in many states of the union, to be harmful to the best interests of the people for one very basic reason: more often than not, the primary goal of powerful "special interest" groups is to block legislation, not pass it. By having an artificial limit on the length of a session, it's possible for such groups to prevail, not by the soundness of the cause of their arguments on the floor of the House and Senate, but rather by simply dragging out and delaying passage of legislation until the mandatory adjournment period comes and goes. In particular, a 90-day or 120-day or other artificial limit would play into the hands of the multinational corporate giants whose wealth and virtually unlimited resources put opposing viewpoints at a considerable disadvantage already.

The argument for a mandatory limit assumes that, by prioritizing, a legislature has 90 days or 120 days (or some similar period) in which to "get its act together" and accomplish the people's business. In the real world of the legislative process, however, this

is not true. It is frequently the case that for very valid and unalterable reasons, major legislation simply cannot even be placed before the legislature until the legislature is well into its session. (The Alpetco Royalty Oil legislation of the last session is a good case in point. For reasons beyond his control, the governor could not even introduce this legislation until March 6, 1978 — the 57th day of the session.)

This is not to say that in the absence of mandatory limits the legislature should be expected to continuously lengthen its annual sessions. To the contrary, by better use of interim committees, by better use of staff (which has only recently been upgraded in the area of research and clerical support) and, most important, by a heightened resolve on the part of all members to expedite legislation as fast as possible and prudently, the session time of future legislation can — and I believe will — range in the 100 or 125-day time period in most instances.

— MIKE MILLER, Representative
Alaska State Legislature

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 2
POWERS OF LEGISLATIVE INTERIM COMMITTEES
Constitutional Amendment

(House Committee Substitute for Senate Joint Resolution No. 16)

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the amendment.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the amendment.

FOR
AGAINST

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>17</u>	Nays <u>2</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>1</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>38</u>	Nays <u>2</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal would amend Article II, Section II (Interim Committees) of the Constitution of the State of Alaska. It authorizes the legislature to establish an interim committee to approve state budget revisions jointly with the governor, including revisions authorizing receipt and expenditure of federal and other program receipts as defined by law.

*— Summary prepared by Legislative
Affairs Agency as required by law*

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 2

The Alaska Constitution vests the "legislative power of the State" in the legislature, and Sections 13-16 of Article II spell out the major legislative powers: the authority to enact bills into law and to reconsider and enact bills overriding the governor's veto. Of the 150 to 250 bills enacted into law annually, some 40 to 60 are appropriation bills, including perhaps the most important — the General Appropriation or Budget Bill.

All appropriation bills when passed by the legislature contain the following elements:

1. amounts appropriated;
2. fund sources from which the amounts are appropriated;
3. departments or agencies to which appropriated;
4. purposes for which appropriations are made.

Since the four elements are stated for each appropriation within an Act, it is not possible to change any of the elements during the course of the budget year without in effect "amending" the appropriation as passed by the legislature.

How then can provision be made for necessary changes or revisions to the state budget during the course of the budget year? One way would be to call the legislature into periodic

special sessions or have it meet year-round so that the legislature would always be available to pass laws accomplishing the various revisions to the state budget. Another way would be to follow the pattern set by some twelve other states — establish an interim committee of the legislature to approve, jointly with the governor, state budget revisions.

Alaska has, in fact, been operating under the governor/legislative committee approach for approval of budget revisions since 1971. The problem is that the Alaska Constitution, though providing for interim committees of the legislature, is silent on the question: Can the legislature delegate responsibility to one of its committees to jointly approve with the governor revisions to the budget? The proposed constitutional amendment, if approved, would clearly authorize continued use of the existing budget revision system.

Approval of this amendment is recommended by your legislative committee who urge you to vote "YES".

— MIKE COLLETTA, State Senator
Chairman, Legislative Budget
and Audit Committee

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 2

This amendment would increase the power of privileged legislators at the expense of executive branch control and efficiency in government. The fundamental American constitutional tradition of "separation of powers" prohibits what the legislature is trying to do here. An Alaska court has so ruled. That is the reason behind this amendment.

But separation of powers is still a good idea, especially in this case. Let the courts decide the boundary between legislative and executive authority. Defeat this legislative "end run".

Even if we believed that budget control problems required a constitutional change, this is the worst way to do it. This amendment authorizes the legislative creation of a committee of super-legislators. You will have no say in their selection.

Legislative committees run by long-term members from "safe" districts already tend to develop special relationships with special interest groups. This amendment will provide a unique opportunity for exercise of that habit. A committee chairman, responsible only to the voters in one district or to "special interests", will end up with the power of an "associate governor".

Note that this amendment does not limit budget revision authority of the proposed committee to federal revenues. That is a misleading example. The proposed budget revision power can become government-wide executive power, affecting private parties who deal with government as well as bureaucrats.

Here is how revision works. The legislature authorizes expenditures by program category through the appropriation bill. A budget is prepared reflecting estimates of money spending within each category. But in detailed budgets, each item is only a target,

not the exact amount necessary. Certainty to the last dime is impossible. Costs of goods and services required for the program both increase and decrease.

