

Submitted By	Comment
<p data-bbox="302 228 485 253">9/26/2018 15:19</p> <p data-bbox="149 306 331 331">Luke Thorington</p> <p data-bbox="149 423 289 448">Sitka, AK, US</p>	<p data-bbox="489 228 1885 431">I know I'm not alone when I recognize salmon as my greatest provider. It has provided me with food, income, recreation and is an essential part of the marine and terrestrial eco systems that I have grown up with and love. I don't want to imagine an Alaska without clean streams or abundant salmon and I don't want future generations to have to consider it either. That's why we need to make changes to Alaska law now that ensure the protection of this resource that is essential to so many Alaskan people and so much of Alaska's wild life. There is no amount of money, gold or copper that could fill the void created when salmon begin to disappear and that is why I stand for salmon.</p>
<p data-bbox="302 621 485 646">9/25/2018 12:16</p> <p data-bbox="149 699 317 724">Kimberly Slone</p> <p data-bbox="149 816 352 841">Sunnyvale, CA, US</p>	<p data-bbox="489 472 1885 878">Hi. My name is Kimberly Slone and I live in Wasilla, Alaska. I am a registered voter and I support the Stand For Salmon, Vote Yes on 1 ballot initiative. As a registered nurse, I know how important salmon is as a source of Omega-3. Omega-3s play an important role in the body as components of the phospholipids that form the structures of cell membranes. DHA (docosahexaenoic acid) is especially high in the retina, brain, and sperm. In addition to their structural role in cell membranes, Omega-3s provide energy for the body. As signaling molecules, they have wide ranging functions in the body's cardiovascular, pulmonary, immune, and endocrine systems. Omega-3s are considered essential fatty acids, meaning they must be obtained from the diet. DHA and EPA are present in salmon but they are originally synthesized by micro algae, not by the fish. Therefore it is vital to the health of all Alaskans to have the latest science-based standards to guide how large projects will be permitted. The current law, as read by me, seems ambiguous and does not allow for public input. The latter is especially concerning since, for many, subsistence is integral to their culture and/or survival. Human Rights must be considered. The new initiative will put the burden on corporations to show whether or not a stream is anadromous or not. As a taxpayer, I am in strong favor of this. The bottom line is the fishing industry is a 2 billion plus sustainable industry and we must protect it.</p>
<p data-bbox="302 1052 485 1076">9/24/2018 12:01</p> <p data-bbox="149 1263 317 1287">Hannah Blanke</p> <p data-bbox="149 1304 289 1328">Sitka, AK, US</p>	<p data-bbox="489 914 1885 1255">I am writing to show my support for the Stand for Salmon initiative. Though I haven't lived in Alaska long, from day one I have marveled at the wondrous wilderness and wildlife this state offers. From the time I've spent here I've also learned from long-term residents just how crucial fishing is to the livelihoods of people. It's beyond crucial to make sure the salmon industry, which employs over 30,000 Alaskans, remains viable for future generations. Not just to ensure the approximate \$2 billion in economic activity keeps our state funded, but also because of the critical role salmon play in maintaining the health of our ecosystem. This initiative will help make sure our salmon are protected instead of put at risk for the promise of a quick profit. It is the simple way out to ignore environmental concerns and just assume everything is fine, but to do so is extremely selfish. With ecological issues already prevalent across the globe, the ability to have a voice in protecting Alaska's amazing salmon is priceless. As opposed to letting developmental companies irresponsibly, and without personal consequences, hurt our future salmon generations.</p> <p data-bbox="489 1271 611 1295">Thank you</p>

<p>9/24/2018 8:29</p> <p>Anchorage, AK, US</p>	<p>Vote no on one. Stand for Alaska. The stand for salmon initiative is a bad deal. The state of Alaska has plenty of existing laws, mechanisms, regulations. and processes in place that protect the environment including the salmon. We do not need more regulation. We do need continued responsible resource development in our state such as mining, oil & gas, infra structure, etc. etc.</p>
<p>9/22/2018 2:47</p> <p>John Gillam</p> <p>Old Kotzebue, AK, US</p>	<p>As a life long Alaskan, I have worked in commercial fisheries, tourism, the oil and gas industry, well as the mining industry. This initiative is bad for business as well as fisheries, poorly written, and was completely changed from the original petition. The supreme court changed the initiative from what was original written, where by changing what the petitioners had signed, in doing so it seems to me that it should not even be on the ballot.</p> <p>This initiative if passed into law will without question place so much burden and expense on any resource development, village improvement projects, state infrastructure projects that it will be nearly impossible, if not impossible to move forward and grow our state, and make it just as difficult to renew existing permits.</p> <p>We already have strictest regulations in the country to protect our fisheries. All the states resources are equally important for a healthy economy. I would venture to guess that the majority of people who were collecting signatures to place this initiative on the ballot have no idea how our permitting actually works. This is an initiative based on emotion not science or the regulations already in place that protect the fisheries. I whole heavyhearted oppose ballot measure #1 and its hidden intent.</p> <p>John Gillam</p>

