

# BONDING PROPOSITION A

## STATE GUARANTEED VETERANS RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE BONDS \$700,000,000 (Ch. 115, SLA 1984)

This proposition would authorize the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation to issue up to \$700,000,000 in revenue bonds which are unconditionally guaranteed by the state for the payment of principal and interest. Bonds would be issued for the purpose of purchasing residential mortgages of qualifying veterans. A "qualified veteran" is defined by law.

### BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska unconditionally guarantee as a general obligation of the state, the payment of principal of and interest on revenue bonds of the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation issued in the principal amount of not more than \$700,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing mortgages made for residences for qualifying veterans, as defined by law?

BONDS YES   
BONDS NO

### VOTES CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 13TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas 19	Nays 1	Absent or Not Voting 0
House	(40 members):	Yeas 33	Nays 0	Absent or Not Voting 7

### LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

Approval of the proposal would authorize the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation to issue revenue bonds unconditionally guaranteed by the state in the principal amount of \$700,000,000 or less for the purchase of residential mortgages for qualifying veterans. This proposal provides that in the event of a default the state would pay the principal and interest on these bonds. The state's liability for these bonds would be limited to the principal amount of the bonds up to \$700,000,000, plus interest.

A qualifying veteran is a person who is a "qualified veteran" under Alaska Statutes title 18, chapter 56.

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** There is no requirement for the inclusion in the *Official Election Pamphlet* of statements either in favor of or opposing any bonding proposition on an Alaskan ballot.

# BALLOT MEASURE NO. 1

## Constitutional Amendment

### LEGISLATIVE ANNULMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

(1983 Legislative Resolve No. 15 (SCS HJR 5[Jud]))

#### SUMMARY

*(As it will appear on the November 6, 1984 General Election Ballot)*

This amendment of the Alaska Constitution would permit the legislature to annul executive-branch regulations by passing a resolution. The annulment would become effective 30 days after passage by the legislature, unless the resolution sets a different date. The resolution must have three readings in each house on separate days, except that it may be advanced from second to third reading on the same day by a three-fourths vote of the house considering it. The resolution must receive approval of a majority of the membership of each house. The yeas and nays on final passage must be entered in the legislative journals. The resolution is not subject to veto by the governor, and it is not subject to repeal by referendum.

#### BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the amendment.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the amendment.

FOR   
AGAINST

#### VOTES CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 13TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas 19	Nays 0	Absent or Not Voting 1
House	(40 members):	Yeas 34	Nays 2	Absent or Not Voting 4

#### LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

*(As required by law)*

This proposal for a constitutional amendment would allow the legislature to annul a regulation adopted by a state department or agency by concurrent resolution. The annulment is effective thirty days after the date the concurrent resolution is approved by both houses unless the resolution specifies a different date. Adoption requires three readings in each house on three separate days except it may be advanced from second to third reading on the same day by concurrence of three fourths of the membership of the house considering it. Adoption requires approval by a majority vote of the membership of each house. The vote on final passage must be entered into the journal.

#### FULL TEXT OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

*(This amendment would add the following section to article II of the Alaska Constitution.)*

**SECTION 22. ANNULMENT OF REGULATIONS.** The legislature by concurrent resolution may annul a regulation adopted by a state department or agency. The annulment of the regulation is effective thirty days after the date the concurrent resolution is approved by both houses unless the concurrent resolution specifies a different date. The concurrent resolution requires three readings in each house on three separate days, except that it may be advanced from second to third reading on the same day by concurrence of three-fourths of the house considering it, and approval by a majority vote of the membership of each house. The yeas and nays on final passage shall be entered into the journal.

# STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT MEASURE NO. 1

Voters who have ever experienced irritation or anger as a result of a problem they have had with state regulations should vote in favor of Ballot Measure No. 1. While many regulations do conform to and support state laws, there are occasionally regulations which are imposed that go beyond the intent of the law and cause undue hardship on our citizens. These regulations often make no sense at all, state agency people are often at a loss to explain the meaning or sense of the regulations, and yet the state agencies involved continue to enforce them, and voters are powerless to change them.