To increase program effectiveness within appropriation categories, the governor is permitted by the legislature to transfer funds among program accounts if he doesn't increase the money available for it. For instance, by reducing travel and increasing contractual expenditures in the same program category, a more pressing operational need may be met without additional funding. By expanding the technical detail of the general budget, thereby deliberately setting up situations where budget revisions will be required, this amendment would permit the legislative committee to effectively run many day-to-day operations of government.

Even if we didn't believe in separation of powers, government by committee is expensive, wasteful and inefficient: Executive government by committee chairman, responsible only to a limited geographic constituency, also tends to corrupt.

Government bureaucrats should be accountable to all the people through the governor and the whole legislature. The legislature reviews all executive expenditures by auditing. Administrators who initiate transfer requests answer for what they have done to the whole legislature during regular session. This is our present system. Let's not exchange separation of powers for a system of legislative kingpins.

— JOHN E. HAVELOCK, Professor
of Justice, Director of Legal
Studies, University of Alaska

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 3
FULL BONDABLE COSTS OF RELOCATING CAPITAL
Initiative No. 6

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" approves the initiative.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the initiative.

FOR
AGAINST

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This initiative, if approved, would authorize the expenditure of state money for the physical relocation of the present functions of the state government only after a majority of those voting in a statewide election have approved a general obligation bond proposition which includes all bondable costs of the relocation to the State through the year 1992. It provides that the estimate of "all bondable costs of the relocation" shall be determined by a commission created by the legislature to plan the relocation. In determining bondable costs, the commission would also be called upon to determine all costs to the State for relocation of the capital. "All costs" includes: moving personnel and offices to the relocation site; planning, building, using, furnishing and financing a new capital having facilities equal to those at the current capital and those required by the 1974 capital move initiative; and the social, economic and environmental impact to the present and relocation sites.

— Summary prepared by Legislative
Affairs Agency as required by law

A full copy of the initiative is available from each of the regional election offices (addresses on inside back cover).

**VOTE
ON
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1978**

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 3

Initiative No. 6 was developed by the FRANK (Frustrated, Responsible Alaskans Needing Knowledge) Committee which was organized in Fairbanks in early 1977 by a group of Alaskans who believe we should have the "Right to Know and the Right to Vote".

The purpose of Initiative No. 6 is to insure the voter's right to know the full costs of the capital move before any significant additional money is spent on the project. It also requires voter approval of those costs in a bond issue which includes all bondable costs of such a move.

FRANK does not know what such a move will cost. However, it appears that it will be one of the most expensive projects undertaken by the State. Therefore, the people should have the right to approve the costs before they are incurred. This is a principle which the voters may wish to apply to other expensive projects so that the people have more control over how tax dollars are spent.

Initiative No. 6, if passed, will insure that not only the total bondable costs but also the total costs to the State through the year 1992 will be made known to Alaskans. It will insure that they have the right to vote on those bondable costs. It will insure that Alaskans have a voice of consent for a new capital.

Initiative No. 6 will give Alaskans the opportunity to establish clearly their priorities for the use of state monies surplus to the basic needs of the State. Quite simply, Alaskans can elect to use those surplus monies to improve the quality of life in Alaska or to relocate the capital.

A potential impact of the passage of Initiative No. 6 that had not been foreseen by the Committee results from the success of the famed Initiative No. 13 recently passed in California. Passage of that initiative expressed the deep concern Californians had for the taxing and spending programs of their governmental bodies. While Initiative No. 6 does not address itself to taxation, approval of it during the forthcoming election will express to the administration and the legislature the very deep concern that Alaskans have to be fully informed and to have an effective voice in final decisions about the use of state monies in many major programs and projects.

The FRANK Committee urges you to read the Initiative. It urges you to insist on your "RIGHT TO KNOW AND RIGHT TO VOTE".

Vote "YES" on Initiative No. 6.

— MARY A. NORDALE, Member
Initiative No. 6 Sponsoring Committee

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 3

Anyone who favors moving the capital to Willow and reducing costs to Alaskan taxpayers should vote "NO"! — against Initiative No. 6. It has confused the public as to the real cost of relocation to the taxpayers. Its true purpose is to prohibit the move to Willow which the voters have authorized.

One stated purpose of Initiative No. 6 is to insure that Alaskans have all pertinent data available to them regarding relocation **costs to the State**. The Capital Site Planning Commission has already published this information. However, the Commission, under terms of the legislation establishing it (as interpreted by the attorney general) estimated the cost of an unrealistically large new capital city — 37,500 people — and included all costs through the next sixteen years of an expanded state bureaucracy increasing at a rate of 6% per year compounded annually.

If this bureaucratic expansion actually occurs, space must be provided, regardless of where the capital is, but this is **not** a relocation cost. If the capital remains in Juneau, the cost of expansion would be vastly greater than at Willow. The State already owns the land at Willow where construction is easy and economical. Land at Juneau must be purchased at an exorbitant price and construction costs there are excessive.

Initiative No. 6 requires advance approval by the voters of a bond authorization which is both unnecessary and highly inflated. None, even those supporting Initiative No. 6, believe that all these bonds will be needed or used. The attorney general says Initiative No. 6 means that the relocation stops unless voters have approved a bond authorization covering everything which conceivably could be "bondable" — private homes, hotels and shopping centers, etc., as well as public facilities. The director of legal services, Alaska Legislative Affairs Agency, says approval must be in a **single** authorization. It is unrealistic to ask the voters to authorize such a fictitious bond issue.

