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OVERSIGHT OF OIL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN ALASKA

TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1969

U.S. Senate,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 1:35 p.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, Senator Henry M. Jackson, chairman, presiding.


Also present: Jerry T. Verkler, staff director; Stewart French, chief counsel; William J. Van Ness, special counsel; Charles Cook, minority counsel; and Dale Shaffer, assistant minority counsel.

Senator JACKSON. The committee will come to order.

This is an open public hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The purpose of today's hearing is to receive a report from Under Secretary Russell E. Train on the Department of the Interior's manpower and funding requirements and capability to oversee oil resource development activities on public lands in the State of Alaska.

In addition, the committee will hear from Mr. Carl H. Schwartz, Jr., Director, Natural Resources Programs Division, Bureau of the Budget, on the disposition of the Department's past requests for necessary personnel and funds.

During the course of Secretary Hickel's confirmation hearing, the Secretary reached an agreement with this committee that he would not modify Public Land Order No. 4582, the so-called land freeze order, without first consulting with the committee. As a result of this agreement, the committee will at some point in the future be called upon to express its views on Trans-Alaska Pipeline System's application for a proposed 48-inch, 800-mile trans-Alaska pipeline right-of-way. The committee's primary interest in this matter, of course, relates to the protection of the rights of the Alaska native people pending a legislative settlement of the Alaska native land claim issue.

The committee does, however, also exercise important legislative oversight responsibilities concerning the impact of technology and large-scale resource development on the quality of the environment and the management of the resources on the public lands located in Alaska.

Very frankly, in recent weeks, the committee has received a number of disturbing reports that present limitations on personnel and funding (1)
make it highly unlikely that proper environmental, conservation, and safety controls in connection with activities now underway or proposed will be fulfilled. I am hopeful that these reports are not true.

The members of this committee have long considered the formulation of appropriate guidelines to govern resource development on Federal lands to be a matter of great national importance.

For example, on August 8, in a letter to the Secretary expressing the committee’s views on a proposed modification of Public Land Order No. 4582 to allow the State of Alaska to construct 53 miles of highway, the committee made a number of recommendations concerning the need for proper environmental controls.

Earlier in the year, at my request, the major oil companies involved in the trans-Alaska pipeline proposal and the major conservation organizations formed ad hoc working committees to discuss ways to minimize conservation and environmental problems.

As a result of these and other activities, industry, Government, and private groups are now working together with the objective of planning a major resource development in a manner which will preserve and protect environmental and natural values for the enjoyment of future generations.

It is my view that this committee and the Department of the Interior have an opportunity to establish a standard of excellence and a precedent which should guide all future resource development projects on the public lands.

This opportunity will, however, be lost if the Department of the Interior and other concerned Federal agencies do not have the personnel to see that appropriate guidelines, standards, and conditions are in fact followed and fulfilled.

On August 5, I requested Secretary Hickel to furnish the committee with a report on the Department’s manpower and funding needs. The report indicates a need, at that time for 142 positions and funds in the amount of $4.2 million.

The report goes on to note the uniqueness of land and resource management problems in Alaska, and to say that it is “vital that adequate planning be done and that constant supervision be provided during construction * * * to insure that undue damage to the environment and wildlife is avoided.”

The departmental report also notes that proper “safety measures must be insured to prevent the consequences of a breakage in the pipe. The pipe will carry 2 million barrels of oil a day. If not provided against, breakage could result in a gravity drain of about one-half million gallons of oil per mile of line.”

Without objection, the complete report will be included at this point.

(The report referred to follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Hon. Henry M. Jackson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Jackson: In response to your letter to Secretary Hickel of August 5, I enclose a statement on the capability of the Department of the Interior to fulfill its responsibilities related to the development of oil production on the North Slope of Alaska.
This statement is broken down into the manpower and funding needs of the Bureau of Land Management, Geological Survey, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

With best regards,
Sincerely yours,

[Enclosure]

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Under Secretary.

STATEMENT ON CAPABILITY OF THE DEPARTMENT TO CARRY OUT ITS RESPONSIBILITIES IN CONNECTION WITH PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF OIL PRODUCTION ON THE ARCTIC NORTH SLOPE IN ALASKA

Bureau of Land Management
Management of lands and resources: 31 positions, $1,350,000.

These funds are for route selection and right-of-way specification work prior to issuance of the right-of-way permit and monitoring work under the terms of the permit during construction of the proposed 800-mile trans-Alaska oil pipeline.

In fiscal year 1970, the Bureau will receive applications for rights-of-way for the 800 mile pipeline and 450 mile support road, and lands or rights for air fields and other facilities, and for gravel and timber.

Many of the land and resource management problems in Alaska are unique to the Arctic. A project of this nature is unprecedented in these regions and the impact on the lands and resources will be difficult to determine. It is vital that adequate advance planning be done and that constant supervision be provided during construction by people trained in resource management, as well as engineering, to ensure that undue damage to the environment and wildlife is avoided.

Proper safety measures must be insured to prevent the consequences of a breakage in the pipe. The pipe will carry two millions barrels of oil a day. If not provided against, breakage could result in a gravity drain of about one-half million gallons of oil per mile of line.

The magnitude of the problem may be visualized by the following statistics:

1. The need for gravel. Estimates range as high as 40 million cubic yards involving hundreds of separate sites to be inspected and approved for sale. At the rate of 10¢ per cubic yard, we can anticipate sales approaching $4 million.
2. An anticipated mobile pipeline work force of approximately 3,000 men divided into five separate crews spaced along the length of the 800 mile location. These crews will be working at least 12 hours a day and seven days a week.
3. The large number of workers and equipment which will create sanitation and fire hazard problems.
4. Need for review and approval of numerous access roads and airfields both for transportation of material for construction and also to provide access for future maintenance.
5. Need for the proper location of facilities such as pumping stations, microwave stations, and power plants.
6. The sale of timber necessary for construction, such as pilings.

The program consists of—

1. Preconstruction review of construction and operation plans and standards (including transportation routes, facility sites, gravel and timber needs).
2. Evaluate impact upon land and water resources.
3. Establish guidelines and stipulations.
4. Inspection and monitoring of stipulations, plus required post construction effect studies, if necessary.

Geological Survey
Surveys, investigations, and research: 85 permanent positions and $1,250,000.

Topographic mapping: These funds are to provide topographic maps needed for approximately 25,000 square miles of unmapped area in the transportation corridor for the proposed oil pipeline.

Environmental geology studies: 7 permanent positions and $535,000 are to analyze permafrost problems on the Arctic slope, and its behavior throughout the annual weather cycle.

Hydrologic studies: 4 permanent positions and $200,000 are to determine effects of potential development on the Arctic slope, particularly with respect to gulling,
waste discharges, and gravel removal, as well as the possible effects of pollution of the natural environment.

**Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife**

Management and investigations of resources: 8 permanent positions and $500,000.

**Bureau of Commercial Fisheries**

Management of investigations of resources: 7 permanent positions and $400,000.

These funds are for studying the effects of this proposed oil pipeline on fish and wildlife resources in Alaska. For example: taking gravel from streambeds for construction can possibly spoil spawning locations for salmon and Arctic char. The effects of this pipeline (heated in winter) on the tundra and permafrost are not now known. It is known, however, that tundra does not withstand improper development and it also has a limited capacity to recover from damage. The pipeline placement either above, on, or under the ground, which must also be studied, can also have quite an effect on the necessary migration of wildlife between summer and winter feeding grounds. The effects of pollution are self-evident in an operation of this type also.

---

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Survey</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Commercial Fisheries</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senator Jackson. In view of the uniqueness of Alaska’s environment, in view of the dangers involved, and in view of the opportunity to insure orderly and proper development of Alaska's resources, it is my judgment that the Federal Government should be prepared, at the earliest possible date, to commit the needed personnel and funds to provide proper oversight and control of Alaska's oil development.

The cost is relatively small—$4.2 million. The sale of gravel for the pipeline at 10 cents a cubic yard alone would, it is anticipated, result in $4 million revenue to the Federal Government. The amount of Federal revenues from oil royalty, rent, filing fees, and bonus bids, when this area is opened up, is unknown.

While the cost of proper control is small, the stakes are very high. We have seen the impact of major resource development activities in the past. Too often they result in pollution, erosion, needless deforestation, poor land-use planning and management, and destruction of wildlife values. But there are other dangers also. The safety questions involved in a pipeline which holds over one-half million gallons in every mile of pipe are tremendous. This is especially true in Alaska’s Arctic environment where earthquake conditions, extreme temperatures, permafrost, and new technology pose new engineering questions.

The parallel to the recent Santa Barbara oil spill is obvious. There, however, the Federal Government did not clearly anticipate the dangers involved. Here, the problems and the dangers are anticipated. In my judgment, it would be a violation of the public trust if the administration failed to provide all necessary funds and personnel to insure proper development and to guard against a disastrous oil spill in one of the great river basins of Alaska.

Speaking for myself alone, I must confess that I would have very grave reservations about granting approval to the pipeline unless
there are very clear assurances that all necessary precautions have been taken by the Federal Government to insure that proper Federal guidelines and controls are designed and implemented.

