MILTON
LIPTON
10/22/1973

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

POUCH Y - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

October 31, 1973

The attached transcript contains the remarks made by Mr. Milton Lipton on October 22, 1973 before the Senate Resources Committee. It is a verbatim transcript of Mr. Lipton's remarks. There is occasionally a word missing or other minor gaps in certain places, which are due to the speaker's testimony being indecipherable at that point. However, it is believed that these occasions are rare and the transcript presents a fair picture of the thoughts expressed by the witness before the committee.

Senator John Sackett
Chairman
Resources Committee

SENATE RESOURCES COMMITTEE

October 22, 1973 Hearing

TESTIMONY OF MR. MILTON LIPTON

The legislation that's directly before you is the Right of Way Leasing Act but before I address myself to that specifically, I would like to say something about the entire package of legislation. It has been stated by industry, of course, that it is a package and they will review whatever decisions come out of the Legislature as a whole. I think it's true even more so for the state than for industry that the whole complex of oil legislation that's before you determines the extent to which the interests of the state are protected or the extent to which the interests of the state are yielded.

I don't want to take too much time on other aspects of it and get to the Right of Way Leasing Act as quickly as possible. So let me start out by saying that, in our opinion, having looked at all the legislation carefully, having listened to a great deal of the testimony that was made before the various committees, we now feel that the pivotal piece of legislation which determines the extent to which any compromise is satisfactory to the interest of the state, is the Alaska Pipeline Commission Act. This is your regulatory bill, a strong bill that was enacted in the 1972 session of the legislature, a bill for which the government and industry have submitted proposed amendments which largely convert what had been intended by the legislature in the first instance as a regulatory bill into an entirely different instrument for

the state, namely a device whereby a commission of the state simply represents the state in hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The amendment to the bill as proposed and as pointed out by Professor Witherspoon yesterday afternoon, in effect, specifically denies (if the amendment is passed) by act of the Alaska legislature any and all jurisdiction which the state of Alaska might in the normal course of events, exercise over pipeline activities in this state, if only a pipeline such as transAlaska subjects itself to or is subjected to the jurisdiction of the ICC.

Now let me explain the reasons for our thinking that this particular act, as it now stands, the Alaska Pipeline Commission, is one of the most important tools available to the state of Alaska in protecting its interest. First of all, the act that's on the books claims very extensive jurisdiction for the pipeline commission which is being established. The jurisdiction extends to various aspects of regulation extensions of services, connections, expansion of capacity, potential abandonments --- so that with respect to these various aspects of pipeline operations the state of Alaska claims jurisdiction for its pipeline commission. Secondly, it vests in this pipeline commission wide authority to pass upon the validity of tariffs which are set by the pipeline. There is no claim made in the existing act, which is on your books, that the state of Alaska can regulate tariffs for the movement of oil in interstate commerce. This falls within the jurisdiction of the ICC. But there will undoubtedly be movement of oil in intrastate commerce, as for example from the northslope

to Fairbanks. There will probably be movement of oil in intrastate commerce from the north slope to Valdez which will remain within the state, for example, if the state should contract to take royalty oil and sell it for a year or two years or five years to the Tesoro Refinery or any other refinery which may be then or in the future be constructed within the state. So the state need only claim jurisdiction over the operations of the pipeline which affect intrastate commerce and jurisdiction over tariffs which involve the movement of oil in intrastate commerce.

Now what's the value of this? Insofar as there may be in the future an issue over the tariff set by the pipeline and this has been pivotal to your deliberations for two years now, insofar as there should be an issue over the tariff, there has really to be two things -- one, a determination as to what the appropriate tariff is, and secondly, a decision by the state as to what it will do to try to enforce what it believes is an appropriate tariff. How does one go about determining what is an appropriate tariff for the pipeline? I don't believe that the legislature in its deliberation is going to want to tackle the job -- that fantastically difficult and complicated job -- of determining what is fair value on a pipeline -- what goes into the capital base and what is not allowed in the capital base, and of what rate of depreciation is appropriate, and everything else --. Or what is a fair return -- this is an incredibly involved problem which the ICC struggles with or avoids by not doing anything about it,

as the case may be. In any case this is really not a problem of the legislature.

