

305 HRES HCR 83 - HCR 142

HCR

83

Requesting the Board of Fisheries to establish a Bristol Bay Salmon Conservation Reserve.

COMMITTEE REPORT

HOUSE

2/5/76

To Resources

Rules

Mr. Speaker:

Date 2-26-76

The Committee on RESOURCES has had HCR 82

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

(X) recommends it DO PASS

( ) recommends it DO NOT PASS

( ) recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

( ) recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR \_\_\_\_\_ AND THAT

CS FOR \_\_\_\_\_ DO PASS

( ) "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_

COMMITTEE

( ) reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

( ) "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

Handwritten signatures: [Signature] \_\_\_\_\_, [Signature] \_\_\_\_\_, [Signature] \_\_\_\_\_, [Signature] \_\_\_\_\_

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

[Signature] recommends: No Rec  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[Signature] Chairman



# CHOGGIUNG LIMITED

P.O. BOX 247 • DILLINGHAM, ALASKA 99576 • PHONE (907) 842-3083

February 26, 1976

Mr. Nels Anderson  
Representative District 16  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Nels:

The Choggiung Limited Board of Directors met last night and considered Senate-House concurrent resolution #83. The Board heartily supports this resolution and urge you to seek its prompt passage. The 200 mile legislation introduces a severe threat to the Western Alaska commercial fisherman and #83 hits the nail right on the head.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "William M. Tennyson".

William Tennyson  
President

TH:WT/RMH

cc: Hon. George Hohman  
Mr. Truman Emberg

M E M O R A N D U M

December 31, 1975

SUBJECT: Concurrent Resolution (W.O. #1638)

TO: Representative Anderson

FROM: Joel Bennett, Legislative Counsel

The implementation of this resolution would undoubtedly run afoul of sec. 15, art. VIII, of the Alaska Constitution (No exclusive right or special privilege of fishery shall be created or authorized in the natural waters of the State).

Also, note the necessity of the legislature approving the Reserve after it is created by the Board.

We should discuss this after you show it to Truman.

Happy holidays --

WESTERN ALASKA  
COOPERATIVE MARKETING ASSOCIATION

---

1

BOX 213 . . . DILLINGHAM, ALASKA

2-17-76

Mr. Nels Anderson, Representative,  
Alaska Legislature,  
Pouch V,  
Juneau,  
Alaska  
99811

Dear Nels:


Just recieved the copy of HCR # 83 in today's mail.

I will plan to be in Juneau for the Feb. 24 th hearing.

The reference to the next meeting and the reuirement for approval by the Legislature may need clarification or rephrasing in order the avoid needless delay. However, I suupose this can be handled in the Committee.

Thanks, and best wishes,

Sincerely,



Truman C. Emberg

HCR

90

# COMMITTEE REPORT

2/11/76

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date 2-18-76

The Committee on RESOURCES has had HCR 90

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

- recommends it DO PASS
- recommends it DO NOT PASS
- recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)
- recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR \_\_\_\_\_ AND THAT  
CS FOR \_\_\_\_\_ DO PASS
- "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_  
COMMITTEE
- reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION
- "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

[Signature] \_\_\_\_\_

[Signature] \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

[Signature] Chairman

AMENDMENT

OFFERED IN THE SENATE:

BY: House Resources Committee

TO: AMEND SENATE BILL No. \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>HER</sup>  
HOUSE BILL No. 90

PAGE: 1

LINE: 24 + 25

LINE 24 - Change the word "recommend" to  
read "inform"

LINE 25 After the word "district", delete  
the words "to participate in" and  
insert the word "of"

House Finance Committee Hearings

Meeting with the Department of Natural Resources February 5, 1976 - 1:30 p.m.

Russell Cahill, Director of Division of Parks is speaking:

Youth Conservation Corps

is managed by the Division of Parks. They are uncertain as to the reliability of receiving their federal funding, 80 percent, so they were asking for a large request to cover the contingency aspect of their current funding base.

There are three camps: Fairbanks, Matanuska Valley and Haines area, and all are projected for this year to operate youth camps. There will be 60 youth at Haines, both boys and girls, separately housed, with a camp cook, paid for at union scale, and all youth who attend these camps have their way paid to and from, plus room and board, plus pay which amounts to wage minimum of \$2.60 an hour. Their ages run 15 to 18.

Recruitment

is done by the Forest Service, BLM and through the Division of Parks, the Division of Parks being by far more successful in doing this task. There are no special requirements other than age.

Teachers

ARE RECRUITED FROM teachers who like to do this summertime work. They have had, last summer, a biology teacher, a p.e. coach, even a music teacher who take the kids out on jobs.

Work done

are jobs connected with forest service maintenance, division of parks projects, etc. Specifically, they clear trails, streams and the like.

Transportation

is a coop project, some being provided by Forest Service and other by Division of Parks, and the National Guard assists with this and equipment.

Rangers

persons from CETA serve.

Ceta positions are used to fill in as substitutes for the rangers during their training, which occurs during September and February.

Length of work term

lasts eight weeks.

HCR

96

COMMITTEE REPORT

2/13/76

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date 2-18-76

The Committee on RESOURCES has had HCR 96

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

recommends it DO PASS

recommends it DO NOT PASS

recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR \_\_\_\_\_ AND THAT

CS FOR \_\_\_\_\_ DO PASS

"and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_

COMMITTEE

reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

"other"

Members signing the Majority report:

Michael Anderson \_\_\_\_\_  
Bob [unclear] \_\_\_\_\_  
[unclear] \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

Michael Anderson - Chairman

## Wood Tikchik Suggestions

### Section 41.20.420 DESIGNATION OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY

The lands and waters described in Section 415 of this chapter are assigned to the Division of Parks, Department of Natural Resources, for management and protection. The Department of Fish and Game is responsible for the management of fish and wildlife resources in the Wood-Tikchik State park, and shall consult with the Department of Natural Resources in the adoption of regulations for fish and wildlife management. A Wood-Tikchik State Park Advisory Council is created and shall be appointed by the commissioner of Natural Resources from the following:

(a) Four members selected from a list of nominees provided by the Bristol Bay Native Association. These nominees shall represent the villages and cities of Aleknagik, Koliganek, New Stuyahok and Dillingham.

(b) One member selected from a list provided by the Alaska Conservation Society.

Members shall serve for a period of 3 years.

The Wood-Tikchik State Park Advisory Council shall meet as often as necessary to complete its business, but at least quarterly. The Advisory Council shall provide advice to the Director, Division of Parks on the development, management and protection of the Wood-Tikchik State Park. The Director of the Division of Parks or his designee shall serve as Executive Director of the Wood-Tikchik State Park Advisory

Council, but shall not be a voting member. Advisory council members may receive the same per diem and travel expenses, subject to appropriations, authorized for members of state boards.

A management and development plan for the Wood-Tikchik State Park shall be prepared by the Division of Parks in consultation with the Advisory Council, and must be approved by the council prior to implementation.

The Division of Parks shall consult with the Wood-Tikchik State Park Advisory Council and the Department of Fish and Game prior to the promulgation of regulations governing public use of the park. Nothing in sections 410-530 of this chapter may be construed as discouraging the provision of fishery habitat facilities, or the management of fisheries programs.

#### Section 41.20.530 SPECIAL USES

(a) The land and water areas described in Section 415 of this chapter may be opened to mineral entry under provisions of AS 38.05.205 and 38.05.245. Before entry on park lands, a mineral permittee or leasee shall file a plan of operations for approval by the Director, Division of Parks. The plan is subject to conditions the Director may impose to minimize environmental impact.

(b) The Department of Fish and Game shall adopt regulations to provide for the continuance of traditional subsistence use of the Wood-Tikchik State Park.

(c) Development and operation of a hydroelectric site at Lake Elva may be allowed subject to the conditions imposed by the Director, Division of Parks, Department of Natural Resources to minimize environmental impact.

HCR

114

CHAIRMAN:  
NELS A. ANDERSON, JR.

STAFF ASSISTANT:  
GUY VANDOREN

POUCH V  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811



VICE CHAIRMAN:  
TED SMITH

SECRETARY:  
~~XXXXXX DONNELLY~~  
Ruth I. Allington  
PHONE: 465-3715  
465-3781

## House Resource Committee

FRED BROWN

MIKE HERSHBERGER

ALVIN OSTERBACK

LESLIE (RED) SWANSON

DICK ELIASON

LEO RHODE

JAMES HUNTINGTON

May 18, 1976

Gordon Jensen, Chairman  
Board of Fisheries  
PO Box 264  
Petersburg, Alaska 99833

Dear Mr. Jensen:

At a House Resources Committee meeting held April 6, 1976, House Concurrent Resolution 114, Relating to the Copper River Subsistence Fishery was discussed. Mr. Gene Carlson, from the Chignik Dipnetters Association, presented background for both HCR 114 and 115. The Committee acted on HCR 115, reporting it out of Committee, but felt that the subject matter of HCR 114 could be better handled by a letter from the Resources Committee to the Board of Fisheries and to the Department.

Testimony the committee received indicated that a total of 39,000 salmon--all species included--was taken in one year by dip-netters, an amount which does not substantially endanger the total run of the fishery.

It was felt that there is a place in the fishery management plan for noncommercial, recreational subsistence use, if it does not significantly endanger the run, from a biological standpoint.

The Committee respectfully requests that the Board look into and enact, if biologically feasible, a longer season in the Copper River Subsistence Fishery, particularly with a view toward covering the late Coho run.

Sincerely,

Nels A. Anderson, J.  
NAA/ra

cc. Gene Carlson  
Commissioner Brooks  
Carl Rosier, Div. of Commercial Fisheries  
Rep. Fred Brown  
All members, Board of Fisheries

HCR

115

Requesting the Department of Fish and Game to change the restrictive procedure for permit issuance for the Copper River subsistence fishery.

# COMMITTEE REPORT

HOUSE

3/25/76

Mr. Speaker:

Date 4-6-76

The Committee on RESOURCES has had HCR 115

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

( ) recommends it DO PASS

( ) recommends it DO NOT PASS

( ) recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR HCR 115 AND THAT  
CS FOR HCR 115 DO PASS

( ) "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_  
COMMITTEE

( ) reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

( ) "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

<u>[Signature]</u>	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
<u>[Signature]</u>	_____	_____
<u>[Signature]</u>	_____	_____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends: \_\_\_\_\_


\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

[Signature] Chairman



COPPER  
RIVER  
NATIVE  
ASSOCIATION, INC.