The Alaska Constitution, patterned essentially upon the Constitution of the United States and the experience of the other states, provides a system of checks and balances among the three branches of government, and further entitles the people to their own checks and balances through the voting booth, the initiative process, and final authority over amendments to the constitution. The one major area of government that is currently **not** directly accessible to the people's checks and balances is the very considerable volume of administrative regulations which are written by the state agencies in the executive branch of government.

These regulations deal with every aspect of government and our lives: fish and game, education, health and social services, traffic, land development, utilities, taxes; the list is endless. And once the regulations go into effect, they have all the force of law. The problem is, that unlike the situation that occurs with laws, the agency people who make and enforce regulations are not subject to voter approval at election time; they are either appointed by the governor or by his commissioners.

While the legislature is often made aware of foolish bureaucratic requirements by unhappy constituents, it is almost powerless to do anything about them. Currently, to annul a regulation, the legislature must pass a new bill which is then subject to veto by the governor. This puts the governor in the powerful position of being able to stop a bill that would overturn a regulation made by his own subordinates.

It was never intended by the framers of our State Constitution that any governmental body except the legislature have the power to make laws. Yet, bad regulations have been written, on occasion by state agencies, which go beyond the letter and intent of the law as passed by the legislature and in effect create law on their own.

This measure would provide a reasonable avenue for annulment of bad regulations. It would allow your elected representatives in the legislature, through a majority vote of both houses, to annul regulations in the same way they pass any legislative bill, except it would **not** be subject to veto by the governor, who clearly has a biased position in the matter.

The House Joint Resolution which created the ballot measure had bi-partisan sponsorship during the last legislative session, and was passed with near-unanimous support by both houses of the legislature.

—Mike Szymanski,  
State Representative

# STATEMENT OPPOSING BALLOT MEASURE NO. 1

This proposed amendment to the Alaska Constitution is very similar to the one proposed in 1980 and rejected by the voters 82,010 to 58,808. Although the present version includes some improvements over the 1980 version, it is another attempt by the legislature to concentrate governmental power in its own hands.

Under the current constitution and statutes, the legislature has all the power it needs to make laws and to limit or guide the adoption of administrative regulations. The regulations are adopted to implement statutes. This proposal would enable legislators to use a law-making procedure that is not subject to veto by the governor or repeal by referendum, and that could be used to ignore the prohibition against special and local legislation.

The constitution now provides for a balance of power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the government. This balance requires a blending or sharing, as well as a dividing, of governmental responsibilities. If this constitutional amendment were to be approved by the voters, it would enable the legislature not only to write the laws, as has traditionally been the legislature's function, but it would also enable the legislature to act in place of the courts in deciding whether the executive has lawfully executed the laws when adopting a regulation; and it would empower the legislature to act in place of the executive by nullifying a specific executive-branch decision.

The annulment is like a repeal. In using this expedited procedure to annul a regulation, the legislature would act only in a negative way. It would not be providing the sort of policy guidance and direction that is appropriate to its law-making function. And it would not be providing the thoughtful analysis necessary to solve a problem. The legislature would be saying to the agency "your decision to adopt that regulation is wrong". But it would not be telling the agency what would be right. This is especially troublesome when dealing with a complex subject. Without any guidance beyond the statute that the executive branch agency was trying to implement in the first place, the agency is left with only the option to guess again. That is neither an efficient nor an appropriate way to run the government.

The Alaska Supreme Court has ruled that the legislature must abide by the Constitution's checks and balances on its power when it exercises that power, including when it acts to annul regulations. The present proposal is intended to overrule the court's decision. As argued four years ago, when the voters rejected the 1980 proposal, this amendment would aid legislators, not the public, and it should be rejected.

—Katherine D. Nordale,  
Delegate to the Alaska Constitutional Convention, 1955-1956

# BALLOT MEASURE NO. 2

## Constitutional Amendment

### LIMITING LENGTH OF REGULAR LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS (SCS CS HJR 2)

#### SUMMARY

*(As it will appear on the November 6, 1984 General Election Ballot)*

This amendment to article II, section 8, of the Alaska Constitution adds a limit on the length of regular sessions of the state legislature. The legislature must adjourn no later than 120 consecutive calendar days after the date it convenes in regular session each year. If at least two-thirds of each house of the legislature votes to extend the regular session, the session may be extended once for up to 10 calendar days. The legislature will adopt deadlines for scheduling session work in keeping with these provisions.

#### BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the amendment.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the amendment.

FOR   
AGAINST

#### VOTES CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 13TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas 18	Nays 2	Absent or Not Voting 0
House	(40 members):	Yeas 33	Nays 6	Absent or Not Voting 1

#### LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

*(As required by law)*

This proposal for a constitutional amendment would limit the length of a regular session of the legislature to 120 consecutive calendar days from the date the session convenes. There may be one extension for up to 10 consecutive calendar days if the extension is approved by at least two-thirds of the membership of each house. The legislature is required to adopt, as part of the uniform rules of procedure, deadlines for scheduling session work to control the length of the session.

#### FULL TEXT OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

*(Italics represent material to be added)*

SECTION 8. **REGULAR SESSIONS.** The legislature shall convene *in regular session* each year on the fourth Monday in January, but the month and day may be changed by law. *The legislature shall adjourn from regular session no later than one hundred twenty consecutive calendar days from the date it convenes except that a regular session may be extended once for up to ten consecutive calendar days. An extension of the regular session requires the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the membership of each house of the legislature. The legislature shall adopt as part of the uniform rules of procedure deadlines for scheduling session work not inconsistent with provisions controlling the length of the session.*

## STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT MEASURE NO. 2

The setting of goals is necessary for success in business, a profession and in our personal lives. Once a goal is set, a timetable must be established to meet the goal.

Despite good intentions in the recent past, there has been no legislative timetable, and results have proven a need for a limit to the length of legislative sessions.

Until 1970, no session had exceeded 95 days. In the past few years they have lengthened to between 140 and 165 days, and each day of the session now costs the state over \$50,000.

33 states have imposed a legislative session limit. They range between 20 and 140 days, with an average of 76. While major complicated issues face our Legislature every session, I believe they can be addressed within 120 days as proposed by this amendment.

Some may argue that a session limit will diminish the Legislature's power in favor of the Administration and the Legislature's ability to address complicated issues. However, the Constitution still provides for the Legislature to call itself into special session at any time it deems necessary to address issues which may require additional study or which may arise unexpectedly.

The proposal also allows one ten-day extension by a 2/3 vote of the Legislature to address critical matters which may not be resolved at the last minute. These are adequate safeguards to protect the Legislature's power.

The Legislature has voluntarily attempted to work within a 120-day limit and set guidelines. But such attempts have not succeeded and will not succeed unless both bodies collectively work toward that goal or are forced to meet a goal.

Approval of this amendment will set a 120-day goal. Additionally, it will require the Legislature to set a timetable for conducting business from introduction of bills to budget negotiations within that 120 days.

If we are to retain the concept of a citizen Legislature, we must be able to attract more than just persons who are retired, independently wealthy or employed in seasonal industries. There must be some assurance that citizens who undertake public service will be able to return to private sector jobs and families in a reasonable amount of time. Establishing a limit will bring that assurance.

120 days is more than sufficient time for a Legislature to address the issues which face Alaska each year. Passage of the proposed limit will produce a goal-oriented atmosphere in the Legislature which will be to the benefit of all Alaskans.

—Joe L. Hayes,  
Speaker of the House

## STATEMENT OPPOSING BALLOT MEASURE NO. 2

Not too many years ago, when we, as a state, literally didn't know where the next nickel was coming from, sessions much shorter than the 120-day session proposed by Ballot Measure No. 2 were commonplace. After the September 1969 Prudhoe Bay sale, when we received slightly more than 900 million dollars cash, we went from rags to riches overnight and we've been waddling in dough ever since. I think the record will reflect that, as a general rule, as our income has increased, the length of the sessions has correspondingly kept pace.

Life was admittedly simpler then; each session saw essentially the same number of bills, excepting bills pertaining to finances, become law. The only significant impact of our vast largess has been upon those legislators who serve on the respective Finance Committees. Always the work horses of the legislative process, those dedicated people have seen their duties expand in direct proportion to income received. There is so much more to be examined, so much more to be considered in the budgetary process, so much more to analyze in terms of what makes economic sense, that it becomes abundantly clear that the Finance Committee members put in a great deal more time than the average member of the Legislature who doesn't serve on either Finance Committee. Moreover, when you look at the structure of the membership of these two committees, you will note that many members chair other committees, thereby guaranteeing additional time will be required if they are going to do their non-financial homework in a proper manner.