My name is Keith Arens, I am the Health and Safety Manager at Fort Knox. I moved to Alaska over 20 years ago because of my love of the outdoors and wild spaces. My wife and I have taken great pride in the fact that we have also instilled this love of the vast resources our state has to offer into our children. I am opposed to ballot measure one because it is not based on facts or science. It was poorly written in private without public review and comment. To me, this shows that the authors and backers of this measure are being secretive and misleading regarding its intent. The supporters of this measure are misguided and only have their own agenda in mind and not of those who live in the state. I believe if this measure were to pass it will negatively impact my family and the entire future of the State of Alaska.

My family and I Stand for Alaska along with many others in this great state because we already have proven effective science-based fish habitat protections. We do not need outsiders coming into our home trying to manage our resources.

Roger L. Suggs
830 Sheep Creek Rd
Fairbanks, Alaska 99709

Written Testimony RE: Ballot Measure #1
before the Governor Bryon Mallot

I see no useful purpose in voting for Ballot Measure #1. This ballot measure has ~~not~~ been written without ~~any~~ public input and ~~is~~ ^{would be very costly} ~~is~~ ^{to implement} ~~is~~ ^{creating very serious} ~~is~~ ^{impact to} ~~is~~ ^{the AK Econ}

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has done an excellent job in managing Alaska's fisheries since statehood.

I have a BS degree from Cornell University in Wildlife Management & Conservation. I worked for the US Fish & WS prior to statehood in Southeast Alaska. The State of Alaska has implemented stringent regulations to protect our salmon, and I agree our fisheries resources should be protected. I also like to harvest and eat salmon.

To develop any resource to extract other natural resources, it can take years to get permitted ^{in many cases} ~~at~~ ^{at} great cost to the company or individual that wants to produce products that benefit the State, the Nation & World Economy. The development of resources provide jobs to thousands of Alaskans, the State of Alaska and Federal Government.

The state has a responsibility to all for the development of our natural resources in a responsible manner.

The salmon are a very important part of our economy but so is Mining, Harvesting Timber, production of oil and gas, building roads airports, allowing village of installing sewage plants, building airports ^{at great cost to the} ^{permittes}

Ballot measure No. 1 would make it very difficult to obtain permits which would benefit Alaska's resources which not only provide jobs; provide villages with the services they need survival and resources the states, our federal Govt & other Nations Need

I am opposed to Ballot Measure #1

DOUGLAS MCINTOSH

2208 Nottingham Drive
FAIRBANKS AK 99709

I support ballot measure one.

Here is why.

The industries opposing the measure rely on non renewable resources.

Sooner or later they fail. When ^{as} the gold in the Klondike ran out the population dropped from 30 000 plus to 1200,

When the miners left the Klondike they left behind square miles of non productive tailings, bare rock every inch of it.

I don't want this to happen to our fish spawning areas.

Our Alaskan fisheries are already a well developed resource.

~~The~~ It is permanent and durable and will provide food and jobs for Alaskans into the future, long after the gold and the oil ~~are~~ are gone.

Thank you.

- Benjamin Meyer (benjamin.meyer.ak@gmail.com)
- Fisheries researcher and lifelong Alaska resident. I have worked throughout Alaska in both the public and the private sector in research on freshwater habitat issues. I am here to testify in support of Ballot Measure 1.
- Two points to share.
- i.) Both supporters and opponents actually have a lot in common. Recent statewide poll conducted by the firm DHM research found that 90% of Alaskans agree that salmon are an important part of their lives. We should keep in mind that all of us here really have a common goal, which is to see that salmon are around for future generations of Alaskans.
- 2.) Throughout history and around the world wild salmon populations have been lost almost everywhere. It falls upon us to things turn out differently in Alaska if we want different results. Not just Pacific Northwest, but in the East coast New England, Medieval England, France, Ireland, Scandanavia... people there once enjoyed the kind of economic, ecological, and spiritual connection we do here today to wild salmon abundance. None of these places explicitly chose to have salmon disappear but not enough people understood that carefully managing their habitat was important, and eventually the salmon were almost gone. In most cases they disappeared slowly, in ways that each new generation of people assumed it was normal. No Alaskan wants this to be our future.
- Ballot Measure 1 makes explicit our intentions as a society to ensure that salmon persist for future generations of Alaskans. The current law – the Anadromous Fish Act (or Title 16) – has one simple, undefined standard for protecting our freshwater fish habitat. It says the ADFG Commissioner must ensure the “proper protection” of fish and game when issuing a permit that destroys or impacts habitat. See 16.05.871(d). That’s it. There’s no definition of “proper protection.” That has to change.
- I am here to tell you today that salmon are a gift. Ballot Measure 1 uses much that we’ve learned not only from our shared lives with salmon but also from history about how we can give back to salmon the wealth that they share with us. Thank you.

