2009-13-04 Pt. 1 SIDE A

RECORDED INTERVIEW

OF

JOHN KATZ

CONDUCTED BY

CHARLES FEDULLO

WITH

PAUL MCCARTHY

IN Washington, D.C.

June 8, 2009

Part 1 of 2, Tape 1, Side A

UAF ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

SENATOR TED STEVENS PROJECT

Transcribed by:

CAROL A. McCUE, RMR

INTERVIEW OF JOHN KATZ

(Beginning of Tape 1, Side A, beginning of recorded interview.)

PAUL MCCARTHY: This is oral history for Senator Ted Stevens. The name of the narrator is John Katz, a long-time D.C. assistant for Alaska governors, also former staffer for Senator Stevens. The interviewers are Paul McCarthy and Charles Fedullo. It is June 8, 2009. We are interviewing in the Washington, D.C., office of the State of Alaska.

John Katz, thanks for taking the time to talk to us.

JOHN KATZ: My pleasure.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Let's kind of start with -- let's start with sort of a simple question. How -- how did you know Senator Stevens? What was your relationship with him? How did you get to know him?

JOHN KATZ: I first met Senator Stevens when I was working for Congressman Howard Pollock in 1969, and we visited with Senator Stevens then, and I've known him in my different capacities ever since.

CHARLES FEDULLO: What would you say your

relationship was with him? Was it more staff? Did it become friendship? Was it personal? Was it professional?

JOHN KATZ: Originally it was --

(Feedback problems.)

CHARLES FEDULLO: Stop for one second. I'm sorry. Okay. We're good.

JOHN KATZ: Originally, it was a professional relationship. I was his legislative director in 1971 during Congressional consideration of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and then I moved to Alaska shortly thereafter.

And over the years, the relationship has broadened into both a professional relationship and a friendship. He was certainly quite important to various Alaska governors and this office over the course of years, and in my capacity here, I had a lot of dealings with him, and he became a friend somewhere along the line, as well.

CHARLES FEDULLO: What did you think of him personally and professionally?

JOHN KATZ: Professionally, I thought he was one of the most accomplished legislators that I've ever witnessed or worked with. He just knew how to get things done in the legislative process, or to use the legislative process to accomplish things for Alaska among the federal executive agencies.

On a personal basis, I always felt that he was a man of integrity who had Alaska's best interests at heart. He had an incredible commitment to the state, a fire in his belly, and I think that manifested itself in his professional work. He's also one of the most intelligent people that I've encountered in my professional life.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Talk a little bit about -- you mentioned one of the issues you worked on when you started working for him. What are some of the other issues that you worked with the Senator on? I'd imagine it's a very lengthy list.

JOHN KATZ: Well, over the years, and he was always in the Senate, I was the one that was switching jobs fairly regularly. And so we started with the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, but also included on the list would be ANILCA, which was an outgrowth of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act, implementation of the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Management and Conservation Act, his work in the appropriations process, his work on oil and gas, natural resources, and various public land issues.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Let's talk about ANCSA little bit. You know, you were -- when ANCSA -- ANCSA went from Congress just a few years after Stevens became a senator. How -- how -- this is what I would imagine is one of his big

first tasks, right?

JOHN KATZ: Uh-hum.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I mean, this is one -- a very bright guy, very good lawyer, but he's coming into the process relatively new.

First big task, you're there with him when you look back, how do you think he faired? I mean, obviously, if he had done it at the end of his career, maybe he'd do some things differently, but first big task, how did he do?

JOHN KATZ: I think he did very well. He demonstrated early in his career all of the traits that served him will through the course of his tenure in the Senate, and one of them was his bipartisan approach to public policymaking.

In the case of ANCSA, he worked very closely with the Chairman of the then Senate Interior Committee, Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson, and I think that enured to Alaska's benefit. But beyond that, the Native Claims Act was very much of a substantive and technical exercise, as well as a political exercise, and I think his abilities as a lawyer were really integral to the process, his capacity to analyze various difficult issues and the legal terms.

And the second part, which I think may have been a bit lost to history, is he charted a course in support of the aboriginal land claims of Alaska's Native people, which

perhaps wasn't all that popular with some of what was then his traditional constituency or his support base, and he spent a lot of time explaining to them why an aboriginal land claim settlement was important to the socioeconomic development of Alaska and also Alaska's Native people.