Bill  
HCR 115

(Ahtna Tanah Ninnah)  
Drawer G  
Copper Center, Alaska 99573

Telephone: 822-3333

April, 14, 1976

Mr. Nels A. Anderson  
P.O. Box 234  
Dillingham, Alaska 99576

Dear Mr. Anderson,

We of the Copper River Area, support House Committee Resource Bill 114, (Relating to the Copper River Subsistence Fishery) and 115 (Requesting Department of Fish & Game to change the restrictive procedure for permit issuance for Copper River Subsistence Fishery) wholeheartedly, since more than 85% (documented in the AHTNA Region Planning Guide, 1973) of the people in the Copper River Basin are subsistence off the land, we feel this would be a great asset of flexibility and convenience for the people in regard to HCR 114 and 115. Also, we of the Copper River Area would like to see some effort of study directed towards banning the use of airplane equipment. I think that a ban on their use would favor rural people, who usually has the time, rather than money to invest in connection with the use of airplane equipment for hunting and fishing, the entire question of access should carefully considered because it can pose serious problems. For instance, people because of their knowledge or time available to them, have access to the resources of their community may not be benefited if access is improved for outsiders. We realize such recommendations would take much time and cooperation between interested parties, but we are willing to cooperate and help in any way.

Sincerely,

Wilbur T. Joe, Executive Director  
Harry Johns, Paralegal (Alaska Legal Services)

cc: Frank Ferguson  
Keith W. Specking  
Jalmar Kerttula

HCR

1 2 3

COMMITTEE REPORT

4/2/76

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date 4-20-76

The Committee on RESOURCES has had HCR 123

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

( ) recommends it DO PASS

( ) recommends it DO NOT PASS

( ) recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR HCR 123 AND THAT

CS FOR HCR 123 DO PASS

( ) "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_  
COMMITTEE

( ) reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

( ) "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

<u>Walter A. Anderson</u>	_____	_____
<u>Leslie B. Anderson</u>	_____	_____
<u>_____</u>	_____	_____
<u>_____</u>	_____	_____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

Walter A. Anderson Chairman

# MEMORANDUM

# State of Alaska

TO: Rep. Nels Andersen, Chairman  
House Resources Committee

DATE: April 15, 1976

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

FROM: Glenn Akins, Coordinator  
Alaska Coastal Management *GA*

SUBJECT: HCR 123

It is my understanding that you are preparing a revision for HCR 123, as discussed in your Committee meeting this morning. I would like to point out a few characteristics of the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 which you may wish to take into consideration in your discussions.

- 1) States must be making "reasonable progress" in the development of a coastal management program to remain in the program. The Office of Coastal Zone Management, U. S. Department of Commerce, feels we in Alaska are, at present, making reasonable progress.
- 2) If the Amendments of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1975 are signed into law (which is likely next month) an OCS impact fund would be established, which would be of importance to many Alaskan communities. If we are developing a program which excludes consideration of private lands, the attitude of the Department of Commerce towards us may change. They (OCZM) are withdrawing funding from several state programs in the near future (primarily Gulf of Mexico states).
- 3) Federal consistency is a major provision of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. This provision would enable Alaska to have a stronger voice in federal management decisions affecting our coastal area. The Alaska Coastal Management Program, in the Office of the Governor, is in a favorable position to coordinate state activities with federal agencies.

# STATE OF ALASKA

JAY S. HAMMOND  
GOVERNOR

## OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

STATE POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

POUCH AD - JUNEAU 99811  
PHONE 465-3512

April 14, 1976

The Honorable Nels Andersen  
Chairman  
House Resources Committee  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

RE: HCR 123


Dear Representative Andersen:

The Administration believes HCR 123 to be an internal matter of the House of Representatives, and therefore will not comment on the substance of the resolution.

However, we are pleased to see legislative interest in the development of a coastal management policy for Alaska. We have hoped that hearings would be held on the two coastal management bills in the Senate Resources Committee. We believe that the Administration's bill, Senate 519, presents a reasonable and effective approach to the development of a management program over the next 18 months. In addition, there are some valuable ideas for increasing public participation in coastal management contained in Senate 711. We feel that discussion of the approaches of these two bills would provide a real opportunity for some decisions regarding how we in the State of Alaska are going to use this important program to solve problems in our coastal area.

Because voluntary guidelines for private lands undoubtedly would not meet the requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, we encourage you to reconsider this provision, or to look to the coastal zone management bills in the Senate Resources Committee.

Sincerely yours,



Robert B. Weeden  
Director

HCR

129

# COMMITTEE REPORT

4/12/76

HOUSE

Mr. Speaker:

Date 4-23-76

The Committee on Resources has had HCR 129

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

recommends it DO PASS

recommends it DO NOT PASS

recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR \_\_\_\_\_ AND THAT  
CS FOR \_\_\_\_\_ DO PASS

"and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_  
COMMITTEE

reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

"other"

Members signing the Majority report:

<u>Walter Anderson</u>	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
<u>Walter Anderson</u>	_____	_____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

Walter Anderson recommends: no look

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

Walter Anderson Chairman

JOHN W. HENDRICKSON

JOHN W. HENDRICKSON  
ATTORNEY AT LAW

~~230 WEST 7TH AVENUE SUITE 202~~  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

TELEPHONE 272-2561

118 East Sixth Avenue

*Opis  
for  
committee  
tomorrow*

OF COUNSEL

BARRY W. JACKSON, Esq.

BOX 348

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701

April 20, 1976

Representative Nels Anderson  
House Resources Committee  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Re: Susitna Flats  
Trading Bay  
Redoubt Bay

Dear Nels:

Most of the lands involved in the above proposed refuges are on State Tidelands, that went to the State at the time of passage of the Statehood Act.

There are a few border areas that are on State selected land, or through the State, Borough selected. We have no problems with the State or Borough. I know of no native selections or objections in these areas. I will try to contact Tyonek and see if they object. Last I knew they didn't. The only thing they do there is fish.

Best regards,

*Jack*  
JOHN W. HENDRICKSON

JWH:bk

*P.S. I think I got the bag limit  
for huck and gear raised this  
year. This will help some of  
the natives who depend on their  
resource.  
J.*

HCR

142

# COMMITTEE REPORT

HOUSE

FINANCE

5/4/76

Mr. Speaker:

Date 5-10-76

The Committee on RESOURCES has had HCR 142

under consideration. A Majority of the members of the Committee

( ) recommends it DO PASS

( ) recommends it DO NOT PASS

( ) recommends it DO PASS WITH ATTACHED AMENDMENT(S)

recommends it BE REPLACED WITH CS FOR HCR 142 AND THAT  
CS FOR HCR 142 DO PASS

( ) "and" recommends it BE REFERRED TO THE \_\_\_\_\_  
COMMITTEE

( ) reports it back WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION

( ) "other"

Members signing the Majority report:

<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	_____
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	_____
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	_____
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	_____

Members NOT concurring in the Majority report:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

\_\_\_\_\_ recommends:

[Signature] Chairman

# STATE OF ALASKA

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

ROYALTY OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD

JAY S. HAMMOND, GOVERNOR

11TH FLOOR, STATE OFFICE BLDG.  
POUCH M - JUNEAU 99811

May 7, 1976

The Honorable Nels Anderson  
Chairman, House Resources  
Committee  
Pouch V  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Mr. Anderson:

In accordance with the requests of you and your committee the items listed below pertaining to HCR 142 are attached.

1. Letter from Alaska Pipeline Company dated September 30, 1975 requesting State royalty gas from North Cook Inlet Field.
2. Minutes of Board meeting October 10, 1975.
3. Roster from October 10, 1975 meeting.
4. Minutes of Board meeting November 10, 1975.
5. Alaska Pipeline Brochure prepared for November 10, 1975 meeting.
6. Letter from Phillips Petroleum Company, dated October 21, 1975.
7. Letter from Phillips Petroleum Company, dated December 5, 1975.
8. Letter from Homer Electric Association requesting royalty gas, dated January 22, 1976.
9. Letter from Homer Electric Association withdrawing request, dated March 30, 1976.
10. Sale terms approved by Board.

The Honorable Nels Anderson


-2-

May 7, 1976

11. Telegram from Pacific Alaska LNG disclaiming interest.
12. Letter from Alaska Pipeline Company agreeing to terms dated April 2, 1976.
13. Minutes of Board meeting April 26, 1976 approving sale.

If you desire additional information regarding the North Cook Inlet Field royalty gas sale, please advise me.

Yours truly,



William C. Faekler  
Executive Director

Attachments



①

# ALASKA PIPELINE COMPANY

P. O. BOX 6288  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99502

3000 SPENARD ROAD  
PHONE (907) 277-5551

September 30, 1975

Mr. Guy Martin  
Commissioner of Natural Resources  
State of Alaska  
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Mr. Martin:

Confirming our discussion at the Anchorage airport on September 30, and my letter to Mr. Gilbreth of August 20, and memorandum to you of September 24, Alaska Pipeline Company is requesting to purchase the royalty share of North Cook Inlet gas field at or near the Phillips-Marathon LNG plant on the North Kenai Road, at the price used by Phillips to acquire this gas from the State for the manufacture of LNG for export to Japan or elsewhere. We believe the most reasonable method for handling the delivery and sale would be by "exchange," or "displacement," so that construction of new pipeline(s) and compression would be minimized. Since our supply at the Kenai gas field is interconnected to the North Cook Inlet gas supply at the LNG plant, for the time being it should be practical that we would take whatever amount of the North Cook Inlet royalty gas may be available day by day by displacement into our system at the Kenai gas field. Later, when additional investment would be required for transporting this royalty gas to shore, we could negotiate our participation in investment, or install our own facilities if necessary, in order to accomplish the purchase on the most reasonable basis for all concerned.