Benjamin Meyer
 290 Beberg Ct.
 Fairbanks. AK 997709

(907) 232-0280

Stand For Salmon Testimony
Sept. 24, 2018

I am a 58 year resident of Alaska. My wife is a 41 year resident. We spent 21 years in the Lower Yukon Kuskokwim Delta as teachers in four Yup'ik villages, which is why we support **Stand For Salmon Initiative 1**.

We are dismayed at how huge multinational resource corporations have hoodwinked Alaskans with their expensive 10 million dollar misinformation campaigns. This is just one more example of how the corporates are doing all they can to convert us everyday folks into job serfs.

We believe that Initiative 1 would put science-based standards and accountability into law that would protect more than 30,000 Alaskan jobs in the fishing industry that generate \$722 million in taxes that pay for schools and other social programs.

Since only 50% of Alaska's salmon rivers are presently protected under Alaska law, the **Stand For Salmon Initiative** would also help prevent catastrophes that could wipe out huge numbers of our state's wild salmon populations.

One big recent decision by the State regarding the gigantic Donlin Mine prospect on the Kuskokwim River infuriates us. Influenced mightily by the Alaska Miners Association and the multinational corporates, the state, in spite of its admission that there will be adverse effects on salmon and their **habitat** in the Kuskokwim River, (Alaska's second most important subsistence river), granted the Donlin Mine's mostly Canadian owners the 13 fish habitat permits they wanted.

So, in a nutshell, the State is giving away our salmon habitat to a foreign mining company so it can make huge profits on a resource that will mostly be exported to Asia.

You tell me, is it ultimately worth trading a long term, renewable resource like salmon for very short-term low-wage pay-offs to a few local workers?

We, for sure, think **not**.

Frank and Jennifer Keim
2220 Penrose Lane
Fairbanks, 99709

My name is Fran Mauer. I am a 47 year resident of Alaska and live here in Fairbanks.

Following the Fairbanks flood of 1967, there was a plan to build a dam and reservoir on the Chena River. It would have blocked salmon migration and had downstream impacts to spawning areas below the dam. At the time I was employed to help map salmon spawning areas in the Chena. Thankfully that plan was not adopted, and today we have a more thoughtful Control structure that allows salmon to migrate past except in flood time. This has allowed the Chena to remain the most important king salmon stream in the entire Yukon system.

I support Prop 1 because it will allow similar careful development that protects our valuable salmon resource. These precautions are the responsible way to go, and we need such protections or Alaska will ultimately go the way of the Pacific northwest which is now a greatly impoverished salmon resource. Please vote YES on prop 1!

Thank you.

Ballot Measure 1 Testimony

Will Collingwood
Fairbanks Legislative Information Office
September 24, 2018

My name is Will Collingwood. I work at the Fort Knox Mine in Fairbanks, Alaska, and I oppose Ballot Measure No. 1.

I moved to Alaska in 2010 to attend graduate school at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. I fell in love with Alaska, and I hope I never have to leave.

I empathize with the fear that fisherman must feel in a changing climate. I too felt a sense of dread as I watched the low salmon returns in the Copper River this year. I researched the issue, and every source I could find said that the problem was in the ocean and not our freshwater habitats.

While I appreciate the worries that fisherman feel, please understand that many other Alaskans also fear for their future when they see yet another set of sweeping regulation changes on the horizon. My ability to live, work, and play, in this great State depends upon continued opportunities for responsible resource development. The same holds true for the many other Alaskans who work in construction, in the oil fields, who operate utilities, who harvest timber, or who benefit from these activities.

