

08.07.07

## Briefing Summary

**A. GROUP:** Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Public Advisory Group (PAG)

**B. DATE/TIME:** November 16, 2000

**C. LOCATION:** Anchorage, Alaska

### D. MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE via Teleconference:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Principal Interest</u>
Rupert Andrews	Sport Hunting and Fishing
Chris Beck	Public-at-Large
Pam Brodie	Environmental
Sheri Buretta	Subsistence
James King	Public-at-Large
Chuck Meacham	Science/Academic
Stacy Studebaker	Recreation Users
Chuck Totemoff	Native Landowners
Ed Zeine	Local Government

### E. NOT REPRESENTED:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Principal Interest</u>
Torie Baker	Commercial Fishing
Dave Cobb	Public-at-Large
Dan Hull	Public-at-Large
Chip Dennerlein	Conservation
Vacant	Public-at-Large
Vacant	Forest Products
Vacant	Commercial Tourism
Vacant	Aquaculture

### F. OTHER PARTICIPANTS:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Molly McCammon	Trustee Council Staff
Doug Mutter	Designated Federal Official, Dept. of the Interior
Sandra Schubert	Trustee Council Staff
Sarah Ward	Trustee Council Staff
Cherri Womac	Trustee Council Staff

### G. SUMMARY:

The briefing began November 16 at 9:05 a.m. Molly McCammon discussed the status of the PAG. The Trustee Council will decide on nominations for the next membership term at their December 4-5, 2000, meeting. Doug Mutter reported that the PAG Charter renewal for the next term is in process at the Department of the Interior in Washington, D.C.

McCammon went through the draft agenda for the upcoming Trustee Council meeting (Handout #1). Rupert Andrews will provide a PAG status report.

McCammon reviewed the status of the Archaeology Repository project. The project has been modified to address questions about costs and the ability to follow the business plan. The

project's modifications are ready for Trustee Council approval.

McCammon presented a status report on the Gulf Ecosystem Monitoring (GEM) program (Handout #3). A "straw dog" version is being reviewed and discussed. The National Research Council (NRC) is reviewing and has provided some preliminary comments, such as: more time is needed to complete the GEM plan. The EVOS Annual Workshop on October 12-13, 2000 focused on GEM. The draft monitoring and research plan will be prepared by next spring for NRC review.

Chris Beck asked how public input fit into the program. McCammon replied that outreach was a vital part of the program. Jim King asked if mapping of resources and physical parameters was included. McCammon replied that a project to prepare environmental sensitivity index maps was being done now. Stacy Studebaker asked how citizen monitoring could fit in. It is important to achieve community support. McCammon answered that they were not yet sure how that would work. Both Studebaker and Chuck Meacham volunteered to sit on a PAG work group to discuss this issue. King also asked about a map of subsistence uses and seabird concentrations. A way to "see" what others are doing would be useful. McCammon said that visualization was a good point. Sarah Ward suggested some tribes would want subsistence use areas to be kept in confidential files, to avoid increased use of sites.

McCammon discussed habitat protection. One large parcel remains in active consideration: the Karluk/Sturgeon Rivers, owned by Koniag Native Corporation on Kodiak. The current conservation easement is over next year; extension of the easement is being discussed with a decision on a possible sale at least 10 years away. The Trustee Council is considering a possible arrangement (Handout #2) with a non-profit, such as The Nature Conservancy and The Conservation Fund, to operate the small parcel program under the direction of the Trustee Council, who would make the decisions on what parcels to buy. The non-profits provide flexibility that the Trustees do not have. The groups have already helped the Trustee Council on some purchases. A two-phased project is proposed. The draft resolution and agreement are to be discussed at the upcoming Trustee Council meeting. Possible action would probably not be taken until early January. McCammon reviewed Attachment A of the draft. The Department of the Interior would be the granting authority for the grant to the non-profits. The habitat program will be much smaller than it has been and will focus on small parcels.

Dan Hull submitted written comments (Handout #4) on the proposed habitat management project. Meacham commented that it appeared that the agreement set up an automatic renewal if only one Trustee wishes to continue the program, and that this was not "unanimous consent" as the Trustee Council has done in the past. Sheri Buretta said she is opposed to how habitat acquisition is being handled. No Request for Proposals was issued, as was done in other projects, such as the Archaeology Repository. She believes the agenda of the non-profits is not in keeping with public interest. Her organization is not a willing seller. Pam Brodie noted that the Trustee Council only deals with willing sellers.

McCammon noted that under this proposal the habitat funds stay with the Trustee Council, not with the grantees; that deals will only be made with willing sellers; and that all decisions rest with the Trustee Council. At this time, this is only an option to consider. King said Sheri's concerns could probably be dealt with in how the project is implemented. Beck supports keeping habitat acquisition on the Trustee Council's agenda and that the most cost-efficient methods should be used. McCammon noted that the Trustee Council had allotted time for public comment at their upcoming meeting; she encouraged PAG members to present their views.

Chuck Totemoff asked about the status of the \$20 million for community-based projects. He said that communities needed to be more involved, could design their own projects, and a dedicated fund would help. McCammon responded that the Trustee Council has taken no action

and will examine this concept during the GEM planning phase.

King stated that GEM needed to look beyond injured resources and include migrant species, as well. McCammon agreed, but that budget limitations meant that they needed to concentrate on representative species and cost-effective study techniques.

Beck noted that the Alaska Wilderness Recreation and Tourism Association was working on tourism guidelines for Prince William Sound and was holding a meeting next week on this topic.

The briefing ended at 10:21 a.m.