Although I suspect this measure will pass handily, and although I realize my stance may be unpopular, I think it's unwise to curtail the length of legislative sessions. After all, we're conducting the business of a multi-billion dollar corporation, and to tell legislators, as members of the board of directors of that corporation, so to speak, that we only have "x" amount of days within which to conduct our business in an orderly fashion may very well do more harm than good.

Finally, members of the Legislature are now paid a flat salary; per diem is a thing of the past. The amount of per diem payments was one of the main reasons for the submission to the voters of Ballot Measure No. 2. It seems to me that issue has now been rendered moot.

—Robert H. Ziegler, Sr.,  
State Senator

# BALLOT MEASURE NO. 3

Initiative No. 83-02

## REDUCING GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY

*(As it will appear on the November 6, 1984 General Election Ballot)*

This initiative would repeal statutes which establish the Alaska Transportation Commission and the statutes which empower the commission to regulate activities of air carriers and motor freight operators. The initiative requires that persons who carry passengers or freight for hire provide insurance or other adequate security to assure financial responsibility for their activities. The initiative restricts the power of municipalities to regulate persons who carry passengers or freight. It also directs the governor to seek repeal of federal statutes (the Jones Act) which require the use of United States vessels to ship goods between United States ports.

### BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the initiative.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the initiative.

FOR   
AGAINST

### LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

*(As required by law)*

This initiative, if approved, would eliminate the Alaska Transportation Commission and would substantially reduce the amount of state regulation of the transportation industry. This initiative would add a new section to the Alaska Statutes that would limit the power of municipalities to regulate the transportation of passengers and freight for hire. The new statute would require that regulation of such activity by a municipality not conflict with regulations in existence on April 1, 1983, that were adopted by the Alaska Transportation Commission under the Alaska Air Commerce Act of 1960 (AS 02.05), the Alaska Transportation Commission Act (AS 42.07), or the Alaska Motor Freight Carrier Act (AS 42.10). This initiative also would add a new section to the Alaska Statutes that would require a person transporting passengers or freight for hire within the state to obtain insurance, post a bond, or file evidence of other security approved by the Department of Public Safety for the protection of the public against damages or injury caused by the person. This initiative also would add a new section to the Alaska Statutes that would direct the governor to "use best efforts and all appropriate means" to secure the repeal by the Congress of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (46 U.S.C. secs. 861-889), which includes the Jones Act (46 U.S.C. sec. 883). The new section also would require the governor, pending the repeal of the Merchant Marine Act, to submit to the legislature an annual report on "the harmful effects of the Act on Alaska commerce, and progress made towards its repeal".

This initiative would repeal the following statutes:

AS 02.05, the Alaska Air Commerce Act of 1960;

AS 28.10.411(b), which requires that certain motor carrier and bus transportation fees be paid at the same time the registration fee is paid;

AS 39.120(c)(7), which lists certain employees of the Alaska Transportation Commission as being in the partially exempt service;

AS 30.50.200(b)(30), which defines the Alaska Transportation Commission as a "state commission or board" for purposes of statutes concerning conflict of interest;

AS 42.07, the Alaska Transportation Commission Act;

AS 42.10, the Alaska Motor Freight Carrier Act; and

AS 44.66.010(a)(2), which specifies June 30, 1985, as the "sunset" expiration date of the Alaska Transportation Commission.

**FULL TEXT OF INITIATIVE**  
**Initiative No. 83-02**

For an Act entitled: "An Act terminating the Alaska Transportation Commission and repealing transportation laws administered by the commission; requiring persons who carry passengers or freight for hire to hold insurance or other security; and requiring the governor to lobby Congress for the repeal of the federal Jones Act."

**BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

\* Section 1. **STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.** The people of Alaska recognize that

- (1) because of Alaska's great size and distance from markets, Alaskans must have access to efficient low-cost transportation in order for people and goods to move safely inside and outside the state;
- (2) a little-known but powerful state regulatory agency, the Alaska Transportation Commission (ATC), creates motor and air carrier monopolies by legalized price fixing and tariffs, which artificially raises shipping rates and makes consumer goods more expensive for all Alaskans;
- (3) the primary purpose of the ATC is to fix rates, not promote safety, and other government agencies can insure safety standards while allowing persons to contract freely for services;
- (4) abolishing the ATC and its anti-competitive practices will subject air carriers and trucking companies to free market competition, thereby reducing freight rates, improving service, and saving Alaskan consumers millions of dollars each year;
- (5) a federal law, known as the Jones Act, requires that ships bound for Alaska from other American ports must be built and registered in the United States and staffed with American crews, thereby granting such ships an unfair monopoly and protecting them from free market competition, which costs Alaskan consumers millions of dollars each year;
- (6) the Jones Act should be repealed, and the governor should use all appropriate means to persuade Congress to do so.

\* Section 2. AS 29.48 is amended by adding a new section to read:

Sec. 29.48.036. **REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION CARRIERS.**

Notwithstanding AS 29.48.035(a), a municipality may not regulate an activity regarding transportation of passengers or freight for hire if the regulation conflicts with the regulation of that activity by the Alaska Transportation Commission as the regulation existed on April 1, 1983 under former AS 02.05, AS 42.07, or AS 42.10.

\* Section 3. AS 42.30 is amended by adding a new section to read:

**ARTICLE 5. RESPONSIBILITIES OF MOTOR AND AIR CARRIERS.**

**Sec. 42.30.200. FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.**

(a) A person who carries passengers or freight for hire intrastate shall procure and maintain security in an amount determined by the Department of Public Safety as necessary for the reasonable protection of the public against damages or injury caused by the person.

(b) Evidence of security required under (a) of this section shall be filed with the department and must be

- (1) a policy or certificate of insurance issued by an insurer acceptable to the department; or
- (2) a bond of a surety company licensed to write surety bonds in the state; or
- (3) evidence accepted by the department, showing ability to self-insure; or
- (4) other security approved by the department.

(c) The department may authorize enforcement officers to enforce this section.

\* Section 4. AS 44.19 is amended by adding a new section to article 1 to read:

Sec. 44.19.035. **JONES ACT REPEAL.** The governor shall use best efforts and all appropriate means to persuade the United States Congress to repeal 46 U.S.C. secs. 861, et seq., known as the Jones Act. Until that Act is repealed, the governor shall publish an annual report documenting the harmful effects of the Act on Alaska commerce, and progress made towards its repeal. The report shall be submitted to the legislature no later than its convening each year.

\* Section 5. If any provision of this Act is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act are severable and remain in effect.

\* Section 6. AS 02.05.; AS 28.10.411(b); AS 39.25.120(c)(7); AS 39.50.200(b)(30); AS 42.07; AS 42.10; and AS 44.66.010(a)(2) are repealed.

# STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT MEASURE NO. 3

You should vote in favor of passing Ballot Measure No. 3 on the November 6 ballot. Ballot Measure No. 3 is an initiative to deregulate the transportation industry in Alaska.

Today we all pay more than necessary for transportation directly and for all the things we need to live here, because Alaska has a highly regulated, politically motivated transportation system, which creates monopolies, increases cost, and reduces service and consumer choice.

The Alaska Transportation Commission, (ATC), is a highly political, inefficient regulatory body from which anyone who wants to provide transportation services within Alaska must get permission.

Even an experienced truck driver or pilot, with new equipment, an excellent safety record, insurance and many potential customers, needs the ATC's permission to go into business.

Earlier this year the State Office of Management and Budget (OMB) prepared a report on the Commission and its anticompetitive practices. It concluded that "open competition will provide a better environment to ensure high quality transportation services at a reasonable rate". It recommended that entry into the transportation business be deregulated. Ballot Measure No. 3 will accomplish this.

The argument that safety would be reduced simply is not true. Air safety is handled by the Federal Aviation Agency, not the Transportation Commission.

Surface transportation safety is shared by three separate state agencies; the Department of Public Safety, the Department of Commerce and the ATC. The OMB found that the ATC was doing a poor job, and recommended that economic regulation be discontinued and that safety responsibility be consolidated in the Department of Public Safety (State Troopers). We agree. The initiative also shifts to that department the duty to make sure carriers have adequate insurance.