Every major mine in Alaska operates in close proximity to fish habitat. Fort Knox, where I work, has created one of the finest grayling habitats in the State in close proximity to our active mine site. The science shows that there has been no adverse effect to fish populations from operating mines in Alaska. You don't have to take my word for it. Go online and read the annual reports, many of which come straight from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

In conclusion, the existing process is working. Let's all work together instead of pitting Alaskans against each other. Thank you for your time.

Janet Kidd
P.O. Box 82348
Fairbanks, AK 99708

29 September 2018
Fairbanks, AK

I am testifying today in support of Ballot Measure 1 because I think it's important for the public to know that the current regulations we have governing Alaska's waters are not adequate. I have three examples that speak to this concern:

- 1) We have at least one mine in Alaska that will require monitoring and treatment of its mine discharge in perpetuity. So, long after the mine closes, someone will have to go out there and monitor and treat the water before it is discharged to natural waters downstream. This is a tremendous liability to the state and Alaskans. What happens if the mining company files for bankruptcy? Mine bonds are typically so low that they rarely cover all the environmental management associated with mine closure. So, the state may find itself on the hook for making sure this regular monitoring and treatment is conducted. I suspect the proposed Pebble Mine also will be face a similar fate. Last I checked it will have a tailings pond, and discharge from the pond will have to be treated before it is released. Don't even get me started on whether the tailings dam will be adequate. Do we really want to be permitting projects that will require environmental management essentially forever?
- 2) A number of oil spills occurred in Prudhoe Bay in association with leaking pipelines symptomatic of aging infrastructure that was not properly maintained. Although a flurry of activity ensued as a result of the spills (pipeline replacement, better monitoring controls), it would have been preferable for this to have happened before the pipelines failed. Better oversight of operations by the state's land manager, ADNR, may have helped facilitate better pipeline management. ADNR (and probably ADEC) used to have a year-round presence in the oilfields; now it is basically in response to an event. I'm not complaining about the agencies; they have good folks. I am talking about leaving the policing of the oilfields to industry. We got a glimpse of how that worked out.
- 3) Locally, we have dozens of homes in North Pole that had to abandon their wells and be tied into city water after it was discovered the wells were contaminated with a chemical that entered the groundwater from the now-closed Flint Hills Refinery. They will now have to disclose to any prospective home buyer that their well is contaminated, which will no doubt make it more difficult to sell their home, should they decide to do so. Again, it appears that state agencies did not have the resources they needed to provide better oversight.

I don't know if Ballot Measure 1 will solve these ^{types of} problems, but at least it is an acknowledgment that what we have now for protecting Alaska's aquatic resources is woefully inadequate. I also take issue with the fear-mongering associated with the Vote-No campaign. No economic study that I am aware of has been conducted that indicates having a more rigorous environmental review process would be cost prohibitive. And I guess my comment regarding that is, are we willing to continue turning a blind eye to the environmental impacts of projects just so we get some more jobs and revenue? Not a great legacy to leave for future generations.

Ballot Measure 1 Public Testimony
Mark Huffington
9/24/2018

My name is Mark Huffington and just 10 days ago I celebrated my 7-year anniversary as an Alaskan resident and Fort Knox Mine employee. This initiative is a poorly worded and ^{one of} the worst proposal that I've seen in my 30-year environmental career.

This measure is not reasonable, responsible, and purposely hinders and restricts any and all types of development in Alaska and negatively impacts the Alaskan economy. The supporters have you believe that this is only for the protection of salmon in salmon spawning waters; specifically the Pebble Mine, but it covers Alaska waters and over 20 other fish species. I also had a young man from the lower 48, paid by Stand for Salmon and who came to my house uninvited to spread their mistruths about Measure 1. He had no idea that over 20 other fish species were included in the initiative besides salmon and also stated that Stand for Salmon made agreements with Alaska Department of Transportation that this measure will not impact any transportation projects, which we know is false. Measure 1 is general in nature and will have subjective interpretation for agency personnel and commissioner to enforce. Not only does it affect all Alaskan industries such as mining, oil, forestry, fishing, tourism, construction, transportation, it negatively impacts all projects (large and small) in Alaskan cities, towns, villages, boroughs, and census areas whether they are private, commercial, or public in nature. The measure may exempt current permitted projects and facilities; however, permits expire and must go through a renewal process; what then, will a billion dollar facility be shut down after 5 years of operation? There is no need to add non-scientific based wild-life habitat standards as Alaska maintains highly restrictive standards for wildlife sustainability. Contrary to Stand for Salmon statements, all industry is held accountable to Alaska's strict environmental standards, which is evident in statutes, regulations, and permitting.