#### **H. FOLLOW-UP:**

1. McCammon will present nominations for members to sit on the next session of the PAG for consideration at the December 4-5, 2000, Trustee Council meeting.
2. Mutter will submit Trustee Council PAG nominations after their December meeting to the Secretary of the Interior for official designation.

#### **I. NEXT MEETINGS:** After the first of the calendar year 2001

#### **J. ATTACHMENTS:** (Handouts, for those not present)

1. Draft Trustee Council Agenda for December 4-5, 2000
2. Draft Resolution and Grant for the Habitat Protection Program
3. Update on GEM Planning Process
4. Comments from Dan Hull re. Draft Habitat Program

#### **K. CERTIFICATION:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
PAG Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Meeting Summary

**A. GROUP:** Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Public Advisory Group (PAG)

**B. DATE/TIME:** July 20, 2000

**C. LOCATION:** Anchorage, Alaska

**D. MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Principal Interest</u>
Rupert Andrews	Sport Hunting and Fishing
Chris Beck	Public-at-Large
Pam Brodie	Environmental
Sheri Buretta	Subsistence
Dave Cobb	Public-at-Large
Dan Hull	Public-at-Large
James King	Public-at-Large
Chuck Meacham, Chair	Science/Academic
Ed Zeine	Local Government
Bruce Bruseth for John Harris	Alaska State House of Representatives ( <i>ex officio</i> )

**E. NOT REPRESENTED:**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Principal Interest</u>
Torie Baker	Commercial Fishing
Chip Dennerlein	Conservation
Stacy Studebaker	Recreation Users
Chuck Totemoff	Native Landowners
Vacant	Public-at-Large
Vacant	Forest Products
Vacant	Commercial Tourism
Vacant	Aquaculture
Loren Leman	Alaska State Senate ( <i>ex officio</i> )

**F. OTHER PARTICIPANTS:**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Debbie Hennigh	Trustee Council Staff
Bill Hauser	AK Department of Fish and Game
Molly McCammon	Trustee Council Staff
Phil Mundy	Trustee Council Staff
Doug Mutter	Designated Federal Officer, Dept. of Interior
Sandra Schubert	Trustee Council Staff
Bob Spies	Chief Scientist, Trustee Council
Cherri Womac	Trustee Council Staff

## G. SUMMARY:

The meeting was convened July 20 at 9:00 a.m. by Chuck Meacham, Vice-Chair. Roll call was taken, a quorum was not met. There were no members of the public present, however, there was a public hearing on the FY 2001 Annual Work Plan the evening of July 19.

Molly McCammon discussed the status of the PAG. The final session of the PAG under the Restoration Settlement Agreement runs from October 1, 2000, to September 30, 2002. The Trustee Council extended the term from January 2002 to October to complete the federal fiscal year. Nominations are now being requested for membership during the next 2-year session of the PAG. They are due August 25. If any current PAG member wishes to serve during the next session, they must submit their intentions in a written statement to Cherri Womac. There will be no revisions to the PAG make-up or charter at this time. Staff will be recruiting for currently vacant PAG seats (see above)—so pass the word. Any suggestions on the future organization of a PAG for the GEM (Gulf Ecosystem Monitoring) program are also welcome.

McCammon noted that there has been a high turnover in Restoration Office staff lately, with most people leaving the state. Joe Hunt, Rebecca Williams, Traci Cramer, and Hugh Short all left. Brenda Hall is the new receptionist and Debbie Hennigh is the new Admin/Special Assistant. The Juneau Restoration Office is closed. A computer/web page support person is needed.

McCammon reviewed the investment program being developed by the Trustee Council. An Investment Working Group was established and has been meeting monthly since January. They produced the Investment Policies, which were adopted by the Trustee Council and previously mailed to the PAG. She noted that the research portion of the fund would be managed as a perpetual endowment. The intent on the land-related portion of the fund was to manage it also as an endowment, but to remain flexible. An asset allocation mix and spending plan were also mailed to PAG members. Spending for research would be fixed for the first 4 years, figuring 8.25% return minus 3.25% inflation, or 5% growth. Also mailed to PAG members was an analysis of where to place the fund. The Council's decision was to go with the Alaska Department of Revenue. The funds will be moved from the District Court in Texas to the Department of Revenue by the end of July. The legislature cannot use this dedicated fund. The PAG's general comments were that this all looked good.

McCammon discussed habitat protection. Only 1 large parcel remains in active consideration: the Karluk/Sturgeon Rivers deal with Koniag Native Corporation on Kodiak Island. Negotiators are close to agreement for a 10-year extension of the current conservation easement, but not for a land sale. Many small parcels (under 1,000 acres) were dropped from the active consideration list if no action had occurred. The Trustee Council is considering a possible arrangement with a non-profit, such as The Nature Conservancy or the Conservation Foundation, to operate the small parcel program under the direction of the Trustee Council, who would make the decisions on what parcels to buy. The non-profits provide flexibility that the Trustees do not have. The groups have already helped the Trustee Council on some purchases. The Council's staff are working out an agreement to take to the Trustee Council this fall. The PAG will have an opportunity to examine and comment on the proposal this fall at a teleconferenced meeting. A draft agreement is due in September.