I admired what he did. I think there was a significant political risk there, but it came together with the enactment of the Settlement Act.

And I also think that his knowledge of the Executive Branch in his work as Solicitor of the Interior Department and his work as the legislative counsel of the Interior Department during Statehood, the fight for Statehood helped a lot because he understood how both the Interior Department worked and the White House worked, and both of those were essential to the ultimate enactment of the Claims Act.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I'm going to stay a little bit on the -- the same line of discussion. ANILCA comes up years later, there's almost an agreement, and then the other Alaska senator at the time disagrees with -- sort of backed out on his agreement at the last minute. What -- what was the relationship at that time? And for some reason --

PAUL MCCARTHY: You mean Gravel?

CHARLES FEDULLO: Mike Gravel. Thank you.

Gravel's and Senator Stevens's relationship was

probably never one of closeness. Talk about ANILCA, the relationship with the two, and how Senator Stevens felt about the -- in his view, Senator Gravel backing out of an agreement he had made.

JOHN KATZ: By then, I was working as Special Counsel to Governor Jay Hammond, and my principle focus was ANILCA, and I was commuting back and forth from my home in Anchorage back here to work on ANILCA.

There were personal differences between the two of them: Political differences, policy differences, and style differences. Senator Gravel was quite flamboyant, very articulate in public. Senator Stevens was more in the trenches of just working to achieve the seven consensus points enacted by the Alaska Legislature which became, in '79, the marching orders for -- for all of us.

They -- they just differed, and I will not attribute motives to either one. I think Senator Gravel felt that the legislation that evolved in '78 was genuinely bad legislation, that Alaska could do better; and Senator Stevens felt that it was the best we were going to do given the circumstances.

And we were contending with the national monuments that President Carter created, and the National Wildlife Refuges that the Secretary of the Interior Andrus created by executive action, and I think Senator Stevens felt

that -- that it was really important to extinguish those administrative actions through legislation; and in the legislation, try to deal with some things that couldn't be dealt with administratively, like expediting past -- expediting implementation of the Alaska Statehood Act, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, trying to assure access for various purposes, including inholdings and traditional purposes, maintaining the state's traditional management role with respect to resident fish and wildlife, a no-more clause that was designed to try to keep that kind of executive action from happening in the future. So there were genuine differences of opinion between the two that manifested themselves in various ways, both in D.C. and in Alaska.

CHARLES FEDULLO: And I'm going to continue on the same sort of issue with two more questions, and then we'll get back to the basics.

In the late '80s, some of the Native corporations were really struggling, and Senator Stevens, as part of something that had been done for other corporations, initiated the opportunity to sell off some of that debt to other corporations.

What was -- I mean, what was the feeling around that? There seemed to be some criticism nationwide, but obviously, it helped the State of Alaska grow by helping

Native corporations get their footing.

Any comments on that process or anything that stood out as -- as that when it went on?

JOHN KATZ: Well, I think there was recognition in a lot of quarters that the Native corporations could be extremely important economic engines for the State of Alaska, aside from the role that they played under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. And Senator Stevens's interest in implementation of the Settlement Act did not end with the enactment of the -- of ANCSA on December 18th, '71.

He recognized that there were differences in the corporations that were dependent on their leadership, their access to professional assistance, the natural resources that they had or didn't have, and he felt that net operating losses, later the Section 8(a) contracting for Alaska Native corporations that he also helped with were very important to get the Native corporations off the ground.

And it turned out that that was a successful effort, that Native corporations did prosper, pending their ability to fully develop their own resources. And when the net operating loss issue basically diminished, then the Section 8(a) ability of Native corporations to contract, particularly with the Department of Defense, was very helpful.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I'm glad you brought up the 8(a)

because, obviously, that's the next logical step.

Did your views -- obviously, you have a lot of respect for Senator Stevens, everyone we've spoken to does. Intellectual, bright. Did your views change of him over the years as far as his skills as a legislator? Did you see how he operated? Did anything change over the years?

JOHN KATZ: My basic respect for him never changed. I've always thought he was a man of significant talent, and in addition, he had the commitment to the State of Alaska, the dedication that one would hope for from a -- a public official.

I think, like anybody that, you know, had such a prominent role in the Senate for a long period of time, his approach to some issues changed, his style changed a little bit.