In conclusion, I will cast my NO vote on Ballot Measure 1 November 6th.

Good afternoon,

I am Patricia Salmon from Chalkyitsik, Alaska. I have two children and two grandchildren. I am a Rural Development student at the University of Alaska. I work for Chalkyitsik Village Council environmental program since 2012.

Chalkyitsik is located 150 miles Northeast of Fairbanks on the Yukon Flats. Chalkyitsik is an isolated village of approximately 85 people. the main source of transportation is the daily flight by Wright Air Service other than chartered flights, boats or snow machines. It is expensive to live in rural area; freight cost is up to \$1.75 a pound and fuel is \$8.00 per gallon.

Ballot Measure One is a bread-and-butter issue for my family and the families in my community; to protect water quality, habitat for salmon and other aquatic species essential to protect our traditional way-of-life. Living off the land as our ancestors have done for thousands of years allows us to feed our families, which is essential for our cultural and economic survival.

There was a study done on the Draanjik River of the spawning area last year. Draanjik/Black River is an important spawning stream for three species of salmon, including Chinook salmon. Until two years ago, the anadromous Catalog did not list Black River for Chinooks of Coho, and even now research is slowly revealing more and more how important Black River is for salmon production in the Yukon River Drainage. It is critical that all stream in Alaska be protected, as it will take decades or longer to complete the Catalog.

Those protections identified in Ballot Measure One will ensure that families in Chalkyitsik will be able to continue to live off the land, and offset the expense to relying solely on groceries shipped in. The decision made about Ballot Measure One will affect my children, grandchildren, and generations to come. We have a responsibility to protect our resources for them, for their futures and for the futures of people across the State, I fully support Ballot Measure One.

Geneva's Heartfelt Testimony

I am going to quote a few passages from a book I found at the dump here in Fairbanks. It is ironic that I should find a book like this in the trash, this is what Fairbanks is throwing away by voting no on 1.

"We as wildlifers believe that wildlife and other natural resources have a permanent place in our society. Those working in the area of Wildlife management (wildlifers) are ultimately involved in the manipulation of the complex man-land-animal triad. These objectives, rising from unselfish motives, are directed toward the well-being of all occupants of our planet. The human aspect of wildlife management can be solved; It cannot be left to non-wildlifers" Wildlife Management Techniques, Published by The wildlife society, and Printed in Washington DC in 1971.

Stand for Alaska claims that this proposal had no public input, but that is not true! We fought HARD to get this on the ballot! We have been fighting this for YEARS!!! We defend the homeland, this state we call home. Stand for Alaska is deceiving you! This measure will not take anyone's jobs away, this measure will not stop any roads from being maintained. But if we let them win this one, it will affect the ecosystem we depend on! The wilderness is our resource by right, and we must maintain it. This measure is for defending the wildlands from corruption, to protect our pure waters from pestilence, to ensure that our culture has a future!

This measure is not just about salmon. Salmon are a keystone species. Do you know what a keystone species is? A Keystone species is one which other species in an ecosystem largely depend on, so much that if removed, the ecosystem would change drastically. Change is constant with the seasons, but the loss of salmon would not be a good change. Bears, eagles, wolves, seals, otters, and so many others depend on salmon. The willows that the moose eat, the berries on the tundra, they all would suffer without the salmon. But it is not just the animals who will suffer. Man will also suffer.

Look to those on the west coast who failed to protect their salmon, and see how they have suffered. Now their governments have to waste money on restoring their wildlands, pouring all of their efforts into restoring the loss of their salmon. It is more economical to conserve, than it is to restore. We must keep our homeland, which we depend on, pristine.

We should not be left to clean up after foreign mining companies. As we've learned from the past, wildlife management CANNOT be left to non-wildlifers!!! We can NOT let our homeland fall into the hands of businesses like BP, Conoco Phillips, DonlinGold, Exxon Mobil or Pebble Partnership. We stand with Wildlifers! Trout Unlimited, The Alaska Center, The Cook Inlet keeper, and the United Tribes of BRISTOL BAY!!!

We do not only hunt the salmon at our leisure for sport, Above all, we hunt the salmon as a family tradition, and we intend to continue for generations! We are all products of survival! We must stand United!

I am Geneva Hobson from Bristol Bay, and this is my Testimony! I Stand for Salmon and I won't back down!!! VOTE YES ON 1!! FOR THE HEALTH OF OUR ECOSYSTEM AND OUR PEOPLE. WE, THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA WILL NOT BE SILENCED!!!