Chuck Meacham supports using conservation groups in this area, although he would just as soon put the funds to work in science endeavors. Sheri Buretta is in strong opposition to using groups with their own agendas to do Trustee Council work; she does not think it relates to restoration. These groups can manipulate the process and put pressure on potential sellers, she said. She does not think pressuring people to sell is right. Dan Hull said there could be a role for contracting work, but he shares concerns about decisions not being made for the good of the general public—which the non-profits do not represent. They may inappropriately skew the process and influence which parcels are considered. He likes efficiency, but not giving control to organizations who don't answer to the public. He is disappointed that this is being considered. Pam Brodie stated that these 2 organizations were not “politically active” and are not influenced by organizations such as hers (Sierra Club). Dave Cobb expressed concern that this may cost more than the cost incurred for the Trustee Council to do it themselves.

McCammon presented a status report on the GEM program. A revised draft was produced in April (mailed to the PAG) and sent to the National Research Council (NRC) for a review. The review committee held its first meeting in June, and will meet again in October—part of this meeting will be open to the public. At this point, GEM is a program, not a plan. The NRC review is to be completed in November 2001. In the meantime, the Trustee Council wants a draft monitoring plan developed by January 2001. Regional focus groups have started to discuss this (this week and the next 2 weeks). A draft monitoring plan is due for public comment in late September. The annual EVOS workshop has been moved to October to focus on this monitoring plan. PAG members are invited to attend the focus group sessions.

Cobb asked if there would be co-mingling of Trustee Council funds with others. McCammon replied that no, but others may want to mingle their funds with ours. There would be opportunities for cooperative efforts and cost-sharing, though. Jim King suggested that “enhancement” be included as well as “monitoring.”

Phil Mundy went through the Focus Group Workbook (Handout #1). He has looked at national and international programs for possible use as a monitoring template, but found none suitable. There are potential funding partners (e.g., Department of Defense). He discussed measurement standards, targeted end human uses, themes, change detection, site location, and incorporating community concerns. Hull said he wants to see a link between research and monitoring and using this information for the management of resources.

McCammon introduced the latest draft Annual Work Plan for 2001 (mailed to PAG). Some 114 proposals totaling \$13 million were received. At this point, 60 projects worth \$6.2 million are being considered. A funding cap of \$6.0 for research, monitoring and general restoration has been set for 2001.

Bob Spies went through the work plan, cluster by cluster (Handout #2 and #3): pink salmon; Pacific herring; SEA and related projects; cutthroat trout, dolly varden and other fish; marine mammals; nearshore ecosystem; seabird/forage fish and related projects; subsistence; reduction of marine pollution; habitat improvement; ecosystem synthesis/GEM transition; public information/science management/administration; project management; and restoration reserve.

Hull voiced his concern about how projects related to resource management, and wanted to know what was normal agency management. McCammon said this is a gray area, depending on many

factors. Rupe Andrews asked about the financial health of the Alaska SeaLife Center. McCammon said it was struggling through start-up but should be okay over time. Spies noted that income is close to operating expenses; the struggle is with the added costs of the bond debt. King thought a book on the restoration program would be a good idea, as would a project mapping seasonal distribution of seabirds. Chris Beck outlined a proposal he submitted (#494) related to recreation in PWS. He hopes to get it in shape to be accepted. McCammon replied that coordination with agencies who were dealing with this issue was needed. Cobb asked if matching funds for projects were still desired. McCammon said yes. Hull asked about the ASLC bench fees. Spies noted that Trustee Council projects get a reduced rate and that costs were high for projects involving care of live animals.

McCammon reviewed the administrative budget (Handout #4). She noted that the Trustee Council funding commitment to the Alaska Resource Library and Information System (ARLIS) is now a separate budget item. If the Council does not continue this support, all the oil spill volumes would transfer to the University of Alaska Anchorage. The Restoration Office has eliminated three staff positions and established one Special Assistant position, closed the Juneau office, and made other cuts to reduce the overhead budget. Peer review is still an expensive item.

Meacham voiced concern that little was being done with herring in FY2001 and that he would like to see the hydroacoustic project funded. Mundy said that a synthesis on herring research needs was needed before investing in more projects and that this project needed more work and there was no compelling need to move ahead on this now. There may be more than one herring stock in PWS, which greatly affects how it should be managed. He added that discussions need to occur to determine how to best proceed. McCammon said there was no single herring "guru" to seek advice from and that hydroacoustics was not accepted by Fish & Game as a management tool. Meacham said he felt we should move ahead anyway and solicit competitive bids for a project, if that is desired. Ed Zeine agreed as did Hull. Cobb said the whole of PWS should be surveyed.

Meacham moved (and Zeine seconded): That the PAG work group recommend that the Trustee Council set aside about \$75,000 for herring hydroacoustic studies and assessment in PWS, to include some level of assessment in non-traditional herring areas. Brodie said we need to figure the best way to spend money on herring first. Cobb and Buretta agreed with the motion. Hull said we don't need to define methods, but we do need stock information. Zeine emphasized that if a good proposal is not there, don't fund it, stick to current evaluation standards (Hull agreed). [There was no quorum, so no vote was taken.] McCammon said she would recommend \$85,000 to be set aside for added herring work via competitive proposals depending on a report on herring being done by Brenda Norcross and coming out this fall.

Hull questioned the use of king salmon in PWS for the tagging project, suggesting the Kenai River may be a better location. Beck said he would like to see a project to synthesize the science and disseminate information to users.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

#### **H. FOLLOW-UP:**

1. PAG members who wish to serve another term on the PAG must submit their intentions



- in writing to Womac by August 25, 2000.
2. McCammon will compile and distribute information on options for organizing a future PAG for the GEM program.
  3. McCammon will follow up on recommendations for additional work on herring stocks in PWS in FY2001.