A sensible program for relocation can be accomplished at little cost to the taxpayers. In such a program the private sector would pay for and construct all non-governmental facilities. Governmental facilities can be financed through land sales in the capital site and through modest initial advances of state funds later to be repaid through land sale proceeds. **No state borrowing is required**; but should the State elect to borrow for access roads, streets, etc., in advance of land sales, the amount should be kept to a minimum. Therefore, no major authorization for borrowing is required and Initiative No. 6 should be defeated.

— FRANK HARRIS, Chairman
Taxpayers Capital Relocation Committee

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 4
DISPOSAL OF STATE LANDS
Initiative No. 10

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" approves the initiative.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the initiative.

FOR
AGAINST

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This initiative, if approved, would classify and make available as homestead entry land all vacant, unappropriated and unreserved general grant land of the State of Alaska except trust lands. The land would remain classified as homestead entry land until 30 per cent or 30 million acres, whichever occurs earlier, of the state general grant land has passed into private ownership through the homestead program established in the initiative. The director of the division of lands would retain the authority to reclassify for public purposes not more than 500,000 acres of the land, thus withdrawing that land from homestead entry land purposes. This initiative also provides a system for the filing of applications and the determination of eligibility for grants of homestead lands. Under the application system, a person who has been a resident of the State for at least three years would be entitled to a homestead grant of not more than 40 acres; a person who has been a resident for at least five years would be entitled to two grants, not to exceed a combined total of 80 acres; a person who has been a resident for at least ten years would be entitled to four grants, not to exceed a combined total of 160 acres. However, no person would be entitled to more than one grant per year and, in Southeastern Alaska, all grants would be subject to a combined maximum of 20 acres for each individual. The application and eligibility standards also describe the duties of the director of the division of lands with respect to notification of available homestead entry land and set out procedures for making application for and perfecting title to a homestead land grant by the applicant.

*— Summary prepared by Legislative
Affairs Agency as required by law*

A full copy of the initiative is available from each of the regional election offices (addresses on inside back cover).

At the time of printing this pamphlet, the Alaska Supreme Court had not yet ruled whether this proposition would appear on the November 7 General Election ballot. For the latest information, contact your regional election office or the Lieutenant Governor's Office in Juneau.

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 4

The purpose of this initiative is to move land that is now owned by the State into private ownership. Of the 365 million acres in the State, only one million is in private ownership.

At statehood, Alaska received rights to 104 million acres (the size of California), but to date we have only received about 27 million acres. The balance will come to us when the d-2 question is settled, hopefully within the year.

The problem is that for the past 20 years the State has not made land available to its citizens for private ownership and use. Keeping land in state government ownership caused an artificial shortage of land, skyrocketing real estate prices and effectively eliminated the working person from owning land. Serious speculation followed dramatic population increases but available land remained fixed in amount. This policy of keeping 99% of the land in government ownership has destroyed agriculture through the subdivision of farms for real estate profits and closed vast recreational areas to all except airplane owners. Local government couldn't tax the state land for money needed to provide services, so it increased taxes on the small amount of privately owned land within its boundaries causing a serious hardship to homeowners by increasing the cost of living. The pride of ownership, which is our stake in Alaska, was denied thousands of Alaskans.

Land idle for millions of years continues to be unused, while the legislature since statehood has failed to produce a meaningful disposal program. Promise after promise was made without results. It was always next year. Laws passed just this year are

pitifully too little, too restrictive and way too late. We don't have to accept crumbs thrown to us by the legislature. We can get a solid piece of Alaska with this initiative. The frustrated people have reacted by deciding to make law through this initiative process as provided in the State Constitution. So here we are today.

Never forget that we, the people, really own the land. Government merely holds and manages land in trust for us; now we want it back and this is the way to get it.

Today the economy is sick with unemployment at record levels. Economic benefits of homesteading would be tremendous. Cheap land will bring back farming. Access roads could open the back country. Realtors will find business opportunity in assisting the homesteaders in selection, filing and surveying. Likewise for surveyors, carpenters, mechanics, lawyers and laborers. Building materials, 4-wheel drive vehicles, commercial communicating equipment and labor would all be needed. Everybody would be working. Jobs will keep our children in Alaska where they belong. And terribly important today, land ownership helps protect you against inflation.

The initiative is very well written and has been thoroughly researched. It would help to have a few minor technical amendments by the next legislature. But the program is simple and direct. A vote for the initiative is a vote for a free America. We can again make Alaska the land of opportunity.

— M. F. "MIKE" BEIRNE, Representative
Alaska State Legislature

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 4

This Act, if passed, will create such massive economic problems for Alaska that it will take us generations to recover from them.

The word "homestead" is a misleading description of this Act. No homesteading is required. In fact, an applicant need never even see the land he receives. The proposed bill is not an attempt to provide land for homes, summer cabins and the other uses for which it has been promoted. In spite of its name, it will do nothing more than transfer a huge area of land — one-third of the state's heritage — into private ownership by those persons and corporations wealthy enough to pay the survey and transportation costs necessary to use it. In doing so, it will not only eliminate all public benefits of this 30 million acres but it will also for many years inhibit or prevent other uses of the remaining lands.