The essential aspect of our request is that we have an immediate need for additional gas on the North Kenai Road and we have a long term requirement for additional gas reserves to serve Alaskan customers in our present service area. We believe that it is in the public interest that we should be allowed to purchase this State royalty gas for local consumption rather than for this gas to be exported to Japan or elsewhere. We will begin preparing a formal

**RECEIVED**  
OCT 6 1975

ALASKA ROYALTY  
OIL & GAS BOARD

DEPARTMENT OF  
NATURAL RESOURCES

OCT 6 1975

RECEIVED  
JUNEAU, ALASKA

ALASKA PIPELINE COMPANY

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Mr. Guy Martin  
September 30, 1975  
Page 2

application to purchase this gas and will appreciate having your guidance as to what supporting data or format may be desired, if any, for presentation to the Royalty Board or to the legislature to satisfy statutes or regulations which apply.

Very truly yours,



Dale Teel

DT/js

cc: O. K. Gilbreth, Director  
Division of Oil and Gas

Alaska Public Utilities Commission

ALASKA PIPELINE COMPANY

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Guy Martin  
Commissioner of Natural Resources

FROM: Dale Teel

DATE: September 24, 1975

SUBJECT: Alaska Pipeline Company's Request to Purchase State Royalty Gas from the North Cook Inlet Gas Field ("Phillips")

DEPARTMENT OF  
NATURAL RESOURCES

SEP 29 1975

RECEIVED  
JUNEAU, ALASKA

Alaska Pipeline Company (APC) and its affiliate Alaska Gas and Service Company ("Anchorage Natural Gas") supply natural gas to 285 customers on the North Kenai Road and to the Bernice Lake power plant of Chugach Electric Association. The gas is obtained from the industrial pipeline which supplies the LNG plant, the Ammonia/Urea plant, and gas for reinjection into the Swanson River Oil field, and comes from the Kenai gas field (Union-Marathon), under a contract which runs to May 1, 1977. Due to unexpectedly heavy usage by the Bernice Lake power plant, the reserve quantity, 10 billion cubic feet (BCF), will be used prior to May 1, 1977, and at that point the contract will terminate. A contract extension and additional commitment of reserves has been requested of Union-Marathon, or the right to receive gas on the North Kenai Road which is committed for the Anchorage area under a separate contract. There has been little if any progress made on these requests thus far.

Alaska Pipeline Company's contract with Union-Marathon has a provision that if APC were to obtain royalty gas from the Kenai gas field, then the commitment of gas reserves by Union-Marathon (originally 550 BCF) would be reduced an equal amount, and thus in effect APC is barred from negotiating for royalty gas from the Kenai gas field.

APC has inquired for a commitment of gas from Phillips, with the (telephone) response that since Phillips' obligations to the gas company of Portland, Oregon are in suspense due to hearings at the Federal Power Commission and since the gas company at Los Angeles is attempting to purchase royalty gas from the North Cook Inlet gas field, Phillips is not clear to negotiate a commitment of reserves to APC. It is known also that the Portland gas company is requesting to purchase North Cook Inlet royalty gas (discussions with Governor Hammond).

RECEIVED  
SEP 29 1975

ALASKA ROYALTY  
OIL & GAS BOARD

AGO 546532

ALASKA PIPELINE COMPANY

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

- 2 -

APC has written to the State (letter to O.K. Gilbreth, August 20, 1975, attached) requesting to purchase the North Cook Inlet royalty gas at the price of 50.45¢ per MCF, which is the price which now applies to the royalty gas which Phillips utilizes for its LNG manufacture, which is known to be 45¢ wellhead plus 5.45¢ transportation. If this gas were to be offered to APC, APC could build a pipeline from the LNG plant to deliver the gas into its pipeline to Anchorage as well as to supply its North Kenai Road customers. Such a pipeline (approximately 35 miles of 8") could be built in the right of way now occupied by Homer Electric Association's power line from the Bernice Lake power plant to "Quartz Creek." However, construction of such a pipeline should not be necessary, because existing pipeline systems could be utilized to "exchange," or "displace," gas and the transaction could be made entirely on paper, continuing actual movement as at present, without change. North Cook Inlet gas is identical to Kenai field gas (the streams are interchangeable at the LNG plant), so adjustments can be made by volume only.

APC would appear to be the ideal customer for State royalty gas because it would "blend" (by price/rate adjustments) the higher priced royalty gas into its present supply, with relatively small impact on its rates to Alaskan gas users. APC has negotiated "deliverability" with Union-Marathon so that it is in a position to take none or the full royalty share of North Cook Inlet gas without placing its suppliers (Union-Marathon) in any hardship and without having to rely on constant or steady rate production from the North Cook Inlet field. In other words, APC could take the State royalty gas from North Cook Inlet if and as it is produced, without requiring "deliverability."

The foregoing description assumes that the producers (Union, Marathon, Phillips) and the State can readily agree to the "exchange" or "displacement" as indicated. If APC were to build the new pipeline so that the royalty gas actually were to be moved from the LNG plant to APC's pipeline to Anchorage, the same general situation would obtain as for displacement, but operation would be relatively complex since gas would have to move to or from the LNG plant in the new pipeline depending on whether or not the LNG plant were running and at what rate. It is anticipated that normally there would be adequate notice available so that flow rate and directional changes would be practical - in fact displacement could be utilized even with such a pipeline, to foster best scheduling by all the parties. Such displacement actually occurs already, from time to time, although it involves only the producers (Union, Marathon, Phillips) and, of course, does not affect APC or the State at present. The proposed displacement, either with or without a new pipeline being added, should be just as practical if the parties would so agree.

DT/js  
enclosure

cc: Alaska Public Utilities Commission

AGO 546533



# ALASKA PIPELINE COMPANY

P. O. BOX 6288  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 98502

3000 SPENARD ROAD  
PHONE (907) 277-5551

August 20, 1975

COPIES SENT TO:

Paul Robison  
Sebe Eastland  
Harold Schmidt  
O. C. Honig

Mr. O. K. Gilbreth, Director  
Division of Oil and Gas  
State of Alaska  
Department of Natural Resources  
3001 Porcupine Street  
Anchorage, Alaska 99504

Dear Easy:

We have a gas supply contract with Union-Marathon for 10 BCF on the Kenai North Road which expires May 1, 1977. Due to accelerated sales to Chugach Electric's Bernice Lake power plant this year, it appears the entire reserve quantity could be used up within less than one year from now, and we are soliciting a replacement supply of gas to serve Chugach and our other customers on the Kenai North Road.

We are in a position to commit to take more than our North Road requirements, however, and would like to offer to purchase the State's royalty share of Phillips' production from North Cook Inlet, delivered to a metering point near the Phillips-Marathon LNG plant on the Kenai North Road. The excess above our Kenai North Road sales would be used to displace deliveries by Union-Marathon to us at the Kenai gas field, and thus serve to prolong the adequacy of our reserve commitment at the Kenai gas field. We are not certain as to whether or not the displacement can be made "on paper," or whether we would be required to lay a pipeline to connect into our Anchorage pipeline either at or near the Kenai gas field or at or near our compressor station east of the Kenai River.

Please consider this letter to be an application to purchase royalty gas as described, pursuant to AS 38.06.010. Since limited time is available to do any necessary construction, we hope all procedural requirements can be determined readily. We would anticipate paying the State the same price it would have received from Phillips, which we believe to be 45¢ per MCF plus 5.45¢ transportation fee, as compared to the current 41.5¢ cost of gas (and deliverability) at the Kenai gas field.

**RECEIVED**  
SEP 29 1975

ALASKA ROYALTY  
OIL & GAS BOARD AGO 546534

ALASKA PIPELINE COMPANY

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Mr. O. K. Gilbreth


August 20, 1975

Page Two

We are relying on approval by the Alaska Public Utilities Commission for us to "flow through" the increased cost of gas to Chugach's Bernice Lake power plant and to "meld" the (higher) cost royalty gas with the (lower) cost Kenai field gas, on a day-to-day basis, since the amount of royalty gas we would receive would depend on the rate of production of the Phillips-Marathon LNG plant and be outside our control. When this plant is down for any reason, we would be utilizing Kenai field gas as replacement.

Please advise regarding any questions or further procedure we should follow in presenting a formal offer to the State.

Very truly yours,



Dale Teel  
President

DT:lkd

cc: Alaska Public Utilities Commission

AGO 546535

2

ALASKA ROYALTY OIL & GAS DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes From October 10, 1975, Meeting in Juneau

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Martin at 9:00 a.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room of the State Office Building. All of the Board members were in attendance. Chairman Martin had no special remarks in opening the meeting and the meeting proceeded according to the agenda (Appendix A). Several members of the public were present.

2. The minutes of the August 4, 1975, meeting were approved as circulated to the Board.

3. Reports

A. Board's Administrative Report.

1. Richard Lyon moved that the Royalty Board go into executive session to discuss the appointment of an Executive Director for the Royalty Board. The motion was seconded by Donald Triplehorn. The motion passed unanimously at 9:10 a.m. The meeting was called back to order at 9:30 a.m. Chairman Martin advised those present that the Board has made a decision on the appointment of an Executive Director. Arlon Tussing moved that William C. Fackler be appointed as Executive Director of the Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board to be effective November 15, 1975, at an advanced step of the salary range. Donald Triplehorn seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

2. Chairman Martin advised that the Department of Law's report was not yet complete, therefore, it will be presented at a later date.

3. Chairman Martin informed the Board that it needed to decide about the distribution of proposals to interested parties. The motion was made that the Board establish open reading files in Anchorage in the Division of Lands' office and in Juneau in the Commissioner's office. The proposals received should be placed in the reading files and mailed to the Board members and after five working days be made available to the public upon request. The motion was seconded by Richard Lyon. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Studies

1. Projected Natural Gas Demand - A report was presented by Mr. Pat Dobey of the Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys of the Department of Natural Resources on the projected natural gas demand. (Appendix B.)

2. Mr. O. K. Gilbreth, Director of the Division of Oil and Gas for the Department of Natural Resources, presented a report on the projected natural gas availability in Cook Inlet to the Royalty Board. (Appendix C.)