**I. NEXT MEETINGS:**

- September 2000 (last week?) PAG Teleconference on small parcel agreement
- October 2000 (12-13) Annual EVOS Workshop on monitoring plan
- November (last week?) or December (first week) PAG Meeting on GEM monitoring plan
- Spring 2001 PAG Teleconference on miscellaneous issues
- July 2001 PAG Meeting on annual work plan

**J. ATTACHMENTS: (Handouts, for those not present)**

1. Focus Group Workbook for the Draft Gulf Ecosystem Monitoring Plan
2. Executive Director's Recommendation/FY01 Work Plan
3. Public comment Received: FY01 Draft Work Plan
4. FY01 Administrative Budget/Project 01100

**K. CERTIFICATION:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**PAG Chairperson**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

## Meeting Summary

**A. GROUP:** Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Public Advisory Group (PAG)

**B. DATE:** March 15, 2000

**C. LOCATION:** Anchorage, Alaska

**D. MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Rupert Andrews (Chair)	Sport Hunting & Fishing
Ed Zeine	Local Government
Torie Baker	Commercial Fishing
Chuck Meacham	Science/Academic
Pam Brodie	Environmental
Dave Cobb	Public-at-Large
Howard Valley	Forest Products
Dan Hull	Public-at-Large
Chris Beck	Public-at-Large
Chip Dennerlein	Conservation

**E. NOT REPRESENTED:**

Sheri Buretta	Subsistence
Jim King	Public-at-Large
Brenda Schwantes	Recreation User
Charles Totemoff	Native Landowners
Stacy Studebaker	Recreation User
Representative John Harris	Ex-officio
Senator Loren Leman	Ex-officio
Vacant	Aquaculture
Vacant	Commercial Tourism

**F. OTHER PARTICIPANTS:**

John Stroud	Alaska Dept of Natural Resources
Ken Adams	Cordova fisherman
Barat LaPorte	Patton Boggs
Valerie Pillian	Kodiak Area Native Association
Henry Tomingas	Ocean Explorers
Molly McCammon	Executive Director
Phil Mundy	Science Coordinator
Joe Hunt	Communications Coordinator
Sandra Schubert	Project Coordinator

Dr. Robert Spies  
Hugh Short  
Pamela Bergman  
Cherri Womac

Chief Scientist  
Community Involvement Coordinator  
Alternate Designated Federal Officer  
Trustee Council Restoration Office Staff

## **G. SUMMARY:**

Molly McCammon gave an update on Trustee activities: At its last meeting the Council adopted investment policies that set the guidelines on how they will make decisions on future investments of settlement funds. At their next meeting the Council will discuss the Trust Fund Asset Allocation Plan, including looking at various investment scenarios. They will also discuss Koniag. The Council is currently negotiating for the Karluk River and Lake areas within the Refuge and a conservation easement on lands owned by the Karluk IRA Council along the lower Karluk River, which include a Alaska Department of Fish and Game weir site. A motion will go before the Council to direct the Executive Director to develop a permanent habitat protection program to be administered by a non-profit organization. There are still a lot of legal questions. Senator Murkowski's bill opened up some new abilities giving the federal Trustees new granting authority.

Dan Hull expressed concern that non-profits would have control over public funds. What safeguards are there to protect the money? He would like to see more public input about where the money goes. Sandra Schubert replied the Council would have a role in the program, whether early on by reviewing a list of potential properties or at some other point having a say. If the money goes to a non-profit there would be strings attached.

McCammon discussed the development of GEM and getting it ready for the National Research Council (NRC) review. She also mentioned the April 15, 2000 deadline for FY 2001 proposals.

Pam Brodie asked if there had been any discussion on the future of the Public Advisory Group. McCammon said no, that is still two years away. It is the Council's goal to continue with the current process and recruit membership for the next two years.

Rupert Andrews asked if the Trustees would be focusing on investment strategies with the state treasury or in the private sector? How will they invite private investors? McCammon replied the Council is not that far along.

### **Public Comment at 9:15 a.m.**

Ken Adams a resident of Cordova and resource user offered comments on the GEM program. He is concerned about the direction GEM is going and the lack of public involvement in the process. He would like to see the SEA project information acknowledged and used in the document. He supports the Cordova District Fishermen United's (CDFU) recommendation of more nearshore focus in GEM.

Chuck Meacham would like to see the CDFU recommendation letter and wanted to know the make-up of the Sound Science Review Team (SSRT). Torie Baker replied it is an off shoot of the PWS Regional Planning Team (RFT).

Bob Spies responded we are all concerned for the resources that people extract from the area and that people care about in the region and want to understand how they change from year to year. SEA has not provided a complete set of deliverable data yet. He is looking forward to the information from the models developed by Dave Eslinger and Vincent Patrick. There have been tremendous changes to many of the resources in the spill area from the 1970's. There were drops in bird and harbor seal populations and salmon had gone up. What is happening cannot be ignored, both top-down and bottom-up systems should be examined as one system, not only in the spill region but also in Cook Inlet and the Gulf of Alaska.

Phil Mundy commented that GEM does not specify what is to be measured. At this stage it is a program, not a plan. It is a scientific backdrop against which the projects will be conducted. The SEA project is still relevant.

McCammon feels the heart of the GEM Program is Sections I-III in the draft, where the process is described. The Council will continue to focus on the spill region as long as there is lingering oil spill injury. The Council has heard the resources users' concerns about monitoring and will continue to pay attention. In GEM we have tried to focus on how to decide what will be monitored and it starts with what resources are important to the people. The SSRT addresses hatchery influence on wild stocks. Sections I-III set up the mission, the goals, looking at various elements of monitoring and research, as well as public information and involvement. The most difficult part, given the amount of money we have to work with, will be what should be the initial focus.