This Act will cost the citizens of Alaska approximately \$5 billion. But the cost will go far beyond this direct loss. In addition to all unclassified lands, essentially all agricultural, grazing, commercial, industrial, private recreation, residential, utility and open-to-entry land will be reclassified as homestead entry land. All of these other uses may be precluded by the Act. The Act will prevent the growth of an effective mining industry. It will lock up hunting and fishing lands. The boroughs and municipalities will lose land needed for community growth. Areas best suited for parks, recreation, wildlife habitat and fisheries protection will be lost. It will prevent any land use planning for Alaska's future.

Further, the residency requirement may well be unconstitutional. If so, it will create a massive land rush by non-residents.

Almost all of this land is located in remote areas, accessible only by long and expensive charter flights. Few people will be able to afford that kind of access. Surveying land in these areas will cost thousands of dollars. Only 15-20% of the state's land is suitable for settlement, so most of the land available will not be habitable in any case. Many persons will find it impossible to pay for or use the land and will be forced to sell their rights to development companies and speculators at very low prices.

The ultimate owner of these lands will, after a single tax-free year, have the right to subdivide and sell the timber, gravel, grazing rights and other resources which now belong to all of us and to our children.

The question here is not whether more land should be made available for private ownership. Public pressure will force that to happen anyway. The question on this ballot is whether that distribution should be done in a rational manner designed to meet a variety of needs or in a manner which will effectively prevent all uses of this land other than a totally unregulated transfer into private hands. A "NO" vote on this initiative is a vote for rational land use.

— WILSON A. RICE, Attorney at Law
Trustees for Alaska

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 5
REFUNDABLE DEPOSITS ON CERTAIN BEVERAGE CONTAINERS
Initiative No. 11

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" approves the initiative.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the initiative.

FOR
AGAINST

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This initiative, if approved, would amend Title 18 of the Alaska Statutes by adding a new chapter which includes provisions which require the payment of a ten cent refund on empty soft drink, beer or other malt beverage containers if those containers are sold in an area of the State which has road, rail or mainline ferry service access to Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau or Ketchikan; provides that municipalities lacking the required access to Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau or Ketchikan are not prohibited from establishing through local legislation the same or similar refund and redemption requirements for empty beverage containers sold in the municipality; requires that beverage containers be marked to indicate that a refund is payable on return, prohibits the sale of beverage containers in Alaska unless they are reusable, recyclable or biodegradable; provides for the establishment of redemption centers for the return, payment of the refund and handling of the empty beverage containers; provides for the establishment of container collection areas within which private contractors can be granted the right to assume the beverage distributors' responsibility for collection and payment of the refund value on beverage containers; requires the Department of Environmental Conservation to report to the Alaska State Legislature before January 1, 1982 concerning the results and costs attributed to the enactment of this initiative. The provisions of this initiative provide that the law enacted would expire on March 14, 1984.

*— Summary prepared by Legislative
Affairs Agency as required by law*

A full copy of the initiative is available from each of the regional election offices (addresses on inside back cover).

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 5

Refundable deposit legislation is not a new concept. Not too long ago, a high proportion of beer and soft drinks were sold in returnable containers. Many people over twenty may remember collecting empties for spending money in their childhood. The Alaska Bottle Bill Initiative was proposed to encourage litter cleanup, decrease waste of non-renewable resources and energy and to set up a reuse and recycling system for beer and soft drink bottles and aluminum cans. The present one-way system of non-returnables puts responsibility solely on the public to control and dispose of beer and soft drink containers. The Bottle Bill is unique in that it shares the responsibility between the producer and the consumer by returning cans and bottles back to the industry for reuse and recycling. Additionally, the proposal should help reduce costs of taxpayer funded solid waste collection and landfill disposal sites. Industry claims they do not want bottles and cans returned to their stores because of "health and storage problems". For that reason, the legislation contains language that allows retailers to refuse to accept an otherwise reusable beverage container which has been damaged in a manner to preclude its reuse or which is in an unsanitary condition. Also, a retailer has several options: 1) He can accept beverage containers for deposit refund at his store; 2) A container collection service could pick up returned beverage containers on a daily/weekly basis; 3) He could designate a recycling center where customers could take their beverage containers to receive refunds.

Industry maintains a litter control act is needed rather than a bottle bill. The main difference is that the litter control act does nothing to decrease the volume and generation of solid waste.

Instead it puts a tax on litterable items and then pays a state-hired litter patrol to pick up after people. The two approaches are not incompatible but the litter control act is not a substitute for the Bottle Bill.

There are three main reasons for enacting the Alaska Bottle Bill:

1. Litter cleanup. Beer and soft drink containers comprise over 50% of all litter by volume. If containers are reused or recycled, they are not entering the litter stream.
2. To establish reuse and recycling systems in Alaska. The refundable deposit on beer and soft drink cans and bottles will be an incentive to look at other things that can be reused or recycled.
3. To conserve energy and raw materials used in the manufacture of non-returnables. Even industry admits that the costs of energy and raw materials are increasing and that getting containers back will be critical in having the materials to market their products.