TESTIMONY ON BALLOT MEASURE 1

Vivian Mendenhall, PhD., September 2018

I presented some of this testimony in person at the public hearing in Anchorage, on September 18, 2018. This is my written submission of the same testimony.

I have a PhD in wildlife science and management. I am not an expert on fish, but I have close colleagues who are. I also served on commercial fishing crews in Nushagak Bay during 12 seasons.

I plan to vote yes on Ballot Measure 1, for sound scientific and economic reasons.

I am very disturbed by some of the claims by the "No on 1" campaign. Some are legitimate points of view; unfortunately, some are disrespectful of other viewpoints. But some claims by "No on 1" are **blatantly misleading**. It appears that either (1) this group has not read the ballot measure, or (2) they do not know basic facts about salmon, or (3) they are purposely misleading the public.

Spawning habitat is vital for salmon, irrespective of ocean conditions.

Everyone agrees that salmon runs have been low in Alaska recently, and that the reason is probably unusual warmth in North Pacific waters. It's also true that we can't change the ocean.

However, **this does not mean that spawning habitat in rivers is unimportant**, as "No on 1" claims. Salmon need all their natural spawning habitat, or the species can't survive. This is independent of other problems. "No on 1" says "Ballot Measure 1 won't fix the problem of declining salmon runs." True (at least for current declines). But if you damage river habitats, you will **ensure that runs will get worse and never come back**.

It is also false that salmon runs will certainly remain low. **Runs are affected by ocean conditions 1-4 years earlier**, while this year's fish were growing at sea. The ocean was warmest in 2014-2016, and has cooled somewhat since then. It would be terrible science to manage fisheries based only on today's runs.

Perhaps the worst aspect of the "No on 1" campaign are quotes from Fish and Game biologists, used to imply that spawning habitat doesn't matter. **These quotes were taken out of context, and are also irrelevant**. Any competent fish biologist would add that spawning habitat is important for salmon survival, whatever the ocean temperature.

Salmon runs were not low everywhere in Alaska this year.

Runs were healthy in parts of western Alaska in 2018. **Over 10 million ran up Nushagak Bay alone**, an all-time record. The King salmon run in the Nushagak River was over 78,000—**the only healthy King run** in the state, probably the world. Some runs farther west were also high—Togiak Bay, Norton Sound, Kotzebue Sound (all data from ADF&G).

"No on 1" say that no habitat has been harmed by development.

This is not true. A number of salmon spawning streams have been impaired or obliterated by badly designed or flood-damaged **culverts**. Such culverts have been replaced in some creeks, e.g. Chester Creek (Anchorage) and Klawock (Prince of Wales Island), but there is more to do.

I have no information on whether industrial development has damaged river habitats. Careful development would deserve full credit—but in some cases this is due to luck, not a robust permitting process. We need to prevent potential future damage to river habitats. Examples:

The Chuitna coal project near Tyonek **would have obliterated 7 miles of salmon spawning habitat**. The company promised mitigation, but it's impossible to create aquatic habitat within decades, if ever. The proposal was withdrawn when an investor pulled out.

Streams below the Red Dog Mine never supported salmon, but they are anadromous (for Dolly Varden). Toxic metals in these waters may have decreased; however, there's still enough pollution from the mine to affect Kivalina and Kotzebue. The mine's Canadian company settled a lawsuit 10 years ago by promising a pipeline to bypass the rivers, but this has never happened. The state has not enforced the requirement, and in fact, DEC recently approved **a permit extension for the mine without mentioning the missing pipeline**.

"No on 1" say that developers always submit detailed plans to conserve river habitats.

This is not true. A proposed mine that's entirely in the headwaters of the Nushagak River could wipe out its uniquely healthy King Salmon run, whenever (not "if") its tailings pond is breached. The developer has submitted a

plan to the US Corps of Engineers that includes **almost no biological or socioeconomic information, and no plan, for the lower Nushagak watershed.** Yet the river has the state's only healthy king salmon run, and the area has major subsistence, commercial, and sport fisheries.

"No on 1" say that many Alaskan jobs will be lost if Ballot Measure 1 passes.

More jobs will be lost if it does **not** pass, so that development is free to injure our renewable resources.