Over the next year the NRC will be looking at some of the questions the PAG has raised. What would be the most effective use of the money in terms of monitoring? The NRC doesn't hold public meetings, but we will try to get at least one meeting where the public is invited.

Baker asked if the NRC was a peer review process or a sounding board for questions? McCammon replied it is a combination of both. They will look at the Council's past programs, scientific literature, and the Council's commitment to long-term research and monitoring. There isn't enough money to do everything, What is the bare minimum to get some indication of change over time? Mundy said the review will ask these questions: Did we get the science right? Did we miss or misinterpret anything? We are looking for strategies, guidance on what is the best scientific thinking at this time, and the most economical means. Meacham was involved in a NRC review; they look at the larger concept and the specifics. Adams stressed the need for public input.

McCammon gave a brief overview of what has been added and changed in the GEM document. We added an Executive Summary and Human Uses was renamed

Socioeconomic Profiles. We added Commercial Fishing and Hatchery Production in Prince William Sound, Cook Inlet and Kodiak. We beefed up Fishery and Ecosystem Based Management, Marine Habitat Protection and influence of continued expansion in urban areas and suburban zones. The mission statement was changed to include sustainability. The Geographic Scope is still within the spill area, but added the concept of watersheds. The funding potential was updated. Governance is the same. Structure and approach was really revised. We beefed up long-term monitoring to clarify it is the combination of what resources are important to the people as well as what resources are indicators of change. Short-term Research remained the same as did Administration and Management, they were just compressed. We beefed up Public Information and Involvement. This document is responsive to the input received at various meetings with Cook Inlet RCAC, Prince William Sound RCAC, Cook Inlet Keeper, CDFU, Board of Fisheries in Valdez, a public hearing in Cordova, Alaska Marine Conservation Council, Nature Conservancy's Science Program, Audubon, AWRTA, UAA Environmental Studies Program, American Fisheries Society, several meetings with fishermen's groups, and public and environmental groups in Kodiak.

Chip Dennerlein feels the changes are an improvement, it is a useful foundation document. It adds value to science.

Hull feels the changes to Sections II-III were good, appreciated seeing human uses of resources added to the mission statement. He still feels goals are disconnected from how they will be achieved. How do institutional and programmatic goals connect? How will the distribution of funding be determined? What will it be based on?

McCammon it depends on the type of monitoring, \$2 to 2.5 million. If we are trying to monitor human use or disturbance it could be higher. Spies, even within the monitoring program, there has been a set of measurements that are highly conservative and protective in order to be assured that you are measuring the same thing at the same place on some sort of regular basis so you can establish long-term trends. Mundy, you can't specify what portion will be spent until you know what it is you need to know. McCammon, we are not thinking of a \$10 million monitoring program. That is the big question to the NRC. Do you get sufficient coverage of enough measurements to be able to get an indication of change over time given that? Another aspect is the investment scenario we choose.

Hull can you explain how the program goals can be addressed through the institutional goals? McCammon that question is better addressed to the Council, they are very committed to the institutional goals as a way of identifying gaps, leveraging, and working together. The Council is frustrated by the lack of coordination and leadership. You can provide leadership and coordination if you have the money. Hull that would require EVOS funds to have a significant influence over how agencies do their business. McCammon, yes. EVOS funds would have influence over other funds. Spies there are tremendous advantage to be able to leverage funds. It will involve a lot of partnership building. Mundy, "the art of leading from behind." McCammon, we can't tell people

what to do, but we can provide forums and the processes for people to work together. Spies we are hoping the program will have the momentum to draw more people and programs in. Hull, leadership isn't just governmental agencies that GEM serves.

Chris Beck likes the changes that have been made and the goal clarifications. He looks forward to seeing the informed goal flushed out. That is one of the least successful parts of the last 10-year effort. Leadership without money requires building a framework of opportunities for lots of people to be involved.

Dennerlein would like to see GEM organized differently. The Trustees are the governance link between GEM, the institutional goals and their agency leadership.

Baker during today's discussion we have gotten a better understanding of GEM. Unfortunately the following ideas weren't clearly reflected in the draft. 1) This is a program not a plan, and 2) it is not going to the NRC signed, sealed and delivered. There is nothing in the document that says we don't have all the deliverables from the SEA program.

McCammon what are the elements that are going to stand the test of time, that are going to be the framework of a long-term program? What are the elements that will constantly be changing, modifying and building over time?

Andrews reviewed the conceptual model and thought it was good as it stands, moving it to an appendix would weaken it.

Hull it is important information, but can't relate program goals to the scientific questions. It should be an appendix.

Mundy this is a wish list of questions compiled by the Council, the Chief Scientist, and comments received from the scientific community and public.

Beck there is the part that will evolve and change. The physical structure of the document is more powerful than a paragraph at the beginning of one of these sections that people will invariably ignore when getting to the heart of the model and find themselves thinking that they are looking at the heart of GEM.

Baker agrees with Chris, this is a masterful scientific program. The Trustees owe it to the program to beef up the two goals, inform and solve. What is the involvement going to be like, what are the management tools, how is it going to apply?

Dennerlein it is important to show the scientific process and right methodology. There is a fundamental difference. We can honor the state of the evolution of our scientific thinking by not building it into the same principle foundation of the document and it is mistaken as it becomes a bureaucracy of the conceptual model rather than a scientific method where this approach informs the next approach.