The wasteful one-way system of convenience containers should be replaced with the Bottle Bill — a responsible proposal for refundable deposits which will help replace our throw-away ethic.

— VIRGINIA DAL PIAZ, Chairman
Alaska Bottle Bill Initiative
Sponsoring Committee

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 5

Alaskans for Litter Control and Recycling oppose Initiative No. 11 because:

- IT ADDRESSES ONLY PART OF THE PROBLEM
- IT COVERS ONLY PART OF THE STATE
- IT WOULD CREATE ECONOMIC HARDSHIP WITH HIGHER PRICES
- IT WOULD REMOVE INCENTIVE FOR COMPREHENSIVE RECYCLING
- IT WOULD PREVENT PASSAGE OF A GENUINELY EFFECTIVE LITTER CONTROL AND RECYCLING LAW

Initiative No. 11, "An Act relating to establishing refundable deposits on beverage containers," is a short-sighted and inadequate solution to the complex need in Alaska for a comprehensive recycling and litter control program.

By limiting the scope of the initiative to beverage bottles and cans, Initiative No. 11 addresses only a small part of Alaska's litter problem. Beverage-related litter comprises only 15-20% of total litter. Even if a program directed at beverage-related litter was successful, it would have a negligible effect on the total litter picture.

In addition, Initiative No. 11 does not offer a statewide approach to the litter problem. It excludes those areas of the State which are not accessible throughout the year to Anchorage, Ketchikan, Juneau or Fairbanks by road, railroad or state mainline ferry system.

Initiative No. 11 would create more economic hardship for Alaskan citizens by increasing prices at the supermarket. Since empty beverage containers must be hauled back to the lower 48 to be refilled, it would add another 50% to retailers' transportation costs. In addition to shipping charges, retailers would be required

to set up a whole new procedure for accepting, refunding, sorting and storing returnable containers. All these extra costs would be added to the retail price of beer and soft drinks. Studies show that returned containers are usually not returned clean which causes sanitation problems. Retail food stores have reported increased sanitation and odor problems as well as insect and rodent infestation.

Most importantly, Initiative No. 11 would reduce the possibility of an effective and comprehensive resource recovery and recycling program. Such programs, which recycle all kinds of metal and glass, newsprint, motor oil, etc. in addition to beverage containers, are usually made possible by the high resale value of the aluminum and glass from the beverage containers. By eliminating this necessary revenue from recycling centers (and forcing grocers to deal with it), the economic incentive for **comprehensive** recycling programs is removed.

The time is right for Alaskans to focus their attention on litter control and recycling programs. Stop-gap measures are just not the answer. Alaskans must attack the problem with a comprehensive litter control and recycling program, directed at the total litter problem. An effective litter control will remedy the situation by educating the public not to litter; by establishing recycling centers; by requiring litter bags and litter receptacles to be conveniently located for the collection of litter and by providing statewide job opportunities for young people to work in keeping Alaska's environment clean.

Although mandatory deposit bills, such as Initiative No. 11, are proposed by people with admirable motives, they create new problems instead of solving old ones.

— TOM COX, Marketing Manager
Pepsi Cola Bottling Company
of Alaska, Inc.

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 1

EROSION AND FLOOD CONTROL, PORT FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT, AND SMALL BOAT LANDING AND HARBOR PROJECTS

(Chapter 95, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$33,290,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of erosion and flood control, port facilities development, and small boat landing and harbor projects, and making related appropriations; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$33,290,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of erosion and flood control, port facilities development, and small boat landing and harbor projects?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate (20 members): Yeas 19 Nays 0 Absent or Not Voting 1
House (40 members): Yeas 34 Nays 2 Absent or Not Voting 4

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$33,290,000 to provide funds to pay for costs of construction of the following programs or projects:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Port development	Bethel	\$ 500,000
(2) Small boat harbor expansion	Cordova	2,500,000
(3) Small boat harbor development	Homer	2,000,000
(4) Small boat harbor development	Hoonah	750,000
(5) Port and boat harbor improvement	Juneau	1,750,000
(6) Small boat harbor development	Kake	500,000
(7) Small boat harbor improvement	Ketchikan	1,250,000
(8) Small boat harbor development	Kodiak	2,500,000
(9) Small boat harbor development	Mettakatla	750,000
(10) Port development	Naknek	1,000,000
(11) Small boat harbor expansion	Petersburg	1,500,000
(12) Small boat harbor development	Port Lions	500,000
(13) Small boat harbor expansion	Seldovia	750,000
(14) Small boat harbor expansion	Seward	2,000,000
(15) Small boat harbor development	Sitka	1,500,000
(16) Small boat harbor expansion	Skagway	1,000,000
(17) Small boat harbor development	Unalaska	1,000,000
(18) Small boat harbor development	Whittier	2,500,000
(19) Dock facility	Dillingham	1,000,000
(20) Port and harbor development	Haines	750,000
(21) Flood control	Anderson	290,000
(22) Erosion and flood control projects	Fairbanks vicinity	4,500,000
(23) Retained for contingencies and to meet cost overruns on port facilities development and small boat harbor projects		2,500,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative
Affairs Agency as required by law

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 2

PARKS, WAYSIDES, TRAILS, FOOTPATHS, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

(Chapter 96, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$5,850,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements to parks, waysides, trails, footpaths, and other recreational facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$5,850,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements to parks, waysides, trails, footpaths, and other recreational facilities?