But you have established in the existing legislation a pipeline commission which has jurisdiction to determine the fairness and adequacy of tariffs insofar as it involves intrastate commerce. It would do so by holding hearings. If a rate is filed for the intrastate movement of oil, your pipeline commission may accept that rate as it's filed, or it may protest that rate in which case it has administrative processes by which it holds hearings, by which if it renders a decision it must support and justify why that particular decision was issued. And it provides opportunity for the pipeline companies to protest any tariff decision, or any other decision of the pipeline commission, insofar as the pipeline companies believe that it runs counter to due process of law, which means that the administrative decision of your pipeline commission will be tested in your state courts, or if necessary in a federal court.

But if in fact, your own adminitrative and judicial process has come up with a tariff which is lower than the tariff set by the pipeline companies it can be then enforced upon the intrastate movements, and the legislature and the state of Alaska is in a position to expect that the companies will apply an equivalent tariff to interstate movements also. Now that may not be enforced but I put it to you that on the day that it is determined by the state of Alaska, through its administrative and judicial processes, that a tariff is appropriate

for the intrastate movement of oil from the north slope to Valdez -- if on that day the companies refuse to reduce the tariff, which means to increase the well head value on all the oil that moves in interstate commerce, then the problem of the legislature in recapturing the interest of the state is a simple one, at that point you have the taxing power and know exactly at what level and what rate to exercise it, because you have through the instrumentalities of your own legislation already created the means and device by which an appropriate tariff can be determined; by which your own courts will reject the findings of the pipeline commission if they are arbitrary, confiscatory o. capricious, but if administratively and judiciously that tariff is upheld, then the legislature has the guidelines precisely how to go about recapturing the interest in the state through its incontrovertible sovereign powers - that is to say the power of taxation.

It's for this reason that we feel the regulatory bill is absolutely the heart of the entire package. Furthermore, it is our feeling, and here of course it's difficult to speak for companies because, as they said, they would go back and review the whole package, but insofar as the companies feel that there is a claim of jurisdiction by the state which is unconstitutional because it involves interstate commerce or insofar as they feel that there's a decision by your pipeline commission in an area where it has jurisdiction but which decision goes against the law because it violates due process, they always have recourse to the courts. They need not litigate this issue in

advance because the mere fact that this law is on your statute books and I'm referring to the 1972 pipeline commission act, the mere fact that this law is on the statute books does not impose in advance the kind of disabilities upon their intentions to construct the pipeline that will require extensive litigation at this state of the game. Furthermore, as we have pointed out at the previous sessions of the legislature where regulatory bills were before you, there is legislation to this effect on the books of other major producing states and these have never involved extensive constitutional issues so far as we know. Well then, this pipeline commission act we feel is the guts of any compromise which the legislature may wish to substitute in lieu of the compromise package which has been put before you by the executive department.

Now let me pass on then to the Right of Way, but before I do, let me say a few words about the other bills and then come to the guts of the legislation which is before you which is the Right of Way Leasing Act. There are three different tax measures before you and I don't believe that any of them are in any respect crucial to the willingness of the companies to abandoning litigation or to going ahead with the construction of the pipeline. The severance tax, of course is in the course of litigation and it's in course of litigation because the 1972 amendment to your severance tax law contains a royalty credit feature which the companies feel would establish a very unacceptable precedent if it were, first of all applied here, and secondly if it were emulated in other states. I think they're misguided in their concerns; I think the state of Alaska has very little interest, really, in maintaining the