C. Current Federal Legislation - Arlon Tussing gave a brief report on current federal legislation (Appendix D). Mr. Tussing informed the Board that in summary it is still in stalemate both on oil and gas legislation, and that the Congress had passed legislation continuing price controls and allocations on oil and gas and did not accept the Administration's proposed schedule for phasing out price controls. The President vetoed it, the veto was sustained and Congress did not override the veto and beginning the first of September there were no price controls or allocation authority for oil and gas. The President did agree to another retroactive extension of price control while there was an attempt to come up with a new compromise. The House and Senate are now in conference on the legislation and both the House and Senate bills that went into this conference have price control provisions which are unacceptable to the Administration. It looks as if in November we will again be faced with a situation where Congress will pass an extension of oil and gas price control which will include a rollback in the price of new oil.

Chairman Martin asked for concurrence of the Board in altering the agenda to take up the definition of surplus question following the presentation of proposals received since the last meeting of the Board. There was no objection by the Board.

5. Correspondence - Mr. Fackler read several letters that had been received from companies that refer to earlier proposals submitted by the various companies to the Board. (Northern Natural Gas, Southern Natural Gas Company and Alaska Petroleum Company.)

6. Proposals since the last meeting.

A. Prudhoe Bay

Mr. Fackler informed the Board that a letter from Murphy Oil Corporation had been received. He advised that Murphy Oil was interested in supplying a portion of their Superior, Wisconsin, refinery's needs with Alaskan crude oil starting in 1977. The vehicle for the crude oil would be the Trans Mountain Pipeline from Puget Sound to Interprovincial Pipeline and then to Superior, Wisconsin. They estimated requirements to be 20,000 to 40,000 barrels per day. They advised that at the present time it

would be impossible with the uncertain conditions in regard to price, government controls, pipeline reversal, et cetera to submit a firm bid for production to be purchased several years in the future. They would be willing to pay competitive world market prices for similar types of crude at the time of purchase.

Mr. Robert C. Thomas of Tennessee Gas Transmission Company was present and was requested to present their proposal. Mr. Thomas advised that their proposal would allow the following benefits:

1. Company acquiring the right to contract the royalty reserves should be capable of giving maximum support to the obtaining of a trans-Alaska pipeline route. He pointed out that in their approach they had covered this point by stating that to date Tennessee Gas Transmission Company has not supported either route designed to transport North Slope gas to market.
2. That the State would receive substantial front-end money. In their approach they indicated that they would make available to the State in excess of 100 million dollars for the right to contract all of the royalty oil and gas reserves in the Prudhoe Bay Field. The exact amount contributed would be subject to further negotiations between the parties and would reflect the needs of the State, the drawdown schedule, and several other factors. The funds would be made available to the State over a three-year period according to the State's needs. There would be no recovery of the advanced funds for a period of three years following the date of the advance. The contribution would be hopefully recovered out of the portion of revenue from the royalty natural gas or oil. The recovery period would be five years, giving a total of eight years. The funds that would be made available would be interest free.
3. They felt that some of the gas must be available for use within the State. In their outline they indicated that they would consider reservation of the State of up to 10 percent of the royalty gas. They did not intend to imply that this represented the maximum anticipated future growth of the State natural gas lease. What it did indicate is that they feel the primary goal at this time should be to secure a trans-Alaska route and that the major source of gas for the future needs of the State would come from future reserves found and transported through this system.

4. The maximum possible wellhead price should be paid for the reserves when produced. They feel that the gas produced in Prudhoe Bay would go into interstate commerce and under current regulations would be subject to control by the Federal Power Commission. Since they are regulated by the Federal Power Commission, they are unable to guarantee a specific wellhead price.

Since the purchaser is subject to unknown timing factors and substantial risks associated with purchasing the right to contract Prudhoe Bay gas, the purchaser must be compensated by certain benefits. They see those benefits to the purchaser as being:

1. the front-end payment must be financeable,
2. the front-end payment must be recoverable at a particular point in time, and
3. the right to contract all of the State's royalty gas in Prudhoe Bay subject to a 10 percent reservation of the gas by the State.

They feel the most important consideration by the State at this time is the securing of the trans-Alaska routing for the Prudhoe Bay gas. This is the biggest single factor that would have an impact on the State throughout its future. To insure that there is no question about their intent in promoting a trans-Alaskan route, Tenneco would add a provision to the memorandum they submitted that they would be willing to give the State the option of terminating their right to contract should the trans-Alaska route not be considered. This termination provision would further provide that Tenneco would receive their capital contribution back plus any interest and that they would not be prejudiced in any further attempts to contract royalty gas.

Chairman Martin asked Mr. Thomas if Tenneco had done any analysis of the El Paso proposal on a comparative basis with their proposal and had they taken a look at the question of the 10 percent set aside and the jurisdictional question in regard to commingling? Mr. Thomas advised that he would get a response to these questions in writing to the Board.

Arlon Tussing asked if Tenneco could provide the Board with the backup on their market analysis and cost analysis. Mr. Thomas stated that he would be happy to get the information together for the Board.

Chairman Martin called a lunch recess until 1:30 p.m. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. and Mr. Fackler read a letter received from Northern Liquid Fuels Companies dated August 11, 1975, to the Board. Northern Liquid Fuels Companies wished to acquire the right to process the State of Alaska's royalty share of the gas to be produced from the Prudhoe Bay Field for the removal of propane, butane, natural gasoline and ethane (NGL) and to purchase any NGL attributable to the State of Alaska's royalty share of the oil

produced from such field. For the right to process the State of Alaska's royalty share of such gas, the Companies would propose a prepayment plus a payment for each barrel of NGL extracted and marketed over the life of the field, the amounts of such payments to be determined upon conclusion of the study hereinafter referred to. The Companies propose to undertake a comprehensive study to determine which of the following programs is more economical: 1) process the gas stream in the field for removal to the NGL and build a liquids pipeline to transport the NGL to Southern Alaska, or 2) leave the NGL in the gas stream and process the stream: a) in Southern Alaska, if a trans-Alaska gas pipeline is built, or b) in Canada or the United States if an Alaska-Canadian pipeline system is built. The studies will take into account the needs of the State, particularly the establishment of a liquid fuels distribution system in the State of Alaska in its principal cities of Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, as well as others to which reasonable transportation can be made available to transport safely liquid fuel. The Companies would be interested in establishing such a system if the studies indicated that the NGL should be removed either in the Prudhoe Bay Field or at the coast or some intermediate point along the trans-Alaska pipeline. The portion of NGL which exceeds the needs of the State of Alaska would be exported to the continental United States. The Companies, together with two other parties, are currently engaged in designing an LPG import terminal facility on the Houston Gulf Coast capable of receiving 100,000 barrels of LPG per day. Mr. Baca was present to answer any questions the Board had. Mr. Baca advised the Board that he would prepare a more detailed proposal concerning purchase of State royalty natural gas liquids.

#### B. Cook Inlet

Mr. Fackler advised the Board that two proposals had been received with regard to Cook Inlet gas. The first one was from Alaska Pipeline Company who were requesting purchase of the royalty share of North Cook Inlet gas field at or near the Phillips/Marathon LNG Plant on the North Kenai Road, at the price paid by Phillips to acquire this gas from the State for the manufacture of LNG for export to Japan or elsewhere. They believe the most reasonable method for handling the delivery and sale would be by "exchange," or "displacement," so that construction of new pipeline and compression would be minimized. Since their supply at the Kenai gas field is interconnected to the North Cook Inlet gas supply at the LNG plant, for the time being, it would be practical that Alaska Pipeline would take whatever amount of the North Cook Inlet royalty gas that may be available day by day by displacement into their system at the Kenai gas field. Later, if additional investment would be required for transporting this royalty gas to shore, they would negotiate their participation in investment, or install their own facilities if necessary, in order to accomplish the purchase on the most reasonable basis for all concerned. The essential aspect of their request is that they have an immediate

need for additional gas on the North Kenai Road and have a long-term requirement for additional gas reserves to serve Alaskan customers in their present service area. They believe that it is in the public interest that they should be allowed to purchase this State royalty gas for local consumption rather than for this gas to be exported to Japan or elsewhere. They would begin preparing a formal application to purchase this gas and would appreciate having the Board's guidance as to what supporting data or format may be desired.

Mr. Fackler gave the Board some background on this request. He advised that Alaska Pipeline Company has renegotiated with Union Marathon and have increased their deliverability but have not increased their reserves. Mr. Teel is seeking increases in reserves now. Chairman Martin advised the Board that what Mr. Teel indicates would require Board action and submission to the upcoming Legislature. Mr. Teel feels that from the consumer's standpoint this would be very attractive legislatively. It would be based totally on the attractiveness applying to the Anchorage area as opposed to other areas in the State. Mr. Gallagher informed the Board that a clause in regard to most favored nations should be included in the new contract. Mr. Gallagher informed the Board that the most favored nations concept is that the price will meet the highest price in the field. Chairman Martin requested that Mr. Fackler direct a letter to Mr. Teel inviting him to make a presentation at the Board's next meeting.

The second letter was from Northwest Natural Gas Company in which they advised that their project for delivering LNG from Alaska to the State of Oregon had hit a snag due to the jurisdictional restrictions which would be imposed on the producers (Phillips Petroleum Company and Marathon Oil Company) by the Federal Power Commission.

4. Definition of Surplus - Chairman Martin read the statute regarding surplus (AS 38.05.13(d)). Chairman Martin advised the Board that some basic standard in regard to surplus is going to have to be established as a part of the regulations. The Board discussed how they should go about putting that regulation together. After much discussion about surplus, three items emerged that should be included in the definition of surplus and they are: 1) time period, 2) demand, and 3) supply. Chairman Martin informed the Board that he would attempt to bring back to the Board at their next meeting a finished product with regard to the definition of surplus.

7. Other Business - Dick Lyon moved that the Board authorize the Board members who wished to take a briefing from Tennessee Gas Transmission Company on their economic analysis and go through their calculations of costs and that either the Board member or Tennessee Gas Transmission Company would send to the Board a written summary of the briefing for the Board's records. Don Triplehorn seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Martin advised that the next item on the agenda was the scheduling of the next Board meeting. The next Board meeting will be held in Anchorage, Alaska on November 10, beginning at 8:30 a.m. He advised that there should be another meeting in December. The meeting is tentatively scheduled some time during the week of December 8. The meeting will be held in Juneau and will begin at 8:30 a.m.

