

EMAIL DOCUMENT

From: **Lieutenant Governor Mead Treadwell**

Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2013 2:29 AM

To: **Representative Wes Keller**

Subject: **Thank you for the invitation to the Overreach Summit**

Dear Wes,

Thank you for the invitation to speak at the summit being held today and tomorrow to discuss federal overreach and the State of Alaska. I was able to attend for a short time today. Governor Parnell and the Administration's team covered our issues well. I am out of town on Tuesday, but I hope you will let attendees know that I have fought federal overreach through my entire career. I am with you in spirit. These two days are vital to renew our efforts.

Were I there, I would raise three quick questions for discussion:

1. Could we move more land into state hands? Around the Arctic, even today, we are seeing national governments devolve ownership and control over public lands to regional and local authorities. Iceland gained independence from Denmark during World War II. Greenland gained control of crown lands from Denmark just recently, with power to decide on mining, drilling and other resource development on and offshore even before they get independence as a country. Canada devolved power over public lands in the 1930's to the provinces, and is doing so now with its territories. The Premier of the Northwest Territories described that process in a PNWER meeting here a few weeks ago, and the NWT will soon have decision-making authority on and offshore. The Yukon, which gained this power in the last decade, was the fastest growing jurisdiction in Canada last year.

Governor Hickel, who pushed for our 103 million acre Statehood land grant, used to say we should have asked for more. Now we are. Efforts to transfer land into a state forest in Southeast, for example, are based on the conviction that the state can offer certainty and continuity to investors in our timber industry that the federal government has failed to do. We have strong state laws to protect the environment.

Federal land management policies threaten our competitive edge in Arctic resource development.. My colleagues in Idaho and Utah tell me they have recently created commissions ---by legislation --to study the how to move more federal land into state control in their states. Their efforts in raising the issue may help us. I have no doubt we can strike a better balance between jobs and the environment than the federal government has with its land management policies.

2. How can the Statehood Compact protect us? Today, Attorney General Geraghty spoke about Alaska's early 1990's lawsuit on the Statehood Compact. We were disappointed in the result: the suit reaffirmed that our Statehood Compact does exist, but decided that the 90-10 revenue share from

development of federal lands we agreed to with Congress at Statehood was -somehow not an enforceable part of the Compact, and could be unilaterally changed by Congress.

I haven't given up on trying to enforce our Statehood Compact with Congress.

In the mid-1990's former Gov. Hickel and I, among others, worked with then-Sen. Drue Pearce and then-Sen. Robin Taylor to amend the Alaska Constitution to ensure that the state maintains the position that any change to the Statehood Compact by Congress has to be agreed to by both sides. That amendment to our Constitution has not been used, to my knowledge. The federal lawsuit that was discussed did not define fully what is enforceable in the Compact and what is not. It would be good to know. As we see more encroachment on subjects we agreed to at Statehood --such as state control of fish and game -- this new clause in our Constitution might help protect us.

At the very least, we should learn how other states who came into the Union by Compact have been treated since. We have allies in other states. The Tenth Amendment of the Constitution gives us additional ammunition to rein in overreach by the Congress.

3. Where revenue sharing does exist, should we demand a development plan? Alaska legislators know how important the state Department of Revenue's regular forecasts of income from state land are to the state. But what are we to expect from federal land? The federal government does not seem to care what revenue they will receive on lands in Alaska, nor do they seem to care about the timing of when they -- and we -- will receive it. Perhaps public land owning states can demand that Congress provide more meaningful revenue forecasts and a timetable for production on federal land. It would sure help Alaska to know what oil from federal lands is headed to the TAPS pipeline, and when.

Alaskans are fed up with Washington's approach to land management in Alaska. I hope we ask these and many more questions, and I hope your efforts this week stimulate much more discussion and solutions. Where I can help, I am with you.

Best. Mead