

## Unknown

---

**From:** Bailey, Frank T (GOV) [frank.bailey@alaska.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 18, 2008 10:35 AM  
**To:** ExternalEmailgsp; fek9wnr@yahoo.com; Perry; Kristina Y (GOV)  
**Subject:** FW: Thank You Letter

I'm sure y'all saw this in the clips the other day...but Elise Patkotak's opinion piece is awesome. That last paragraph is great.

F

---

**From:** Bailey, Frank T (GOV)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 18, 2008 10:32 AM  
**To:** 'akpfklk@gmail.com'; 'glen'; 'dab@nhtiusa.com'  
**Subject:** FW: Thank You Letter

Hi Gentlemen,

This is a fantastic comment y'all probably saw in the A.D.N.

F

---

**From:** Bailey, Frank T (GOV)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 18, 2008 10:31 AM  
**To:** Fradley, Tara D (GOV)  
**Subject:** Thank You Letter

Hiya Tara,

Could we send a thank you letter to Elise Patkotak regarding her fantastic letter below?

Thanks!

F

## Letters to the Editor/Opinion

### ANCHORAGE DAILY NEWS

(Letters to the Editor/Opinion)

#### **Palin doesn't confuse oil companies' embrace with love**

ELISE PATKOTAK  
COMMENT

(01/16/08 00:45:47)

**ROSTON 01383**

10/14/2009

Here's the thing about Alaska and the oil industry. Without the industry, Alaska would still be trying to figure out how to pay to keep the lights on in the winter. For this we should be grateful to them. Industry investment dragged this state into the economic life of America in a way that would never have happened without it. The size of our Permanent Fund alone makes us players with the big boys in the financial world.

But let us be very real about industry's dedication to our state. Neither Exxon, nor ARCO, nor BP nor Conoco Phillips, nor any other oil company that has operated in Alaska, did so out of a sense of loving charity for the citizens of this state. They did it because it made sense to their bottom line. They did it because by doing so they could make their shareholders happy. Along the way, they proved to be good corporate citizens in some ways, like charitable giving, and questionable ones in other ways -- think Exxon Valdez, and missing pigs.

So when we talk about what industry has done for this state, I think we need to be very sure we are using the right perspective. So long as we have something they want, they'll be here. The minute our nonrenewable resources are exhausted, the only question we will have about industry is who will turn the lights off when the last employee leaves.

I have lived in this state long enough to be very aware of the benefits we have accrued due to the natural resources we possess. I am equally aware that when those resources have been used up and there are no more, we'd better have one heck of a good backup plan to keep this state alive. If we want our children, and our children's children to enjoy this state, then we need a Plan B.

Because Plan A, the extraction of natural resources, has a very definite expiration date.

This may be why our governor continues to ride high in the approval ratings as she faces down industry, demanding what's best for her constituents. So many oil apologists in this state act as though the only way to approach industry is on bended knee with hand outstretched in supplication for whatever crumbs they are willing to leave us.

Palin doesn't like that approach. Good for her. She is doing for Alaska what oil executives do for their shareholders -- standing up and demanding the fairest deal possible for the people she represents. Alaska should always face industry on an equal footing because they need us as much as we need them. Palin gets that. And I think Alaskans appreciate the fact that she gets it. Honestly, does anyone really think that if one company pulls out another company won't come pulling right in?

Oil and gas are on our land and they are going nowhere until such time as a deal is made that benefits the people of this state to the greatest extent possible. And if the companies currently doing business with us don't like the terms, then some other company will step up to the plate. Those who fear that industry will go elsewhere and forget about Alaska are ignoring a couple of very important factors.

One, these are nonrenewable resources. There is only so much available in this world. Industry is not apt to walk away from its hold on any of it. And two, we are a stable state and country with minimal security problems and little risk of the resources suddenly being nationalized so that the company loses its entire asset.

Standing up to industry and demanding our fair share is something we should have been doing all along. Good for Sarah Palin for getting this state up off its knees in front of these huge conglomerates and letting them know there is a new sheriff in town and she's not afraid to use her power to protect the people she swore to serve.

**You want to know why Sarah Palin is still so popular? It's because she stands tall and does not bow to outside interests. Isn't it interesting that just when we needed a John Wayne to make us proud again, we got Annie Oakley instead? Who'd have ever thought she'd be the one with the guts needed to deal with industry?**

---

ROSTON 01384

10/14/2009