8. Public Participation - Mr. Swetnam of Phillips Petroleum Company requested that Phillips have an opportunity to make a presentation to the Board regarding North Cook Inlet royalty gas. Chairman Martin requested that Phillips make a written presentation to at least the Commissioner's Office, which the Commissioner would make available to the Board and based on this proposal talk with his office in the interim so they could decide whether an appearance would be necessary and desirable.

Mr. A. Baca of Northern Liquid Fuels Companies wanted to add to their presentation that if an LPG system is feasible to be constructed that the State's royalty liquids would be available to serve any market within Alaska that might exist.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

# Roster

3

10/10

Bruce Monroe

Rep  
Birch, Jermain, Horton Pittman  
- Elmer

M. C. Holladay

El Paso ALASKA Co

LARRY EPPENBACH

TREASURY Div.

SAIGER EPPENBACH

ALASKA CONSTRUCTION & OIL MFG.

Apolonio Baca

NORTHERN LIQUID FUELS  
Co

ROBERT C. THOMAS

TENNESSEE GAS TRANSMISSION

Bob Sweetnam

Phillips Petroleum

O. K. Gribble

Div Oil & Gas - Anch.

PATRICK

~~Pat~~ Pobe

Div of Geol & Geoph Survey

ALASKA ROYALTY OIL & GAS DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes From November 10, 1975, Meeting in Anchorage

1. The Meeting was called to order by Chairman Martin at 8:30 a.m. in the Division of Lands Conference Room in Anchorage. All Board members were in attendance, together with members of our legislative liaison group, distinguished Commissioners of Public Utilities and other dignataries.

2. The Minutes of the October 10, 1975, meeting were discussed. Arlon Tussing raised a question on the wording of Section 4 on page 6 on Definitions of Surplus, and whether or not Mr. Tussing had made a motion defining parameters needed in the definitions. Mr. Fackler was instructed to determine if the recorded tapes of that meeting were still available and transcribe that portion if possible.

3. Reports

A. Chairman Martin was informed that the reports on Natural Gas Future Demand and Existing Gas Contracts scheduled at this time would be delayed several hours pending last minute work. The Board decided to amend the schedule and advance to Part V - Proposals.

5. Proposals

A. Prudhoe Bay

1. Mr. John Bennett, El Paso Alaska Company, reviewed the El Paso trans-Alaska gas pipeline project efforts to date emphasizing El Paso's need for a contract to purchase or transport State royalty gas from Prudhoe Bay which is surplus to State's needs. A transcript of the testimony is attached.

B. Cook Inlet

1. Mr Dale Teel, Alaska Pipeline Company, presented a request that the State royalty gas from North Cook Inlet gas field be taken in-kind and sold to Alaska Pipeline Company. His testimony was followed by Mr. John Horn, Phillips Petroleum Company, who opposed Mr. Teel's request. A transcript of the testimony of Mr. Teel and Mr. Horn is attached to the minutes.

Mr. Thomas Stahr, Anchorage Municipal Light and Power, read a letter to the Board supporting the Alaska Pipeline Company request. A copy of the letter is attached.

Mr. John Miller, Division of Oil and Gas, presented a table summarizing the existing gas contracts in the Cook Inlet area. Items include quantity of gas dedicated, length of contract, price, remaining reserves to contract and uncommitted reserves.

Mr. Patrick Dobey, Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, reviewed current progress on the computer model study of probable future demand for gas in Alaska. A copy of his presentation is attached.

Mr. Robert C. Thomas, Tennessee Gas Transmission, presented additional information on the effect of Federal Power Commission regulations on Alaska's use of its royalty gas. This information was requested by the Board at the October 10 meeting in Juneau.

Their legal counsel is of the opinion that the State as a political subdivision is not subject to direct FPC control. However, any State gas transmitted by a transfer would require a certificate thereby allowing at least a measure of indirect control.

Tenneco suggests that FPC control could be minimized by either of two ways. One is to secure an immunity or exemption by the FPC in the original certificate. Second is an exemption through legislative action by Congress approved by the President. A copy of this memorandum is attached.

Following this discussion the Board instructed the Chairman and staff to proceed in drafting proposed regulations on determining surplus definitions of supply and demand. The proposed regulations are to be published in several newspapers. Final language and approval will depend on comments on the public notice.

Chairman Martin requested approval by the Board to extend the term of acting directorship for Mr. Fackler until the appointment of a new Deputy Commissioner. There being no objection by the Board, approval was granted.

Authority was also requested to expend up to \$20,000 of Board contractual funds for consulting purposes. After a short discussion on possible types of consultant activities, the Board approved the request.

The next meeting date of the Board was set as December 9 and 10, 1975, in Juneau. There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

Nov 10, 1975 My Anchorage

Name	Representative of:
JOHN L. WILLIFORD	PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY
JOHN HORN	✓        ✓        ✓
LEN McLEAN	PACIFIC ALASKA LNG Co.
Don Triplehorn	Univ. of Alaska - Board Mbr.
Arden Tussing	"        "
Eric Eckholm	Gas Pipeline Legislative Comm.
Dale Tapp	Anchorage Natural Gas
Paul F. Robison	Atty
Richard A. Lyon	GOODS MEMBER
M. C. HOLLAND	EL PASO ALASKA CO
J. C. BENNETT	EL PASO ALASKA CO
Jack Rokovich	self
Thomas Stahr	Anchorage Municipal Light & Power
CAROLYN GUESS	ALASKA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Paul F. Roberson	above
Gordon Schadt	Birch, Terminus, Horton & Bittner
Fred Boness	Dept. of Law
Julius J. Brecht	"        "
GORDON ZARBETZ	ALASKA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Noel Bugre	MARATHON
Chancy Croft	Alaska Senate
C. J. DIVER	MARATHON
Harold Schmitt	Alaska Gas & Service
Peter C. Hinder	Ely, Guss & Rudd (PAC AK LNG CO)
Ken Sheppard	Consulting Engineer
Dale Tapp	EL PASO ALASKA

Jared G. Carter  
Kay M. Linton  
ROBERT C. THOMAS  
BILL MAGUIRE  
Rosemary Shirohan  
Mike Broder  
Elyse Todd  
Lawrence Eppelbach  
W.C. Fackler  
John C. Miller  
Tom Marshall  
Patrick L. Dobe

Tennessee  
O.M.A.P.  
TENN. GAS TRANSMISSION  
Legislative Affairs  
Daily News  
State House of Representatives  
Anchorage Times  
Dept. of Revenue  
Natural Resources  
✓ ✓  
✓ ✓  
✓ ✓

OCT 23 1975

RECEIVED  
JUNEAU, ALASKA



6  
PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY  
BARTLESVILLE, OKLAHOMA 74004 513 561-6600

NATURAL RESOURCES GROUP  
Gas and Gas Liquids Division

October 21, 1975

North Cook Inlet Royalty Gas

File: 1-No-381-75-GSEL

Commissioner Guy Martin, Chairman  
Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development  
Advisory Board  
c/o Department of Natural Resources  
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Commissioner Martin:

We are advised that certain interests have made application or may make application to purchase royalty gas owned by the State of Alaska and produced from the North Cook Inlet Field. Phillips is the Owner and Operator of this field.


Phillips has at considerable risk and expense, developed the North Cook Inlet Field and has provided a market for the natural gas when no markets existed. Phillips constructed a pipeline, liquefaction plant, and LNG tankers which were designed to utilize all of the natural gas produced from the North Cook Inlet Field. Through our efforts, we have negotiated several substantial price increases with our customers and have shared these price increases with the State of Alaska. This, we believe, gives strong evidence of Phillips' willingness to establish a fair and reasonable wellhead price as a basis of royalty payment. We know of no other natural gas royalty settlement in Alaska at a price as high as Phillips is paying.

For the State of Alaska to take the royalty gas in kind and separately dispose of it will impose severe economic hardships on Phillips. Such disposal to a third party will cause a premature abandonment of the pipeline, liquefaction and transportation facilities due to the early depletion of our natural gas reserves. All of these facilities were specifically built to create and provide a market for all of the natural gas from the North Cook Inlet Field. Additionally, it would require the drilling of more wells and the installation of additional compression equipment as well as the installation of certain compression equipment at an earlier date.

We strongly oppose the sale of royalty gas from the North Cook Inlet Field by the State of Alaska to any third party because of the undue economic hardships that it will impose on us. Further, Phillips is settling with the State of Alaska on a fair and reasonable value for the State's royalty gas.

Please take a look at our performance record. We believe that the State of Alaska will receive the greatest overall benefit by allowing Phillips to continue to market Alaska's royalty gas from the North Cook Inlet Field.

Very truly yours,



John Horn, Manager  
Gas and LNG Sales Branch

JH:bla

cc: Mr. R. I. Swetnam  
Phillips Petroleum Company  
Hoblit Building  
515 "D" Street  
Anchorage, AK 99501



PHILLIPS PETROLEUM COMPANY  
BARTLESVILLE, OKLAHOMA 74004 918 661-6600

1

NATURAL RESOURCES GROUP  
Gas and Gas Liquids Division

December 5, 1975

State Royalty Gas  
North Cook Inlet Field  
Alaska Gas & Service  
Company Proposal

File: 1-Ho-438-75-G&GL

Commissioner Guy Martin, Chairman  
Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development  
Advisory Board  
c/o Department of Natural Resources  
Pouch M  
Juneau, AK 99801


Dear Mr. Martin:

During the hearing before the Alaska Royalty Advisory Board on November 10, 1975, in Anchorage, a brochure entitled "The Case for Committing Alaska State Royalty Gas from the North Cook Inlet Gas Field to Alaska Pipeline Company (Anchorage Natural Gas)" was presented to the Board. We offer the following comments to the Board on this proposal in addition to the oral presentation made in behalf of Phillips at the November 10 hearing.

1. Phillips recognizes that the State has the right to take its royalty share of the gas in kind at the wellhead. But we believe that such action will not in the long run be to the best advantage to the citizens of the State.
2. Phillips has invested over \$125,000,000 to develop a market for the North Cook Inlet Field gas when no market existed. Our investment was made with the expectation that we would market all of the gas from the field — it was our obligation to market the State's royalty gas along with our working interest gas.
3. Deliveries commenced six years ago and we had visualized at least a 20-year project.
4. Phillips has actively worked with various groups and individuals in Alaska, including Alaska Gas & Service Company, to try to make LNG available to the more remote areas; however, thus far the high cost of transportation has thwarted these efforts.