royalty offset provision. It's applied actually by the state of Alaska in a very generous way so that the relatively high cents per barrel tax, which was imposed in your 72 legislation is evaded and reduced by virtue of the royalty credit. You could settle the legal issue in five minutes by repealing the royalty credit and leaving everything else stand, in which case the companies would be subjected to considerably higher taxation than they were previously and that they are in the governor's proposal. So that the removal of the royalty credit feature in your severance tax which the companies are so eager to obtain, we would surely recommend that the legislature give to them. Perhaps the easiest way of doing it is to give it to them by accepting the severance tax amendment which is before you. But I caution one thing: I don't believe that this is the time for the Alaskan legislature to enact a severance tax schedule, whether it's a percent of value at the wellhead or cents per barrel or a combination of both with the idea that what is enacted today is going to be appropriate to whatever the volumes and values of oil may be that are going to be produced in 1977 and 1978. So if you prepare to accept the proposed severance tax amendment as part of a compromise package, I would strongly suggest that it is part of the legislative record in your committee hearings and in your debate that in no sense does this represent a commitment on the part of the legislature that these particular tax rates are the rates which will obtain five and six and seven and eight years from today. We will have time to review that. So that in a sense what you are giving by accepting the proposed amendment to the severance tax is a willingness

on the part of the legislature to avoid extensive litigation on the royalty offset feature which we think is of very little interest to the state of Alaska, in any case.

Now, the severance tax of course is one of your important weapons. I mentioned in previous hearings before this committee and elsewhere, that eventually your income tax is an important thing but that's not up for discussion. It's not an appropriate time for the legislature to review your state income tax legislation although I strongly urge that at one of your sessions you review with your commissioner of revenue your entire concept of corporate income taxation here in the state. The conservation tax bill which is before you, I think is unncessary. We had recommended that the conservation tax which had been on your statute books in the past be eliminated and simply subsumed within your severance tax. It's an added piece of legislation that we don't feel strongly about one way or the other, but it complicates the whole process of paying and collecting monies as between the state and the industry. On the ad valorem tax, as we see it, this is a revenue measure designed largely to yield income to the state over interim years before Prudhoe Bay production begins, before the pipeline is completed. It falls within the province of the legislature to decide how, when and under what conditions it wants to raise that amount of money.

It's the combination then of a strong regulatory bill and the fact that you have continuing flexibility and authority

to tax via your severance tax or eventually through your income tax that we believe yields the greatest control by the state over the operations and the tariff determinations of the pipeline so as to protect the interest of the state.

Now let me get on the Right-of-Way Leasing Bill. We have gone through this bill chapter, book and verse, section, sub-section and paragraph and I think we are prepared to sit down with this committee and other committees of the legislature to discuss it in detail. I don't believe we have time to go through each and every aspect of this here, but I will report on those which we feel are most critical to whatever compromise package comes out. The first issue, as we see it, involving any amendments to the Right-of-Way Leasing Act is how much of the regulatory power that the state wants to exercise shall be done by indirection in the form of stipulations and agreements as conditions of leasing. The industry is challenging the 1972 Right-of-Way Leasing Act in the courts on constitutional grounds, claiming that in effect regulation achieved by indirection which cannot be exercised by the state directly is an illegal exercise of the leasing powers of the state of Alaska. This is one of the major issues under litigation. We obviously are not in a position to pass any judgment whatsoever on the merits of the case in litigation. I think there is a spirit of compromise abroad, I see it very much in the proposals of the Governor's Office, I'm not quite sure I see that much spirit of compromise

in what the companies are proposing in their package, but nevertheless, there is a spirit of compromise abroad and certainly we would feel strongly, and I hope the legislature does also, that it is desirable to avoid unnecessary prolongation of litigation, and the possibility that such continuing litigation may delay the start of construction. So if it is possible to avoid litigation without unduly sapping the legislative enactments that are vital to the state interest, we would feel that there is some merit in the legislature going ahead with the executive departments decision that a compromise is now in order. So on then to the question of the regulatory items which are introduced into the Right-of-Way Leasing Act by virtue of stipulations as a conditions of lease. One, the most important one in our opinion, which is largely eliminated is in section 120 (a) (3) that's the common carrier section. For many reasons it is of importance to this state that it is understood beyond any doubt that the transAlaska pipeline is a common carrier; a common carrier not only for purposes of regulation of interstate oil movements by ICC but a common carrier also for purposes of regulation by your pipeline commission. There is merit, that as a condition of the lease the pipeline stipulates that it is a common carrier period --without reservations, without qualifications, or anything else. Now this is so common, this is so common in state and federal regulation, that it is really surprising to me that any amendment to the existing Right-of-Way Leasing Act should in effect qualify the common carrier status here. It says first of all, that there will be common carrier if the