In honesty, I was sorry to see him threaten resignation at a critical point during the Senate debate on ANWR. At one level it demonstrated how -- how strongly he felt about the issue, and that was great, but -- but manifesting itself in that way, I don't think, you know, did the issue any good, and it -- it may have hurt him a little bit in the -- in the Senate.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I'm going to come back to that, but talk about his skills as a legislator and his strongest trait as a senator.

JOHN KATZ: I think his strongest trait as a Senator was his integrity and how his colleagues viewed him. The Senate prides itself on being a pretty exclusive club, and you're either a member of the club or you aren't. And if you're a member of the club, you know, good things can happen for your state.

And despite, you know, Senator Stevens being angry with certain senators at certain times, I think that basic respect they had for him never diminished, and they understood his respect for the institution.

In terms of sheer talent, one of the things that always impressed me about him was his tremendous capacity to grasp a full spectrum of issues, and not just Alaska issues, national issues, international issues. He became a genuine expert on defense issues, natural resource and public lands issues. He had a capacity to look into the future to see the future and not be totally mired in the activities of the moment.

He also had an excellent sense of strategy and tactics, when -- when to fight, when to compromise. And that, coupled with his knowledge of the issues and his ability to assimilate information, I think, served him and serve him well.

CHARLES FEDULLO: What about his biggest -- what was his biggest weakness? What did people perceive? Was

there a weakness? What was the biggest weakness that the senator had?

JOHN KATZ: Some people thought that he -- he didn't listen well. I don't really subscribe to that. I think he captured the kernel of what people were trying to convey. Some people felt that way.

Some people felt that his temper was a detriment, but I think what some of those people didn't realize was, for the most part, he used the perception of anger as a tool. It was a tool in his arsenal, and whether he was genuinely angry or just using anger as a tool, you couldn't tell, particularly when you were the recipient, but he never held a grudge.

And many times I would see him be angry with somebody and immediately, when the meeting was over, he would put his arm around them and walk them out and there were never any hard feelings.

So I think if you asked people, they might say his anger and whether he listened or not, but if you knew him pretty well, I think if it got below that level of inquiry, you would see some other things going on, as well.

CHARLES FEDULLO: You know, the temper is interesting. We've heard a lot of people say they felt like he used it as a tool. And I think one of the most interesting things was Jack Roderick, who he spent a few years with as

a law partner and -- and a number of -- is still close friends with Jack, Jack said he's -- he's never really seen the temper. And I was -- that was an interesting note. That -- and I think that subscribes to the philosophy that most of the time the Senator knew what he was doing with his temper.

I wanted to ask you something that's a little off script but that Jack Roderick brought up. He started talking about Stevens's upbringing, parents getting divorced at an early age, living in a house in Indianapolis with 10 people in it that it was probably very small, and that that's sort of where a little bit of the temper came from, but that Stevens learned to manage it, and that part of the reason he worked so hard and -- and everybody -- his -- his work ethic is legendary, was he was sort of searching for some -- if not approval, he wanted to accomplish something. Any -- I mean, what do you think of that?

JOHN KATZ: I'm not a psychoanalyst, and I've never really talked to him about his early life, but I can see that his early life would contribute to what he became, and also his experience in World War II, and his experience at Harvard Law School, I think, were all extremely germane to what he became.

And I don't know what all the causal connections

would be, but clearly, he was driven and had an absolute commitment to the things he believed in. He had this work ethic, and however they came to be, they certainly enured to Alaska's benefit over the years.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I want to talk a little bit about some of the issues you worked on. You've mentioned ANILCA, and we've talked a little bit about ANILCA and ANCSA. Is there anything you'd like to add as far as how the Senator approached the issues, any things that you think would be germane that we didn't talk about regarding ANCSA, ANILCA?

And I know I'm giving you a broad brush, John, but ANCSA, ANILCA, 8(a), and the -- the -- allowing the Native corporations to sell their debt.

JOHN KATZ: Well, I only worked with -- for him as a staff person for one year, and I wanted to move to Alaska, so when the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act was enacted in December, I was literally on the next airplane to Alaska to join my wife and daughter.

The dominant issue that year was certainly the Native Claims Act, but in my other incarnations, I worked with him from then until even now. And our -- our business, my -- my agenda was -- was really the state's federal agenda in Washington, D.C., so we covered the full spectrum of -- of Alaska issues in the Congress and in the Executive Branch: ANWR, the gas pipeline, OCS, oil and gas leasing, a plethora

of public land issues over time.