5. Phillips has persistently sought to improve the market for the North Cook Inlet Field gas and as this has improved, the benefits have flowed to the State in the form of higher royalty settlements.
6. We believe that the State would receive the greatest benefit if it continued to receive the royalty payments made from the North Cook Inlet Field by Phillips, which is substantially higher than the prices presently being paid for natural gas by Alaska Gas & Service Company for other gas in the area. We submit that if Alaska Gas & Service Company would offer producers in the Cook Inlet Area the same amount that it would pay for the royalty gas from North Cook Inlet Field, this should be a very attractive market for natural gas and would encourage the development of additional natural gas reserves in the Kenai-Cook Inlet Area for Alaska Gas & Service Company even beyond the 15 million cubic feet per day which they propose to receive from North Cook Inlet Field.
7. The State is in the enviable position of not having to decide on an "either/or" basis but has the opportunity to continue to receive income from the present market while encouraging the creation of new markets and new development of the undeveloped natural gas resources in the area — thus winning on both bases.
8. We submit that in the best interest of the State of Alaska, the State should continue to allow Phillips to utilize the royalty gas in its LNG facilities and thereby open up new markets for the undeveloped natural gas resources in the area.

Very truly yours,



John Horn, Manager  
Gas and LNG Sales Branch

JH:bla

cc: Mr. R. I. Swetnam  
Phillips Petroleum Company  
Hoblit Building  
515 "D" Street  
Anchorage, AK 99501

Comments by John Horn  
Phillips Petroleum Company  
to  
Alaska Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board  
Juneau, Alaska, December 9, 1975

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board,

Phillips Petroleum Company appreciates the opportunity once again to appear before you. Let me state again that we share with you the concern that the citizens of Alaska derive a fair and reasonable benefit from the State's natural resources — including its natural gas. We recognize that the State has the right to take its royalty share of gas in kind at the wellhead.

We have handed to you a folder which contains (1) our written response to the Board on the brochure entitled "The Case for Committing Alaska State Royalty Gas from the North Cook Inlet Gas Field to Alaska Pipeline Company (Anchorage Natural Gas)" which was presented to the Board at the November 10, 1975 hearing in Anchorage, and (2) reproduced copies of some letters from governmental officials written at the time our LNG project was in its formative stages so that you may have the benefit of their feelings toward the Phillips-Marathon LNG Project at that time.

Although we have reprinted the entire texts for your review, I would like to quote from two of these latter mentioned letters.

The first is from a letter dated March 21, 1967, from Senators E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening, addressed to Honorable Lee C. White, then Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, with respect to the Phillips-Marathon LNG Project.

"It is our hope that favorable action on the two applications and the subsequent development of Japanese markets will encourage the exploration and utilization of new Alaska gas fields. The present proposal and those we hope will follow will have a very measurable, favorable and tremendous effect on Alaska's economy.

"We support the applications in the strongest way possible."

The second is dated April 7, 1967, from Mr. Anthony M. Solomon, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Economic Affairs, Department of State, and also addressed to Honorable Lee C. White.

"The Department of State raises no objections to the substance of the Phillips-Marathon proposal and in view of trade expansion policy supports the prompt action of the Federal Power Commission toward favorable response to the application."

During this time, we worked with Mr. Frank H. Murkowski, then Commissioner of the Department of Economic Development, who was most anxious to further the economic development of Alaska and to develop and utilize its natural gas resources.

We were advised at that time that 1967 marked the 100th year since Alaska was purchased from Russia and that our proposed LNG plant would be one of the top four industrial installations in Alaska during those first 100 years.

We believe that the State would receive the greatest benefit if it continued to receive the royalty payments made from the North Cook Inlet Field by Phillips, which is substantially higher than the prices presently being paid for natural gas by Alaska Gas & Service Company for other gas in the area. We submit that if Alaska Gas & Service Company would offer producers in the Cook Inlet Area the same amount that it would pay for the royalty gas from North Cook Inlet Field, this should be a very attractive market for natural gas and would encourage the development of additional natural gas reserves in the Kenai-Cook Inlet Area for Alaska Gas & Service Company even beyond the 15 million cubic feet per day which they propose to receive from North Cook Inlet Field.

The State is in the enviable position of not having to decide on an "either/or" basis but has the opportunity to continue to receive income from the present market while encouraging the creation of new markets and development of the undeveloped natural gas resources in the area — thus winning on both bases.

It might be interesting to the Board to know that Phillips Petroleum Company in 1975 will pay <sup>from this project</sup> to the State of Alaska revenues in excess of \$60,000 for each of its employees in the State.

We would hope that the State of Alaska would encourage the judicious development of its natural gas resources. We believe that the State should take that action which will result in a long term supply available for the development of Alaska's economy. Certainly, we would hope that the State would avoid the mistakes made in the Lower 48 States in the past which depressed exploration and development. The result has been an inadequate supply of natural gas and the Federal and State regulatory agencies in the Lower 48 now find themselves simply trying to allocate the shortage. We believe that the course we suggest you take is one of the types of State action which will be conducive to expand development of Alaska's natural gas resources and will help assure the citizens of Alaska an adequate supply of gas for the long term.

We would be happy to answer any questions.

JH:bla  
12-5-75

AGO 546554



Homer Electric Association, Inc.

P. O. BOX 255 • HOMER, ALASKA 99603 • PHONE (907) 235-8551

9

January 22, 1976

Mr. William C. Fackler, Exec. Secy.  
Alaska Royalty Oil & Gas Advisory Board  
Pouch M  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

RECEIVED  
JAN 26 1976

Department of  
Natural Resources

Dear Mr. Fackler:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you and your Commission that our Association is entering into negotiations with Chugach Electric Association to acquire their gas fired electric generation facilities at Nikiski.

These facilities are presently consuming approximately 9 million cu. ft. per day of natural gas, which is purchased from the Alaska Pipeline Company. In addition to the present gas consumption, we intend to construct prior to the end of calendar year 1978 an additional generating facility at that location requiring an additional 5 to 6 million cu. ft. per day.

We are familiar with the on-going negotiations between your office and the Alaska Pipeline Company concerning State Royalty gas for resale to Chugach and the Anchorage area.

Please consider this letter as an inquiry to determine whether or not we will be able to purchase Royalty Gas in the amounts described above pursuant to Alaska Statutes AS 38.06.010. We would anticipate purchasing all of the royalty gas available at the Phillips Petroleum LNG Plant with the assumption that the amount in excess of our needs available on a day to day basis could be resold to Phillips for their processing plant.

We assume that we would be required to pay the current market price for the gas which we believe to be 45¢ per MCF plus a negotiated transportation fee. Our negotiations to acquire the electric generating facilities in the area and build additional generation facilities is dependent upon our ability to acquire the State Royalty Gas or a like quantity of other gas in that area.

RECEIVED  
JAN 22 1976

ALASKA ROYALTY  
OIL & GAS BOARD

Our association is a non-profit cooperative. The membership includes all of the residents and business organizations of the Western Kenai Peninsula. We will greatly appreciate any cooperation that your office can lend us in bringing these negotiations to a mutually beneficial conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC.



W. C. Rhodes  
General Manager

WCR:em

cc: O. K. Gilbreth  
W. I. Palmer  
Sen. Clem Tillion  
Rep. Hugh Malone  
Rep. Leo Rhode  
Guy Martin



**Homer Electric Association, Inc.**

P. O. BOX 255    ◦    HOMER, ALASKA 99603    ◦    PHONE (907) 235-8551

*cc  
all Bu  
memo 4-5*

9

March 30, 1976

**RECEIVED**  
APR - 2 1976

Mr. Guy Martin, Commissioner  
Royalty Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board  
Department of Natural Resources  
Pouch M  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Department of  
Natural Resources

Dear Sir:

In our letter to Mr. Fackler dated January 22, 1976, and at a hearing before your Advisory Board, we applied for the State Royalty Gas that you plan to make available from presently producing fields in the North Kenai area.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that we have been able to obtain commitments to purchase fuel for the proposed new electric generating facility at North Kenai from what we believe to be a reliable source; and, further, Mr. Dale Teel of the Alaska Pipeline Company has agreed to supply our Association with natural gas for fuel for the existing electric generating plants in the North Kenai area if we are successful in acquiring these from Chugach Electric Association.

In view of the foregoing, we feel that it is in the best interest of all concerned that we withdraw our application as outlined in our letter of January 22.

As the Kenai Peninsula continues to attract industry, we do not wish to imply that we will not, at some future time, be interested in dealing with the State for royalty gas that may become available in other, yet to be developed, fields on the Kenai Peninsula area. If, at any time, additional royalty gas does become available we would appreciate it very much if your office would advise us so that we can ascertain whether or not it would be needed in our ever-expanding operation.

We note with interest the development of the Advisory Board's intention to adopt a regulation in Title 11 of the Alaska Administrative Code to interpret and make specific Alaska Statute 38.06, including the determination of surplus.

**RECEIVED**  
APR 05 1976

ALASKA ROYALTY  
OIL & GAS BOARD

AGO 546557


March 30, 1976

We sincerely hope that the proposed regulation 11AAC26.900(a) (5) will define the term "industrial use" as referred to in existing regulations, and that the State's royalty gas will be made available first to industrial use and then to all other uses, according to priorities established by your office.

We sincerely appreciate the courtesies extended to our Association by the Advisory Board and your office, and we are looking forward to further negotiations should the need arise.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC.



W. C. Rhodes  
General Manager

WCR:em

cc: Rep. Leo Rhode

cc: Mr. Dale Teel

North Cook Inlet Field Royalty Gas  
Commissioner's Proposal in Concept

The Commissioner of Natural Resources has recognized that the increasing growth of the Cook Inlet area of Alaska with its resultant increase in the use of natural gas requires that additional natural gas reserves be allocated for that purpose from State of Alaska royalty gas. From the standpoint of size of uncommitted gas reserves, geographical location and possible pipeline access, the North Cook Inlet field royalty gas appears the best available supply at this time. Pursuant to AS 38.05.182 the Commissioner proposes that it is in the best interest of the State to take in kind the State's royalty share of the gas production from the North Cook Inlet gas field and requests the consent of the Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board for this change.