Subsistence, commercial fishing, and sport fishing are the lifeblood of some coastal areas. Some places may need industrial jobs—but in other areas, industry would destroy more jobs than it offers. Some rural areas want to protect their fisheries, and this must be taken into account. It is dishonest to say that all areas (or even all Alaska Native corporations) urge a "No" vote. The United Tribes of Bristol Bay state on their website, "Ballot Measure 1 **can help protect salmon and fish habitat throughout the state**" (<http://utbb.org/>).

"No on 1" say that some vital infrastructure projects will not go forward.

This is not true. State **permits are already required** for much work in an anadromous stream or its watershed. Ballot Measure 1 would institute a two-tier permit system: Applications **would be processed rapidly** for projects with no significant effect on streams (and many such projects are nowhere near salmon streams). Larger projects would get more thorough review, including public hearings.

"No on 1" say that Ballot Measure 1 will deny public input.

This is simply false. Public notice of all permit applications will be **required**, and major projects would have mandatory **public hearings**. Public notice and hearings are not required now; they are at the discretion of commissioners and the governor.

"No on 1" say there will be burdensome new regulations.

Careful management of anadromous streams is nothing new. In fact, the "No on 1" campaign agrees on this. And ADF&G biologists are doing their best. But **project oversight is inconsistent**, because there are no clear requirements and standards in the law. Negligent permits are issued partly because top administrators are legally free to disregard their experts' recommendations. Sometimes they do just that (in all government agencies, not just ADF&G). It depends on who is governor and whom they select as commissioners.

Alaska's salmon are a crucial part of our economy and culture. Some increase in regulation will doubtless happen, although not the apocalypse that "No on 1" wants us to believe in. This will be a very reasonable trade-off for protecting the vital spawning habitat of salmon.

"No on 1" say that the Ballot Measure is badly written.

It may need adjustments in the future; many new laws do. But it's vital to get responsible salmon habitat management into Alaska's law. The Board of Fish requested three years ago that the Legislature fix glaring omissions in the obsolete law, but the lawmakers have not acted. That leaves the care of our salmon resources to public action and the ballot, which is not ideal.

I doubt that "Stand for Alaska" really believe their own title. Otherwise they would work in good faith with "Stand for Salmon" to draft a proposition that protects salmon habitat, while also being acceptable to their Outside industrial interests.

TESTIMONY ON BALLOT MEASURE 1

Vivian Mendenhall, PhD., September 2018

I presented some of this testimony in person at the public hearing in Anchorage, on September 18, 2018. This is my written submission of the same testimony.

I have a PhD in wildlife science and management. I am not an expert on fish, but I have close colleagues who are. I also served on commercial fishing crews in Nushagak Bay during 12 seasons.

I plan to vote yes on Ballot Measure 1, for sound scientific and economic reasons.

I am very disturbed by some of the claims by the "No on 1" campaign. Some are legitimate points of view; unfortunately, some are disrespectful of other viewpoints. But some claims by "No on 1" are **blatantly misleading**. It appears that either (1) this group has not read the ballot measure, or (2) they do not know basic facts about salmon, or (3) they are purposely misleading the public.

Spawning habitat is vital for salmon, irrespective of ocean conditions.

Everyone agrees that salmon runs have been low in Alaska recently, and that the reason is probably unusual warmth in North Pacific waters. It's also true that we can't change the ocean.

However, **this does not mean that spawning habitat in rivers is unimportant**, as "No on 1" claims. Salmon need all their natural spawning habitat, or the species can't survive. This is independent of other problems. "No on 1" says "Ballot Measure 1 won't fix the problem of declining salmon runs." True (at least for current declines). But if you damage river habitats, you will **ensure that runs will get worse and never come back**.

It is also false that salmon runs will certainly remain low. **Runs are affected by ocean conditions 1-4 years earlier**, while this year's fish were growing at sea. The ocean was warmest in 2014-2016, and has cooled somewhat since then. It would be terrible science to manage fisheries based only on today's runs.

Perhaps the worst aspect of the "No on 1" campaign are quotes from Fish and Game biologists, used to imply that spawning habitat doesn't matter. **These quotes were taken out of context, and are also irrelevant**. Any competent fish biologist would add that spawning habitat is important for salmon survival, whatever the ocean temperature.

Salmon runs were not low everywhere in Alaska this year.

Runs were healthy in parts of western Alaska in 2018. **Over 10 million ran up Nushagak Bay alone**, an all-time record. The King salmon run in the Nushagak River was over 78,000—**the only healthy King run** in the state, probably the world. Some runs farther west were also high—Togiak Bay, Norton Sound, Kotzebue Sound (all data from ADF&G).

"No on 1" say that no habitat has been harmed by development.