It is my understanding that the Department of Interior has done a good job over the past few months in monitoring route selection activities and in preparing specifications for road and pipeline rights-of-way. The President's interagency task force has been active and we all look forward to receiving its report. The pipeline applicant, Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, has hired and funded the work of competent ecologists, biologists, and geologists and has conducted extensive testing to insure that environmental and wildlife problems are eliminated or minimized. In addition, Trans-Alaska Pipeline System has worked closely with the leaders of major conservation and outdoor recreation organizations, and has been responsive to their concerns and their suggestions.

In short, through the cooperation of the oil industry, conservation organizations, the administration, and the Congress, we now have an opportunity to insure that Alaska's future environment is balanced and well-planned. Resource development can be compatible with the preservation and enhancement of natural values.

Seizing upon this opportunity to provide a new standard of excellence in resource development does, however, require that the Federal Government exercise leadership. This will require manpower and funds. The committee looks forward to hearing the Department's requirements and the administration's plans.

Secretary Train and Mr. Schwartz, maybe both of you can come up together.

The purpose of today's hearing, of course, is to give an up-to-date review of the situation. You may make your statement first, Secretary Train, and then Mr. Schwartz, however you wish to proceed.

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL E. TRAIN, UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ACCOMPANIED BY BOYD L. RASMUSSEN, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND JOHN M. DE NOYER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, RESEARCH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. Train. Mr. Chairman, Senator Allott, and members of the committee, it is a pleasure to be with you this afternoon and to discuss the financial and manpower needs of the Department of Interior in relation to the exploration, development, and transportation of oil on the North Slope of Alaska.

I have a brief formal statement, after which I will be happy to answer questions your committee may have, aided by the representatives who are with me from the Bureau of Land Management, Geological Survey, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

In August of 1968 the discovery of oil at Prudhoe Bay on the North Slope was announced. Estimates of the reserves of this discovery vary from 5 to 100 billion barrels. However, there is little question that the North Slope strike, as extrapolated to adjacent Arctic areas, represents a discovery of major importance at least of the magnitude
of the east Texas field and perhaps the size of all previously known national reserves.

In April of this year Secretary Hickel created the North Slope task force within the Department of the Interior to insure that oil exploration and development in northern Alaska would be consistent with the protection of the Arctic and subarctic environment and with the safeguarding of native interest. In May, the President enlarged this departmental task group into an all-governmental group, to include the Departments of Defense, Transportation, Commerce, HEW, and HUD, and I might add there are a number of other entities represented by observers at those meetings.

On June 11, the Department received an application from the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, a consortium of three oil companies, Atlantic Richfield, Humble and British Petroleum, for an 800-mile pipeline and associated construction road right-of-way from Prudhoe Bay on the Beaufort Sea, to the Port of Valdez on the Pacific.

Most recently, on July 25, the Department received a request from the State of Alaska to modify the “land freeze” along a certain portion of the intended pipeline route to allow for the construction of a 53-mile secondary highway, which the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System would build and the State of Alaska subsequently would maintain.

This secondary highway section is the initial step in the development of what is regarded as perhaps the single largest private construction project in the free world. TAPS plans to complete this section by early winter and to start construction of several sections of the pipeline in February and March of next year, with construction activity proceeding year round until the project is completed in mid-1972.

It is now estimated that there will be eight prime contractors working simultaneously on the route, requiring some 3,000 employees. The project is scheduled to include 5 to 12 pumping stations, landing fields, camp and administrative sites, microwave stations and access roads as ancillary units to the pipeline.

The potential impact of this large scale technology upon the delicate Arctic ecosystem, the fish and wildlife resources and the native peoples is of very great concern to the Department of Interior. As trustees of the public domain over which the pipeline is to be built and as stewards of our Nation’s natural resources, it is our responsibility to insure, as the President has charged, that oil development be accomplished “without destruction and with minimum disturbance” to the natural environment.

Our most immediate efforts have been to survey the overall right-of-way in regard to the permafrost, fish and wildlife, water, land, and human resources involved along the route, and to draft sufficient conditions and stipulations for their proper safeguarding. Once the application, subject to these stipulations, is approved, close supervision of construction activity will be required. Inasmuch as these stipulations must necessarily be open-ended, departmental personnel will be constantly required in the field to examine and protect the entire spectrum of land, water, wildlife and native values along the route. Additional personnel will be required for the inspection and granting of special use permits for construction camps, gravel sites, airfields, and access roads.
Specific examples of the type of work that needs to be done include land surveys and mapping; geologic investigations of right-of-way terrain; the study and analysis of Arctic construction techniques, particularly those relative to the problems of permafrost insulation; the examination of anadromous fish spawning areas and the migration patterns of caribou; the inspection and control of gravel sites and timber resources; the study needed to solve particularly difficult problems of liquid and solid waste disposal and those of human sanitation; the plans necessary to detect and respond to oil spills from a line with a capacity of 500,000 barrels per mile; the study of native groups in the vicinity of development to insure that concern is given toward protecting their traditional way of life as well as providing the opportunity for training and employment; and certainly not the least, the problems arising from the opening of new areas to public travel in a severe climate and unique terrain.

In early May, a supplemental appropriation estimate of $4,235,000 and 142 additional positions was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. This reflected the funding and manpower requirements of the four bureaus most chiefly involved with the Arctic oil and pipeline development, who felt they needed a supplemental, I should add.

These overall figures had the following bureau breakdown: Bureau of Land Management, $1,350,000; Geological Survey, $1,985,000; Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, $500,000; Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, $400,000—total, $4,235,000.

And along the lines of my previous remark in introducing those figures, of course, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, among other agencies in the Department, are very much involved with this pipeline application, and the development of specifics for the permit, although they are not listed here for a supplemental.

This May estimate was made prior to the filing of the actual 800-mile right-of-way application for the pipeline, and prior to the application for the 53-mile secondary highway. It was made before we had definite knowledge of the timetable for the entire project, of the numbers of contractors that would be operating simultaneously, and before we knew the exact route requested.

We have just recalculated these funding requirements to reflect the present needs for this overall effort, and this recalculation, Mr. Chairman, has been carried out subsequent to our most recent request for information. Our current estimate now totals $3,150,000 with the following breakdown: Bureau of Land Management, $1,500,000; Geological Survey, $1,200,000; Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, $250,000; Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, $200,000.

The difference between the May figures and the current estimate is explained by work already accomplished in the intervening months and by changes in circumstances resulting from the actual filing of the pipeline right-of-way application in June and by the subsequent secondary highway application in July.

This concludes my formal statement. We are happy to answer whatever questions the committee may have.

If I might at this point add two more items of information for the record, my statement refers to pipeline specifications as does yours, Mr. Chairman. We provided, I believe, late yesterday to the staff of
this committee copies of preliminary sets of specifications, both for
the pipeline and for road construction in connection with the pipeline.

The second point I would like to bring to the committee's attention,
and I know you would be very interested in this, is that the Secretary,
Secretary Hickel, intends to announce today, I believe, the holding of
public hearings in Alaska on the pipeline application, and it is my
understanding that those hearings will be held toward the latter part
of August in Alaska, and to afford all interested segments of the public
a full opportunity to address themselves to questions raised by the
pipeline in these draft specifications stipulations among other ques-
tions that may come up.

That completes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Jackson. The proposed specifications and stipulations will
be made available to the public so they will be prepared to raise any
questions at the hearing?

Mr. Train. That is correct, sir. They are in the process of being
reproduced at the present time. Copies are, a very limited number of
copies were, available last Friday, I think only three. One set was
made available to the State of Alaska at that time and one set to the
Trans-Alaska Pipeline System.

Senator Jackson. Mr. Schwartz, would you care to comment? I
want to do whatever best fits in with the presentation here. We can
ask Mr. Train questions now or we can defer. I think it would be
helpful if you could comment at this time and then we can ask questions
of both of you.

STATEMENT OF CARL H. SCHWARTZ, JR., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL
RESOURCES PROGRAMS DIVISION, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. Schwartz. I have no prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, but
I would be glad to answer any questions.

I would like to tell you the status of this estimate. I would like to
explain the situation with respect to the estimate that Secretary Train
referred to.

We received that in May. About the same time, of course, we were
involved in this problem of the surtax extension and the decision by
the Congress to impose an overall cash outlay ceiling on the 1970
budget.

Staff work has proceeded on this estimate. I think we now have
from the Department all of the information that we need. We hope
that before Congress convenes, that we will have completed our work
and have a recommendation that can be presented to the Congress.

Senator Jackson. By "convene" you mean when we come back
after Labor Day?

Mr. Schwartz. That is right.

Senator Jackson. You hope to have the decision on the estimate
at that time?

Mr. Schwartz. This is our plan. And, as you know, the President
when he signed the second supplemental bill, directed the executive
agencies and the Bureau of the Budget, in particular, to scrutinize
every Federal program, to determine whether or not there were
possibilities of reprogramming or setting a lower priority for certain
programs in order to make room for new programs such as the one we are talking about here this afternoon.

I think the Bureau of the Budget fully recognizes the need on the part of Interior, for additional strengthening in the area that Secretary Train mentioned, and how this will be financed, will depend on the completion of our review, and what the Director and the President finally decide.

Senator Jackson. I am sure you understand the importance, of course, of getting adequate and competent personnel. The committee is in the unique position here of having to comment when a recommendation is made by the Secretary on the pipeline, as we did last week on the highway application on the part of the State of Alaska.

The experiences that we have had in the Santa Barbara affair and with the unique problems that pertain to Alaska, not only as to the size of this proposed operation, but also the geological problems pertaining to earthquakes, the uniqueness of the environment in all of its aspects poses serious problems for this committee to pass on.

One of the obvious conditions, precedent to the proper construction of the proposed pipeline in all of its aspects, whether it is safety or whether it is environmental, certainly is directly related to the adequacy and the competency of the personnel, who must be there on the site. This is the reason for this hearing today. We are not here to bulldoze anyone. The committee has these responsibilities and we are in the dark as to what the situation is going to be when the Secretary sends his letter up indicating the course of action that he intends to follow.

Secretary Train, how many people do you have in Alaska at the present time that are assigned specifically—have any of your people come up with you that you wish at the table—how many people have you assigned at this time specifically, to the proposed pipeline and the related problems of the oil development?

Mr. Train. The primary operating agency in the field on this matter, has been the Bureau of Land Management, as the Bureau of Land Management has the responsibility for the actual public lands involved.

Mr. Rasmussen is with me and he can amplify on this.

He informs me we have averaged about 10 personnel from the Bureau of Land Management working on the pipeline application. This has involved moving some people from the lower 48—

Senator Jackson. Other assignments?

Mr. Train. Other assignments, of course. The Geological Survey, we have 25 men from the Geological Survey working on the pipeline application proper at this time.

Senator Jackson. Either in the surveys that are involved or—

Mr. Train. This is Dr. De Noyer.

Senator Jackson. On the paperwork how many are in the area?

Mr. De Noyer. I do not have that figure, Mr. Chairman, but it would be about three in the area and about five in related, directly related, research.

Senator Jackson. Suppose after we are through here, that you furnish for the record the specific breakdown. Can you give us a rough breakdown now, as to what activities they are engaged in?

Mr. De Noyer. Yes, Mr. Chairman.
DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of August 13, we are enclosing certain information relating to the Department’s program in connection with the development of oil production on the Arctic North Slope in Alaska.

We shall be pleased to supply such additional information as you may require.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

Summary

Answers to questions in Chairman Jackson’s letter of August 13, 1969:

1. Question. How many full-time personnel does the Department of the Interior now have in Alaska who are assigned specifically to the proposed pipeline and to the related problems of oil development on public lands?

   Answer.
   Land Management  10
   Geological Survey  16
   Sport Fisheries  6
   Commercial Fisheries  2

   Total  34

1(a). Question. What activities are these personnel engaged in (break down by agency).

   Answer. See details in attached Bureau statements.

1(b). Question. How many of these personnel were transferred from other State and regional offices? (Identify the State and regional offices).

   Answer. None. However, during initial program 6 personnel were sent to Alaska for 6 weeks from Portland, Oreg., service center; two temporarily reassigned from water resources project in Colorado; one from North Central States region, Minneapolis, Minn. because of past field and airplane pilot experience in Alaska. None. Three.

1(c). Question. How many more personnel are currently needed?

   Answer.
   Land Management  45
   Geological Survey  47
   Sport Fisheries  2
   Commercial Fisheries  2

   Total  96

1(d). Question. How many will be needed to monitor work under the terms of the right-of-way permit?

   Answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land Management</th>
<th>Geological Survey</th>
<th>Sport Fisheries</th>
<th>Commercial Fisheries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1970</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1971</td>
<td>88 do</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 1972</td>
<td>88 do</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After construction</td>
<td>25 None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See attached bureau statements containing answers to questions 2 through 3.
The following are in response to Senator Jackson's specific questions.

1. How many full-time personnel does the Department of the Interior (BLM) now have in Alaska who are assigned specifically to the proposed pipeline and to the related problems of oil development on public lands?

In Alaska BLM has 10 full-time people on these problems. In the Portland Service Center there are six people assigned part-time.

(a) What activities are these people engaged in?

Ten full-time in Alaska to—

- Review road construction with State of Alaska and aid in study of material (gravel) sites.
- Review, inspect and administer the stipulations in Special Land Use Permits and Rights-of-Way.

PART TIME IN ALASKA

Fairbanks and Anchorage District Area Managers, etc., three. Supervise all activity, including oil development which occurs on specific resource areas.

(b) How many of these personnel were transferred from other State regional offices?

None of the above were transferred from other places. However, during the initial inspections and investigations to develop R/W stipulations a task force of 6 experts were sent for a period of 6 weeks from our Service Center at Portland, Oreg.

(c) How many more personnel are currently needed?

Currently BLM needs 45 additional positions.

(d) How many will be needed to monitor work under the terms of the right-of-way permit during construction? After construction?

The construction work will essentially be accomplished in only three years. In FY 1970 BLM requires 45; in FY 1971 BLM requires 43 more for a total of 88; and in FY 1972 88 total. After construction we estimate 25 total will be required.

2. What action does the Department have in mind in the event that funds are not made available for the purpose of overseeing development? Would this Administration consider imposing a requirement that the applicant pay the cost of Federal supervision for the planning, construction, and development involved?

It has been proposed that BLM transfer funds from the Oregon and California Grant Lands Fund in FY 1970 if no other course is possible. In FY 1971 it is proposed that the full amount of $2.5 million needed be funded by direct appropriation.

BLM cannot answer for the administration on the second question because there are many ramifications which go beyond the affect on BLM.

3. If the requested personnel and funds are granted, will the lands within and adjacent to the right-of-way corridor be classified by the Bureau of Land Management? To what extent have these lands already been surveyed and classified?

Yes. The Arctic Corridor classification (2.5 million acres) includes part of the pipeline route—from Livengood to the Jim River. At this point the pipeline leaves the Corridor and takes another route. Our plans for FY 1971 include classification of 25 million acres in the Brooks Range area and would include the pipeline route. (See attached map). Some resource data has been collected on this general area of the Brooks Range in preparation for proceeding with the classification. However, the proposal to classify this area has not proceeded to the point of coordination with the State nor have the local people been contacted for their views. We can adjust our classification schedule to consider classification of the Brooks Range area at an earlier date. The oil development activities will cause settlement pressure on the public lands in the secluded canyons of the Brooks Range. Because of favorable climate in the canyons on the South slope of the range, settlers will select the key tracts on the streams and lakes. Notwithstanding PLO 4582, people in Alaska can settle anywhere on the land prior to application. Therefore, the area indicated on the attached map should be classified for multiple use to allow orderly settlement and mineral development.

(a) Does the Department have funds and personnel to undertake this classification even if the requested funds are not granted?

The funds and personnel that were planned for this classification work have been diverted to preparing for the proposed pipeline right-of-way. With the increased manpower requirement for the pipeline it is doubtful that we can complete the classification and also process the right-of-way without additional funds and personnel.
(b) Does the Department feel that classification should be undertaken before the right-of-way is granted?
Yes. PLO 4582 allows mining claim locations for metalliferous minerals. Although a right-of-way grant would preclude locations in the right-of-way itself, mining locations along the right-of-way boundary could create location and construction problems. This is particularly true should it become necessary to adjust the right-of-way location. The classification could use the "corridor" concept in segregating from mining location to minimize the acreage closed to mining. The classification could be modified to allow mining location within the corridor after the pipeline is constructed.

The proposed pipeline and road stipulations are attached.

**Geological Survey**

The following information is supplied in response to questions in Senator Jackson's undated letter to the Under Secretary, and your oral request of August 22:

1. Question. How many full-time personnel does the Department of the Interior now have in Alaska who are assigned specifically to the proposed pipeline and to the related problems of oil development on public lands?
   Answer. 16 employees in Alaska as of August 22 are assigned full-time to the transportation corridor program.
In addition, the Conservation Division currently has five permanent employees stationed at Anchorage, Alaska, who are involved in pre-sale evaluation and supervision of oil and gas operations on Federal leases in Alaska. As of July 31, there were 46 leases in Alaska, either actively producing oil or gas or being drilled, all requiring operational supervision. Eight of these were on the North Slope of Alaska. An estimated one man-year of the Anchorage staff is currently utilized on problems related to that area of Alaska, none on a full-time basis.

(a) Question. What activities are these personnel engaged in?
Answer.

Geologic and permafrost problems connected with the proposed pipeline... 6
Reconnaissance trips to collect hydrologic, sediment, and geomorphologic information along the proposed pipeline and highway routes.......... 10

Total.................................................. 16

(b) Question. How many of these personnel were transferred from other State and regional offices? (Identify the State and regional offices.)
Answer. Two were temporarily reassigned from a water resources project in Colorado. The others were reassigned from other on-going projects in Alaska.

c) Question. How many more personnel are currently needed?
Answer.

Forty-seven, for activities as follows:

Geologic studies..................................... 16
Hydrologic studies.................................... 6
Topographic mapping................................... 25

Total.................................................. 47

1 The total shown is for the current fiscal year. The majority of the hiring would be during the winter and spring.

(d) Question. How many will be needed to monitor work under the terms of the right-of-way permit during construction? After construction?
Answer. None directly, although Survey may be called upon by Bureau of Land Management for assistance.

The remaining questions are not applicable to the Geological Survey.