The Commissioner further proposes to dispose of the North Cook Inlet field royalty gas to Alaska Pipeline Company and its subsidiaries through a negotiated contract. The proposed contract will contain the following provisions:

1. Purchaser agrees to take 1/8 of daily production from the North Cook Inlet gas field on an if and as deliverable basis for the contract period. The State will report to the Purchaser each month the amount of royalty gas produced by Phillips during the prior months.

The approximate average daily royalty gas share of the production from Phillips' North Cook Inlet field platform is 17,000 MCF. Gas production from the platform varies as LNG plant needs dictate therefore no daily amount can be specified.

2. Point of delivery will be the wellhead.
3. Purchaser is responsible for measurement costs, and any compression or dehydration costs if or when necessary.
4. The contract expires on June 1, 1984, unless extended by mutual agreement for a period not to exceed one year.
5. The price of the gas will be equal to the price the State otherwise would have received from Phillips for its royalty gas for export as LNG to Japan; but not less than the highest price paid by any purchaser in the Cook Inlet area for a similar sale of gas of similar quality. The price will be adjusted yearly on the anniversary date of the contract.

6. The contract shall not be effective until

-all necessary permits and authorizations by governing bodies are obtained

-all transportation or exchange arrangements have been completed to the satisfaction of the parties involved.

-six month's notice required under lease

The Commissioner request approval of the above proposed conceptual plan by the Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board.

# TELEGRAM

ALASKA ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS, INC

PHONE: 586-6440

JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

11

MAR 29 PM 5 03

IPMAFUE AFG

1-0349800389 23/29/76

TRX PAC LGHT LSA

2 15 LOS ANGELES, CA MARCH 29, 1976

PMS MR. GUY MARTIN, CHAIRMAN

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

7580

POUCH W

JUNEAU, ALASKA 99821

WITH REFERENCE TO THE LETTER FROM PACIFIC ALASKA LNG COMPANY TO MR. GUY R. MARTIN, COMMISSIONER OF NATURAL RESOURCES, DATED MARCH 5, 1976. OUR OFFER TO BID ON THE PURCHASE OF THE STATES ROYALTY SHARE OF GAS IN THE NORTH COOK INLET AREA WAS LIMITED ONLY TO THOSE FIELDS IN THAT GENERAL AREA IN WHICH WE CURRENTLY HAVE THE RIGHT TO PURCHASE GAS OR MAY IN THE FUTURE HAVE THE RIGHT TO PURCHASE GAS. WE HAVE NO INTEREST IN BIDDING ON THE PURCHASE OF ANY STATE ROYALTY GAS PRODUCED FROM THE "NORTH COOK INLET FIELD"

PACIFIC ALASKA LNG COMPANY

BY P. VER PLANCK

1956 EST

IPMAFUE AFG

AGO 546562



# ALASKA PIPELINE COMPANY

P. O. BOX 6288  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99502

3000 SPENARD ROAD  
PHONE (907) 277-5551

12

April 2, 1976

Mr. Guy T. Martin  
Commissioner of Natural Resources  
11th Floor, State Office Building  
Pouch M  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Commissioner Martin:

The purpose of this letter is to confirm our oral proposal made to the Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board during its March 30/31 meeting in Juneau.

The proposal can be outlined as follows:

1. The State take North Cook Inlet royalty gas in kind and sell such gas to AGAS.
2. AGAS will take delivery of the gas at the platform. This presumes that--
  - (a) an arrangement can be made whereby, for suitable compensation, Phillips will transport the gas via their existing system to a point adjacent to the LNG plant.
  - (b) the APUC waives jurisdiction over the Phillips facilities to the extent that they may otherwise come under regulation due to the transport of the "royalty" gas.
3. The price will be equal to the Phillips price for royalty gas exported to Japan or equal to the highest price paid in the Cook Inlet area for similar quality gas.
4. The proposal is to cover the "life of the contract" and will terminate on or about June 1, 1984.
5. AGAS will take or pay

This presumes that--

- (a) it may be agreed with the State that royalty will be taken in kind for resale to AGAS on a selective lease by lease basis so that the volume in question will approximate AGAS' North Road requirements or

RECEIVED  
APR 06 1975

ALASKA ROYALTY  
OIL & GAS BOARD

AGO 546563

ALASKA PIPELINE COMPANY

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Commissioner Guy T. Martin  
Continuation Sheet #2  
April 2, 1976

- (b) if suitable exchange arrangements can be made with others or if AGAS chooses to build the pipeline connection to its Anchorage line--it may be agreed with the State that all of the royalty be taken in kind for resale to AGAS.
  - (c) The notice date regarding the State taking royalty in kind be so arranged as to permit AGAS a reasonable length of time to make exchange arrangement with others or to build the required pipeline facilities on a reasoned schedule.
6. The volume of gas expected to be taken in kind for resale to AGAS over the life of the contract is approximately 40 BCF with the actual amount being dependent upon the date of commencement, the arrangement agreed to under #5 above and the actual rate at which the field is produced.
7. It is understood that a deliverability feature is not required in this agreement.

Very truly yours,



Harold F. Schmidt  
Senior Vice President

dh

AGO 546564

Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board  
Minutes of the April 26, 1976, Meeting  
Juneau, Alaska

13

The meeting was called to order-by Chairman Martin at 10:00 a.m. April 26, 1976. All members present except Mr. Gallagher who was late.

The minutes of the previous meeting, March 30 and 31, 1976, had been mailed to Board members prior to the meeting. Mr. Lyon moved for approval and Dr. Triplehorn seconded the motion. Mr. Martin noted that Paul Robison's name was misspelled. The correction was made by the secretary. The minutes were approved unanimously by the four members present.

Chairman Martin advised the Board of an agenda change. No proposed sale of North Slope royalty gas would be introduced to the Board at this meeting. He wished to brief the Board on the status of negotiations during the meeting but in an executive session. Also he wanted to determine a satisfactory date for the next meeting within the next ten days to two weeks.

After discussion, the dates of May 7 and 8 and May 11 and 12 were selected with the decision made by the Chairman depending on progress.

Next item for consideration was the proposed sale of North Cook Inlet Field royalty gas to Alaska Pipeline Company. The contract draft was reviewed in detail by the Board, item by item. All corrections were noted and a corrected draft prepared for the afternoon session.

Mr. Martin gave a brief status report on the North Slope royalty oil solicitation including a recent conversation with Mr. Downey of Tesoro Alaska Oil Company. Tesoro maintains their interest in expanding the Kenai refinery using North Slope royalty oil.

Mr. Gallagher moved that the Board reconvene in executive session at 1:30 p.m. and public session at 2:30 p.m. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyon. Motion passed unanimously.

The Board reconvened in public session resuming consideration of the North Cook Inlet Field royalty gas sale. Documents before the Board were: a corrected draft of the contract, request for approval to waive the competitive bidding requirement and approval for the rejection of bids or applications.

Several changes in wording in contract provisions were worked out and noted for retyping.

There was no response to a call for public participation

Mr. Boness reported on the legal research by Mr. Allen, Covington and Burling, on a set of questions relating to State taking of royalty-in-kind. He had received a preliminary draft by telecopy which was not suitable for copying for the Board. The legal research essentially confirmed the opinions of the Department of Law and industry counsel who have responded to State questions on the matter. Mr. Allen's work has bolstered these opinions by case citations and also pointed out the areas where case law has not developed, particularly in reference to a State taking royalty gas in-kind. The authority of the Federal Power Commission to control gas arising from its jurisdiction over pipeline transport is of special interest to the State. Mr. Allen recommends procedures to follow to reduce FPC control as much as possible. The State should make its desires known to the producers in time to be included in the producer's contracts with gas purchasers and to the FPC. The report also was not optimistic about the FPC granting the State authority to abandon gas sales at the time of initial sale or preabandonment authority as some refer to it.

Mr. Gallagher returned from his telephone call to Mr. Harold Schmidt, Alaska Pipeline Company, about certain wording in the price provision of the contract. The wording added to the provision was explanatory.

The requests for prior written approval to reject bids and to waive competitive sales were circulated. Mr. Gallagher moved that the Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development Board approve the waiver of competitive sales, Dr. Triplehorn made the second. On a roll call vote each member voted yes and signed the waiver.

Mr. Lyon moved that AROGDAB approve rejection of all bids or applications for the royalty gas in the North Cook Inlet Gas Field except that of Alaska Pipeline Company as provided for in AS.38.06.050(b). Dr. Triplehorn made the second. The motion was approved by unanimous vote on a call of the roll and each member signed the approval.

Mr. Gallagher moved that AROGDAB approve the gas purchase and sale contract, as amended, for the sale of the North Cook Inlet Gas Field royalty gas to the Alaska Pipeline Company as provided for in AS.38.05.183 and AS.38.06.050. Mr. Lyon was the second. On a roll call vote all members voted affirmatively.

The Chairman announced that the Board had concluded its first sale. He also said that he would initiate an inquiry regarding possible exchange of gas between the State, producers and gas purchasers.

The meeting was adjourned.

# STATE OF ALASKA THE LEGISLATURE

POUCH Y - STATE CAPITOL  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
907-465-3800

## LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

### MEMORANDUM

May 8, 1976

**SUBJECT:** Contract for Sale of State Royalty Gas from the North Cook Inlet Field to Alaska Pipeline Company

**TO:** The Honorable Fred Brown

**FROM:** Gregg Erickson  
Director of Research Services

#### Summary

As you requested on Friday, May 7, we have reviewed the unexecuted gas purchase contract identified as #76-1, between the State of Alaska (seller) and Alaska Pipeline Company (buyer) with particular reference to several specific questions you raised. Our analysis raises questions concerning the contract's pricing provisions and suggests that more extensive review by the Department of Natural Resources of Cook Inlet gas prices is called for. We also suggest that a requirement for in-state use of this gas be considered or, alternatively, that the contract be made unilaterally terminable by the state. In general, however, we find no obvious conditions or terms in the contract that appear contrary to the state's interests. Finally, we suggest revised wording for the resolution approving the contract.