Bonds Yes
 Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>20</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>30</u>	Nays <u>6</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$5,850,000 for the purpose of paying the costs of improvements to parks, waysides, trails, footpaths, and other recreational areas. The proceeds of the bond would be allocated by the Department of Natural Resources in accordance with the following projects and estimates:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Chena River recreation area	Fairbanks	\$277,600
(2) Chiniak Highway wayside	Kodiak	25,000
(3) Anton Larson Bay boat ramp	Kodiak	60,000
(4) Bicycle trails and footpaths	Statewide	500,000
(5) Totem Bight Historic Park	Ketchikan	160,300
(6) Highway roadsides	Copper Basin area	403,400
(7) Anchor River wayside	Kenai Peninsula	100,000
(8) Moose Creek wayside	Matanuska-Susitna area	360,000
(9) Matanuska Glacier wayside	Matanuska-Susitna area	117,000
(10) Deadman Lake wayside	Interior	230,000
(11) Johnson Lake wayside	Kenai Peninsula	450,000
(12) Kasilof River wayside	Kenai Peninsula	50,000
(13) Willow Creek wayside	Matanuska-Susitna area	504,900
(14) Quartz Lake development	Delta Junction	411,900
(15) Noatak River wayside	Northwest Alaska	100,000
(16) Kobuk River wayside	Northwest Alaska	360,000
(17) Sadie Creek wayside	Northwest Alaska	50,000
(18) June Creek wayside	Northwest Alaska	50,000
(19) Baldwin Peninsula recreation area	Northwest Alaska	275,400
(20) Kotzebue Youth recreation area	Northwest Alaska	250,000
(21) Baldwin Peninsula, bicycle trails and footpaths	Northwest Alaska	400,000
(22) Bicycle trails and footpaths	Anchorage	500,000
(23) Bethel Wayside Park	Bethel	89,500
(24) Fort Greely bicycle trail	Delta Junction	125,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency as required by law

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 3

HEALTH FACILITIES, SENIOR CITIZEN CENTERS AND PIONEERS' HOMES

(Chapter 122, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$25,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for health facilities, senior citizen centers, and pioneers' homes; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$25,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for health facilities, senior citizen centers and pioneers' homes?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate (20 members): Yeas 19 Nays 1 Absent or Not Voting 0
House (40 members): Yeas 34 Nays 2 Absent or Not Voting 4

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$25,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of construction and development of health facilities, senior citizen centers, and pioneers' homes. Bond proceeds would be allocated among the following projects:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Community hospital	Sitka	\$5,600,000
(2) Harborview Hospital fire prevention system	Valdez	305,000
(3) Alaska Psychiatric Institute fire prevention system	Anchorage	206,100
(4) Health facility	Hooper Bay	100,000
(5) Health facility	Nenana	200,000
(6) Health facility	McGrath	100,000
(7) Health facility	Shungnak	100,000
(8) Health facility	Kivalina	100,000
(9) Health facility	Kobuk	100,000
(10) Health facility	Buckland	100,000
(11) Health facility	Ambler	100,000
(12) Health facility	Unalakleet	200,000
(13) Health facility	Kaktovik	150,000
(14) Health facility	Gambell	100,000
(15) Health facility	Savoonga	100,000
(16) Health facility	Pedro Bay	15,000
(17) Health facility	Platinum	20,000
(18) Health facility	Togiak	20,000
(19) Health facility	Ekwok	20,000
(20) Health facility	Portage Creek	20,000
(21) Health facility	King Salmon	35,000
(22) Health facility	Nondalton	20,000
(23) Health facility	Goodnews Bay	20,000
(24) Nursing home	Juneau	283,000
(25) Multipurpose senior citizen center	Anchorage	800,000
(26) Care center	Kenai Peninsula	250,000
(27) Senior citizen center	Homer	433,500
(28) Senior citizen center	Nome	872,400
(29) Senior citizen center	Bethel	1,565,000
(30) Senior citizen center	Dillingham	565,000
(31) Pioneers' Home addition	Anchorage	7,500,000
(32) Pioneers' Home	Ketchikan	5,000,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency as required by law

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 4

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

(Chapter 137, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$33,656,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for educational facilities for vocational education and the University of Alaska; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$33,656,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for the educational facilities for vocational education and the University of Alaska?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>20</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>26</u>	Nays <u>10</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of State general obligation bonds for the purpose of paying the cost of improvements for educational facilities for vocational education and facilities for the University of Alaska. The funds would be allocated among the following projects:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Storage facilities	Fairbanks	\$ 300,000
(2) Water treatment improvements Fairbanks campus	Fairbanks	1,000,000
(3) Upgrade utilities	Juneau	800,000
(4) Maintenance/warehouse building	Kenai	235,000
(5) Removal of architectural barriers	Fairbanks	300,000
(6) Removal of architectural barriers	Ketchikan	100,000
(7) Removal of architectural barriers	Anchorage	100,000
(8) Library access and improvements	Juneau	100,000
(9) Science lab completion	Ketchikan	75,000
(10) Educational equipment	Statewide	500,000
(11) Classroom/office building	Anchorage	5,000,000
(12) Renovate Phase I building	Kenai	70,000
(13) Community College	Nome	1,875,000
(14) Classrooms, Extension Center	Kotzebue	750,000
(15) Classrooms	Fort Yukon	750,000
(16) Classrooms	Delta Junction	750,000
(17) Classrooms	Juneau	750,000
(18) Land acquisition	Nome	100,000
(19) Land acquisition	Kotzebue	100,000
(20) Library	Kotzebue	100,000
(21) Library	Nenana	100,000
(22) Classrooms	Kodiak	750,000
(23) Physical Science Laboratory	Barrow	275,000
(24) Extension Center	Dillingham	750,000
(25) Tanana Valley Community College	Fairbanks	2,300,000
(26) Matanuska-Susitna Community College	Palmer	1,136,000
(27) Bargaining unit faculty offices	Anchorage	700,000
(28) Fire hazard removal, University of Alaska	Anchorage	320,000
(29) Career Ed Center completion	Ketchikan	200,000
(30) Classroom additional science and nursing	Bethel	445,000
(31) Technical laboratory building	Juneau	800,000
(32) Career Ed building	Juneau	1,220,000
(33) Career Technical building	Bethel	1,430,000
(34) Additions to library and electrical laboratory	Kenai	775,000
(35) Aircraft/Airframe Vocational Ed building	Anchorage	3,600,000
(36) Community College Library	Kodiak	525,000
(37) Classroom/shop building skill center	Seward	2,175,000
(38) Educational facilities and equipment	Kaktovik	400,000
(39) Educational facilities and equipment	Tok	500,000
(40) Educational facilities and equipment	Elim	400,000
(41) Educational facilities and equipment	Gambell	400,000
(42) Educational facilities and equipment	Nome	500,000
(43) School building and equipment	Kiana	200,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative
Affairs Agency as required by law

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 5

HIGHWAY, FERRY, AIRPORT, LOCAL SERVICE ROADS AND TRAILS CONSTRUCTION, CONSTRUCTING AND EQUIPPING MAINTENANCE FACILITIES, AND PLANNING VARIOUS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

(Chapter 138, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$88,450,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of highway, ferry, airport, and local service roads and trail construction, for constructing and equipping maintenance facilities, and for planning various transportation projects; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$88,450,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of highway, ferry, airport, local service roads and trails construction, constructing and equipping maintenance facilities, and planning various transportation projects?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>20</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>35</u>	Nays <u>1</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$88,450,000 to provide funding for highway, ferry, airport and local service roads and trails construction, for constructing and equipping certain transportation maintenance facilities, and for planning transportation projects. The funds would be allocated as follows:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Planning, project planning and research	Statewide	\$ 4,801,800
(2) Aviation Projects:		
(A) Region I	Central	2,370,000
(B) Region II	Interior	910,000
(C) Region III	Southeast	475,000
(D) Region IV	Western	1,110,000
(E) Region V	Southcentral	250,000
(F) Statewide		1,285,000
(G) Airport development	Ruby	1,500,000
(3) Highways Projects:		
(A) Region I	Central	10,227,000
(B) Fairview Loop Road	Wasilla	1,500,000
(C) Mountain View Drive, Phase II	Anchorage	1,200,000
(D) Sidewalks	Bethel	150,000
(E) Sidewalks	Homer	150,000
(F) Pedestrian crossing, 6th and Muldoon	Anchorage	200,000
(G) Upgrade and paving of Eagle River North Road	Anchorage	1,200,000
(H) Sealcoating municipal streets and state highways	Anchorage	9,625,000
(I) Upgrade Eagle River South Road	Anchorage	375,000
(J) Region II	Interior	6,119,400
(K) Region III	Southeast	2,965,200
(L) Sidewalks	Wrangell	150,000
(M) Region IV	Western	1,524,000
(N) Region V	Southcentral	3,596,200
(O) Selawik River bridge	Selawik	2,500,000
(P) Local service roads and trails	Statewide, including specific allocations for Districts 2 and 4	15,800,000
(Q) Safety programs	Statewide	3,400,300
(R) Special bridge replacement program	Statewide	1,631,500
(S) Abandoned motor vehicle program	Statewide	120,000
(4) Marine Projects:		
(A) Region III	Southeast	3,076,000
(B) Region V	Southcentral	24,000
(C) Statewide		1,100,000
(5) Maintenance Facilities:		
(A) Region I	Central	1,050,000
(B) Region II	Interior	1,489,700
(C) Region III	Southeast	1,574,900
(D) Facilities and equipment	Unorganized borough	5,000,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency as required by law

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 6

CORRECTIONAL AND PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES

(Chapter 139, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$30,504,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for correctional and public safety facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$30,504,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for correctional and public safety facilities?