We worked with him in the federal appropriations process every year, the annual process. If it was on Alaska's agenda in D.C., we interacted with him.

And so for me, things like ANCSA, ANILCA, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the TAPS Act, they are all the high points, but there was almost a daily ebb and flow, not necessarily me talking to him because that wasn't necessary, but my office here or my office when I was Special Counsel to Governor Hammond interacting with his office, and in that way, we dealt just with the normal day-to-day ebb and flow of what happens in Congress and the executive agencies that relates to Alaska.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Let's -- there's -- there's numerous issues. I mean, well, let's talk about appropriations because that's probably someplace as -- as the state's liaison to the federal side of things, and you probably worked the closest.

Senator Stevens sort of set the view of what an Alaska senator should be as far as bringing appropriations and helping a western state grow. Talk about the appropriations process, and talk about what you think the Senator's view of why it was important to bring money to the state for infrastructure projects, or rural community.

JOHN KATZ: Well, first, let me say that I've been

chagrined particularly in the last few years that the national media, in particular, seems to see him as -- as nothing but an appropriator, as, in their view, somebody that pork barrelled for Alaska. In my view, that really diminishes his legacy for Alaska in the Senate because he was instrumental on so many other issues.

And he was formidable in the appropriations process because he understood the process, he did his homework, at various times he was in a leadership position, either as chairman of the committee or ranking member, chairman or ranking member of important subcommittees.

He saw the appropriations process as just one instrument in his effort to facilitate the social and economic development of Alaska, and it coincided with some of his other interests; for example, his substantive expertise in Department of Defense issues, and he expressed that not only in the appropriations process, but in other ways, as well.

So he and his staff had the capacity to accept recommendations from hundreds of Alaska -- Alaskans and Alaska entities regarding things that should be or should not -- should be in the appropriations process, and he went through those and culled out the ones that he thought were really in Alaska's best interests.

He also supplemented that from time to time by

making changes in formulas and in authorizations that, in turn, fed back into the appropriations process.

CHARLES FEDULLO: You know, with the appropriations process, we've heard that the public in a state determines what senators should be. For example, some states decide that their senators, because of the history, should be involved in foreign policy and development of foreign policy. Senator Stevens really, it seems, sort of determined what Alaska's use of the senator should be, and it was to help the state grow through appropriations.

Do you think Senator Stevens was bothered by the fact that there seemed to be this turn on the national media that bringing appropriations to your state was somehow not what a senator was supposed to do, particularly when the state believed that it was what his job was?

JOHN KATZ: I guess I'd say a couple things. He was certainly sensitive to the body politic in Alaska, and he met with hundreds and hundreds of Alaskans who came to D.C., and he went home probably more frequently than senators who -- who represent states on the East Coast to be involved with Alaskans back home.

But more than most political leaders I've encountered, he created an agenda that was partly, at least, his judgment about what would benefit Alaska and what Alaska needed, and what the nation needed in -- at least in the

sphere of national defense and the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation Act, and things like that.

I've got to think that this more recent focus by the national media on his prowess in the appropriations process to the exclusion of almost everything else that he did for the state or the nation had to be problematic for him. I know it was problematic for a lot of the people around him and the people that used to work for him because, in a very real sense, it diminished his legacy and the things he accomplished.

Of course, he responded to the fact that we were a young state; the theory was that the Alaska Statehood Act would be our patrimony, and we would derive what we needed from that, but you know, the -- it was hard to get to that point because the federal government has such an overriding presence in Alaska, even to this day, in land ownership and regulatory presence. And it was clear in the early days, at least, that the Statehood Act itself and the revenues derived from Statehood lands were not going to be sufficient, and so he worked to get federal appropriations.

One of the better examples is the Denali Commission. He recognized the needs of rural Alaska, they weren't being totally met by all the existing federal programs, and so he became the creator of the Denali Commission to bring a focus to rural economic development,

and the Denali Commission has -- has done that.

But I discovered in talking to him one day that he is less concerned about his legacy than a lot of other people who respect him are, he's always thinking to the next thing; and as he said publicly, he doesn't -- he doesn't view life by looking in the rearview mirror. Nevertheless, as accomplished as he was in the appropriations process, that was definitely not his sole contribution.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Well, let's talk -- I'm going to move on to some of the other issues.