the commission so determines at the time the lease is issued. I don't think this should require a determination by the commissioner. Under these circumstances the pipeline is a common carrier -- without hearing, without determination, or anything else. Secondly, I don't think it is necessary in the Right-of-Way Leasing Act to stipulate what obligations fall upon a common carrier and certainly not to qualify the obligations incumbent upon a common carrier. 120 (a) (3) says that it will accept, convey, transport without discrimination, crude oil. This is something which will be covered by your pipeline commission in the course of regulation if it is a common carrier. Certainly not in advance to limit the jurisdiction over a common carrier by your own pipeline commission by saying that the imposition of common carrier status does not require the lessee to accept tenders of crude oil, except at points where there exists public, etc. etc. Do not c 'y the obligations of a common carrier. This is a function of your regulatory agency and insofar as your regulatory agency in its individual decision from month to month or year to year may either deny rights to a common carrier or impose obligations upon a common carrier which the pipeline owning companies feel are unduly onerous, they have recourse to the courts. So I don't think that one should qualify the obligations of a common carrier. I think that your 120 (a) (3) should simply stipulate that as a condition of obtaining a right-of-way over state lands, the lease for the right-of-way over state lands, the pipeline carrier itself, submits itself as a common carrier. Not only for the ICC

jurisdictional purposes but for the purposes of the exercise of jurisdiction by your pipeline commission.

120 (a) (4) in the recommended legislation removes the common purchaser provision from your 1972 legislation. At that time it was a permissible feature of your law. In place of the removal of the common purchaser status as a condition of leasing, the Governor has sent down a special bill that would make it possible to establish under certain conditions and subject to certain provisos, common purchaser status for companies owning the transAlaska pipeline. We do not feel now and we felt for a long time that there is real doubt as to how important common purchaser provision is in the state of Alaska, under the conditions where your oil is being produced and transported. Common carrier, yes, because it provides access to transportation and an equitable basis for everybody who is able to achieve production in the new state. Common purchaser for many reasons we have reservations about whether to leave it or not. The bill which is proposed to you we think is a weak and rather attenuated version of a common purchaser act, as it is applied in other states in the United States. Our recommendation at this stage of the game would be that you can afford and should yield the common purchaser provision as a condition of right-of-way leasing and probably simply pass over this special piece of legislation which establishes a common purchaser provision and hold that over to future sessions of the legislature as not being important at this time. When and as common purchaser provisions become meaningful in the conditions of the state of Alaska, at that

time to enact not the legislation that's proposed by the Governor, but a strong common purchaser act which is appropriate to the circumstances at such time. You will have ability and time to do that in the future. I don't think it's an essential point of the compromise, either from the companies' standpoint or from the State's standpoint.

I'm bringing before you here only major things or illustrative aspects of it. 030 - 040 -- these are repealed in the proposed amendment. In the proposed amendment to the Right of Way Leasing Act 1972, section 2 repeals 030-040. Now, 030-040 in the act that is now on the books governs the abandonment of or reduction or impairment of service and temporary emergencies services, and so on. It has to do with the authority that the state claims for itself and buttresses that authority by virtue of this being a condition of the lease. I would think that it might be appropriate, again in the spirit of compromise, that 030 and 040 be retained but that the language be rewritten to say that insofar as these are imposed upon the carrier, that they are in accordance with the jurisdiction and orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Alaska Pipeline Commission, as is appropriate to the case. Which means in effect that the companies, although they are governed by these two clauses, nonetheless know that these two clauses are in accordance -- what is obligatory upon them is in accordance with the regulations that may be promulgated, either by the ICC if it involves interstate commerce or by the Alaska Pipeline Commission if it involves intrastate commerce. I put these out only as illustrative of the

aspects of regulation within the Right of Way Leasing Act which is at issue in the courts -- where we think either the state should stand firm, such as in the matter of common carrier, or where we think the state may very well yield. In general I would think that insofar as the state can achieve a right of way leasing act which avoids litigation but does not give up essential rights which the state still retains through, and I repeat, the combination of a strong regulatory bill and the ultimate enforcement of state regulation through its taxing power, that the legislature can yield on certain of these items in the Right of Way Leasing Act.