Beck Sections I-III are the principles that don't change. Section IV is the context as it exists today, that will obviously change.

Dennerlein the principles are well thought through and money, seed money at any level, is a strong leadership tool.

Mundy the model does what it is designed to do.

McCammon sees GEM in three potential volumes: 1) Description of the program and process. 2) Science as we know it today (which could include everything from the ecological setting, to the model, to the scientific questions, to the long-term monitoring), it is the wish list of everything we know or don't know today. And 3) is the first RFP, (knowing all that and knowing that we still don't have enough money) what is it that we are really going to try to do in the first 5-10 years? What is our research and monitoring plan for the first 5-10 years?

Dennerlein encouraged more on adaptive management be added. Mundy said there will be more on adaptive management we just ran out of time, but now with further encouragement from the PAG, it will be followed through on.

Beck the third part, "What are people collecting and doing?" What are the gaps in the contextual information? Translate research into a State of the Gulf; use the process of monitoring to get a fresh look at what the real environmental issues and challenges are. What are the issues available to deal with those issues, those problems? GEM is in a unique position to fill many needs both with governments and public concerns.

Schubert looked at a narrower question, the structure of other public advisory groups, yet Chris referred to a larger question, "How do these groups involve the public?" Chris' question would take more work, but be easier to find samples of. She looked at groups with a regional focus that had a similar mission of education and stewardship. They are mostly non-profit; they typically have public membership and no public advisory group. She also looked at government groups that had advisory groups and found that the members were technical experts whose advice was more authoritative than advisory. You have to decide what the purpose of the group will be before you can decide what the membership will be.

Hull we should go back to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council as a possible model, they serve some of the same purposes as this PAG. Dennerlein the National Park System has the National Leadership Council that is comprised of the regional directors of the agency; they make the decisions with the director and the secretary. This PAG has improved over the years. Schubert you have to decide whether the advisory group has a real decision making function or just an information exchange function.

Dennerlein the governance structure of the council needs to define how they want to use the advisory group. This meeting has been very informative, learned a lot. When you asked about making an appendix, it brought it all together, eliminated some of the confusion

Beck as Sandra pointed out, defining the goals is the right way and Chip has laid out the way to do it. We serve as a sounding board, help set priorities, offer substantive advice, and are a keeper of the mission function. It would be helpful to have a group of public that could be asked if we are providing the needed information, such as planners and political entities? Political support and fund raising are other aspects of the advisory group's role. McCammon the Council has never viewed the PAG as its only source of public input and involvement. When talking about the issue of public advice, we want to look at other elements, not just the PAG. A key element of the program is going to be using citizen monitoring, whether through the GLOBE program and students or Youth Area Watch, the community, and the village folks who are interested in natural resources. Dennerlein the PAG cannot be mistaken for the public.

Hull this has been the most productive meeting he's attended, because we fulfilled our role: to inform, make recommendations, and provide an interface between the public and the Council. All meetings should be timely to have appropriate input in the Trustee Council decision making process. We need to improve communications with the Trustees by being a little more formal. He would like to see more specifics in the meeting summaries. He would like to see the summaries before they are finalized.

McCammon it is difficult to get and keep a quorum. Doug prepares the meeting summaries and Sandra, Cherri and I review them. One of the things about the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council is their advisory group meet two or three days before the council. They use the same agenda as the council. The council's meetings are scheduled three years in advance. We have tried to get the participation and attention of the top, key people in all these agencies so our meetings have not been firmly scheduled.

Baker how flexible is this document? Will we see GEM again as it evolves?

McCammon depending up the Council's action and based on the PAG and other participant input, I'm proposing that they adopt for the next level of review this draft with a list of suggested revisions. Then it will go to the NRC. I'm proposing they have five meetings in Alaska. Their purpose is not to take public comment or do a public review, but to provide a scientific, technical review of the program. The NRC will be meeting with the Community Facilitators. I have asked that there be an opportunity for public comment at one of their meetings. It will be advertised. We will receive the NRC's tentative recommendations in the fall, with the final report in January 2001. Then a written report two or three months later. Now it looks like the tentative recommendations won't be available until November or December 2001.

Baker from Chuck's comments, we understand that it is a scientific review, but now through comments at this meeting I realize we are interested in the public aspect of it and



how it will be handled further. McCammon it will be worked on more in the next two years. Baker when do you see this beefed up endeavor available for public comment? McCammon not for some time. We have a science plan for monitoring and research. We will be developing a data management plan. Do we need a public involvement plan? Baker a lot of good work has already been done on the science portion of it, but where do we go now with public involvement? This has been a very productive meeting.

Andrews putting the GEM on the web, was a wise step. It makes it more accessible to more people.

Ed Zeine appreciates the work that has gone into the GEM. It is a terrific program for the Gulf and appreciates seeing so much effort going into it.

Adjourn 12:40 p.m.