Magnuson-Stevens was a very bold stroke in fisheries to allow more income for the state, for state fisheries. Talk about the process of Magnuson-Stevens, talk about the difficulties in getting President Ford to sign it, and -- and the process.

JOHN KATZ: I wasn't really here then, so I -- I was in Alaska, so I don't know all the machinations of the process. I just know that -- that there was a -- kind of a consensus in Alaska that the United States need to -- needed to pay more attention to its fisheries and, you know, we -- the Congress eventually extended the limit of U.S. jurisdiction to 200 miles, which a lot of other countries had already asserted.

And within that context, there was an effort to -- to do better research, scientific analysis, to

understand the fisheries better, to manage the fisheries better. And I think one of Senator Stevens's mechanisms for doing that, along with others that worked on the bill, like Senator Magnuson, was to create the -- the Fisheries Management Councils, in the case of North Pacific National Fisheries Management Council, which combined various fishing interests in a decision-making body, and also allowed for representation of both federal and state interests, and perhaps that's a microcosm of what the Senator had in mind in working on the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Let's talk about defense appropriations, or defense and some of the directions the Senator took on that. Obviously, the Sixth Infantry Light, and then more recently the Stryker, the missile defense system at Greely. Do you have any sense of what was his sort of statewide and global view on defense issues?

JOHN KATZ: Well, I think a lot of his views were molded in the World War II era, along with people like Bob Dole and Senator Inouye. They saw the world in a -- in a certain context, and they -- they wanted to make sure that the Armed Forces of the United States had the wherewithal to protect our strategic interests and our liberty.

And I think for Senator -- Senator Stevens, this was a congruence of some of his national views with his focus on the State of Alaska because in pursuing the projects he

pursued in Alaska, I think he felt that he was also genuinely pursuing the interests of the United States.

For example, having Fort Richardson and Elmendorf in tandem with each other, and Eielson and Fort Wainwright in Fairbanks enabled the United States to project power either east or west from a strategic location on the Pacific Rim, and Senator Stevens wanted to provide the logistic support, the barracks, the residences, all the other accoutrements that would enable us to do that; and in so doing, he also was able to help Alaska with a significant benefits that the defense presence there allows.

But I think in -- in that respect, he was truly representing the body politic in Alaska, too, which is very patriotic, very supportive of the military, and very understanding of the role that -- that Alaska contributes in global strategy.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Along those lines, did his tenure in the Senate, his -- his length of time and his relationships with -- his ability to work over the aisle really help the military system and help better show the rest of the nation and other senators the strategic value that Alaska has because of its placement?

JOHN KATZ: Oh, I think, without question, his presence in the Senate did that. His constant travelling with Senator Inouye to look at our military installations

around the world. And you know, we didn't have defense contractors like, you know, California does or Virginia and other states, so certainly defense contractors spoke with Senator Stevens, but he didn't necessarily have to represent those parochial interests. He was, I think, representing what he thought of as a national defense interest, and how Alaska fit into that. And so he avoided some of the pitfalls that some members of Congress fall into.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Let's talk about the Trans-Alaska Pipeline authorization. You worked closely with him on that. That must have been -- I can't imagine the amount of information you're trying to just kind of discover, to try to understand. What was the process like to get the authorization done?

JOHN KATZ: Well, again, I was in Alaska then, but I have always seen the TAPS Act as an extension of the Alaska Statehood Act. And I've never asked Senator Stevens whether he sees it the same way, but maybe he did because the Statehood Act contemplated that Alaska would develop its own resources, and in that way, become self-sufficient.

If it hadn't been for the TAPS Act, how would that have happened? You know, we had discovered these abundant oil and gas resources on state lands on the North Slope, how were we going to commercialize them? And it required Congressional action. The national environmental

community was reasonably strong by then, they had weighed in, and there was a lot of high drama. You know, the classic situation in the Senate where the Vice-President had to break a tie vote.

And I've often reflected on, you know, what Alaska would be like if the vote had -- had been otherwise in the Congress and we have been denied the opportunity to commercialize those resources.

And I've also reflected on whether the public policy process is such today whether you could ever pass something like the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act amidst all of the special interests of politics that now occurs.