**Statement of Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on North Slope Oil Activities**

Questions

1. The Bureau currently has 6 people detailed to the pipeline and related studies.

(a) Current activities: Program divided into two phases. One is on the ground inspection of the total pipeline alignment to determine the impact of the develop-
ment on wildlife resources and their habitat; and to devise measures to mitigate the development-occasioned damages. Two, a determination and documentation of the present general environmental status of the North Slope including a historical critique of the progress of past change.

(b) One of the 6 people currently detailed to the assignment came from outside of Alaska. He was assigned from the Bureau's North Central States Region, Minneapolis, Minnesota, because of his past field and airplane pilot experience in Alaska.

(c) Two additional people are needed.

(d) Six people will be required to monitor the work under the terms of the right-of-way. After construction, 4 people will be required for at least a 2-year period to continue longer term monitoring activities to establish the impact of the project on the environment.

2. The lack of additional funding will limit the Bureau activities primarily to the designing of specific fish and wildlife stipulations as the work construction proceeds. Monitoring of construction technique results and resultant change effects to the fish and wildlife resources would be severely limited.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

ARCTIC NORTH SLOPE

Answers are keyed to the letter from Chairman Jackson.

1. Two full time personnel (5 part-time) total man years 4.

(a) Purpose: To conduct studies and to monitor activities associated with the proposed pipeline and related facilities, with the following objectives:

To determine the extent of the fishery resources affected throughout the pipeline route and at both Prudhoe Bay and Prince William Sound.

To review plans and pinpoint critical areas such as stream crossing, gravel borrow areas and storage and shipping facilities at the terminus.

To develop solutions or proposals for problem areas so as to mitigate damage.

To provide liaison with Taps and other Federal and State Agencies in connection with both planning and construction.

To monitor the construction work.

(b) None

(c) Two

(d) During and after construction—one full-time and two part-time.

2. The Bureau's present fiscal year 1970 effort is funded by diverting about $37 thousand from continuing biological research studies and using about $73 thousand provided by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for reimbursable River Basin studies. If funds are not appropriated for the Bureau work on North Slope project the work will be continued at about the present inadequate level, subject to the continued availability of funds from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. If Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife funding were to decrease materially the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries effort would be reduced accordingly.

Mr. DE NOYER. The major effort to date is with the Geological Division, Geologic Division of the Geological Survey, and one project we have completed is an assessment of engineering problems in permafrost. That was published in mid-July as a professional paper which gives specific guidelines for construction in this delicate material.

We are also conducting detailed studies and reconnaissance studies along the proposed route, and possible routes of the permafrost, its location, its conditions and construction material supply areas.

We are conducting model studies of hot pipelines in frozen material to assess for ourselves what the expected consequences would be in the long-term view.

We are hoping to work out a cooperative program of sidelaying radar and infrared surveys with the Department of Defense and with industry which is also interested in participating.

In the water resources area we have been conducting overall examinations of the effects of construction in the Arctic, to the water resource and erosion problems concerned. At the present time we
have not fielded any topographic activities. These require rather long-term commitments for contractors to fly the aerial photography that is necessary, that we plan to initiate these early next spring when the weather will be breaking.

Senator Jackson. Do you have enough in-house capability to undertake most of the work, or do you contemplate bringing in some outside consultants?

Mr. De Noyer. Mr. Chairman, the people who are most experienced with the geologic problems related to permafrost, obtained their training within the Geological Survey during the NPR-4 investigations, and in other Arctic investigations. We have a lot of these in the USGS and we have been redirecting them to this problem as much as possible.

However, there is an additional cadre of people that could be brought to bear. Many who have been with the USGS work in this environment, and gone to academic institutions and industry, and we are not able to solicit their help at the present time.

Senator Jackson. Can you get some of them in as consultants?

Mr. De Noyer. Within the funding limitations, yes, sir.

Senator Jackson. You are allowed, what is it, a hundred dollars a day for outside consultants. I would think you would want to or need to bring in some outside experts in a construction job as big as this one. In fact, you are plowing a lot of new ground here.

Mr. De Noyer. We could certainly use additional help.

Senator Jackson. It involves, I would think, some of the best engineering talent in the world because you are in a totally foreign environment. I realize there is a lot of information available about the Arctic, but the problem here of building something of that size and taking into consideration the things that could happen such as earthquakes and so forth, places a special responsibility on the Department. I would hope that in your request that you would make a special point to emphasize the need to bring the best disciplines with the greatest expertise to bear on the problems that you will be facing. The committee wants to cooperate and help, because—for better or for worse—we are involved in this matter. It may have been wiser if we had not been involved, but we do have great responsibility in problems relating to the public domain.

Mr. Train. Could I make a couple of comments?

Senator Jackson. Yes.

Mr. Train. I think your suggestion is a very worthwhile one which we certainly will bear in mind.

I would like to refer to two of the other bureaus who are present and I did not ask them up at the table.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has two full-time and five part-time employees. Dr. Crowther, the Director, is here, if you wish to question him about that.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has six full-time employees working entirely on pipeline and pipeline related matters.

One other comment, Mr. Chairman, on your own statement. You referred to the receipts from, I think, some $4 million possibly.

Senator Jackson. Gravel sale receipts.

Mr. Train. Gravel receipts. I would point out to the committee that 90 percent of such receipts belong to the State of Alaska, and while they do get deposited into the Federal Treasury, I think it is only fair
to recognize that the Federal Government in the long run will only keep 10 percent.

Senator Jackson. I think that is the Anderson-Jackson amendment to the Statehood Act. We made a special exception for Alaska at that time.

I just have one other question at this time before turning to my colleagues, and in connection with the enormous environmental impact, the safety problems. I take it that the Department is giving serious consideration to make certain that there are adequate safeguards built in from a technological point of view so that the moment a break occurred that the spillage can be foreclosed as rapidly as possible. Is that correct?

Mr. Train. This certainly has been our endeavor, and while our stipulations are still in a preliminary form, I think that in that form, if you should have an opportunity—the committee—to examine them, you will see we made a very real effort in that regard.

Senator Jackson. Senator Allott.

Senator Allott. I just want to comment briefly on one item, and then turn it over to my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska, but I have found in similar situations, that outside help is of assistance. It helps to temper judgments and to bring a fresh outlook.

I wonder why some of the people who have skills and experience in this particular area, and have been lost through the beneficence of the Federal Government to universities and research institutions, could not be obtained for their cooperation and assistance, perhaps it would be possible to get these people on a temporary basis, a 3-month basis or even a 6-month basis to assist you. Do you think this is possible?

Mr. De Noye. It is very possible, Senator. In fact many of them would be delighted to do this, provided we had the funds to pay for it.

Senator Allott. Well, that is——

Mr. De Noye. We have a very large WAE program and such people do participate heavily in our programs.

Senator Allott. How much can you pay these people per diem?

Mr. De Noye. I do not have the figures, sir.

Senator Allott. Is there anybody in the room who knows the answer?

Mr. Train. I think we can pay consultant fees in some cases almost up to a hundred dollars.

Mr. Schwartz. That is the usual fee.

Senator Allott. "Almost up to a hundred dollars a day" so the compensation is reasonably adequate. I hope that you do not overlook this. I think the value of having somebody who is outside a formal organization of the Interior Department can be very advantageous. Many times we all get in a forest and lose sight of it, by counting the trees. As we well know by looking around, this can also happen in the disciplines; and I would hope that this would not occur in this instance.

When you consider the type of a project that we have underway, I would think that you wouldn't have to beg for people. The only problem is money, and that is the problem of this Committee and the Appropriations Committee. It seems to me that the mere nature of this project, would challenge any man involved in any of the disciplines that pertain to this construction. Is this your point of view?
Mr. DE NOYER. Yes, sir, it is.

Senator ALLOTT. In other words, you don’t think, considering the challenge and considering the rate of compensation, that the basic problem is getting a wholly diversified staff. It would be your opinion that the basic problem is in the financing of the consultants?

Mr. DE NOYER. Yes, sir.

Senator ALLOTT. Thank you.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Schwartz, as I understand it, the payment of $100 per day does not include the travel allowance or the costs incurred for that purpose. A hundred dollars a day is direct compensation. The rest would be extra?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes, sir.

Senator JACKSON. I would hope that when the decision is made on the budget request that there will be enough flexibility so that the Department will be able to utilize the funds for the employment of experts because I would assume that there will be a substantial need in that area. Maybe the oil companies have most of them right now, I don’t know. I am advised that they have been going all out to get the best ecologists in the environmental area that can be found, and I want to commend them. I would assume that in the interest of meeting the safety requirements they will want to have the best seismologists and people from various other disciplines that are involved.

Senator ANDERSON.

Senator ANDERSON. Who authorized this pipeline? What sort of authority was there, and who authorized the pipeline?

Mr. TRAIN. Have we authorized the pipeline, sir?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. TRAIN. No, sir. No, we have an application for a permit pending before the Department, before the Secretary.

Senator JACKSON. Senator, there is a consortium made up of Standard Oil of New Jersey through Humble, Atlantic Richfield, and British Petroleum that have gone together and formed a pipeline company. Inasmuch as public domain is involved they have applied to the Department of Interior for the necessary permit to construct the pipeline. As you will recall, we took up the matter of the so-called access road last week, and we made our comments in a letter to the Secretary in that regard. What we have involved here today are the requirements and the needed resources of the Department to make an evaluation: First, to determine whether the permit should be granted, and second, if it is granted, the conditions under which it should be granted, and third, the policing of the construction operation. The committee is involved because of the Alaska Native claims problem which is still pending. All lands in Alaska have been withdrawn by order of Secretary Udall pending the disposition by the Congress of the Native land claims case.

Our interest here today is to be sure the Department has the necessary personnel and resources to carry out its management responsibilities.

Senator ANDERSON. Do you have a figure of total cost?

What I am trying to get at when the Big Inch pipeline was built a good many people of talent were brought into it. You have a small crew. What about this?
Mr. Train. I have heard varying estimates of the total cost of the pipeline to the pipeline system itself, and these range from some $800 million to a billion or two or thereabouts. I am not too sure of my figures but it will give you an idea of the range involved.

Now, those costs are costs which will be borne by the private companies who have applied for the permit. There is no Federal financing being provided for the pipeline itself.

Senator Anderson. Should there be?
Mr. Train. Could there be?
Senator Anderson. Should there be?
Mr. Train. I suppose there could be. Whether there should be or not, I don't know. I don't believe I would be competent to comment on that. At least I haven't given it any thought.

The funding that we are discussing with the committee today are the needs which we in the Department of the Interior see in order to enable the Department to do an adequate job of inspection, surveillance, and environmental protection with respect to the construction and operation of the pipeline, now and in the future.

Senator Anderson. In the case of the Big Inch pipeline I believe it was built by the Government and turned over to private investors. Is this eventually going to be in the hands of private investors?

Mr. Train. It is built by a syndicate of private companies. I am not personally familiar with the ownership arrangements but so far as I know it will remain in private ownership.

Senator Jackson. I think, Senator Anderson, the Big Inch, as I recall, was built in World War II as a wartime requirement.

Senator Anderson. At a cost of $145 million.

Senator Jackson. Yes. That was a wartime requirement to meet the situation at that time. What we have here is the application of a pipeline joint venture made up of varying degrees of ownership. I gather, of these three companies who plan to spend an estimated $900 million. I assume we can say $1 billion in this age of overruns. I don't think the private sector is immune. So that the request comes from a private corporation, and they are to pay the costs. It is a privately owned oil pipeline.

Senator Anderson. A billion dollars ordinarily is done by bid contracts.

Senator Jackson. Of course it will be up to the company how they will award it and how they will handle it. I don't know what their plans are. We will hear from them when we get the recommendations or comments of the Secretary of Interior on the pipeline itself.

Senator Anderson. I do think we ought to find out how private industry would feel about this because ordinarily when we have got a billion dollar figure—

Senator Jackson. Well, they have to report to their shareholders, and I suppose they will be watching it carefully. We have to realize that costs in Alaska are entirely different from the other 48 States because of the remoteness of the area and the unique climatic conditions that exist there.

Senator Jordan.
Senator Jordan. No, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.
Senator Jackson. Senator Stevens.
Senator Stevens. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I assume we won't go into the details of these stipulations today, but as they relate to hiring, I would like to ask a couple of questions.

I note you have an antidiscrimination provision in the proposed stipulations, which I commend you for, and as the chairman has noted, there are going to be 42 new positions in the Department of Interior. As a result of money involved, I would like to know if you are going to advertise the jobs so we can hire native people and Alaskans first, or if you are going to require the industry to do it?

Mr. Train. I will defer to Mr. Rasmussen on that.

Mr. Rasmussen. It would depend upon the jobs we are filling. Some of them will probably be filled by Alaskans, and some by other outside hires.

In our particular job which is the surveillance of the construction program and the inspection as the work progresses, but there will be people hired in Alaska. We have already hired two.

Senator Stevens. I don't think I made my point clearly enough. We have had these hearings on natives hired in Alaska, and we have the percentage hired by each department; and of that percentage the number who have been native Alaskans. Your department and the Department of Defense are woefully lacking in the new employees who have been native Alaskans.

Now, you are in a position of supervising the oil industry in connection with this job, and the Department of Defense supervises through the contract compliance. Of DOD's staff in Alaska, only 2.9 percent are native Alaskans. I think yours is a little bit higher than that because of the BIA, but if you exclude the BIA it is very small.

I think if you are going to insist that this applies to the industry that we ought to insist that it apply to you. I would like to suggest that you advertise the availability of these jobs in conspicuous places and in the newspapers, and Mr. Willard Bowman from our State office involved in discrimination problems in Alaska, I am sure, would be very pleased to help you.

But it seems to me that you cannot force this clause on industry, if you don't enforce it on yourself.

Mr. Train. Senator, let me assure you that we certainly will impose upon ourselves equally firm rules with respect to hiring as we do in our stipulations on the private contractors; no question about it.

Senator Stevens. Thank you.

Mr. Train. Beyond that I will assure you that whatever the specifications may say, the Department of the Interior will do whatever it can to do more than a fair share in providing employment opportunities for native skills in Alaska.

I think you recognize the problem that in hiring highly technical skills, maybe a soil scientist or something of that sort, it is not always easy to find the person from the area where you would like to hire them. You have to sort of take the skill as you can find it. But with that one qualification I repeat that I can assure you and this committee that the Department will lean over backward to provide every opportunity for native skills in Alaska.

Senator Stevens. Thank you for that.

I am happy, Mr. Chairman, to see our old friend, Mr. Schwartz, here. He helped us through the statehood days, as you will recall, and
I am sure he will be just as generous in this matter as he was in those days when he helped in getting us the 90 percent. He shakes his head and wishes he hadn’t now.

Senator Stevens. Mr. Secretary, I have read these stipulations, and proposed stipulations, and I want to tell you that I agree and I am sure the whole committee agrees, with the chairman’s point of view that we have got to do the best job we can. Having lived in this area and being fairly familiar with it, I am impressed with the fact that you are trying to duplicate the job of the Bureau of Public Roads. We have got a Bureau of Public Roads up there that knows construction in Alaska, has lived in Alaska, and they have experimented in Alaska for the whole world in terms of Arctic construction; and you have in these stipulations suggested that the construction of this road going north of Fairbanks should be equivalent to the standards for the secondary highway system for all of Alaska, which incidentally the Federal Government has never been willing to finance. The Federal Government has never financed the construction of a road north of the Yukon River, and yet we are saying here that private industry, if it wishes to go up there, must meet the stipulations for a secondary highway system that the Federal Government, with all its money, has never been willing to meet, and I want to suggest to you that you should review this to take out those road construction items and let the Bureau of Public Roads pay attention to the standards for construction and maintenance of highways, because I don’t think it has anything to do with the conservation problems or the problems that this committee is trying to deal with in terms of protecting environment and ecology of the area. It has to do with engineering, and those of us who have lived in Alaska for many years, and Mr. Rasmussen I know is familiar with it, know that in many areas because of the tremendous costs we have had to cut the requirements for construction of roads.

For instance, our superhighway is two lanes. Now, if you think that you are going to build a secondary highway north of the Yukon and maintain it year around and that is what these stipulations say, that it will be maintained, protected from icing conditions, from drainage problems throughout the year, well, then, I don’t think you are ever going to get a road north of the Yukon, and I am convinced that the Bureau of Public Roads knows how to deal with our roads and that you people know how to deal with the ecology and environment, and I hope you will share the burden and perhaps we can use some of the money they have already appropriated for the Bureau of Public Roads so they can do the job up there and do it faster.

But I would urge you to review this from the point of view of not having Interior duplicate the Bureau of Public Roads and, believe me, my dear friends, I know what I am saying north of the Yukon.

We have just had an experience with the road that some people playfully called the Hickel Highway, which he opposed for 2 years because of the great problems in financing, and I would hope that we are not going to prohibit the development of Alaska by virtue of imposing upon industry such financial burdens that we cannot survive.

I call Mr. Schwartz’ attention to this because we have experts in Alaska in road construction and they are in the Bureau of Public Roads and in the State division of highways and they are not in the Department of Interior.
I call your particular attention to this provision on maintenance in your proposed stipulation. Now, if your 142 positions envision duplication of our road construction activity on the State and Federal level already, I think we ought to know.

I would like to see, Mr. Chairman, if we could have a breakdown of what type of jobs are involved in these 142 jobs because we, I am sure as far as I am concerned, would support everything you want to do to prevent catastrophe in Alaska, from the problem of destroying the environments, from any other activity that might happen, including earthquakes, but I am constrained to the point of view that you are rewriting the road standards for Alaska here, and I have told my colleagues from the West I think it has a tremendous impact on the rest of the West if we can use this vehicle to impose additional standards on the Western States that we cannot afford to meet on a year-around basis, and again I point out to you no one in history has ever maintained a year-round road north of Fort Yukon anywhere, and that is what this thing says, your proposed stipulation says this is a secondary road. A secondary road under your definition must be maintained year round, it must be ice free and it must be drainage free.

There are times of the year when the Yukon is going to start rampaging and I don’t think anyone has got the money to protect this road without some awfully big bridges. I really urge you to review this and, Mr. Schwartz, I urge you in the Bureau of the Budget to confine the Department of Interior to environment, and the protection of conservation interests, and the Bureau of Public Roads to the building of the roads.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Jackson. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, did you wish to comment?

Mr. Train. Senator, I think it is important to recognize that the 53-mile stretch of road from Livengood and north to the Yukon is contemplated as a somewhat different piece of construction than the road to be constructed north of the Yukon, and is also coming both to this committee and to the Department under different circumstances.

The 53-mile road from Livengood north to the Yukon is the subject of the State of Alaska’s application for a lifting of the land freeze and the State of Alaska has entered into a contract with the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System for the construction of that road and that contract calls for the road to be, as I recall, constructed to minimum secondary highway standards, because it is contemplated that TAPS will turn the road over to the State following its completion and the completion of the pipeline.

However, in this case the permit is not requested by the pipeline company nor is a permit involved. There is no permit involved here but simply a modification of the land order and the lifting of the freeze.

The road construction north of the Yukon, as I understand it, does not contemplate a secondary highway type of construction but simply a facility which would service the construction and the laying of the pipeline. So the stipulation generally has been up to the, or rather, with north of the road to the Yukon in mind.

Senator Stevens. I am glad to hear you say that, because it will mean, of course, your people will modify these proposed stipu-
lations. The Prudhoe Road is defined as the road constructed parallel to the pipeline near the point near Livengood, which is sort of south of the Yukon to the Prudhoe Bay operations, which is all the way up to the other end of the slope, and in your road standard design and compliance section it says Prudhoe Road, "The standards and technical criteria governing the design and construction of secondary highways in the State of Alaska shall apply."

Under these circumstances we can only envision that the Department contemplates that a secondary highway is going to be built from Livengood all the way to Prudhoe Bay complying with the secondary highway standards of the State of Alaska which, of course, are the Federal standards.

All I can tell you, I hope my colleagues are with me on this, that when you go into the costs of trying to maintain a road year round to meet secondary standards and it must be open 12 months a year, to meet them you are imposing on the industry a tremendous burden.

I am happy to hear you say that you don't contemplate this. That it is 53 miles which we all know is going to be a State road and maintained as a State road. The other is a pipeline access road primarily.

Mr. Train. That is as I understand the situation.

Senator Stevens. If it is then I think we have to maintain the definitions here where everyone understands them and they don't start out by thinking that north of the Yukon the oil industry is going to maintain a secondary highway for all people who want to go see the North Slope 12 months a year because it would be financially impossible at this stage of development, in my opinion, to do that.

Mr. Train. I do appreciate these comments. We are aware of many of these problems. The stipulations you have before you are preliminary draft. They have been made available to the State of Alaska, as I said. They were made available today to the Department of Transportation, to the Bureau of Public Roads, to give us their comments on. The Commissioner of the Alaska Highway Department, Mr. Beardsley, is working since yesterday here in Washington on these stipulations with our own staff people.

From the outset we have said that these are the best jobs we could do at this time, and we invite your comments and help in improving them and that has been our object from the beginning, and we have been and expect to continue to work closely with the Alaska State Public Roads people on these matters.

I would comment this for the record: That unless there are Federal highway funds involved in the construction of any of these roads that there would be no Bureau of Public Roads supervision of their construction.

Senator Stevens. I don't agree with that, but what I am saying is in the course of building up 142 new positions I would not like to see us build up a small Bureau of Public Roads staff in the Department of Interior. We have got the experience there in the Bureau of Public Roads already. They know how to build roads and even though there won't be any Federal money involved I am sure they are willing to assist the industry in review of their design and their construction engineering of this road which in my opinion has nothing to do with the conservation aspects of the road.

Mr. Train. Right.
Senator Stevens. Thank you.

Senator Jackson. Senator Gravel.

Senator Gravel, I would like to touch upon that whole area because I think what we are doing now is reexamining the policy aspects of the problem in regard to jurisdiction and responsibility.

Let me ask this question, Mr. Train: When the Kenai Moose Reserve was opened up on the Kenai Peninsula, what kind of regulations governed the establishment of the roads and drilling and all of the activity from the Department of Interior? Does anybody know that? Can you answer that question?

Mr. Train. I don't seem to have the necessary expertise with me.

Senator Gravel. Let me offer a suggestion, sir. Maybe somebody from the Interior Department, who controls the Moose Range, might drive around there and take a look at what has been done by the companies in that area, particularly ARCO (Atlantic Richfield Co.); it might offer some example of what you might expect from the oil companies operating in Alaska.

Mr. Train. I am generally familiar with the record there, it is a very good one, and I think most conservationists feel a very good job has been done in accommodating the different uses of oil development and wildlife protection and management on the same land, and this has involved a close cooperation between the oil companies and operators and the Federal Government.

I also understand that the fact that the Federal Government in that case the personnel capability to be able to maintain on-the-site surveillance was a very important factor in developing that very fine record.

Senator Gravel. I couldn't agree with you more and, of course, as you recall the last meeting we had in the Secretary's office I was advocating along with my colleague, that the best way to handle this would be for continuous surveillance and working right with the companies. Of course, I assume this is the offshoot of that, which are the stipulations in question.

Let me ask another question to lay the groundwork for policy.

The Hickel Highway, which has been mentioned already, which of course was constructed by the State of Alaska, went across, I presume, Federal lands, and it is a highway of some length that goes all the way through the North Slope. Was there any involvement by the Department of the Interior in developing some stipulations so that the State of Alaska would take proper cognizance of conservation factors and ecology?

Mr. Train. This is subject to correction by my associates.

My understanding was that the construction of that road was undertaken prior to the imposition of the land freeze formally—I see I am subject to correction already.

Senator Gravel, You are subject to correction. That is not correct. The land freeze was in existence.

Mr. Train. I understood it was formally in existence.

Senator Stevens. This road was built last fall. It was an engineering feat and took a road that was an ice road from the Yukon to the North Slope right through the area we are going with this, and it is my understanding that there wasn't one single stipulation that applied to the development.

Mr. Train. That is correct.
Senator Stevens. And it hasn't harmed the place at all.

Senator Gravel. Yes, I would just like to bring to the attention of you gentlemen—

Mr. Train. I believe the public land order instituting the freeze only went into effect on January 16 of 1969. I think you gentlemen know much more about this than I do.

Senator Gravel. There was a land freeze and the State of Alaska went up and built the road without as much as a murmur from the Department of the Interior, and now we have a private company building a road and there is more than a murmur. I raise the dichotomy for your examination.

Another point I would like to raise regarding your budget proposals, this really is the purpose for this hearing, is your initial cost figure of $4,235,000 in May, and now in August we are down to $1,300,000, and I quote from your statement, the difference between the May figures and the current estimates are explained by work already accomplished in the intervening months. Now, you are coming in for a supplemental request. Am I to assume that the $3 million has been expended already in an effort—there is a $3 million difference?

Senator Jackson. They modified it. It has been reduced from the May submission, as I understand it.

Mr. Train. It is really just a reexamination of the situation, updating it.

Senator Gravel. Let me ask you—

Mr. Train. Can I comment on the earlier question?

Senator Gravel. Please.

Mr. Train. Of the winter road. It is perfectly true that were it not for the freeze at this time, were it not for the freeze, the State of Alaska would not have to apply to anyone for building this stretch of road from Livengood north to the Yukon. It would simply let its contract and build the road under section 2477 of the Revised Statutes.

Senator Jackson. As it relates to unreserved lands. That is an 1866 law, as I recall.

Mr. Train. That is correct. And the right-of-way as I understand it then attaches by operation of law to that road. So that again there will be no stipulations, no permit, no action by the Department at all except for the fact of the freeze, and—

Senator Gravel. Which in this case, and by the simple definition of item 2 right in at the beginning, the permittee must obtain some type of permit or permission to go ahead; and throughout these stipulations you can read that if the permittee doesn't perform properly, then this permit can be jerked from under them or they can be stopped right where they are.

Mr. Train. Of course, these stipulations are drawn up with the full pipeline route in mind and other construction and campsite permits and things of that sort.

Senator Gravel. The stipulations I am reading from just involve the road. I understand there is another group of stipulations involving pipeline, there are two books involved, one for the pipeline and one for the road. I am reading from the section concerning proposed stipulations relative to the road.

Mr. Train. That is correct, Senator, but that is all road construction not just the 53 miles from Livengood to the Yukon.
Senator Gravel. Here is really the point I want to make, and I can make it very graphically because I have dogeared a group of pages in these stipulations that state a road can’t go within a quarter of a mile of a spring, they refer to the size of a nozzle for a firehose, and I could go on and on, and show you how anybody who has been to Alaska and knows the problem up there that some of these stipulations are really pretty far out.

I would hate to see, and I am the first to realize that we have to exercise conservation in the State of Alaska, the thing can get out of hand from a bureaucratic point of view, where we can place in motion here activities where you could have bureaucratic harassment to a degree that has not been imagined by man. It would be out there in the tundra many, many miles from various people that decisions are necessarily made. But a lot of the stipulations in here would be onsite decisions involving judgment, and if you had a personality conflict with the head of a camp, a construction camp, and a member of the Department of the Interior, I submit it could cost many thousands of dollars to the construction company and, in turn, to your company and in turn to the people of Alaska because our return is based upon the cost of getting this oil to market.

So that in the final analysis, a bureaucratic harassment would penalize the people of Alaska. I would hope that without going through and making these points which I am sure you can do with your own perusal of the document, that you will find there could be some exaggeration here, and I could think of the Hickel Highway or I could think of a year ago where the State of Alaska would have thanked its lucky stars to be able to get a gravel road, and this is really all it is, a gravel road, and the only access road in that whole area for thousands of miles. So the thing can certainly get out of hand.

I would hope in pursuing not only the qualifications for this road but also the pipeline that it be uppermost in your minds to facilitate the private sector in accomplishing its job while still protecting ecology, and I don’t say the ecology should be last but I would hope that would be the policy consideration on your part.

I would only add one question. I know there is a great emphasis on gravel, and this of course would cause the primary ecological disturbance. Has any thought been given to some chemical types, particularly foam or styrofoam or various types of foam that could be just put right across the tundra, and has any experimentation been done in that area?

Mr. Train. I understand that the pipeline companies have experimented with this and have made certain judgments. What those are, I don’t know.

Senator Gravel. But the Interior Department has made no such experimentation?

Mr. Train. No, sir, we have not, to my knowledge.

Senator Stevens. May I interrupt you there?

Senator Gravel. Certainly, please.

Senator Stevens. Just talking with the chamber, it is my understanding 142 positions are desired for this supervisory job on an annual basis; is that correct, on an annual basis?

Mr. Train. This is correct.

Senator Stevens. This is a continuing concept.

Senator Jackson. It is only through the construction period.
Mr. Train. No; we are talking about 1970.

Senator Jackson. Fiscal year 1970?

Mr. Train. That is fiscal year 1970; that is what is the basis upon which these figures were developed.

As the construction of the pipeline proceeds and is completed, certain of these personnel requirements will evaporate.

Senator Jackson. Well, the Department of Transportation—

Mr. Train. Will be eliminated. On the other hand, other kinds of surveillance which are probably not covered in these figures may come about.

Senator Jackson. The Department of Transportation has the jurisdiction on pipeline safety and overall supervision, is that not correct, once it is in operation?

Mr. Schwartz.

Mr. Schwartz. Pipeline safety is their responsibility.

Senator Jackson. Right.

Senator Stevens. And the Department of Defense has contract compliance as far as antidiscrimination and things like that on contracts on the pipeline.

Senator Jackson. The Department of Defense? Because they are the largest employer?

Senator Stevens. And the largest user of petroleum products.

My reason for interrupting you here is I would like to know where are those 142 people going to go. That is more people than you have got in Fairbanks today.

Mr. Train. May we send you a breakdown for the record on this? I think it would be useful.

Senator Jackson. Yes, if you would supply that for the record and also, I would hope, as indicated here earlier, that there would be some provision for flexibility in the hiring of consultants and experts. Obviously, you will not be able to find all of them in-house in the Department of the Interior.

(The breakdown is printed on p. 10.)

Senator Gravel. Mr. Chairman, if I could just go on for a second.

There are a good many good points here. I don't mean to deprecate this effort because I think you have some good guidelines. Let me give you an example of pesticides and herbicides and God knows a lot of legislatures are passing laws against DDT. I think it is a good thing, but here you are prohibiting outright DDT, and I don't think the State of Alaska has such a prohibition. But, also, that if any pesticides or herbicides are to be used, the user has to submit his application 90 days prior to proposed treatment.

Well, anybody who has worked in Alaska and seen the size of our mosquitoes and the problem involved and has to submit an application 90 days in advance, that means they won't be able to build the road this year, because there is nobody who can work in a tundra of Alaska with the mosquitoes we have. They would go crazy in a few days. But, as I read the regulations here, they would have to submit a plan for the use of pesticides and herbicides for at least the balance of this construction year.

Mr. Train. I can see that 90-day problem.

Senator Gravel. I merely demonstrate this as a small complaint—anybody who is a resident of the State of Alaska can go down to the drugstore and buy some of this stuff for his personal protection. But
you are putting a liability on the construction of this road that they must furnish a plan for the use of these 90 days in advance.

Another point is commercial timber. I don’t know the economics of transportation of timber in the interior and I don’t know if anybody else does. The language of the stipulation reads as follows, “prior to clearing operations,” and, of course, if they get their permit they would have to start clearing immediately if they are to make any progress this year, “prior to clearing operations permittee will enter into a contract with the United States of America for the sale of marketable timber contained within the road right-of-way as required under the authority of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended by an act of September 25, 1962 (78 Stat. 567), and regulations as set forth in title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, part 5400.”

Now, undoubtedly these concern themselves with the sale and utilization of timber. I have been a land developer in the State of Alaska and I would submit that any other citizen in the State of Alaska building a road would turn around and burn his timber. Now, if they are forced to sell it, and adhere to some regulations, I submit they won’t build that road in the next 2 years. I mean clear, I don’t know about building, but they will have trouble clearing it and marketing the timber according to what I suspect these rules require.

Apparently they would have to set up a chipping mill to implement some facet of it.

Mr. Train. I am sure these are problems. But the fact also remains that that particular timber is Federal timber, and is the property of the United States and must be given consideration.

Senator Gravel. I am sure, Mr. Train, the Hickel Highway destroyed a lot of Federal timber and nobody raised an eyebrow when they cut through.

Mr. Train. That was built by the State and not private contractors.

Senator Gravel. That is the point I make. We can permit the State of Alaska to be abusive, if that is the terminology, but we can’t permit private areas to be abusive. In other words, we are differentiating between the oil companies in the State of Alaska, that is the point I made and I brought out the example of the Kenai Moose Range. They have been much more judicious and much more conservation minded as regards the actions of the State of Alaska and yet there is afoot what I feel is a sense of discrimination.

Mr. Train. Well, the law under which we operate gives the State government, not just the State of Alaska government, all State governments, certain rights which it does not give private parties with respect to the public domain.

Senator Gravel. We were just talking about this lumber. Maybe there is a Federal law that says when the State takes the lumber it is all right and they don’t have to turn around and bring it into some commercial areas. But I merely raise the dichotomous interest that is involved here.

Here is another, explosive use, “permittee shall submit at least 30 days prior, in advance, a résumé of anticipated underwater blasting for review.”

When you start tying things down to 30, 90 days, and when you have some knowledge of the construction season in the State of Alaska you are placing burdens which are not soluble. They are impossible to solve, and here again I would say that probably the
judgment in the field would be the answer here. But here I want to caution you that the judgment in the field could be capricious so it is not an easy way you have charted for yourself. But I do want to emphasize that from a policy point of view it should be one of proper ecological consideration but also some consideration for the fact that these people are trying to do a job against probably the most severe elements man has ever encountered. It is the largest private endeavor as far as the State of Alaska is concerned. They have a fairly decent record, probably a record better than most in the ecological considerations, and I would hope that all these things would come into play because this thing could turn out to be quite a nightmare, and I would hate to see these funds go to retard the situation and not do the job as they should. I only advance these thoughts.

Mr. Train. May I assure the committee that the Department is, in my sincere judgment, making no effort to be obstructionist or to harass the companies involved in this project. We have got a very serious problem which is not just the Department of Interior's problem, it is the Federal Government's, the State of Alaska and the people of Alaska and private industry. We can only solve this problem by working together.

We have moved in the Department, I think, with quite extraordinary expedition, and with conscientious effort to develop the best stipulations that we can in cooperation with the parties concerned. The road stipulations, the preliminary stipulations worked out with the regional representatives of the Alaska State highway people, both in Anchorage and in Fairbanks, I believe, that they may have further thoughts on these, but we have made every effort to work with these people right along.

We are confident that this permit is going to be granted. We are working as best we can to see that the job is done right, and I do assure the committee that absolutely no unreasonable delay is being imposed by the Department of Interior.

Senator Gravel. If I could just underline that point on the cost of delays, I will just leave it there. That is under the time element requirement right at the beginning they must submit their application 20 days initially, you have 20 days to answer, that is 40 days and then there is another 45 days before they can begin construction after they submit detailed designs. Well, there will be no construction season left in the State of Alaska if that initial sequence is adhered to, and I can only say that there have been sins committed in the name of progress and many of them, you need but go across the United States to see them, and I think on occasion there can be sins committed in the name of conservation.

Senator Jackson. Just one comment, Senator Metcalf, before I call on you. As I understand it, Mr. Secretary, of course this is a proposed set of regulations. This is not final, and there will be this time to comment and to make whatever adjustments might be required in the public interest.

Generally, I want to commend you for laying, I think, a sensible foundation here for a problem which, while technically is not involved in this road, is a forerunner to the problem that we have in connection with the line itself. I believe it is in that context that these regulations, I assume, have been proposed, not in final form, but for purposes of discussion. Is that correct, sir?
I think it is important that those conditions be discussed at this time because they will be involved in connection with the pipeline itself and the supporting road system for that pipeline.

I might mention one thing before turning to Senator Metcalf. Some of the conservation groups, and I think most of them are concerned, Mr. Secretary, have sent a note up. The hearing to be held in August, that is late this month, will make it difficult for some of the conservation people to respond in time. I wish you would bring back to Secretary Hickel their concern in this regard. They would like to have the hearing in late September instead of late August.

I don't think that is an unreasonable request because I assume that is going to be a rather complicated technical document that will require substantial thought and review.

Senator STEVENS. Could I interrupt, Mr. Chairman?