#### Analysis

In general, the contract calls for the state to deliver to the buyer--currently the sole supplier of natural gas to Anchorage--an unspecified quantity of royalty gas received from its lessee in the North Cook Inlet field. It provides that the state shall direct its lessee (which in this case is Phillips Petroleum Company) to make these deliveries directly to the buyer who will then be responsible for its transportation to wherever it is to be consumed. Overall, a review of this contract reveals no glaring inequities or conditions which are

AGO 546568 +

obviously not in the state's best interest. We do note, however, a number of minor policy issues and technical considerations which the legislature may wish to call to the attention of Commissioner Martin and the Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board.

The first question you raised concerned the point at which the royalty gas will be delivered to the buyer. The gas purchase contract itself does not specify this point. Under the terms of the lease between the State of Alaska and Phillips, the state has the right to take its royalty gas in kind but must do so on or adjacent to the lease from which it is produced. In the case of an offshore platform such as that from which the North Cook Inlet field is produced, this means that, absent other mutually acceptable arrangements, the state must take delivery of its in-kind royalty gas at the platform and arrange for its own transportation ashore. Thus, unless the state wishes to assume this responsibility, the contract provision as currently framed regarding point of delivery would seem to be the only appropriate alternative, i.e., that the state make its delivery to the buyer at the point where it receives delivery from the lessee.

As a practical matter, pipeline capacity sufficient to transport both the royalty and producer's gas to shore already exists, and Alaska Pipeline Company should be willing to pay Phillips a reasonable fee for the use of that capacity. Normally, both Phillips and Alaska Pipeline would be expected to have plenty of incentive to reach an agreement on these transportation charges. They represent additional income to Phillips without any additional expense (since the pipeline capacity is already in being) and, in the case of the Alaska Pipeline Company,

should be substantially lower than the cost of building and operating its own platform-to-shore pipeline.

The only situation where we could envision difficulties arising would be in the case where the lessee was willing to make significant immediate financial sacrifices in order to sabotage the royalty gas sale and thus regain for itself control over the entire production stream. If the cost of constructing a separate pipeline for the royalty share were economically prohibitive, denial of access of the existing facility might be sufficient to torpedo the entire deal. We do not see this as a likely eventuality, and if it were it is probable that the state could bring countervailing pressure to bear on the lessee. In any event, the possibility of such a confrontation would not seem to require any change in the contract here presented to the legislature.

You also asked us to review the provisions concerning the pricing of royalty gas delivered to the buyer. In general, this provision calls for the buyer to pay the state the higher of either the price the state would have received from Phillips Petroleum Company had it not taken its gas in kind, the highest price paid for gas elsewhere within 100 kilometers (62 miles) of the North Cook Inlet field, or a minimum price (which is 60.36¢ per Mcf as of July, 1977, escalating thereafter at the rate of 2¢ per Mcf annually).

We find these provisions unexceptionable, but we would call your attention to what appears to be unnecessary vagueness with respect to the provisions (on page 4 and repeated on page 5 of the contract) concerning how prices received for gas elsewhere in the Upper Cook Inlet Basin are to be related to the price of gas sold under this contract. The problem

arises from the fact that natural gas may be sold elsewhere within the 100 kilometer radius at a price higher than that which would be due under either of the other two pricing provisions, but that the conditions of delivery of that higher priced gas or its quality may be different enough to raise the question of whether the price is properly comparable to that received for gas purchased by the buyer. The contract states that these comparisons shall be made "with due regard to appropriate factors including, but not limited to, difference of BTU content, delivery pressure, term of contract and connection charges." We would suggest that the semicolons preceding this phrase on pages 4 and 5 be deleted so that it will be clear the phrase applies only to the part of the sentence following the "(iii)", applying only to the comparison of prices within the basin and not to the minimum price or the price that the state would have received from Phillips.

In addition, you might consider it appropriate to work with the commissioner to develop substitute wording defining exactly how the BTU content and delivery pressure differences will influence the comparison prices, eliminating the reference to contract term and connection charges, and adding words indicating how the quantity of gas delivered is to affect the comparison. As it stands now, almost any difference in terms of delivery or quality could be used to justify an effective exemption from the "highest price received elsewhere" requirement.

It should be noted that the price currently received by the state for royalty gas produced from the North Cook Inlet field is an "imputed price". This means that it is not determined on the basis of actual

sales but rather on the basis of a "netback calculation" whereby one takes the price received for this gas in Japan and subtracts therefrom the costs of transportation and liquifaction incurred between the production platform and the delivery point in Tokyo. In the past the state has devoted little or no attention to actual verification of the validity of this imputed price, since it happens to be the highest price received for any gas in the basin. We have no reason to believe there is anything phony about the current price but would suggest that it would be appropriate in the future for the department to pay closer attention to this and other similarly determined prices in the basin since changes in one may influence others as well.

We would also call your attention to the fact that as the contract is currently written the state has no right of termination other than by mutual agreement. The buyer, on the other hand, may unilaterally terminate the contract prior to January 31, 1978. We would also point out in this context that although the "Whereas" paragraphs prior to the body of the contract indicate that the "buyer ...[delivers] natural gas for ultimate consumption within the State of Alaska", nowhere in the contract does the buyer agree to use or sell the gas purchased here only for consumption within the state. Conceivably the buyer could either export the gas from the state himself or sell it to some other party who would do the same thing. If the point of sale is greater than 100 kilometers from the North Cook Inlet field, the price of the sale would not result in any readjustment of the price paid by the buyer to the state. Since the purpose of this contract is to insure adequate supplies of natural gas for domestic consumption within the state, it would seem

logical that the contract include guarantees with respect to this matter or, alternatively, provisions allowing the state to unilaterally terminate the arrangement.

Finally, we would note that the "Resolved" clause of the resolution offered by the governor when he requested approval of this contract (HCR 14.) would appear to be incorrectly worded. We would suggest that the following language be substituted:

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Alaska State Legislature that Alaska royalty gas sale No. 76-1 and the contract providing for the sale of royalty gas from the North Cook Inlet gas field pertaining to it, between the State and the Alaska Pipeline Company, is hereby approved."\*

We would also suggest that the contract itself be made a part of the legislature's official record by its inclusion in the House Committee Report, and thus the Supplement.

\* If the legislature or a committee thereof believes that the above comments or other considerations require some revision of the contract, the most expeditious way of bringing them about might be to instruct the Department of Natural Resources or Mr. Fackler (executive director of the Royalty Board) to work with the proposed buyer to develop the necessary language. The resolved clause could then read:

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Alaska State Legislature that Alaska Royalty Gas Sale No. 76-1 and the amended contract (submitted to the legislature on \_\_\_ May 1976 and appearing in the House Journal Supplement for \_\_\_ May 1976) providing for ..."

STATE OF ALASKA  
THE LEGISLATURE  
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

POUCH Y - STATE CAPITOL  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811  
907.465.3800

MEMORANDUM

May 11, 1976

SUBJECT: Request by the Honorable Nels Anderson for Legal Opinion -  
Constitutionality, Legislative Review of Royalty Oil and  
Gas Contracts

TO: Bill Berrier  
Director, Legal Services

FROM: Gregg Erickson  
Director, Research Services

As I indicated to you in our conversation earlier today, Representative Anderson requested that the Agency provide him with a formal opinion on the constitutionality of the provisions in the Royalty Board Statute (AS 38.06.55) requiring legislative approval of contracts for the sale of royalty oil or gas. Commissioner Martin testified this morning before the House Resources Committee that the opinion of the Attorney General concerning this statute was that the provision requiring legislative approval was unconstitutional. I'm not certain whether the opinion is a formal one or not.

*DICTATED 5/10*

GE:jm

cc: Honorable Nels Anderson ✓

AGO 546574 +



Storage  
in Gallons

	<u>Village</u>	<u>Cost. Per Gallon</u>	<u>AVEC</u>	<u>School</u>
Atkasook (512)	80,000	1.00	125,800	84,000
Barrow (7,400)	850,000	2.47	city owned generators	95,200
Chevak (450)	81,000	.95	183,100	122,280
Chignik (375, total) (Chignik Lake Lagoon)	215,000	.50 owned by cannery Village adding own storage		22,000
Craig (467)	118,000	.45		
Dillingham (40)				
Emmonak (545)	90,000	1.00	134,100	82,000
	Village planning much storage, around 250,000.			
Gembell	100,000	1.40	118,700	71,470
	adding 40,000			

new construction of 30 homes

Village

Postpubl. A.V.E.C

School

Hooper Bay (630)	122,000	7.00	171,000	
---------------------	---------	------	---------	--

more going in this summer  
 new construction: 30 new homes  
 High School

Kipmek (387)	45,000	1.00		72,000
-----------------	--------	------	--	--------

Mr. Village	94,000	1.00	158,700	63,190
-------------	--------	------	---------	--------

more going in

Noorvik	130,000	1.00 50	143,700	56,000
---------	---------	------------	---------	--------

Pt. Hope (400)	350,000	1.00	62,200 <del>49,150</del>	49,130
-------------------	---------	------	-----------------------------	--------

adding 34 new homes

	<u>Village</u>	<u>Cost.</u>	<u>Avec</u>	<u>School</u>
Nevoonga	150,000	\$1.40	133,500	
	adding 40,000 storage			
	30 new homes going in			

~~Uvala plot~~

Gas Purchase Contract 76-1

This Contract, made and entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 1976, by and between the Alaska Pipeline Company ("APC") herein referred to as "Buyer" and the State of Alaska, hereinafter referred to as "Seller" :

WITNESSED

WHEREAS, Buyer owns and operates a natural gas pipeline system in areas of Alaska for the delivery of natural gas for ultimate consumption within the State of Alaska, and

WHEREAS, Seller has the right under each of the leases identified at Exhibit "A" attached hereto to be paid by the lessee thereunder a royalty of twelve and one-half percent (12½%) in kind or in value of the natural gas produced and saved and used off of the lands covered by each such lease, and

WHEREAS, Seller is authorized by AS 38.05.183 to sell royalty gas; and

WHEREAS, Buyer represents to Seller that all gas purchased under this contract will be used to meet the requirements of its customers within the State of Alaska;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the representations, covenants, and conditions herein contained, Buyer and Seller hereby agree as follows: