ALASKA'S NEW COMMERCIAL FISHING AND AGRICULTURE BANK

By Lynn Pistoll

Good news for the fishing industry! The Alaska legislature recently established the Commercial Fishing and Agriculture Bank (CFAB). The purpose of the new organization is to provide funding for fisheries and agricultural development in the state.

The bank should have sufficient revenues to work with in the immediate future; \$2.5 million was authorized for fiscal year 1979 and 20 percent of the revenues from the new raw fish tax will be available to the corporation. The ownership concept of the bank is unique in that after twenty years the ownership stock will be retired and the bank will evolve into a private organization.

At least three members of the newly elected board have fisheries related backgrounds; Dale Philman is a commercial fisherman from Ketchikan, Bob Thorstenson is president of Icicle Seafoods of Petersburg, and Byron Mallott is a commercial fisherman from Yakutat as well as chairman of the board for the Sealaska Native Corporation and a woard member of Behrends Bank in Juneau. The other two board members are Paul Huppert, a farmer from Palmer, and Frank Homan, a consultant from Juneau. Frank Homan has been elected president and chairman of the board.

At the second board meeting on April 4, Frank Orth, a consultant to the bank, provided the board with a discussion on the background of the CFAB concept, characteristics of fisheries financing, potential markets, and bottomfish development as a CFAB market. Mr. Orth feels that the bank would primarily concentrate on all levels of fisheries development, leveraging its money by discounting the loans through the Cooperative Farm Credit System.

The CFAB concept was largely designed to target on several areas that were identified in a study conducted for the Senate Interim Committee on the Permanent Fund. The study concluded that the private financing industry in the state was highly concentrated, viewed the fishing industry as a high risk industry, and lacked interest and knowledge of the industry. At the public sector level, the study pointed out that state financing programs lacked

expansion capability, were costly to the public, and had an inhibiting influence on private financing institutions. Finally, at the seafood industry level, the study concluded that there is a lack of equity among potentially qualified borrowers, especially for large bottomfish investments. With respect to seafood harvesters, there is a lack of business expertise to properly utilize appropriate financing institutions.

A major characteristic of the Commercial Fishery and Agriculture Bank which addresses these areas is its ability to participate at all levels of agriculture and seafood industries, including harvesting, processing, marketing, and support services. Potential CFAB markets include the financing of fleet expansion and upgrading for traditional fisheries, small-scale underutilized species projects such as geoducks and clams, bottomfish development, marine support and service businesses, and technical assistance services.

Mr. Orth feels that because of the large investment capital required for bottomfish development, the industry could very well become a major market for CFAB. Probable bottomfish organizations desiring funding may include small-scale proprietorships from existing fisheries, corporate and cooperative of successful fisherman. processors desiring expansion, and large-scale new entrants. The bank could provide loans for all possible categories of bottomfish development. Near shore development may include conversion financing for existing vessels and processing plants. Offshore development could include funding for large trawlers, catcher/processors, processing barges, floaters, tenders, and transshipment bases.

The Commercial Fishing and Agriculture Bank has many challenges ahead. Initial work will be directed towards developing a corporate planning structure and establishing relations with other financial institutions. The organization is a step in the right direction with regard to the current administration's desire to strengthen the renewable resource economy and reduce future levels of state spending. The organization may eventually assume a major role in fisheries development policy and provide leadership for large project financing. At any rate, this all sums up to a break for Alaska's fishing industry.

LABOR FORCE BY REGION AND CENSUS DIVISION

i i	Labor Force			Unemployment			Rate			Emp	Employment		
	P/79	$\frac{r}{4}/79$	5/78	P/ 5/79	r/ 4/79	5/78	p/ 5/79	4/79	5/78	\$/79	r/ 4/79	5/78	
Alaska Statewide	188187	182809	184403	16934	18221	22278	9.0	10.0	12.1	171253	164588	162125	
Anchorage-Matsu Region	92029	90156	90091	7160	7791	8790	7.8	8.6	9,8	84869	82365	81301	
Anchorage	84743 7286	7314	82865 7226	6034 1 1126	6455 1336	7465 1325	7.1	7.8 18.3	9.0	78709 6160	76387 5978	75400 5901	
Gulf Coast Region	22545	21317	21299	2284	2407	3024	10.1	11.3	14.2	20261	18910	18275	
Cordova	1212	1129	1111	107	98	114	8+8	8.7	10+3	1105	1031	997	
Kenai	10643	10112	10032	1276	1370	1583	12.0	13.5	15.8	9367	8742	8449	
Kodiak	4947 1549	4682 1463	4650 1505	355	397 168	508 253	1 10.4	8.5	16.8	4592 1 1388	4285 1295	1252	
Seward	4194	3931	4001	385	374	566	9,2	9.5	14.1	3809	3557	3435	
Interior Region	26242	25450	27579	3706	3767	5595	14.1	14.8	20.3	22536	21683	21984	
Fairbanks	21414	20741	22519	3104	3124	4658	1 14.5	15.1	20.7	18310	17617	17861	
Southeast Fairbanks	1974	1945	2084	213	251	366	10.8	12.9	17.6	1761	1694	1718	
Upper Yukon	600	572	641	80	72	134	13.3	12.6	20.9	520	500	507	
Yukon-Koyukuk	2254	2192	2335	309	320	437	1 13.7	14.6	18.7	1945	1872	1898	
Northern Region	9016	8688	8481	659	668	962	7.3	7.7	11.3	8357	8020	7515	
Barrow-North Slope	2439	2335	2275	119	108	187	1 4.9	4.6	8.2	2320	2227	2088	
Kobuk	2695 3882	2606 3747	2595	239	249	385 390	1 8.9	9.6	14.8	2456	2357 3436	3221	
Nome	3862	3/4/	3611	301	311	390	7.8	0.3	10.8	3301	3430	3223	
Southeast Region	28846	28259	27319	2009	2548	2721	7.0	9.0	10.0	26837	25711	24598	
Angoon	483 1024	485 1029	450 990	51	71 148	54 147	1 10.6	14.6	12.0	432	881	396	
Haines	1024	9965	9661	1 631	724	822	1 6.1	7.3	8.5	9646	9241	8839	
Juneau	6015	5951	5766	1 410	581	628	6.8	9.8	10.9	5605	5370	5138	
Outer Ketchikan	1040	1017	1043	1 64	82	148	1 6.2	8.1	14.2	976	935	895	
Prince of Wales	1617	1581	1490	122	148	119	7.5	9.4	8.0	1 1495	1433	1371	
Sitka	3782	3704	3533	1 233	304	280	1 6.2	8.2	7.9	3549	3400	3253	
Skagway	1513	1504	1460	1 135	184	197	1 8.9	12.2	13.5	1 1378	1320	1263	
Wrangell-Petersburg	3095	3023	2926	1 259	306	326	8.4	10.1	11.1	2836	2717	2600	
Southwest Region	9509	8939	9634	1116	1040	1186	11.7	11,6	12.3	8393	7899	844	
Aleutian Islands	2358	2220	2396	164	155	188	1 7.0	7.0	7.8	2194	2065	220	
Bethel	2996	2815	3069	386	358	442	12.9	12.7	14.4	2610	2457	262	
Bristol Bay Borough	388	378	391	31	42	32	1 8.0	11.1	8.2	357	336	359	
Bristol Bay	1300	1207	1323	158	133	174	12.2	11.0	13.2	1142		114	
Kuskokwim	965	909	896	194	184	120	20.1	20.2		771	725	776	
Wade Hampton	1502	1410	1559	183	168	230	12.2	11.9	14.8	1 1319	1242	1329	

p/=Preliminary r/=Revised

1978 Benchmark

Federal guidelines require the use of unrounded labor force data, adjusted to be consistent with the Current Population Survey (CPS) in formulas used to allocate federal funds. Comparisons between different time periods are not as meaningful as other time series published by the Alaska Department of Labor; because Alaska'a CPS sample size is inadequate to accurately indicate monthly changes in level. The sampling errors are random in nature; meaning that the unemployment rates, in any given month, are as likely to be high as frequently as they are low. The official definitions of unemployment, currently in place, exclude anyone who has made no attempt to find work in the four week period up to and including the week that includes the twelfth of each month. Most economists feel that Alaska's bush localities have proportionately more of these discouraged workers.