**H. NEXT MEETINGS:**

July 19, 2000 – 7 p.m. public comment on Draft FY 2001 Work Plan, Restoration Office, Anchorage

July 20, 2000 – 8:30 a.m. Public Advisory Group meeting, EVOS Office, FY 2001 Draft Work Plan

August 3, 2000 – Trustee Council meeting on Draft FY 2001 Work Plan

October 10-11, 2000 – Annual Workshop

**J. ATTACHMENTS:**

**K. CERTIFICATION:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**PAG Chairperson**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

## Meeting Summary

A. **GROUP:** Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Public Advisory Group (PAG)

B. **DATE:** February 10, 2000

C. **LOCATION:** Anchorage, Alaska

D. **MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

Chuck Meacham (Chair)	Science/Academic
Torie Baker*	Commercial Fishing
Chris Beck*	Public-at-Large
Pamela Brodie	Environmental
Sheri Buretta	Subsistence
Chip Dennerlein*	Conservation
Dan Hull	Public-at-Large
Jim King	Public-at-Large
Brenda Schwantes*	Public-at-Large
Bruce Bruseth for John Harris*	Alaska State House of Representative ( <i>ex officio</i> )
*part of meeting	

E. **NOT REPRESENTED:**

Rupert Andrews	Sport Hunting and Fishing
Dave Cobb	Public-at-Large
Stacy Studebaker	Recreation User
Charles Totemoff	Native Landowners
Ed Zeine	Local Government
Senator Loren Leman	Alaska State Senate ( <i>ex officio</i> )
vacant	Aquaculture
vacant	Commercial Tourism

F. **OTHER PARTICIPANTS:**

Molly McCammon	Trustee Council, Executive Director
Sandra Schubert	Trustee Council, Project Coordinator
Phil Mundy	Trustee Council, Science Coordinator
Joe Hunt	Trustee Council, Communications Coordinator
Hugh Short	Trustee Council, Community Involvement Coordinator
George Rose	Memorial University of Newfoundland, Marine Institute
Elena Sparrow	University of Alaska Fairbanks
Patty Brown-Schwalenberg	Chugach Regional Resources Commission

Bob Shavelson  
Doug Mutter  
Cherri Womac

Cook Inlet Keeper  
Designated Federal Office, Dept. of Interior  
Trustee Council Restoration Office Staff

## G. SUMMARY:

### 1. Community Involvement Efforts

George Rose presented the Newfoundland and Labrador Inshore Sentinel Survey, a program of fishers and scientists working together to improve stock assessments. It uses local knowledge and scientific methods to sample designated sites and favored personal fishing sites of local fishermen. Participating fishers are trained at Memorial University in St. Johns. Time series data of catch rates by fishing gear throughout the region are collected (the original target was cod, but other species are also recorded). Oceanographic data is also collected. The data enhances any other data being collected by the Dept. of Fish and Ocean Sciences. The data is entered by the University and discussed with the sentinel fishers before being provided to the Dept. Funding originally came from federal government, but program costs are now offset by selling catches. The program began mid 90's and is designed to continue long term. It is year-round program, even in areas closed to commercial fishing. The initial start up cost was high, but to keep it going is modest.

Two challenges facing the program are overcoming the skepticism of some scientists and ensuring the data is incorporated into the stock assessment process.

1:30 p.m. - Public Comment - none

Dr. Elena Sparrow provided information about the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment (GLOBE) program. The mission of this international program is to enhance individuals' environmental awareness, increase scientific understanding of the earth and improve student achievement in science and math. The program is implemented through primary and secondary schools. Teachers are trained and provided materials (an instrument kit); grant funds support the training and kit purchase. Students collect data near their schools and report their data through the Internet. They are currently doing a study on changes in the length of the growing season. There are 62 GLOBE schools in Alaska, three in the spill area: Kodiak High School, and in Nanwalek and Port Graham.

Bob Shavelson gave an overview of the Cook Inlet Keeper water quality monitoring program. Located in Homer, they are a part of the National Alliance of Keepers. The program began with \$200,000 in funds from a legal settlement. They conducted public meetings and looked into a variety of other programs, before settling on a citizen-based water quality monitoring program. The program, which was developed with the advice of a Technical Advisory Committee and a Citizens Advisory Panel, includes strenuous quality control protocols and has been approved by both DEC and EPA. Monitors are required to participate in a four-part training program and an

annual refresher course. Each site is monitored by a team. This allows for coverage during work, vacation, or illness. Sites are located near people's homes in fresh estuaries. The sites must be convenient to get monitors to be consistent in their sampling. Data collected is submitted to EPA and DEC - the data parameters parallel the US Clean Water Act. The program began as a pilot in Kachemak Bay and has now expanded to other locations in the Cook Inlet watershed, including Kenai River, Anchorage bowl, and Mat-Su. Annual cost of the program is roughly \$150,000-200,000. The money comes from EPA, DEC and private foundations. They will soon link to Internet and GIS. The program has been in existence for four years.

Patty Brown-Schwalenberg summarized duties and responsibilities of Chugach Regional Resources Commission (CRRC) natural resource managers in several communities in the spill area. She also outlined how CRRC is planning to expand the program, including a plan for CRRC to eventually facilitate all the natural resource and environmental programs for the region.

There are seven tribes in the Chugach Region. The Tatitlek program (example provided in a handout) is based on the Lac du Flambeau Tribe's (located in Wisconsin) program. The first steps are a Memorandum of Understanding for management/data collection and a regionwide natural resource plan.

Molly McCammon advised the PAG that the "Invitation to Submit Restoration Proposals for Federal Fiscal Year 2001" is at the printer. The Council is seeking proposals to develop conceptual prototypes of community-based marine monitoring programs.

Chris Beck asked if the Council is looking for clarification or just to flush out a concept and how it would take effect.

Dan Hull thinks tour boats and commercial traffic in PWS could collect samples because they go through sound on a regular schedule. Commercial fishermen could count spawners in fall.

Torie Baker agrees marine environment monitoring is needed, and said the challenge is to ensure managers use the data collected.

Chip Dennerlein suggests a partnership with lodge operators interested in eco-tourism for monitoring, e.g., support facilities for people, use commercial guides.