This is not true. A number of salmon spawning streams have been impaired or obliterated by badly designed or flood-damaged **culverts**. Such culverts have been replaced in some creeks, e.g. Chester Creek (Anchorage) and Klawock (Prince of Wales Island), but there is more to do.

I have no information on whether industrial development has damaged river habitats. Careful development would deserve full credit—but in some cases this is due to luck, not a robust permitting process. We need to prevent potential future damage to river habitats. Examples:

The Chuitna coal project near Tyonek **would have obliterated 7 miles of salmon spawning habitat**. The company promised mitigation, but it's impossible to create aquatic habitat within decades, if ever. The proposal was withdrawn when an investor pulled out.

Streams below the Red Dog Mine never supported salmon, but they are anadromous (for Dolly Varden). Toxic metals in these waters may have decreased; however, there's still enough pollution from the mine to affect Kivalina and Kotzebue. The mine's Canadian company settled a lawsuit 10 years ago by promising a pipeline to bypass the rivers, but this has never happened. The state has not enforced the requirement, and in fact, DEC recently approved **a permit extension for the mine without mentioning the missing pipeline**.

"No on 1" say that developers always submit detailed plans to conserve river habitats.

This is not true. A proposed mine that's entirely in the headwaters of the Nushagak River could wipe out its uniquely healthy King Salmon run, whenever (not "if") its tailings pond is breached. The developer has submitted a

plan to the US Corps of Engineers that includes **almost no biological or socioeconomic information, and no plan, for the lower Nushagak watershed.** Yet the river has the state's only healthy king salmon run, and the area has major subsistence, commercial, and sport fisheries.

"No on 1" say that many Alaskan jobs will be lost if Ballot Measure 1 passes.

More jobs will be lost if it does **not** pass, so that development is free to injure our renewable resources.

Subsistence, commercial fishing, and sport fishing are the lifeblood of some coastal areas. Some places may need industrial jobs—but in other areas, industry would destroy more jobs than it offers. Some rural areas want to protect their fisheries, and this must be taken into account. It is dishonest to say that all areas (or even all Alaska Native corporations) urge a "No" vote. The United Tribes of Bristol Bay state on their website, "Ballot Measure 1 **can help protect salmon and fish habitat throughout the state**" (<http://utbb.org/>).

"No on 1" say that some vital infrastructure projects will not go forward.

This is not true. State **permits are already required** for much work in an anadromous stream or its watershed. Ballot Measure 1 would institute a two-tier permit system: Applications **would be processed rapidly** for projects with no significant effect on streams (and many such projects are nowhere near salmon streams). Larger projects would get more thorough review, including public hearings.

"No on 1" say that Ballot Measure 1 will deny public input.

This is simply false. Public notice of all permit applications will be **required**, and major projects would have mandatory **public hearings**. Public notice and hearings are not required now; they are at the discretion of commissioners and the governor.

"No on 1" say there will be burdensome new regulations.

Careful management of anadromous streams is nothing new. In fact, the "No on 1" campaign agrees on this. And ADF&G biologists are doing their best. But **project oversight is inconsistent**, because there are no clear requirements and standards in the law. Negligent permits are issued partly because top administrators are legally free to disregard their experts' recommendations. Sometimes they do just that (in all government agencies, not just ADF&G). It depends on who is governor and whom they select as commissioners.

Alaska's salmon are a crucial part of our economy and culture. Some increase in regulation will doubtless happen, although not the apocalypse that "No on 1" wants us to believe in. This will be a very reasonable trade-off for protecting the vital spawning habitat of salmon.

"No on 1" say that the Ballot Measure is badly written.

It may need adjustments in the future; many new laws do. But it's vital to get responsible salmon habitat management into Alaska's law. The Board of Fish requested three years ago that the Legislature fix glaring omissions in the obsolete law, but the lawmakers have not acted. That leaves the care of our salmon resources to public action and the ballot, which is not ideal.

I doubt that "Stand for Alaska" really believe their own title. Otherwise they would work in good faith with "Stand for Salmon" to draft a proposition that protects salmon habitat, while also being acceptable to their Outside industrial interests.

The following point was added on September 25, 2018, after Valerie Brown, the Legal Director for Trustees for Alaska, replied to my questions:

"No on 1" say that the Ballot Measure was written without input from biologists.

This is false. Ms. Brown stated to me, "The ballot measure was drafted by a group of people that included biologists, fishermen, conservationists and lawyers . . . Some of the language in the initiative was drawn from previous regulatory packages prepared by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game."