Wouldn't it be possible for the conservation people to present their comments here in Washington at a later date and go ahead with the Alaska hearing in August? I think it is already anticipated that that hearing will take place in August, but I would say that the conservation people certainly ought to have every opportunity and I think most of them are here now and most of them reside here and it would be much easier for them to present their statements at a national hearing here in Washington that you could conduct down at your Department.

I would urge if you can to accommodate both the Alaskans and the problem of conservation groups.

Mr. Train. We certainly have no desire to force people to travel from Washington to Alaska to testify, and copies of these stipulations will be made available to the conservation groups and others. We will be delighted to receive their comments here in Washington.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Hall is here. John Hall is chairman of the ad hoc committee on the conservation side. I wonder if you could comment on that. It seems like a sensible request to have the hearings in Alaska as it relates to the local people, and then have hearings late in September here for the major conservation groups.

Mr. Hall. The question we might ask there is; is there enough time for the Alaskans to be prepared for these hearings, read the stipulations, review them? I think the last week in August is a busy week with science conferences going on and I thought for the consideration of the Alaskans something that can be worked out into a period where the Alaska conservationists would have ample time, plus the Washington group, I think——

Senator JACKSON. I suggest that you get together after the meeting today and see if you can't work that out.

Mr. Hall. Thank you.

Senator JACKSON. Thank you, Mr. Hall.

Senator ALLOTT. Mr. Chairman, hasn't the ad hoc committee been included in all the way along the line on this?

Senator JACKSON. I think there have been continuous discussions but, of course, they don't know what the stipulations that are to be proposed by the Department are I assume there has been a wide discussion of suggestions but this has been primarily between the industry and the conservation groups and not with the Department, except on a limited basis. Is that not correct?
Mr. Train. They will have copies today. They might have had them already today, I am not sure, but if they don't, they will, and Mr. Hall has been meeting with our task force from time to time, and we certainly will continue to work closely with him.

Senator Jackson. Senator Metcalf.

Senator Metcalf. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have very little to add.

This discovery of oil on the North Slope, of course, is a challenge to all of us. This insatiable demand we have for energy in America is going to be partially satisfied with this discovery but many of us want to take the fullest advantage of it and not get ourselves into a situation such as we inadvertently got into in Santa Barbara. So I want to add my comments to that of the chairman that I think we should aggressively get people up there to supervise the development of roads, pipelines, and drilling so that we can take the fullest advantage of this tremendous resource we have but, at the same time, not destroy the ecology and the environment of that rather pristine and fresh area. This Senator will give you every bit of support in getting every dollar that you can for the necessary people that you need, and I hope you will aggressively press the Appropriations Committee to get the kind of people up there to supervise the development of this area so as to avoid another Santa Barbara situation.

I want to say that, whether it means the hiring of experts on a per diem basis or getting people up on an annual basis for a year or so or adding experts to your staff, it seems to me that the most important thing you are doing right now down at the Department of the Interior is to be sure that we preserve the area and at the same time take fullest advantage of this great discovery of a new source of energy.

Senator Jackson. Thank you, Senator Metcalf.

Senator Allott.

Senator Allott. If I may be permitted to make a remark, Mr. Chairman, I think that what has been brought out this afternoon is that in an undertaking of this size—which is not only an engineering undertaking, but is also a great technological undertaking—cannot be completed without some errors and some mistakes. We have devoted $24 billion to putting a man on the moon, and that was not done without some mistakes.

I hope in this project that we don't get into the area of alining groups against groups. There is a proper interest for the vital technological interest and there is a proper interest for those who are particularly interested in the conservation aspect.

I am sorry the junior Senator from Alaska left because I wanted to comment on one statement he made, and in so doing to correct the record, as I understand it.

He talked about the Department of Interior granting a permit for this road, as I review the action taken by this committee, the Department of Interior, at this time, is not the determining body in this matter. The Department of Interior having made the withdrawal, agreed that there would be no further uses without consultation, therefore, this committee and the House committee are really the ones who determine whether or not there should be a road. In our report to the Department, we specifically made it clear that this is
not an exception to the general law of 1866. In this respect I don't think the Department is in the position of a permitter. Perhaps I am wrong, but I wanted to make that statement for the record.

Senator Stevens. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. May I say something?

I want to take this opportunity to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the ranking member, too, and commend Mr. Train and point out the people here in the audience who are members of the conservation organizations who are expending their money, I am sure they have got other things they can spend their money for, too, to assist us in this development, and I am extremely pleased we have this working relationship and we haven't reached that point of the ultimate conflict in this development and I hope we won't.

I do believe that we need all the help the chairman and Senator Allott here have indicated their support of this afternoon. I think it is pretty plain. I hope, Mr. Schwartz, we would get this money back. I do hope as you review the conservation objectives that we are trying to achieve here that, and I say this politely, we won't try to improve the Arctic. It has been there a long time and we like it and I would like to preserve what is there and not use this as an occasion to try to improve the Arctic conditions as we build this road, and I hope we keep that in mind, and I think we will get this thing done a lot easier and cheaper.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Jackson. Thank you, Senator Stevens.

I certainly agree with Senator Allott regarding the importance of the industry, in this case the oil industry in Alaska. I think what we face in the period ahead is the problem of balancing the economic interest with the environmental interest and with the public interest. This is going to require the work of a genius at times.

There are situations, as we look to the future, that are going to be very difficult. But there is no reason why in this so-called affluent society, that we cannot meet those future economic requirements, and at the same time provide for a better life and a better environment in which people can live in an affluent society, lest it become, as someone has said on many occasions, the most "effluent" society that the world has ever known, I am convinced that it can be done.

We are working, I think, on an outstanding case here where we can set an example and a precedent for the country as a whole in trying to resolve some very difficult problems concerning the development of the Nation's resources. I want to commend you, Mr. Secretary, for the very fine way in which you have approached this problem and continue to approach it in the Department of Interior.

I think it would be useful, Mr. Schwartz, if we could be assured that there will be a decision now when we get back.

Senator Bible, who is the senior member of this committee and chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, is out of the country at this time. He will, I think, be in the process of marking up the Interior appropriations bill shortly after Labor Day. The hearings have been completed, and I am sure he will be anxious
to have that decision when he gets back. Can we be assured that when we return on Wednesday there will be such a decision by the Bureau.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It is our objective, Senator.

Senator JACKSON. All right. I hope you will do that without any question because of the obvious importance of this to our responsibilities and, of course, to the responsibilities of the Department of Interior.

Mr. TRAIN. The Department of Interior stands ready to work with the Bureau of the Budget at any time.

Senator JACKSON. Especially on this kind of a problem.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The only thing——

Mr. TRAIN. With this sort of support.

Mr. Chairman, we do have some budgetary problems as you realize and we will do the very best we can.

Senator JACKSON. You have another freeze in addition, there are several freezes here, there is the Arctic freeze, there is the land freeze, and then there is a budgetary freeze so we need a little thawing here without doing violence to the budget itself, the ecology of the budget.

Thank you, gentlemen. We appreciate your cooperation here today.

The committee has received a statement from Thomas L. Kimball, on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation, for inclusion in the hearing record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF THOMAS L. KIMBALL ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman, I am Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director of the National Wildlife Federation which has its national headquarters at 1412 Sixteenth Street, N.W., here in Washington, D.C.

The National Wildlife Federation is a private organization which seeks to attain conservation goals through educational means. The Federation has independent affiliates in 49 States, including Alaska. These Affiliates, in turn, are made up of local groups and individuals who, when combined with associate members and other supporters of the National Wildlife Federation, number an estimated 2½ million persons.

We welcome and appreciate the invitation to appear here today.

Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from an extensive air trip over much of the State of Alaska, including the North Slope area where oil operations are concentrated. I made many observations on this trip and developed some impressions and attitudes which I would like to share with the Committee. Summarized, I might list them in this manner:

1. Representatives of the oil industry, and others, in haste to develop the oil resources in the region have created a mess in some areas. This results from road construction, the establishment of housing and drilling sites, and other operations.

2. The surface of much of Alaska, be it tundra or forest, is extremely fragile and man's impact on the environment is profound and long-lasting; and,

3. Governmental agencies, Federal and State, are woefully understaffed to do a proper job in safeguarding public resource values. The Interior Department, for example, simply does not have the manpower to even police the regulations to say nothing about research and other activities which obviously are needed to develop information necessary to protect public interests.
To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I must express disappointment and dismay that the Interior Department apparently is not seeking funds for the purpose of developing a suitable staff to deal with the problems which are involved with the North Slope oil operation. The Department should be represented more directly, and thoroughly, in the operations. The Department should be gathering facts about world-wide Arctic ecology as it relates to man’s activities. The Department should be taking soil samples and making other tests to determine how best the pipeline can be routed to minimize damages to the wide range of natural resources. The Department should be conducting research and investigations on such things as check valves and other items of equipment which can be of importance in minimizing effects of a break or oil spill. In view of the widespread effects on natural resources and the substantial revenues which the Federal Government will realize from the North Slope oil operations, I would consider as reasonable an expenditure of up to $2 million per year in suitable staffing and operations. I hope this Committee will agree and so recommend.

Thank you again for the opportunity of making these observations.

Senator Jackson. If there is no further business before the committee we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:20 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned.)