CHARLES FEDULLO: You know, ANWR, and I'm -- it is probably one of the issues that the senator worked hardest on. He has so many successes; this is one he has not been able to accomplish.

You mentioned earlier the Senator became emotional and upset on more than one occasion in regards to ANWR votes.

JOHN KATZ: Well, at one level, he saw ANWR as demonstrably in the national interests of the United States, plus, obviously, the interests of Alaska, as well, in terms of all the things that ANWR would represent.

I think at another level, it was frustrating to him and also to the rest of us who worked on ANWR because we think

the merits are so clear that ANWR could be explored and developed in a way that would be protective of the environment, but we were never able to -- to accomplish that.

And I -- I think it was frustrating for the Senator, but for all of us, as well, that the issue from our perspective was not decided on the merits; it was decided, I think, for political reasons relating to the influence that certain interest groups had in various states and congressional districts.

Emblazoned in my memory is a meeting that I had a long time ago with a member of the House of Representatives about ANWR, and we were talking on the merits, and he said, "John, we don't need to talk about the merits anymore, I'm convinced on the merits. My problem is political. You know, the environmental community represents the margin of victory or defeat in my district, I cannot go against them." And all I could do is thank the Congressman for his honesty because I think he was portraying a reality that exists.

ANWR was an easy environmental vote for a lot of members of Congress because it didn't directly affect their districts or the effect was attenuated, and it required a vote that was kind of in the national interest.

And I think as the Congress has evolved, those kinds of votes are more difficult; and I don't want to put thoughts and words in Senator Stevens, but my guess is that

part of the frustration and anger that people saw on the Senate Floor was that inability to overcome the political object -- objectives and focus on the merits. And whether it had any particular validity in the process or not, he also felt that if Scoop Jackson had lived, they had an understanding that would have ultimately been reflected in congressional action.

We also had come so close on various occasions: Legislation moving through the Congress when the Exxon Valdez hit Bligh Reef, ANWR included in the budget reconciliation process in 1995 when President Clinton vetoed the bill for ANWR and other reasons, so that frustration must have built, as well.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Some areas where the Senator -- one area that was opened and leases are being looked at now is in NPR.

JOHN KATZ: Yeah.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Any discussion on that? Anything of interest?

JOHN KATZ: Well, when the National Petroleum -- the Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 4, was transferred to the Interior Department from the Navy and became NPRA, the expectation was that it would be a locus for oil and gas development. Even the environmental community said, you know, ANWR is off limits but NPRA is open.

Part of the problem with NPRA in the early phases was there was a government exploration program that didn't work out very well. Later the geology is such that it may be more important for gas than for oil. The oil deposits, except those that are close to the pipeline, may not yet be economic.

The environmental community has changed a bit from the earlier days. It now has a significant interest in NPRA, as well. So I think for geologic reasons, economic reasons, political reasons, NPRA hasn't achieved what everybody hoped it would; but nevertheless, there are significant exploration going on now, people are finding things, and hopefully they will be -- some of the prospects will be economic through the TAPS pipeline and others relating to natural gas will be, once we have a natural gas pipeline from the North Slope.

CHARLES FEDULLO: What was Senator Stevens's role in National Petroleum Reserve Alaska, getting it to the point where we could lease it?

JOHN KATZ: He worked very closely with Senator Scoop Jackson. My recollection is that legislation passed in 1980, and it very much had Senator Jackson's imprint on it, but also Senator Stevens's. And they saw it for what it was, a place that had a -- a history of -- of possible oil and gas development, they wanted to try to realize that

potential.

CHARLES FEDULLO: And I'm sorry, I've got to back up one second just to get something.

Paul Tsongas was the other member of Congress that the Senator worked with and felt there was an agreement regarding ANWR. It was Scoop Jackson and Paul Tsongas? Am I remembering that correctly?

JOHN KATZ: Well, he's talked about Tsongas, and I don't know about what transpired there.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Sure.

JOHN KATZ: Senator Tsongas was somebody that we all worked with very closely during the ANILCA period, and I think all of us grew to admire Senator Tsongas. He didn't necessarily have the same philosophical perspective, but he was a worthy adversary, and when he came to an agreement, he -- by gosh, he kept that agreement; and whatever agreement there may have been between him and Senator Stevens on ANWR, I think, unfortunately, is lost to history.

(End of Part 1, Tape 1, Side A.)