This by no means exhausts the regulatory aspects, but in the interest of time I want to move on to other things and as I said we're prepared to go through section by section with our specific recommendations to you.

The second major issue in the Right of Way Leasing Act is the percentage lease rental formula. There are two different impressions abroad as to the purpose of the percentage lease rental formula. Prof. Witherspoon yesterday afternoon suggested that he looked upon it as a revenue measure for the state. That if, in fact, the value of state lands were to be appreciated by the construction of the pipeline then the state like any other owner of land should be in a position to bargain for a fair share of the value of the land when it is being put to a superior use. I have no quarrel with this in principle; however, our position always has been that the leasing of state lands for pipeline right of way should not be regarded as a revenue device by the state of Alaska. We have always recommended that the interest of the state of Alaska is in the lowest possible cost transporta-

tion and the state of Alaska should not in and of itself undertake measures which inherently tend to increase costs of transportation, insofar as producing operation in the development of Alaska's resources provide the base for state taxation. It should be other than through the rentals of the right of way leasing of state land. So we have always urged the lowest reasonable rental for the commitment of state land to right of way. I would point out, for example, that even private property insofar as it's condemned by eminent domain for public utility or pipeline purposes does not convey even to a private owner any right or any entitlement to the enhanced value of land if it's put to other use. So we would recommend that however one looks at the rental for right of way lease that this not be regarded by the legislature as an aspect of its taxing power or as a means of gaining state revenues. That comes from other taxing devices in the state.

The other aspect of the percentage lease rental provision in the right of way leasing bill was that it was to be looked upon as an alternative -- either pain of paying or inducement to the companies to bring their tariffs down to a level which is compatible with the interests of the state; that is to say, a tariff that is lower than the maximum it might obtain under the ICC rate-making rule, certainly high enough to be rewarding for their investment and their risks but a level which is appropriate to the circumstances of pipeline operation in the state. And insofar as they increased their tariffs above a certain level, they were in effect subjecting themselves to the pains of progressively higher lease rental.

This was the percentage lease rental formula. This is one of the major items under litigation. For very obvious reasons the companies regard this as not only as something which is onerous to their circumstances in the state of Alaska but a precedent that if it were followed could lead to all kinds of things in their operation elsewhere. We have reservations about the effectiveness with which the percentage lease rental formula would operate for its major purpose, that is to say, in and of itself to induce the companies to bring the tariff down. It might for some companies, it might not for others. The extent to which it does for any of them would be largely contingent upon their respective equities in the pipeline as sellers of transportation services and in production as buyers of pipeline transportation services. There is an element of unpredictability in the operation of it. And while it was from the beginning, in our opinion, an imaginative and constructive approach and we're not saying even today that if properly effective it might not be a useful tool in right of way leasing legislation; but in the context of the violent litigation associated with this aspect of the right of way leasing bill, with the chances that continued litigation over this aspect of the bill may delay construction of the line, and on the presumption that what you have is not an emasculative regulatory bill but a strong regulatory bill, then we would feel that the legislature could give on the percentage lease rental and adopt the alternative to it as is proposed in the amendment to the Right of Way Leasing Act of 1972 by the Governor's amendments. Again, I say

that there are questions about how effectively it would operate in practice. Notwithstanding, there might be reasons for the state to hold to its case, to fight through the issue of litigation, if there weren't such a sense of urgency about getting the pipeline built, if there might not be such a large cost to the state in litigating. And whatever is done by way of amending the Right of Way Leasing Act in order to assuage the fears and concerns of the pipeline companies, either because of what it does or the precedent that it sets, I would say that what the legislature may do in terms of amending the Right of Way Leasing Act, in our opinion should be contingent first upon the retention of a strong and effective regulatory bill, that is to say Alaska Pipeline Commission Act. A strong regulatory bill which is backed then also by the state's taxing power and so that although you yield another tool in the entire package of legislation which was designed in 1972 to effect and enforce the state interest, really yielding to industry concerns, you do so here in the interest of avoiding undue litigation and the danger of delay on the pipeline.