Chuck Meacham encouraged moving ahead with the invitation for community monitoring. The opportunities are limitless.

Beck said the Alaska Wilderness, Recreation and Tourism Association (AWRTA) wants to submit a proposal and coordinate with CRRC to include an education element.

McCammon reminded the PAG the Trustee Council is not thinking in specifics at this point. They are looking at the concept. The concept is a key element in Gulf Ecosystem Monitoring

program (GEM). GEM is in need of partners to make it happen.

Dennerlein said agencies may need to add a science outreach coordinator to assist in program guidance.

## 2. Update on Trustee Council activities

McCammon gave an update on Trustee Council activities.

- Investments: The Trustee Council is working on transition of funds from court to another entity.
- Invitation to Submit Restoration Proposals for Federal Fiscal Year 2001 is due out February 15, 2000.
- Habitat: Discuss future of a habitat program. Koniag, Karluk/Sturgeon negotiations are in progress. The Trustee Council requested a list by June 15 of small parcel commitments over next two years. An updated Habitat Status Report will be sent to the PAG.
- Continue planning for GEM. On March 3, 2000 a new draft will be available on the web. GEM goes to the NRC in April. A draft with recommendations and responses will be out in the fall 2000. The Council will accept comments on GEM anytime. It is an ongoing process.

## 3. Future public involvement

Doug Mutter provided an overview of documents governing the PAG including the Memorandum of Agreement signed in 1991 which calls for establishment of a PAG, FACA guidelines on public notice, etc., the PAG Charter signed by the Secretary of the Interior in 1997 which anticipates continuation of the PAG to January 2002, and the PAG's Background & Guidelines. Membership nominations and renewal of the charter are due again in October 2000. It will be the last PAG under the current program. Copies of the sections mentioned will be provided to the PAG with the summary.

McCammon offered the following for discussion:

Can you have meaningful public involvement without a PAG? If no, how should PAG be structured in the future? How should it be run?

Is there a need for separate PAGs for habitat and for GEM?

Should it be smaller?

Should the make up change?

Sandra Schubert offered information she had gathered on other organizations' advisory groups. The Marine Mammal Commission has an Alaska Native advisor in addition to a scientific advisory group. The North Pacific Fisheries Management Council and the Arctic Research Commission also have citizen advisory councils.

McCammon asked whether the PAG should be kept the same for the next two years and change in October 2002.

Pam Brodie feels the role of the PAG has shifted from giving advice to receiving briefings. It would be appropriate to reduce or eliminate the PAG, but maintain an open public process. She thinks the PAG should be eliminated in the next two years or at least reduce the number of seats. If the PAG is kept, it should represent both habitat and science.

Meacham stated that the PAG budget has shrunk.

Dennerlein concurs with Pam. It has been good at scoping. There is a need for oversight, and a group that can provide a check and balance: agencies, peer review scientists, citizens.

Beck agrees with Chip. There are lots of decisions to be made in the next few years and the PAG can help steer the course. He asks that the Council look at other regional groups for a model to follow. Sandra will continue to do research on other advisory groups.

Hull feels a group like the PAG should continue. It may be more important now than ever. Can't advise on composition until know the focus of GEM. Advise the same PAG for both GEM and habitat, the benefits from sharing perspectives as one group are best.

Sheri Buretta thinks the PAG facilitates education among the various interest groups. It is better to meet face-to-face.

Meacham sees possibility for separate PAGs for habitat and science. A role for the PAG under GEM could be to ensure community involvement is more integrated into the process. PAG should be modified to be more effective, though he isn't sure how. Noted the PAG budget reduced from \$113,000 in FY 99 to \$21,000 FY 00.

Dennerlein thinks the PAG should continue for major decisions, such as GEM, investments, and habitat.

Brenda Schwantes thinks term limits should be set on membership to encourage "new blood" and maybe different interest groups.

Mutter says trends are toward collaboration and inclusion.

Baker suggests staggered terms.

McCammon indicated the PAG is not the only connection to public involvement. The Council and staff have never viewed the PAG as the only meaningful way to have public participation. The Trustees have benefited from using the PAG as a sounding board.

Beck says a formal body forces a more reflective attitude, much better than a forum (such as public hearings) where you simply make your pitch.

Dennerlein says function should come before form. Need to know function of PAG before can debate its structure. Suggests possibly one PAG for both science and habitat, but with specialized committees that would come together at times.

Hull suggested an earlier meeting than April 5, to review GEM before it goes to the National Research Council (NRC).

#### **H. FOLLOW-UP:**

The PAG will meet by teleconference March 15, 2000 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. for another GEM review and discussion on possible options for PAG make-up. Sandra Schubert will also explore other advisory group options.

#### **I. NEXT MEETINGS:**

February 29, 2000 -1 p.m. Trustee Council teleconference, Restoration Office, Anchorage  
March 15, 2000 - 9 a.m.-1 p.m. Public Advisory Group teleconference, Restoration Office, Anchorage  
March 16, 2000 - 1 p.m. Trustee Council meeting, NMFS conference room, Juneau  
July 19, 2000 - 7 p.m. public comment on FY 2001 Draft Work Plan, Restoration Office, Anchorage  
July 20, 2000 - 8:30 a.m. Public Advisory Group meeting, EVOS Office, FY 2001 Draft Work Plan

#### **J. ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Tatitlek Village IRA Council Traditional Natural Resource Management Program
2. Excerpts from MOA, PAG Charter, and PAG Background & Guidelines

#### **K. CERTIFICATION:**

---

**PAG Chairperson**

---

**Date**