**THUS THE INITIATIVE PROVIDES FOR FREE MARKET COMPETITION, SAFETY AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY.**

This initiative also requires the governor to lobby Congress for repeal of the Jones Act. This Act requires that freight moving to and from Alaska and the South 48 be carried on ships built in the U.S. That means goods leaving or coming into Alaska aren't transported by the most economical means. Therefore we Alaskans lose oil revenue and must pay for the higher freight rates in the cost of goods we buy.

The Statehood Commission found that the Jones Act reduces the wellhead value of Alaska oil by one-half billion dollars yearly, and costs Alaska consumers \$41 million yearly in higher price on incoming products. That's \$400 a year for the average Alaskan family! They recommended that Alaskans fight for the repeal of the Jones Act. We agree.

Powerful groups now protected from competition plan to spend huge amounts of money to defeat this people's initiative. These groups can afford an expensive campaign against the initiative because its defeat will allow the continuation of their protective monopolies and insure their ability to continue higher prices than competition would warrant!

Only by a vote of the people will Alaskans enjoy the benefits of a transportation industry built upon free-market competition, not government-created monopolies.

VOTE YES ON BALLOT MEASURE NO. 3.

—Andre Marrou  
—Dick Randolph

# STATEMENT OPPOSING BALLOT MEASURE NO. 3

Ballot Measure No. 3 proponents claim abolishing the Alaska Transportation Commission (ATC) will "reduce costs for consumers and eliminate anticompetitive practices". They have yet to demonstrate the factual basis for this statement. In fact, abolishing the ATC would increase costs to shippers and consumers alike, and leave the State without an effective safety enforcement agency.

The ATC enforces the rates set by the carriers and prevents predatory rate practices. Alaska now has over 478 ATC-authorized trucking firms. In 1983, the ATC approved 95% of all applications. The transportation industry is quite competitive.

Alaskans should consider the deregulation experiences of other states:

**FACT:** Service to small communities has deteriorated under deregulation while prices have increased dramatically. As for service to rural Alaska, the initiative's supporters say "too bad, you chose to live there".

**FACT:** Under deregulation, many carriers have sharply limited their liability for loss and damage; they now make discriminatory rate arrangements preferring individual shippers of their choice. The small shippers of Alaska would suffer should this occur.

**FACT:** Recent independent studies conclude that regulated carriers have a far superior safety and compliance record.

The Ballot Measure has no adequate provision for public safety. Maintenance records, employment records, log books, and physical examinations of drivers are required under ATC regulations. The Ballot Measure would merely require insurance or security. Insurance will not assure safety. Insurance becomes important only after an accident. Safety inspections help prevent accidents.

The Ballot Measure would transfer these responsibilities to the Department of Public Safety. That department does not have the regulations, laws, experienced manpower, or facilities to effectively enforce safety. Safety and other ATC standards will be eliminated. The initiative further restricts local governments from imposing any requirement on carriers to the extent such regulations conflict with ATC regulations in existence on April 1, 1983. Since all regulations are included in this prohibition, local municipalities will be severely restricted from imposing effective safety regulations. The initiative is not a workable alternative to current regulation.

Ballot Measure No. 3 directs the Governor to lobby Congress for repeal of the Jones Act and to report on his progress. The Jones Act has been unpopular with many Alaskans. However, the Jones Act is federal legislation over which Alaska has no direct control. Our Statehood Commission, in 1983, directed Alaska's government to seek repeal or modification of the Jones Act and such efforts continue. This initiative's contribution toward repeal would therefore be insignificant at best.

The measure's proponents have used the Jones Act issue to indirectly garner public support for the more controversial issue. This initiative in substance does one thing: it abolishes the ATC, deregulating intra-state transportation at the expense of safety, service to smaller communities, and equitable rate treatment. Abolishing the body charged with maintaining a critical element of Alaska's infrastructure is not responsible legislation. There are better alternatives.

Alaskans should vote "NO" on Ballot Measure No. 3.

—T. J. Thrasher,  
Managing Director, Alaska Trucking Association, Inc.