The third aspect of the Right of Way Leasing Act to which I'd like to refer is the option to buy a percentage interest in the pipeline. The option to buy a percentage interest in the pipeline. I will not take time now to review the reasons why we have supported the insertion of the option to buy in the 1972 legislation. I think they're fairly familiar and

they've been reviewed I believe in previous sessions of this committee. We still feel that the option to buy a percentage interest is an important feature of right of way leasing. I think that insofar as the companies have allowed the purchase by the state of an interest in the pipeline to appear as a condition of the lease, even in the proposed amendment by the Governor, suggests that it is not a disabling aspect of the legislation from the standpoint of constitutionality of the legislation -- I don't know. But certainly the alternative which appears in the legislation which is section 120 (a) (7), the alternative which is substituted in the proposed legislation in our opinion represents nothing whatsoever for the state.

I think to amend the Right of Way Leasing Act to include the amended 120 (a) (7) would be to retain nothing for the state in this respect. I certainly would not recommend that part of the amendment. An opportunity to negotiate for an equity in the pipeline under highly qualified conditions, means that the state has an opportunity to negotiate when it serves the interests and purpose of the companies, which is really not what is intended in the option to buy as contained in the existing law. We do feel, however, that the legislature should give very serious consideration to the advice laid before it by Mr. Spahr of Standard of Ohio, that the option as it stands in the

legislation today may pose difficulty to the financing, or at least the financing at attractive terms, of the pipeline. Because of the uncertainty in the minds of prospective lenders as to what the capacity of the state as a possible future owner of a share of the pipeline may be to carry out obligations for the debt that is incurred at the time of construction which carries over and then may have to be shouldered by the state if the state buys the pipeline. I can appreciate that concern. But I would like to point out first of all -- and I have said this in general and I like to be very specific -- that there are precedents for this. The illustrations that I have made before various committees of this legislature the last two days, I would like to refer to very specifically here. There is the agreement between a consortium of oil companies called Syncrude and the province of Alberta in Canada which determines the basis upon which they get the lease to produce oil from the Athabasca tar sands and transport that oil via pipeline from Athabasca to Edmonton where the oil would enter into the major pipeline systems that traverse Canada and enter the United States. First of all, this has to do with ownership of the pipeline. This synthetic crude pipeline shall be constructed and owned as to an undivided 80 percent thereof by Her Majesty and/or an entity or entities hereafter formed by Her Majesty.

So that from the start, the province of Alberta is being given 80 percent participation in the pipeline. Now, an eighty percent participation in the pipeline--where is the oil going to come from? The province of Alberta is going to finance its 80 percent share of the pipeline just as a private company would. But how do you finance construction of a pipeline if you are not sure you are going to have the oil to put through? The lessees, and her Majesty, and the respective assignees of any interests in the Syncrude projects will dedicate their respective shares of the Syncrude oil recovered from the project to the Syncrude pipelines. That is to say, where the oil being produced by that project is committed to the pipeline irrespective of the fact that Her Majesty's government, that is to say in the province of Alberta, has 80 percent interest in the pipeline. So the percent of interest in the pipeline is there, the difference, of course, being that the state of Alaska in its Right-of-Way Leasing Act had wanted an option.

Now the issue of an option comes up. In this same agreement between the Syncrude consortium and the province of Alberta, the lessees, the Syncrude group including Exxon through Imperial Oil Canada, Atlantic Richfield (these are familiar names to you), Cities Service, and Gulf Oil--these lessees hereby grant Her Majesty an irrevocable option to acquire an interest in the Syncrude project. This is in the producing operation including the project sites, the leases and rights granted thereby, and all facilities acquired or constructed as part of the Syncrude project, which interest may equal undivided percentage interest of not less than 5 percent and up to and

including 20 percent. The option may be exercised at any time during the period from the date hereof and up to and including that date which is 6 months after the date of start of production or the 31st day of December 1982, whichever is the earliest.