Bonds Yes
 Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>18</u>	Nays <u>2</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>34</u>	Nays <u>2</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$30,504,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of constructing, remodeling and equipping correctional and public safety facilities. The proceeds of the bond are to be allocated to the following facilities:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Construct and equip regional public safety building	Fairbanks	\$ 4,385,000
(2) Construct and equip public safety detachment facility	Soldotna	1,216,500
(3) Construct and equip pre-trial jail facilities	Anchorage	12,367,000
(4) Construct and equip a regional jail facility	Ketchikan	1,992,700
(5) Construct youth facility	Fairbanks	2,400,000
(6) Renovate Sixth Avenue Jail Annex facilities	Anchorage	1,421,800
(7) Construct Youth Residence Center	Nome	792,000
(8) Construct McLaughlin Youth Facility gymnasium	Anchorage	1,300,000
(9) Construct state jail recreational and program facilities	Juneau	1,300,000
(10) Construct classroom and learning lab	Juneau	200,000
(11) Construct correctional facility	Bethel	3,129,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency as required by law

STUDY THE
ISSUES
CAREFULLY

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 7

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

(Chapter 140, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$26,965,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for fisheries management and development facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$26,965,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for fisheries management and development facilities?

Bonds Yes
 Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>18</u>	Nays <u>2</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>31</u>	Nays <u>5</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$26,965,000 to provide funding for capital improvements for fisheries management and development facilities. The allocation of the funds to specific projects and locations is as follows:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Field station	Dutch Harbor	\$ 372,000
(2) Field station and weir	Chignik	500,000
(3) Snettisham hatchery	Southeast	6,002,000
(4) Ship Creek hatchery	Cook Inlet	6,400,000
(5) Kotzebue hatchery	Kotzebue Sound	5,000,000
(6) Main Bay hatchery	Prince William Sound	8,341,000
(7) Markers and buoys	Bristol Bay	350,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency as required by law

APPLY FOR YOUR

ABSENTEE BALLOT

EARLY

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 8

ARMORIES AND NATIONAL GUARD FACILITIES

(Chapter 142, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$3,645,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for armories and National Guard facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$3,645,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for construction of armories and National Guard facilities?

Bonds Yes
 Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>20</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>35</u>	Nays <u>1</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$3,645,000 to provide funds for the construction and equipping of armories and National Guard facilities. The specific projects and their locations which will be completed are:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Armory construction and equipping	Anchorage	\$1,958,400
(2) Armory construction and equipping	Kotzebue	742,800
(3) Organizational maintenance shop construction and equipping	Juneau	187,900
(4) Aviation flight activity construction and equipping	Nome	130,000
(5) Armory construction and equipping	Sitka	625,900

The bond proposition also appropriates \$6,560,700 of anticipated federal receipts for the construction and equipping of each of the five projects to be completed with the proceeds of the bond issue.

— Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency as required by law

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 9

WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS

(Chapter 145, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$27,640,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for water supply and sewerage systems; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$27,640,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for water supply and sewerage systems?

Bonds Yes
 Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>19</u>	Nays <u>1</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>34</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>6</u>

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$27,640,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of water supply and sewerage systems. Of the total principal amount of the bond, \$19,890,000 would be allocated by the governor for paying a part of the cost of water supply and sewerage system construction by municipalities, and \$7,750,000 would be allocated to the following village safe water projects in accordance with the Alaska Village Safe Water Act:

Project/Location	Amount
(1) Kotzebue	\$1,800,000
(2) Kobuk	400,000
(3) Kotlik	400,000
(4) Kipnuk	400,000
(5) McGrath	400,000
(6) Koyuk	400,000
(7) Point Lay	400,000
(8) Shaktoolik	400,000
(9) Hooper Bay	100,000
(10) Cantwell	50,000
(11) Bethel "Phase II"	2,000,000
(12) Various statewide projects	1,000,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency as required by law

**CLIP THE SAMPLE BALLOTS
 AND MARK YOUR CHOICES.
 TAKE THIS INFORMATION TO THE
 POLLS ON NOVEMBER 7, 1978.**

(See Pages 64-71)

BONDING PROPOSITION NO. 10

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF THE NEW ALASKA CAPITAL

(Chapter 157, Session Laws of Alaska 1978)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$966,000,000 for the purpose of paying capital construction costs of the new Alaska capital; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$966,000,000 for the purpose of paying the costs of capital improvements for the new state capital?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 10TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate (20 members): Yeas 17 Nays 1 Absent or Not Voting 2
House (40 members): Yeas 28 Nays 9 Absent or Not Voting 3

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$966,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for the new state capital. The legislation provides that, unless the Alaska Capital City Development Corporation or the state bond committee recommends a different schedule of issuing the bonds, the bonds would be issued in accordance with the following schedule:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1978	none
1979	none
1980	\$ 8,800,000
1981	30,800,000
1982	58,700,000
1983	64,400,000
1984	63,300,000
1985	51,500,000
1986	63,700,000
1987	58,400,000
1988	78,600,000
1989	83,100,000
1990	92,800,000
1991	87,800,000
1992	104,500,000
1993	80,200,000
1994	39,400,000

In conjunction with construction of the new capital city near Willow, the funds would be allocated as follows:

<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Amount</u>
(1) Implementation of the development program of the Alaska Capital City Development Corporation	\$604,100,000
(2) Capital city water, sewer and heating plant construction projects	21,900,000
(3) School construction projects	260,700,000
(4) University of Alaska construction projects	9,200,000
(5) New capital highway construction	65,100,000
(6) New capital airport construction	5,000,000

— Summary prepared by Legislative Affairs Agency as required by law