Now as to how this is paid for, the payment by the government of Alberta to the members, the private companies, that make up Syncrude: Such costs shall be computed (in accordance with the accounting manual) on the basis of all of the costs which they, the companies, have incurred up to the date of the exercise of the option and shall include interest compounded annually at 8 percent. No portion of such costs shall be attributed to the reserves of leased substances. The province of Alberta could thus be buying in at what is the investment costs of the company plus the payment of 8 percent interest for all time that is elapsed. An interest in the producing operation of between 5 and 20 percent.

Why do I introduce this? Simply because I'm trying to suggest that there is precedence where the companies are prepared to undertake both to accept government participation in the pipeline and whereby companies are prepared to accept an option for governments to participate in what is essentially private operation. That the financing of this project does not seem to be inhibited whether by the government's participation in the pipeline or by the government's option to acquire an interest even in producing operations. Now I grant you that there is a very significant difference in the capital costs of the two projects. The TransAlaska pipeline will probably involve an aggregate initial investment on the order of ten times as much as the Syncrude operation. But that doesn't mean that

individual bond holders are lending ten times as much money. The problem of the bondholder, whatever the number of dollars, always is what security lies behind; what security is there which insures that the viability of the operation will provide for interest and sinking fund contributions. To get back to the crucial point, if the option is retained in the Right-of Way Leasing Act, the existing legislation may be amended so as to stipulate in advance, first of all, what the basis of compensation will be so that there is clear protection that no member of the Trans Alaska group will in effect suffer deterioration of its capital position by virtue of the exercise of the option by the state. And that in negotiating that option, the commissioner shall be prepared to enter into such stipulations by the state as provides the assurance necessary for the indebtedness that bondholders will be entering into prior to any possible exercise of the state's option. We feel that the right of the option to obtain an equity is a useful aspect of the entire package of legislation which you enacted in 1972. We think there may be a question about the way it is now written, whether or not the companies have as much, what shall I say, protection for their borrowing capacity as they would like to have. This protection can probably be provided both in the legislation where it refers to the terms at which the price will be paid and in the lease negotiation itself where the commissioner is authorized to give certain commitments on the part of the state of Alaska. Existing legislation also requires considerable other steps before an option can ever be exercised, including the positive act by the legislature and a referendum by the people of the

state of Alaska if there is to be debt financing. So I think there can be fair protection all around.

This again, represents in our judgment an approach to the issues which confront the state of Alaska. The issues being, must you continue litigation and risk the fact that prolonged litigation may result in delay in the pipeline? Or must you accept a negotiated package of legislation such as submitted to the legislature by the Governor? Or is there an alternative package of legislation which in your judgment represents the protection of the vital interests of the state of Alaska insofar as resource development and pipeline development is concerned, and probably represents a package which the industry can accept? It may pose uncertainties for industry but insofar as they may be obliged or feel they want to litigate, they need not do it in advance but can start construction of the pipeline and be prepared to litigate specific aspects of it as they become relevant. For example, if your pipeline commission, sometime in the future, issues an order which is deemed to be an unreasonable, in violation of due process, the companies can protest such order in the courts, and upset it if their protest is upheld. I think that what we are suggesting here is in the spirit of the negotiations between the Governor and the companies. It certainly represents a yielding on the part of the legislature, if our recommendations are followed, which go a considerable way to meet the issues posed in litigation by the companies. But I do believe it retains for the state of Alaska in two critical areas--namely the regulatory bill and the ultimate ability to enforce the intentions of regulation by the state's taxing

powers. Plus the retention in the Right-of-Way Leasing Act of certain conditions including the common carrier provision. It means yielding on what had been one of the most provocative and imaginative aspects of the legislation which is percentage lease rental. It means compromise on the option to buy so as to provide certain added protection for the companies. In our judgment, I think that this combination of action by the legislature would secure the interests of the state, and in our judgment (of course we are not in a position to speak for the companies) might not be wholly attractive to the companies, but we would think that they would not litigate to the extent that it would involve delay in the construction of the pipeline.